

# Wandering Poets and the Dissemination of Greek Tragedy in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC

Edmund Stewart

## Abstract

This work is the first full-length study of the dissemination of Greek tragedy in the earliest period of the history of drama. In recent years, especially with the growth of reception studies, scholars have become increasingly interested in studying drama outside its fifth century Athenian performance context. As a result, it has become all the more important to establish both when and how tragedy first became popular across the Greek world. This study aims to provide detailed answers to these questions.

In doing so, the thesis challenges the prevailing assumption that tragedy was, in its origins, an exclusively Athenian cultural product, and that its ‘export’ outside Attica only occurred at a later period. Instead, I argue that the dissemination of tragedy took place simultaneously with its development and growth at Athens. We will see, through an examination of both the material and literary evidence, that non-Athenian Greeks were aware of the works of Athenian tragedians from at least the first half of the fifth century. In order to explain how this came about, I suggest that tragic playwrights should be seen in the context of the ancient tradition of wandering poets, and that travel was a usual and even necessary part of a poet’s work. I consider the evidence for the travels of Athenian and non-Athenian poets, as well as actors, and examine their motives for travelling and their activities on the road. In doing so, I attempt to reconstruct, as far as possible, the circuit of festivals and patrons, on which both tragedians and other poetic professionals moved. This study thus aims

to both chart the process of tragedy's dissemination and to situate the genre within the context of the broader 'song culture' of the Greek wandering poet.

### Acknowledgements

I wish, in particular, to thank my supervisors Patrick Finglass and Alan Sommerstein. Not only have they tirelessly read and commented on my work, but they have been a source of inspiration, ideas and encouragement on which I have liberally drawn. I also wish to thank Judith Mossman for her valuable support and advice on any number of issues connected with academic life at Nottingham. Finally, I must thank my parents Gordon and Teresa and my wife Louise. Their contribution to this work is of a different kind, yet no less essential or less appreciated.

## Contents

Introduction	4
1. How early? The spread of tragedy and the material evidence	29
2. Wandering in Greek culture: the circuit of fame (and money)	60
3. Athenian wandering poets: the early fifth century	108
4. Athenian wandering poets: the later fifth century	138
5. Non-Athenian wandering poets	192
6. Wandering actors	239
Conclusion	268
Abbreviations and Bibliography	272

# Introduction

## 1. The Problem

This work is the first in-depth study of the dissemination of tragedy in the fifth and fourth centuries BC. It aims to chart the process by which tragedy was disseminated throughout the Greek world. Most of the early dramatic performances that we know of took place in Athens and all the poets, whose plays survive intact, were Athenian. However, tragedy had become astonishingly popular outside Athens by at least the Hellenistic period, with performances taking place at an increasing number of international festivals held across the Mediterranean. When did tragedy begin to be disseminated outside Attica? How did this dissemination take place? In answering these questions, I aim to not only assemble and assess the available evidence for the performance of tragedy outside Athens, but also to challenge the prevailing assumptions regarding this phenomenon.

At stake is our understanding of the context of drama, throughout the period in which the first and greatest of the tragedians were operating. Until recently scholars have tended to focus on tragedy's place in the fifth century Athenian democracy. As a result, some have been less inclined to consider the question of tragedy's early dissemination. Before we proceed, we will examine some of these longstanding assumptions. We will then look at some recent challenges to the traditional view, which have contributed to a growing willingness among scholars to study tragedy in contexts other than fifth century Athens. This debate has raised important questions, which demand a full examination of the available evidence if they are to be answered properly. This study aims to provide just such a comprehensive analysis. In addition, I outline a number of new approaches and methodologies that have not been previously considered in this context, but which are of crucial importance if we are to understand both tragedy and its history.

## 2. Tragedy at Athens: the ‘Athenocentric’ theory of tragic performance

Perhaps the most influential trend in scholarship on ancient drama has been to situate tragedy within its Athenian performance context. Though writing over seventy years ago, Kitto provides perhaps the best and boldest statement of the ‘Athenocentric’ view:

Greek drama is peculiarly the creation and glory of Athens. Athens and the Theatre of Dionysus are, in a very real sense, its Unity of Place. Not only were the plays performed in this theatre, not only was nearly every dramatic poet of eminence an Athenian, not only does the art as a whole bear indelibly the mark of Athenian intelligence and plastic imagination; beyond all this Greek drama is in a special degree the work of the Athenian people. All Attic drama, tragic and comic, was composed for one of the Festivals of Dionysus; this fact is capital.<sup>1</sup>

While many scholars today would probably not accept such a statement without qualifications, Kitto nonetheless articulates two basic premises from which much of the literary criticism of tragedy has begun. These are, first, that tragedy was performed entirely at Athens in the fifth century and, second, that tragedy was uniquely Athenian in character.

It has long been believed, then, that Athens was not just the original but also the most important performance context. Indeed, some scholars have taken to referring to ‘Attic’ or ‘Athenian’ rather than ‘Greek’ tragedy.<sup>2</sup> It is almost as if tragedy belonged to a special subset of Greek poetry that, unlike other forms of literature, was the creation and possession of only one city. As Edith Hall has argued:

---

<sup>1</sup> Kitto (1939) 401-2.

<sup>2</sup> ‘Attic tragedy’: e.g. Podlecki (1986); Griffith (1995) 62; Griffin (1998); Seaford (2000); Burian (2011); ‘Attic drama’: e.g. Rosenbloom (2012) 270.

While other ancient cities and eras had other genres – epic, lyric, biography, fiction – it was in the theatre that the classical Athenian encountered many of the roles through which they imagined themselves.<sup>3</sup>

Because of this, some have believed it unnecessary to consider whether Greeks from cities other than Athens knew of tragedy, either in the fifth century or even in subsequent epochs. As Sommerstein has put it, ‘to understand fifth century Athenian plays we need to understand the fifth century theatre audience [at Athens] – and no other.’<sup>4</sup>

The supporters of this theory allege that tragedy was intimately connected with – and even designed to play a part in – the political and social life of fifth century Athens. The Athenians not only created tragedy: it in turn played a crucial role in forming them as a people. ‘Life in classical Athens’, Hall argues, ‘informed every detail of the stage fictions it enacted; but those stage fictions informed in turn the way that Athenian life was itself conducted.’<sup>5</sup> Many commentators point to echoes of Athenian history embedded in tragedy. According to this view, choruses in general are the Athenian citizenry at large, contrasted with and pitted against individualistic heroes who stand for the aristocratic statesmen of Athens.<sup>6</sup> Oedipus is no longer tyrant of Thebes, but Athens herself in disguise.<sup>7</sup> Ajax is no

---

<sup>3</sup> Hall (2006) 8.

<sup>4</sup> Sommerstein (1998) 64 = (2010a) 119. Cf. Taplin (2012) 227: ‘it seems fair to say . . . that “tragedy outside Athens” remained tragedy that was descended from or had been disseminated from the Athenian core.’

<sup>5</sup> Hall (2006) 5.

<sup>6</sup> Longo (1990) 17 describes the chorus as ‘something like a staged metaphor for the community involved’. Cf. Goldhill (2000) 45, who claims that ‘the interplay between collective and individual, mirrored in the relation of chorus and hero on stage, is a central dynamic of democratic power in action’. Winkler (1990) argued that choruses were composed of ephebes and that choral performance had a social function in preparing them for their duties as citizens. For further discussion see Gould (1996); Goldhill (1996), (2007) 50-3; Wilson (1997) 82; Murnaghan (2011).

<sup>7</sup> See Knox (1954) and (1998) 110-24. Cf. Zeitlin (1986) and (1993), on Thebes as a ‘mirror’ for Athens. Her views have been convincingly challenged by Finglass (2012a), who points in particular to the positive presentation of Thebes in Soph. *OC* 919-23.

longer Ajax but Cimon or Pericles and his followers have become contemporary Athenian sailors.<sup>8</sup> And all the while, the Athenian people scan the plays for allusions to itself.<sup>9</sup>

If tragedy was fundamentally linked to Athens, then, scholars assume, it must in some way have interacted with its democratic politics. Those who support the historicist perspective have been keen to point out that both tragedy and democracy appear at roughly the same time and that both sustain each other.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, they claim, it was the particular historical situation that gave birth to tragedy in Athens and caused it to thrive there. In the words of Schwartz:

Tragedy did not flourish until the fifth century and it did not survive the fifth century.

It was born with the political culture of the age of Pericles, it both reflected and constituted that culture, and it matured, grew old and died with that culture.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Rose (1995) and Scodel (2003); see also Bradshaw (1991) 114-5 and 123, who interprets Ajax as 'an Athenian agonist, not only in that he embodies traditional values, but also in that he confronts the problems of redefinition which the contemporary polis was addressing'. For a similar approach see Michelakis (2002) 22, who claims that Aeschylus 'recasts' Achilles as 'an early fifth century aristocrat' in his *Myrmidons*. Griffin (1999b) 83-9 and Finglass (2005), however, reject such suggestions of political allegory in Sophocles. Cf. Finglass (2011) 9-10 n. 30, who compares parallels made between Ajax and Athenian demagogues with (now disputed) allegorical interpretations of Pindar.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. Morwood (2009) 355 on Eur. *Supp.* 399-46: 'This particular scene would clearly have had strong political resonances for a contemporary Athenian audience'. Cf. Osborne (1994) 57-8 = (2010) 36, who states that 'issues that led a theatre audience to react would be precisely those to which the Athenian citizen body as a whole would react . . . we should therefore expect Athenian drama to offer a mirror to the whole Athenian world in a way in which no modern drama could be expected to.'

<sup>10</sup> E.g. Connor (1990) 16 dates the foundation of the Dionysia to 501 BC and sets it in the context of the foundation of the democracy and the annexation of Eleutherai. West (1989) argues that there were no secure records in antiquity for performances of tragedy before 500. Cf. Cartledge (1997) 23; Rabinowitz (2008) 35-7; Wilson (2011) 20-2 who link the foundation of the Dionysia with the birth of the democracy.

<sup>11</sup> Schwartz (1986) 185. Cf. Vernant and Vidal Naquet (1988) 25: 'Greek tragedy appears at a turning point precisely limited and dated. It is born flourishes and degenerates in Athens and all almost within the space of a hundred years.'

Because tragedy was written for and served the interests of a democratic Athenian audience, it properly belonged to one place and one time only.

Tragedy, furthermore, supposedly fulfilled an active political function within the democratic *polis*. Peter Wilson has gone so far as to term drama the ‘glue of democracy’: the term used by the orator Demades in the fourth century to describe the state subsidy of theatre tickets.<sup>12</sup> One approach has been to identify topical allusions to political issues, which the poets had inserted into the plays.<sup>13</sup> The views of Aeschylus, for example, on the reform of the Areopagus have long been a point of contention.<sup>14</sup> More recently the focus has shifted away from identifying political allegory and more to the possible reactions of the audience to questions posed by tragedians. Rather than providing one political message, it is argued, tragedy evokes tensions and debates integral to the workings of democracy in order to provide the Athenian people with a ‘perspective on their collective organism in order to analyse how it functions’.<sup>15</sup>

The theatre, then, is seen as but one of the institutions of the democracy: another forum for discussing weighty issues of state, akin to the assembly, council and courts.<sup>16</sup> It is alleged that the audience in the theatre played a similar role in the city to that of the citizens gathered in the assembly.<sup>17</sup> The citizen body in both cases were expected to listen to opposing

---

<sup>12</sup> Plut. *Plat. Quaest.* 1011b κόλλαν ὀνομάζων τὰ θεωρικὰ τῆς δημοκρατίας. See Wilson (2011) 42-3.

<sup>13</sup> On this ‘historicist approach’ see Carter (2007) 22-9.

<sup>14</sup> See e.g. Dodds (1960b); Podlecki (1966) 81-100; Macleod (1982); Sommerstein (1989) 31-2.

<sup>15</sup> Hall (2006) 31; c.f. Segal (1995) 3: ‘all Greek Tragedy is a kind of poetic laboratory for exploring different and sometimes conflicting models of moral, social and political order’.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. Goldhill (2000) 35: the Dionysia is an ‘institution of the [Athenian] *polis*’ producing plays ‘that constantly reflect their genesis in a fifth century Athenian political environment’; cf. Kolb (1979) 530-4; Vernant and Vidal-Naquet (1988) 32-3; Said (1998) 275-6; Croally (2005) 64.

<sup>17</sup> E.g. Wilson (2000) 136, ‘In Athens, the cultural, socio-political institutions of the Assembly, the Council and the people’s courts in particular repay close study as sites in which many of the basic techniques and strategies



arguments, voiced in the one case by orators and in the other by actors in a tragic *agon*, and to make up their minds on the political points raised. Democracy and tragedy thus shared, it is argued, this need for self-reflection, debate and the constant questioning of civic values.<sup>18</sup>

Not only was performance a political act, according to the Athenocentric theory, it was also embedded in the festival of the Dionysia, which was managed by and indeed resembled the democracy itself.<sup>19</sup> Goldhill notes the ‘signs and symptoms of democracy in action’ in the organisation of the festival.<sup>20</sup> These included subsidised tickets, the use of the deme roll to distribute tickets, the election of judges by lot, tribal seating and an assembly which criticised poor organisation, if the festival was not a success, and thanked the worthy magistrates if it was.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, the ‘pre-play’ ceremonies – including ritual processions, the presentation of crowns to distinguished citizens, the libations offered by the generals, the

---

that we tend principally to associate with the theatre play a vital role.’ Cf. Cartledge (1997) 20-1 and Goldhill (1997) 58.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. Burian (2011) 95 argues that ‘Attic tragedy participates palpably and at times assertively in democratic discourse through a use of dialogue and debate that has a demonstrably democratic character’. Cf. Goldhill (2009) 46-47; Valakas (2009) 203.

<sup>19</sup> For the connection between the cult of Dionysus and democracy see Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.). On tragedy and religion see Seaford (1993); (1994) and (1996); Sourvinou-Inwood (2003). On ritual and the origins of tragedy see Csapo and Miller (2007). For contrary views see Friedrich (1996) and Scullion (2002a).

<sup>20</sup> Goldhill (2000) 38. Cf. Wilson (2010) 20, ‘the theatrical festivals of Athens were entirely built around the units of Athenian democratic society’. *Contra* Rhodes (2003), who argues that many of the events and rituals of the festival were typical of the Greek *polis* in general and can be found even in cities that operated under other forms of constitution. Cf. Carter (2004), who questions whether the rituals mentioned by Goldhill were democratic or even took place in the fifth century.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Kolb (1979) 517-22. Tickets: see Harp. s.v. *θεωρικά* = Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 33; Ulpian ad Dem. 1.1; Csapo (2007) 100-3; Wilson (2008) 94-5; Roselli (2011) 88-114.; Judges: Plut. *Cim.* 8.7-9; Isocr. 17.33-4; Assembly: Dem. 21.1. There is little evidence for tribal seating in the classical period: see Roselli (2011) 85. In his study of the *choregia*, Wilson (2000) 108-43 has similarly identified in that institution a democratic ‘socio-political critique’ that mirrors the ‘questioning thrust’ of ‘Attic drama’.

delivery of tribute by the allies and the parade of war-orphans – were loaded with the ideology of the democratic imperial city.<sup>22</sup>

‘After such a prelude,’ says Meier ‘it is hard to see how politics can have simply disappeared from the stage.’<sup>23</sup> Rather, according to Goldhill, tragedy prompted ‘civic discourse’ between the ‘dominant ideology of the city’ demonstrated in the ‘pre-play ceremonies’ and the tragic texts themselves, which ‘seem to question, examine and often subvert the language of the city’s order.’<sup>24</sup> The plays, then, were not merely political in their content, but in the specific role they played in the Dionysia as a whole. Tragedy is treated as a

---

<sup>22</sup> On the events of the Dionysia in general see *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 57-125 and C-S 112-21; for their political significance see Goldhill (1987). For the procession see  $\Sigma$  Ar. *Ach.* 243, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1006.11-13, 1008.14-16, 1028.17-19. On crowns and honours see Wilson and Hartwig (2009) 22-3, who provide a full list of testimonia. Goldhill (1987) 63 = (1990) 105 claims that this practice is political in that it ‘stresses the moral and social imperative of doing good for the city as a key way of defining behaviour in the democratic *polis*’. Carter (2004) 9 has pointed out that there is no evidence for the presentation of crowns to citizens in the fifth century. Even in the fourth century, it was arguably unconstitutional to award a citizen a crown in the theatre: see Dem. 18.120; Aeschin. 3.32-48, 153-4. Wilson (2009a), however, has given support to Goldhill’s idea of an ideological ‘frame’ by citing a small number of late fifth century inscriptions that detail the award of honours in the theatre to non-Athenians in the late fifth century: in particular see *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 102 and 125; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 20. Rhodes (2011), on the other hand, notes that these inscriptions do not specifically celebrate democracy. The one exception is the inscription detailing the honours due to Thrasybulus for aiding in the restoration of the democracy (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 102). The award of these honours, however, was an unusual occasion and, as Rhodes notes (p. 74), ‘there is no evidence that the Dionysia was specifically and consciously democratic in other years’. The offering of libations in the theatre by the generals is attested for the early fifth century by Plutarch (*Cim.* 8.7). For the presentation of tribute in the theatre see Isoc. 8.82,  $\Sigma$  Ar. *Ach* 504. This practice was probably not instituted before 454 and may have been a one off occurrence: see Carter (2004) 7. For the orphans’ parade see Isoc. 8. 82, Aeschin. 3.153-4; Goldhill (1987) 68 = (1990) 113.

<sup>23</sup> Meier (1993) 58.

<sup>24</sup> Goldhill (1987) 68 = (1990) 114. Vernant and Vidal Naquet (1988) 33 similarly envisaged a clash between the older political order and ‘the new forms of legal and political thought.’ Meier (1993) 47 sees the dramatic festivals as a ‘safety valve’ where public tensions could be aired. Burian (2011) 98 points to the paradox inherent in the questioning of civic values in the midst of an elaborate display of civic ideology at the Dionysia.

‘social drama’: raising and resolving problems in Athenian state ideology, in a manner not easily replicated outside the Athenian dramatic festivals.<sup>25</sup>

A natural result of the ‘Athenocentric’ view has been the notion that tragedy can only be understood in one place and time: fifth century Athens, the only venue where the pure notions of democracy and the delicate social functions of tragedy can really be seen in action. Another audience, in another context, might enjoy a re-performance for its spectacle and pathos, but it would not understand it in the same way. As Wilson argues, ‘the transplantation of tragedy outside this festival structure generated a very different phenomenon . . . It is very hard to say whether its reception [in cities other than Athens] was in any way akin to the Athenian experience.’<sup>26</sup> This is certainly felt to be true for modern audiences of non-specialists who go to the theatre for pure entertainment.<sup>27</sup> They are not participating in a political or ritual act and, therefore, supposedly cannot fully appreciate tragedy in the way that it was originally intended.

It has even been doubted whether non-Athenian Greeks in antiquity, especially those languishing under a tyranny or oligarchy, could have understood such a uniquely Athenian phenomenon. Aristotle is singled out for criticism: ‘a rationalising thinker, who was not even a participant in the culture, since he did not live in the fifth century and he was not

---

<sup>25</sup> Goldhill (1997) 57. The term is borrowed from Turner (1982) and other anthropologists who use the analogy of drama to describe the functioning of primitive societies, itself influenced by modern experimental theatre. See also Schechner and Appel (1990) and Goldhill (1999) 12-13.

<sup>26</sup> Wilson (2011) 27.

<sup>27</sup> E.g. Croally (1994) 1-2 ‘Unlike any literary event we know in the modern western world, the tragedies were performed on an occasion of great political importance...The invention of tragedy. . . is dependent itself on the invention of politics...it was not merely an art form.’ Wilson (2000) 137, also refers to a modern ‘(perhaps typically bourgeois) opposition between “art” and “politics” [that] is radically inapplicable’ to the ancient theatre. Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) 4-24 argues for the need to reconstruct the ‘perceptual filters’ of the original audience. Cf. Walcot (1976) 1-6; Osborne (1994) 57-8 = (2010) 36; Goldhill (1997) 54.

Athenian.<sup>28</sup> The implication is clear: Greeks from other cities and in later periods were incapable of appreciating theatre as the fifth century Athenian audience understood it. Tragedy was not written for them: it was a distinctively fifth century Athenian cultural product – and nothing else.

### 3. Challenges to ‘Athenocentrism’

Despite its influence, the traditional ‘Athenocentric’ argument is not without its critics. In particular, the overriding political function of tragedy has not been universally accepted. Heath and Griffin have argued that pleasure, the result of a heightening of the emotions, was the primary function of tragedy.<sup>29</sup> This view is more in line with ancient literary criticism, which barely touches on politics.<sup>30</sup> The absence of any mention of the *polis* in Aristotle’s *Poetics*, for example, is a constant source of discomfort for Athenocentrists.<sup>31</sup> This tragic pleasure, in the words of Griffin, ‘has no history’ and could have been understood and appreciated by other audiences, including non-Athenians in later periods.<sup>32</sup> This, he claims, is the reason ‘why Attic tragedy, not parochial in time or place, so long survived the passing of the Attic democracy.’<sup>33</sup> In questioning tragedy’s political function, therefore, Griffin and

---

<sup>28</sup> Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) 2; cf. Hall (1996b) who questions why Aristotle makes no mention of the democratic *polis* in his discussion of tragedy. On Aristotle’s status as a metic see Whitehead (1975).

<sup>29</sup> Griffin (1998) 54-61, (1999 b) 90-1; Heath (1987) 5-36, (2006) 263; Taplin (1978) 169-71; *Contra*: Goldhill (2000) 36-7; Seaford (2000) 32-3 and Rosenbloom (2012) who argue that pleasurable emotions can be political and evocative of the democratic state.

<sup>30</sup> E.g. Pl. *Resp.* 605c10-d5 and Arist. *Poet.* 1449b24-31; cf. Gorgias B 11, 8-10 D-K.

<sup>31</sup> See e.g. Hall (1996b); Griffith and Carter (2011) 5-6. Heath (2009) 472, on the other hand, has argued that Hall begins from the false premise that tragedy must be Athenian, and that the absence of the *polis* from Aristotle’s discussion of poetry is not as surprising as Hall supposes.

<sup>32</sup> Griffin (1998) 55. *Contra*: Goldhill (2000) 36; Heath (2006) 261-2; Rosenbloom (2012) 272-3.

<sup>33</sup> Griffin (1998) 61.

others at least open up the possibility of a drama of universal appeal, even if they do not examine it in detail.

Furthermore, Rhodes has noted that various features of the festival were not exclusively Athenian but common to other Greek cities, and not only democracies.<sup>34</sup> Debate and communal decision making, for example, frequently take place in epic.<sup>35</sup> We should, therefore, be cautious about thinking that tragedy was inspired by a culture or national character unique to Athenians simply because it was produced at Athens. As Kurke has argued,

We cannot read Athenian cultural production in a vacuum: we must read it against other non-Athenian forms, to establish an ideological base-line, as it were. Only when we see what Athenian and non-Athenian art have in common can we isolate the elements that are unique to the former.<sup>36</sup>

While she assumes that certain art forms can be described as specifically ‘Athenian’, in acknowledging that Athenians did not operate in isolation from other Greeks she has raised serious difficulties regarding the definition of ‘Athenian elements’.

The notion that the theatre was somehow equivalent to political institutions also has its problems. There is little to suggest that the Greeks thought of the theatre as somehow the equivalent of the Assembly or the courts. Rather audiences only seem to resemble the *demos* when democracy is not functioning as it should. Thucydides’ Cleon, to give one example, rails at the Athenians for acting more like the seated spectators (θεαταῖς) of a clever sophist.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Rhodes (2003) 105-6.

<sup>35</sup> Deliberative assemblies are a frequent occurrence in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*: see *Il.* 1.54, 490-2; 2.48-55; 3. 209; *Od.* 2.6-8; 6.53-5; 8. 3-14.

<sup>36</sup> Kurke (1997) 156.

<sup>37</sup> Thuc. 3.38.7; cf. Andoc. 4.23; Dem. 5.7; Pl. *Resp.* 605c-d, *Gorg.* 502b-c.

Furthermore, Sommerstein has argued that theatre audiences were unlikely to have been truly representative of the citizen body as a whole. The charging of entrance fees probably meant that the poorest of the *demos* were excluded from attending, at least until the introduction of the *theorikon*, the date of which is uncertain.<sup>38</sup> In addition, as Roselli has shown, it is probable that non-citizens, including women and children, were present.<sup>39</sup> There is adequate evidence for the attendance of women at the theatre and none at all to show that they were excluded.<sup>40</sup> The only reason to think otherwise is that the audiences of comedy are often addressed as men and citizens.<sup>41</sup> But this is not a serious objection in a society where women took only a marginal role.<sup>42</sup> Although women were barred from many parts of public life, religious festivals (of which drama formed a part) were not one of them. The determination of some scholars to exclude women eloquently testifies to their desire to equate the theatre with the assembly.<sup>43</sup>

The presence of foreigners is not disputed. Greeks from allied states displayed tribute in the theatre from at least the second half of the fifth century, and others may have travelled to Athens specifically for the festival.<sup>44</sup> This has led Carter to argue that the Dionysia had a

---

<sup>38</sup> See Sommerstein (1998) 68 = (2010a) 124-5. On the *theorikon* see n. 21.

<sup>39</sup> Roselli (2011) 118-194.

<sup>40</sup> See Ar. *Pax* 964, *Lys.* 1043-53, *Ran* 1050-1; Alexis fr. 41 K-A; Pl. *Gorg.* 502 b-d, *Leg.* 658a-d, 817c. Passages such as Ar. *Thesm.* 395-7 suggest that at least some women did not attend the theatre, but this does little to prove that women were never in the audience. For the arguments in support of the presence of women see Henderson (1991); Roselli (2011) 158-94; C-S 286-7 and 291-2. For opposing views see *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 263-5; Zeitlin (1990) 68; Goldhill (1994), (1997) 64-6; Sommerstein (1998) 65 = (2010) 120-1.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. Ar. *Pax* 50-3.

<sup>42</sup> A good example is Our Lord's 'feeding of the five thousand': i.e. five thousand men 'besides women and children' (Matthew 14.20). Women and children were certainly present but they are not counted and only Matthew mentions them. The other Gospels refer only to the presence of men (Mark 6.44, Luke 9.14, John 6.10).

<sup>43</sup> As has been noted by Goldhill (1997) 66 and Carter (2011b) 50.

<sup>44</sup> On the presence of foreigners see e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 501-8; Pl. *Symp.* 175e; Aeschin. 3.33-4; Dem. 18.28, 21.74; Isoc. 8.82; Ael. *V.H.* 2.13. See Roselli (2011) 118-25; my discussion pp.137-9.

political function, but one less to do with internal debate and more about the presentation of the Athenian city and empire to foreign visitors.<sup>45</sup> The politics of tragedy, he claims, were less closely linked to Athens and applicable to a wide range of cities. Tragedy, he argues, while being ‘fundamentally’ a part of the Athenian culture of debate, was also a genre that had ‘the potential to carry across political boundaries’.<sup>46</sup>

As the fifth century Dionysia has itself become less distinctively Attic, we have become more prepared to examine drama outside its Athenian context. Scholars are beginning to see ancient Sicilian drama, for example, as an art form in its own right, which may to some extent have developed independently of Athens.<sup>47</sup> A growth in reception studies has also prompted the study of other performance contexts for ancient drama besides the first production.<sup>48</sup> We are coming to terms with the fact that tragedy did not die at the end of the fifth century or even at the end of the classical period, but instead enjoyed a long and complex afterlife that continues to this day.<sup>49</sup>

An undoubted feature of tragedy after the fifth century was that plays were being performed outside Athens. Taplin, among others, have demonstrated the extent to which Greeks in Sicily and Italy were exposed to tragedy by the fourth century.<sup>50</sup> They have argued that the images on many vases made in the Greek West from the end of the fifth century were inspired in part by the works of Athenian dramatists. The first indications of an international

---

<sup>45</sup> Carter (2004) 10-13; (2007) 6-8; 42-3. Cf. Zacharia (2003) 73-4: ‘the context [of tragedy] is more imperial than domestic’; Rosenbloom (2011) 357 and 364-5: tragedy presents to its audience a ‘democratically inflected panhellenism’, which serves as ‘a function of Athenian imperialism’.

<sup>46</sup> Carter (2011b) 63 and 64.

<sup>47</sup> As argued in Bosher (2012a); see especially Bosher (2012b) 1 and 6-12.

<sup>48</sup> E.g. Hall *et al.* (2000); Macintosh (2005); Gildenhard and Revermann (2010); Bakogianni (2011).

<sup>49</sup> See Easterling (1993); Le Guen (1995).

<sup>50</sup> Taplin (1993), (1997), (1999), (2007) and (2012). Cf. Allan (2001); Csapo (1986), (2010a) 38-76; Green (1994) 49-88, Revermann (2005), Taplin and Wyles (2011).

acting profession also date to this period.<sup>51</sup> As a result, it is often suspected that the dissemination or export of tragedy began in the late fifth century.<sup>52</sup> By the second half of the fourth century, tragedy was well known and frequently performed in Macedonia.<sup>53</sup> From there, drama was brought to the East by the armies of Alexander. This development coincides with the final eclipse of Athenian political fortunes and the end of the democracy. From the start of the Hellenistic epoch we begin to have increasing numbers of inscriptions that attest to performances of tragedy in locations as diverse as Delphi, Delos and Iasos in Asia Minor.<sup>54</sup> Festivals increase in number and many of them include tragic competitions.<sup>55</sup> International guilds of actors and poets were established across the Greek world.<sup>56</sup> Even the guild of Athenian artists contained members from other Greek cities.<sup>57</sup>

While it is acknowledged that theatre later became more ‘international’, it is often assumed that tragedy was always, or almost always, performed in Athens in the fifth century. The few exceptions are often thought to prove the rule. Euripides’ visit to Macedonia at the end of the fifth century, for instance, has been interpreted as heralding the later internationalisation of the Athenian theatre.<sup>58</sup> However, as we have become more open to the possibility both of a Panhellenic Dionysia and of alternative audiences for tragedy in later periods, so the known examples of fifth century performances outside Athens have gained in significance. Some have questioned whether the poets took an active role in this early dissemination. Scodel, for instance, has suggested that ‘tragedy must have had an audience

---

<sup>51</sup> See Csapo (2010a) 100-7.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Taplin (2007) 7; Csapo (2010a) 39; Green (1994) 64-7.

<sup>53</sup> See Revermann (2000) 453-8.

<sup>54</sup> See Sifakis (1967); Crowther (2007).

<sup>55</sup> See Parker (2004).

<sup>56</sup> The inscriptionary evidence for these institutions is presented and discussed by Le Guen (2001) and Aneziri (2003).

<sup>57</sup> Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 175; Aneziri (2003) 230-3.

<sup>58</sup> E.g. Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 109-10.



that the poets could imagine as extended in time and probably also in space.<sup>59</sup> This has caused some to wonder how intrinsically Athenian tragedy was to begin with, if even in the fifth century it was able to function outside Athens.<sup>60</sup>

Furthermore, by no means all of the performances that took place outside Attica in the fifth century were held in democracies or cities friendly to Athens. Much of our material evidence for theatre production in Magna Graecia comes from Doric speaking cities largely hostile to Athens during the period of the Peloponnesian War: Syracuse, Taras and Heraklea.<sup>61</sup> Absolute rulers such as Archelaus of Macedon or Dionysius of Syracuse, while opposed to democracy in their own cities, were keen sponsors of tragic poets and used drama to help legitimise their rule and broadcast their own political messages. The poet was capable of tailoring his plays to the needs of any client, whether he was Athenian or not, democrat or tyrant.<sup>62</sup> Rather than being intrinsically democratic, the genre seems in fact to have been ‘ideologically flexible’.<sup>63</sup> In a similar vein, Sourvinou-Inwood claimed that plays produced abroad could be designed to explore the religious discourse of other communities besides Athens.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Scodel (2001) 217.

<sup>60</sup> E.g. Duncan (2011) 69; Heath (2011).

<sup>61</sup> Dearden (1999) 234; on the production of vases inspired by theatre manufactured in the Greek West see Taplin (1993) 13-19.

<sup>62</sup> Duncan (2011) 83-4.

<sup>63</sup> Duncan (2011) 70; cf. Poli-Palladini (2001) 324. *Contra*: Seaford (2011) 87 who argues that ‘the ideology of the *polis* . . . is hard-wired into the genre’. If so, such an ideology would presumably be common to every Greek polis, whether a democracy or a tyranny. Rather than being ‘ideologically flexible’, tragedy taps into a commonly held Greek ideology. Rosenbloom (2012) 294, on the other hand, has suggested that this flexibility was itself a feature of democracy. However, his argument backfires by making it very difficult to define what it is about tragedy that is democratic or Athenian. If Athenian democracy is all-inclusive, then nothing can be distinctively Athenian.

<sup>64</sup> Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) 40-4.

Foreign rulers and audiences, then, were especially interested in plays that praised them and justified their rule or which concerned local *polis* cults. It has been suggested that poets deliberately tried to make their, initially Athenian, poetry more palatable to non-Athenian audiences and thereby gain entry to a wider market overseas. Easterling has argued that evidence within the texts themselves suggests that they may have been aimed at more than one audience.<sup>65</sup> Not only could plays be designed for non-Athenian clients, but even those produced first at Athens could also have been written with future re-performances outside Athens in mind. She focusses on the choral odes of Euripides and the praise for foreign locations liberally scattered throughout many of them. These encomia, termed ‘localisations’ by Taplin, are designed to appeal to future audiences in the locations mentioned.<sup>66</sup> As the number of plays exported grew, so, it is assumed, did the frequency with which poets inserted praise of other cities into their works. Gibert has suggested that this may be especially true of the last plays Euripides wrote, which he judges less Athenocentric than his earlier works.<sup>67</sup>

#### **4. A compromise: the Export Theory**

These objections make it necessary to reconsider the traditional Athenocentric position. Other Greeks certainly appreciated tragedy. However, the question of exactly when tragedy ceased to be an Athenian genre, or indeed whether it had ever been truly Athenian in the first place, is still debated. To some extent a compromise has been reached with what I will term the ‘export’ theory of dissemination. This is the view that tragedy was in its origins Athenian and

---

<sup>65</sup> Easterling (1994).

<sup>66</sup> Taplin (1999) 43-8.

<sup>67</sup> Gibert (2011) 399-400.

an organ of the democratic polis, but that at some point it was ‘exported’ or ‘spread’ abroad.<sup>68</sup> This development either followed or prompted a change in the nature of tragedy, which made the genre more accessible to other Greeks and less grounded in the politics of the Athenian state.

A compromise of this sort is suggested by Griffith and Carter who affirm that ‘fifth century tragedy was BOTH [their emphasis] (a) a specifically Attic art form, designed for a very Athenocentric performance context AND (b) a conspicuously (and increasingly) Panhellenic phenomenon.’<sup>69</sup> They suggest that the ‘panhellenic’ aspect of tragedy does not detract from its fundamentally Athenian character. This model posits a period of development in Athens in the fifth century before the gradual process of export began. The description of tragedy as an ‘increasingly’ Panhellenic phenomenon implies that there may have been an earlier period at which tragedy was entirely or considerably more Athenian. Taplin summarises this middle position: ‘from 450 to 350 tragedy went, piecemeal, from being primarily and predominantly Athenian to being shared . . . throughout the whole Greek world.’<sup>70</sup> A locally manufactured product that had been in demand almost exclusively in Attica is shipped abroad. The consumers, to whom this product was shipped, played a largely passive role, at least at first. Sommerstein, for example, has argued that audiences of tragedy outside Athens were ‘derivative from and in a sense parasitic on the original Athenian audience’.<sup>71</sup> Their growing appreciation of the genre may have encouraged increased exports, but their contribution to the development of the genre was minimal.

---

<sup>68</sup> Spread: Taplin (1999). Export: Dearden (1999); Hanink (2011) 322; Carter (2011b) 46 ‘tragedy was one of Athens’ most significant cultural exports’.

<sup>69</sup> Griffith and Carter (2011) 3.

<sup>70</sup> Taplin (2007) 7; cf. Visvardi (2011) 274-7; Taplin (2012) 226.

<sup>71</sup> Sommerstein (1998) 64 = (2010a) 119.

This view is justified by the argument that tragedy performed a function within both Athens and the Athenian empire. Fifth century tragedy was ‘a medium through which the relationship between Athens and the rest of the world . . . was carried out.’<sup>72</sup> The intended audience would naturally have included Greeks from allied states and foreign ambassadors, even though tragedy remained an Athenian cultural product at least initially. The occasions in the fifth century when tragedy was performed abroad can thus be explained in the light of Athenian foreign policy. Kowalzig, for example, sets Aeschylus’ visit to Syracuse in the context of Athens’s desire to secure a supply of grain from the Greek West.<sup>73</sup> And as at Athens, tragedy fulfilled in other cities a political function, if not always a democratic one. Thus, according to this view, tragedy still preserved the tragic ‘ideology of the *polis*’, which was of particular relevance to Athens, though also applicable to other cities as well.<sup>74</sup>

On the other hand, it is accepted by many that a major change also took place, sometime around the end of the fifth and beginning of the fourth century, which in part resulted in tragedy’s dissemination outside Athens. According to Hall, tragedy in around 380 was ‘qualitatively different’ from what it had been in 430.<sup>75</sup> Kuch went further, claiming that ‘in the fourth century a fundamental functional change occurred in the tragic genre’.<sup>76</sup> Theatre ceased to operate as part of the democratic city’s constitution and became less serious and designed more to entertain. As a result, tragedy became more accessible to other Greek audiences. Xanthakis-Karamanos, for example, has written of ‘the broadening outlook of tragedy at the end of the fifth century, foreshadowing the transition from the “theatre of the

---

<sup>72</sup> Kowalzig (2008) 130.

<sup>73</sup> Kowalzig (2008).

<sup>74</sup> Seaford (2011) 87.

<sup>75</sup> Hall (2007b) 269.

<sup>76</sup> Kuch (1993) 547.

city-state” to a theatre that is more Panhellenic in orientation.<sup>77</sup> At the same time, the internationalisation of tragedy contributed to its depoliticisation. Hall reasons that ‘during the process by which tragedy metastasised over the entire Greek-speaking world, it became inappropriate for its content to be so explicitly designed to glorify Athens’.<sup>78</sup>

The defeat of Athens in 404 provides, in the eyes of some, an attractive explanation for the decline in serious Athenian political theatre.<sup>79</sup> Symptoms are commonly supposed to include the allegedly melodramatic or romantic plays of Euripides and his successors.<sup>80</sup> More recently it has been suggested that the growing professionalism of poetry and music that is referred to with disdain by our ancient sources may have transformed the theatre into a large-scale, international venture.<sup>81</sup> In particular, from the mid fifth century actors gradually began to form a profession, distinct from that of poets.<sup>82</sup> Star performers such as the actor Callippides, who was active at the start of the fourth century, boasted of their ability to make audiences cry through displays of emotion (Xen. *Symp.* 3.11). Often they commanded large fees as a result. The new melodramatic tragedy was eminently suitable for making money out of entertaining large audiences. Actors are also thought to have been instrumental in popularising tragedy abroad. After the deaths of Euripides and Sophocles, a tragic repertoire developed as texts became more available. Travelling actors could travel freely, using these scripts to perform in various locations. Around this point, with the advent of the cosmopolitan

---

<sup>77</sup> Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 110; cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980) 5.

<sup>78</sup> Hall (2007b) 278.

<sup>79</sup> See Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980) 3-5; Markantonatos and Zimmerman (2012) assemble a range of studies considering the ways in which the tragic poets responded to this political ‘crisis’ at the end of the fifth century.

<sup>80</sup> E.g. melodramatic acting: Arist. *Rhet.* 1404b; mass audience: Pl. *Leg.* 700a-701b.

<sup>81</sup> Professionalism: Arist. *Pol.* 1341b, *Poet.* 1451b35-40; [Arist.] *Prob.* 956b; see pp. 97-106.

