CITY DIONYSIA AND ATHENIAN DEMOCRACY*

BY
W. R. CONNOR

One of the most characteristic institutions of classical Athens was its civic celebration in honor of Dionysus - each year in late March the statue of Dionysus Eleuthereus was removed from its temple in the city, brought to the Academy and then escorted back with great pomp; contests of dithyrambs, tragedies and comedies were held and the work and business of the city temporarily gave way to festivity.[1] During the period of Athens' greatest dominance the Dionysia provided an occasion for the city to celebrate its power, display its wealth and proclaim its vitality both to its own citizens and to foreign visitors. In this period the tribute contributed by Athens' allies was displayed in the orchestra of the theatre of Dionysus.[2] The orphaned children of those who had died for Athens in war paraded in the theatre in full armor, and honors were proclaimed for those who had done good service to the city.

The City Dionysia was clearly a central part of the life of democratic Athens. Yet this festival is commonly thought to have been established in a pre-democratic period, perhaps by the tyrant Peisistratus. The conventional view is succinctly set forth by J. Winkler in his stimulating article on the Athenian *ephebeia*:

* This paper has benefitted from the discussion at the the Liberty Fund colloquium on Democracy held at Boston University in 1987 and from the suggestions of colleagues and students at Princeton. I must especially mention David Rosenbloom's incisive criticisms and help and the bibliographical assistance of Burke Rogers. Froma Zeitlin's stimulation and encouragement have been crucial at every stage of the project.

[1] Among the most important discussions of the Dionysia are L. Deubner *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932) 134-42, A. W. Pickard-Cambridge *Dramatic Festivals of Athens* second edition, revised by John Gould and D. M. Lewis (Oxford 1968) 57-125, Erica Simon *Festivals of Attica* (Madison 1983) 101-104; H. W. Parke *Festivals of the Athenians* (Ithaca 1977) 125-36.

[2] Isocrates *de pace* 82; cf. Pickard-Cambridge *DFA*[2] 58. Simon Goldhill in 'The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology' in *JHS* 107 (1987) discusses the relationship to Aristophanes *Acharnians* 496ff.

> ... the history of performances at the City Dionysia is marked by three stages: τραγῷδοι first performed under the direction of Thespis in 534 B.C.E. ... ; prizes for men's and boy's dithyrambs are added at the time of the constitutional reforms of Kleisthenes, 508 B.C.E; κωμῷδοι are introduced as a prize category in 486 B.C.E.[3]

This chronology fits neatly with the view that »Peisistratos invented or elaborated the City Dionysia to please the common people.«[4] Such a theory has gained wide currency, yet a closer look at the evidence raises serious doubts about it. This paper explores an alternative view — the possibility that, although there were various local celebrations in honor of Dionysus in early Attica, there was no state sponsored celebration in the city itself until a few years after the overthrow of the Peisistratid regime, when the City Dionysia was established.[5] If this alternative view proves correct, the new festival may have been developed in part as a celebration of the new freedom and civic order that Athens enjoyed.

The argument is initially chronological, exploring the reasons for believing that the City Dionysia was established in the last decade of the sixth century B.C., after the fall of the Peisistratid tyranny. This chronology leads to a reconsideration of the festival itself in the second part of this paper. The conclusion of that section — that the festival is in part a celebration of the freedom which Athenians saw as an important feature of their democracy — requires some discussion, necessarily tentative, about the relation between the festival and the literary forms that flourished in this setting. Tragedy in particular, it will be suggested, needs to be understood within this festival context.

I.

The aetiologies for the cult of Dionysus Eleuthereus provide a mythologized version of the institution of the festival. Pausanias 1.2.5 describes a building near the place where he entered the city. It held, he says, ceramic images of Amphictyon, king of Athens, shown feasting Dionysus and other

[3] J. Winkler 'The Ephebes' Song' *Representations* Summer 1985 41.
[4] Ibid. p. 45.
[5] On local celebrations in honor of Dionysus see D. Whitehead *Demes of Attica* (Princeton 1986) 212 ff. There are fourteen known deme theatres in Attica.

gods. Pausanias adds »Here also is Pegasus of Eleutherae, who introduced the god to the Athenians. Herein he was helped by the oracle at Delphi, which called to mind that the god once dwelt in Athens in the days of Icarius«.[6]

Some scholars have thought this a historical account concerning the actual person who was responsible for the transfer of the cult to Athens.[7] More likely it is mythic and part of a series of stories and folk-tales such as that found in the scholia to Aristophanes *Acharnians* 243. In this version Pegasus brought an image of Dionysus to Athens but the Athenians rejected it. They were then afflicted with a disease of the genitals — an affliction commemorated by the carrying of *phalloi* in the procession at the city Dionysia.[8]

Scholars have long recognized that these aetiologies indicate that the City Dionysia must be linked to the incorporation of the town of Eleutherae into Attica, an event described by Pausanias, who says that Eleutherae formerly formed the boundary between Attica and Boeotia

> but when it came over to the Athenians henceforth the boundary of Boeotia was Cithaeron. The reason why the people of Eleutherae came over was not because they were reduced by war but because they desired to share Athenian citizenship and hated the Thebans. In this plain is a temple of Dionysus, from which the old image (*xoanon*) was taken to the Athenians.[9]

The classical form of the city festival in honor of Dionysus is likely then to be a result of the annexation of Eleutherae. This much is widely accep-

[6] Pausanias 1.2.5, trans. W. H. S. Jones.

[7] E. g. H. W. Parke (above, note 1) 126.

[8] See also Suda s. v. *melan* (mu 451) which reports the daughters of Eleuther saw Dionysus in an apparition and criticized the black aegis he wore. In his anger Dionysus drove them mad until Eleuther received an oracle to honor Dionysus Melanaegis as a way of stopping their affliction; cf. W. Burkert 'Herodot über die Namen der Götter' *Museum Helveticum* 42 (1985) 122 n. 3.

[9] Pausanias 1.38.8, trans. W. H. S. Jones, modified. Ernst Badian has pointed out that the text of Pausanias admits the possibility that the *xoanon* had been conveyed to Athens before the incorporation of Eleutherae into Attica. The site of Eleutherae may be below the hill of Gypthokastro; see J. Ober *Fortress Attica* (Leiden 1985) 223 and his publication of pottery from the site in *Hesperia*, forthcoming. See also L. Chandler 'The North-west Frontier of Attica' *JHS* 46 (1946) 1-21, and note 14, below.

ted. But when did the annexation take place? The conventional answer is in Peisistratid times.[10] This, however, is unlikely, for two reasons.

First, as G. Shrimpton has pointed out, the Peisistratids were cautious in their foreign policy towards Boeotia.[11] The annexation of a border town such as Eleutherae would be most unlikely as long as such a policy prevailed. Second, Eleutherae was not incorporated in the Cleisthenic system of demes.[12] Residents of Eleutherae may have been given certain privileges of citizenship, but their town did not become one of the official demes. The most likely explanation of this is that the town was acquired after that system had been implemented. Both of these considerations point to a date after ca. 508/7 for the annexation of Eleutherae.[13]

The likely setting for such an annexation is the military success (probably in 506 B.C.) which Athens enjoyed in the campaigns described by Herodotus:

> So when the Spartan army had broken up from its quarters thus ingloriously, the Athenians wishing to revenge themselves, marched first against the Chalcideans. The Boeotians, however, advancing to the aid of the latter as far as the

[10] For example: M. P. Nilsson *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics* (Lund, 1951) 26 f.; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge *DFA*[2] 58.

[11] G. Shrimpton 'When did Plataea Join Athens?' *Classical Philology* 79 (1984) 296. Shrimpton's argument that Plataea received a limited form of Athenian *politeia* ca. 506 and then became an independent polis allied with Athens ca. 479 entails the emendation of Thucydides 3.68.5 to read *pentekostoi* rather than *enenekostoi*. I find Shrimpton's case plausible, but one need not go so far as he does to recognize that the annexation of a town such as Eleutherae would be a highly provocative act. The relationships between this area and Attica in the late sixth century are likely to have been very complex. Is it possible that the establishment of the resistance fort at Leipsydrion on the slopes of Mt. Parnes resulted in an alliance (ca. 519) between Plataea and the *opposition* forces in Attica? The chronology of the Leipsydrion resistance is uncertain: see Rhodes on *Athenaion Politeia* 19.3; although it is widely assumed that the Alcmaeonids and others remained until after the assassination of Hipparchus ca. 514, there is no clear evidence of their presence in Athens after the 520's.

[12] See for example *IG* I[2] 943 = Meiggs and Lewis *Greek Historical Inscriptions* no. 48 l. 96, redated by W. K. Pritchett *Greek State at War* IV (Berkeley 1985) 183 f. to 447 B.C. My colleague Froma Zeitlin called my attention to Pritchett's redating by sharing with me a valuable letter from Josiah Ober (dated 10 January 1987), which has been helpful on other points as well. The failure to incorporate Eleutherae into the deme system is easily explained by the complex system of bouleutic representation; the Athenians would understandably be reluctant to change this system so soon after its adoption.

[13] For a different view: F. J. Frost 'Toward a History of Peisistratid Athens' in J. Eadie and J. Ober (eds.) *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Festschrift for C. G. Starr* (Lanham 1985) 69 f.

> Euripus, the Athenians thought it best to attack them first. A battle was fought accordingly, and the Athenians gained a very complete victory, killing a vast number of the enemy, and taking 700 of them alive. After this, on the very same day, they crossed into Euboea, and engaged the Chalcideans with like success.
>
> Herodotus 5. 77, trans. Rawlinson

The picture that emerges is a coherent one. After the overthrow of the Peisistratids their policy of friendship with Boeotia was abandoned. The Athenian military success against Chalcis and Boeotia changed the balance of power in the region. This is the logical context for Eleutherae to ask to be incorporated into Attica, or for the Athenians to further consolidate their control over the border territory between themselves and Boeotia. The symbolism of joining a town of this name to Attica would also be welcome – especially in a setting about which Herodotus observed:

> Thus did the Athenians increase in strength. And it is plain enough, not from this instance only but from many everywhere, that freedom (*isēgorie*) is an excellent thing; since even the Athenians, who, while they continued under the rule of tyrants, were not a whit more valiant than any of their neighbours, no sooner shook off the yoke (*eleutherothentōn*) than they became decidedly the first of all.
>
> Herodotus 5. 78, trans. Rawlinson

It would not be surprising if the annexation of Eleutherae were marked by some addition to Athenian cults. The analogy of the earlier annexation of Eleusis naturally makes one look for the some linkage between the prominent local cult and the city of Athens itself. Processions were especially appropriate for such purposes. The pattern of the City Dionysia seems ideal: the statue of the god Dionysus Eleuthereus was first brought to Athens and housed in a sanctuary, then it was annually moved to a place near the Academy.[14] Thence a procession escorted it back to Athens, and festivities

[14] The title »Eleuthereus« is regular for Dionysus. The ethnic used for the person from Eleutherae in *IG* 1^2 943 is *Eleutherathen*. The epithet *Eleutheriōs*, as Kurt Raaflaub *Entdeckung der Freiheit* (Munich 1985) 133f. points out, was restricted to Zeus (or in one case Helios). The connotations connecting Eleutherae to *eleutheria* must have been especially welcome to the Athenians at this juncture. Is it possible in the light of our persistent

were held in honor of the god. The pattern was appropriate for a festival of integration but could easily grow into a celebration of Athenian freedom and might.[15] These consideration suggest a date a few years after 506 B.C. for the introduction of the cult of Dionysus Eleuthereus and for the beginning of the City Dionysia.[16] In such a context the cult would be a celebration of the success of the system that had replaced the Peisitratid regime.[17]

This chronology is consistent with our other major evidence concerning the beginning of the City Dionysia, IG II^2 2318, the so-called Fasti, or record of victories in the festival. This important document has a fragmentary heading and lacks two or possibly three of the left hand columns. Hence »it is uncertain with what year it began, though it claims to go back to the beginning of *komoi* in honour of Dionysus, whatever this expression means. It certainly would not have gone back as far as 534 B.C., in or about which year Thespis won a prize for tragedy ... perhaps the most probable view places the beginning of the record in or about 501 B.C.«[18]

This summary alludes to the heading, which, it is widely agreed, reads:

[ΠΡΩ]ΤΟΝ ΚΩΜΟΙ ΗΣΑΝ Τ[ΩΙ ΔΙΟΝΥΣ]ΩΙ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΙ Δ[

for the first time there were *komoi* to Dionysus, tragedies ...

In their discussion of the inscription Gould and Lewis suggest that the inscription may have begun:

uncertainty about the topography of the area that Eleutherae was actually a *renaming* of some other town in the region, e. g. Hysiae? On the location of Hysiae: W. K. Pritchett *Studies in Topography* I (Berkeley 1965) 103 ff.; G. Shrimpton *CP* 79 (1984) 297, n. 9, J. Ober *Fortress Attica* (Leiden 1985) 119, 121.

[15] On the military aspects of Cleisthenes' work see P. Siewert *Die Trittyen Attikas* (Munich 1982).

[16] It is likely that the cult of Demokratia, attested in *IG* II^2 5029a et alibi, was also established in the period between 508/7 and ca. 450. See M. Hansen *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 11.3 (1986) 35f.

[17] Ernst Badian has pointed out that Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* 6.17.2 indicates that in Rome a temple of Liber, Ceres and Libera (i. e. the analogues to Dionysus, Demeter and Persephone) was established in 496 B.C., not long after the overthrow of the tyrants. It later became a place of sanctuary for the plebs. Note that *liber* and *eleutheria* are cognate: E. Benveniste *Le vocabulaire des institution indoeurop.* I (Paris 1968) 323. On the identification of Liber with the Dionysus from Eleutherae see Alexander Polyhistor *FGrHist* 273 F 109.

[18] Pickard-Cambridge *DFA*^{2} 71 f. The evidence is discussed more fully in the Appendix to Chapter II pp. 101-197. the reorganization of the Athenian military command in 501 B.C. (*Athenaion Politeia* 22) is a striking convergence, if Winkler (above, note 3) 29 is correct in arguing that the Dionysia was a »social event focused precisely on the ephebes«.

ἐπὶ ... ἄρχοντος πρῶτον κῶμοι ἦσαν τῷ Διονύσῳ, τραγῳδοὶ δὲ ἐπὶ ..., κωμῳδοὶ δὲ ἐπὶ Τελεσίνου (488/7 B.C.).[19]

The missing letters after *epi* would include the name of the eponymous archon for the year in which the choruses were established. There would then follow the familiar indications that tragedies were included at some point between 501/0 and 487/6, and comedy in the archonship of Telesinos (487/6) B.C..

This is a very attractive restoration, but it leaves unresolved the question of what happened in the first of these years. Under the now conventional view we must assume that the old city Dionysia of Thespis' day was somehow restructured at this date. Gould and Lewis, for example, in their revision of Pickard- Cambridge's *Dramatic Festivals of Athens* follow Capps and Wilhelm in the view that the »festival was reorganized and the chorègic system introduced at that time« (p.103). While the choregic system may indeed have been instituted at this time, the heading of the inscription points in a different direction — to the *first* establishment of a civic festival for Dionysus.

A more economical construction of the evidence is the following: The plays of Thespis and of several other early Attic tragic poets were performed in rural Dionysia, and only later were tragic performances regularly held in the city.[20] The first form of the City Dionysia began between 509 and 501 B.C. (probably at the latter date) and took the form of a ritualized revel, a *komos*. This may well have included dithyrambic choruses.[21] Soon thereafter tragic and then comic performances were added to the festival until its fully developed classical form was achieved.[22] The sequence in which these literary forms were, in this view, added to the festival is consistent with Aris-

[19] Ibid. p. 101.

[20] If the Olympiad dates provided by the entries in the Suda are correct, the first tragedies of Choirilos (523-0) and Phrynicos (511-08) were earlier than the date this paper suggests for the establishment of the City Dionysia.