<sup>82</sup> On the actors and the acting profession see Easterling and Hall (2002) and Csapo (2010a).

acting profession, the theatre and the city (more particularly Athens) supposedly ‘went their own independent ways’.<sup>83</sup>

The proponents of the Athenocentric approach have thus, by and large, succeeded in reconciling their understanding of tragedy with a growing awareness of tragedy’s wider dissemination. Tragedy was Athenian in the fifth century and concerned with democratic politics. When tragedy goes abroad, it does so in the form of a cultural export and the traffic is almost entirely one way. Only at the end of the fifth century does tragedy cease to be so dependent on Athens and so distinctively Athenian.<sup>84</sup> It has taken a hundred years or more, then, for tragedy to lose its political edge and become for the first time truly Greek.

However, as with the ‘Athenocentric’ theory, there are a number of problems with the various approaches bracketed above under the rough heading of the ‘export theory’. Undoubtedly Athens’ position as an imperial power played a part in aiding the process of tragedy’s dissemination, but that cannot explain everything. As we have seen, the Dorian cities of Italy and Sicily, such as Taras and Syracuse, whose relationship with Athens in the fifth century was ambivalent at best, appear to have accepted drama enthusiastically. The proposed solution – that tragedy dramatised debates and political tensions found in every Greek city – may leave us wondering what exactly it was that made tragedy so distinctively Athenian in the first place. Furthermore, both the Athenocentric and the export models tend to underestimate the contribution of schools of poetry and drama other than Athens. And yet, how do we account for non-Athenian tragic poets appearing in Athens in the fifth century? Could the traffic in tragedy have gone in more than one direction?

---

<sup>83</sup> Ceccarelli (2010) 146; for similar views see Easterling (1993) 569, who refers to a ‘new cosmopolitan sensibility’ in later theatre and Rehm (2007) 191-2.

<sup>84</sup> See Csapo (2010a) 39: ‘it may be that there was no “Athenian” or “Sicilian” drama by 400BC, only Greek drama.’

Moreover, it is not immediately apparent why tragedy should have been ‘qualitatively different’ in the fourth century from what it had been in the fifth. We have seen that at least some tragedies were produced for non-Athenian audiences in the fifth century, though the frequency of such performances and their impact remains to be seen. On the other hand, in the following era old tragedies were still being read and performed in Attica and elsewhere.<sup>85</sup> Fourth century non-Athenians must to some extent have appreciated tragedy for the same reasons as the original fifth century audience. If tragedy was in its origins distinctively Athenian and highly political, could the new audiences have been unaware of its former identity? Supporters of this theory also exaggerate the extent to which the political climate had changed at the end of the fifth century. Athens, despite its heavy defeat in the Peloponnesian Wars, returned to being a democracy after the brief reign of the thirty tyrants and would remain so until 322. Moreover, though she never fully regained her former power, Athens did not entirely abandon her imperial ambitions. The historical situation that had supposedly given birth to tragedy was not changed beyond all recognition. The dissemination of tragedy cannot be disregarded as a later innovation. Rather, as we shall see, tragedy is characterised as a Panhellenic genre from the beginning.

## **5. New directions**

We have now surveyed the various approaches that have been taken by scholars on this issue. We have seen that the Athenocentric position, though highly influential, cannot be accepted in its entirety, and that any study of the context of tragedy must now take into account performances outside Athens. Most recent studies, however, start from the assumption that

---

<sup>85</sup> An old play was re-performed at the Dionysia from 386BC. See Wilson (1996) 315-16, who points out that the majority of plays quoted by fourth century orators are from the fifth century. Older plays, particularly Euripides, appear on vase painting. See Taplin (2007).

tragedy began as an Athenian cultural product and attempt to explain how and when tragedy ceased to be so. This work both provides a full assessment of the evidence for theatre outside Athens and, in doing so, challenges the current orthodoxy on this question. In this section, I outline new approaches that will allow us to fundamentally reassess the assumptions concerning tragedy's dissemination.

Rather than assuming that tragedy was originally unique to Athens and only later exported abroad, I argue that the process of dissemination began at the earliest period in the history of drama. Tragedy was a Greek art-form from the beginning: we should see its dissemination less in terms of an export and more in terms of a growth in popularity that took place simultaneously in multiple Greek cities. Drama, in the Greek West at least, developed in parallel to the Athenian theatre.<sup>86</sup> The same may be true of other areas of Greece. That is not to say that we should underestimate the fundamental importance of Athens in the growth of tragedy. Athens was indisputably the most important centre for tragedy and the greatest tragedians were Athenian. This, however, did not at any stage make tragedy uniquely Athenian. Instead, Athenians were the main proponents of a new Greek art form.

I argue that we must consider Greek poetry and Greek poetic culture as a whole. The importance of Panhellenism for epic and lyric poetry has been stressed, for example, by Nagy. The results of panhellenism are, in his view, that 'no single polis has an unequivocal claim on Homer' and, moreover, that 'the *polis* can best promote its prestige by promoting its own traditions in poetry and song on a panhellenic scale'.<sup>87</sup> However it has rarely been acknowledged that tragedy was not only a panhellenic genre, but was so from the beginning. An exception is found in the work of Herington, who argued that drama developed not out of civic ritual or politics but out of earlier poetic genres. Tragedy, along with epic, lyric,

---

<sup>86</sup> Bosher (2012a); cf. Dearden (1990) who assesses the evidence for Sicilian forms of tragedy.

<sup>87</sup> Nagy (1990) 67, 78-9.



rhapsody and citharody, thus formed what he termed an overall ‘song culture’, performed at a net-work of city-festivals, of which the Dionysia formed a part.<sup>88</sup>

The institution of the tragic contests at the Athenian Great Dionysia is . . . very far from being the radical innovation that it is often represented to be. Rather it marks an end, for it is the last important member of a long series of archaic *agones mousikoi* stretching back at least into the eighth century BC.<sup>89</sup>

Although we will not be focusing primarily on the origins of drama, Herington’s conclusions have implications for our inquiry. Tragedy was not an export because the origins and influences that informed tragedy were not exclusively or even primarily Athenian.

An appreciation of the wider Greek ‘song-culture’ also has the potential to help us explain how and why tragedy was disseminated. Poetry was but part of the overall panhellenic culture that united the disparate Greek communities. My research taps into recent studies on the links between these cities.<sup>90</sup> Unlike the Roman empire, the Greek world lacked a political centre. Instead, what we find are multiple centres, linked by a complex web of networks, reciprocal relationships and shared traditions. One of these networks, studied in detail by Ian Rutherford, is that of pilgrimage or *theoria*.<sup>91</sup> The world of the Greeks was crisscrossed by numerous pilgrimage routes between different panhellenic sanctuaries, such as Delos, Delphi or Dodona. As the Greeks travelled, their poetry travelled with them, becoming part of the shared panhellenic culture. Poets, alongside other professionals, were active along many of the same routes. Sanctuaries, for instance, were also sites of musical

---

<sup>88</sup> Herington (1985) 3; 125-6.

<sup>89</sup> Herington (1985) 9.

<sup>90</sup> E.g. Horden and Purcell (2000) 342-400; Malkin *et al.* (2009); Malkin (2011) 3-20; Vlassopoulos (forthcoming).

<sup>91</sup> See Elsner and Rutherford (2005) and Rutherford (2007b).

competitions and pilgrims often travelled accompanied by a chorus.<sup>92</sup> And *theoria* was but one of the many networks along which poets and poetry, including tragedy, travelled.

Poets frequently appear in our ancient sources as wanderers, moving between different poetic centres and actively disseminating their own poetry by giving performances in multiple locations. This aspect of the poet in the classical period has received little attention, although a recent volume on the subject edited by Hunter and Rutherford indicates fresh appreciation of this particular aspect of an ancient poet's work.<sup>93</sup> It is rarely acknowledged, however, that the fifth century tragic poet was operating in a similar manner.<sup>94</sup> As Hunter and Rutherford note, 'the song-culture of Athens might seem to have been relatively autochthonous and to have remained generally independent of the mobility of the rest of the Greek world'.<sup>95</sup> My study argues that accounts of the travels of tragic poets also need to be seen in the light of this general culture of wandering. In doing so, it aims to reconstruct the network, or circuit, upon which the tragedians moved.

Poets travelled between different festivals and the courts of wealthy patrons. One of the main reasons was financial: poets were professionals who needed to secure an income from a variety of sources.<sup>96</sup> However, despite a growing interest in the interplay between money and poetry and the commercial aspects of Greek festivals, it is rarely acknowledged

---

<sup>92</sup> For poetry and pilgrimage see Rutherford (2004); (2005) 142-4; Kowalzig (2005). For *theoria* as presented in drama see Rutherford (1998).

<sup>93</sup> See Hunter and Rutherford (2009a). Guarducci (1929) assembled evidence for such practices in the Hellenistic era. See also Aneziri (2009) on the wanderings of the Hellenistic artists of Dionysus and Cameron (1965) on wandering poets in Egypt in late antiquity. Montiglio (2000) and (2005) 91-116 addresses the question of the peripatetic sage as part of a general discussion on wandering in antiquity.

<sup>94</sup> An important exception is Bremer (1991). Hanink (2010a) 58-63 also acknowledges the existence of 'ancient constructions of the "wandering poet"' in the biographies of the tragedians.

<sup>95</sup> Hunter and Rutherford (2009b) 13.

<sup>96</sup> Bremer (1991) 44-57. Cf. Schachter and Slater (2007), who provide evidence for the payment of wandering poets in the Hellenistic period.

that tragic poets were professionals.<sup>97</sup> Musical professionalism, when it has been considered, is often thought of as a late development, occurring at the end of the fifth century.<sup>98</sup> There has been even less interest in Greek literary patronage.<sup>99</sup> I argue that tragedians formed part of a network of professional groups, all of whom were frequent travellers and had a similar financial motivation. Tragic poets worked and moved alongside these groups and even competed for funding and patronage. By recognising the importance of the identity of tragic poets as wandering professionals we may begin to understand the process by which tragedy grew in popularity.

An awareness of the context for this process of dissemination enables us to recognise the full significance of the available evidence. In addition, I aim to show that performances of tragedy were more common outside Attica than is generally realised. The evidence, however, is fragmentary and any analysis must rely on a wide variety of information. Chapter one assesses the material evidence – especially vase-painting – which tells us a certain amount both about which plays were known and admired outside Athens as well as the period at which Greeks in southern Italy or Sicily became aware of tragedy. I suggest that this process of dissemination began at a date earlier than is usually supposed. Chapter two considers the means by which tragedy was disseminated. Central to this question will be the wandering poet and the ways in which he traditionally advertised his work to diverse audiences. Chapters three and four look in detail at instances of performances of tragedy outside Athens.

---

<sup>97</sup> An exception is Duncan (2011) 80, who characterises Euripides' visit to Macedonia as an example of a tragic poet 'following the market'; cf. Seaford (2011). On ancient money and society see Seaford (2004) and Le Guen (2010). On the financial outlay necessary to hold a dramatic festival see Wilson (2008); (2010).

<sup>98</sup> See my discussion pp 97-106. This view is commonly held in spite of early references to poets hiring themselves out for a fee, e.g. Pind. *Isthm.* 2.1-11; *Pyth.* 11. 41-5.

<sup>99</sup> According to Millett (1989) 15, 'a bibliography on the subject of patronage in the ancient Greek world would be brief almost to the point of non-existence'; the situation has not greatly changed since. See also Gold (1987) 8-16. For the patronage of epinician poets see e.g. Morgan (2007).

Chapter five focuses on the arrival of non-Athenian poets and performers in Athens, demonstrating that it was possible for a foreigner not only to understand but to be successful at and contribute to this ‘distinctively Athenian’ genre. Finally, we look at actors and how they continued the tradition of the wandering musical professional.

# 1. The material evidence for the spread of tragedy

## 1. Introduction

Our first objective is to establish when tragedy began to reach audiences beyond Attica: both when the first tragedies were performed outside Athens, and when tragedy became a familiar part of the culture of other Greek cities and the broader canon of Greek myth and poetry. For example, it has long been known from literary evidence that Aeschylus staged a small number of dramas in Sicily in first half of the fifth century.<sup>1</sup> We need to know what impact these early plays might have had. Were these one-off performances or part of an early attempt to attract new audiences to the fledgling genre? Were non-Athenians aware of other plays which had first appeared in Athens and, if so, when?

We will focus initially on the material remains. These are roughly of two types: the remains of Greek theatres and fourth century vase painting in the Greek West. The latter have long attracted attention, due to the close connection, in some instances, between the scenes depicted and our extant texts of tragedy and comedy. I will address some of the methodological problems affecting this type of evidence and illustrate the case for a link between drama and western art. New conclusions will emerge regarding the approximate date at which tragedy became widely known among Italian and Sicilian Greeks. In particular, by examining the largely neglected evidence of theatre-inspired Attic vase painting, I will demonstrate that tragedy became popular among Greeks outside Athens earlier than is often supposed.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Vit. Aesch.* 8-11 Paus. 1.2.3; see van Leeuwen (1890); Herington (1967).

## 2. The evidence of theatres

Some theatre remains may date to the fifth century, suggesting that the regular performance of tragedy in those areas was at least possible then. A theatre at Syracuse was in place in the time of Aeschylus.<sup>2</sup> There is also archaeological evidence for theatres on the Greek mainland at Argos and Chaeroneia in Boeotia from at least the second half of the fifth century.<sup>3</sup> Other theatres at Corinth, Isthmia, Eretria, Mantinea, Megalopolis, Priene and Montangna dei Cavalli in Sicily were built in the fourth century.<sup>4</sup> This list does not take into account theatres attested only in literary sources or inscriptions.<sup>5</sup> Theatres discovered in Attica – at Thoricus, Icarion and Rhamnous – point towards the existence of a deme circuit, indicating that, even in Attica, tragedy was not written for performance in the Theatre of Dionysus alone. The theatre at Thoricus is the earliest, possibly dating from the late sixth century.<sup>6</sup> Those at

---

<sup>2</sup> See Polacco and Anti (1981) 43 and 218 n.8; Scaparro *et al.* (1994) III 33.

<sup>3</sup> Argos: Dilke (1950) 41; Scaparro *et al.* (1994) II 123; Chaeroneia: Dilke (1950) 37; Scaparro *et al.* (1994) II 146. See also Frederiksen (2002) 95-120, who compiles the evidence for known theatres; Taplin (1999) 36 and Csapo (2010a) 95-99.

<sup>4</sup> Corinth: Scaparro *et al.* (1994) II 152-5; Isthmia: see Gebhard (1973) 24-6; Scaparro *et al.* (1994) II 224-6. Eretria: see Dörpfeld and Reisch (1896) 113 and Dilke (1950) 34-5, who believed the theatre could have dated from the fifth century; for more recent studies suggesting a later date see Scaparro *et al.* (1994) II 215-16. Mantinea: see Dilke (1950) 46-7; Scaparro *et al.* (1994) II 313; Megalopolis: Dörpfeld and Reisch (1896) 140; Dilke (1950) 47-8; Scaparro *et al.* (1994) II 262-3; Priene: Bieber (1961) 108-10; Scaparro *et al.* (1994) III 441-2; Montanga dei Cavalli: see Vassallo (2012).

<sup>5</sup> E.g. a theatre in Sparta is attested from the fifth century: Hdt. 6.67.3; Plut. *Ages.* 29. The archaeological remains of a theatre date from the Hellenistic or Roman period: see Dilke (1950) 49-51; Scaparro *et al.* (1994) II 298-301. Dramatic contests were held in Macedonia from the end of the fifth century: D.S. 17.16.4; Arr. 1.11.1; Σ Dem. 19.401.13.

<sup>6</sup> See Dörpfeld and Reisch (1896) 109; Dilke (1950) 25-8; *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 52-4; C-S 127-8; Scaparro *et al.* (1994) II 308-9.

Icarion, the birthplace of Thespis, and Rhamnous are from the late fifth century.<sup>7</sup> Other fifth century deme theatres are known to have existed.<sup>8</sup>

From this by no means exhaustive list above, we can draw two conclusions. First, the number of theatres, and thus presumably the popularity of drama outside Athens, grew over time. Second, theatres were nevertheless being built from relatively early on and in diverse locations. Rather than a sudden expansion outside Athens, the evidence points to a gradual period of growth beginning as early as the mid fifth century. In addition, the early theatres are often situated in cities that were neither close to Athens in their location (as in the Greek West) nor aligned in their politics (as in Boeotia). We cannot know for certain what was performed at these theatres. In fifth century Syracuse, the Sicilian comedies of Epicharmus probably appeared more frequently than the tragedies of Aeschylus. Theatres could be used for a variety of purposes other than dramatic performances, including purely musical contests and the meetings of local assemblies. Nevertheless theatres, while providing a space for other activities, were primarily concerned with the performance of drama.<sup>9</sup> While this is not conclusive proof of the dissemination of tragedy, these theatres do at least provide us with welcome confirmation that drama of some kind could have been staged outside Athens during the fifth and fourth centuries.

Dramatic performances could take place even before the erection of the stone structures that survive. A temporary wooden stage and benches on a sloping hill probably

---

<sup>7</sup> Icarion: see Dilke (1950) 31. The deme boasted a sanctuary of Dionysus from the sixth century, while a Dionysia at Icarion was held in the late fifth century: see *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 254; Whitehead (1986) 215; *DFA<sup>2</sup>* 54; C-S 125-7, 131; Camp (2001) 289-91. Rhamnous: Dilke (1950) 28-30; *DFA<sup>2</sup>* 53; Camp (2001) 301-5.

<sup>8</sup> See Whitehead (1986) 219-22. There was a theatre at the Piraeus by at least 411 BC, at which Euripides is said to have produced plays, though no traces have survived: Thuc. 8. 93, Lys. 8.32, Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.32; Euripides: Ael. *VH* 2.13; see *DFA<sup>2</sup>* 46-7; C-S 124-5. The works of Sophocles and Aristophanes may also have been performed at the deme theatre of Eleusis: *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 970; see *DFA<sup>2</sup>* 47-8; C-S 129; Csapo (2010a) 90-1.

<sup>9</sup> See Frederiksen (2002) 70-6 and 80-7.

constituted the whole of the earliest theatres and would have left little or no trace in the archaeological record. This was certainly the case at Athens and in Attica in general in the fifth century.<sup>10</sup> Stone theatres represent a substantial investment in drama by a city and the expectation of a large audience. Their construction in the late fifth and early fourth centuries is thus likely to represent not the first but rather the final stage of a long process of dissemination.

### **3. Iconographic Evidence: Comedy and Phlyax Vases**

Scholars first seriously considered the possibility of performances outside Athens following a re-evaluation of Greek vases from southern Italy depicting scenes from comedy and tragedy.<sup>11</sup> Vase paintings are particularly useful for our purposes. They can indicate which plays were widely known and give an idea of the impact of tragedy on local culture by the time the vase was made. Even when the provenance of a vase is unknown, we can still identify the area in which it was made and possibly the painter from the evidence of the pot itself. Vase paintings can also be dated with a fair degree of accuracy, giving us an idea of when painters and buyers outside Athens first became interested in drama.

Of the images that are believed to be inspired by the theatre, those with comic rather than tragic subjects are most easily identifiable. A number of vases and figurines depict actors performing comedies, the majority of which were made in southern Italy in the fourth century. This suggests that the staging of plays was common in the Greek West, as opposed to the circulation of texts alone. The figures are exaggeratedly hideous or corpulent, appear to

---

<sup>10</sup> See e.g. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1176 + *SEG* 19.117 + *SEG* 21, 521: a contract dated 324/3 BC sold by the deme of Peiraeus for the construction of wooden seats at the theatre. For wooden theatres in general and the fifth century theatre of Dionysus see Csapo (2007) 103-8.

<sup>11</sup> See especially Taplin (1993) 1-10 and (2007) 7-22; Dearden (1999) 236-44 and Alan (2001).



be wearing masks and padding and, in some cases, to be standing on a stage.<sup>12</sup> We cannot be certain that all of these images represent re-performances of comedies produced first at Athens. In fact these images were originally thought to be of local Italian comedies of the type produced by Rhinthon from the late fourth century, termed Phlyax plays.<sup>13</sup> However, these so-called Phlyax vases pre-date Rhinthon, many belonging to the beginning rather than the end of the fourth century.<sup>14</sup> This has helped to vindicate Webster's claim that some scenes show Attic, rather than Italian comedy.<sup>15</sup> Athenian dramatists were not the only ones to produce comedies, yet Athenian comedies were not only performed at Athens.

Four or five vases may be inspired by known plays of Attic old comedy.<sup>16</sup> The Würzburg bell-crater, made in Apulia around 370, corresponds exactly to a scene from Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* (689-756).<sup>17</sup> A man seemingly dressed in woman's clothes kneels on an altar, holding a sword in one hand and what appears to be a wine skin in the other.<sup>18</sup> This strongly resembles Aristophanes' parody of Euripides' *Telephus*. In Euripides, the cornered Telephus leaps upon the altar of Apollo and threatens the infant Orestes with his

---

<sup>12</sup> See *PV*<sup>2</sup> pp.12-13; Green (1994) 77-82.

<sup>13</sup> Athen. 14.621f; *Suda* ρ 171, cf. φ 547; Steph. Byz. p. 603 Meineke; *PV*<sup>2</sup> pp. 9-10; Webster (1948) 17-19; Taplin (1993) 49-50.

<sup>14</sup> See *PV*<sup>2</sup> p.9; Taplin (1993) 52-4.

<sup>15</sup> Webster (1948) 17-26; cf. Green (1991a) 54-5; Csapo (2001) 27; *contra* Pickard-Cambridge (1949); Kossatz-Deissmann (1980) 289.

<sup>16</sup> Taplin (1993) 30-47.

<sup>17</sup> Würzburg H5697 = *RVAp.* 65, 4 = *LIMC* VII 868 'Telephus' no. 81; see Csapo (1986), (2001) 29, (2010a) 52-67; Taplin (1993) 44, 89-90 and Green (1994) 64-7; Small (2005) 110-12. *Contra*: Kossatz-Deissmann (1980) 289-90, who believes that the vase was inspired by a West Greek comedy, itself inspired by Aristophanes.

<sup>18</sup> For the disguise of the relative see *Thesm.* 252-6. Taplin (1993) 38 suggests that the actor's phallus is covered by a dress and that there may be indications of male clothing underneath. The S. Agata Antigone, another Apulian bell crater from the same period, similarly shows a comic actor playing an old man disguised as a woman (coll. Rainone = *RVAp.* 96, 224 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> no. 59 p.44 = *MOMC*<sup>3</sup> no. TV Ph 59 p. 107; cf. Taplin (1993) 38, 83-8). He also notes that the figure on the vase is wearing a woman's headband, mentioned lines 257-8.

sword.<sup>19</sup> Euripides' relative, in Aristophanes' version, caught at the Thesmophoria disguised as a woman seizes what appears to be a baby and holds it hostage.

On the vase, the baby Orestes is a wine skin corresponding to the ἄσκος mistaken by the relative for a child:

τουτὶ τί ἐστίν; ἄσκος ἐγένεθ' ἡ κόρη  
οἴνου πλέως, καὶ ταῦτα Περσικὰς ἔχων.

(733-4)

The wine skin on the vase has what look like little feet at the bottom: these are the booties (Περσικάς) of the text. A woman moves from the left with a large bowl. This is probably the bowl the dipsomaniac 'mother' of this wineskin employs in order to preserve its contents (754-5). The stubble and blotches on the face of the relative seem to recall Euripides' rather inept attempt at shaving him (215-35). The mirror hanging from the wall in the vase may be a stage prop, used in the shaving scene to allow the relative to see the results of Euripides' efforts (233-5).<sup>20</sup> Taken together, this Apulian bell crater was almost certainly inspired either by a performance of Aristophanes' play or knowledge of the text. The prominent masks, as well as the stages found on other vases, point to the former interpretation.<sup>21</sup>

Two other South Italian works show scenes from known plays of Aristophanes. The first is a relief guttus also made in Apulia in around 330 BC that has been plausibly identified as the other parody of Telephus in Aristophanes *Acharnians* (204-625).<sup>22</sup> A third play of Aristophanes, the *Frogs*, is represented by another Apulian bell crater painted probably not

---

<sup>19</sup> For Euripides' *Telephus*, see Collard, Cropp and Lee (2009) 17-25. Cf. Austin and Olson (2004) lvi-lviii.

<sup>20</sup> Csapo (1986) 386-7.

<sup>21</sup> For the possible influences of texts rather than performance, see Giuliani (2001) 35-7.

<sup>22</sup> Naples SA 368 = *LIMC* VII 868 'Telephus' no. 83; see Csapo (2001) 29.

long after the Würzburg Telephus.<sup>23</sup> Finally we may have a vase inspired by the work of Aristophanes' contemporary Eupolis.<sup>24</sup> In addition two other vases have been tentatively connected with Cratinus, another rival of Aristophanes.<sup>25</sup>

At least a few of the other unidentified dramatic scenes on Italian vases are likely to come from lost Attic comedies. The New York 'Choregos' vase, dated to around 380BC, may be one example.<sup>26</sup> On this vase an elaborately costumed Aegisthus converses with two old men in comic stage masks, labelled ΧΟΡΗΓΟΙ. The painter used the Attic 'η' rather than the Doric 'α', which would have been more usual in the Doric city of Taras, in which the majority of phlyax vases were made.<sup>27</sup> The Attic spelling and a possible allusion to the Athenian institution suggests that the scene comes from the work of an Athenian, rather than a Greek-Italian playwright.<sup>28</sup>

An indeterminate number of other 'Phlyax' vases may thus allude to lost Attic comedies.<sup>29</sup> The references to actual performance, such as masks, costumes and stages, suggest that Greeks in Southern Italy were used to seeing these plays in the theatre on a fairly

---

<sup>23</sup> Berlin 3046 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> 29 no. 22 = *MOMC*<sup>3</sup> no. TV Ph 22 p. 106; Taplin (1993) 44-7.

<sup>24</sup> Salerno PC 1812 = *RVP* 65, 19 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> 43-4 no. 58; Taplin (1993) 42.

<sup>25</sup> Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros*: Bari 8014 = *RVAp* 266, 45 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> no. 20 p.28-9 = *MOMC*<sup>3</sup> no. TV Ph 20 p. 106; Cratinus' *Pytine*: Berlin 3047 = *RVAp*. 175, 67 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> 30 no. 23; see Taplin (1993) 43.

<sup>26</sup> New York Fleischman coll. F93 = *RVAp Supp.* II 7-8, 124. See Taplin (1993) 55-66. On differing interpretations of this scene see Gilula (1995). The 'New York Goose Play' vase (New York 24.97.104 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> no. 84 p.53-4 = *MOMC*<sup>3</sup> no. TV Ph 84 p. 65), painted by the Tarporley painter around 400BC, also has an inscription in Attic which has been reconstructed as an iambic tetrameter: see Beazley (1952). Webster (1948) 25 suggested that the scene on the vase showing the binding of an old man resembled similar scenes in Attic comedy e.g. Ar. *Thesm.* 930-1055.

<sup>27</sup> The presence of the Athenian colony of Thurii in the Bay of Tarentum, however, suggests that Attic dialect may not have been as alien to the Greeks of Taras as Taplin supposes.

<sup>28</sup> Gilula (1995) 9-10 doubts that these are *choregoi* on the Athenian model, preferring to see them as professional furnishers of props and costumes known from Roman comedy (e.g. Plautus *Triumnus* 858, *Persa* 159-60).

<sup>29</sup> Webster (1948) 19-27 lists plausible candidates.

regular basis from the end of the fifth century. Many of our examples come from the Greek city of Taras, where there may have been regular performances of drama, and not from the indigenous settlements of the interior, further suggesting that the consumers of these vases knew the plays depicted on them.<sup>30</sup>

Although the vase paintings of southern Italy have excited the most interest, non-Athenian appreciation of comic theatre was not limited to the west. Versions of comedy from the Peloponnese and central Greece are attested by Athenaeus (621 d-f) and vase evidence may suggest some form of Doric comedy was known as early as the sixth century.<sup>31</sup> In the fifth century, Megara was the site of a rival comic school to that of Athens, which was satirised by Aristophanes.<sup>32</sup> Vases and figurines from mainland Greece attest to an awareness of Attic and other regional forms of comedy. Green points to fourth century works produced in Corinth that display a connection to the theatre.<sup>33</sup> A comic figurine of a woman holding a large bowl possibly recalls the woman from the *Thesmophoriazusae* found on the Würzburg crater.<sup>34</sup> Green suggests that the play may have become famous in Corinth before passing on to the Greek West. Three Corinthian bell craters display scenes similar to those found on the phryx vases.<sup>35</sup> They all date from the second quarter of the fourth century, not much later than the Würzburg vase.

---

<sup>30</sup> See Green (1991a) 50-2.

<sup>31</sup> See Kerkhof (2001) 13-50; Rusten (2006) 40-1.

<sup>32</sup> *Vesp.* 57; for early Megarian comedy see Arist. *Poet.* 1448a31.

<sup>33</sup> In a paper 'Regional theatre in the fourth century', delivered at Sydney, 19<sup>th</sup> July 2011.

<sup>34</sup> Athens NM 12556; cf. Corinth 7398 = *MOMC*<sup>3</sup> no. AT15e p. 52: a comic figurine of a seated slave from Corinth.

<sup>35</sup> Corinth CP 2577 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> no. 16 p. 25 = *MOMC*<sup>3</sup> no. CV4 p. 98; Corinth CP 534 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> no. 15 p. 25 = *MOMC*<sup>3</sup> no. CV3 p. 98; Athens NM 5815 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> no. 14 p. 25-6 = *MOMC*<sup>3</sup> no. CV2 p. 98.

Scholars have rarely linked Boeotian pottery to theatre.<sup>36</sup> One vase, however, may show the influence of comic drama: a late fifth century black-figure scyphos, on which Odysseus appears, naked and with drawn sword, confronting the astonished Circe who holds a pelike, presumably containing her magical draught.<sup>37</sup> The vase recalls the *Odyssey* (10.321-47). However, a number of features appear strangely out of place in a work inspired by epic. The comic ugliness of the figures resembles the masks of the Italian phryx vases. The figure of Circe recalls the women of the Würzburg Telephus and the Corinthian figurine. Odysseus is heroically naked but sports a pot belly and phallus. His rounded face, which is turned directly to the viewer, wide eyes and open mouth possibly evoke a mask. The reverse shows Odysseus again, chased across the sea by the wind Boreas, balancing on wine amphorae. The allusions to wine and drinking may suggest comic inspiration. Comic scenes featuring Odysseus appear on a number of Italian vessels.<sup>38</sup>

The provenance of the vase, the Theban sanctuary of the Cabeiri, prompted the suggestion that this and other similar vessels might depict local ritual comedy.<sup>39</sup> However,

---

<sup>36</sup> The comic Boeotian Cabeiric vases are discussed by Bieber (1961) 48-9 and included in *MOMC*<sup>3</sup> no. BV 1-10 pp. 61-4. See also Walsh (2009) 14-15, 247-52 and Mitchell (2009) 251-2, who are cautious about associating the vases with drama.

<sup>37</sup> Oxford G249 (V 262) = *LIMC* VI 54 'Kirke' no. 32 = *MOMC*<sup>3</sup> no. BV1 p. 61 = Walsh (2009) no. 93 pp. 197-9; Mitchell (2009) 272-4.

<sup>38</sup> A comic scene involving Odysseus, Alcinoos and Arete may be depicted on a Campanian calyx crater c.350-325 (Paris Louvre K523 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> 54 no. 85 = *LCS* 363 no.13; see Webster (1948) 22). Euripides' Cyclops may be represented by an early Lucanian calyx crater of the Cyclops painter, also from the late fifth century, on which Odysseus blinds Polyphemus with the help of satyrs (London 1947.7-14.8). Depending on the date, it may be related to Euripides' Cyclops or another fifth century comic version of the Odysseus myth. See Trendall and Webster (1971) 36; Trendall (1989) 19-20; Williams (1999), 100; Allan (2001) 71-2. On the date of the play see Seaford (1982) and (1998) 48-51, who places it after 411BC, and therefore probably too late for this vase. An alternative source of inspiration might be Cratinus' *Odysses*, dated to around 430 BC.

<sup>39</sup> See Walters (1892-3); Sparkes (1967) 126; Walsh (2009) 15. This has been questioned by Mitchell (2009) 251-2. There is evidence for ritual dining, in the vases may have played a part, and the possibility of a theatre or Telesterion for the performance of rituals in the fourth century. See Schachter (1986) 78, 102 and 107.

more probably this is not a scene from a particular play, but rather the application of comic features to the traditional iconography. The vase resembles other irreverent parodies of myth from Thebes, Athens, Corinth and the Greek West: these ‘burlesques’ display comic characteristics, without necessarily depicting particular literary works.<sup>40</sup> Although it is unlikely that the Circe vases represent the scene of a play or comic actors, some of these examples exhibit the same awareness of comic theatre that we find in southern Italian ‘phlyax’ vases. In fact, burlesque versions of epic subjects, such as Oedipus and the Sphinx, were also produced in the Greek West in the fourth century.<sup>41</sup> In these western Greek paintings neither character is wearing a mask, but Oedipus’ pot belly and the comic appearance of the characters are in some cases very close to ‘phlyax’ vases. It is quite possible that artists in Italy were inspired by comedy in general, rather than a specific play, to create such a parody of a well known scene in earlier art. The same is likely to be true for our Boeotian examples.

There is ample evidence, therefore, for the dissemination of Attic comedy in the Greek West and elsewhere during the fourth century. Comic drama as a whole was not an import, but it is also clear that a number of the scenes depicted on vases from Italy and Sicily were taken from Attic comedy. This suggests a climate of frequent cultural exchange between Athens and the other cities of Greece and that non-Athenians were aware of Athenian drama by at least 400 BC. We now have to assess whether audiences outside Attica were aware specifically of tragedy, and if so how early.

---

<sup>40</sup> Walsh (2009). For other examples see *LIMC* VI ‘Kirke’ 53-4 no. 27-33, especially London BM 1893,0303.1 = *LIMC* no. 30 = Walsh (2009) no. 94 p. 196-9: this vase bears a particularly striking resemblance to the Ashmolean example, yet again the comic features are less distinct.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. Boston 01.8036 = *PV*<sup>2</sup> 87 no. 200 = *LIMC* VII 8 no. 71: a Campanian vase dated to 350-325, featuring a naked Oedipus with phallus, pot belly and stubbly beard addressing an ugly Sphinx on a cliff. There is no suggestion of masks. Naples 81417: a Paestan bell crater by Python showing a similar scene.

#### 4. Tragedy and Greek Vase Painting

##### a) Problems of Interpretation

The evidence for tragedy is more complex. Antiphanes, the fourth century comic poet, complained that while comedy was a genre in which novelty was essential, tragedies were far easier to compose, being merely retellings of myths in a traditional format.<sup>42</sup> In considering the vases inspired by the tragic theatre, we might be inclined to sympathise with Antiphanes. While comic vases exhibit a certain ‘scene-specificity’, few paintings are true ‘illustrations’ of tragedy. This is because depictions of comedy cannot be understood fully without some knowledge of the dramas that inspired them. The artist must produce a picture that is closely related to the text for his audience to recognise it and get the joke. He is unlikely to have any literary sources other than the play in question.

In the case of tragedy, however, the artist enters the realm of myth. Like the poet, he can pick and choose from a variety of mythic elements to create an aesthetically pleasing composition. The painter is not influenced by earlier texts alone, as the poet is, but also by previous artistic representations of the myth. Unsurprisingly even the vases that seem to show a clear link with tragedy depart from the text in some aspects of their presentation. Moreover, unlike comic vases, depictions of tragedy keep the sense of dramatic illusion contained within the genre.<sup>43</sup> Giuliani has noted that vases related to tragedy ‘*never* [his emphasis] ... contain any element that would refer to the dramaturgic reality of theatre production: no costumes, no masks, no stage.’<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Fr. 189 K–A; cf. Olson (2007) 172–5.

<sup>43</sup> Green (1994) 26–7.

<sup>44</sup> Giuliani (2001) 37; cf. Giuliani (1996) 73–4. A notable exception is the late fourth century calyx crater of the Capadorso Painter, which possibly recreates the final revelation scene of the *Oedipus Rex* (924–1085), with the

The relationship between literature and art in antiquity is uncertain and has long been a topic of fierce debate.<sup>45</sup> Giuliani has termed the two camps ‘philodramatists’ and ‘iconocentrists’.<sup>46</sup> The first group aim to utilise the evidence of vase painting to glean information on lost plays, ancient staging or the reception of tragedy. Their opponents, often, though not exclusively, scholars specialising in art history, have argued that such approaches are overly simplistic. They claim that ancient art is not dependent on literature. The Greek painter was not only dealing with a different medium, he also had his own agenda, which involved manipulating different literary and iconographic traditions in order to produce an entirely new work of art.

‘Philodramatists’, by contrast, look for images lifted directly from the texts of plays. One such, who specialised in ancient art, was Trendall. Both he and Webster tended to see the art works as illustrations of poetic texts, indeed the title of their work *Illustrations of Greek Drama* somewhat begged the question.<sup>47</sup> To give one example, he characterised a mid-fourth century Sicilian crater, alluding to a wrestling bout between Heracles and the river Achelous, as a ‘perfect illustration of the *Trachiniae* of Sophocles, in which all the principal characters appear and the development of the plot is foreshadowed. It would have made a splendid poster.’<sup>48</sup> Small, on the other hand, has made one of the strongest cases for the ‘iconocentric’ argument. Her book, *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Text*, has been described, perhaps unfairly, as ‘a kind of blunderbuss deconstruction of every possible link

---

addition of a stage: Syracuse 66557 = *MTS*<sup>2</sup> no. ST5 pp. 124 and 150; see C–S 63–4; Green (1994) 61 and Taplin (2007) 90–2.

<sup>45</sup> Early studies include Robert (1881) and Huddilston (1898).

<sup>46</sup> See Giuliani (1996); Taplin (2007) 23–4.

<sup>47</sup> E.g. Trendall and Webster (1971).

<sup>48</sup> Lipari 9341; *LCS Supp.* III 275 no.46f; quotation: Trendall (1990) 228; cf. Trendall and Webster (1971) 71; Trendall (1989) 236.



between the plastic arts and other forms of cultural expression'.<sup>49</sup> She cautions against treating images as direct representations of a given text. 'We assume', she argues 'that because we need the texts [to identify the mythical subjects of artworks] classical artists must have also'.<sup>50</sup>

Giuliani has given a good example of this problem in the case of depictions of Rhesus' death.<sup>51</sup> He argues that an artist was capable of taking different aspects of the story from more than one literary source, those ascribed to Homer and Euripides in this case, and constructing an aesthetically pleasing composition suited to its medium and the demands of his clients.<sup>52</sup> An Apulian crater of around 340 by the Darius painter appears to follow reasonably closely the account of the night raid described in the *Iliad*.<sup>53</sup> Odysseus looses the horses of king Rhesus while Diomedes approaches to kill the king as his companions sleep. The division of labour between the two heroes, as well as the presence of Athena (who does not directly participate in the raid in the tragedy) accords well with Homer's narration of events (*Il.* 10.477-81; 507-11). However, the divine figures on the right hand side of the scene are plausibly identified as Rhesus' parents: the river Strymon and a Muse who arrives at the end of the tragedy to mourn and carry away the body of her son (*Rhes.* 886-982).<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Small (2003); Csapo (2010a) 1.

<sup>50</sup> Small (2003) 9.

<sup>51</sup> Giuliani (1996) 76-86.

<sup>52</sup> For the sources of the Rhesus see Liapis (2009b); (2012) xvi-xxvii. The authenticity of Euripides' *Rhesus* has been questioned since antiquity (*arg.* Eur. *Rhes.* b 23-32). See Ritchie (1964); Fraenkel (1965); Liapis (2012) lxvii-lxxv. Liapis (2009a) has argued that the play was written in Macedonia in the fourth century BC.

<sup>53</sup> *Il.* 10. 469-514; Berlin 1984.39 = *RVAp Supp.* II 146, 17a = *LIMC* VIII 1045-6 'Rhesos' no. 4; Giuliani (1996) 77.