[21] The Marmor Parium *FGrHist* 239 A 46 assigns to the archonship of one Lysagoras (between 510 and 508) the first contest of *choroi andron*. If we assume these were dithyrambic choruses, they are likely to have been part of the celebration of the overthrow of the Peisistratids. At a later date the dithyrambs would have been incorporated within the new City Dionysia. Note, however, the presence of similar choruses in the Thargelia and the Panathenaea: Lysias 21.1 f. cf. Euripides *HM* 780. On the introduction of the dithyramb see also W. Burkert *GRBS* 7 (1966) 90 ff. Informal *komoi* were probably a feature of Attic life at least as early as 540 B.C., to judge from vase paintings: J. M. Hurwit *Art and Culture of Early Greece* (Ithaca 1985) 270.

[22] There may even be preserved an oracle enjoining the establishment of the Dionysia: see

totle's comments in the *Poetics* indicating that tragedy followed and derived from dithyramb; he may have been thinking not of some remote past but of the stages in the development of the Athenian festival.[23]

This interpretation does not contradict the archaeological evidence for the cult of Dionysus at Athens (see Appendix I) nor is there good evidence for the familiar handbook statement that Thespis in 534 B.C. introduced tragedy into a *city* Dionysia, or for the assertions of some special connection between the Peisistratids and Dionysiac cult.[24] The evidence for these often repeated statements is by no means compelling (See also Appendix II). The evidence is better adapted to the view that Thespis' performances took place in rural Attica, probably at his home deme of Ikarion, modern Dionyso.[25] There in the 530's a prize may indeed have been established for tragic drama. The indications in the Marmor Parium that this prize was a goat, if correct, should warn us that it is not the city festival which is

Demosthenes 21 (Against Meidias) 52 f. cf. Demosthenes 43 (Against Macartatus) 66. I am indebted to A. E Raubitschek for this suggestion.

[23] *Poetics* 4. 1449 a 9ff. See also G. F. Else *Origin and Early Form of Greek Tragedy* [Martin Classical Lectures 1965] (New York 1972) 12-16, 73. There is a possible further affinity to Aristotle. In *Politics* 8. 1341 b 32 - 1342 a 15 Aristotle discusses the psychological effects of various forms of music. He notes that one of the effects of music is *katharsis*, a term he leaves undefined for the time being, promising a fuller discussion in his treatise on poetry. The context strongly suggests, however, that he is thinking of emotional effects on the audience at festal performances (e. g. at the production of tragedies) and views these as similar to the effects that result from a medical purge. See also C. Gill *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46 (1985) 310 n. 11.

[24] That there was considerable interest in Dionysus and Dionysiac performances in Attica during the sixth century is evident. More problematic is the specific connection between the Peisistratids and Dionysiac cult. Comic performances at Icaria, for example, probably antedate the Peisistratids: Marmor Parium *FGrHist* 239 A 39 (581-561 B.C.). On the tradition that Solon witnessed a performance by Thespis, see A. J. Podlecki 'Solon or Pisistratus' *Ancient World* 16 (1987) 6 ff. Athenaeus 12.533 c. indicates that some sources said that the *prosopon* of Dionysus at Athens was a likeness of Peisistratus: the source and origin of the story is unknown. Idomeneus *FGrHist* 338 F 3 apud Athenaeus indicates that Hippias and Hipparchus discovered (*heurein*) *thalias kai komous* — but his authority on such matters is not great. F. Kolb in *JDAI* 92 (1977) 124-130, argued that since Peisistratus was a descendant of Melanthus who in Hellanicus' version did battle with King Xanthus of Boeotia (*FGrHist* 4 F 125), the stories concerning Dionysus Melanaigis are likely to have been promulgated by the Peisistratids. Peisistratus' association with this family, however, is by no means established by Herodotus 5. 65; nor is it there decisive evidence to prove that the story in Hellanicus went back to Peisistratus' time. If the story is rightly associated with the *ephebeia* (cf. P. Vidal-Naquet 'The Black Hunter and the Origin of the Athenian *Ephebeia*' *The Black Hunter* trans. A. Szegedy-Maszak (Baltimore 1986) 106-28), one would expect a post-Peisistratid date.

[25] On the demotic: Eratosthenes *Erigone* apud Hyginus de astr. ii. 4, cf. Athenaeus 2.40 a f. (as emended by Casaubon), Diogenes Laertius 5.69, and Suda s. v. *Thespis* (theta 282, Ad-

under discussion, for in this contest the prize of a goat is never attested.[26] In a rural festival, however, such a prize is not impossible.[27] In addition to Thespis several other early tragedians may have produced plays for such rural festivals, and the form may have become quite a popular one.[28] For the reasons we have already seen, however, its introduction into a festival in the city of Athens and run by that city, however, is likely to have taken place only in the last decade of the sixth century.[29]

This festival, including the performances of dithyramb, tragedy and comedy, ought to be seen as part of the emerging civic order of the new Athenian democracy, which extended the practice already evident in the earlier sixth century of linking the cults of outlying regions, such as those at Brauron and at Eleusis, to shrines in the city itself. At the heart of Cleisthenes' reforms was an assertion of the importance of the apparently peripheral regions and institutions of Athens, above all the demes. These are given a central role in the new civic order, and residents even of the most rural villages could now be expected to come to the city for service on the Council or attendance at the assembly. Membership in a deme now takes on a new significance in Attica. This movement from periphery to center is a significant parallel to the adaptation of old local cults and dramatic performances in honor of Dionysus into a new civic festival.

The festival, in other words, fits perfectly into the context of the

ler). See also Pickard-Cambridge *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* second edition, revised by T. B. L. Webster (Oxford 1962) [thereafter *DTC*^{2}] p. 69, no. 6. On the form of the deme name see D. M. Lewis *BSA* 50 (1955) 13 and 51 (1956) 172. On the rustic nature of his drama see Dioscorides *AP* 7. 410, the heading of which bears a remarkable resemblance to some of the wording on the Marmor Parium. I believe it is almost certainly derived from the same source as the entry on the inscription. If so the gist of the passage is likely to be that Thespis invented tragedy and was the first to establish a [tragic] chorus and embellish the stage in the ancient (i. e. pre-Aeschylean?) manner. Note also Horace *Ars Poetica* 275f. on Thespis' use of wagons — perhaps more likely in the countryside than in the city.

[26] Note, however, that a goat was sacrificed in the Marathonian Tetrapolis on the first day of the City Dionysia: *IG* II^2 1358 B 17 f. See also Winkler (above, note 3) n. 95.

[27] The allusion to a goat may, however, be simply an etymological conjecture based on the word *tragodia*. On the etymology and the lack of evidence for such a prize see W. Burkert 'Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual' *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 7 (1966) 92 and Winkler (above, note 3) 47.

[28] See above, note 20. Aeschylus' first victory in 499/8, however, may have been in the City Dionysia, in one of the first years of tragic performances at that festival.

[29] To be sure, Dionysus is an old divinity, and likely to have received some cult, perhaps even civic cult, in the city before the fall of the Peisistratids. The sites may have included that of the later sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus. But since the evidence for an early civic festival is lacking, any early cult on the slopes of the Acropolis probably took a significantly different form from that of the classical festival.

years immediately following the establishment of the Cleisthenic system of government.[30] Indeed there is a remarkable convergence between the pattern just suggested and Herodotus' famous comments that Cleisthenes imitated his maternal grandfather, Cleisthenes of Sicyon. Herodotus' excursus on this topic (5. 67 f.) emphasizes the tribal reforms implemented by the two relatives. Herodotus goes out of his way, however, to point out that the elder Cleisthenes also made changes in Sicyon's cults. Out of hostility for Adrastus he brought Melanippus back with him from Boeotia, with the permission of the Thebans and assigned to him a precinct in Sicyon. He then

> took away from Adrastus the sacrifices and festivals wherewith he had been honoured, and transferred them to his adversary (sc. Melanippus). ... Besides other ceremonies, it had been their custom to honour Adrastus with tragic choruses, which they assigned to him rather than Dionysus ... Cleisthenes now gave the choruses to Dionysus, transferring to Melanippus the rest of the sacred rites.
>
> Herodotus 5.67, trans. Rawlinson

If the view proposed above is correct, the similarity between the changes in Sicyon and those in Athens is closer than has hitherto been suspected. Both cities at a time of major political change incorporated a Boeotian cult and instituted choruses in honor of Dionysus.