<sup>54</sup> Taplin (2007) 165 claims that the story shown on this vase is closer to the tragedy than the epic. He notes the presence of Rhesus' parents who are referred to repeatedly throughout the play (279, 346-54, 394, 919-20, 929) but are not mentioned in the *Doloneia*. Diomedes and Odysseus' division of labour is also briefly referred to in the tragedy (625).

These features suggest the influence of another version of the myth, quite possibly that ascribed to Euripides.<sup>55</sup>

However, while it is undoubtedly justifiable to urge caution, the case of the ‘iconocentrists’ can also at times be overstated. The objection that fourth century vases do not, for the most part, explicitly show a stage building is not fatal by any means. To take a modern example, Johan Zoffany’s painting of 1762, *David Garrick in ‘the Farmer’s Return’*, which portrays the actor in mid performance, is still a painting of a farmer’s cottage with no indication of any staging whatsoever. Nor need the action take place on stage for it to stimulate the artist’s imagination. One has only to think of Millais’s *Ophelia*, to find an early modern narrative of events off stage that has directly inspired a work of art.

While ancient vase painters did not sit down to work either directly after a performance or with a book open before them, neither were they entirely removed from literature. The overall myth upon which they drew was ultimately based on poetry and could change over time under the influence of poets. If an art work is to tell a story, that story must be intelligible to anyone viewing it. Labels and even speech ‘bubbles’, as well as iconographic conventions, will help the educated viewer to understand the subject matter and action of the image. But those parts of the story not covered in the painting must be filled in by the knowledgeable viewer. Our Greek artist cannot give us both the beginning and the end of the story in the same image. And although artists can adapt myth, they cannot generate it.

Vase painting is then in a sense one degree removed from the literary text. Artists did not illustrate plays, but they were inspired by myth, which was itself influenced by tragedy. Nevertheless how are we to tell when a painter’s interpretation of a myth is affected by tragedy? Taplin has compiled a list of vase paintings which he believes to have been inspired

---

<sup>55</sup> See Liapis (2012) xxvii-xxix.

by tragedy, and has proceeded to delicately weigh up what he calls ‘pro-’ and ‘contraindications’.<sup>56</sup> For instance the old men resembling messengers or *paedagogi*, who are commonly depicted on vases, have been characterised by Green as one of a type particularly associated with tragedy.<sup>57</sup> Their presence on a vase, he claims, ‘is a means of saying “this is a scene from a play”’. Others might include dress and poses possibly inspired by the theatre, porticoes drawn from scene buildings, rocky arches perhaps recalling a standard piece of stage equipment, or tripods and other symbols of dramatic victory.<sup>58</sup> To decide the value of a particular painting as evidence for the dissemination of tragedy, each of these ‘pro’ and ‘contraindications’ must be carefully weighed and balanced against each other.

Signs of this kind, while important, advertise the influence of drama in general, and may not be enough on their own to establish whether a painter knew of a particular play. To be certain, a number of other factors need to be considered. First we need to be able to show that the vase post-dates the first production of the play. Second, we must demonstrate either a) that the scene in our text is an innovation and, therefore, not derived from an earlier literary tradition; or b) that images of the myth produced previous to the première of the tragedy are substantially different. In short, what we are looking for is the point at which tragedy becomes part of the mythic tradition, and its subsequent impact upon the iconographic tradition.

#### **b) Attic Vases inspired by tragedy**

---

<sup>56</sup> Taplin (2007) 35-43.

<sup>57</sup> Green (1999) 49.

<sup>58</sup> Taplin (2007) 38-43.

It is quite possible, then, that some Greek vases were inspired by tragedy and we have hopefully now established some criteria for assessing whether a vase might be linked to the theatre. Let us now look at the vases themselves. A large number of scenes on pots made in southern Italy and Sicily during the fourth century have been connected with different tragedies. These works were produced at around the same time, and sometimes by the same painters, as the comic phlyax vases. This suggests an awareness of tragedy among artists and their patrons in the Greek West from at least the end of the fifth century.

It may seem strange to begin with Attic vases. However, to understand how Greek painters in southern Italy took up tragic subjects for their works we must set this development in context with what came before. For example, a decline in the numbers for Attic vases linked to tragedy, combined with an increase in southern Italian examples over time, might be taken as evidence for the ‘internationalisation’ of drama. Were Attic renderings of dramatic subjects exported alongside tragedy and when? Do the vases from the Greek West differ noticeably from the Athenian images?

It may be a surprise, then, to discover that there are in fact very few fifth century Attic vases that can be linked to tragedy with any degree of certainty. Taplin has even argued that there are no fourth century Attic representations of tragedy that pre-date the south Italian examples.<sup>59</sup> The depiction of tragedy, he argues, was a Western Greek innovation. How are we to explain this unexpected dearth of Attic vases and how might this affect our understanding of the dissemination of tragedy?

Athenian painters certainly cannot have been ignorant of tragedy. It is inconceivable that the inhabitants of the Kerameikos managed to avoid the theatre and the twice-yearly

---

<sup>59</sup> Taplin (2007) 33. Cf. Robert (1881) 28, 129-48 who was also sceptical of a link between Attic vase painting and tragedy.

performances taking place there for an entire century. Giuliani has argued that the Attic vases are substantially different to later Western examples.<sup>60</sup> He claims that the Attic examples give a general flavour of the myth, without relying on the literature, while the Italian examples are closely based on the tragic texts. Taplin goes further, suggesting that vase painters avoided political themes and that tragedy in Athens was a political activity. For the Western Greeks, on the other hand, tragedy was an “import”, a form of narrative and spectacle pioneered by another *polis* back in mainland Hellas. Somehow this “released” tragedy for incorporation in the decoration of pottery’.<sup>61</sup> In other words, Attic vase painters knew of tragedy in the fifth century but made a conscious decision not to paint scenes from the plays. Artists in the Greek West, on the other hand, began to paint theatre-inspired pieces from shortly after the point at which the Athenian ‘export’ of tragedy fully got underway. Taplin dates this development to the late fifth and early fourth century.<sup>62</sup> In the remainder of this chapter, I aim to show that tragedy’s dissemination took place much earlier.

Taplin is right to believe that tragedy only began to seriously influence vase painting in the fourth century. However, it is unlikely that Attic painters deliberately avoided tragedy or that the depiction of subjects derived from the theatre was a direct result of tragedy’s transportation abroad. Taplin is ready to admit that there are at least a few early Attic vases that could be linked to tragedy. However, most of these images seem to illustrate performances of theatre in general rather than scenes of particular plays, as in the later western Greek examples. The focus is mostly on choruses rather than the heroes of tragedy. Most notably, an Attic crater from around 490 may show a performance by a tragic chorus.<sup>63</sup> A line of young men, wearing armour and possibly masks, approach an altar from which a

---

<sup>60</sup> Giuliani (2001) 27-37.

<sup>61</sup> Taplin (1997) 89.

<sup>62</sup> Taplin (2007) 7.

<sup>63</sup> Basel BS 415; C-S 57; Green (1991b) 34-7; Taplin (1997) 70 and (2007) 29. Cf. Froning (2002) 72.

man appears to be rising. The ‘realism’ of this piece suggests that the artist is interested more in showing a tragic performance in progress, than in evoking the plot of a specific play.

Csapo has also pointed to a number of Attic depictions of choruses in performance, often with the addition of an aulete, or at rest, with the chorus members and actors holding their masks.<sup>64</sup> One pelike shows a maenad dancing accompanied by an aulete.<sup>65</sup> The face and hair may hint at a mask. The Pronomos Vase, by contrast, shows the cast of a tragic tetralogy after a performance in the sanctuary of Dionysus.<sup>66</sup> Another vase has been supposed to show a tragic chorus in rehearsal.<sup>67</sup>

These vases show that Attic painters were interested in the theatre and make it difficult to believe that Athenian artists deliberately avoided depicting subjects derived from tragedy, whether because they thought of drama as a political act or for any other reason. However, all the images discussed above are ‘genre scenes’, rather than depictions of myth influenced by tragedy. Even the few examples that show performances in progress do not seem to ‘illustrate’ a specific play. Both the costumes and the masks show little variation, and are probably designed as standard theatrical dress for chorus members. They are comparable with the portraits of chorus-men found on choral victory monuments.<sup>68</sup> Athenian painters, therefore, went to the theatre and painted what they saw there but for some reason tragedy made almost no impact on their depictions of myth in the fifth century.

Except in a few cases, fifth century Athenian artists seem to have been influenced by earlier mythic traditions unconnected to tragedy. A few examples from the second half of the

---

<sup>64</sup> Csapo (2010a) 1-29; cf. (2001) 19-20.

<sup>65</sup> Berlin 3223 = ARV<sup>2</sup> 586.47 = MTS<sup>2</sup> no. AV15 p. 46; see Beazley (1955) 312-3; Webster (1960) 255; Froning (2002) 73.

<sup>66</sup> See Csapo (2010b).

<sup>67</sup> New York 27.74 = ARV<sup>2</sup> 407.18 = MTS<sup>2</sup> no. AV5 p. 45; Bieber (1941); Wilson (2000), 73.

<sup>68</sup> See Csapo (2010b).

fifth century, however, may be more promising. These are early versions of two scenes that appear in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, frequently repeated in the works of fourth century painters. The first involves the meeting of Orestes and Electra at the tomb of Agamemnon, dramatised in the *Libation Bearers*.<sup>69</sup> Five pots also seem to show the scene from the start of the *Eumenides*.<sup>70</sup> Orestes, in the pose of a cornered suppliant similar to Telephus, kneels on a mound of stones, sword in hand. One winged Erinyes, or in some cases two, lunges at him. Apollo interposes himself between Orestes and the Erinyes in order to protect him. The artist has captured the spirit of the two scenes, first Orestes' appearance on the omphalos surrounded by the Erinyes and then Apollo's confrontation of the chorus once Orestes has left the stage.<sup>71</sup>

These fifth century pieces exhibit none of the 'implicit signals of theatricality' – or 'proindications' – that are found on vases produced in the fourth century.<sup>72</sup> In each of these examples the composition is relatively simple. However, there are a number of factors that strongly suggest a link to Aeschylus' *Oresteia*. All of these examples date from around 450-440: between ten and twenty years after Aeschylus' play was first performed in 458. Orestes is often depicted in archaic art, either killing Aegisthus or being chased by an Erinyes, often

---

<sup>69</sup> Copenhagen 597 = ARV<sup>2</sup> 1301.5 = LIMC III 713 'Electra' no. 34; see Trendall and Webster (1971) 41; Prag (1985) 54. This scene also appears on a series of stone reliefs from Melos that are of a similar date; see MTS<sup>2</sup> 138. A similar example by the Jena Painter dates to around 380 BC (Exeter University; ARV<sup>2</sup> 1516.80). The tomb, offerings, Electra and Orestes and Pylades all appear in southern Italian vase painting from around 380. E.g. Syracuse 36334 = LCS 203.26: a Sicilian calyx crater by the Dirce painter; see Trendall and Webster (1971) 42-4.

<sup>70</sup> See MTS<sup>2</sup> pp. 140-1; Prag (1985) 48-51; Taplin (2007) 59. 1) London BM 1923.1016.10 = ARV<sup>2</sup> 1112.5 = LIMC VII 71 'Orestes' no.8; see Trendall and Webster (1971) 45. 2) Berlin 2380 = ARV<sup>2</sup> 1121.16 = LIMC no.7. 3) Syracuse 41621 = ARV<sup>2</sup> 1115.31 = LIMC no.9. 4) San Antonio 86.134.73 = ARV<sup>2</sup> 1097.21 = LIMC no.10. 5) Paris K343 = ARV<sup>2</sup> 1117.7.

<sup>71</sup> Aesch. *Eum.* 39-63; 179-243.

<sup>72</sup> Taplin (2007) 32.

shown as a snake.<sup>73</sup> These are the earliest appearances of the tomb and Delphi scenes and represent a change in the iconography of the Orestes myth. The depictions of the Delphi scene may also have been responding to an innovation introduced by Aeschylus. All the Erinyes thrust snakes towards Orestes, and some have snakes coiled in their hair, as does Aeschylus' chorus, who are frequently compared to gorgons.<sup>74</sup> Pausanias (1.28.6) noted that Aeschylus was the first to depict the Erinyes with snakes and that his description of these fearsome monsters did not correspond to a number of the statues visible in Athens. Furthermore, the dress of the Erinyes in these vases, short knee-length chitons, is quite extraordinary for women, yet corresponds closely to the description given by Orestes in the *Libation Bearers*.<sup>75</sup> We appear, then, to have a number of vases dated to after the production of the *Oresteia* showing a change in the iconography that can be linked to Aeschylus.<sup>76</sup> Although these vases do not display an obvious theatricality, they nonetheless fulfil all of the other criteria we established in the previous section for assessing the influence of tragedy on a given piece.

There are admittedly a number of instances in which the Attic depictions of the Delphi scene diverge from the text of Aeschylus. The first is the pile of stones. In the fourth century examples, Orestes clings to a stone recognisable as the Delphic omphalos. However, in the Attic examples, the omphalos resembles a cairn of stones.<sup>77</sup> Secondly, the Erinyes do not quite correspond to the text. For one, they are actively in pursuit of Orestes and for another they are winged, whereas in Aeschylus' text they are flightless and black-skinned. In addition, at the commencement of the play they are asleep. Giuliani argues that the fourth

---

<sup>73</sup> Most notably on the reliefs from Focē del Sele c. 540 BC: see Prag (1985) 44-8.

<sup>74</sup> Aesch. *Cho.* 1049-50; *Eum.* 48-9.

<sup>75</sup> φαίονχίτονες Aesch. *Cho.* 1048; cf. Prag (1985) 49.

<sup>76</sup> See Prag (1985) 48 who argues for a 'sudden and clearly defined change', taking place 'immediately after the first production of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*'.

<sup>77</sup> Prag (1985) 49.



century examples are a better fit with the play: the Erinyes are black, without wings and fast asleep. In one the ghost of Clytemnestra tries to wake them up to continue the pursuit of her son, as in the text of Aeschylus.<sup>78</sup> These objections have led Taplin to largely discount the Attic examples as reflections of Aeschylean drama.<sup>79</sup>

This conclusion ignores the astonishing parallels between the fifth and fourth century vases. In both the Attic and southern Italian depictions Orestes is seated sword in hand in the pose of a suppliant, while Apollo places himself between Orestes and the attacking Erinys or Erinyes. Neither objection raised by Taplin and Giuliani is fatal. The omphalos is not shown on all of the fourth century examples. On an Apulian column crater in Bari, Orestes is kneeling in the same pose but on a raised platform.<sup>80</sup> It may be that the conventions for how the omphalos should look had not developed by the second half of the fifth century. We might also note that the omphalos appears on an Attic pelike of around 380-360 BC: much the same date as our earliest Western Greek examples.<sup>81</sup>

Secondly, Giuliani neglects to mention one particularly important vase: an Apulian crater dated to around 370.<sup>82</sup> The scene closely resembles the Attic vases. An Erinys, who is wide awake, rushes in from the left. She is confronted by Apollo standing, as in the Attic vases, between the Erinys and Orestes, who is, as always, clinging to the omphalos, brandishing his sword. On the left stands Artemis, who plays no role in Aeschylus' version. She also appears in one of the fifth century Attic depiction of this scene, where Giuliani treated her presence as a 'contraindication' against the vase's connection to the tragedy.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Louvre K710 = *RVAp* 97, 229 = *MTS<sup>2</sup>* no. TV13 p. 75; Taplin (2007) 62-4.

<sup>79</sup> Taplin (2007) 59.

<sup>80</sup> Bari 1366 = *RVAp.* 251.205 = *LIMC* VII 72 'Orestes' no.20.

<sup>81</sup> Trendall and Webster (1971) 45; Taplin (2007) 60.

<sup>82</sup> Naples 3249 (inv. 82270) = *RVAp* 167, 13 = *LIMC* VII 72 'Orestes' no.12.

<sup>83</sup> Berlin F2380 = *ARV<sup>2</sup>* 1121.16; Giuliani (2001) 28.

Although the Apulian vase, like the Attic paintings, appears to diverge from the text according to Giuliani's criteria, it is closely related to Aeschylus in two ways. Firstly, the Erinys is black-skinned, as on the other Apulian examples, and without wings. Secondly, fleeing the approach of the Erinys to the left is a terrified old woman, certainly the Delphic priestess who opens the *Eumenides*.<sup>84</sup> The Apulian artist has borrowed from the Attic examples the pose of Apollo, Orestes and the advancing Erinys. He has not, as Giuliani thought, relied solely on the text. Both Athenian and Southern Italian artists work in the same way, painting a popular scene from myth that has been inspired by a performance of tragedy. We must conclude that these Attic vases are inspired by the plays of Aeschylus and that they influenced the later iconography adopted by the Greek vase painters of southern Italy.

These Attic examples thus provide confirmation that the links between theatre and vase painting go back further than the fourth century and did not begin in the Greek West, as Taplin supposes. However, outside the depictions of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, we have almost no other vases that can be said with certainty to represent a scene from tragedy. The only other possibilities are vases that have been connected to lost dramas. Five images concerning the sacrifice of Andromeda, dating from the 440s, were possibly informed by Sophocles' lost *Andromeda*.<sup>85</sup> One of these vases, a hydria in the British Museum, has theatrical elements found also in our Italian vases: notably the oriental costumes and possible 'props'.<sup>86</sup> However, we should remember that we know little about the action and staging of Sophocles'

---

<sup>84</sup> Aesch. *Eum.* 1-63.

<sup>85</sup> See *MTS*<sup>2</sup> p. 147; Trendall and Webster (1971) 63-5; Green (1991b) 42-3. 1) London 1843.11-3.24 = *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1062 and 1681 = *MTS*<sup>2</sup> 117 no.AV56 = *LIMC* I 776 'Andromeda' 3; see Williams (1999) 91-2. 2) Agrigento; *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1017.53 = *MTS*<sup>2</sup> 116 no.AV53 (481) = *LIMC* 5. 3) Boston 63.2663 = *LIMC* 2; 4) Caltanissetta V.1818 = *MTS*<sup>2</sup> 117 no.AV55 (482); 5) Basle BS 403 = *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1684 = *LIMC* 6; 7) Paris = *LIMC* 7.

<sup>86</sup> Both the Basle and Paris examples (6 and 7) could also conceivably depict theatrical costumes: see Schauenburg *LIMC* p.787. On the spotted sleeved chiton as a sign of theatricality see Trendall and Webster (1971) 66-7.

play and nothing at all concerning its date.<sup>87</sup> In addition, Small argues that some of these features, such as the stakes to which Andromeda is bound, are found on sixth century images.<sup>88</sup> Although the depictions of the Andromeda myth are the most likely candidates, even in this case a link between Attic vase painting and lost tragedies cannot be established with any certainty.<sup>89</sup>

Why was the *Oresteia* a more suitable subject for vase painters than other plays? One of the reasons must be that the myth was well known by the time of Aeschylus. And even though the plays prompted artists to focus on new and different aspects of the story, they were already quite used to producing images of Orestes. We also have to take into account the visual impact made by the plays on the original audience. The appearance of the Erinyes on stage in the *Oresteia* seems to have made a lasting impression, recalling the *Vita*'s account of the horror felt by the audience at the first appearance of the chorus.<sup>90</sup> It is hardly surprising that the unusual and exotic appearance of the Erinyes appealed to the vase painters. In contrast the tomb scene from the *Libation Bearers*, while not as visually spectacular, was

---

<sup>87</sup> For the available testimonia see *TrGF* IV pp. 156-7.

<sup>88</sup> Small (2003) 40-2; (2005) 105-6.

<sup>89</sup> These difficulties can be demonstrated in the case of a series of vases dating from around 490-480 (*LIMC* I 108-11 'Achilleus' no. 439-54). They represent a mantled and silent Achilles, who is being addressed by one or more figures, presumably Odysseus and Phoenix. Michelakis (2002) 31-6 has argued that these images draw on Aeschylus' *Myrmidons*, in which Achilles sat in silence without responding to the appeals of the Achaeans for help (*Ar. Ran.* 911-5). However, this is unlikely for a number of reasons. As Michelakis notes, on vase painting a mantle wrapped around a figure's head can be used to indicate indifference or hostility. Achilles is shown in such a pose on vases depicting other scenes from the myth, such as the abduction of Briseis (e.g. London 1843.11-3.92 = *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 406.1; see Carpenter (1991) 201). The artists were more likely to be using the common motif of the veiled Achilles to indicate his refusal to fight and need not have been inspired by a stage version of the myth. If they did draw on a literary version, it was almost certainly that of Homer. The *Myrmidons* was a famous play in antiquity and, while not impossible, it seems unlikely that it could have been produced before Aeschylus' first victory in 484, while the earliest example of this type of scene dates from around 490. See Sommerstein (2008) 135.

<sup>90</sup> *Vit. Aesch.* 10-13.

eminently suitable for funerary vases.<sup>91</sup> It seems then that at an early stage only certain scenes – and those that were either particularly dramatic or suitable for a certain context – made an impact on the visual arts, and not the genre of tragedy as a whole.

There is then evidence that tragedy was beginning to make an impact on vase painting in the fifth century, though probably only from around 440 BC and even then in just a few special cases. This means that tragedy had been produced in Athens for half a century or more before the genre began to gradually enter the iconographical record. And even then, painters do not seem to have incorporated into their works the signs of theatricality that we find in the fourth century. I would like to suggest that a possible reason for the state of the evidence is that during the earlier part of the fifth century tragedy was still a young genre. It was only with Sophocles and Euripides that ancient scholars believed that it had come into its final polished form. Significantly, after the deaths of these two poets, the re-performance of old tragedies was instituted at the Dionysia in 386. Because vase painters selected their subjects from their knowledge of myth and not from texts alone, a gap between the early performances of tragedy and the entry of tragic themes into the iconographic repertoire was perfectly natural. This is the point at which the plays become an accepted part of the literary canon and begin to affect the broader mythic tradition.

The tendency of the Greeks to value canonical works is evident in the speeches of the fourth century orators, who quote or refer only to fifth century tragedies, despite the prodigious and high quality output of contemporary tragedians.<sup>92</sup> The same phenomenon is noticeable in the representations of other literary works in art. Depictions of the *Iliad* and the

---

<sup>91</sup> E.g. London 1893,0728.2: a funerary lecythos depicting Agamemnon's tomb. On the use of tragically-inspired vases for funerals, see Giuliani (1995) 155; Taplin (2007) 43-6; Todisco (2012) 252.

<sup>92</sup> See Wilson (1996) 315-6.

*Odyssey* only appeared relatively late in vase painting.<sup>93</sup> Even fifth century examples can differ from the text of Homer in important ways. Again painters were influenced by alternative versions of the Trojan saga, drawn from a plethora of sources including the epic cycle and the choral lyric of Stesichorus. One example is an early fifth century Attic painting of the abduction of Briseis from the tent of Achilles.<sup>94</sup> Here it is Agamemnon who is taking hold of his concubine, rather than the heralds Talthibius and Eurybates who perform this service in the *Iliad* (1.318-49). It seems then that even the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were long in circulation before they made a noticeable impact upon the visual culture. This does not mean that they were not widely known or popular at an earlier period: it is merely that these texts had not achieved the dominance over other versions of the myth that they would later enjoy. Much the same could be said of tragedy.

### c) Vase Painting in the Greek West and Tragedy

We now move on finally to consider the tragic vases produced in southern Italy and Sicily from the end of the fifth century. We have somewhat delayed this discussion, but only in order to establish the context needed to fully appreciate the importance of these vases. From our study of Attic vases we have seen that performances of tragedy could take place for some time before the influence of tragedy became noticeable in art. The date of the vase only gives us an idea of when a play became accepted as part of the canon, not when the process of dissemination began. Vases evoking the plots of tragedy were made in Italy from the end of the fifth century, when pottery production first began there. We must assume then that the Greeks in Italy had known about tragedy for some time before 400, but for how long?

---

<sup>93</sup> See Lowenstam (1997); Snodgrass (1998); Small (2003) 8-36.

<sup>94</sup> Louvre G 146, ARV<sup>2</sup> 458.2; Lowenstam (1997) 39-44.

We cannot know exactly, but I hope in the following discussion to point to a number of factors that may provide at least a partial answer. We should consider how developed the representations of tragedy are at an early stage. If tragedy was only exported to the Greek West towards the end of the fifth century, we might expect the earliest Italian examples to be less theatrical than those produced later in the century, as was the case with Attic vase painting. On the other hand, if these early vases show strong signs of an awareness of tragedy, it might suggest that the plays had been well known outside Athens for much longer and were already fully established as part of the broader Greek culture.

Let us now consider the vases themselves. We have already noted that scenes from tragedy, like the comic phlyax vases, appear on some of the first pots made in the Greek West. A good example is the Cleveland Medea, which depicts the concluding scene of Euripides' play.<sup>95</sup> This Lucanian crater, made in around 400, was found in the Greek city of Heraclea (Policoro), east of Taras on the Gulf of Taranto. In the centre Medea, encircled by the rays of the sun, is driving her serpent chariot. This was sent by the sun-god Helios at the end of the play (1321-2). The children lie dead on an altar to the right, where an old woman and man are grieving for them (possibly the *paedagogus* and nurse, who had tried to protect the children).<sup>96</sup> To the left, Jason stands with his sword. Above are two hideous winged Erinyes, who are invoked in the text by Jason (1389). On the reverse is Euripides' version of the Telephus myth: Telephus kneels on an altar clutching Orestes and a drawn sword.<sup>97</sup> The wound he received from Achilles is clearly in evidence on his right leg. Agamemnon, rushes at him and makes to draw his own weapon, while a distraught Clytemnestra holds out her

---

<sup>95</sup> Cleveland 1991.1 = *LIMC* VI 391-2 'Medeia' no. 36. See Sourvinou-Inwood (1997) 269-72; Revermann (2005); (2010) 73-90; Taplin (2007), 120.

<sup>96</sup> Eur. *Med.* 89-95.

<sup>97</sup> *LIMC* VII 866-7 'Telephus' no. 59; See Taplin (2007) 207.

arms towards her child. These are two of the earliest and most likely western representations of tragedy.

We can also compare these images to three other vases dating from the same period, also from Policoro. Another less spectacular Medea scene closely resembles the one in Cleveland, this time on a hydria rather than a crater.<sup>98</sup> It was made by the Policoro painter, who may have been responsible for the Cleveland crater. The same artist also produced another representation of a play of Euripides: the bull of Dirce from Euripides' *Antiope*, on a pelike of the same period.<sup>99</sup> A third vase, an early Lucanian pelike by the Carneia painter, appears to evoke the opening scene of the *Heraclidae*.<sup>100</sup>

Trendall believed the Policoro Dirce and Medea were works commissioned by a particularly avid enthusiast for the works of Euripides, perhaps even an actor.<sup>101</sup> However, a strict comparison between the text and the images will not be enough to establish this as a fact. As in earlier Attic vase painting, and unlike the comic vases, we have no stages, no masks and no stage equipment. Moreover, as Small has noted, there are a number of inconsistencies in the presentation of the scene.<sup>102</sup> The children are not in the chariot, as in the text (1376-81), but lie either on an altar (on the Cleveland crater) or on the ground (the Policoro hydria). When we examine the Telephus scene on the reverse of the Cleveland Bell Crater an even more glaring break with the stage-version is evident. Telephus in Euripides'

---

<sup>98</sup> Policoro 35296 = *LCS* 58, 286 = *MTS*<sup>2</sup> no. LV5 (519) p. 129; see Trendall and Webster (1971) 96; Trendall (1989) no. 28 p. 22; Taplin (2007), 117-20.

<sup>99</sup> Policoro 35297 = *LCS* 58, 288 = *MTS*<sup>2</sup> no. LV7 (521) p. 130. Trendall and Webster (1971) 82-3; Trendall (1989) no. 29 p. 22; Taplin (1998) 33-4, cf. (2007) 187-8; Alan (2001) 72.

<sup>100</sup> *LCS* 55, 283 = *MTS*<sup>2</sup> no. LV6 (520) p. 130 = *LIMC* IV 725 'Heraclidae' no. 2; see Trendall and Webster (1971) 86; Wiles (1997) 192; Allan (2001) 75-6; Taplin (2007) 126. Another early Lucanian vase of the same date shows the later scene in the play (55-119) in which the herald attempts to remove Iolaus by force: Berlin 1969.6 = *LCS Suppl.* II 158, 291a = *LIMC* no.3.

<sup>101</sup> Trendall (1989) 22.

<sup>102</sup> Small (2003) 47-52; (2005) 106-9.

play was famous for his beggar's rags with which he disguised himself in order to steal into Argos.<sup>103</sup> On the vase, Telephus, like Agamemnon, is heroically naked, except for his bandage. In order to be certain of a link between these vases and tragedy we need to apply the tests we developed earlier: could the creator of this vase have been influenced by a literary version of the myth or artistic tradition pre-dating Euripides?

In fact a change in the artistic record can be demonstrated and attributed to the impact of Euripides' tragedies. The scene of Medea's escape depicted in both vases does not appear in art before 431, the date of Euripides' play. Our two vases are the earliest examples. Before Euripides other episodes from Medea's life are more common, such as the deception of the Peliades.<sup>104</sup> Furthermore, in both, the bodies of the dead children are clearly evident. The actual act of infanticide appears on a number of other vases made in Italy later in the fourth century.<sup>105</sup> We can therefore be reasonably confident that the dead children on the Cleveland and Policoro vases are the victims of their own mother, following the account in Euripides' *Medea*. In the earlier literary tradition the children were said to have been murdered by the people of Corinth in revenge for the poisoning of Creon and his daughter.<sup>106</sup> Euripides may

---

<sup>103</sup> Eur. fr. 697 and 698 *TrGF*; Ar. *Nub.* 921-4 cf. Σ 922 (Holwerda pp.131 and 373), *Ach.* 383-446, *Ran.* 846 cf. Σ (Holwerda p.112).

<sup>104</sup> E.g. London 1843,1103.76 = *ARV*<sup>2</sup> and Berlin 2188 = *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 297,1: early fifth century Attic vases showing the rejuvenation of a ram by Medea. For a detailed survey of images related to the Medea myth, see Sourvinou-Inwood (1997) 262-9.

<sup>105</sup> See Sourvinou-Inwood (1997) 272-4; Taplin (2007) 114.

<sup>106</sup> According to the sixth century *Corinthiaca* ascribed to Eumelus (fr. 23 *GEF*), Medea killed her children by accident while trying to make them immortal; see West (2002) 123-4; 130-1 = (2011a) 375-7; 386-7. An unidentified Creophylus, possibly the fourth century historian Creophylus of Ephesus, cited at Σ Eur. *Med.* 264 = *FGrHist* 417 F 3, claimed that the children were killed by the Corinthians, who then blamed the murder falsely on their mother. Cf. Gaetulicus *Anth. Pal.* 7.354 = *FGE* 213-16, which is dated to the first century AD and which also blames Glaucus and the Corinthians for the deaths of the children. The possibility of the Corinthians taking such revenge is mentioned in the play (781, 1060-1, 1238-41, 1301-5, 1380-1), suggesting that Euripides was alluding to an earlier tradition. See Page (1938) xxi-v; Mastronarde (2002) 50-3; Mossman (2011) 5-8.



have been the first to have included the infanticide in his version of the myth.<sup>107</sup> It was a shocking innovation: so much so that the younger Carcinus in the fourth century seems to have avoided making Medea the murderer of her own children in his play.<sup>108</sup>

Vase painters in Italy and their customers were, it seems, well aware of the works of Euripides by the end of the fifth century. However, none of the plays from the last years of Euripides' life are represented in the early vases. The *Medea*, *Telephus* and *Heracleidae* all date from the 430s, allowing a gap of at least thirty years for the plays to have reached the Greek West. The possible exception is *Antiope*, which is dated by the scholion on Aristophanes' *Frogs* to the final decade of the fifth century. However, the metrical data points to a date as early as 425 BC and it may well be that the scholiast has confused this play with Euripides' *Antigone*.<sup>109</sup>

This suggests that, as with Attic vase painting, it took some time for plays to make an impact on visual culture. By 400 the *Medea* and other plays were not only known in Italy: they were recognised as classics. We will recall that it took between ten and twenty years before the first appearance of Aeschylus' *Oresteia* on a vase. If we assume a similar gap in time for the dissemination of the *Medea*, re-performances may have taken place for the first time no more than a decade after the play's first production at Athens in 431. Then we need to take into account the fact that the production of vases in the Greek West only began at the end of the fifth century. We may speculate whether, had the Italian potteries been in

---

<sup>107</sup> Arist. *Poet.* 1453b29-30: καθάπερ καὶ Εὐριπίδης ἐποίησεν ἀποκτείνουσιν τοὺς παῖδας τὴν Μήδειαν. See Mastronarde (2002) 50-3. For the version of Neophron of Sicyon and its date see my discussion in chapter 6.

<sup>108</sup> Fr. 1e *TrGF* = Arist. *Rhet.* 1400b9; see Xanthakis-Keramanos (1980) 35-6. In a papyrus fragment recently discussed by West (2007), the character of Medea denies that she has killed her children.

<sup>109</sup> Σ Ar. *Ran.* 53a (Holwerda p. 12). See Cropp and Fick (1985) 75-6; Luppe (1992) 97-8; Jouan and Van Looy (1998) 220-1; Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 269.

operation before then, we might have found even earlier representations of *Medea* or other plays.

What else can we say about the dissemination of the genre of tragedy as a whole? Taplin has suggested that ‘the vases add up to a good case for the activity of performances of tragedy . . . in Heraclea before 390 BC, maybe even within Euripides’ lifetime.’ It is my contention that this assessment is overly cautious and that performances of tragedy took place much earlier, conceivably going back as far as the middle of the fifth century or earlier. Not only do some of the pots show the direct influence of Euripides, but they also exhibit general theatrical motifs that are not found in the earlier Attic vases. On the Cleveland *Medea*, for example, we can point to a number of ‘proindications’. Most notable are the two gruesome Erinyes hanging above the scene, which could be understood almost as personifications of tragedy, as well as a reference to Jason’s curse (1381-3). The exotic oriental garb worn by *Medea* and Jason’s high boots may suggest theatrical costumes. The nurse and paedagogus figures mourning the dead boys are stock characters of tragedy, also appearing in Euripides’ play. The artist is arguably not only aware of Euripides but he evokes the atmosphere of the tragic theatre. The fact that we find these ‘pro-indications’ in the earliest vases made in Italy indicates that painters in the Greek West were already familiar with performances of tragedy, indeed no less so than their Athenian counterparts.

Towards the end of the fifth century Athens was beginning to lose its grip on the virtual monopoly it had enjoyed over vase production for two centuries. The new fabrics in Apulia and elsewhere satisfied local demand and imports from Attica declined. The quality and output of the Athenian Kerameikos was no longer as high as it had been, although representations of myth continued to be produced, some of which are clearly influenced by

tragedy.<sup>110</sup> Possibly the reason why we have so few tragedy-inspired Attic vases is that they came into fashion in both southern Italy and Athens precisely at the point at which Attic pottery was in decline. On the other hand, as soon as potteries were established in the Greek West at the end of the century, tragedy-inspired vases appeared. This means that tragedy began to make a major impact in mythological iconography in Italy *at roughly the same time as in Athens*.

An interest in tragedy among vase painters cannot have been an Athenian idea exported to the Greek West, as tragedy was no more popular a subject for painters in Athens than elsewhere. However, while earlier Attic vases lacked ‘theatricality’, Italian artists were not the first to conceive of painting scenes from tragedy. This means that the appearance of theatre-inspired vases did not coincide with the first performances of tragedy in southern Italy, but took place sometime later. A build up of interest in tragic drama must therefore have taken place more or less simultaneously in both Italy and Athens over the course of the fifth century. If so this suggests that tragedy was being performed in the Greek West often enough in the fifth century, if not quite as often or as early as in Athens, for painters and their patrons to have a strong appetite for art inspired by tragedy at the close of the century.

The iconographic evidence suggests that the dissemination of tragedy was a relatively early development. This process took place continuously throughout the fifth century, conceivably from the point at which tragic competitions were first held at Athens. In the chapters that follow, I will present further literary evidence, which also suggests that tragedy’s dissemination abroad and development as a genre took place simultaneously from the early fifth century.

But if that is so, how did this spread take place and why so early

---

<sup>110</sup> E.g. four of the vases in Taplin’s study are Attic: Taplin (2007) 20 no.1; 60 no.6; 176 no.59; 206 no.75.

## 2. Wandering in Greek culture: the circuit of fame (and money)

### 1. Introduction

Tragedy travelled fast across the Greek world. How did it do so? How were texts and performers able to pass from one region to another? From an early period, the Greeks travelled far and often.<sup>1</sup> In fact travel seems to permeate every aspect of Greek culture, both as a necessary part of everyday life and as a constant theme in myth. Why was this so? There are two major complementary factors: the desire for fame and the desire for money. Both of these were to be gained from travel. In what follows, I argue that a culture of travel and the tradition of wandering poets played a key role in the dissemination of Greek tragedy.

Poets, our main focus of interest, were required to travel to compete in Panhellenic festivals or to answer the invitations of wealthy patrons. As wanderers, poets emulated the heroic subjects of their poems, as did members of other ‘parallel’ professions, including athletes, sophists, orators and prophets.<sup>2</sup> Each claimed to have a skill (*techne*) and used it to win fame and a livelihood. Often the same festivals, situated in the various cities and sanctuaries of Greece, provided venues for all of these groups of performers. They were therefore of crucial importance for the dissemination of wisdom and ideas, including poetry.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Purcell (1990); Lane Fox (2008); Osborne (2009) 47-51.

<sup>2</sup> These various professions are rarely studied together or seen as working in tandem. An exception is Tell (2007) 252 and (2009) 26-30, who demonstrates that sophists, as well as doctors and seers, could be criticised for accepting fees.

<sup>3</sup> See Tell (2007) 265-7.

Consequently, the intended audience of a performer was not restricted to the citizen body of any one place.

A skilled workforce was desirable for every Greek *polis*. Those who possessed a *techne* could find employment in almost any city that had need of their particular talents. The demand for skilled labour often led states to take measures to attract foreign specialists.<sup>4</sup> Athens was a particularly attractive destination for such professionals: at the end of the fourth century, after a period of decline, there were still as many as ten thousand metics there.<sup>5</sup> The professions practiced by these resident aliens were varied. A series of inscriptions, believed to concern resident-aliens who avoided prosecution for the non-payment of the *metoikon* tax, list a large number of skilled and unskilled tradesmen and banausic workers, including some musical professionals.<sup>6</sup>

Poets frequently appear in lists of foreigners whose skills are in demand among prosperous communities. Xenophon declares that a peaceful Athens will be an attractive destination for many such professionals:

χειροτέχνηαι τε καὶ σοφισταὶ καὶ φιλόσοφοι, οἳ δὲ ποιηταί, οἳ δὲ τὰ τούτων  
μεταχειριζόμενοι, οἳ δὲ ἀξιοθεάτων ἢ ἀξιακούστων ἱερῶν ἢ ὁσίων  
ἐπιθυμοῦντες.

(*Vect.* 5.4)

---

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Xen. *Vect.* 2.1-2. Xenophon also discusses ways of attracting foreign merchants 3.3, and proposes the building of hotels and other facilities for foreigners 3.12. Cf. Isocr. 8.21, on foreigners and metics and the economic benefits they bring in peacetime. On metic tradesmen in Athens see Whitehead (1977) 116-21. The skilled craftsmen working on the Erechtheum were mostly free non-citizens: see Randall (1953) and Epstein (2008). Agora inv. IL 1702 is letter incised on a lead tablet was written by a young metic apprentice at a foundry: see Jordan (2000).

<sup>5</sup> Ctesicles *FGrHist* 245 F 1.

<sup>6</sup> See Meyer (2010) 83-7= *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1554-9, *Agora Inv.* I 3183 and *SEG* XXV. 178. Musicians e.g.: Δημητρία κιθαρῳιδό *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1557.63.

A similar list is found in as early a source as the *Odyssey*. The suitor Antinoos rails at Eumaeus for inviting another parasitic beggar (the disguised Odysseus) to the palace. Eumaeus replies that no one ever invites a stranger to come from abroad, except for craftsmen (δημιοεργοί 383):

μάντιν ἢ ἱητῆρα κακῶν ἢ τέκτονα δούρων  
ἢ καὶ θέσπιν ἀοιδόν, ὃ κεν τέρπησιν αἰείδων;  
οὔτοι γὰρ δὴ κλητοί γε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν  
(*Od.* 17. 384-5).

We may compare this with Hesiod's list of craftsmen who compete against each other:

καὶ κεραμεὺς κεραμεῖ κοτέει καὶ τέκτονι τέκτων,  
καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῷ φθονέει καὶ ἀοιδὸς ἀοιδῷ.  
(*Hes. Op.* 24-5)

None of these catalogues is exhaustive, but they illustrate the range of skilled *demiourgoi* routinely imported from abroad. And in all of them poets are prominently included.

Another type of list is found in Plato. While Homer had classed professionals together using the term craftsmen (*demiourgoi*), in Plato's dialogue *Protagoras* groups famous poets and wise men together with the collective term 'sophist' (316d-e). The profession or *technē* of the sophist (τὴν σοφιστικὴν τέχνην, 316d3) is nothing new, he argues, but was in fact practiced under other names for many centuries. Protagoras includes in his list of past 'sophists' the poets Homer, Hesiod and Simonides, the mystics Orpheus and Musaeus, as well as the athlete Iccus of Taras and Herodicus of Selymbria, who mixed athletics with medicine.<sup>7</sup> The skills practiced by professionals belonged not merely to the intellectual

---

<sup>7</sup> Pl. *Prot.* 316d. See Denyer (2008) 86-90 for further discussion on this passage. Iccus of Taras: cf. Pl. *Leg.* 840a; Paus. 6.10.5 and Ael. *VH* 11.3. Herodicus of Selymbria cf. Pl. *Resp.* 406a-b.

sphere, but extended also to the physical training undertaken by athletes. To Protagoras, all of these skills are connected and can be summed up by one term. And, once again, all of these professions are united in their tendency to travel: a tendency exemplified by the non-Athenian sophists in Plato's dialogue who are staying in the house of their patron Callias.

To attract these professionals, a city had to offer them opportunities they could not get elsewhere. This meant pay, in coin or in kind. Trade could of course be lucrative, but those with skills could also expect to earn a great deal of money by sharing their talent and its fruits with others. Any skill could potentially earn one a livelihood. Socrates, in Xenophon's *Symposium*, praises the art of pandering (μαστροπεία), which would allow him to charge large fees.<sup>8</sup> The great physician Democedes, who found employment with Polycrates of Samos and King Darius of Persia, was richly rewarded for his *technē*.<sup>9</sup> Professional educators, lambasted by Plato as sophists, took large fees.<sup>10</sup> Callias, son of Hipponicus, is said to have given considerable sums to sophists. Eupolis mocks Protagoras in his *Kolaces* (fr. 157-8 K-A) for devouring Callias' fortune. Xenophon's Socrates also chides Callias for looking down on 'amateur' philosophers (ἀντουργούς τινὰς τῆς φιλοσοφίας) now that he has paid large sums of money to Protagoras, Gorgias and Prodicus to learn from their sophistries.<sup>11</sup>

At the same time, where there was no money to be had, there were likely to be few skilled foreigners.<sup>12</sup> This was not always seen as a bad thing. Plutarch claims Lycurgus banned currency from Sparta. One of the consequences of this policy was that it deterred foreign labourers:

---

<sup>8</sup> Xen. *Symp.* 4.60.

<sup>9</sup> Hdt. 3.129-31.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. Pl. *Hp. Mai.* 282c-e.

<sup>11</sup> Xen. *Symp.* 3.6.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Ar. *Plut.* 407-8.

οὐ σοφιστῆς λόγων, οὐ μάντις ἄγυρτικός, οὐχ ἑταιρῶν τροφεύς, οὐ χρυσῶν  
τις, οὐκ ἀργυρῶν καλλωπισμάτων δημιουργός, ἅτε δὴ νομίσματος οὐκ  
ὄντος.<sup>13</sup>

This is a different kind of catalogue, one with negative overtones, but still making the same point: money is responsible for encouraging movement and a city that has money attracts foreign *demiourgoi*.

Plutarch, in approving of this exclusion of foreign professionals, betrays a moralising agenda, which dismissed money-making activities as slavish and base. Aristotle similarly separates retail trade, which is concerned with coin, from household management, which is concerned with gaining produce from the land. He adds that household management is honourable while retail trade is not.<sup>14</sup> To be a member of the ‘gentry’ or *kaloi k’agathoi*, often required the possession of wealth, as poverty deprives a man of an education and tends to make him mercenary, base and unjust.<sup>15</sup> Trade and spending time on the acquisition of wealth is a lowly and slavish occupation.<sup>16</sup> Free men do not busy themselves with making money but with improving themselves and enjoying the company of their friends.<sup>17</sup> Professionals of all types and in all periods had to battle against a pervasive ideology that prized the ability to be at leisure as an essential requirement if a man was to be truly free.

Professionals had a number of strategies for dealing with these prejudices. Rather than challenging the dominant ideology, they found ways of making themselves respectable by

---

<sup>13</sup> Plut. *Lyc.* 9.3-4; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1272b 15-20.

<sup>14</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 1257a-b; 1258b.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. Pind. *Isthm.* 2.9; Eur. *El.* 375-6; Ar. *Div.* 149-59; Xen. *Symp.* 4. 1-2; ps. Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 1.5; Dem. 18. 257-8.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. Xen. *Ap.* 27, *Lac.* 7.1-2; Arist. *Pol.* 1.10 1258b; Plut. *Lyc.* 24.4.

<sup>17</sup> E.g. Socrates, who by not taking money was free to converse only with those whose company he valued Xen. *Mem.* 1.6.1-5 cf. *Symp.* 1.5. Importance of leisure: Arist. *Pol.* 1337b-1338a. On the contrast between ‘sophists’ who charge for conversations and ‘philosophers’ who do not, see Tell (2009).



these social standards. In doing so, their status as foreigners and wanderers was essential.

Firstly the professional was not merely an employee, but, as a foreigner, he was also a guest of his patron: a *xenos*, entitled to protection, shelter and sustenance.<sup>18</sup> The laws of *xenia* were guaranteed by the gods. In addition, professionals often claimed a special closeness to a particular deity: in the case of poets, to the Muses or Dionysus. Adopting the persona of a servant of the gods both guaranteed protection on the road and justified their fees.

Secondly, professionals were open to criticism if their sole aim was to make money from their travels. The search for fame (*kleos*) legitimised any profit made in the process of a poet's journeys. Fame and the desire for fame was a heroic quality, and professionals used the mythic *exempla* of heroes to justify and glorify their own travels. It was also a reason in and of itself for travel. Like heroes, professionals gained fame by demonstrating their skills as widely as possible, or, especially in the case of poets, by ensuring that their works were exported and re-performed as far afield as possible. Large cosmopolitan cities and Panhellenic gatherings provided ideal opportunities for such self-promotion. Fame, then, for both poets and heroes, was a reason for travel in its own right.

In this chapter, I would like to reconstruct part of the 'circuit', along which members of these parallel professions travelled: that is, the network of festivals and patrons between which poets and other groups were frequently moving. I look at three particular areas. First, we shall consider the models on which our circuit was constructed, namely the journeys of the heroes of myth. Second, I wish to focus on athletics and professional athletes. There are a number of reasons for this. Perhaps more than any other profession, athletes were intimately

---

<sup>18</sup> E.g. compare the contrast between Aeschines' claim to be a *xenos* of Alexander and Demosthenes' accusation that he is a hired lackey, Dem. 18.51-2. Tell (2007) 266-7 and (2009) 22 argues that an institutional framework for cultural networks of interaction was provided by *xenia*.

connected to poets.<sup>19</sup> Like poets they were constantly on the move across the Greek world in a circuit (*periodos*) of panhellenic contests, often performing at the same festivals and, like poets, they competed for both fame and money. If the two groups can truly be said to be working in parallel, an examination of the athletic *periodos* will give us an idea of the nature and extent of the poetic circuit.

Moreover, in the epinicians of Pindar and Bacchylides we have excellent evidence for the ideology – constructed by the poet and based in part on the models provided by myth – that both encouraged and justified athletic endeavour and travels. These poems are also an instance when poets cease to be members of a rival profession, and are instead employed by those athletes wealthy enough to afford to celebrate their victories. The poet, while celebrating his employer's achievements, is eager to give us an insight into the value of poetry and provides us with information on his own travels.

In the third and final part of this chapter, we move on to look at non-tragic poets in detail, to see how they fitted into the circuit alongside athletes and how they provided a precedent for the travels of the later tragic poets. We will first survey the evidence for wandering poets from the earliest period down to the fifth century. Then we shall look in detail at what drove poets to travel. We will see that poets travelled for the same reasons as athletes and often to the same festivals. I argue that, as for athletes, travel was an important part of the work of the professional poet, and poets were wandering professionals from an early period.

Our aim is to understand the framework, already long in existence, that would enable tragedy to sweep across Greece in the fifth and fourth centuries. Tragic poets and actors also travelled along this circuit of fame (and money). Tragedy, like lyric poetry, was not produced

---

<sup>19</sup> As argued in detail by Larmour (1999).

exclusively for one city or one performance, but rather as part of a broader tradition of the wandering professional and the wandering poet, who, never content with one audience alone, was all but compelled to spread the fame of his poetry throughout the Greek world.

## 2. Heroes

Let us begin by examining the myths that both served as subjects for poetry and as paradigms for the behaviour of wandering performers. Many of the myths and cults are specific to one particular city. However, if we look more closely, we often see that these *polis*-centred myths form part of an over-arching matrix that ties one god or hero to many different locations. Even myths that concern the fate of one city, such as Troy, are in fact the stories of great journeys. Troy is a destination on our circuit, where men must win fame through suffering, before embarking on their return. The journey home becomes itself a trial and from being one element of a broader myth, it is worked into a unified whole. When we consider Greek myth in its entirety, we quickly come to realise that this ‘circuit’, what Kurke has termed the ‘loop of *nostos*’, is a pervasive element.<sup>20</sup>

The importance of the *nostos* theme is easily explained. To claim greatness, the heroes of myth must travel and suffer, only to enjoy the rewards of fame and wealth on their successful return. No one wins immortal glory by staying at home. Pindar’s heroes are almost compelled to leave their homes by their desire to demonstrate their prowess. They go in search of contests (*athloi*) that will demonstrate their excellence (*arete*) and thereby bring

---

<sup>20</sup> Kurke (1991) 15-34; she notes Pindar’s frequent sea-faring metaphors: e.g. *Ol.* 12.5-6, 11-12; *Nem.* 6.26, *Isth.* 4.5-6. On travelling metaphors in Pindar see Steiner (1986) 76-86. On the theme of *nostos* in myth see Alexopoulou (2009).

them fame.<sup>21</sup> To stay ‘sitting’ at home is the mark of a coward who wins only an old age in obscurity.<sup>22</sup> A great danger, Pelops tells Poseidon, does not take hold of cowards (*Ol.*1.81) – the danger in question being the perilous contest with Oenomaus. It is by taking risks on great expeditions that great men prove themselves.

One of the greatest was the voyage of the Argo, celebrated in Pindar’s fourth *Pythian*. The quest for the Golden Fleece is a contest, in which Jason must be victorious.<sup>23</sup> He assembles the greatest heroes of his age, who are driven by a passion not to be left behind at home in safety with their mothers (185-6) but to endure toil (πόνον 178). It is through toil that a hero accomplishes great deeds and wins his glorious return.<sup>24</sup> In offering a great opportunity to distinguish themselves, the quest becomes a salve for their excellence (φάρμακον κάλλιστον ἔᾶς ἀρετᾶς, 187). The need to win fame, so essential for a hero, propels the Argonauts towards their distant contest.

If a hero must leave home to gain fame, then the greatest heroes are often those who go the furthest and return to celebrate their adventures. Perhaps the most inveterate of travellers and Panhellenic of heroes was Heracles.<sup>25</sup> His particular pre-eminence was set by the pillars of Heracles, which both served as a boundary for the Greek world and a metaphor for the limits of human achievement. These pillars were set up by Heracles as ‘witnesses of

---

<sup>21</sup> Pindar uses the term *aethlos* to refer to the race of Pelops (*Ol.* 1.84), the expedition of the Argo (*Pyth.* 4.165 and 220), Heracles’ Labours (*Isthm.* 6.48). The uncontracted form is also used by Homer except at *Od.* 8.160.

<sup>22</sup> καθήμενος *Ol.*1.83; Gerber (1982) 128.

<sup>23</sup> ἄεθλον, *Pyth.* 4. 165 and 220; cf. *Mimn.* fr. 11.3 West. See West (2005) 41.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Ol.* 5.16.

<sup>25</sup> See Stafford (2012) 23-78.

the limits of his glorious seafaring'.<sup>26</sup> Heracles had journeyed to the very limits of the world in the encircling Ocean, and thus to the limits of human achievement.

A hero secures his fame by returning successfully from his journeys and enjoying the fruits of his labour: fame, as well as more tangible rewards. This may involve a meal.

Heracles, after his death at the end of his labours, feasts with Hebe and the gods.<sup>27</sup> The hero may also accrue wealth from his travels. This is especially evident in the case of Odysseus.

The gifts from Scheria given to Odysseus after ten years of wandering turn out to be more valuable than even the riches taken from Troy after ten years of war (*Od.* 13.135-8).

From this small selection of myths, then, the exceptional importance of travel begins to emerge, along with a clear pattern which I shall call a 'circuit' or 'loop' of fame. Heroes are not restricted to one particular place but are compelled to be constantly on the move. They are often driven by a desire for the fame which is their reason for being, demanded by their *arete* as heroes. They go beyond the reaches of ordinary men, even circumnavigating the known world, and the distance they cover is a measure of their greatness. In returning home, they may enjoy both the glory accrued on their travels and (we should not forget) the wealth gained in war, as guest-gifts or as payment for hired service. The home and city to which the hero returns can claim much of the reflected glory. So too can those cities, at which the hero stops on his travels and performs his labours. These are the regions and communities that together make up the circuit of fame.

---

<sup>26</sup> ναυτιλίας ἔσχάτας / μάρτυρας κλυτὰς, Pind. *Nem.* 3.2-3. Apollod. 2.5.10 connects the construction of the pillars with his tenth labour: the killing of Geryon and the stealing of his cattle. In order to reach Geryon and to transport his cattle he sailed in the goblet of the sun, a feature of Stesichorus' account: Athen. 469e = S17 *PMGF*; see Davies and Finglass (forthcoming). Hesiod stresses the distance covered in this labour by referring to Ocean: διαβάς πόρον Ὀκεανοῖο (*Theog.* 292).

<sup>27</sup> E.g. *Od.* 11. 601-6; Pind. *Nem.* 1.72; Soph. *Phil.* 1418-22.

### 3. Athletes

The language used in our literary sources to describe the initial destination and contest of the wandering hero, the *athlos* or *agon*, is the same as that used by ancient athletes. Just as athletes, in time of war, belong as much on the battlefield as on the track, so heroes frequently engage in athletics.<sup>28</sup> The funeral games of Patroclus, Achilles and Pelias were popular subjects in archaic Greek poetry and art.<sup>29</sup> The expeditions of heroes are themselves, more often than not, athletic in nature, providing aetiological explanations for the foundation of historical games.

Pelops, in winning a chariot race at Olympia, the prize for which is the beautiful Hippodameia, is one of the legendary founders of the Olympic games. Oenomaus, Hippodameia's father, was the king of Pisa, a city in the neighbourhood of Olympia and the ruins of his house were shown to visitors in Pausanias' day.<sup>30</sup> To Pindar, the palace had

---

<sup>28</sup> E.g. Milo of Croton successfully led the forces of his city into battle dressed as Heracles (DS 12.9.5; cf. 17.100.2-101.2). The Pythian victor Phayllus from the same city commanded the only ship at Salamis sent from the Greek West (Hdt. 8.47). On war and athletics see Kurke (1993) 134 = König (2010) (ed.) 208; on the parallels drawn between heroes and athletes see Larmour (1999) 56-63. Athletics could even resemble warfare. The *hoplitodromus* was traditionally introduced into the program at Olympia in 520BC (Paus. 5.8.10; see Miller (2004) 32). Pausanias understood the purpose of the hoplite race to be military training. Hoplite races are known at Athens from Panathenaic Amphora (e.g. London BM 1875.8-18.8 from Gela; see Shear (2003) 107) and Σ Pind. *Ol.* 13. 51b (Drachmann p. 367). Physical training in the gymnasium was seen as an important part of military training (Xen. *Vect.* 4.52; Pl. *Leg.* 830d).

<sup>29</sup> Patroclus: *Il.* 23.257-897; Achilles: *Od.* 24.85-92. Pelias: Stesichorus fr. 178-80 *PMGF*. Fragments of an Attic vase (580-570 BC) depict wrestling, boxing and spear-throwing, giving the names of the Argonauts who competed. Pausanias (5.17.9-10) lists the heroes who are depicted on the chest of Cypselus as competing in the games. See Vojatzki (1982) and Davies and Finglass (forthcoming).

<sup>30</sup> Paus. 5.1.6; 20.6-7. It has been suggested that there was another older version told by Sophocles and Euripides (Soph. *El.* 504-15; Eur. *Or.* 988-94) in which the race took place elsewhere, before Pelops' arrival in Greece, and that Myrtilus was murdered (in the Myrtoan Sea, off the coast of Euboea) en route to Greece after the race. See Willink (1986) 248-51; West (1997) 472-3 and Davidson (2003) 110. However, as Sommerstein and Talbot (2012) 80 n. 24 note, neither passage necessarily implies that the race took place in Asia. The story may have been designed simply to provide an aetiology for the name of the 'Myrtoan Sea'.

become synonymous with the games themselves.<sup>31</sup> Preparations for the race were depicted on the east pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, while the race itself appeared on the Chest of Cypselus in the temple of Hera.<sup>32</sup> The figures on the pediment are shown wearing helmets, again stressing the perilous and martial nature of both the mythical contest and the actual chariot races taking place at Olympia.<sup>33</sup> Athletics could become a matter of life and death, and this is very much the case with the contests of the heroes. In the case of Pelops, the usual dangers of a chariot race are magnified by the bride's father, Oenomaus, who kills all whom he beats. Oenomaus, in the version given by Sophocles, decorated his palace with the severed heads of his victims.<sup>34</sup>

In myth, athletic contests, like military expeditions or the killing of monsters, encourage heroes to travel, and while they are on the road they are classed as *xenoi*. A number of athletic events that aimed to draw competitors from a wide range of cities appear in tragedy. Heracles in Euripides' *Alceste* pretends to have competed at an athletic contest that is open to all peoples (ἀγῶνα πάνδημον, 1026). Orestes in Sophocles' *Electra* was supposed to have been killed in the chariot race at the Pythian games. His fellow competitors in that fatal event are drawn from across mainland Greece.<sup>35</sup> Acrisius, in Sophocles' *Men of Larissa*, announces a 'contest open to all strangers' (ἀγῶνα πάγξενον) at which he is killed

---

<sup>31</sup> *Ol.* 5.10-11; cf. the tomb of Pelops *Ol.* 10. 23b.

<sup>32</sup> Pediments: see *LIMC* VII 284 'Pelops' no. 23; Säflund (1970); Shapiro (1994) 82-3; Barringer (2008) 9-13 and 32-46; Chest of Cypselus: Paus. 5.10.7-8; 17.7. For Pelops at Olympia see Ekroth (2012).

<sup>33</sup> Barringer (2008) 40-5.

<sup>34</sup> Soph. fr. 473a; see Sommerstein and Talbot (2012) 100-1. He is compared to Antaeus, one of Heracles' opponents, who decorated Poseidon's temple with the heads of strangers; see Σ Pind. *Isthm.* 4.92a (p.236 Drachmann); cf. Philostr. *Mai. Imag.* 1.17.1, Tzetis in *Lycophr.* 160.

<sup>35</sup> Soph. *El.* 701-8; see Finglass (2007a) 312. Pindar (*Pyth.* 11.16) may have been aware of a tradition of Orestes as a Pythian victor and stresses that he is a *xenos* in the home of Pylades. See Egan (1983) 195-8; Finglass (2007b) 45-7, 86. On Orestes as an athlete, see Golden (1998) 95-103.

by his grandson Perseus with an unlucky discus throw.<sup>36</sup> As with other contests, athletics attracts the attention of heroes by holding out promises of glory and material rewards. In Euripides' *Alcestis*, Heracles pretends that he has won a woman, Alcestis in disguise. Acrisius offers not a woman but one hundred and twenty valuable drinking vessels.<sup>37</sup> Athletic contests, like other great feats of myth, can encourage heroes to travel far and for the same reasons: fame and money.

Athletics therefore is but one of the type of contests in which heroes participate. Athletes, for their part, both emulate and at times even become heroes. The achievement of Pelops, victory in a chariot race, was emulated by many athletes, notably Hieron, for whom Pindar's first *Olympian* was written. By competing in this contest (ἄεθλος *Ol.* 1.84) Pelops will gain the fame he desires and a hero's tomb in the vicinity of the site of the games (93). Like Pelops, Pindar tells us, the one who wins at the games by exerting himself to the fullest will have 'sweet tranquillity' (μελιτόεσσον εὐδίαν 98) and fame (97-8). Bacchylides, in his celebration of a chariot victory in 468, alludes to Hieron's hopes for a life after death, in the form of hero-cult.<sup>38</sup> In the ode Croesus is rescued from his pyre by Apollo and transported to the land of the Hyperboreans because of his piety in sending so many dedications to Delphi.<sup>39</sup> Hieron has been as generous, if not more so (63-6) and is perhaps as deserving of a miraculous rescue from death. He was, in time, to realise his wish as the recipient of hero

---

<sup>36</sup> Soph. fr. 378.1. The results of a discus competition are given fr. 380. Cf. Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.4.4 (where it is Teutamidas, the king of Larissa, who is holding the games for his deceased father) and Paus. 2.16.2.

<sup>37</sup> χαλκηλάτους λέβετας ἐκτιθεὶς φέρειν / καὶ κοῖλα χρυσόκολλα καὶ πανάργυρα / ἐκπώματ', εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἐξήκοντα δίδωμι, fr. 378 2-4 *TrGF*. For similar prizes cf. *Il.* 23.259-61.

<sup>38</sup> Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 46 and Σ 89a (p. 17-18 Drachmann); Plut. *de Pyth. Or.* 403c. See Maehler (2003) 79-80. On the ambitions of Hieron and other Greeks to achieve cult status as heroes see Currie (2002) and (2005).

<sup>39</sup> 3.58-62 Maehler.



cult.<sup>40</sup> Hieron indeed equals Pelops' achievement, as Pindar hoped he would, in gaining not only the eternal glory of an Olympic chariot victory, but also a hero's tomb.

In search of this eternal fame, athletes become travellers on the circuit. In Pindar's first *Nemean*, the labours and wanderings of Heracles are briefly sketched in a prophecy by Teiresias, as is the rest he will gain at the end of his life, feasting in the company of his father Zeus (*Nem.* 1.72).<sup>41</sup> The peace (ἡσυχίαν καμάτων, *Nem.* 1.70) he has obtained reminds us of the 'sweet tranquillity' (μελιτόεσσαν εὐδίαν, *Ol.* 1. 98) obtained by the Olympic victor. The feasting among the gods is also designed to resemble the meal served at the house of Hieron's general Chromius on the occasion of his victory (ἀρμόδιον / δεῖπνον, *Nem.* 1.21-2).<sup>42</sup> Chromius has come full circle in the circuit of fame. He is victorious in the games and has displayed his excellence (δαιμονίαις ἀρεταῖς . . . μεγάλων δ' ἀέθλων 9 and 11). Now, like Heracles, on his return he may enjoy the lasting glory of his achievements.

On their travels, athletes are treated as *xenoi*: strangers under the special protection of the gods. Timasarchus, the honorand of Pindar's fourth *Nemean*, was victorious both at Athens and Thebes as well as winning a crown at Nemea (*Nem.* 4. 17-22). Pindar especially dwells upon Timasarchus' visit to his own native city Thebes. He came, Pindar tells us, to the strange city (ξένιον ἄστυ) 'as a friend among friends' and saw the 'prosperous court' of Heracles, the defender of *xenoi* (22-4). Traditionally strangers, when they arrive, stand in the court or portico of the house waiting to be admitted.<sup>43</sup> Pindar himself has stood at the Chromius' door (αὐλείαις θύραις *Nem.* 1.19) before receiving hospitality. The athlete

---

<sup>40</sup> D.S. 11.53.2, Strab. 6.2.3. Currie (2005) 3-5.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. *Od.* 11. 601-6; *Soph. Phil.* 1418-22.

<sup>42</sup> Rose (1974) 159-173 demonstrates the close parallels between Chromius and Heracles. Pindar, according to Rose, demonstrates the superiority of the aristocracy in his two exempla, both of whom are of superior birth. For the relevance of the myth see Radt (1966).

<sup>43</sup> E.g. *Od.* 1.105 οὐδοῦ ἐπ' αὐλείου; see Reece (1993) 12-15.

Timasarchus, when he is away from his home city of Aegina, is also a stranger entitled to hospitality from Pindar's fellow citizens.<sup>44</sup>

In the course of the fifth and fourth centuries a network of athletic contacts was to develop as a 'direct response to the growing complexity and hazards of the festival circuit across the Greek world.'<sup>45</sup> As strangers athletes were automatically under the protection of sacred rules of hospitality. Their safety was further guaranteed by the announcement of the Olympic 'truce' (*ekecheiria*), which guaranteed the inviolability both of the sanctuaries at which festivals were held and those who competed.<sup>46</sup> Although we tend to associate the truce with Olympia, similar arrangements are attested at other games. For example, an Athenian delegation was present, under the protection of the truce, at the Isthmian games in 412, which was presided over by Corinth, a city then at war with Athens.<sup>47</sup> The truce was announced by *theoroi* (ambassadors).<sup>48</sup> All cities who accepted the truce had to ensure the safety of participants in the games for its duration. A breaking of the truce could bring penalties upon those responsible and any city that harboured them.<sup>49</sup>

Travelling long distances was an essential part of an athlete's life with the development of the *periodos*. The most prestigious contests were the crown games, which were organised so as to avoid clashes between each festival and to permit athletes to move

---

<sup>44</sup> Cf. *Isthm.* 2. 23-7 Xenocrates is welcomed by the Elean heralds at Olympia, whom he had hosted in Sicily when they came to announce the Olympic truce.

<sup>45</sup> Hornblower and Morgan (2007b) 42.

<sup>46</sup> See Plut. *Lyc.* 1.2; Paus. 5.4.5. Lämmer, M. (1982-3) and Golden (2011) 6-7, note that the truce was designed to enable athletes to reach the games in war-time, rather than to promote peace (an aim of the modern Olympic movement).

<sup>47</sup> Thuc. 8.10.1.

<sup>48</sup> Thuc. 5.49.2-3; Lucian *Icaromenippus* 33; see Elsner and Rutherford (2005) 13.

<sup>49</sup> E.g. Aeschin. 2.12.

between them all.<sup>50</sup> Although these competitions often took place within city festivals, they were open to all Greeks and aimed to attract as broad a group of entrants as possible. Of the total number of victors from the sixth to the first century BC in the crown games, 34% were from the Peloponnese, with the next largest group from central and northern Greece. A further 25% were from the Aegean and Asia Minor and 11.6% from the Greek West, meaning that over a third were not from the Greek mainland.<sup>51</sup> A similar proportion of the thirty two victors honoured by Pindar, over a shorter period in the fifth century, were required to travel great distances to compete. Only one of his clients (Xenophon) is from the Isthmus, while another two are Athenian. Six are fellow Boeotians. The largest group is from Aegina (ten victors) but not far behind are the athletes from Italy and Sicily, eight in total. If we exclude the Aeginetans, and include Diagoras of Rhodes and Arcesilas and Telesicrates of Cyrene, then twelve of Pindar's victors, or 34%, were not from the Greek mainland.

Athletes did not restrict themselves to the crown games. There were other events, many of which were of considerable size and importance, to attract their attention. Rather than making a journey once in four or two years, athletes were constantly on the road between different festivals. They boast of the number of victories won, and they frequently tell us where. A fifth century epigram for the athlete Nicolaidas of Corinth lists victories at the Pythian, Nemean and Isthmian games as well as Athens, Pallene, Arcadia, Aegina, Epidaurus, Thebes, Megara and Phlius.<sup>52</sup> At much the same time, Pindar's client Diagoras of Rhodes could be found on the same circuit.<sup>53</sup> While Nicolaidas and Diagoras covered much of mainland Greece, Theogenes of Thasos may have been even more active, also in the fifth century. His epigram mentions thirteen hundred victories and claims that in twenty two years

---

<sup>50</sup> See Golden (1998) 10-11.

<sup>51</sup> Figures are from Golden (1998) 36 and Klee (1918).

<sup>52</sup> Anon. *Anth. Pal.* 13.19 = 857-68 *FGE* = Ebert n. 26.

<sup>53</sup> Pind. *Ol.* 7.81-7; see Young (1968) 91.

he was never defeated in boxing: the equivalent of about a victory a week, if this was the span of his whole career.<sup>54</sup> Some may have been won when he was a boy, but even assuming that his career lasted longer than two decades (no small feat in itself), Theogenes must have been constantly on the move between competitions great and small.

Why did athletes such as Theogenes and Diagoras travel so much and compete so frequently? Their passion for glory must not be underestimated, but it does not entirely explain why great champions felt the need to compete so regularly. The answer is that ancient athletes, like many of today's sportsmen, were professionals who earned substantial sums of money in the form of prizes. There were exceptions: the crown games offered prizes of only symbolic value.<sup>55</sup> An important minority of sporting dilettantes, those who competed in the equestrian events, will in all likelihood have spent rather than earned money on their horses and drivers. However, these victors belonged to an exclusive group made up of only the richest competitors: the likes of the elder Cimon or the tyrants Hieron and Theron. These wealthy contestants have given rise, in part, to the 'myth' that athletics was originally the preserve of the aristocracy and was only later degraded by lower-class athletes competing for money.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Ebert no. 27. On the professionalism of an athlete such as Theogenes see Pleket (1975) 60 = (2010) 153 and Young (1984) 95.

<sup>55</sup> Hdt. 8.26.2-3.

<sup>56</sup> The principle exponents of this view were Gardiner (1930) 99-116 and Harris (1964) 187-97. They were inspired by the amateur Olympic movement of de Coubertin in the late nineteenth century. The myth was first challenged by Pleket (1974) and (1976) and then savaged by Young (1984). Recent scholarship has sought to identify in athletics aristocratic discourses designed to defend the ruling elite against the rising tide of Athenian democracy. See Rose (1974); Golden (1998) and (2009) and Nicholson (2005). This view has also not gone without criticism: see Thomas (2007).

Not all athletes, however, were wealthy aristocrats, nor were they motivated only by the desire for honour and love of the sport.<sup>57</sup> In fact athletes gained substantial sums in prizes from at least the fifth century, if not earlier. Nicolaidas claims to have won sixty amphorae of oil at the Panatheneia at Athens. This was a valuable prize: roughly equivalent in cash values to over two years' wages for a common labourer.<sup>58</sup> Most of the prizes for the boys' athletic games are conveniently recorded in an inscription dated to around 380BC.<sup>59</sup> Similar figures are given which seem to corroborate Nicolaidas' claim for the men's pentathlon.<sup>60</sup> The prizes are even greater for the equestrian events, showing that even our putative disinterested 'aristocrats' were not averse to profiting from the games if they could. And even if athletes were unable to win money prizes at the crown games, their home cities regularly rewarded them with gifts of money.<sup>61</sup> Athens granted athletes, as well as cash gifts, the privilege of dining at the state's expense at the prytaneum.<sup>62</sup>

These monetary rewards enticed athletes to travel far and often. It also explains how athletes from less distinguished backgrounds were able not only to make a living but also invest the time and money needed to be successful. Ancient athletes followed as strict

---

<sup>57</sup> For professional athletes drawn from the poor see Isoc. 16.33-4; cf. Pleket (1976) 72-3 = (2010) 162 and Young (1984) 100-1.

<sup>58</sup> Young (1984) 115-17 estimates that the minimum daily wage was around 1.4 drachmas and that the lowest price of oil was twelve drachmas an amphora. Therefore, a prize for the men's stadion of one hundred amphoras would represent the equivalent of 847 days' wages. By comparing the minimum Greek wage with that of the USA in 1980 he estimates that the cash value of a hundred amphoras would be the equivalent of \$121,200. Using the same calculation, I estimate that the same prize would represent over £40,000 GBP in 2012. Miller (2004) 134 also gives an estimate of around US\$150,000.

<sup>59</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2311. For the text and suggested restorations see Shear (2003); on the date see p. 96.

<sup>60</sup> Shear (2003) 95.

<sup>61</sup> Plut. *Sol.* 23, D.L. 1.55. See Young (1984) 128-131.

<sup>62</sup> Xenoph. fr. 2 West, Plat. *Ap.* 36e, Andoc. 4.31, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 131.11-17.

regimens of training and diet as their modern counterparts.<sup>63</sup> Professional trainers, often former athletes themselves, were frequently hired to improve the athlete's chances of winning.<sup>64</sup> These men were driven not by the love of sport alone: it had to be justified by a material return.

Why did the idea of the amateur athlete gain such currency in modern times? While some competitors possessed inherited wealth and a long ancestry, athletes in general aspired to an 'aristocratic' ideology.<sup>65</sup> This disdain for trade mirrors the concern of nineteenth century amateur sporting associations to exclude all those who had ever worked in a lowly profession or trade, and explains why the modern amateur sporting movement seized upon the notion of the Greek amateur athlete.<sup>66</sup>

However, there is a crucial difference between the Greek outlook and that of amateur athletes a century ago. Unlike the nineteenth century gentleman, the Greek of antiquity did not hesitate to win money *as long as it was gained honourably*. He could win money if he won glory as well: he only objected to those who were concerned for gain alone. Euryalus, at the games of the Phaeacians, in likening Odysseus to a merchant, criticises him not for being interested in money but because, he claims, money is his only interest.<sup>67</sup> Both athletes and heroes profit from contests, but the noble nature of their endeavours justifies their reward. Fame is therefore not just an end in itself but also justifies the acceptance of wages and cash-

---

<sup>63</sup> Plat. *Leg.* 795b: Athletes, like soldiers, need training. *Resp.* 403e: approves of an athletes' diet for the guardians. Cf. *Leg.* 830a-b and *Resp.* 410b on athletes' diet and training in general, which might even include sexual abstinence. See Pleket (1974) 64 and Young (1984) 143-5.

<sup>64</sup> For example the trainer Melesias who was a retired athlete Pind. *Ol.* 8. 54-66; cf. *Nem.* 4. 93, 6.64-6. On trainers in general see Nicholson (2005).

<sup>65</sup> See Pleket (1976).

<sup>66</sup> The original Henley Regatta rules for membership excluded anyone from entering 'who is or has been by trade or employment for wages a mechanic, artisan, or labourer or engaged in any menial duty'. See Young (1984) 20.

<sup>67</sup> *Od.* 8.159-64.

prizes. In addition, because travel is an essential part of this process, and athletes are classed as *xenoi*, this money can be treated as guest gifts, reinforcing ties of friendship among fellow members of that elite, rather than wages given for a service.

The second reason why athletes are often seen as aristocratic amateurs is because one of our major sources, epinician, presents them as such. Athletes could avoid censure for being professionals by winning glory and by commissioning sculptors and poets to both immortalise that glory. At the moment at which the epinician is commissioned, the athlete has won his prize and ended his journey. The journey of the poet, in search of a commission, is just beginning. Pindar is interested in encouraging his clients to spend money in order to commemorate their victory. We could be forgiven, then, for failing to notice that the athlete commissioning the epinician is sometimes as much a professional as the poet he is employing. Poets joined the other professionals on our circuit, in search of the immortality of fame but also for a basic living. Because poets were often themselves compelled to travel, their natural audience was not necessarily the citizen body of any one area but a Panhellenic audience across the whole Greek world.

#### **4. Poets**

Modern sport has little to do with poetry, but in the ancient world the connection between poetic skill and athletic prowess could hardly have been stronger. Together they formed the two main components of a man's education.<sup>68</sup> More importantly for our purposes, poets, like the heroes and athletes they celebrate, are constantly travelling. As Larmour notes:

---

<sup>68</sup> See Pl. *Resp.* 410c-412a: athletic and musical training balance each other. cf. Arist. *Pol.* 7.3. 1337b. On hiring athletic and musical trainers see Xen. *Lac.* 2.1. Both disciplines are important parts of the education of a 'gentleman' e.g.: τοὺς δὲ γυμναζομένους αὐτόθι καὶ τὴν μουσικὴν ἐπιτηδεύοντας καταλέλκεν ὁ δῆμος,

Both the poet and the athlete are on a journey, in the literal and metaphorical sense. They both travel to and from the festival where their skill is displayed and recognised. The poet escorts the victor back from the festival, back to his native city. It is the athlete's performance on the stadium track or the hippodrome that sets the poet on his path of words.<sup>69</sup>

To honour his athletic clients, Pindar claims to have journeyed to destinations as diverse as Sicily and Rhodes.<sup>70</sup> With the completion of an athlete's journey, the travels of the poet must begin.

Poets did not just celebrate victors at the games: they also won victories in their own right and at the same games. The only crown games not to hold a musical contest was Olympia, and even here poetic and oratorical displays were common.<sup>71</sup> The Delian festival mentioned in the *Hymn to Apollo* (144-5) held both athletic and musical competitions. The prizes for the musical events at the Panathenaea were even more valuable than those for which the athletes competed.<sup>72</sup> Funeral games could also include poetic contests: Hesiod was victorious at just such an event.<sup>73</sup> There is even a tradition that Archilochus' *tenella*, his victory song for athletes, may actually have been composed to celebrate the success of his

---

[Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.13. Music and athletics are both separately considered to stand for the education of a citizen. Compare such statements as Eur. *Phoen.* 368 (athletics) with Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.20 (poetry).

<sup>69</sup> Larmour (1999) 48-9.

<sup>70</sup> E.g. to visit Chromius (*Nem.* 1.19-20) and Diagoras (*Ol.* 7.13).

<sup>71</sup> See Larmour (1999) 171-84. On musical competitions at Delphi see Pind. *Pyth.* 12; Paus. 10.9.2; Miller (2004) 82-3. On poetic performances at Olympia see DS 15.7.3; Pl. *Hp.Mi.* 368b; Dio Chrys. 8.9. On travelling sages and the games see Tell (2007).

<sup>72</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2311.1-22.

<sup>73</sup> *Op.* 650-58.



hymn to Demeter.<sup>74</sup> It was even possible for a man to compete both as an athlete and as a poet.<sup>75</sup>

While athletes sometimes acted as their patrons, poets saw athletics as merely an equal or inferior profession to their own. Xenophanes (fr.2.11-12 West) certainly believed that as a poet he was more deserving of praise and financial rewards than athletes. His complaint indicates that poets were comparing themselves to athletes from an early period and that they were already ambitious for the rewards bestowed on the sporting heroes of the time. Euripides, who had a character in his *Autolycus* denounce sportsmen in similar terms (fr. 282), may have taken the same view. Nevertheless, he was not averse to becoming a successful athlete's patron, if it is true that he composed an epinician for Alcibiades.<sup>76</sup> Xenophanes and Euripides, therefore, do not reject athletics but treat athletes as members of a rival profession.<sup>77</sup>

Poets, therefore, join athletes on the same circuit, at the same time, for much the same reasons, working both alongside and sometimes for athletes. We will now look briefly at three areas: the evidence for the travels of poets and their twin motives: the need to secure fame and money. In doing so, we will see strong parallels developing between poets and athletes from an early period up until the fifth and fourth centuries. Poets worked within a 'song-culture' that saw them move between major poetic festivals and wealthy clients, and which was part of the broader panhellenic culture of the travelling professional. It is this

---

<sup>74</sup> Σ Ar. Av. 1764 (Holwerda p.241).