In summary then we may suggest the following chronology:

510	Fall of Peisistratid regime
508/7	Cleisthenic tribal reform
506	Campaigns vs. Chalcis and Boeotia
506-501	Incorporation of Eleutherae
ca. 501	Inauguration of City Dionysia

[30] »Cleisthenic« does not, however, imply that Cleisthenes was still politically active in 501 B.C. See J. V. A. Fine *The Ancient Greeks* (Cambridge, Mass. 1983) 242 f.

II.

This chronology invites a renewed examination of the festival and its relationship to the civic life of Athens. In undertaking such an investigation scholars will be keenly aware of the ambiguities of the evidence. Festivals in Greek antiquity were far from static or unchanging; they were dynamic expressions of a complex set of social and political relationships, and hence closely linked to the life of the *polis*.[31] As symbolic activities festivals are also likely to function on several levels and invite multiple interpretations. Yet despite interpretive difficulties the City Dionysia reveals a great deal about the nature of the city in which it took place. The following section argues that the festival included both a ritual of integration, celebrating the inclusion of Eleutherae in Attica (or perhaps more generally the ability of Athens to incorporate outsiders in its civic life) and the liberation and civic freedom Athens now enjoyed.[32] Such a view of the festival does not exhaust its significance nor deny that it included fertility rituals and a carnival-like mood of relaxation from tensions. But these elements were not, as we sometimes assume, of narrowly agricultural significance, nor were they expressions of purely individual autonomy. Rather they are linked to civic consciousness and serve to celebrate Athens' identity, freedom and power.[33] Since we have long been accustomed to think of this and other festivals through the categories of the Cambridge anthropologists, even when rejecting their more extravagant claims, classicists have looked for Jahresdämonen, fertility rites, the cycle of death and resurrection and the Dionysus of personal ecstasy and release. Such phenomena may characterize the cult of Dionysus at some early stage, but the historical form of this festival points to different concerns and to a close connection to the Athenian polis, which organized and supervised the celebrations. The form of the classical festival calls attention to the civic order of the Athenians and to their claims that they resisted enslavement and tyranny.[34]

This much is increasingly recognized, but perhaps one must go one step

[31] On the role of festivals in Archaic Athens see W. R. Connor 'Tribes, Festivals and Processions: Civic Ceremonial in Archaic Athens' *JHS* 107 (1987) 40–50.

[32] Some Athenians used the festival to announce the freeing of slaves; such announcements were eventually prohibited: Aeschines 3 (Against Ctesiphon) 41–45.

[33] On the festival as a representation of Athenian civic structure see Winkler (above, note 3). An important discussion is also forthcoming by J. Henderson. Note also that the connection to Athenian citizenship is also affirmed through the exclusion of non-citizens from the choruses at the City Dionysia: scholia Aristophanes *Plutus* 953.

[34] Few will doubt that the Athenians of the mid fifth century thought of themselves as the opponents of oppression and enslavement. Did they, however, as early as the late sixth cen-

further in the effort to understand the festival and suggest that the festival itself was a celebration of freedom and that the Dionysus who was venerated on these occasions was in part an expression of political freedom. Dionysus' role as a divinity of freedom is attested on various occasions in several Greek cities, for example in the celebrations at Eretria in 308 B.C. in which a festival for Dionysus marked the removal of the Macedonian garrison, the liberation of the demos and restoration of the laws and the democracy.[35]

Athens used similar forms.[36] The role of Dionysiac festivals in the celebration of Athenian freedom can perhaps best be seen by examining another famous event in Athenian history — the Athenian responses to the visits of Demetrius Poliorcetes to their city. Our sources concerning his arrival at the Piraeus in 307 B.C. concentrate on the excessive honors and flattery directed to him.[37] But a deeply rooted pattern may underlie both these events and those two centuries earlier when the Peisistratids were overthrown. Once Cassander's garrison had been expelled from the Peiraeus and their fort razed, a procession was held from the periphery to the center of the city.[38] Demetrius then proclaimed the freedom of the city, and the

tury think of their freedom as the antithesis of tyranny? Kurt Raaflaub *Zum Freiheitsbegriff der Griechen* [Soziale Typenbegriffe 4] (Berlin, 1981) 258 f. argues that while slavery was a metaphor for tyranny in the sixth century, the association of freedom with the overthrow of tyranny is only attested after the first two decades of the fifth century — Pindar *Olympian* 12 and Aeschylus *Choephoroi*. The documentation of such terminology in the late sixth and early fifth century, however, is so deficient that the argument from silence must be used with caution. Martin Ostwald in his review of Raaflaub *Classical Review* 39 (1988) 85 has hesitated to follow him in rejecting the evidence that a cult of Zeus Eleutherios was established in Samos after the death of Polycrates (ca. 522 B.C.: Herodotus 3.142; note also the Adespota melic fragment (*PMG* 978 c)). The oracle in *Ath. Pol.* 19.4, if authentic, associates *eleutheria* with freedom from the tyrants. The strong attestation of an association between freedom and the overthrow of tyranny in fifth century sources such as Herodotus (e. g. 5.62), Thucydides (e. g. 6.56) and Euripides (e. g. *Supplices* 405) may well then reflect terminology already in mind at the time of the overthrow of the Peisistratids.

[35] See Ch. Habicht *Gottmenschentum* second edition (Munich 1970) 231 f. R. R. R. Smith has pointed out to me that the title Dionysus on the coinage of Mithradates VI may indicate his role as the liberator of the oppressed Greeks of Asia. See also G. Tondriau 'Dionysos: dieu royal' *Melanges H. Gregoire* (Brussels 1953) [Univ. ... Bruxelles, Annuaire de l'institut de philologie] 441-66.

[36] Thucydides 8.93-94 reports the use of sanctuaries of Dionysus as meeting places for those opposed to the oligarchy of the Four Hundred. The symbolism of political liberation was perhaps all the sharper given the oligarchs' choice of the sanctuary with associations with the cavalry (Poseidon Hippios at Colonos) for their initial meeting: 8.67.2. William Furley called my attention to these passages.

[37] See especially Plutarch *Demetrius* chs. 8-10,and Diodorus Siculus 20. 45f.. Polyaenus 4.7.6 notes the proclamation of freedom.

[38] The razing of the fort was probably a *kataskaphe*, a razing to the ground with ritual ele

Athenians responded with elaborate honors for him and his father. The honors accorded him, however extravagant, underline the message of political freedom — Demetrius' statues, for example, located next to those of Harmodius and Aristogeiton and close to one of Demokratia, presented him as the person who restored liberty after a period of tyranny.[39]

The eventual association of Demetrius Poliorcetes with Dionysus may also be part of the same pattern — a reflection of his role as liberator.[40] In 294 the Athenians voted to invite him *as Dionysus* to a *theoxenion*. In 291 received him with wreaths, libations, choruses and the famous ithyphallic hymn. It is not surprising that the honors paid him by the Athenians eventually extended to the renaming of the city Dionysia after him; the festival became, temporarily, the Demetria. He was treated as the new benefactor and god of liberation and the ithyphallic procession is reminiscent of the *phallophoria* of the Dionysia.[41]

The Athenians may deliberately have echoed the patterns developed two centuries earlier when they came to honor Demetrius Poliorcetes. Perhaps they even wished to suggest their acceptance of the parallel between his »liberation« from Demetrius of Phaleron and the overthrow of the Peisistratids. The revisions in the tribal system making two additional tribes that could be named after Demetrius and his father may not only be compliments to the Macedonian »liberators« but also allusions to the change in the tribal system that accompanied an earlier Athenian liberation from tyranny.