<sup>75</sup> A red figure pelice from around 430 BC (Plovdiv 1812), depicting a victorious citharode or citharist, lists victories including ones at Nemea and Isthmia. Power (2010) 491 suggests that these may be athletic victories. A third century BC actor's inscription from Tegea lists a victory in boxing at Alexandria (*IG* V 118).

<sup>76</sup> Fr. 755 *PMG* = Plut. *Alc.* 11-12 (cf. Plut. *Dem.* 1). See Bowra (1960); Kovacs (1995) 565-6.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Larmour (1999) 44, 'It is clear that virulent criticism and lavish praise of athletes and athletic endeavours are, in reality, two sides of the same coin.'

circuit, so important for the later dissemination of tragedy, which we will examine in detail now.

### a) Travelling Poets

The evidence for the travels of poets begins with our earliest literary sources. We have already noted the passage from *Odyssey* 17 (383-5) in which Eumaeus describes a poet as a stranger (*xenos*) called from abroad. This passage indicates that poets could be persuaded to leave home and perform at the courts of wealthy patrons. They are brought in from outside because of their particular skill and the benefits they can deliver through practising it. It is primarily the ability to entertain, for which Odysseus rewards Demodocus. Poets, however, are also called from abroad for their wisdom, particularly in preventing civil strife.<sup>78</sup>

Poets in epic also travel to perform at contests. The Muses punished the hapless Thamyris for claiming to be their match in contest.<sup>79</sup> They came upon him and maimed the poet as he was travelling through the Peloponnese from Oechalia (596).<sup>80</sup> In later versions, the details of the contest are developed as Thamyris comes to resemble a professional itinerant citharode.<sup>81</sup> Hesiod also travelled to a contest on Euboea (*Op.* 650-58). The authors of the early epics were, therefore, aware that poets on occasion travelled, either to gain patronage or to compete in contests.

This pattern appears frequently throughout the archaic and classical periods. As early as the seventh century, poets were believed to have competed at the great panhellenic games.

---

<sup>78</sup> E.g. the poet is set to watch and advise Clytemnestra *Od.* 3. 267-72.

<sup>79</sup> *Il.* 2.597-8.

<sup>80</sup> On the location of the mythical Oechalia, for which there are several candidates, see Paus. 4.2.2-3 and 9.30.2; Strab. 9.5.17; Eustathius s.v. *Il.* 2.596; see Wilson (2009b) 48-53.

<sup>81</sup> See Power (2010) 48-9.

Many of these performers came from Lesbos. Sappho speaks of the interest a singer of Lesbos excites among other Greeks:

πέροχος, ὥς ὅτ' ᾠδοῖς ὁ Λέσβιος ἄλλοδάποισι

(Sappho fr. 106 Voigt).

Terpander, thought by some to have been the Lesbian poet of whom Sappho speaks, was the greatest of these poets and almost a mythical figure in later sources. The Spartans were believed to have invited the descendants of Terpander to compete first at their competitions, thus showing their particular regard for Lesbian poets and their distinguished ancestor.<sup>82</sup> He is connected with the founding of the Spartan Carneia in the first quarter of the seventh century.<sup>83</sup> Philodemus punned on his name, noting the pleasure (ἔτερπεν) he gave to audiences at contests (ἐπ[ί τῶν] ἀγόνων).<sup>84</sup> He was thought to have won four victories at the Pythian games and to have composed songs for competitions using his own words and those of Homer.<sup>85</sup>

Terpander's arrival is also said to have put an end to civic strife in Laconia.<sup>86</sup> The idea of a stranger poet who is summoned from abroad for the benefit of the city is a recurring theme. In a similar way, Lycurgus is said to have brought the Cretan poet Thaletas to Sparta to help him institute his new constitution.<sup>87</sup> This echoes ideas developed by Plato on the importance of poetry in the constitution of the state.<sup>88</sup> The legends associated with Terpander

---

<sup>82</sup> Hesych. μ 1004; Suda μ 701; Eustathius s.v. *Il.* 9.129.

<sup>83</sup> See Athen. 635e-f.

<sup>84</sup> Philod. *Mus.* IV 11 col. 20. 1-21 = *PMG* 281 (d).

<sup>85</sup> ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν, [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1132e.

<sup>86</sup> Suda μ 701; Philodemus *de Mus.* fr. 133; [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1146b; DS 8.28.

<sup>87</sup> Plut. *Lyc.* 4.1; *Agis.* 10.6.

<sup>88</sup> E.g. Pl. *Resp.* 424c.

are also paralleled in the stories surrounding the early sages, such as Thales and Epimenides of Crete.<sup>89</sup>

Many of these stories must reflect the interests of later professional musicians, who were keen to promote their craft by spreading the myth of a semi-heroic predecessor.<sup>90</sup> Most scholars agree that the surviving fragments attributed to Terpander are in fact only written under the name of this legendary travelling poet.<sup>91</sup> However, whether a man named Terpander existed or not, the legend of Terpander, as Power points out, tells us something about how poets wished to be viewed: as a stranger bringing wisdom and healing to the cities he visits. This image of the poet being brought in to heal stasis is crucial to the ideology of the professional wandering poet, who, upon his arrival, must advertise the benefits a city will receive in order to ensure a proper welcome.<sup>92</sup> Using the name and persona of a famous wandering poet also helps to attract an audience and allay any suspicions they might have about these visitors. Moreover, it is probable that some of these accounts do reflect the historical reality of the seventh century. The idea of Terpander as a travelling poet certainly fits well with the evidence from epic and Sappho mentioned above.

Alcman is another travelling poet said to have benefited Sparta in the manner of Terpander.<sup>93</sup> According to ancient sources that included Aristotle and Crates of Pergamon, he was a stranger-poet from Lydia and not a native Spartan.<sup>94</sup> This seems to have been based on

---

<sup>89</sup> Thales: Plut. *Lyc.* 4.1, DS 8.28; Epimenides: Diog. Laert. 1.115.

<sup>90</sup> Power (2010) 320-3. Beecroft (2008) 225.

<sup>91</sup> See Page on *PMG* 697-8 p. 362; West (1982) 56; Beecroft (2008).

<sup>92</sup> See Martin (2009).

<sup>93</sup> Ael. *VH* 12.50.

<sup>94</sup> Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ [σύ]μψηφοι, fr. 13a 12-13 *PMGF*; Ἀλκμάν· Λάκων ἀπὸ Μεισσοῦ· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Κράττηα πταίουτα Λυδὸς ἐκ Σαρδέων, *Suda* α 1289. For the full *testimonia* see TA1-9 *PMGF*; Campbell (1988) 336-345.

Alcman's own poetry, where the poet possibly referred to his Lydian background in order to demonstrate his urbanity or sophistication.

οὐκ ἦς ἀνὴρ ἀγρεῖος . . .  
ἀλλὰ Σαρδίων ἀπ' ἀκράν.  
(fr. 16 *PMGF*)

The story of Alcman's Lydian origins was not accepted by all ancient scholars.<sup>95</sup> Even the evidence of fragment 16 is ambiguous: the verb in line one may be in the second or third person.

Nevertheless, it is quite probable that the poet is making a claim, either for himself or somebody else, to a degree of sophistication associated with Lydia and Sardis, its capital. He may wish to be counted among the wise (σοφοί) because of his Lydian connections. This Anatolian kingdom was particularly associated with music. The Lydian and Phrygian modes are thought to have been brought to Greece from the East.<sup>96</sup> Pindar claimed that Terpander had invented the barbitos from listening to music at the banquets of the Lydians.<sup>97</sup> Herodotus (1.55.4) attests to the Lydian passion for music. In addition, much early Greek literature, including the poetry of Alcman, shows the influence of Eastern cultures.<sup>98</sup> A Lydian connection is far from surprising.

Lydia is also associated with wandering sages by at least the fifth century. The archetypical travelling sage, who brings with him new wisdom and knowledge from the East, is Dionysus.<sup>99</sup> Sages and poets similarly benefit the cities they come to by advising their

---

<sup>95</sup> *Suda* α 1289; see further Campbell (1967) 215-16; Hutchinson (2001) 74-5.

<sup>96</sup> Telestes fr. 806 *PMG*.

<sup>97</sup> Fr. 125 S-M.

<sup>98</sup> See West (1997) 524-6.

<sup>99</sup> E.g. Eur. *Bacch.* 463-4; on Dionysus as a traveller in literature and cult see Seaford (1994) 250-1.

citizens and rulers. The last king of Lydia, Croesus, was linked in Herodotus to Solon, who is one of the numerous travelling sophists (σοφιστᾶί) who visited the court at Sardis during its heyday.<sup>100</sup> Solon gained his wisdom as a lawgiver through his travels abroad, particularly in Egypt.<sup>101</sup> Poets and sages, then, travel to the east to gain the wisdom that they use to benefit the cities of Greece upon their return.

This tradition may have been based on an actual traffic in wisdom taking place in the archaic period.<sup>102</sup> Alcman was a contemporary of Ardys, Croesus' great-grandfather, around a century earlier.<sup>103</sup> Was Sardis a destination for sophists already in the seventh century? Nicolaus of Damascus mentioned a Magnes of Smyrna, a travelling epic poet and favourite of Gyges, the father of Ardys.<sup>104</sup> West has argued that Nicolaus probably used the fifth century *Lydiaca* of Xanthus of Sardis as his source.<sup>105</sup> If so, it is likely that the tradition has some basis in fact. Lydia and the Greek cities of the East may have been a hub for both Greek and non-Greek wandering poets from an early period. The county's fabled wealth was a major inducement to travel east, while on his return a poet could lay claim to that knowledge of oriental wisdom, on which he would establish his credentials as a professional poet.

Once we take this context into account, it seems probable that Alcman (fr. 16) means not that he was born in Sardis but that he has travelled to Sardis and is therefore in a position

---

<sup>100</sup> Hdt. 1.29.1: he is termed one of the travelling sophists who visit Croesus' court. [Pl.] *Ep.* 2. 311a-b: Croesus and Solon both appear together in a list of wise advisors to tyrants. For a defence of Herodotus' narrative, which does not agree with later chronologies, see Markianos (1974) 13-17.

<sup>101</sup> Solon fr. 28 West; Hdt. 2.177.2; see Markianos (1974) 8.

<sup>102</sup> On the interaction between Greeks and the east see West (1997) 1-9; Lane Fox (2008) 45-88; Vlassopoulos (forthcoming). On the influence of the Persian magi on early Greek philosophy see Horky (2009) 50-66.

<sup>103</sup> *Suda* α 1289; Eusebius *Chron.* Ol.30.3 (p.94 Helm). For the chronology see Markianos (1974) 11; Campbell (1988) 337 n. 4.

<sup>104</sup> περιήει τε τὰς πόλεις ἐπιδεικνύμενος τὴν ποιήσιν. τούτου δὲ πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι ἥρων, Γύγης δὲ μᾶλλον τι ἐφλέγετο, καὶ αὐτὸν εἶχε παιδικά. Nicolaus *FGrHist* 90 F 62.

<sup>105</sup> West (2011b) 345-6; Hunter and Rutherford (2009b) 2 mention Magnes as an example of a wandering poet but are cautious as to the veracity of Nicolaus' account.

to benefit the city with the wisdom learned there. Terpander was believed to have travelled in Lydia and Sardis was within easy reach of Lesbos. Terpander, like Alcman, was also associated with Sparta: both these cities may have been destinations for travelling poets and wise men from an early period. Telestes in the late fifth century contrasts Lydian music with the ‘Dorian’ Muse: perhaps evoking a time at which Lydia and Sparta were competing musical centres, between which the singers of Lesbos would travel.<sup>106</sup> The ancient tradition of Alcman’s Lydian origins suggests that he also fits into the pattern of the wandering poet who comes from abroad to benefit a new city with his wisdom and oriental lore.

Later on in the seventh century we have the poet Arion, who is credited with the invention of the dithyramb.<sup>107</sup> Herodotus claimed he was the guest of Periander, the tyrant of Corinth. He continues by stating that Arion then travelled to Italy where he earned substantial sums (χρήματα μεγάλα 1.23-4), presumably in prizes at competitions or in gifts from other patrons. On the return journey Arion is robbed and forced to leap into the sea, only to be rescued and brought to shore by a dolphin. This story highlights both the financial rewards of travel and the dangers of such journeys. In addition, it reinforces the right of the poet to pass unhindered and to be respected for his *technē*. It is this claim that lies behind both the Olympic truce for athletes and the right of free passage granted by cities to poetic professionals.

Herodotus’ account indicates that the Greek cities of Italy and Sicily had become attractive destinations for poets by the late seventh century. Performers from this region were

---

<sup>106</sup> Fr. 806 *PMG*; for similar oppositions between the Dorian and Lydian modes see Pl. *Lach.* 188 d. Wilson (2003a) 190-2 places these passages in the context of the conflict between the new musicians of the late fifth century and the aristocratic conservatives.

<sup>107</sup> *Suda* α 3886; Hdt. 1.23.

active at about the same time on both the mainland and the Greek West.<sup>108</sup> The most famous was Stesichorus. Stesichorus was influenced by the broad Doric *koine* shared by many of the cities of the Greek West.<sup>109</sup> He may well have travelled widely in Italy and Sicily. While most ancient authorities believed that he was a native of Himera in Sicily, there was nonetheless a certain amount of disagreement as to his place of birth. The *Suda* lists some alternative suggestions: Mataurus in Italy and Pallantium in Arcadia from which he is said to have fled into exile.<sup>110</sup> This may point to his status as an itinerant poet: as he passed through several cities, each one in turn made a claim to him and his poetry. He is also associated with Epizephyrian Locri, situated in the ‘toe’ of Italy, though that city seems not to have made any claims to be his place of birth or death.<sup>111</sup> Stesichorus may have travelled in mainland Italy and made an extended stay in Locri and Mataurus. The story of the advice he gave to the Locrians to avoid war certainly fits with the tradition of the stranger poet healing divisions through his wisdom. Finally, he is said to have died at Catana in Sicily, where his tomb was placed just outside the gates that bear his name.<sup>112</sup> These traditions resemble those of the tragic poets Aeschylus and Euripides, who also died abroad and whose tombs and funerary epigrams were famous in antiquity.

There are indications that Stesichorus’ circuit was very wide indeed. Though his main area of operations was the Greek West, he is likely to have travelled to Greece itself. The

---

<sup>108</sup> These include Xenocritus of Locri, who is associated with the Sparta: [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1134c; Σ Pind. *Ol.* 10.17f and 18b (p. 315 Drachmann). Eunomus of Locri and Ariston of Rhegium competed at Delphi (Strabo 6.1.9). See Morgan (2012) 38-40.

<sup>109</sup> Willi (2008) 82-5; Hutchinson (2001) 114-5.

<sup>110</sup> *Suda* σ 1095; cf. Steph. Byz. p. 437 Meineke; see Kivilo (2010) 68. Cf. Terpander’s exile in Sparta: *Suda* μ 701.

<sup>111</sup> For advice given to the Locrians see Arist. *Rhet.* 1394b-1395a. Helen supposedly sent Leonymus of Croton, wounded in a battle between Croton and Locri, to tell Stesichorus to write his palinode; see Pl. *Phaedr.* 243a; Paus. 3.19.11-13; Conon *FGrHist* 26 F 1.

<sup>112</sup> *Suda* π 225; Phot. π 378; *Anth. Pal.* 7.75; see Kivilo (2010) 79.



Parian Marble gives the date of Stesichorus' arrival in Greece.<sup>113</sup> Unfortunately it is a century too late, erroneously coinciding with Aeschylus' first victory and Euripides' birth in either 486/5 or 485/4. Was this a different Stesichorus or did the compiler of the chronology simply make a mistake? The latter is more likely, as no other Stesichorus was famous enough to merit inclusion on the tablet. What little we know of his poetry indicates that he was well aware of myths concerning central and mainland Greece and it is probable that he aimed to address a panhellenic audience, rather than the Greek West alone.<sup>114</sup> The setting of his *Oresteia* in Sparta, for instance, has long been taken as evidence that Stesichorus did indeed reach the banks of the Eurotas.<sup>115</sup> The location of the narrative is not sufficient proof on its own. Nevertheless, given the international importance of Sparta as a centre for poetry in the archaic period, a journey to Laconia is certainly plausible.

This interaction between the Greek west and Greece itself was to remain strong over the classical period. Ibycus of Rhegium, another poet from western Greece, certainly did travel in the Aegean and possibly mainland Greece as well. Ibycus may have written epinician odes for athletic patrons from the Peloponnese. A fragment of his poetry hints at an athletic contest, possibly at Sparta, while another suggests a visit to Sicyon.<sup>116</sup> Polycrates of

---

<sup>113</sup> *Marm. Par.* Ep. 50 = *FGrHist* 239 A 50.

<sup>114</sup> Finglass (2012b), on fr. 222 *PMGF*, has shown that Stesichorus had an intimate knowledge of both the geography of mainland Greece and the mythical traditions concerning specific ethnic groups, such as the Dryopes and Achaeans.

<sup>115</sup> See Bowra (1934); Kivilo (2010) 68. Recent studies have noted the possibility that Stesichorus could have been playing to the pro-Spartan sentiments of Dorian Taras as well. See Burnett (1988) 145-7; Willi (2008) 83-4 and Morgan (2012) 43-5. Finglass (2012b) 43-4 has suggested that on at least one occasion Stesichorus may have avoided mentioning a myth that reflected well on Sparta, possibly suggesting that he had other patrons in mainland Greece. Davies and Finglass (forthcoming) suggest that Stesichorus' poetry was suitable for performance in multiple locations.

<sup>116</sup> Sparta: Ibycus fr. S166.30; 36-9 *PMGF*. Sicyon: fr. S151.41; see Barron (1961) 187. On Ibycus' patrons see West (1970) 206-9; Bowie (2009) 122-5; Morgan (2012) 46.

Samos was certainly a patron.<sup>117</sup> Like Arion, Ibycus is a poet brought in from abroad by a tyrant to perform at his court. He is also a traveller who falls victim to pirates. Ibycus was less fortunate than Arion, according to the biographical tradition: these pirates successfully murder their poet, but they are later tricked into admitting the crime and punished. An epigram addresses the murderers of Ibycus:

ἰὼ φιλοκερδέα φῦλα

λῆιστέων, τί θεῶν οὐ πεφόβησθε χόλον;

(Antip. Sid. *Anth. Pal.* 7.745 = *HE* 292-3).

Here the dead poet is clearly placed under the protection of the gods and the sacred code of hospitality. The poet is a wanderer and deserves respect and protection along the way.

Anacreon of Teos was probably on Samos at roughly the same time as Ibycus in the final quarter of the sixth century and composed a number of works in praise of his patron's wealth and fortune.<sup>118</sup> According to Strabo (14.1.16), the name of Polycrates appeared frequently in his works. Herodotus (3.121.2) indicates that Anacreon was with Polycrates up until the time of his death in 522. After the murder of the tyrant, Anacreon seems to have sought a new patron in the tyrants of Athens, who were busily developing their city's reputation as a centre for poetry and possibly even overseeing the early development of tragedy.<sup>119</sup> Hipparchus, the son of Pisistratus, is said to have detailed a warship to transport Anacreon to Athens.<sup>120</sup> Attica clearly suited Anacreon, as he continued to visit the city even after the fall of the tyrants. He lived to a great age, long enough indeed to address love poems

---

<sup>117</sup> Ibycus fr. S151.47-8 *PMGF*; *Suda* ι 80.

<sup>118</sup> Fr. 483 *PMG*. See other testimonia listed Campbell (1988) 27.

<sup>119</sup> On Pisistratus see Herington (1985) 88; on the performance of early tragedy see Connor (1990) and West (1989).

<sup>120</sup> [Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228 b-c.

to the Athenian Critias, father of the oligarch, and to become an admirer of the young Aeschylus' poetry.<sup>121</sup> His statue was erected at some point on the Acropolis. In Pausanias' day it was placed in the vicinity of the images of Xanthippus and Pericles.<sup>122</sup>

Like Anacreon, Simonides of Ceos was active at this time of transition, in which tragedy was in the early stages of its development. He seems to have spent some time in Athens and was summoned to the court of Hipparchus at the same time as Anacreon.<sup>123</sup> Simonides counted numerous patrons in addition to the tyrants of Athens. Foremost among them, in the latter part of his career, was Hieron of Syracuse, with whom he is most closely associated. Their relationship was to become famous and to be seen in the same light as that between Solon and Croesus.<sup>124</sup> Simonides was not the only poet, however, to travel to Sicily. With him went his nephew Bacchylides, Pindar of Thebes and, now for the first time, a tragic poet: Aeschylus. We will examine the activities of these poets in Sicily in the next chapter.

We have come at last to the fifth century. The tradition of wandering poets goes on, providing evidence of continuity between the archaic and the classical periods. Patrons and poetic centres change, but the habits and activities of poets seem largely unaltered, despite the growing importance of Athens as a political and cultural centre. After the fall of the tyrants and the institution of the tragic festivals, the importance of Athens as a centre for poetry on the circuit continued to grow with her political fortunes. Athens began to import a large number of lyric poets who took part in the dithyrambic and tragic competitions of the new Dionysia festival. Big names included Pindar and, later in the century, Timotheus of Miletus and the aulos-player Pronomus. These will be discussed in more detail in chapter five. There

---

<sup>121</sup> Pl. *Charm.* 157e; Athen. 600 d-e; Σ [Aesch.] *PV* 128 (Dindorf p. 15) = fr. 412 *PMG*; [Luc.] *Macr.* 26.

<sup>122</sup> Paus. 1.25.1.

<sup>123</sup> [Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228 b-c.

<sup>124</sup> See [Pl.] *Ep.* 2. 311 a-b; Paus. 1.2.3; cf. Xen. *Hier.* For the anecdotal tradition concerning Simonides and his patrons see Rawles (forthcoming).

also remained opportunities for securing private patronage under the democracy.

Themistocles, for one, hosted the citharode Epicles of Hermione in his house.<sup>125</sup> The system of the *choregia* involved the feeding of poets by a private individual: a system which, even if organised by the democracy, bears a strong similarity to the patronage offered by the tyrants in the previous century.

This concludes our survey of the evidence for the travels of poets up to our period of interest in the fifth and fourth centuries. We have seen how travel between festivals and patrons formed a crucial part of the lives of many poets, as it did with athletes. The image of the travelling poet appears first in our earliest sources and continues throughout our period. We have also seen that poets deliberately presented themselves as wanderers, possessors of special wisdom gained from their travels abroad. The idea of the poet who comes from outside to benefit the city is a recurring theme in the ancient sources. In the next two sections we will look at some of the reasons for why poets travel. The answer, as we shall see, is broadly the same as with athletes and other ‘parallel professionals’: fame and money.

## **b) Motives: Fame**

Like athletes, poets travelled between festivals, publicising themselves and their works. Homer is even thought to have travelled and publicised his poetry in his own lifetime. Plato claimed that Homer and Hesiod could not have been genuinely wise as they never founded schools of followers but wandered like rhapsodes.<sup>126</sup> The *Hymn to Apollo* – ascribed to Homer by Thucydides (3.104) – describes a musical and athletic festival at Delos, which attracts a large audience from across Ionia:

---

<sup>125</sup> Plut. *Them.* 5.3.

<sup>126</sup> *Resp.* 600d.

ἔνθα τοι ἔλκεχίτωνες Ἰάονες ἡγερέθονται  
αὐτοῖς σὺν παίδεσσι καὶ αἰδοίης ἀλόχοισιν.

(147-8).

‘Homer’ is drawn to Delos as it is a large ‘international’ festival sited at a cult centre of notable pan-Ionian and indeed panhellenic importance. The island, barren and mostly uninhabited at the time of Apollo’s birth, is itself promised fame and honour (περιτιμήεσσα 65) as well as sustenance from the crowds of foreigners attracted to the sanctuary (χειρὸς ἅπ’ ἄλλοτρίης 60). The catalogue of regions which mirrors the description of the festival (30-43) is intended to show the importance of his sanctuary across the Aegean.<sup>127</sup> Delos had indeed been a major site of pilgrimage for the Greeks from early on, even before the re-organisation of the festival there in 426/5.<sup>128</sup> Thucydides (3.104.3-6) cites this hymn as evidence for the antiquity of Delos’ prominence as a panhellenic centre. Poetic performance at Delos is also attested elsewhere: Eumolpus of Corinth wrote a processional hymn for the Messenians to perform on the island in around the eighth or seventh centuries.<sup>129</sup>

At such an event, a wide variety of people could hear a poet’s works and report on it either to future visitors or (if the audience itself contained men from other regions) to their compatriots when they returned to their different cities. This is what ‘Homer’ explicitly tells the Ionian girls to do:

χαίρετε δ’ ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι· ἐμεῖο δὲ καὶ μετόπισθε  
μνήσασθ’, ὅπποτε κέν τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων  
ἐνθάδ’ ἀνείρηται ξείνος ταλαπείριος ἐλθών·  
ὦ κοῦραι, τίς δ’ ὕμιν ἀνὴρ ἥδιστος ἀοιδῶν

<sup>127</sup> Richardson (2010) 9-13 and 103.

<sup>128</sup> *Od.* 6. 162-9; *Athen.* 234 e-f; *Plut. Thes.* 21; *Paus.* 1.31.2, 8.48.3. See Richardson (2010) 104-5.

<sup>129</sup> *Paus.* 2.3.2 = fr. 696 *PMG*.

ἐνθάδε πωλεῖται, καὶ τέω τέρπεσθε μάλιστα;  
ὑμεῖς δ' εὖ μάλα πᾶσαι ὑποκρίνασθ' ἄμφ' ἡμέων·

(166-71).

As was the case with athletes, so with our poet the object of performing is to gain fame (*kleos*), here as the sweetest of the poets (ἡδιστος ἀοιδῶν). The poet builds his reputation from travelling to Delos (ἐνθάδε πωλεῖται) and also because other strangers who come there (ξείνος ταλαπείριος) will hear of his fame and in turn contribute to its growth.

In return, the poet promises to celebrate Delos and its maiden choruses, both in thanks and because, quite reasonably, the more famous the sanctuary, the more visitors it will attract and therefore the more famous the poet will become. And Homer is in an especially good position to spread their fame precisely because he is a wanderer:

ἡμεῖς δ' ὑμέτερον κλέος οἴσομεν ὅσσον ἐπ' αἶαν  
ἀνθρώπων στρεφόμεσθα πόλεις εὖ ναιεταώσας·

(174-5)

In both cases, if the poet and the sanctuary are to become famous, constant movement is essential.

The works of Homer became the common possession of all Greeks from being continuously re-performed by the travelling rhapsodes, who, in moving among the many poetic festivals, seem to have transcended the differences and rivalries of the various Greek cities.<sup>130</sup> The probable author of the *Hymn to Apollo*, the rhapsodist Cynaethus, aimed to emulate the great master in his travels and is said to have been the first to perform the

---

<sup>130</sup> On the *Homeridai* see West (1999) 366-7.

poetry of Homer at Syracuse at the end of the sixth century.<sup>131</sup> Performances of Homer at Athens are known from the time of the tyrants in the sixth century and several Attic black figure vases may depict rhapsodes in competition.<sup>132</sup> The wide audience gained through the medium of such competitions, by the fourth century at least, is illustrated by Plato's *Ion*. The dialogue is set during the Panathenaea, but the artists present at that festival are not Athenian, nor is Athens the only place to attract their attention. Ion himself is an Ephesian who has come via Epidaurus in the Peloponnese where he has been victorious in the Asclepieia: 'a contest of rhapsodes and other music'.<sup>133</sup> A key motive again is fame through victory in the games. Ion seeks recognition: he claims he should be crowned by the Homeridae for his work reciting the poems of Homer.<sup>134</sup> Both the reputation of the rhapsode and the original poet is enhanced by frequent re-performance.

Not only the legendary Homer, but all poets sought fame by travelling to different festivals. Like athletes, some musical professionals publicised their victories. The epitaph of the fourth century tragic poet Theodectas of Phaselis recorded eight crowns in thirteen contests.<sup>135</sup> A possibly Hellenistic epigram proclaims Simonides as the victor of fifty seven dithyrambic competitions.<sup>136</sup> A third century BC actor's inscription from Tegea records four separate victories at Athens, Delphi, Argos and Dodona, with a fifth in boxing at Alexandria. A further eighty-eight victories were won at lesser contests.<sup>137</sup>

<sup>131</sup> Σ. Pind. *Nem.* 2.1c (p.29 Drachmann); see West (1975) 165-6; (1999) 368.

<sup>132</sup> [Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228b, Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 18.1. On the vases see Shapiro (1993) 95-8.

<sup>133</sup> ῥαψωδῶν ἀγῶνα . . . καὶ τῆς ἄλλης γε μουσικῆς, 530a.

<sup>134</sup> εὖ κεκόσμηκα τὸν Ὅμηρον· ὥστε οἶμαι ὑπὸ Ὀμηριδῶν ἄξιος εἶναι χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ στεφανωθῆναι, Pl. *Ion* 530 d 6-7.

<sup>135</sup> 72 T 2 *TrGF* = Steph. Byz. p.660 Meineke.

<sup>136</sup> 'Simonides' *Anth. Pal.* 6.213 = *FGE* 796-81, pp. 241-3.

<sup>137</sup> *IG* V 118.

As well as travelling to compete in festivals, poets also, in many cases, move in order to secure a patron. Lyric poetry contains frequent references to these patrons. Wandering poets promise their patrons fame on the basis that their poetry will be continuously re-performed across the Greek world. Ibycus promised Polycrates fame to rival the heroes of Troy through the fame of Ibycus himself and his song:

καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐξεῖς  
ὥς κατ' αἰοῖδαν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος.

(fr. S151.47-8 *PMGF*).

Pindar promises his athletes fame, because he will spread it across Greece on his travels. He adopts, for example, the chariot of the athlete as the means by which he travels.<sup>138</sup> But Pindar will only be successful if his own reputation is secure and if his poetry is performed as widely as possible. The chariot of the athlete is easily transformed into the chariot of the Muses, by which successful poets are raised to the height of glory.<sup>139</sup> The fame of the poet is as pressing a concern as that of his patron.

Not only does a poet travel, but so does his poetry, carrying his name and that of his patron. Pindar compares his poetry to victory statues: both have the same end in bringing the victor fame. The poem is more successful because, by means of sea travel, it can move and, we may assume, be re-performed in a variety of locations.<sup>140</sup> His poetry is like the exotic wares shipped across the sea by Phoenician traders:

τόδε μὲν κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν  
μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἄλως πέμπεται·

<sup>138</sup> Pind. *Ol.* 1.110, 6.22-8, *Nem.* 1.4-6.

<sup>139</sup> 'Simonides' *Anth. Pal.* 6.213 = *FGE* 795; Simon. fr. 519.79 *PMG*; Pind. *Isthm.* 2.1-2.

<sup>140</sup> Moving poems: Pind. *Nem.* 5. 1-5; *Isthm.* 2. 45-6. See Steiner (1998), O'Sullivan (2003) and Hubbard (2004) 75-9. Monuments and poems: cf. Simon. fr. 581 *PMG*; see Smith (2007).



(Pind. *Pyth.* 2.67-8).

Pindar points to an international market for poetry, as with other commodities. We might also think of the traders of Samos and Aegina, mentioned by Herodotus, who allegedly travelled further than any other Greeks before their day, even as far as the Pillars of Heracles and beyond.<sup>141</sup>

It is along these same lines that Theognis predicts a poetic afterlife for his beloved Cynrus:

σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ πτέρ' ἔδωκα, σὺν οἷσ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον

πωτήσῃ, κατὰ γῆν πᾶσαν ἀειρόμενος

(Theogn. 236-7).

Rather than prosaically travelling by ship, Cynrus is given wings by Theognis' poetry to transport him across the sea, even as the poetry is being re-performed in diverse locations. Again fame is sought both for the poet and his subject through as wide a geographical area as possible. Theognis' poem implies a first performance and an original audience: Cynrus in this case. With Pindar it is the athlete and his fellow revellers.<sup>142</sup> In each case, however, a future and wider audience is envisaged, to keep the fame of both poet and honorand alive. One performance in one place is never enough: the poems must travel through the whole expanse of Greece and for all time.

Theognis envisions frequent re-performance in the context of the symposium.<sup>143</sup>

This, alongside more formal musical festivals, was a common venue for poetry, including excerpts of tragedy. In Aristophanes' *Clouds* (1353-72), an ode by Simonides and speeches

---

<sup>141</sup> Hdt. 4.152. A Sostratus of Aegina is mentioned in a sixth century dedication at Gavisca in Etruria may be the same man as the one known to Herodotus; see Jeffery (1990) 439.

<sup>142</sup> See Heath (1988).

<sup>143</sup> θοίνῃς δὲ καὶ εἰλαπίνῃσι, Theogn. 239; see Herington (1985) 38, 48-56; Hubbard (2004) 82-4.

by Aeschylus and Euripides are proposed for recitation at a celebratory banquet. In the case of epinician, odes were probably performed at a celebration for the victor and subsequently re-performed either in the manner suggested by Aristophanes, or more formally possibly involving a full chorus and even in the context of a larger festival.<sup>144</sup>

For such re-performance to be possible, we must assume that the dissemination of texts occurred at an early stage. Indeed Hubbard has argued that the diffusion of texts of epinician odes began with their first performances.<sup>145</sup> These texts might have been exchanged among the elite with the aim of advertising their achievements to as wide an audience as possible: the stated purpose of epinician lyric itself. The author may have sent the text of the poem to his clients. Bacchylides despatches a winged poem to the king of Macedon:

ὄρμαίνω τι πέμπ[ειν]  
χρύσειον Μουσᾶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πτερόν  
(Bacchyl. 20B 3-4 Maehler).

Poets and patrons intended for these works to circulate as quickly as possible. A poem's success is measured by the ground it covers.

### c) **Motives: Money**

Poets, however, travel not only in search of fame but in search of an income as well. Pindar implies that he does not merely send his poems abroad but is at times physically present at the house of his patron, for example in an ode honouring Chromios, Hieron of Syracuse's general:

---

<sup>144</sup> See Clay (1999); Currie (2004) 51-62 and (2011); Hubbard (2004) and (2011) 347-8; Swift (2010) 105. Choral performance has been disputed, e.g. by Heath (1988) and Heath and Lefkowitz (1991).

<sup>145</sup> Hubbard (2004) and (2011).

ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις  
ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου καλὰ μελπόμενος

(Pindar *Nem.* 1.19-20).

On his arrival, however, Pindar expects to be paid for his poetry with a meal (δειπνον).<sup>146</sup>

Like athletes and heroes, poets see themselves as strangers (*xenoi*) and therefore entitled to hospitality.<sup>147</sup> As the athlete is rewarded at the conclusion of his journey with a feast and other rewards, so is the poet.

Pindar presents himself as a traveller in search of a patron who will feed him. He simultaneously demands hospitality as a stranger and payment as a professional poet. In ancient sources, travelling sages frequently gather at the doors of great men, hoping for a meal.<sup>148</sup> Simonides, for instance, when asked by the wife of Hieron of Syracuse whether he would rather be rich or wise, replied that he would rather have wealth, for the wise gather at the doors of the rich.<sup>149</sup> Of all poets, Simonides was the most famous in antiquity for greed.<sup>150</sup> Hipparchus, for one, kept Simonides in Athens by offering him money.<sup>151</sup> He was, however, certainly not the first or the only one to ask for money from his patrons. Earlier generations of poets also worked for money. Arion earned large sums in Sicily and Italy.<sup>152</sup> There is no especial reason to believe, with Wilson, that this is a later anachronism.<sup>153</sup> Pindar was also

---

<sup>146</sup> *Nem.* 1.23; μισθός *Pyth.* 1.77, 3.55, 11.40-45

<sup>147</sup> On *xenia* in epinician see Kurke (1991) 135-59.

<sup>148</sup> E.g. Pl. *Resp.* 489 b-c; Diog. Laert. 2.69.

<sup>149</sup> τοὺς σοφοὺς γὰρ ἔφη ὄραν ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν πλουσίων θύραις διατρίβοντας, Arist. *Rhet.* 1391a 10-12. See Rawles (forthcoming).

<sup>150</sup> E.g. Quint. *Inst.* 11.2.11 On his sources see 11.2.14. On this anecdote see Slater (1972) 232-4; Bell (1978) 82-3 and Rawles (forthcoming).

<sup>151</sup> μέγαλοις μισθοῖς καὶ δώροις πείθων [Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228c.

<sup>152</sup> Hdt. 1.24.1 cf. Lucian *Dial. D.* 5.2.

<sup>153</sup> Wilson (2004) 285.

known, from his poetry, to have charged high fees.<sup>154</sup> This reputation may have given rise to a number of anecdotes concerning the poet's life. In one example, Pindar is said to have asked for the massive fee of three thousand drachmas.<sup>155</sup> In the fourth century Plato could envisage the idea of the professional poet wandering for the sake of a living wage.<sup>156</sup>

The possibility of earning money in the form of prizes at festivals was another potent motive for travel, just as it was for athletes. Two fourth century accounts of prizes at musical competitions survive from Eretria and Athens.<sup>157</sup> The prizes for the Eretrian Artemisia are lower than those at the Panathenaea, yet even these were not inconsiderable. Citharodes, the highest earning musical professionals, if successful at the Artemisia would be rewarded with two hundred drachmas. A victorious citharode at the Panathenaea could expect a crown worth no less than a thousand drachmas.<sup>158</sup> Both of these contests offered prizes for the runners up and all competitors received money to cover their expenses while at the festival.<sup>159</sup> Such provisions made it worthwhile for poets to spend money on travelling to competitions even if they were ultimately unsuccessful.

Despite the evidence for professionalism, some scholars have argued that the commercialisation of poetry was a late development, connected in part with the 'New Music' in the second half of the fifth century.<sup>160</sup> Before then, as with athletics, music and poetry were supposedly the preserve of aristocratic amateurs. Bowie has argued that before this time poets were members of the elite who travelled not primarily in order to perform their poetry, but to

---

<sup>154</sup> *Pyth.* 11. 42, see Finglass (2007b) 112-3; cf. *Nem.* 1.19-24, 10.43; *Isthm.* 2,6-11.

<sup>155</sup>  $\Sigma$  *Nem.* 5. 1a (p.89 Drachmann).

<sup>156</sup> *Pl. Resp.* 568 c2-9.

<sup>157</sup> Athens, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2311.1-22, cf. Shear (2003) 88-9; Eretria, *IG* XII/9.189 = R-O 362-7 no.73.

<sup>158</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2311.5-7; see R-O 365-6.

<sup>159</sup> *IG* XII/9.189.15-24.

<sup>160</sup> See Wilson (2003a) 181-6, (2004); Csapo (2004b); D'Angour (2007) 300; Power (2010) 475-535.

visit ‘aristocratic houses in Greek cities, in which his primary status was that of a *xenos*’.<sup>161</sup>

The advance of professionalism is then connected, by Csapo and others, to the increasing power of the lower classes in the Athenian democracy during the second half of the fifth century. The attacks on the New Music by late fifth and fourth century authors are thought to express ‘the hostility of a class which felt the loss of its ascendancy in matters of culture as in so much else’.<sup>162</sup>

However, we need to allow for the fact that poets wanted to avoid the stigma of professionalism, by pretending to be members of the elite. The notion of a time before poetry was corrupted, when poets only worked for honour, was part of the same strategy used by poets to counter potential criticism. The idea itself was actually very old, predating the New Music by at least half a century or more. Pindar affects disappointment that a servant of the Muses should be forced to work for pay, rather than love or honour. He reflects on a former (and no doubt imaginary) era when this was not so:

ἅ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής

πῶ τότ’ ἦν οὐδ’ ἐργάτις

(*Isth.* 2.5-6).

He pretends to apologise for the current state of affairs: asserting that poets are not naturally greedy, but that this is only a new development.

At the same time he shows no intention of reforming his ways. The scholiast thought Pindar was bemoaning the new practice of charging for poetry, which, he adds, had been

---

<sup>161</sup> Bowie (2009) 124; cf. 135-5.

<sup>162</sup> Csapo (2004b) 246. E.g. Pl. *Leg.* 700a-701b. Power (2010) 111, commenting on this passage, argues that Plato is influenced by the ‘resentment of fourth century elites towards their own musical culture’. D’Angour (2006), however, while not disputing that professionalism was a late development, argues that the changes brought about by the New Music were less revolutionary and more the product of a gradual development dating back to the sixth century.

started by Simonides, and interprets this passage as a possible jibe against Pindar's rival.<sup>163</sup> However, when Pindar, in his second *Isthmian*, talks of the disinterested poets of old who boarded the chariot of the Muses (οἱ μὲν πάλαι... φῶτες 1) he is not attacking Simonides, but including himself among those poets who, living in a baser age, must reluctantly perform for money. If there was a decadence of poetry which saw the rise of the professional musician, it must have already begun by Pindar's day.<sup>164</sup> Elsewhere in his poetry, Pindar freely admits that his Muse has been contracted out for a fee in return for praise.<sup>165</sup> In all likelihood, the golden age of Pindar's imagination never existed.<sup>166</sup> The amateur poet, like the amateur athlete, was an invention propagated by poets in order to enhance the prestige of the profession. In reality, as Aristophanes noted (*Plut.* 1162-3), money was essential for the holding of both athletic and musical festivals.

Bowie mistakenly assumes that if archaic poets claimed to be merely the guest-friends of their host, then they cannot have been professionals. In fact, poets disguise their professional status by presenting themselves as guest-friends, ironically in order to sell their poetry. As Hermann Fraenkel noted: 'die Idee der Gastfreundschaft half auch das eingewurzelte griechische Vorturteil zu umgehen, das an entgeltlichen Leistungen für

---

<sup>163</sup> Σ *Isthm.* 2.9a (p. 214 Drachmann) = Call. fr. 222 Pfeiffer; see Woodbury (1968) 529 and Cairns (2011) 23-4 who are rightly sceptical of this explanation.

<sup>164</sup> Cf. Bowra (1964) 126 who recognises that Pindar is using the poem to ask for money.

<sup>165</sup> *Pyth.* 11. 41-5; fr. 287 S-M.

<sup>166</sup> Woodbury (1968) 532-5 suggested that Pindar knew of a historical shift from monodic love poetry and religious poetry to choral works sponsored by wealthy patrons. Cf. Slater (1972) 234-5. Cairns (2011) has challenged this view, claiming that Pindar is in fact contrasting choral songs for youths, akin to Alcman's *Parthenaea*, with choral performances of epinician. However, Cairns does not cite any evidence in support of his assertion that the new epinician performances were more expensive than previous choral genres, with the sole exception of *Athen.* 617b-c. It is more likely that all forms of choral performance entailed considerable expense on the part of the *choregos*, whether the individual choreuts were amateurs or not. See above pp. 110-11.

Auswärtige Anstoss nahm'.<sup>167</sup> In a similar way, poets also claimed the right to pay on religious grounds as servants of the Muses. Plato, while expelling the wandering poet from his city, affirms his sacred right to proper treatment and a crown of honour (*Resp.* 398a). Another way in which poets justify their fees is to claim that they possess a skill that is truly valuable and deserving of reward. Odysseus offers Demodocus the finest cuts because he is beloved of the Muses and as such able best to entertain those present at a feast.<sup>168</sup> In the first *Nemean* it is stressed that Pindar is able to command this hospitality because of his ability as a poet to please his patrons (καλὰ μελπόμενος). Furthermore, the patron or host-city gains tangible benefit from the company of wise poets.<sup>169</sup> Hence, the tradition of the wandering poet who prevents wars and ends civil strife through his wisdom. However demeaning working for money may be, yet 'the labourer is worthy of his fee'.

If a poet is not a guest or does not benefit his host, but is interested only in his meal, then he is a parasite. The etymology of the term parasite (παράσιτος) derives originally from the consumption of food, suggesting a dependence on a patron for sustenance.<sup>170</sup> The original word for a parasite was 'flatterer' (κόλαξ): a man who praises his patron, not out of affection, but in return for food or money.<sup>171</sup> The word is used first as early as the sixth century BC by Asius of Samos (fr. 14 West), who describes a κνισοκόλαξ (i.e. a flatterer drawn by the smell of roasted meat) as a wandering beggar who is not invited (ἄκλητος) but comes anyway in order to be given food in return for his unwanted chatter (βομβόρου).

The type is in fact known even earlier, resembling as it does Hesiod's brother Perses, who is forced to rely on his ability to talk as he wanders between his neighbours asking for

---

<sup>167</sup> Fraenkel (1962) 492 n.13.

<sup>168</sup> *Od.* 8.474-81; 9.11.

<sup>169</sup> E.g. Xenophan. fr. 2.12-14 West; cf. Eur. fr. 199; 888b.

<sup>170</sup> E.g. Athen. 6. 234c-235e; cf. Plut. *Sol.* 24.3. See Millett (1989) 31; Storey (2003) 188.

<sup>171</sup> Arist. *EN* 1127a7.

food.<sup>172</sup> The flatterer became a stock character of comedy from the fifth century.<sup>173</sup> Its earliest appearance is in Epicharmus (fr. 32 K–A), where the uninvited flatterer earns his meal through his ability to make the diners laugh. Eupolis dedicated an entire play to the theme, as did Menander in the fourth century. Theophrastus includes a flatterer in his list of *Characters*.<sup>174</sup> In these sources, the flatterer is universally disreputable, idle in all things except the pursuit of easy money, mercenary though feigning friendship and yet, despite his best efforts, always poor.

In some cases the flatterer comes uncomfortably close to resembling the wandering professional poet, who also must ask for his pay and food at the houses of the rich in return for his skill with words. Hesiod lists beggars as a parallel profession to poets (*Op.* 26). Among those characterised as flatterers in Eupolis' *Kolakes* is the tragic poet Acestor (fr. 172.14 K–A). In Aristophanes' *Clouds*, Socrates, in illustrating the importance of the chorus of *Clouds*, gives a list of those sophists whom they provide with food:

οὐ γὰρ μὰ Δί' οἶσθ' ὅτιῃ πλείστους αὐται βόσκουσι σοφιστάς,  
 Θουριομάντεις, ἰατροτέχνας, σφραγιδονυχαργοκομήτας,  
 κυκλίων τε χορῶν ἄσματοκάμπτας, ἄνδρας μετεωροφένακας,  
 οὐδὲν δρῶντας βόσκουσ' ἀργούς, ὅτι ταύτας μουσοποιούσιν.

(331-4)

Once again, poets, here the competitors in dithyrambic competitions (κυκλίων τε χορῶν ἄσματοκάμπτας) appear in a list of parallel professions. Here though they are characterised as idle sophists, fed only because of the flattery they give to the *Clouds*. Poetry is categorised, along with rhetoric, cosmetics and cookery, as a form of flattery (κολακεία) by Plato,

<sup>172</sup> ἄχρεῖος δ' ἔσται ἐπέων νομός. Hes. *Op.* 403.

<sup>173</sup> See Olson (2007) 55.

<sup>174</sup> *Char.* 2; see Diggle (2004) 181-2.



because such supposedly lesser professions only aim to give pleasure to the consumer in exchange for money.<sup>175</sup> Unlike philosophy, poetry only entertains without making anyone any better.<sup>176</sup>

The implication is that poets, along with practitioners of other equally specious skills, earn a living at Athens solely off their insubstantial skills and wits without really benefiting anyone. They are base charlatans who will do anything for money or meat. Poets have no independent means, but depend on success at contests and in attracting patrons.<sup>177</sup> If a poet is bad at his profession, he will be poor. In comedy abuse for incompetence and penury go together. A good example is the tragic poet Sthenelus who allegedly had to sell his stage equipment and costumes because of his lack of success.<sup>178</sup> The orator Aeschines was such a failure as an actor that he was reduced to stealing fruit from orchards during his tour of the rural Dionysias.<sup>179</sup> The comedian Phrynichus wrote a comedy entitled the *Tragedians* or the *Freedmen* in which a character claims that the cause of another's poverty is his *techne*, presumably a tragic poet or actor (fr. 56 K–A). In another fragment (57) from the same play, a character complains of being unfed, without drink and unwashed. The fourth century philosopher Diogenes of Sinope was thought to have written tragedies.<sup>180</sup> This story may have come about because his ascetic lifestyle resembled the sufferings of the unsuccessful poet. He is said to have complained about his life as a wanderer: similar to that endured by the heroes of tragedy themselves:

ἄπολις, ἄοικος, πατρίδος ἐστερημένος,

---

<sup>175</sup> Pl. *Gorg.* 462e–465e.

<sup>176</sup> Pl. *Gorg.* 501d–502d. Plato objects to poets pandering to their audience (*Resp.* 602b; cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1453a) and argues that poetry is not in fact a *techne* (*Resp.* 597e–600e; *Ion* 533c–534e, 542a–b).

<sup>177</sup> [Arist.] *Problemata* 956b.

<sup>178</sup> Σ Ar. *Vesp.* 1312 (Holwerda p.209).

<sup>179</sup> Dem. 18. 262.

<sup>180</sup> Diog. Laert. 6.80.

πτωχός, πλανήτης, βίον ἔχων ἐφήμερον

(88 fr. 4 *TrGF*).<sup>181</sup>

The bad poet is thus like a wandering beggar: poor if found lacking in ability and fed on the charity of others. It is no surprise that, in order to avoid the stigma of flattery, poets cultivated an image of themselves that was the exact opposite of the parasite.

There is, therefore, strong evidence that poets were professionals from an early period. Although sources tend to be reticent on the subject of money, there is still sufficient evidence to suggest that poets did receive payment, even if this was sometimes disguised as hospitality. The controversy surrounding such payments and the accusations of mercenary behaviour levelled against some poets strengthens this supposition. Furthermore, the desire for money was a powerful motive for travel. Because they worked for coin and did not need to cultivate land or property, they were not tied to any particular area. In addition, poets did not generally have independent means and, in order to make a living, they had to travel between patrons or festivals. They argued that, as travellers, they were entitled to support and welcome both as strangers, and because they offered tangible benefits in both entertaining and educating their audiences.

## 5. Conclusion

Our purpose in this chapter has been to give an impression of the ‘infrastructure’ that permitted the swift dissemination of tragedy in the fifth and fourth centuries. Travel between the scattered communities of the Greeks was essential for the development of an overarching panhellenic culture. We saw that poets formed but one group in an overall class of

---

<sup>181</sup> Cf. Diog. Laert. 6.38; Ael. *VH* 3.29. For similar passages in tragedy see e.g. Soph. *OC* 344-52; Eur. *Med.* 252-8; *Phoen.* 400-5.

professionals who are all characterised in ancient sources as travellers. These professionals modelled themselves on the heroes, whom they saw as travellers on a 'circuit', motivated to embark on journeys by the promise of fame and material reward. Athletes, in particular, aimed to reach a wide and panhellenic audience in the pursuit of glory and material rewards. Poets journey on a similar circuit and are driven by the same motives.

Let us now look in detail at some of the places where the tragic poets found work, the types of poetry they brought with them and the patrons they gained.

### 3. Athenian wandering poets: the early fifth century

#### 1. Introduction

So far we have sketched the culture of the professional wanderer in the archaic and classical periods. We have seen that poets frequently travelled because of the nature of their work. Wandering professionals transcended the differences between individual *poleis*, moving as they did between numerous festivals and patrons. The achievements of individuals were celebrated in their home cities, which formed the beginning and end of the circuit. But the events at which they performed could be in diverse locations, inspired by a culture that was comprehensible and accessible to all Greeks.

While the travels of tragic poets in the classical period are well known, they have generally been treated either as exceptions to the rule of exclusive Athenian performance or as a gradual export of an intrinsically Athenian cultural product. My purpose is to demonstrate that the journeys of the tragedians should be seen in the light of their status as professional wanderers. Furthermore, tragedians were wanderers from the beginning. This should lead us to conclude that travel was not something alien to tragedy, which only developed later on the occasion of its export to the wider Greek world. Although Athens was one of the first and most important cities to stage tragedy, tragic poets began to seek out new audiences from the earliest period. The opportunities for performances outside Athens undoubtedly grew over time as the genre became gradually better known and more established. But, I argue, it was always an inherent characteristic of tragedy to address as wide an audience as possible, an audience in fact of all the Greeks.

We will be looking for evidence that Athenian poets visited cities abroad and put on plays there. While epic and lyric poets regularly identify themselves as wandering

professionals in their own work, the evidence for the tragedians is not so clear cut. Lyric poets tell us where they and their patrons have been, because of the nature of the genre. For the tragedians there is no such authorial voice. We must rely instead on inferences from the plays, the biographical tradition and any other information that can be gleaned from the surviving work of ancient scholarship. None of these sources is entirely satisfactory and all must be handled with care. However, we can draw three conclusions. Firstly, tragic poets were seen as wandering professionals in antiquity and, furthermore, saw themselves in this light. Secondly, certain facts can be established regarding the travels of the tragedians. Finally, in some cases Athenian poets were more active outside Athens than has been realised.

Often the only way of knowing if a play was performed abroad is if it shows signs of having been commissioned by a foreign ruler. The play may have been designed to fit in with a broader political programme or concern a local subject. However, we should not be encouraged to believe that tragedy fulfilled an entirely political function when abroad, or that foreign audiences were only interested in plays that concerned themselves. We saw, from the iconographic evidence, that southern Italian audiences enjoyed a wide range of tragedies and even Athenian comedy, which was much more obviously topical in its subject matter. Foreign rulers such as Archelaus and Dionysius of Syracuse seem to have been devotees of tragedy and poetry in general. Just as Athenian audiences were interested in tragedy as a whole, and not just plays concerning their city and its politics, so non-Athenian audiences were likely to have valued tragedy for its own sake. Therefore, although, because of the nature of the evidence, this chapter and its sequel will focus on plays that were commissioned by foreigners, we have to keep in mind that these may not have been the only ones performed outside Athens.

## 2. Aeschylus

### a) Sicily and Hieron of Syracuse

We begin in Sicily. This island, the largest in the Mediterranean, fertile and prosperous, was home to a large number of ancient Greek colonies. In the scale and beauty of their temples, such as those at Segesta and Acragas, these colonists have left an obvious memorial to their presence. However, it was not only in their architecture that the Greeks of Sicily were preeminent. A number of Sicilians were innovators and masters in the fields of art and science for which the Greeks, as a whole, and the Athenians, in particular, are celebrated. In philosophy we think of Empedocles of Acragas, in rhetoric Corax, Tisias and Gorgias, in lyric poetry Stesichorus and in comedy Epicharmus.<sup>1</sup> These Sicilians were well known and regarded in the rest of the Greek world, where, in some cases, they are known to have travelled.<sup>2</sup>

By the early fifth century Sicily was already attracting a large number of foreign *technitai*. The rhapsode Cynaethus was active in Syracuse in 504-501 BC.<sup>3</sup> As we have seen, from the start of the fifth century the growing circle of poetic talent centred on Syracuse included Pindar, Simonides and Bacchylides. However, most crucially for our purposes, tragic poets also begin to appear in Sicily at this time. They were attracted to Sicily by the wealth and generosity of the Sicilian tyrants: notably Hieron of Syracuse and Theron of Acragas.

---

<sup>1</sup> Epicharmus' origins are uncertain, though he seems to have spent much of his career in Syracuse: *Suda* ε 2766; see Kerkhof (2001) 55-6; Olson (2007) 6-7 and Willi (2008) 120-1.

<sup>2</sup> Stesichorus: see above pp. 86-8. A visit by Gorgias to Athens is the scene for Plato's dialogue. For his travels in Thessaly see Pl. *Meno* 70b-c. Epicharmus was well known in Athens by the fourth century and probably earlier; cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1449b 5-9. He is quoted Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.20 = fr. 236 and 270 K-A; Pl. *Tht.* 152d-e = fr. 136 K-A; see Olson (2007) 10-11.

<sup>3</sup> See above pp. 93-4.

In Sicily, as in Athens, poetry was sustained by the wealthy and powerful: those with substantial private resources or the resources of the state itself to call their own. Poetry cost money. Pindar routinely urges Hieron that everlasting fame cannot be won cheaply, as does Simonides in Xenophon's dialogue.<sup>4</sup> The poet himself needed to be maintained, which was no small matter. Pindar comments on the wealth and beneficence of Hieron that has drawn an array of poets to Sicily.<sup>5</sup> To Pindar, subscribing to the ideology of the wandering professional that we outlined earlier, these visitors are guests of Hieron. The relationship of *xenia* is stressed frequently.<sup>6</sup> The Deinomenids of Sicily, in acting as hosts to famous poets, were carrying on a long-standing tradition of aristocratic patronage.<sup>7</sup> Pisistratus and his sons had laid the foundations for Athens' future artistic brilliance in the same way.

But that was not all. A chorus was required for many of the poetic genres funded by tyrants or elites, not least that of tragedy, but also the dithyramb and probably epinician.<sup>8</sup> In the context of a victory celebration, it is likely that some formal and largely public performance took place. Even nominally private symposia could involve choral performances.<sup>9</sup> Victory celebrations probably also took place as part of the larger musical

---

<sup>4</sup> E.g. *Pyth.* 1. 90; *Xen. Hier.* 9.11; see Carey (2007) 203-4.

<sup>5</sup> *Pind. Ol.* 1.10-11: ἐς ἀφνεῶν ἱκομένους / μάκαιραν ἱέρωνος ἐστίαν; cf. *Pyth.* 5. 11.

<sup>6</sup> ἱέρωνι φιλοξείνῳ, *Bacchyl.* 5.11; 49 Maehler; cf. (on Theron) *Pind. Ol.* 2.6, ὅπι δίκαιον ξένων.

<sup>7</sup> Hubbard (2004) 82-4.

<sup>8</sup> On the problem of the performance of epinician see Davies (1988) 56-7; Heath (1988); Lefkowitz (1963) and (1988) and Heath and Lefkowitz (1991), who argue for purely monodic performance within the context of the symposium. Carey (1989), (1991) and Burnett (1989) offer alternative arguments supporting the traditional view, interpreting references in the texts to multiple singers as the chorus and not simply separate members of the *komos*. I find the latter argument more persuasive, although it seems unlikely that the question can be answered decisively.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. *Xen. Hier.* 6.2; see Clay (1999).

festivals, which also required aristocratic sponsorship.<sup>10</sup> This is all the more probable in the case of a patron as important as Hieron.

We can get some idea of the expense involved and of the nature of this patronage by comparing it with the Athenian *choregia*.<sup>11</sup> By means of this institution, the Athenian democracy continued to fund the arts in the way they had always been funded: with the resources of the aristocracy. Indeed, the ‘Old Oligarch’ would complain that the common people were incapable of undertaking this role.<sup>12</sup> The difference is that the democratic state supervised the overall running of the various Athenian musical festivals, choosing the poets and their respective *choregoi*. However, once the performers were assigned to their *choregos*, he was to pay for their training, time, sustenance and provide a rehearsal space, possibly in his own home.<sup>13</sup> Despite this expense, wealthy Athenians were willing to volunteer their services to reap the glory of having staged a lyric or dramatic performance and gained a victory.<sup>14</sup> It is quite probable that Hieron had the motive and resources for staging public or semi-public performances on a scale similar to the great Athenian festivals, much as the Pisistratids had done before him.

---

<sup>10</sup> For epinicia performed at public festivals see *Ol.* 9. 108-12, *Pyth.* 11. 1-6; *Nem.* 10. 21-3; cf. Currie (2004) 64-9, (2011) 272 and Carey (2007) 205 who argues ‘it is inherently implausible that a grand song of praise...was squandered on an informal gathering’. It is unwise to assume that the victory celebration was automatically a private occasion. The whole city was liable to glory in an athlete’s victory, not merely his immediate family, and it is possible that they were included to some extent in the celebrations. See Kurke (1991) 6-7; Golden (1998) 81-2 and Swift (2010) 109-111. Hubbard (2011) argues for the public performance of Pindar’s other poetry. On the performative and dramatic aspect of all Greek poetry see Herington (1985) 3-40.

<sup>11</sup> On the cost of epinician performances, see Cairns (2011) 30-2.

<sup>12</sup> [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.12.

<sup>13</sup> Note the expenses detailed by fourth century *choregoi* in *Lys.* 21.1; *Antiphon* 6.11-14; *Dem.* 21.16; see Wilson (2002) 127-8, 138-41. On the common practice of private individuals funding of events at public festivals, see Currie (2011).

<sup>14</sup> Wilson (2000) 53-4.



During the 470s Hieron channelled some of those resources into poetic commissions. The epinician poets gave him a fine opportunity for advertising his achievements: his athletic victories, the founding of a new city at Aetna in 476 and the defeat of a combined Carthaginian and Etruscan fleet at Cumae in 474, rivalling the achievement of his brother Gelon at Himera six years previously. The foundation of Aetna is frequently referred to by both Bacchylides and Pindar, who addresses him as the city's 'glorious founder'.<sup>15</sup> Hieron encouraged this, deliberately celebrating the colony as much as his Olympian and Pythian triumphs; so much so that on the occasion of his Pythian victory in 470 he was announced as Hieron of Aetna rather than Syracuse.<sup>16</sup>

A parody of a city foundation in Aristophanes' *Birds* (904-959) suggests that he may have brought poets to Sicily specifically to celebrate the new city, and, moreover, that poets may have come on their own initiative sensing an opportunity for a commission. No sooner has Pisetaerus named his new city and begun the ceremonial sacrifices for Cloudeuckooland, then a poet appears offering his services. He is but the first of a number of travelling professionals to ask the new founder for employment (904-1057). He advertises himself as a servant of the Muses (Μουσάων θεράπων 909). Bacchylides also claimed to be a servant of the divine (χρυσάμπυκος Οὐρανίας / κλεινὸς θεράπων 5.13-14 Maehler), when he celebrated Hieron's Olympic victory in 476 (the same year as the foundation of Aetna).<sup>17</sup> In reality, Aristophanes' poet swiftly turns out to be something of a parasite, crossing the

---

<sup>15</sup> κλεινὸς οἰκιστήρ, *Pyth* 1.31; Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 1.60; *Nem.* 9.2 and fr. 105a S-M; Αἴτναν ἐς εὐκτιτον, Bacchyl. 20c. 7 Maehler.

<sup>16</sup> Pind. *Pyth.* 1.32-3; 3.69.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. πρόπολος / Μουσῶν 5.192-3 Maehler. This is a common term for a poet, however: cf. *Margites* fr. 1.2; *Hom. Hy.* 32. 20; Hes. *Thgn.* 100; Choerilus fr. 317 *SH*. The poet notes at *Av.* 910 and 914 that it is in the manner of Homer (κατὰ τὸν Ὅμηρον). See Dunbar (1995) 529-30.

carefully delineated line between poet and beggar, as is usual in comedy.<sup>18</sup> He requests, as his fee, clothing to keep him warm on his travels through the icy city of the birds (949-50): a comic parody of the lyric poet's claim to hospitality.<sup>19</sup> Pisetaerus is, as it turns out, justifiably disturbed that the news has got out so quickly, hinting that other parasites will come to plague him (956-7). This, it seems, is the sort of thing that happens at a city's foundation.

The link between Pisetaerus and Hieron is made explicit in the poet's choice of verses for the occasion - a hyporchema of Pindar's cunningly reworked to make the mercenary nature of his offer that bit more blatant:

σὺ δὲ πάτερ, κτίστορ Αἴτνας,  
 ζαθέων ἱερῶν ὁμώνυμε,  
 δὸς ἐμὶν ὅ τι περ τεῶ κεφαλᾷ θέλης  
 πρόφρων δόμεν.

(926-30 = Pind. fr. 105 a-b S-M)<sup>20</sup>

The poet may be hinting to Pisetaerus to be as generous as his predecessor Hieron. If so, Aristophanes is parodying an actual event: the gathering (whether summoned or not) of poets to mark the founding of Aetna in 476 by Hieron.

The poet claims he has brought with him a wide variety of material:

μέλη πεποίηκ' εἰς τὰς Νεφελοκοκκυγίας  
 τὰς ὑμετέρας κύκλιά τε πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ

<sup>18</sup> Dover (1972) 141: this passage provides 'the stock comic picture of a lyric poet... as a parasite dependent for his living on eloquent flattery of the rich and powerful.' See Dunbar (1995) 521; cf. Ar. *Nub.* 334-8; *Pax* 967-9; Dover (1968) 146. Hieron complains about this type of entertainer in Xenophon's dialogue, *Hier.* 1.13;11.10.

<sup>19</sup> Appeals for clothing: Hipponax fr. 32-34 West; cf. the cloak given by Eumaeus to Odysseus *Od.* 14. 459-61. On gifts of clothing in Homer see Block (1985).

<sup>20</sup> On Aristophanes' parody of Pindar see Dunbar (1995) 532-3; Martin (2009) 94.

καὶ παρθένεια καὶ κατὰ τὰ Σιμωνίδου.

(917-9)

At least two of these poetic forms — dithyrambs and parthenia — require a chorus. It is not quite clear what the ‘poems in the style of Simonides’ (κατὰ τὰ Σιμωνίδου) are, although it may allude to that poet’s reputation for avarice, as well as his fame as an epinician poet.<sup>21</sup>

Pisetaerus, as the *de facto* ruler of the city, will presumably have to provide this chorus at his own expense and from local talent, as no foreign troupe of dancers is anywhere in evidence.

In this capacity the poet terms himself and those of his profession as ‘trainers’ (διδάσκαλοι 912), perhaps indicating his role as composer and orchestrator rather than performer. The presence of a chorus therefore leads us to suspect that the projected performance is to be on a large and lavish scale, involving members of the new city, designed to celebrate the foundation publicly.

In Hieron’s case, this event could well have taken the form of a celebratory choral performance, like those of epinician victors, or a musical competition within the context of a (new) city festival either at Aetna or Syracuse. A possible contender is the festival dedicated to the cult of Zeus Aetnaeus, which is attested in the Pindaric scholia.<sup>22</sup> It may have been at this festival that Pindar’s first *Pythian* and first *Nemean* odes were performed.<sup>23</sup> It is quite possible that there was a full scale poetic competition as well. The existence of musical competitions at festivals in fifth century Sicily has been proven by a lead curse tablet, possibly from Gela or Camerina, dated from the letter forms to around 470-450 (conceivably

---

<sup>21</sup> See Bell (1978) 40; Rawles (forthcoming).

<sup>22</sup> Zeus Aetnaeus: Pind. *Ol.* 6.96; see Hutchinson (2001) 419; Currie (2011) 276. *Nem.* 1.6: see Braswell (1992) 37; *Pyth.* 1: see Wilamowitz (1922) 296-8; Currie (2005) 18 and (2011) 274-5. Festival of Zeus Aetnaeus: ἐν τῇ Αἴτνῃ Διὸς Αἰτναίου ἄγαλμα ἵδρυται, καὶ ἑορτὴ Αἰτναῖα καλεῖται, Σ *Ol.* 6. 162a (p. 192 Drachmann); Σ *Nem.* 1. 7b (pp. 11-12 Drachmann).

<sup>23</sup> παρόσον ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι καὶ ἐν τῇ πανηγύρει τοῦ Αἰτναίου Διὸς ἦδον οἱ περὶ τὸν ἱέρωνα τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖς στεφανίταις ἀγῶσι πεποιημένους ἐπινίκους, Σ *Nem.* 1. 7b (pp. 11-12 Drachmann).

written during Hieron's lifetime or shortly after his death).<sup>24</sup> The text is confusing in the extreme and a number of interpretations are possible. What we can say for certain is that contests (ἀγόνων 6) are mentioned as are *choregoi*:

ἐπὶ φιλότατι τᾷ Εὐνίῳ ἀπογαράφο τὸς χοραγὸς πάντας ἐπ' ἀτελείᾳ<ι>  
κέπεον καὶ ἔργον<sup>25</sup>.

A certain Apellis appears to be cursing a group of *choregoi* for the sake of his friendship with one Eunicus (who is presumably competing against them) and praying for Eunicus' future and unending victory. Unfortunately we cannot be entirely certain of the meaning of *choregoi* here. A liturgical context on the Athenian model, funding either drama or other choral art forms, is a possibility.<sup>26</sup>

Fifth century Syracuse, therefore, could in all probability have supported wandering poets much as any other Greek city and in a similar manner. Multiple musical competitions certainly existed during the mid fifth century BC in Sicily. We may then assume a local population used to both watching and performing in a chorus. Of the organisation, we can surmise that it may have been broadly similar to those found in Athens and other Greek cities. We have suggestions of a liturgical system and a body of angels/poets/trainers. To this we can add a fragment from Epicharmus (ἐν πέντε κριτῶν γούνασι κέϊται fr. 237 K–A) and Plato's comment on the (far too democratic) way of judging dramatic competitions by the

---

<sup>24</sup> Text edited by Jordan (2007), translation and analysis by Wilson (2007b). On the date see Jordan (2007) 336-7.

<sup>25</sup> 3-4; see Jordan (2007) 343 and 346-7. Wilson (2007b) 352 translates these lines as 'For love of Eunikos I mark down all the *choragoi* so that they may be ineffectual both in word and deed, along with their sons and fathers; and so that they fail both in the contest and outside the contests'.

<sup>26</sup> Alternative explanations: 'leader of the choral performance' e.g. Athen. 14.633b; 'trainer' e.g. Poll. 9.41-2. Jordan (2007) 346 suggests that Eunicus may be the young star of the chorus and Apellis his trainer and lover. For pederasty and choruses see Aeschin. 1. 9-11 cf. Wilson (2000) 56.

applause of the people in Sicily and Italy (*Leg.* 659c). As to what poetry was performed, in all likelihood the range of genres was as wide as that suggested by Peisetairus' poet and included tragedy.

## **b) Aeschylus in Sicily**

If Hieron had something of this sort in mind for the founding of his city - either as an *ad hoc* celebration or a new festival – we have seen that he had a pool of local talent from which to draw the choruses and the best poets to whom he might grant them. It is in this context that we must view the first recorded performances of tragedy outside Athens, Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae* and his *Persians*.<sup>27</sup>

It is sometimes assumed that Aeschylus, as a tragedian and a democratic Athenian, must have had some higher political motive in visiting Sicily and that these performances should not be compared too readily with the contemporaneous activities of Simonides, Bacchylides or Pindar. Rehm has cautioned us against ignoring what he calls 'the fundamental difference between the genre of the epinician . . . and that of tragedy.'

Unlike the older and more traditional 'poetry of praise', tragedy grew hand-and-glove with the new democracy at Athens and, as a result, carried with it a particular social and political agenda.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> *Aetnaeae* see *Vit. Aesch.* 9 *TrGF*; *Persians*: *Vit. Aesch.* 18 *TrGF*. See van Leeuwen (1890); Wilamowitz (1897); Huddilston (1898) 66; Stanford (1937/8); Herington (1967); Bremer (1991) 40-1; Taplin (1993) 2-3; Easterling (1994) 73; Kowalzig (2008) 129; Hanink (2010a) 48-53. On the possible problems with the tradition of Aeschylean re-performance see Lefkowitz (1981) 71-3.

<sup>28</sup> Rehm (1989) 32-3. For explanations for Aeschylus' Sicilian interludes involving Athenian politics see Kowalzig (2008). Duncan (2011) 72 has questioned this assumption, claiming that it is motivated merely by 'the desire to rescue Aeschylus as the champion of democracy.'

In fact Aeschylus operated in the same way as any other wandering poet, contributing to the already ancient traffic in poetry between Sicily and the Greek mainland.

Aeschylus' visits to the court of Hieron were well-known in antiquity. Pausanias (1.2.3) saw Aeschylus as part of the tradition of the wandering poet at the court of the foreign ruler: Aeschylus and Hieron had followed Anacreon and Polycrates. They would be succeeded in their turn by Euripides and Archelaus. Aeschylus is also included in Plutarch's list of poets who benefited from going into exile in a foreign city.<sup>29</sup> The *Vita* places this 'exile' at the end of Aeschylus' life. Rather than leaving temporarily and voluntarily, the biographical tradition relates that Aeschylus left in a fit of pique after a defeat by Sophocles or Simonides.<sup>30</sup> The *Suda* suggests that Aeschylus left Athens after the dramatic collapse of the stage mid-performance.<sup>31</sup> However, ancient scholars certainly knew of more than one visit in Aeschylus' lifetime. Athenaeus and Eustathius attributed to Aeschylus an intimate knowledge of Sicily, thus explaining the appearance of words from Western Greek dialects in his works.<sup>32</sup> To the scholiast on Aristophanes' *Peace* Aeschylus was virtually a native Sicilian.<sup>33</sup> He certainly stayed long enough in Sicily to become a target of Epicharmus' wit.<sup>34</sup>

At least two visits are certain and a third is probable.<sup>35</sup> The *Vita* ties the first performance of the *Aetnaeae* directly to the founding of Aetna in 476 BC:

---

<sup>29</sup> *De exil.* 604e-605b.

<sup>30</sup> *Vit. Aesch.* 8; *Plut. Cim.* 483 f.

<sup>31</sup> *Suda* α1 357.

<sup>32</sup> *Athen.* 402 b; Eustathius s.v. *Od.* 19. 439. On Sicilian Greek dialect in Aeschylus see Stanford (1938/9). Griffith (1978) 107-9 argues that few or none can be said to have been exclusively Athenian.

<sup>33</sup> *τρόπον δέ τινα καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐπιχώριος*, Σ *Ar. Pac.* 73b (Holwerda p. 20). The same comment is made by Macrobius *Sat.* 5.19.17.

<sup>34</sup> Epicharmus fr. 221 K-A. See Willi (2008) 166-7.

<sup>35</sup> For a full discussion see van Leeuwen (1890) and Herington (1967).

ἐλθὼν τοῖνυν εἰς Σικελίαν Ἰέρωνος τότε τὴν Αἴτνην κτίζοντος ἐπεδείξατο τὰς  
Αἰτναίας οἰωνιζόμενος βίον ἀγαθὸν τοῖς συνοικίζουσι τὴν πόλιν.

(*Vit. Aesch.* 9)

Aeschylus seems to have been one of the poets assembled by Hieron to commemorate his achievements at Aetna and elsewhere. The celebrations probably took place in around 476. The *Persians* was probably performed on a second visit after its first performance in Athens in 472, possibly in 470, a year in which Pindar commemorated both the founding of Aetna and the victory at Cumae in his first *Pythian*, perhaps at the same festival of Zeus Aetnaeus.<sup>36</sup>

A third visit took place at the end of Aeschylus' life. After his victory with the *Oresteia* in 458, and a decade after Hieron's death and his family's overthrow, Aeschylus was invited back to Sicily by the people of Gela (*Vita* 10). He died in Gela and was buried there. His death abroad fits nicely with the tradition of the wandering poet: Stesichorus, Ibycus, Phrynichus, Euripides, Timotheus and Agathon all supposedly died on their travels. Some aspects of this tradition are clearly fictitious. The amusing story that he was killed by a tortoise dropped onto his head is the sort of fantasy ancient biographers took particular

---

<sup>36</sup> Herington (1967) 76, suggested that the celebration of Aetna's foundation could have been delayed to around 470, and, if so, the *Aetnaeae* and *Persians* were performed on the same visit. Boshier (2012c) has recently argued that the *Persians* was first performed with the *Aetnaeae* in Sicily in 475 and only reperformed later in Athens in 472. A first performance in Sicily is not inherently improbable. However, the arguments she puts forward are not very compelling. In particular, Boshier argues that the *Persians* is an unusual play, but that is partly because it is our earliest extant tragedy and not because of any Sicilian characteristics. She suggests that the epiphany of Darius could only have been possible in a theatre with a tunnel under the orchestra. Such a tunnel has not been discovered at Athens. However, the emergence of Darius from within the tomb could just as easily have been managed by a trap-door in the stage or some other contrivance. An Attic vase produced at least a decade before *Persians* shows such an epiphany taking place (Basel Antikenmuseum BS 415). Finally, she notes that the other plays performed with *Persians* in Athens in 472 dealt with mythological subjects and that their plots were unconnected. She assumes that *Persians* was performed on its own first in Syracuse and then the other plays were tacked on for the Athenian production. However, the plays shared similar themes and were probably performed together in Sicily: see Sommerstein (2012) and my discussion pp. 127-9.

pleasure in.<sup>37</sup> However, there is little reason to doubt that he died in Gela. His demise in Sicily is recorded by the Parian Marble and his tomb became a famous pilgrimage site for actors and poets.<sup>38</sup> While Aeschylus is generally associated with Hieron and Syracuse, the visit to Gela suggests that tragedy had made a lasting impression, not only on the tyrants, but on the broader Sicilian population, that would continue to grow even after the fall of the Deinomenids.

### c) **The *Aetnaeae***

Let us look in detail at some of the plays Aeschylus produced in Sicily. The *Aetnaeae* predicted good fortune for the citizens of Aetna, probably with an aetiological prophecy at its close: a device he employed more than once and in other Sicilian contexts. Pindar makes a similar prediction – which he asks Apollo to confirm – that after Hieron’s victory at Delphi, the city he founds may be as successful as the founder (*Pyth.* 1.35-40). Unlike Pindar, Aeschylus could not build his work directly around the foundation, but he could allude to it, and in doing so he was conceivably echoing Pindar and other poets who competed with him for the tyrant’s attention.

What little we know of the play’s content and the myth it covered seems to support the *Vita*’s account. The play concerned in some way the Palici: Sicilian chthonic deities, whom the Greeks identified as children of the nymph Thalia and Zeus.<sup>39</sup> Their mother’s father was Hephaestus who is associated with Mount Etna by both Pindar and the author of

---

<sup>37</sup> *Vit. Aesch.* 10; Val. Max. 9.12; Plin. *NH* 10.7; Ael. *NA* 7.16; [Sotad.] fr. 15.12 Powell = Stob. 4.34.8.

<sup>38</sup> *FGrHist* 239 A 59; *Vit. Aesch.* 11.

<sup>39</sup> On the cult see Croon (1952).



*Prometheus Bound*.<sup>40</sup> The Palici were linked to a volcanic spring, pushing water up from under the ground to a great height.<sup>41</sup> When the mother of the Palici became pregnant by Zeus, she was so distraught at the threat of Hera's anger that she asked for the earth to open and swallow her. Her children then re-emerged from the ground and from this they were known as Palici from the Greek πάλιν ἰκέσθαι.<sup>42</sup>

Fraenkel added to the *Aetnaeae* the fragments of an unidentified play of Aeschylus concerning the arrival of Justice on earth.<sup>43</sup> A chorus converse with the personified Justice, who claims to have been sent by Zeus to their city. Another fragment may describe the honour shown to a city by Justice and the happiness, peace and prosperity resulting from her attention.<sup>44</sup> Fraenkel argued that these fragments were especially suited to the *Aetnaeae*: a 'Festspiel' celebrating the foundation of Aetna.<sup>45</sup> The theme of justice may have been only too appropriate with the establishment of a new Dorian constitution for the city of Aetna: mentioned in Pindar's ode.<sup>46</sup> The 'Justice play' also celebrated peace: the result of the arrival of Justice. The papyrus seems to refer to the birth of Ares, who is presumably defeated or reformed by Justice.<sup>47</sup> Similarly, in the first *Pythian*, the myth of Typhos, placed under Aetna by the victorious Zeus Aetnaeus, suggests the theme of the imposition of order and justice

---

<sup>40</sup> Steph. Byz. p.496 Meineke; [Aesch.] *PV* 366-9; Pind. *Pyth.* 1.25. Hephaestus and Demeter were said by Simonides (fr. 552 PMG) to have made competing claims to the island.

<sup>41</sup> DS 11.89. 1-4; Strabo 6.2.9; Steph. Byz. p.496 Meineke.