A further possibility, however, also deserves consideration: that behind both the honors paid to Demetrius and the establishment of the City Dionysia may have been a common ritual pattern used to celebrate the end of an oppressive rule.[42] This pattern, probably including such elements as garlanding, a *komos*, the music of *auloi*, *phallophoria*, and sometimes a special role for the god who above all others rejected oppression, Dionysus,

ments similar to those described by W. R. Connor 'The Razing of the House in Greek Society' *TAPA* 115 (1985) 79–102. For cognates of *kataskaphe* in the sources for this episode see Plutarch *Demetrius* 10, Marmor Parius *FGrHist* 239 B 21.

[39] Diodorus Siculus 20. 46.2 and Habicht (above, note 35) 44f, and 230 n. 29. The tradition that the Athenians in 324 B.C. deified Alexander as a second Dionysus is probably to be rejected: A. D. Nock 'Notes of Ruler Cult I: Alexander and Dionysus' *Essays on Religion* (ed. Z. Stewart) (Cambridge Mass. 1972) 136.

[40] Plutarch *Demetrius* 12.1, cf. Democharas *FGrHist* 75 F 2; Habicht (above, note 35) 234. Marc Antony's entrance into Ephesus (Plutarch *Antony* 24) may also be modelled on such celebrations.

[41] See Habicht (above, note 35) 234; the Ithyphallic hymn is found in Athenaeus 6. 253 ff.

[42] Cf. the festivities in Eretria described above. On freedom festivals see W. R. Connor (above, note 38) 96–99.

may also be detected in other Greek celebrations of the overthrow of oppressive rule. The Spartans led such a celebration in Athens, for example, at the end of the Peloponnesian War:

> Lysander sent for many flute girls from the city [of Athens], and assembled all those who were already in the camp, and then tore down the walls and burned up the triremes, to the sound of the *aulos*, while the allies crowned themselves with garlands and made merry together, counting that day as the beginning of freedom.
>
> (Plutarch *Lysander* 15, trans. B. Perrin, modified)

Timoleon introduced a similar cermony in Syracuse after the overthrow of Dionysius in 343/2.[43]

In Greek tragedy one also finds echoes of such festivals. The open representation of the *komos* or of a *phallophoria* would not, to be sure, be expected in a tragedy. But the language of celebration over the overthrow of tyrants suggests that tragedy sometimes utilized, occasionally in quite ironic ways, the language and tone of such festivals. In Euripides' *Electra*, for example, the death of Aegisthus is followed by the garlanding of Orestes and the cry *alala* (lines 854 f.).[44] The chorus then calls for celebration and a victory song:

> Come, lift your foot, lady, to dance
> now like a fawn ...
> He wins a garland of glory
> more great than those Alphaeus' glades grant to the perfect,
> your own brother; now, in the hymn strain,
> praise the fair victor, chant to my step.
> (*kallinikon oidan emoi choroi*)
>
> Euripides Electra 859-66, trans. Emily Vermeule

After Electra rejoices that she »can unfold my sight to freedom« (line 868) and prepares to crown the head of her brother, the chorus continues its dance to the cry of the *aulos* (lines 873-79).

[43] Plutarch *Timoleon* 22.

[44] On *Alala* (personified) in dithyrambic setting note Pindar's dithyramb for the Athenians, fr. 78 Snell.

The *Herakles Mainomenos* has a similar scene after Heracles' destruction of the tyrant Lycus. The chorus calls »turn to the dances« (line 761) and then sings:

> Let dance and feasting now prevail
> throughout this holy town of Thebes!
> Euripides Herakles Mainomenos 764 f., trans. W. Arrowsmith

and later

> O Ismenus, come with crowns!
> Dance and sing: you gleaming streets
> of seven gated Thebes!
> ...
> Come and sing the famous crown
> of Heracles the victor!
> (*ton Herakleous/ kallinikon agona*)
> lines 781–83, and 88f.

The recurrence of the term *kallinikos* in both of these passages calls for special mention. The pattern behind what we have called »freedom festivals« clearly resembles that used to welcome a victorious athlete home from a panhellenic competition — it involved a festive entry into the city, choruses, dancing perhaps in the agora or near the altars of the gods, feasting, a *komos*, etc.[45] Celebrations for such a victor would provide a ready model for the festivities following the overthrow of a repressive regime.

In passages such as these Greek tragedy may adapt and reflect its festival setting. More significant, however, is the way in which the literary forms produced within the City Dionysia link to the civic institutions and political concerns of democratic Athens. We have come to recognize the extent to which another major literary form produced at Athens within the City Dionysia — dithyramb — reflects the Cleisthenic civic order. The contest was a tribal one with fifty men or boys from each of the ten Cleisthenic tribes singing and dancing.[46] »[E]ach chorus was drawn entirely from one of the ten tribes, and as five choruses of men and five of boys competed, all ten tribes took part«.[47] The total of five hundred participants — initially at least all free Athenians — was precisely the number of the council Cleis-

[45] On the form of celebration see William Mullen *Choreia* (Princeton 1982).
[46] Pickard-Cambridge *DTC*[2].
[47] Ibid. 36.

thenes established after the overthrow of the Peisistratids.[48] In an important dicussion J. Winkler has recently shown the significance of this parallelism and the representation of Athenian civic order entailed by it.[49]

Winkler's study has also opened up anew the question of the relationship between the other two literary forms produced within the festival — comedy and tragedy — and the civic order celebrated by the festival.[50] Recent scholarship has reacted against an earlier consensus that there was no significant »way in which the Dionysiac occasion invades or affects the entertainment ... To put it in another way, there is nothing intrinsically Dionysiac about Greek tragedy.«[51] In a suggestive article in the most recent *Journal of Hellenic Studies* Simon Goldhill has examined several features of the ritual of the City Dionysia. These he finds are »deeply involved with the city's sense of itself«. He goes on to argue that

> After such preplay ceremonials, the performances of tragedy and comedy that follow could scarcely seem — at first sight — a more surprising institution ... For both tragedy and comedy ... in their particular depictions and use of myth and language time after time implicate the dominant ideology in the preplay cermonials in a far from straightforward manner; indeed, the tragic texts seem to question, examine and often subvert the language of the city's order.

Goldhill's conclusion, that »again and again, tragedy portrays the dissolution and collapse of social order, portrays man reaching beyond the bounds of social behaviour, portrays a universe of conflict, aggression, impasse. ... [T]ragedy seems deliberately to ... make difficult the assumption of the values of civic discourse« is controversial and will surely receive careful assessment in the coming years. Ultimately it may appear that he has over-

[48] Dithyrambic choruses were initially danced and sung by free citizens: [Aristotle] *Problemata* 19. 15, 918 b. On performance in the agora until perhaps the mid-fifth century see P. Siewert (above, note 15) 62-66.

[49] J. Winkler (above, note 3) 30. Note also that in the festival itself, » ... as at the festivals of Athena, the different classes of the inhabitants of Athens were represented in appropriate groups and functions. The resident aliens (*metoikoi*) put on purple robes and carried trays of offerings (*skaphia*) ... The citizens wore what clothes they pleased and carried bottles (*askoi*) on their shoulders ... « Parke (above, note 1) 127.

[50] Important new discussions are forthcoming by J. Henderson, J. Ober, Barry Strauss and others in a volume edited by Froma Zeitlin.