<sup>42</sup> Macrobius *Sat.* 5.19.24 = Aesch. fr. 6; Steph. Byz. 496 Meineke = Aesch. fr. 7; Servius ad Virg. *Aen.* 9.581. For similar puns cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 62-5, where the river Amenes is derived from the Greek ἀεὶ μένειν, in order to suggest that Aetna will flourish *in perpetuum*. See Dougherty (1992) 126-7.

<sup>43</sup> *P. Oxy.* 2256 fr. 9 a-b = fr. 281a-b *TrGF*; Fraenkel (1954); followed by Lloyd-Jones (1983) 99-100. This suggestion has been rejected by Taplin (1977) 464-5 and Poli-Palladini (2001) 315-16. For further studies see Bremer (1991) 40-1; Ippolito (1997) 9-11; Sommerstein (2008) 276-87.

<sup>44</sup> *P. Oxy.* 2256 fr. 8; Fraenkel (1954) 74-5 = (1964) 261-2.

<sup>45</sup> Fraenkel (1954) 71 = (1964) 258-9.

<sup>46</sup> *Pyth.* 1. 61-6; Σ 118c (p. 20 Drachmann). See Fraenkel (1954) 69-70 = (1964) 257.

<sup>47</sup> *P. Oxy.* 2256 fr. 8. 2. Fr. 9a 30-41 See Sommerstein (2010c) 208 n. 47.

over chaos. War, in Pindar's ode, is banished by music, in the same way that Hieron, as the victor of Cumae, has brought peace to Sicily. The 'Justice Play' therefore seems to touch on themes that were only too suitable for a play celebrating the foundation of a city, and which, moreover, were addressed by Pindar in his celebration of Hieron's achievements. Moreover, the Palici were said to assist in the administration of justice and, in particular, to punish those who made false oaths.<sup>48</sup> The establishment of their cult may have prepared for the advent of Justice.

The action of the play did not only take place at Aetna, as we would expect. It began in Aetna but then moved across Sicily, through Xuthia, Aetna again and Leontini, ending at Syracuse.<sup>49</sup> The disappearance of Thalia into the earth perhaps prompted the chorus, consisting presumably of nymphs from Mount Etna, to tour the areas of Sicily in search of her.<sup>50</sup> The chorus may have met the newly risen Palici at Leontini or Xuthia: two of the settings for the play, both of which are in the vicinity of their shrine.<sup>51</sup> The sanctuary of the Palici was, in part, an oracular shrine and the chorus could have been sent there for advice or directions.<sup>52</sup> If we are right to add the 'Justice Play' play fragments to the play, then the new goddesses may have directed them on to Syracuse where they met the figure of Justice, who is linked to the Palici through their father, Zeus, who honours her and sends her to earth.<sup>53</sup> Her arrival probably resulted in a celebration of Syracuse and the prediction of good fortune for the future city of Aetna. The journey across Eastern Sicily, thus demonstrated the extent

---

<sup>48</sup> DS 11.89.5-8; Macr. *Sat.* 5.19.20.

<sup>49</sup> *P.Oxy.* 2257. fr. 1. 8-14. See Fraenkel (1954) 63-4 = (1964) 250-1. For a discussion of the problems of staging see Taplin (1977) 416-18.

<sup>50</sup> See Ippolito (1997) 8; Poli-Palladini (2001) 311; Sommerstein (2010c) 193.

<sup>51</sup> See Croon (1952) 116; Fraenkel (1954) 64 = (1964) 251; La Rosa (1974).

<sup>52</sup> Macr. *Sat.* 5.19.22.

<sup>53</sup> *P. Oxy.* 2256 fr. 9 a = fr. 281 a 8 and 12 *TrGF*.

of Hieron's power and influence. The culmination of the play may have involved a celebration of Syracuse and its role in setting up the new colony.

The plot of the *Aetnaeae* seems to have been similar to that of the *Eumenides*.<sup>54</sup> The ancient hypothesis, in discussing plays in which the action takes place in more than one location, may even have made a comparison between the two.<sup>55</sup> However, the two plays may have even more in common. The theme of rebirth in the *Aetnaeae* may hint that the play ended on a strong positive note after a period of uncertainty, a pattern similar to that found in the *Eumenides*. The *Eumenides* dramatised the foundation of the Argive alliance (762-777), which secured Athens in war, and the Areopagus court, which safeguarded justice as the first ever homicide court (681-4). In addition, it saw the establishment of the cult of the Eumenides at Athens (854-7), which will also in turn contribute to the prosperity of Athens (894-5). In the *Aetnaeae*, the new city is similarly protected from external enemies by Syracuse and from internal strife by the twin powers of Justice on earth and a chthonic cult beneath it. Syracuse, as the setting for the conclusion of the *Aetnaeae*, could have taken the role of Athens in the *Eumenides* and received many of the same benefits.

The *Aetnaeae* was thus a political drama designed to celebrate Aetna, Syracuse and its ruler Hieron. Aeschylus probably deployed many of the same themes and elements that are found in the *Eumenides* over a decade earlier in Sicily. This is further confirmation that the politics of tragedy were neither exclusively Athenian nor democratic. Nor, in this case, were they articulated first in Athens. The *Aetnaeae* demonstrates the ways in which tragedy could be used to reflect the political agendas of cities other than Athens. However, this does not mean that the play was only performed in Sicily and during Hieron's lifetime. The catalogues

---

<sup>54</sup> Poli-Palladini (2001) 324 notes that both plays employ strikingly propagandist devices.

<sup>55</sup> *P.Oxy.* 2257.6 = fr. 1. 6 *TrGF* is tentatively restored by Lobel to εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐκ Δελφῶν μεταβιβάζεται. This, he argues, refers to the *Eumenides*.

of plays in the medieval manuscripts mention an inauthentic version of the *Aetnaeae*.<sup>56</sup> The play must have been popular enough to prompt a second version or adaptation, possibly undertaken either by Aeschylus himself or his son Euphorion.<sup>57</sup> The original play may have been re-performed several times, and it is not impossible that it was staged in Athens, either before or after Aeschylus' death. Once again we are reminded that a tragedy was not designed solely for the audience present at its first performance. Each play was destined to travel, spreading the fame of its author and the heroes it celebrated.

#### d) *Persians*

The *Persians* was believed in antiquity to have been re-performed in Sicily at Hieron's request.<sup>58</sup> According to the scholion on Aristophanes' *Frogs*, Eratosthenes, in order to explain Dionysus' confusing reference to the death of Darius (1027-8) – an event which clearly featured neither in our extant text nor that known to ancient scholars – supposed that the *Persians* was altered in some way in its revival at Syracuse.<sup>59</sup> While this is possible, the text of the *Persians* as we have it would have fitted well with Hieron's overall political agenda alongside the *Aetnaeae*. Although the play celebrates Athens' contribution to the Greek cause, especially in Atossa's conversation with the Chorus on the strengths of the democratic Athenian state (230-45), Hieron probably saw the *Persians* as a reflection of his

---

<sup>56</sup> Aesch. T 78, 1d. 2a *TrGF*.

<sup>57</sup> Sommerstein (2008) 7.

<sup>58</sup> δοκοῦσι δὲ οὗτοι οἱ Πέρσαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου δεδιδάχθαι ἐν Συρακούσαις, σπουδάσαντος Ἰέρωνος, ὥς φησιν Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν γ' περὶ κωμωδιῶν, Σ *Ran.* 1028f (p. 127 Holwerda).

<sup>59</sup> See Garvie (2009) liii-lvii.

family's achievements in the combined struggle against barbarian forces.<sup>60</sup> The play celebrates the joint victory of the Greek states. Victory at Salamis safeguards the freedom of all Greece, not just Athens. The rallying cry at Salamis is directed to all Greeks (ὦ παῖδες Ἑλλήνων 402). Although the credit for Salamis is reserved largely for Athens, Darius predicts that the future defeat at Plataea will be caused by the 'Dorian spear': a reference to Sparta.<sup>61</sup>

Aeschylus probably also had in mind victories won in Sicily by Hieron and his brother Gelon. For we are told that on the same day that Persian arms received their first major reverse at Salamis, Gelon crushed a Carthaginian force at Himera. This was followed six years later by Hieron's own naval victory at Cumae.<sup>62</sup> According to Diodorus Siculus, Gelon's victory against the barbarian Carthaginians at Himera was thought by many to rival those at Salamis and Plataea.<sup>63</sup> Although Gelon had turned down requests for help against the Persians (Hdt. 7.157), Himera was publicised as another Hellenic victory on a different front against a common enemy. It was claimed that the Carthaginians had allied themselves with the Persians and were acting in conjunction with them.<sup>64</sup> Gelon dedicated a tripod of sixteen talents of gold at Delphi alongside those of the cities of mainland Greece.<sup>65</sup>

Hieron intended to use poetry to publicise his family's achievements and stress their equal worth in what Taplin has termed the Panhellenic 'celebration culture' of the victorious

---

<sup>60</sup> Lattimore (1943) 90 -3 claimed that the pro-Athenian bias of the play wilfully obscures the collaborative efforts made by the Greek states. Hall (1996a) 12, points instead to 'a nascent expression of the very tension between Panhellenic ideals and Athenian imperial ideology.'

<sup>61</sup> πρὸς γῆ Πλαταιῶν Δωρίδος λόγχης ὕπο, *Pers.* 817; see Garvie (2009) 314.

<sup>62</sup> Hdt. 7.166 and Arist. *Poet.* 1459a. DS 11.24.1 places Himera and Themopylae on the same day.

<sup>63</sup> DS 11.23.1.

<sup>64</sup> DS 11.20; cf. Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 1.146 (p.24 Drachmann).

<sup>65</sup> DS 11.25.7; Athen. 6. 231e-232c; Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 1.152b (p.26 Drachmann).

Greek states.<sup>66</sup> It seems likely that Pindar and Aeschylus were collaborating or competing in this programme. Taplin argues that Aeschylus, with his first performance of the *Persians* in Athens, may have been hoping to firmly establish the relatively new genre of tragedy as part of the official celebratory poetry, by composing a work that could rival Simonides and his elegy on the battle of Plataea.<sup>67</sup> Something similar seems to have been happening in Sicily later in the decade.

Many of the themes of the conflict raised by Aeschylus and Pindar are similar. In the same ode in which Pindar celebrates the founding of Aetna he specifically juxtaposes Salamis and Plataea with Cumae at which Hieron is described as ‘rescuing Greece from grave slavery’ (Ἑλλάδ’ ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας *Pyth.* 1.75). Freedom from slavery is the dominant motivation for the Greeks of Aeschylus, as shown by the Athenian war cry ‘free the fatherland’ (ἐλευθεροῦτε πατρίδα *Pers.* 403). Pindar recalls the cult of Zeus of Freedom in connection with the city of Himera (Ζηνὸς Ἐλευθερίου *Ol.* 12.1). The barbarian war-cry (ἀλαλατός *Pind. Pyth.* 1.72) resembles the incoherent shout described by Aeschylus (Περσίδος γλώσσης ῥόθος *Pers.* 406). Both enemies are defeated as a punishment for *hybris* (*Pind. Pyth.* 1.72; *Aesch. Pers.* 821). Simonides, Pindar and Aeschylus all had broadly similar briefs, but in Sicily Aeschylus and Pindar were working for the sons of Deinomenes.

Pindar admits that Hieron is not his only patron. He has travelled widely enough to be rewarded by both the Athenians and the Spartans:

ἀρέομαι  
παρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθαναίων χάριν

---

<sup>66</sup> Taplin (2006).

<sup>67</sup> *P. Oxy.* 2327 and 3965; see Taplin (2006) 4-6.

μισθόν, ἐν Σπάρτᾳ δ' <ἀπὸ> τᾶν πρὸ Κιθαιρῶνος μαχᾶν,

(*Pyth.* 1.75-7).

The Athenian and Spartan victories are jointly celebrated, as in Aeschylus' *Persians*. In addition, Pindar presents himself as a praise-poet, moving between Athens and Sparta, taking his pay (μισθόν), in the form of *charis*, for his poems in honour of their victories. We know that he had Athenian patrons and had written poetry in praise of that city.<sup>68</sup> He probably also visited Sparta. But here he sings a different ode for another group of patrons and for another battle:

παρ<ὰ> δὲ τᾶν εὐνυδρον ἄκτᾶν

Ἰμέρα παίδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεος τελέσας,

τὸν ἐδέξαντ' ἀμφ' ἀρετᾶ, πολέμιων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων.

(78-80).

Pindar not only equates the victories of Hieron and Gelon with the triumphs at Salamis and Plataea, but also illustrates his different clients. If Pindar was in demand in both Athens and Sicily, it is quite probable that Aeschylus was as well. Pindar is a poet for hire: he is able to travel from one part of Greece to another upon the poetic circuit. The same was true of Aeschylus. In Sicily, Aeschylus, the great Athenian, employs what have been termed 'the poetic strategies of wandering poets'.<sup>69</sup>

#### e) Other plays: a Persian trilogy?

---

<sup>68</sup> *Pyth.* 7; *Nem.* 2; paeans: 5 fr. 52e S-M, see Rutherford (2001) 293-8; dithyrambs: fr. 74a-88 S-M; *threnoi*: fr. 137 S-M.

<sup>69</sup> Martin (2009) 81.

At its first performance in Athens, the *Persians* was performed second in a tetralogy, preceded by *Phineus* and followed by *Glaucus of Potniae*, both of which are now lost.<sup>70</sup> The satyr play *Prometheus* rounded off the whole.<sup>71</sup> The Prometheus satyr play has been identified as *Prometheus Fire Kindler*.<sup>72</sup> Were any of these plays re-performed in Sicily alongside the *Persians*? We have no ancient evidence to show that they were and we cannot automatically assume that trilogies would have been produced at Sicilian festivals. However, there are reasons to suggest that the entire trilogy was performed in Syracuse, and not just the *Persians*.

The works performed with *Persians* do not seem to have been closely linked, after the manner of other Aeschylean trilogies such as the *Oresteia*. It is unclear what the connection between these plays was, especially given that an historical tragedy has been sandwiched between two works dealing with separate myths. *Phineus* told the story of the seer who was tormented by the Harpies before his rescue by the Argonauts. *Glaucus of Potniae* covered the death of Glaucus at the funeral games of Pelias. The unfortunate hero is killed in a chariot crash and then devoured by his own horses. The scholion on Pindar's first *Pythian* quotes a passage, possibly from the *Glaucus of Potniae*, which may provide a clue as to the connection between these plays:

καλοῖσι λουτροῖς ἐκλέλουμαι δέμας  
εἰς ὑψίκρημνον ἱμέραν δ' ἀφικόμην.

---

<sup>70</sup> Another play, *Glaucus Pontios*, could also have been performed in the tetralogy. Most scholars have preferred *Potnieus*, especially since this is the title given in most, though not all, of the manuscripts of the *Persians* hypothesis. See Garvie (2009) xvii and Sommerstein (2012) 96-7.

<sup>71</sup> ἐπὶ Μένωνος τραγωδῶν Αἰσχύλος ἐνίκᾳ Φινεῖ, Πέρσαις, Γλαύκῳ, Προμηθεῖ, *arg. Pers.* 16-17.

<sup>72</sup> This work may be the same play as the *Prometheus Fire Bearer*, sometimes associated with the trilogy of the *Prometheus Bound*. See Brown (1990).



(Aesch. fr. 25a *TrGF*).<sup>73</sup>

Someone has bathed at Himera in Sicily. What has Himera to do with Potniae in Boeotia or Iolcus in Thessaly at which the funeral games of Pelias took place?

Given that *Glaucus of Potniae* was performed just after *Persians*, it seems likely (as Sommerstein has argued) that we have here an oblique reference to the battle of Himera. Hamilcar, the Carthaginian general, was killed by the Syracusan cavalry as he was about to sacrifice to Poseidon.<sup>74</sup> There may have been a link made between the fates of Glaucus and Hamilcar, both of which involved horses. And if the speaker of 25a has come from Sicily to Boeotia, he must in all likelihood be a god. Poseidon seems a likely candidate. In the *Eumenides* (397-404) Athena reveals, on entering, that she was on the Scamander in the Troad, but has been summoned by Orestes' prayer to Athens. Was Poseidon summoned from Himera in a similar way? If so, these lines may belong to the opening of a speech by Poseidon, who could well have predicted the future battle at Himera and his role in securing success for the Greeks.

If this is right, then how does the *Phineus* fit in? The two Argonauts who chased off the Harpies were Zetes and Calais, the sons of the wind god Boreas. Their mother was Oreithyia, the daughter of Erechtheus, the mythical king of Athens. Herodotus (7.189) tells us that the Athenians prayed to Boreas and Oreithyia to destroy the Persian fleet as it was proceeding south along the coast of Greece in the weeks before Salamis. Phineus, a prophet, could easily have predicted these events in a speech of thanks to his protectors.<sup>75</sup> Alternatively, the myth of the Argonauts deals with an early Greek expedition into barbarian territory and the theft of a barbarian woman: the origin, according to Herodotus (1.2), of the

---

<sup>73</sup> Assigned to *Glaucus of Potniae* by Sommerstein (2012); cf. (2008) 22-4.

<sup>74</sup> DS 11.21.4-22.1.

<sup>75</sup> Sommerstein (2012) 101-2.

conflicts between Greeks and Persians. The presence of the Argonauts at the funeral Games of Pelias may have been noted in the *Glaucus at Potniae*: thus the two plays provided a convenient frame to the historical drama of the *Persians*.<sup>76</sup>

Sommerstein argues that the trilogy covered all the main events of the Persian War in temporal sequence, though with a special emphasis on the victory at Salamis.<sup>77</sup> Phineus predicted the destruction of the Persian fleet off Cape Sepias. Persians covered the battle at Salamis in detail and predicted the final victory at Plataea. Glaucus of Potniae ended with Poseidon predicting defeat for the Carthaginians at Himera. We cannot be certain that the entire Persian tetralogy was performed in Sicily but, if Sommerstein is right, it seems likely.

#### **f) Other plays: the Prometheus trilogy?**

If the whole of the Persian trilogy was re-performed in Syracuse in around 470, was the *Aetnaeae* also part of a trilogy? The *Vita* only mentions one play, but this need not suggest that only single plays were produced at Sicilian festivals.<sup>78</sup> The biographers, whose main source was the texts themselves, were not interested in listing all the plays performed in Sicily and only mentioned works providing evidence for an event in Aeschylus' life. The *Aetnaeae* could easily be used to demonstrate the relationship between Aeschylus and his patron Hieron; in the case of the *Persians*, though it was also performed in Sicily, this was less obvious. The Sicilian re-performance was probably only remembered because of the need to explain the peculiar passage in Aristophanes' *Frogs*. We shall see that, in the same way, the *Archelaus* of Euripides, while not the only play produced in Macedonia, is the only

---

<sup>76</sup> As argued by Moreau (1992/3) 124, 131-4.

<sup>77</sup> Sommerstein (2012) 102.

<sup>78</sup> As is suggested by Bosher (2012c) 106.

one mentioned in the biographical tradition because the title unambiguously alluded to Euripides' patron, king Archelaus.

We have seen already that the play concluded on a positive note, possibly resembling the final scene of the *Eumenides*. Could the successful foundation of the cult of the Palici have been the culmination of a trilogy, just as the establishment of the cult of the Eumenides is in the *Oresteia*? A major objection to the addition of the 'Justice Play' fragments to the *Aetnaeae* is that, according to Lobel, the language is closer to satyr play than tragedy.<sup>79</sup> In particular, Lobel pointed to the use of the word ὀτίη (fr. 281a 9 *TrGF*) which also appears in Euripides' *Cyclops* (643) but not in any tragedy. On the other hand, the celebration of future prosperity in the *Aetnaeae* is a theme suitable for a satyr play. There is nothing to suggest that the *Aetnaeae* was not a proper tragedy, but if it was the culmination of a trilogy it is not impossible that it could have had satyric elements. Euripides' *Alcestis* is one known example of a pro-satyric tragedy and there may have been others. Aeschylus is also not above using words otherwise unattested in serious poetry in the *Eumenides* and elsewhere.<sup>80</sup> It is not impossible that the *Aetnaeae* functioned as a celebratory and pro-satyric concluding piece in a tragic trilogy. If there were two Sicilian trilogies, this might further support the suggestion that Aeschylus visited Sicily twice, in 476 and after 472, rather than just once in 470, as Herington supposed.<sup>81</sup>

If so, what were its companion plays and was it followed by a true satyr play? We cannot know for certain. The only candidates that have been suggested are the Prometheus plays, of which the much-debated *Prometheus Bound* is still extant. We know of two Prometheus plays, *Bound* and *Unbound*. A third play, *Prometheus the Fire-Bearer*, was

---

<sup>79</sup> Lobel s.v. *P.Oxy.* 2256 fr. 9a (p. 39); see Sutton (1983) 21 and Poli-Palladini (2001) 313-314 who believe that this rules out a link with the *Aetnaeae*. *Contra*: Lloyd-Jones (1983) 99-100 and Ippolito (1997) 10-11.

<sup>80</sup> E.g. βδελύκτροποι, *Eum.* 52 and ἀβδέλυκτ', fr. 137; ἐμοῦσα *Eum.* 184.

<sup>81</sup> See p.119 n.36.

probably not part of the same trilogy as *Prometheus Bound*.<sup>82</sup> We thus have two certainly connected tragedies with space for a third unknown tragedy. Lloyd-Jones suggested that the final play in the Prometheus trilogy was in fact the *Aetnaeae*.<sup>83</sup>

The *Prometheus Bound* has long been linked with Sicily, prompted in part by references in the play to the defeat of the monster Typhos.<sup>84</sup> Prometheus recalls that this terrible enemy of the gods was blasted by Zeus' thunderbolt and cast beneath Sicily, where he belches fire from Mount Etna (355-74). The myth of Typhos is known from Hesiod (*Thgn.* 820-68). However, Pindar and the author of *Prometheus Bound* are the first to connect Typhos with Sicily.<sup>85</sup> It is tempting to suppose that both were inspired by the recent eruption of Etna, and by the foundation of the nearby city of Aetna. There are other parallels too. In Plato's *Protagoras* (322c1-4), Justice is granted to mortals after the disastrous distribution of Prometheus and Epimetheus. The *Aetnaeae* may have completed the trilogy, presenting the arrival of Justice in Sicily as the denouement of the myth of Prometheus, which had earlier questioned the justice of Zeus. Even if we do not link the 'Justice Play' with the *Aetnaeae*, there could have been a connection made in the trilogy between the buried Prometheus and the Palici who return again to the upper world.

Though undoubtedly attractive, the theory of a Prometheus trilogy, which included the *Aetnaeae*, runs into serious difficulties. We would first have to suppose that, for one, the

---

<sup>82</sup> West (1979) 130-2 = (2007) 362-3 supposed that this was the first play of the trilogy, dealing with the theft of fire for which Prometheus is punished in our extant tragedy. However, if *Fire Bearer* set the scene for the binding of Prometheus, why does the *Prometheus Bound* narrate the events of the earlier play (197-241)? Brown (1990) argued that the *Fire-Bearer* was identical to the *Prometheus Fire-Kindler*, the satyr play of the *Persians* trilogy.

<sup>83</sup> Lloyd-Jones (1983) 97-103. This suggestion has been rejected by Taplin (1977) 464-5 and Poli-Palladini (2001) 315-316.

<sup>84</sup> See Focke (1930) 287-94.

<sup>85</sup> *Pyth.* 1. 15-20; cf. fr. 92 S-M; *Il.* 2. 782 situates Typhos' bed in Cilicia: εἰν' Ἀρίμοις.

play was composed by Aeschylus and, for another, that it is dated no later than 467, the year of Hieron's death. Both of these assumptions run counter to current views on the play's date and author.<sup>86</sup> The brevity of the choral odes, the addition of a third actor and the supposedly unusual theology of the play suggest a late date and cannot be so easily explained away.<sup>87</sup> Lloyd-Jones' theory of a Prometheus trilogy involving the *Aetnaeae* remains highly speculative.

While it is quite possible that the *Aetnaeae* concluded a trilogy, it cannot be certainly linked to the Prometheus plays. What we can say is that Aeschylus visited Sicily at least twice and probably three times. He certainly produced two plays (the *Aetnaeae* and the *Persians*). In addition, the other plays from the Persian trilogy were probably also staged in Sicily. It is possible that the *Aetnaeae* was also the concluding part of a trilogy, perhaps concerning Prometheus, though not including the *Prometheus Bound* (or at least not the play

---

<sup>86</sup> West (1979) 135-49 = (2007) 392-5 and (1990) 65-6 dates the play to around 440BC and Bees (1993) even later to the 430s. Focke (1930) 262 n.1 and Zuntz (1983) and (1993) claimed that Sophocles' *Triptolemus* of 468 BC was influenced by the Prometheus trilogy. However, there is no absolute certainty that the *Prometheus Bound* is not later and influenced in fact by Sophocles: see Herington (1970) 128-9 and West (1990) 51-2. Griffith (1977), in studying the metres and vocabulary of *Prometheus*, concluded that it was inauthentic. The suggestion of Sicilian performance has been used in the past to excuse some of the supposedly un-Aeschylean elements. E.g. Focke (1930) 294-7, who suggested that Aeschylus may have left the choral odes deliberately short because of his Sicilian choruses' lack of experience. However, as Griffith (1978) argues, this is mere special pleading. For further discussion see Lloyd-Jones (2003).

<sup>87</sup> Chorus: Only thirteen percent of the lines in *PV* are given to the chorus as opposed to an average of close to forty per cent in the remaining six plays of Aeschylus. See Lefèvre (2003) 152 and Sommerstein (2010b) 230. In addition, Griffith (1977) 19-67 argued that the lyric metres of the play differ significantly from those of Aeschylus' other tragedies. For the suggestion that the choral odes were shortened to accommodate the inexperienced Sicilian choreuts see Focke (1930) 294-7. Theology see West (1990) 62-3; *contra* Herington (1970) 76-87; Lloyd Jones (1983) 95-103 and (2003) who argue that the 'theology' of the *Prometheus Bound* is not radically different to that found in the other plays of Aeschylus.

as it survives today). Aeschylus may also have intended to produce other plays when he returned to Sicily in around 456. He was indeed ‘quite the Sicilian’.<sup>88</sup>

Aeschylus was drawn to Sicily for the same reason as Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar. Under Hieron, Syracuse had become a centre for poetry, offering commissions to professional poets large enough to bring them to the West. Aeschylus behaves no differently from the non-Athenian lyric poets of his generation and, in fact, fits seamlessly into the long-standing model of the wandering professional poet. Tragedy was disseminated at an early period, so early in fact that our earliest extant play (*Persians*) is also the first known to have been re-performed outside Attica. If we understand the early tragic poets as wandering professionals, we may begin to see why.

### 3. Phrynichus in Sicily

It is possible that Aeschylus was not the first tragedian to arrive in Sicily. Phrynichus, an older contemporary of Aeschylus, may also have travelled to the island. A passage in a comic treatise referred to another Phrynichus, the late fifth century comic poet rather than the tragedian, as the son of Phradmon and claimed that he died in Sicily.<sup>89</sup> However, according to the scholiast of Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, the name of the comedian’s father was not Phradmon but Eunomides.<sup>90</sup> Could it in fact be the tragic poet who travelled to Sicily and died there?

---

<sup>88</sup> ‘vir utique Siculus’, Macr. *Sat.* 5.19.7.

<sup>89</sup> Φρύνιχος Φράδμονος ἔθανεν ἐν Σικελίᾳ, *De comoedia* III 32 (Holwerda p.9). Phrynichus *comicus*: cf. *testimonia* K–A vol.7 pp.393–4. Harvey (2000) makes the case that this passage refers to the comedian; cf. Nevegna (2013) 19.

<sup>90</sup> Σ Ar. *Ran.* 13a (Holwerda p.7).

There is some confusion as to the name of the tragedian's father. The *Suda*, in its entry on the tragedian, lists three possibilities: Polyphradmon, Minyrus and Chorocles.<sup>91</sup> If Phrynichus the tragic poet's father was called Polyphradmon, then the author of the *de comoedia* might have confused the two. The first four letters of his name could have easily been lost during the copying of the manuscript or, as Snell suggests, Polyphradmon could have been also known as Phradmon.<sup>92</sup>

Happily, a scholion to Aristophanes' *Birds* somewhat clarifies this issue.<sup>93</sup> There were four men named Phrynichus: a) the tragic poet and son of Polyphradmon, b) the comic poet, c) the Athenian general and later oligarch in 411 BC and, finally, d) an actor the son of Chorocles, possibly the same Phrynichus as the retired dancer implicated in the mutilation of the herms in 415.<sup>94</sup> Chorocles was therefore not the father of the earlier tragedian. The claim that the tragic poet Phrynichus (a) was the son of Polyphradmon is given weight by the *Suda*, which notes that the tragedian himself had a son, whom he named Polyphrasmon and who also became a tragic poet, losing to Aeschylus in 467.<sup>95</sup> We know that the sons of poets would usually enter the same profession as their fathers. There was also no cross-over between tragic and comic families: the son of a tragic poet always produces tragedies.

---

<sup>91</sup> *Suda* φ 762: Φρύνιχος Πολυφράδμονος ἢ Μινύρου, οἱ δὲ Χοροκλέους. A Phrynichus son of Melanthes, probably active in the third century, is attested by the *Suda* φ 765, with whom the Aldine edition of the scholia on Aristophanes confuses the elder tragedian (Σ Ar. *Vesp.* 1490b (Holwerda p.231): υἱὸς Μελανθᾶ); see Sutton (1987) 12.

<sup>92</sup> *ad loc.* 3 T 6 *TrGF* p. 70.

<sup>93</sup> Σ Ar. *Av.* 749b (Holwerda p.117).

<sup>94</sup> Phrynichus the oligarch: cf. Thuc. 8.25-7, 48-51, 54, 68 and 90. Phrynichus the actor may be the retired dancer listed Andoc. 1.47 (Φρύνιχος ὁ ὀρχησάμενος). Snell *TrGF* p.69 suggested that he may have belonged the same family as Phrynichus the tragedian; cf. Sutton (1987) 12. See Sommerstein (1987b) who argues against suggested emendations of the text of Andocides.

<sup>95</sup> *Suda* φ 762: καὶ παῖδα ἔσχε τραγικὸν Πολυφράσμονα (Πολυφράδμονα AG); *arg. Sept.* 8-9.

Furthermore, Greeks tended to give their sons the name, or style of name, of their fathers.<sup>96</sup>

Therefore if a certain Phrynichus had a son named Polyphradmon who was a tragedian, then it is likely that he was a tragic poet and that his father's name was Polyphradmon.

Did the author of the comic treatise only get the name of the father wrong? He may have known of a tradition in which Phrynichus the comedian died in Sicily. However, the tradition of a death in Sicily seems more likely to have been associated with Phrynichus the tragedian rather than the comedian given the similar stories surrounding Aeschylus. Aeschylus' death in Sicily and tomb there were famous in antiquity. Phrynichus' death could have been overshadowed or absorbed into the biographical tradition of his more famous rival Aeschylus. Furthermore, it is probable that Hieron would have invited Phrynichus as well as Aeschylus to Syracuse.

He may well have been in Sicily even earlier. I suggest that the most obvious time for him to travel to the Greek West was after the disastrous reception of his *Capture of Miletus* in around 490, for which he was fined a thousand drachmas.<sup>97</sup> If he did go to Sicily at that time he may well have visited the tyrant Gelon, who ruled in Gela and later Syracuse from 491, or his brother Hieron, who acted as regent in Gela from 486. He must have returned to Athens by 477, when he won a victory with Themistocles as his *choregos*, probably with the *Phoenician Women*: just before Hieron's foundation of Aetna.<sup>98</sup> Hieron may have heard of this play and, if so, could have persuaded Phrynichus to return to Sicily. The *Phoenician*

---

<sup>96</sup> E.g. Aeschylus was the son of Euphorion, whose sons Euphorion and Euaeon were both said to be tragedians, the former producing his father's plays posthumously (*Suda* α1 357; ε 3800). Sophocles had two grandsons named Sophocles, one of whom was a tragic poet (*Suda* σ 816; *Vit.Soph.* 13). Carcinus the son of Xenotimus had an uncertain number of sons including the tragic poet Xenocles and another named Xenotimus: see Σ *Ar. Pac.* 783 (Holwerda p.122); Σ *Ar. Vesp.* 1502 (Holwerda p.232). The grandson of Carcinus, also called Carcinus, was a celebrated tragic poet of the fourth century. See Sutton (1987) 12-18.

<sup>97</sup> Hdt. 6.21; cf. Σ *Ar. Vesp.* 1490a (Holwerda p.230); Ael. *VH* 13.17.

<sup>98</sup> Plut. *Them.* 5.5; see Lloyd Jones (1966) 23-4 = (1990) 233-4.



*Women* was as suitable as Aeschylus' Persian trilogy for Hieron's grand celebration of the wider Greek victory. If Aeschylus went to Sicily to produce the *Aetnaeae* in 476, Phrynichus probably went with him. It is quite possible then that he died in Sicily before 472, prompting Aeschylus to make an implicit tribute to him in the opening words of the *Persians*.<sup>99</sup> Phrynichus' works were certainly known in Sicily by the fourth century, and his own travels may have contributed to his fame on the island (see Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 32 = Athen. 250b).

We have no other evidence for Phrynichus' presence in Sicily, but we know little about Phrynichus' career in any case. He might just be the earliest Athenian tragic poet to have travelled abroad. He is also one of the earliest of the tragedians, a pupil, the *Suda* tells us, of Thespis, who was thought to have performed the first tragedies in Athens around 530.<sup>100</sup> Tragic poets appear then to have travelled for almost as long as tragedy existed.

#### 4. Conclusion

Athens was not the only centre of the arts in the early fifth century, though she was steadily assuming the status she would enjoy in later centuries. Syracuse, for a brief period, was as attractive to poets: able to secure the services one of the greatest Athenian dramatists and possessing enough choral talent to put on large public performances of tragedy and lyric. This suggests that, from the beginning, non-Athenians were keen to attract tragic poets to their festivals and that the tragedians, for their part, were willing to travel long distances. Tragedy

---

<sup>99</sup> *arg. Pers.* 5-7.

<sup>100</sup> See Lloyd-Jones (1966) 19; West (1989); Connor (1990) and Scullion (2002b) 81-4 have questioned the traditional dating of the early tragedians. However, even if the dates for Phrynichus are uncertain, he was certainly somewhat older than Aeschylus: see Ar. *Ran.* 910, 1298-1300; Ar. *Vesp.* 219 and 269.

thus developed in the context not only of the nascent Athenian democracy, but also of the broader Greek ‘song culture’, at the heart of which was the circuit of the wandering poet.

#### 4. Athenian wandering poets: The later fifth century

##### 1. Introduction

I have attempted so far to show that tragedy developed in the context of a panhellenic culture of wandering poets who passed between the poetic competitions of different cities across Greece, funded by tyrants or wealthy elites. The earliest tragedians, Phrynicus and Aeschylus, seem to have been no different: producing plays at Syracuse and, in the last years of Aeschylus’ life, at Gela as well. Aeschylus certainly worked in the company of the great lyric poets of his age and competed with them on similar projects (though in different genres). Tragedy did not develop in isolation but as an extension of a long-standing poetic culture that was Greek first and foremost.

Was the culture of wandering as important in the second half of the fifth century? Conceivably the pre-eminence of Athens could have removed the need for poets to travel. That city had a large and well funded programme of festivals to which foreign visitors would flock each year.<sup>101</sup> The diverse nature of the audience at the Dionysia must have contributed to tragedy’s dissemination. Was travelling less important to the generation of poets that followed Aeschylus?

---

<sup>101</sup> See Goldhill (1997) 58; Roselli (2011) 118-57. For the political and financial importance of bringing so many foreigners to Athens see Ar. *Vesp.* 656-60; Xen. *Vect.* 3.4 and [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.16-17.

The presence of a wide and diverse audience at Athens is frequently alluded to in ancient sources. The poet Agathon appears in front of ‘thirty thousand Greeks’.<sup>102</sup> Aeschines is opposed to the unconstitutional presentation of Demosthenes’ crown in the theatre, because, unlike in the Assembly, it will be in the full view of foreign visitors, adding significantly to Demosthenes’ dubious prestige.<sup>103</sup> Similarly Demosthenes is outraged at being beaten by Meidias in the theatre in front of so many people, both strangers and citizens.<sup>104</sup> Cleon supposedly attacked Aristophanes for slandering the city in front of foreigners.<sup>105</sup>

These visitors were in some cases ambassadors who could be granted front row seats.<sup>106</sup> The allies sent delegations to accompany their offerings of tribute. Aristophanes, looking forward to the next Dionysia, includes them in the audience in the parabasis of the *Acharnians* (643-4). Isocrates refers to the presence of both allies and other Greeks (8.82). However, it is likely that many visitors were present in an unofficial capacity. Plato (*Resp.* 475d) refers to fans of tragedy who travel from city to city to see performances. Theophrastus’ ‘shameless man’ (*Char.* 9.5) makes his foreign guests (*xenoi*) pay for seats at the theatre for him and his family.<sup>107</sup> Perhaps these men are the tourists Plato mentioned.

---

<sup>102</sup> Pl. *Symp.* 175e; see Carter (2011b) 54; Sider (1980) 45-6. The figure of thirty thousand is likely to be an exaggeration. On the presence of non-citizens in the audience at the Dionysia see Roselli (2011) 118-58.

<sup>103</sup> οὐδ’ ἐναντίον τοῦ δήμου ἀλλ’ ἐναντίον τῶν Ἑλλήνων Aeschin. 3.33-4. On the political importance of the award of the crown in the theatre in general see Goldhill (2000) 45 and Wilson (2009a); *contra* Carter (2004) 8 and Rhodes (2011). Most of those so honoured in the theatre were non-Athenians: E.g. Epiclerdes of Cyrene: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 125; Thrasybulus of Calydon: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 102 = M-L 260-1 no.85; see Wilson and Hartwig (2009) 24 and Wilson (2009a) 9-16; Euagoras of Salamis: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 20. 29-30 = R-O 50-4 no.11.

<sup>104</sup> ἐναντίον πολλῶν ξένων καὶ πολιτῶν, 21.74.

<sup>105</sup> Ar. *Ach.* 501-8.

<sup>106</sup> Dem. 18.28.

<sup>107</sup> Following Diggle’s emendation ἀγοράσασσι. See Diggle (2004) 297. Cf. *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 265-6; C-S 290; Roselli (2011) 122.

Individual Athenians could benefit from such an influx of foreigners into their native city. Socrates is the most famous example of the intellectual who never travelled, unlike his contemporaries among the sophists. Xenophon nevertheless noted that he attracted both Athenian and foreign admirers (καὶ ἄστούς καὶ ξένους *Mem.* 1.2.60). In doing so he brought great honour to Athens among the world at large, more indeed than the Spartan Lichas who entertained strangers at the Gymnopaedia in Sparta.<sup>108</sup> In a similar anecdote provided by Aelian (*V.H.* 2.13), Socrates makes himself known to the foreigners at the Dionysia by standing up in the theatre so that all there could see him. Festivals in general and the Dionysia in particular were great opportunities for Athenians to enhance their reputation abroad, even as members of the audience. However, in one important respect Socrates is different from other sophists and poets: he is not interested in money and therefore does not seek it out by travelling.<sup>109</sup> Our poets were generally not so disinterested. Nevertheless we have at least one important case of a tragedian who took full advantage of the international audience of the Dionysia in order to remain permanently at Athens.

## 2. Sophocles the wandering poet

Sophocles is the outstanding example of a tragic poet who never travelled. The *Vita* ascribes this to particularly strong patriotism (φιλαθηναϊότητος 10). Later generations would seize on his *Oedipus at Colonus* as evidence for his loyalty to Athens and desire to appeal to his fellow citizens.<sup>110</sup> Written in his last year, during which Athens continued its increasingly

---

<sup>108</sup> *Mem.* 1.2.61.

<sup>109</sup> Xen. *Symp.* 1.5, 3.6; *Mem.* 1.6.1-5.