[51] O. Taplin *Greek Tragedy in Action* (London 1978) 162, as cited by Goldhill.

emphasized the tension between the ceremonial of the festival and the themes of the tragedy produced within it. In particular one might wonder whether his work gives sufficient weight to the theme of freedom in the tragedies, which, as Madame de Romilly has shown, is not restricted to the contrast between Greek freedom and barbarian servitude but also includes »la liberté à l'intérieur de la cité — la liberté opposée soit à la tyrannie soit à l'oligarchie.«[52] Her analyses of the *Prometheus Bound*, the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus and that of Euripides and of the *Iphigenia in Aulis* are especially incisive and show both the prominence of this theme and its radical evolution over the course of the century. Yet even if Goldhill's analysis ultimately proves to need substantial qualification, his central insight — that Greek tragedy needs to be understood within its festive setting rather than as an abstract form of »entertainment« — encourages a fresh appproach to Greek tragedy, one based on a closer understanding of the relationship between the plays and the festival and the ways in which the Athenians understood their history, political structure and civic identity. This paper can only point to the potential benefits of re-contextualizing Greek drama, both tragedy and comedy, and looking more closely at the relationship between the individual plays, the festival setting and the civic order. Our understanding of the cultural and political life of the ancient city of Athens can only be enriched by awareness of the importance of the Dionysia as a celebration of civic freedom. The festival integrates old forms of festivity, such as rural fertility cults in honor of Dionysus, with dithyrambic choruses, the *komos*, celebratory patterns used for athletic victors, and practices derived from other Greek cities. Although its origin is complex and its functions multiple, the City Dionysia reflects the tensions and civic realities of early classical Athens — it is an urban festival with rural elements and roots, a time of relaxation and release combined with a representation of civic order, and of the strength, success and prosperity, that the Athenians associated with freedom and democratic institutions.[53]

[52] J. de Romilly 'Le thème de la liberté ...' *Théâtres et spectacles* (Leiden [1981]). An especially important contribution of this article is its observation (p. 215) that »le thème de la liberté, dans la tragédie grecque, sera le plus souvent traité par une image inverse« — tragedy affirms freedom by showing the nature and effects of oppression.

[53] Note the special position accorded to the priests of Demokratia in the preserved seats in the theatre of Dionysus: *IG* II^2 5029 a.

Appendix I

THE EVIDENCE FOR THE CULT OF DIONYSUS ELEUTHEREUS IN ATHENS[1]

The sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus stood on the slopes of the Acropolis not far from the theatre of Dionysus. Many scholars have felt that the oldest constructions within the sanctuary area date from the time of Pisistratus, or possibly of his sons.[2] The later temple on this site is now known to be of the mid-fourth century or later and need not enter into our discussion.[3]

The evidence behind the *communis opinio* about the older parts of the sanctuary, however, is far from decisive and clearly needs re-assessment.[4] On the south slope of the Acropolis within the area consecrated to Dionysus Eleuthereus are foundations, most likely of a temple. The masonry of the foundation and the use of Z clamps are reminiscent of the South east fountain house in the agora, probably to be dated ca. 530-520.[5] It also, however, resembles work in the Stoa Basileios, as Professor T. L. Shear has pointed out to me. This does not permit a precise date for the temple, but certainly does not rule out a date in the very late sixth or early fifth century B.C.

Various architectural remains have been found in the vicinity, some or all of which may be associated with these foundations. The most interesting of these, a poros tympanum fragment bearing two satyrs and a maenad, was found in a house near the theatre of Dionysus. Surely it is likely to have been part of a building honoring that god, possibly that of a temple

[1] These observations on the archaeological evidence owe much to T. Leslie Shear Jr. and Homer Thompson, though they should not be thought to represent their views.

[2] Cf. J. Kolb 'Die Bau-, Religions- und Kulturpolitik der Peisistratiden' *JDAI* 92 (1977) 124 and n. 155. John Travlos has urged that both the older temple and the semicircular retaining wall are more likely to belong to the time of Pisistratus' successors. (John Travlos *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* 537).

[3] The date of the orchestra within this sanctuary area is also controversial. See the bibliography in F. Kolb (above,note 2) and Travlos *PDAA*. It is likely that Dionysiac contest were held for some while in the agora before the theatre of Dionysus was constructed. So Photius s. v. *ikria*.

[4] The archaelological evidence is crucial, especially since the literary testimonia are inconsistent: Pausanias 1.20.3 says that the sanctuary of Dionysus near the theatre is *to archaiotaton*; [Demosthenes] 59 (Against Neaira) 76, however, asserts that the sanctuary of Dionysus of the Marshes was the oldest and holiest of the god. On this cult see now N. Slater 'The Lenaean Theatre' *ZPE* 66 (1986) 255-63.

[5] See J. Camp *The Athenian Agora* (London 1986) 42 f., *Hesperia* 22 (1953) 32.

of Dionysus Eleuthereus.[6] We cannot, however, be confident of its association with the foundations in the precinct of Dionysus Eleuthereus.[7] The size of the full pediment cannot satisfactorily be compared to that of the front of the temple.[8] Nor can we be sure of the dating. The publication of the piece by Studniczka in the *Athenische Mitteilungen* 11 (1886) 78, Tafel II shows how badly mutilated the piece was at the time of its discovery and how difficult a precise dating would be.[9]

A more precise dating may ultimately be achieved by a close stylistic examination of the pedimental piece. The dancing satyr on the left of the piece, with heavy tail and thighs, very large erection and double flutes is perhaps the most promising figure for more precise dating. There are some analogies to a belly amphora by the Amasis painter (Boardman *Attic Black Figure Vases* no. 88) but the parallel to the skyphos of the Theseus painter, no. 246 in John Boardman's *Attic Black Figure Vases* seems to me point to the possibility of a date quite late in the sixth century. This vase, in Boardman's view, belongs to the latest black figure. The Theseus painter's skyphoi are probably part of his early work, »perhaps mainly before 500«. Thus if the tympanum piece does belong to the original temple of Dionysus Eleuthereus, a date of ca. 501 is not excluded.

The uncertanties that afflict the study of every aspect of this problem

[6] The piece was published by Studniczka in *Athenische Mitteilungen* 11 (1886) 78 and Tafel II, and by R. Heberdey *Altattische Porosskulptur* (Vienna 1919) 75ff. For further bibliography see F. Brommer *Satyroi* (Würzburg 1937) 56 n. 25.

[7] The sanctuary of Dionysus *en limnais* was not impossibly far away (cf. N. Slater, above, note 3), and was perhaps a more appropriate location for sculpture emphasizing the role of Maenads. It is also possible that some of the material may originally have been part of a small temple on the Acropolis, and fallen or been hauled down to the slope where it was found.

[8] Dörpfeld estimated the width of the temple at ca. 8.00 m.; R. Heberdey (above, note 4) 75 f. suggested 5.80 - 5.90 m. for the pediment based on the size and slope of the tympanum piece. But the estimates are quite imprecise.

[9] There is also a useful discussion by W. Dörpfeld and E. Reisch in *Das griechische Theater* (Athens 1896) pp. 13-19. For further bibliography see the work cited by Kolb, above, note 2, 124 n. 155. The argument that poros pedimental work implies a date well before the end of the sixth century seems to me highly dubious. There are, of course well known examples of poros pedimental sculpture from the Acropolis, probably to be dated 560-540, although more widely ranging dates have been proposed. Cf. B. Ridgway *Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture* (Princeton 1977) 205. The poros pedimental sculpture on the temple of Apollo at Delphi, however, may be from the Alcmaeonid building program at that site: P. de la Coste Messelière *BCH* 70 (1946) 271-87. It is also possible that economic constraints played a considerable role in the selection of building materials and that financial pressures may have encouraged the use of poros even after the use of marble became common. Cost considerations cannot be totally excluded.

call for caution, and a through archaeological re- investigation of all the material. The possibility that in Pisistratid times a temple to Dionysus stood near the location of the later theatre cannot be excluded, but the case, given the present state of our knowledge, is far from conclusive.[10]

Appendix II

THE EVIDENCE OF THE MARMOR PARIUM

The case for believing that there was already a City Dionysia under Pisistratus comes down, in the last analysis, to a single passage on the Marmor Parium. Readers who encounter it in such standard works as Bruno Snell's *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*[2] 1 (Thespis) T 2 or Pickard-Cambridge's *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy*[2] (p. 69) will find little reason for hesitation. The latter work, for example, offers the following translation, without any indication that it depends upon restorations and conjectures:

> From when Thespis the poet first acted, who produced a play in the city and the prize was a goat, years 270(?)....

To be sure, even this passage does not explicitly state that Thespis produced his play in the City Dionysia, although the inference is likely if the text can be relied upon. But how secure is it?

The history of the stone provides a confirmation of Jacoby's warning,»überall ist aüsserste vorsicht geboten«.[1] The stone was part of the collection assembled by the Duke of Norwich and brought to their house, Arundel, in London in 1627. There it was studied by various learned men of the day, including J. Selden (assisted by Patrick Young and others),[2] who produced

[10] Even if a temple could be shown to have existed on this site before the fall of the Peisistratids, it would not necessarily follow that the city was already running a festival to Dionysus analogous to that attested for later times. Nor would a late dating for the temple exclude the possibility of earlier Dionysiac performances in the Orchestra of the Agora.

[1] Introduction to the commentary on *FGrHist* 239, p. 665.

[2] The best account of the early history of the stone is to be found in the Preface to Richard Chandler's *Marmora Oxoniensia* (Oxford 1763).

an edition of the stone in 1629.[3] During the Civil wars the stone stood exposed to the elements for some time and the portion containing the first 45 lines was built into the fireplace of the Arundel mansion and lost. By 1667 when Henry Howard gave the Arundel collection to Oxford, the surviving portion of the Marmor Parium was extremely difficult to read. Humphrey Prideaux, writing in 1676 described what he found

> ad ipsa marmora recurrebam, eaque, ut haec etiam tibi ederentur quam accuratissime, eadem cura perlegi omnia, excepto uno tantum, eo scilicet, a quo incipit pars secunda [sc. of Prideaux's volume, i. e. his discussion of the Marmor Parium] cuius cum dimidiam tantum partem habeamus (altera a lapidica quodam ad reficiendum focum in Palatio Arundelliano adhibita) eamque ita totam erasam, ut vix una literula in illa iam legi possit, pro vera illius lectione soli Seldeno est fidendum ... .[4]

Richard Chandler, nearly a century later, re-emphasized the poor condition of the stone and followed Selden's majuscule transcription, while correcting archon names and numerals etc.[5] Even the most skilled epigraphers today find the stone a formidable challenge.[6]

Our knowledge of the text depends then in large measure on the work done by Selden and his assistants especially Patrick Young. Their efforts, when judged by today's standards, were deficient in major respects; they failed, as Chandler noted, to correct typographical errors and properly to indicate the size of lacunae. Yet their work is not to be despised: they labored under formidable difficulties in transcribing a stone which even in their

[3] Ioannes Selden *Marmora Arundelliana* (London, 1629) pp. 1-21. The early editions and discussions of the stone are reproduced in [Michael Maittaire, ed.] *Marmorum Arundelliorum, Seldenianorum, aliorumque* ... second edition (London 1732).

[4] Humphridus Prideaux *Marmora Oxoniensia, pars secunda* (Oxford 1676), preface, pages unnumbered.

[5] [Richard Chandler] *Marmora Oxoniensia* (Oxford 1763) pars II, p. xi.

[6] I asked David Lewis of Christ Church, Oxford to look at the stone but he replied »I long ago gave up trying to answer MP questions from the stone, which is not in a wonderful light. What I have is a very large blow up of a picture which was taken in sunlight and this generally gets me nowhere. It is one of the sections where the surface has deteriorated to such an extent that I get totally lost after ποιητής and have no confidence whatever in my ability to relate any of the reported traces to what survives.« (letter of 16 June 1986). Cf. Hiller ad l. 58 (*IG* 12,5 444): »Coram lapide ipso frustra operam et lucem electricam in loco desperato perdidimus.«

day was not always easily read. Selden provided two texts: The majuscules appeared as follows on p. 4 of his edition:

58. ... ΑΦΟΥΘΕΣΠΙΣΟΠΟΙΗΤΗΣ.....ΑΧΙ...ΟΣΕΔΙΔΑΞΕΝΑΛ... ΣΤΙΝ.....ΤΕΘΗΟ..ΡΑΓΟΣ..... Χ...ΕΤΗΗΗΗ ...ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣΑΘ .....

59. ...ΝΑΙΟΥΤΟΥΠΡΟΤΕΡΟΥ.

The Corrigenda, (following p. 182), however, indicate that ΡΑΓΟΣ should be directly followed by ΕΤΗ.[7]

Selden's minuscule text (p. 10) was as follows:

'Αφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς ....αχι.....ος ἐδίδαξεν 'Αλ.. στιν.....τεθη ὁ τράγος, ἔτη ΗΗΗ ...ἄρχοντος 'Αθ..... ναίου τοῦ προτέρου.

Selden's suggestion that the text meant »ex quo Thespis poeta ..... edidit Alcestim...proponebatur hircus anni CCL...archonte Athenis .....naeo primo« was widely accepted for some years, with variants such as that proposed by Thomas Lydiatus.[8] In 1676 Humphrey Prideaux reprinted Selden's uncorrected majuscules and in minuscules proposed:

... 'Αφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς ἐξ ἁμάξης πρῶτος ἐδίδαξεν Ἄλκεστιν (sic) καὶ ἐτέθη ὁ τράγος ἄθλον νενικηκότι ...[9]

Prideaux's testimony is of special interest since, it appears, he was not simply copying Selden, but had actually seen the stone, as his report of the word πρῶτος indicates. This word was on the stone, but was not reported by Sel-

[7] Dodwell in his *Tabulae Chronologiae* (London 1701) was the first to call attention to the importance of Selden's corrigenda. The report of a *chi* had misled most of the early commentators on the stone; the letter is most likely a correcting mark of Selden's, misunderstood by his typographer. Cf. Jacoby *Marmor Parium* p. 108.

[8] Thomas Lydiatus' notes on the marble were made in 1629, and printed in Prideaux (above, note 4) pars secunda, p. 48, ep. 44, and reprinted in Maittaire (above, note 3) pp. 222 ff. Lydiatus translates the passage: »A quo Thespis poeta ... docuit Alcestin tragoediam, (cuius praemium) proponebatur hircus; anni CCE (sic) ... «. John Marsham also followed Selden's text in his *Chronicus Canon* (London 1672) pp. 618 ff. (Maittaire pp. 295 ff.). The views of Le Paulmier de Grontemesnil (Palmerius) were presented in his *Supplementa et notae ad Chronicum Marmoris Arundelliani* (1668) (Maittaire pp. 200 ff.); he says »nihil habeo quod addam« sc. to Selden's text.

[9] Prideaux (above, note 4) reprinted in Maittaire (above, note 3) as ep. 43 and with minor inaccuracies in Jacoby *Marmor Parium* p. 14.

den; hence Prideaux or an informant must have re-examined the stone and seen its traces.[10] His testimony then confirms that traces resembling ΑΛ..ΣΤΙΝ were visible on the stone in the seventeenth century.

In the 1690's, however, after the stone had been damaged in the Civil Wars and moved to Oxford, Richard Bentley asked his friend Dr. John Mill to examine it. This is what Bentley said was found:

> The word πρῶτος is not in the printed editions [sc. of Selden]: but my Learned Friend Dr. Mill ... assures me, 'tis plainly so in the marble it self, which is now at Oxford ... [A]t the present there is nothing of ΑΛ...ΣΤΙΝ to be seen; and if anything can be made of the first letter, it seems to be O rather than A. ... Mr. Selden was not overly accurate in copying the inscription; and this very place before us is another proof of it: for instead of ΑΧΙ...ΟΣ as he published it, I am informed by the same very good hand, that it is yet legibly and plainly ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΟΣ.[11]

The observation that ΠΡΩΤΟΣ stood upon the stone had, as we have seen, already been made by Prideaux. Selden had mistaken the traces of that word and printed ΑΧΙ in the midst of a lacuna. But Bentley's objections to ΑΛ...ΣΤΙΝ are less compelling.[12] The letters are reported both by Prideaux and by Selden; their absence in Bentley's day is readily explained by the damage the stone had suffered. Bentley was correct, to be sure, in doubting that the marble had given the title *Alcestis*. But the decisive argument is philological rather epigraphic. As Bentley pointed out, the Marmor Parium does not give the titles of plays in similar entries. It is highly unlikely that it gave the title *Alcestis* here. We can accept Bentley's conclusion without denying that traces resembling ΑΛ...ΣΤΙΝ once stood upon the stone.

In the 1760's Richard Chandler produced a new edition of the stone, which, as we have seen, recognized the importance of Selden's majuscules.[13]

[10] It is by no means clear the Selden's other sixteenth century followers studied the stone itself rather than his transcription.

[11] Richard Bentley *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris* in the edition printed in London in 1816, 210, 215f. The passages are on pp. 259 and 267 of the edition by W. Wagner, Berlin 1874. They were added in the 1699 edition of the *Dissertation*, and do not appear in the 1697 edition.

[12] On the *chi* see note 7, above.

[13] See also J. A. R. Munro's criticisms of Chandler's text: *CR* 15 (1901) 357.

Chandler, however, melded Selden's report with Bentley's and thus produced a composite text, containing the well attested πρῶτος ὅς, as well as καί, almost certainly a mistaken addition from Mill and Bentley. On this basis he offered:

> Ἀφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς [ἐφάνη] πρῶτος ὃς καὶ ἐδίδαξε [τραγωιδίαν, ἧς ἆθλον ἐ]τέθη ὁ [τ]ράγος ....[14]

Chandler, like Bentley, felt justified in proposing conjectures in some parts of the stone where Selden's majuscules gave grounds for doubt, while accepting Selden's readings for other equally problematic parts.

Up to this point there is no hint that any one who studied the stone saw any traces justifying the restoration δρ]ᾶ[μα ἐν ἄ]στ[ει. In 1843, however, Boeckh provided (*CIG* II 2374) »the foundation on which all later editors have built«.[15] He had not, it would appear, himself examined the stone, but had seen various printed texts and an unpublished study in the Imperial Library in Berlin done in the mid-eighteenth century by one Reinhold Foster, with marginalia and other annotations in other hands. Some of these notes were probably based on direct observation of the stone, although long after the stone had suffered so badly. In his majuscule text Boeckh printed:

> ΑΦΟΥΘΕΣΠΙΣΟΠΟΙΗΤΗΣ.....ΠΡΩΤΟΣΟΣΕΔΙΔΑΞΕΝ...
> ΣΤΙΝ.....ΤΕΘΗΟ..ΡΑΓΟΣ.....Χ... ΕΤΗ ΗΗΗ ...

In other words he reintroduced the lacuna between ΡΑΓΟΣ and ΕΤΗ, which Selden expressly denied in the Errata, refused to recognize the letters *alpha* and *lambda* attested by Selden and Le Paulmier, yet retained the ΣΤΙΝ combination, which rests on the same authority and which Bentley had expressly rejected. These inconsistencies were compounded by another: in his minuscules Boeckh introduced a reading that is inconsistent with his majuscules and which injected into scholarly discussions the views that Thespis produced his work in a City Dionysia that had already been established ca. 534 B.C. Boeckh's minuscule text is as follows:

[14] Chandler (above, note 2) II p. 27, ep. 58.
[15] Munro *CR* 15 (1901) 149.

'Αφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς [ἐφάνη] πρῶτος ὃς ἐδίδαξε [δρ]ᾶ[μα ἐν ἄ]στ[ει, καὶ ἐ]τέθη ὁ [τ]ράγος [ἄθλον], ...

Although subsequent editors have often doubted Boeckh's reintroduction of a lacuna after [τ]ράγος, his suggestion ἐν ἄ]στ[ει has been widely adopted, e.g. by Hiller in *IG* 12.5 444 (1903) and Jacoby in his *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin 1904) and *FGrHist* 239 A 43.[16] In B. Snell's re-edition of the *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, as we have noted, the conjecture is presented without brackets, as if the letters were clear on the stone.[17]

Some scholars, to be sure, have noted the difficulties. Th. Bergk, while accepting the view that Thespis produced his plays at the City Dionysia, observed that there was reason to believe that there had once been traces on the stone that would exclude the restoration ἄ]στ[ει.[18] Munro also remarked that it was »difficult to fit [Boeckh's] version to the traces on the stone« but did not directly challenge the restoration ἐν ἄ[στ]ει. More recent scholars have paid little attention to these warnings. Instead they have relied on a text that contradicts the testimony of *all* those who saw the stone before it was severely damaged. Modern texts unhesitatingly follow Mill in his rejection of the *iota* and the *nu*, which Selden said followed the *sigma* and the *tau*. At the same time they have followed Selden for the *sigma* and the *tau*, dismissing Mill's assertions that there were no traces of ΑΛ...ΣΤΙΝ on the stone.

The tendency to gloss over the the disagreements of the seventeenth century scholars and produce an apparently uncontroversial text has been accentuated by the Beilage in Jacoby's 1904 edition, based on a sketch in *IG* 12,5 444, but purporting to be »Seldens maiuskeltext, durchkorrigirt nach den Errata«. A comparison of line 58 in Jacoby's edition with the material

[16] Munro in *CR* 15 (1901) 357 rejected the restoration [ἐφάνη] and suggested a word ending in -το or -ατο, but did not challenge the restoration ἄ]στ[ει. It should be noted that the parallel passages cited in Jacoby's commentaries on the entry never have a phrase corresponding to ἐν ἄ]στ[ει.

[17] Cf. Jacoby *Marmor Parium* p. 109 and Wilamowitz apud Jacoby ibid. who contend that the Great Dionysia was founded »als die erste Tragödie gegeben war«. It seems much more likely that an art form that had already achieved popularity in other settings would ultimately be introduced into a major festival.

[18] Th. Bergk *Griechische Litteraturgeschichte* III (Berlin 1884) p. 256 n. 15. Bergk accepted the idea that Thespis performed at a city Dionysia but noted: »ist aber abzuweisen, weil sie die Schriftzüge des Steines willkürlich abändert. Es ist zu lesen: ἀφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς (ἔνικα) πρῶτος, ὃς ἐδίδαξεν ἅλ(λου)ς τιν(ὰς, καὶ ἐ)τέθη ὁ (τ)ράγος (ἄθλον) χ(όρου oder χόρῳ).

from Selden printed above shows that this statement is inaccurate and that the sketch is not a close approximation of what Selden saw.[19]

In view of the poor preservation of the stone and the difficulties we have detected in the scholarly record, scholars would do best to work with a very conservative text, relying most heavily on the authorities who studied the stone before it was extensively damaged. Selden's majuscule transcription is surely of great value, although it must be supplemented by πρῶτος ὅς, and possibly by the ατο, which Munro reported. Although we normally have no good indication of the length of the individual lacunae within the line, the overall length of the line provides some control on restorations.[20] Until the stone receives a careful new study, we would be rash to go beyond the following text:

> ἀφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς [ὑπεκρίν]ατο πρῶτος, ὃς ἐδίδαξεΝΑΛ - ΣΤΙΝ [καὶ ἄθλον ἐ]τέθη ὁ [τ]ράγος ἔτη ΗΗΗ - ἄρχοντος Ἀθή[νησι -]ναίου τοῦ προτέρου.

Although the restoration ἐν ἄ]στ[ει goes beyond the evidence, Thespis need not be relegated to the realm of myth or fiction. As argued in the text, his activities are likely to have taken place in rural Attica, quite possibly at his home deme of Ikaria, where in the 530's a prize may indeed have been established for tragic drama. The importation of this rural form into the city of Athens, however, is not securely dated by the Marmor Parium, whose testimony is consistent with the view that the City Dionysia was established very late in the sixth century.[21]

[19] Since Boeckh's publication there has been one further noteworthy effort to examine this portion of the stone, by Munro, whose results were published in the *Classical Review* for 1901. Munro pointed out that the lacuna between ποιητής and πρῶτος ὅς was perhaps twice the length filled by the then commonly accepted restoration ἐφάνη; he also believed he could detect traces that suggested ὑπεκρίνατο as the verb.

[20] On the line lengths in the Marmor Parium see F. Jacoby *Rheinisches Museum* (1904) 74. The line length in A seems regularly over 100 letters, but only in the lines immediately adjoining the one under discussion to be over 130 letters. The common range is 110-130 letters. Selden's text often makes the lacunae seem too small.

[21] It is likely in any event that the City Dionysia was derived from practices already in existence in rural areas of Attica; cf. W. Burkert 'Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual' *GRBS* 7 (1966) 100.