<sup>110</sup> Arg. *OC* 1.12-17; Σ Soph. *OC* 92, 457 and 1593 (pp. 1, 11, 28 and 62 de Marco) cf. Σ Soph. *El.* 707. On the special emphasis placed on Sophocles' patriotism in the biographical tradition see Hanink (2010a) 59-60.

desperate defence of a dwindling empire, the play's first stasimon has appeared to some to be appealing to the Athens of Theseus, while glorifying the poet's deme of Colonus.<sup>111</sup>

According to his biographers, Sophocles was especially valued by Athens, more so than his contemporaries. He appears to have been a thoroughly likeable person, a tradition which was based on more than his literary style.<sup>112</sup> His services to Athens are especially mentioned. The success of the *Antigone* allegedly led to his appointment as general.<sup>113</sup> His piety was also to prove beneficial to his city: Heracles revealed to him in a dream the location of a crown stolen from the Acropolis, for which he was rewarded with the gift of one talent.<sup>114</sup> His burial, which had been prevented by the invading Spartans, took place after the intervention of Dionysus himself.<sup>115</sup> According to Ister, Sophocles received hero cult from the Athenians.<sup>116</sup>

Not only was Sophocles likeable and pious but, in the biographical tradition, he was continually popular among the theatre-going public, unlike Aeschylus and Euripides whose fortunes at the Dionysia fluctuated. His victory over Aeschylus was supposed to have so

---

<sup>111</sup> ἡ διατριβὴ τοῦ χοροῦ πρὸς τὸ ἐγκώμιον τῆς χώρας, Σ Soph. OC 668 (p.35 de Marco); cf. Σ OC 712 (pp.39-40 de Marco). On the relationship between the *Oedipus at Colonus* and fifth century Athens see Nilsson (1951) 85; Knox (1964) 143-62; Blundell (1993); Mills (1997) 160-85; Walker (1995) 171-89; Suksi (2001) 656-7. Zeitlin (1986) 116; 140-1 = (1991) 144; 166-7 sees Thebes in the *Oedipus at Colonus* as an 'anti-Athens', an example of everything Athens is not. Finglass (2012a) argues against treating the play as a commentary on the decline of the Athenian empire.

<sup>112</sup> See Lefkowitz (1981) 80. To her references, however, we should add Ion of Chios's *Epidemiae* (fr. 104 Leurini = *FGrHist.* 392 F 7), almost certainly written in Sophocles' lifetime, which corroborates the biographical tradition. For other fifth century sources see Ar. *Ran.* 786-94 and Phrynichus *comicus* fr. 32 K-A.

<sup>113</sup> *Antigone*: arg. *Ant.*; generalship: *Vit. Soph.* 9; cf. T 19-25 *TrGF*.

<sup>114</sup> *Vit. Soph.* 12.

<sup>115</sup> *Vit. Soph.* 15; cf. T 92-4 *TrGF*.

<sup>116</sup> *Vit. Soph.* 15 = Ister *FGrHist.* 334 F 38. On the improbable tradition of the hero cult of Sophocles see Connolly (1998). On poets and hero cult see Clay (2004).

angered that poet that he left Athens for Sicily.<sup>117</sup> Euripides, according to Plutarch, was at least as patriotic an Athenian: he had praised his native land in his *Erechtheus*.<sup>118</sup> However, as Plutarch notes, Euripides' love of Athens was not strong enough to prevent him from going abroad. He was, according to the *Vita*, dearest not to the Athenians, with whom his relationship was ambivalent at best, but to strangers (ξеноφιλότατος).<sup>119</sup> We might be tempted to think of Sophocles instead as the ideal 'Athenocentric' poet (φιλαθηναϊότατος).

However, Sophocles certainly alluded to non-Athenian settings (in particular those of the Greek West) in a number of his plays, such as *Triptolemus*, leading Zacharia to argue that the context of their performance at Athens was at least 'more imperial than domestic'.<sup>120</sup> In addition, though Sophocles never travelled, he was still very much a professional poet with the same aims and objectives as Pindar and Aeschylus. Hanink notes that the narrative of Sophocles' life in the *Vita* is 'crafted according to the same template that shapes the patronage narratives found in the biographies of his two counterparts [sc. Aeschylus and Euripides]'.<sup>121</sup> As an example of Sophocles' patriotic sentiment, the *Vita* informs us that although he received numerous invitations to visit the courts of foreign rulers, he turned them all down.<sup>122</sup> The biographers were surprised at this reluctance to leave Athens, indicating that they saw travel as a natural part of a poet's life. Sophocles' refusal is thus taken as evidence for an unusually fervent devotion to his homeland. However, was Sophocles simply fortunate enough to not need to travel? It is a reminder that professional poets in ancient Greece

---

<sup>117</sup> Plut. *Cim.* 8; *Vit. Aesch.* 8.

<sup>118</sup> Plut. *de exil.* 604d-e; cf. Lycurg. *In Leocr.* 100; Eur. fr. 360; Collard, Cropp and Lee (2009) 178. Athens is favourably presented in other plays, such as the *Medea* (824-65), *Hippolytus* (1093-5); *Suppliants* (426-62); *Heracles* (1322-35); *Troades* (208-9); and *Ion* (8-9).

<sup>119</sup> *Vit. Eur.* III 4. See Hanink (2010a) 57; cf. (2008) 115-6.

<sup>120</sup> Zacharia (2003) 73-4.

<sup>121</sup> Hanink (2010a) 58.

<sup>122</sup> *Vit. Soph.* 10: οὕτω δὲ φιλαθηναϊότατος ἦν ὥστε πολλῶν βασιλέων μεταπεμπομένων αὐτὸν οὐκ ἠθέλησε τὴν πατρίδα καταλιπεῖν.

travelled for practical reasons in search of employment. Sophocles may have simply felt that he could gain enough by staying in Athens. At any rate, he was certainly not compelled to leave Athens in search of work. In this regard he resembles the poet described in Plato's *Laches* (183a-b) who travels straight to Athens as the best place to develop a career in poetry.

Although he did not venture further afield, Sophocles was active on the Attic deme circuit and did not restrict himself to the more prestigious city festivals. There is evidence that he produced plays in the deme theatres at Eleusis and Aexion.<sup>123</sup> These festivals were by no means as prestigious as the Dionysia, but they could still tempt big names such as Sophocles and Euripides away from the city. Why? Aeschines, touring with Sophocles' plays several generations later, saw these festivals as a financial opportunity for his struggling troupe.<sup>124</sup> Sophocles' visit to Eleusis may well have been motivated by the same desire to make money, even if his needs were less acute than those of Aeschines. Sophocles' contemporaries certainly did not see him as anything hugely different from Simonides, the ultimate professional travelling poet. In Aristophanes' *Peace* (697-9), Sophocles, like a second Simonides in his old age, is said to be ready to put to sea in a sieve for financial gain. Furthermore, the story of Sophocles' vision and the subsequent reward of a talent is another sign that he was seen as a professional poet/prophet, who gained material rewards because of his close relationship with the divine.

To some extent Sophocles was also seen as a wanderer even though he never travelled far, simply by virtue of the fact that he was a poet. Hermesianax includes Sophocles alongside Euripides in his catalogue of poets who leave their homelands driven by love.<sup>125</sup> His description of Sophocles as the 'Attic bee' ('Ατθὶς δ' οἶα μέλισσα 57) who leaves

---

<sup>123</sup> Eleusis: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 970; Aexion: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3091.8. See *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 47-8, 54-7; C-S 129; Csapo (2010a) 90-1

<sup>124</sup> Dem. 18. 180; cf. 19.247; *Vit. Aeschin.* 7 = Demochares *FGrHist* 75 F 6a.

<sup>125</sup> Fr. 7. 57-60 Powell. See Caspers (2006) 29-35.

Colonus to sing in tragic choruses may recall Sophocles' appearances on the Attic deme circuit. Ister even argued that Sophocles was not Athenian but from Phlius in the northern Peloponnese.<sup>126</sup> This story may have arisen from the claim that he had a Sicyonian mistress.<sup>127</sup> Sophocles may well have had contacts in the area. This city had raised at least two tragic poets in the fifth century, Pratinas and Aristias. Alternatively Ister may be relying on Peloponnesian sources who attempted to claim tragedy as their own. However, there may be something more at work here. The tradition of Sophocles' foreign birth may derive from the basic assumption held by ancient authors that poetry and travel go together. If a poet remains in one place, he must have come there originally from outside.

A comparison with the biographical tradition of Aristophanes may be helpful here. Aristophanes never mentions travels abroad, but he does, nevertheless, aim to address a wider audience beyond the Athens, and was credited, as a result, with non-Athenian origins. The chorus of the *Acharnians* claims that the fame of the poet who abuses his countrymen has spread abroad to other cities (641-2). They add that the king of Persia is one of Aristophanes' admirers.<sup>128</sup> Aristophanes in the *Acharnians* sees himself as a potential benefactor of Athens and other cities: indeed he supposedly received a crown for the wisdom of the parabasis in *Frogs*.<sup>129</sup> Both Sophocles and Aristophanes fit into the idea of the wandering poet who travels between cities, benefiting these communities in return for honour and money (in the case of Aristophanes and Sophocles, the golden crown and talent respectively). This is the type of poet envisaged by Euripides in *Frogs*, when he claims that the purpose of a poet is to

---

<sup>126</sup> *Vit. Soph.* 3 = *FGrHist* 334 F 34.

<sup>127</sup> *Vit. Soph.* 13.

<sup>128</sup> *Ar. Ach.* 647-51; *Vit. Ar.* (Holwerda pp.135; 138); see Lefkowitz (1981) 111-12.

<sup>129</sup> *Vit. Ar.* (Holwerda pp.135; 138); *Ar. Ran.* 718-37.



make men better in the cities.<sup>130</sup> In order for these poets to fit the tradition of the wandering poet, fictitious birthplaces were invented at some stage from which they supposedly travelled to Athens. Aristophanes allegedly came from either Aegina, Egypt or Rhodes.<sup>131</sup> Egypt was particularly suitable as a centre of exotic and arcane knowledge, to which the sages of Greece, such as Solon, were wont to travel.<sup>132</sup>

Sophocles is, therefore, an example of a wandering poet who never travelled. Despite this, he was not radically different from any of his contemporaries in his needs and aspirations. Nor was he interested in addressing his poetry to Athenians alone. Because of the large numbers of non-Athenians at the Dionysia Sophocles would have felt able to reach out to much of the wider Greek world from within the confines of Attica. Finally, because Sophocles was seen as fitting the type of the wandering poet by later generations, a false account of his foreign birth in Phlius grew up. The message is clear: all poets travel and if they do not, they must have been travelling before they arrived.

### **3. Euripides**

#### **a) Introduction**

Sophocles demonstrated that it was possible for a professional poet to remain largely in Athens throughout his career. Nevertheless, travel was to remain an important part of a poet's

---

<sup>130</sup> Ar. *Ran.* 1009-10 ὅτι βελτίους τε ποιούμεν / τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν; see Dover (1993) 15-17. Cf. Xen. *Symp.* 3.5; Pl. *Ion* 538a-542b, *Gorg.* 501e; Arist. *Pol.* 1338a; Plut. *Lyc.* 4.4. The claim to the ability make men better is common among other professionals, especially sophists: see Pl. *Prot.* 318a 5-8; *Hipp. Min.* 368b; *Ti.* 19d.

<sup>131</sup> See Heath (1990) 152, who argues that accounts of the origins of Aristophanes are derived from the invective of his rivals.

<sup>132</sup> Solon: Solon fr. 28 West; Hdt. 1.30.1-2; Pl. *Ti.* 21e; Plut. *Sol.* 26; Homer was allegedly from Egypt and Rhodes: *Vit. Hom.* 4. 23-5; *Suda* ο 251.15-17.

work, both for Sophocles' contemporaries and for subsequent generations. It is a sign of how important wandering was to the identity of the poet that so many did travel, even though, in theory, it was possible not to. Euripides is, like Aeschylus, an example of a wandering professional poet. He was capable of praising Athens in his *Erechtheus*, but did not restrict himself to his own city. Instead he was available for different patrons and audiences.

We will examine the evidence for the travels of Euripides. How many plays were probably produced outside Athens during his lifetime and where? Did Euripides ever travel to Macedonia, as was believed in antiquity, and if so, how often and when? We will also look at other possible venues for the performance of his plays. These include Epirus, Thessaly and Italy. In addition, can we see a pattern of continuity between the travels of Aeschylus at the start of the fifth century and those of Euripides at its close?

## **b) Euripides in Macedonia: Problems**

Euripides' travels in Macedonia and his relationship with King Archelaus of Macedon form a major part of the *Vita* tradition. The special honour he was held in by this monarch in the last few years of his life is contrasted with his generally unfavourable reception in Athens.<sup>133</sup> As with Aeschylus, the *Vita* explains Euripides' departure as a voluntary exile from which he would not return. Like Aeschylus, he died and was buried in a foreign land, a lasting reproach to the Athenians for offending so great a poet.<sup>134</sup> Until relatively recently, modern scholars

---

<sup>133</sup> This tradition, which is found in all our sources, seems to be descended from Satyrus, like much of the biographical tradition: προσοχθίσας τῷ ἐπιχωρίῳ φθόνῳ τῶν πολιτῶν, Satyrus F 6 (p.106 Schorn) = *P.Oxy.* 1176 fr. 39 col. 15. This antipathy conveniently serves as the reason for his departure, as does Archelaus' fulsome welcome: κατεγήρασε ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ μάλ' ἐντίμως ἀγόμενος παρὰ τῷ δυνάστη τά τε λοιπά (fr. 39, col. 18 = Schorn F 6, p. 108). See Lefkowitz (1981) 96; Compton (2006) 138-9; Hanink (2010a) 49-51.

<sup>134</sup> *Vit. Eur.* Ia. 10; Satyrus F 6 (p. 109 Schorn) = *POxy.* 1176 fr. 39, col. 19. 1; Plut. *Lyc.* 31.3.

accepted the testimony of the biographical tradition almost without reservation. Dodds saw in Euripides' retirement to Macedonia evidence that he was 'a disappointed man'.

If the prize lists were any test, he had been relatively unsuccessful as a dramatist; he had become the butt of the comic poets; and in an Athens crazed by twenty years of increasingly disastrous war his outspoken criticisms of demagogy and of power politics must have made him many enemies.<sup>135</sup>

During his stay Euripides is said to have written the *Archelaus*, dramatising the exploits of a founder of the Macedonian kingdom. On this play the *Vita* relates:

ἐκεῖθεν δὲ εἰς Μακεδονίαν παρὰ Ἀρχέλαον γενόμενος διέτριψε καὶ  
χαριζόμενος αὐτῷ δρᾶμα ὁμωνύμως ἔγραψε.

(*Vit. Eur.* 1a. 6)

The language here recalls that of the Aeschylean *Vita*. The phrase 'pleasing him' (χαριζόμενος αὐτῷ) suggests that the relationship between the two men was characterised by an exchange of *charis*, similar to that between a guest and host.<sup>136</sup> At first sight we appear to have a similar relationship between poet and patron as that between Hieron and Aeschylus, resulting in the production of a play, which in some way praised the poet's host.

However, the *Lives* of the poets have in recent years been treated with increased scrutiny and scepticism, and a number of doubts have been raised concerning Euripides' visit to Macedonia. The biographical tradition of Euripides has been discredited as an historical source, perhaps more so than in the case of the other tragedians.<sup>137</sup> The fantastical stories told

---

<sup>135</sup> Dodds (1960a) xxxix. Cf. Segal (1982) 55-6 who claims that the later plays show evidence of an increasing pessimism with the 'male-centred polis'.

<sup>136</sup> E.g. *Pyth.* 1. 75-80. See Kurke (1991) 103-7; MacLachlan (1993) 73-86; Hanink (2010a) 59-61.

<sup>137</sup> See Fairweather (1974); Lefkowitz (1978) = (1991) 111-26, (1979), (1981) 71-3, 88-103; Scullion (2003). *Contra*: Kivilo (2011) 1-6. For the testimonia see *TrGF* V/1 pp. 45-56. The *Life of Aeschylus* has suffered

concerning the travels and death of Euripides in Macedon – torn apart by dogs in the manner of Pentheus or Actaeon – do not inspire confidence. Though Euripides was undoubtedly less successful in terms of numbers of victories, the ‘exile’ of Euripides, the romantic unappreciated genius, has been shown to be a *topos* of ancient biography and is unlikely to reflect the historical reality.<sup>138</sup> The stories of Euripides’ unpopularity and his attempted lynching by the women of Athens, given as a cause for his departure from Athens, were almost certainly derived from comedy. Satyrus even blames the comic poets for driving him from Athens.<sup>139</sup> However, the frequent jokes made at Euripides’ expense in comedy paradoxically suggest that he was well-known enough and popular enough to merit such interest. The myth of the ‘exile’ may also be part of a common *pharmakos* tradition, in which the poet is treated as his home-city’s scapegoat, driven out (often unjustly) to prevent some calamity from befalling the community.<sup>140</sup>

There is little evidence to support the notion that Euripides was driven out of Athens by an unappreciative Athenian public. However, although Stevens demonstrated that the ‘exile’ was largely a fiction, both he and other scholars continued to treat Euripides’ visit to Macedonia as historical fact.<sup>141</sup> In addition to the account of the *Vita*, the fragments of the *Archelaus* and the praise of Macedonia in the *Bacchae* (409-11, 568-75) seemed to confirm that Euripides had certainly travelled to Macedonia, even if he was not driven out of Athens first.<sup>142</sup> This stay was dated from after the production of the *Orestes* at the Dionysia in the

---

slightly less. See Scullion (2003) 393, who is sceptical of the *Vita*’s account of the death of Euripides, accepts as a fact that Aeschylus died in Sicily.

<sup>138</sup> Stevens (1956); Lefkowitz (1979) 209; (1981) 91-2, 96-7; Scullion (2003) 389-90.

<sup>139</sup> Satyrus F6 (Schorn p. 107) = *P. Oxy.* 1176, fr. 39, col. 16.

<sup>140</sup> See Compton (2006) 3-18, 135-41. On *pharmakoi* see Parker (1983) 258-71 and Burkert (1985) 82-4.

<sup>141</sup> Stevens (1956).

<sup>142</sup> See Webster (1967) 252-7; on the *Bacchae* see Dodds (1960 a) xxxix-xl.

spring of 408 to his death in 406, during which time the *Archelaus*, according to the received opinion, was performed.<sup>143</sup>

Scullion, however, has called the visit into question.<sup>144</sup> Like Lefkowitz, he dismisses the *Lives* as historical sources and treats the anecdotes concerning Euripides' stay with Archelaus and death in Macedonia as romantic fictions.<sup>145</sup> However, he goes further, pointing out that Aristophanes, in the *Frogs*, fails to mention a Macedonian sojourn or note that Euripides' recent death occurred outside Athens. To Scullion it appears 'incredible' that Aristophanes should have passed up such a comic opportunity: 'nowhere [is there] a word of reproach nor a touch of pathos about Euripides' death so far from Athens'.<sup>146</sup>

Scullion does not rule out a Macedonian connection. He accepts that the *Archelaus*, and possibly a number of other plays such as the *Temenus* and *Temenidae*, were probably written for a Macedonian audience.<sup>147</sup> His contention is that either Euripides sent plays north to Archelaus, quite possibly from before 408, without ever going there himself, or that, if he did go to Macedonia, it was only a fleeting visit and that he was back in Athens by the time of his death. The *Archelaus* was also, he argues, re-performed at Athens, assuming that the first lines of the prologue were quoted by Aristophanes in the *Frogs*.<sup>148</sup> Collard, Cropp and Gibert have followed Scullion to some extent in their commentary by suggesting that the

---

<sup>143</sup> See Zielinski (1922) 325-6; Webster (1967) 238; Harder (1985) 125; Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 337.

<sup>144</sup> Scullion (2003).

<sup>145</sup> Lefkowitz (1981) 103-4 who suggests that the Macedonian localisation in the *Bacchae* 409 and 565 may have given rise to the idea of the Macedonian exile. However, as Scullion notes, 'this argument is founded on general scepticism rather than detailed argument'. Furthermore, Lefkowitz's argument relied in part on the belief that the information on the posthumous performance the *Bacchae* given by the scholion on the *Frogs* (Σ *Ran.* 67 Holwerda p.14) derived from the biographical tradition, whereas in fact its source was probably the more reliable *Didascaliae*. See Harder (1985) 125 and Scullion (2003) 389 n. 2.

<sup>146</sup> Scullion (2003) 393.

<sup>147</sup> Scullion (2003) 394; (2006) 196-7.

<sup>148</sup> *Ar. Ran.* 1206-8 = Eur. fr. 846.

*Archelaus* could have been written for an Athenian audience, given the positive feelings towards the Macedonian king following his offer to supply Athens with timber for ship-building.<sup>149</sup> Harder has even suggested that the character of Archelaus may have been derived from an earlier mythic tradition, and need not automatically imply a flattering compliment to king Archelaus.<sup>150</sup>

I will argue in the next section that Euripides almost certainly did visit Macedonia in person, dying there in 406. There are good reasons for thinking that the *Archelaus* was written for performance in Macedonia and that Euripides was a guest of king Archelaus. Euripides' play was almost certainly put on as part of a programme of self-aggrandisement and Hellenisation undertaken by the historical king. This conclusion supports the account of Euripides' journey to Macedonia found in the biographical tradition and other ancient sources.

While there is no reason to doubt Euripides' presence in Macedonia, Scullion raises legitimate questions regarding the date of the *Archelaus*. I will argue that the play was most probably performed in Macedonia before 408, the date accepted by most scholars. This suggests that Euripides visited Macedonia twice: the first occasion was probably in 411 and the second in 408. I propose that the *Archelaus* was performed with the *Temenus* on the occasion of Euripides' first journey to Macedonia, the *Temenidae* on the second. Furthermore, I will demonstrate that Archelaus acted as the patron of a number of other poets and artists, and the arrival of Euripides in Macedonia needs to be seen in the context of Archelaus' attempt to turn Macedonia into a centre for poetry, as Hieron had done in Syracuse.

---

<sup>149</sup> Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 337; however see p.351, in which they reject the suggestion, endorsed by Scullion, that fr. 846 constituted the original opening of the play and provides evidence for an Athenian production before 405 BC. Archelaus and Athens: see *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 117 = M-L 277-80 no. 91.

<sup>150</sup> Harder (1991) 130.

c) **Euripides in Macedonia: the *Archelaus***

The first major piece of evidence is the name of the play: the *Archelaus*. In antiquity it was supposed that Euripides chose this name in order to praise his royal patron. It is rarely acknowledged that, in doing so, Euripides departed from the canonical genealogy of the Macedonian kings. Let us, firstly, consider the name of Archelaus and its place within the Macedonian foundation myth. The surviving prologue, delivered by the legendary Archelaus, gives his ancestors going back to the Danaids. An alternative prologue (fr. 846), beginning with Aegyptus, is cited by Aristophanes (*Ran.* 1204-6): a problem that we will consider later. The Danaids, Archelaus relates, were distant ancestors of the Argive Heracles, whose grandson Temenus was the father of our hero.<sup>151</sup> Temenus was one of the Heraclidae who, along with his brothers Cresphontes and Aristodemus, returned to the Peloponnese to reassert their ancestral rights over this land and expelled Tisamenus, the son of Orestes, from Argos.<sup>152</sup> Following the victory they divided the Peloponnese between them by casting lots.<sup>153</sup>

Throughout the Classical period, the Macedonians had to justify their status as Greeks, appealing to the descent of their kings from Heracles and, through Heracles, from Hellen, the eponymous ancestor of the Hellenic race.<sup>154</sup> The Macedonian rulers had established themselves as Heraclids from the time of Alexander I (498-452), who had been compelled to prove his Argive descent in order to enter the games at Olympia as a Greek.<sup>155</sup> By the end of the fifth century the status of the Macedonians as descendents of Temenus was

---

<sup>151</sup> This genealogy is given in Eur. fr. 228b. See Harder (1985) 148-56; Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 351-3.

<sup>152</sup> Pl. *Leg.* 683c-d; Isoc. 6. 16-21; Paus. 2.18.6-7; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.8.2-5

<sup>153</sup> See Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 115; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.8.2-5; Paus. 2.18.6-8; 4.3.3-5.

<sup>154</sup> See Hall (2001). Hellen: [Hes.] fr. 2 and 3 M-W.

<sup>155</sup> Hdt. 5.21-22; see Hammond and Griffith (1979) 3-13; Borza (1982) 7-13.

taken by Thucydides as established fact (2.99.3; 5.80.2). Others, however, were still ready to call the Macedonians barbarians when it suited their purposes. Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, in a polemic against Macedonia, claimed that the barbarian Archelaus had enslaved the Greeks of Larissa.<sup>156</sup> Demosthenes would use the same rhetoric against Philip half a century later. Every Macedonian king would be dogged by the same prejudice, and it seems that Archelaus was no exception. Like his grandfather Alexander, he intended to reiterate the Macedonian claim to Argive descent; and Euripides would help him.

Let us look in detail at the Macedonian foundation myth upon which Euripides drew. Herodotus (8.139) gives the names of seven kings including Alexander and, like Euripides, asserts that these were of the line of Temenus. However, here it is not Archelaus but Perdiccas who is the descendent of Temenus and the first Macedonian king.<sup>157</sup> Euripides also appears to have made almost no impact on the official royal genealogies adopted by Alexander the Great and his successors, who continued to trace their descent from Temenus and Perdiccas.<sup>158</sup> Nowhere is there any mention of the legendary Archelaus.

Diodorus (relying in part on the fourth century historian Theopompus) introduces an entirely new Macedonian founder: a certain Caranus whom he makes the great-grandfather of

---

<sup>156</sup> Ἀρχελάῳ δουλεύουσιν Ἕλληνες ὄντες βαρβάρῳ, D-K 85 F 2.

<sup>157</sup> Hdt 8. 139: γενέτωρ Περδίκκης ἐστὶ ὁ κτησάμενος τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν τυραννίδα; cf. 5.22.1

Ἕλληνας δὲ εἶναι τούτους τοὺς ἀπὸ Περδίκκew γεγότας.

<sup>158</sup> DS 7.16; ‘Satyrus’ F 28.1.20-1 (p.129 Schorn) = *P.Oxy* 2465. Fr. 1, col. 2. 20-1; ‘Satyrus’ F29.9 (p.136 Schorn) = *FGrHist* 631 F 1; see West (1974) 284-5, Hammond and Griffith (1979) 13, Bosworth (1996) 155. *SEG* XXXVIII 1476, 40-2: an inscription from Xanthos dated to 206/5 BC reiterates the Ptolemy’s claim to Heraclid descent. On the Seleucid claim to descend from the Temenids see Libanius *Or.* 11.91. The only exceptions I am aware of are Hyg. *Fab.* 219 – which may well be entirely derived from Euripides’ play – and Dio Chryst. 4. 70-2, which is also probably influenced by Euripides. See Harder (1985) 170 and 175-6. The only other possibilities are a son of Temenus named Agelaus (Apollodorus 2.8.5) or Agraius (Nicolaus *FGrHist* 90 F 30; Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 18b-c; Paus. 2.28.3) but he is never connected with Macedonia. Rusten (1980) 42 suggests that the name Agelaus in the text of Apollodorus may have come about the confusion of the names Agraius and Archelaus.



Perdiccas and the distant ancestor of Temenus.<sup>159</sup> This later addition, described by Eusebius as one ‘who first held the rule of the Macedonians united into one kingdom’, supplants Perdiccas as the founder, yet retains him as the first king who expanded the Macedonian realm, much as Aeneas and Romulus were both treated as the founders of Rome.<sup>160</sup> Another branch of the myth names the son of Temenus as Ceisus, from whom Perdiccas was descended according to the author of a treatise on the demes of Alexandria.<sup>161</sup> Elsewhere, however, Ceisus seems to be unconnected with Macedonia and appears only in the context of the history of the Peloponnese.<sup>162</sup> Finally, the eponymous hero Macedon appears in the literary record as early as Hesiod, but seems to be unconnected to any of these foundation myths.<sup>163</sup> And in all of this there is still no sign of an Archelaus.

Nevertheless, the action of the play appears to have followed the Macedonian foundation myth.<sup>164</sup> We know that the Archelaus of the play was the son of Temenus much like Perdiccas/Caranus. Perdiccas, exiled from Argos, is a servant of a local king in the tale told by Herodotus (8.137). In a fragment of the play (fr. 229) a Cisseus is named as the king, agreeing with the account given by Hyginus (*Fab.* 219), which was in all likelihood entirely derived from Euripides.<sup>165</sup> In addition, the fragments indicate that the value of hereditary

---

<sup>159</sup> DS 7.17; cf. Satyrus F 28 and F 29 (pp. 129-38 Schorn). Theopompus: *FGrHist* 115 F 393, see Jacoby’s commentary pp. 400-2; Schorn pp. 447, 451. Greenwalt (1985) dates this change to early fourth century during the reigns of either Amyntas II or Amyntas III.

<sup>160</sup> *qui primus in unum conflatum tenuit Makedoniorum potestatem*, DS 7.15.3 = Eusebius *Chron.* I p.227.

<sup>161</sup> ‘Satyrus’ F 28.1.15 and 29.7 (pp.129 and 136 Schorn).

<sup>162</sup> Paus. 2.19.1, 28.3-7.

<sup>163</sup> [Hes.] fr. 7 M-W.

<sup>164</sup> On the reconstruction of the action of the play see Harder (1985) 131-9; di Gregorio (1988); Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 330-3; Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 111-22.

<sup>165</sup> Harder (1985) 170; Di Gregorio (1988) 37-8 and Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 110 treat Hyginus’ account as essentially a retelling of the *Archelaus*’ plot. Huys (1997) 11-30 has urged caution on the use of Hyginus for the reconstruction of Euripides’ plays, including the *Archelaus* (‘num recte’ in the opinion of Kannicht *TrGF* V/1 p. 314). However, in this case it is likely that Euripides was Hyginus’ only source as he shows no awareness of the

excellence even in poverty was a major theme of the play.<sup>166</sup> This fits with the Perdiccas legend of a hero forced to servile employment (and indeed is worthy of his great ancestor Heracles).

In the Caranus legend, the hero is not merely a hired labourer but is summoned as a mercenary to aid the king against his enemies with the promise of part of his kingdom. In Euripides the king needs help from the descendent of Heracles:

(Archelaus?) ἡμῶν τί δῆτα τυγχάνεις χρείαν ἔχων;

(Cisseus?) πατέρων γὰρ ἐσθλῶν ἐλπίδας δίδως γεγώς.

(fr. 231)

Eusebius, whose source is Diodorus, tells the Caranus story as follows:

*Eodem tempore Orestarum regi bellum erat cum vicinis suis, qui vocantur Eordaei, rogavit Karanum, ut ipsi auxilio esset: suaeque regionis mediam partem ei se daturum pollicitus est Orestarum rebus compositis; et rege fidem exsolvente Karanus regionem obtinuit.*

(*Chron.* I p. 227 Schöne = DS 7.15.1)

Hyginus gives his account of the Archelaus story in similar wording:

*Archelaus Temeni filius exsul a fratribus eiectus in Thraciam ad regem Cisseum venit, qui cum a finitimis oppugnaretur Archelao regnum et filiam in coniugium dare pollicetur si se ab hoste tutatus esset Archelaus, quia ab Hercule esset oriundus...*

(*Fab.* 219)

---

alternative myths surrounding the Temenidae and most importantly uses the name Archelaus which is found in no other source. In addition, unlike many other entries, *Fab.* 219 covers only one event (Cisseus' death and its causes), which could easily take place within the action of one play.

<sup>166</sup> E.g. fr. 232.

The basic elements of story are the same: the neighbouring enemies (*vicinis / finitimis*) and the promise (*regionis mediam partem / regnum et filiam*). The major differences are that in the Caranus version the king honours his pledge whereas with Hyginus / Euripides the king attempts to murder the successful Archelaus. The plot is revealed to Archelaus and the deceitful king is himself killed. Archelaus' subsequent flight out of Thrace and into Macedonia brings about the foundation of the dynasty.

On this flight Hyginus writes: *inde profugit ex responso Apollinis in Macedoniam capra duce, oppidumque ex nomine caprae Aegaeas constituit*. This looks distinctly like a *deus ex machina* prophecy of the sort that Euripides was particularly fond.<sup>167</sup> The myth derives from a popular etymology of Aegae, the old Macedonian capital. The name Caranus may itself come from another word for goat.<sup>168</sup> In Diodorus' version (7.16), Perdiccas, as the descendent of Caranus, when seeking to expand his kingdom, is given a prophecy to found a new city where he saw goats. Herodotus may have been influenced by this story when he claimed that Perdiccas, as the king's thrall, looked after the smaller livestock while his brothers tended the cows and horses.<sup>169</sup> It is probable that the end of the play alluded explicitly to the foundation of Aegae, in line with the Macedonian royal myth.

Euripides borrowed directly from a series of interlinking traditions propagated by the Macedonian royal house from at least the start of the fifth century. The first to publicise these myths was Alexander I: keen to justify himself as 'a Greek man, the leader of the Macedonians' (ἀνὴρ Ἕλλην, Μακεδόνων ὑπάρχος, Hdt. 5.20.4). Alexander was the first Macedonian king to mint coins and among his designs was a goat.<sup>170</sup> Possibly in emulation of

---

<sup>167</sup> See Harder (1985) 174; Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 121.

<sup>168</sup> Hesych. κ 768; see Hammond and Griffith (1979) 12. Schorn p. 451 understands Caranus to be a term for ruler following Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.3.

<sup>169</sup> Hdt. 8.137; Harder (1985) 135.

<sup>170</sup> Hammond and Griffith (1979) 99-100, 138.

his ancestor, whose fame he was so keen to propagate, he named his son Perdiccas. When Perdiccas' son Archelaus came to the throne he continued the Hellenising agenda of his grandfather with both the Heracles and the goat motif reappearing on the coinage. It seems far too convenient that during the reign of Perdiccas, the Macedonian founder should be Perdiccas and that during the reign of Archelaus that same founder should be called Archelaus. Rather the sudden change in the name of the Macedonian founder was part of that ruler's own propaganda strategy designed to associate himself more closely with his Greek Heraclid ancestor.

Archelaus, however, had a further motive to legitimise his claim to the throne he had usurped in 413. He was the bastard son of Perdiccas and to reach the throne he had had to kill his half-brother, uncle and cousin. Polus in Plato's *Gorgias* mentions Archelaus as an example of someone who is able to commit injustice with impunity.<sup>171</sup> As Plato knew, however, Polus was ultimately mistaken: Archelaus was himself murdered in 399.<sup>172</sup> Euripides' play was probably intended to ease tensions following Archelaus' seizure of power. Archelaus, in all likelihood, also had a passion for tragedy. This is suggested by an anecdote preserved by the fourth century AD grammarian Diomedes:

*Ideoque Euripides petente Archelao rege ut de se tragoediam scriberet abnuit ac precatus est ne accideret Archelao aliquid trageodiae proprium.*

(*Art. Gramm.* 3).

Archelaus wanted a tragedy about himself. Euripides obliged as best he could by using a Macedonian myth and changing the name of the protagonist to that of his patron. Even if the anecdote is spurious, this is in effect what Euripides did.

---

<sup>171</sup> Pl. *Gorg.* 470 d-471d.

<sup>172</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 1311b8-20; [Pl.] *Alc.* II 141d5-e3.

**d) The court of Archelaus and the tradition of the wandering poet**

The *Archelaus* was certainly a royal commission. Euripides could not have written such a play otherwise, as the hero 'Archelaus' does not appear anywhere else in the foundation myth or any source written previous to or after Archelaus' reign. It should be seen in the context of Archelaus' plan to continue the programme of Hellenisation initiated by Alexander I.

However, did Euripides travel to Macedonia to put on this play or did he, as Scullion argues, merely send it north and only later stage a version of it himself in Athens?

'The silence of the *Frogs*' – Scullion's principal objection to the Macedonian visit – is not sufficient on its own to overrule the biographical tradition. If the ghost of Aeschylus had accused Euripides of leaving his homeland, the shade of Euripides might have pointed to Aeschylus' tomb in Gela. As it is, the *Frogs* is as silent on Aeschylus' sojourn in Sicily as on Euripides' Macedonian adventures. The silence may be a sign that, for fifth century Athenians, it was not unusual for a poet to work and live abroad for a short time. Aristophanes attests to the fact that Agathon had left Athens by 405 but barely alludes to his stay at Archelaus' court, if at all.<sup>173</sup> Euripides' final departure may not have been as dramatic as the biographical tradition made it. He probably intended to return to Athens. The silence of Aristophanes is both intriguing and, for our purposes, regrettable, but it does not pose serious difficulties for the traditional view found in our ancient sources.

Furthermore, the *Vita* tradition is not entirely unsupported by earlier sources. Aristotle provides an anecdote concerning Euripides at the court of Archelaus, where his behaviour provoked one Macedonian to assassinate the king.<sup>174</sup> Aristotle may well have heard this anecdote during his stay at Pella from 343. Scullion is quite correct to doubt the historicity of

---

<sup>173</sup> Ar. *Ran.* 83-5; Σ 85a-b (Holwerda p.17); see Dover (1993) 201; Sommerstein (1996) 164.

<sup>174</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 1311b30-4; Dicaearchus (Plut. *de E. ap. Delph.* 384d) was also aware of the Macedonian visit and claimed that the lines of fr. 969 were delivered to Archelaus.

this anecdote: Euripides was long dead by the time of Archelaus' assassination and hardly in a position to affect court politics at Aegae or Pella.<sup>175</sup> However, this story does at least indicate that a tradition surrounding Euripides' visit to Macedonia was well established around half a century after Euripides' death, if not earlier. Plato's claim (*Resp.* 568a-d) that tragic poets, including Euripides, liked to praise tyrants and frequent their courts may reflect this same tradition. Hermesianax (fr. 7.65-8 Powell) similarly testifies to the popularity of stories featuring Euripides and Archelaus by the end of the fourth century. While this evidence is not conclusive, the visit cannot be written off as an invention of later biographers.

Euripides' travels seem far from unusual when set in the context of Archelaus' broader ambition to transform Macedonia into a major poetic centre. Archelaus' Hellenising agenda included the foundation of a poetic festival at Dion which involved theatrical contests.<sup>176</sup> The establishment of this festival placed Macedonia on the circuit as a potential destination for wandering poets. Euripides' *Archelaus* could well have been performed at the new festival at Dion, although a performance at Aegae cannot be ruled out.<sup>177</sup> Archelaus wanted to attract some of the finest performers of the age for his new festival. As was the case for Aeschylus in Sicily, Euripides was not the only foreign poet in Macedonia. Aristophanes, in the *Frogs* (83-5), indicates that the tragedian Agathon had left Athens for an extended stay, if not for good, by 405. At the start of Plato's *Symposium* (172c4-5), Agathon has been abroad for some time. The action of the dialogue is ostensibly narrated before Socrates' death, again indicating that Agathon was away from Athens for several years in the last decade of the fifth century. Where did he go? If Archelaus was intent on founding a

---

<sup>175</sup> Scullion (2003) 396.

<sup>176</sup> σκηνικούς ἄγωνας, D.S. 17.16.4; Arr. 1.11.1; Σ Dem. 19.401.13; see Hammond and Griffith (1979) 150-1; Hatzopoulos (1999) I 289 n.7. A late fourth century inscription from Dion concerns the award of *prohedria* at the Dionysia: see Hatzopoulos (1996) II no. 57 pp. 73-4.

<sup>177</sup> Dion: Harder (1985) 127; Aegae: Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) 41-4.

dramatic festival at Dion, Macedonia would be an attractive destination. Later sources confirm that Agathon did indeed stay in Macedonia.<sup>178</sup>

Archelaus was not content with tragedians alone but seems to have invited poets and philosophers of every sort. Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1398a 24-7) claims that Socrates was invited to Archelaus' court but that he refused. The same could not be said for Euripides or many others. Archelaus' father, Perdiccas, is said to have entertained the lyric poet Melanippides of Melos.<sup>179</sup> The epic poet Choerilus of Samos was also present at the court of Archelaus.<sup>180</sup> The painter Zeuxis of Heraclea was said to have decorated Archelaus' palace.<sup>181</sup> The great poet of the New Music, Timotheus of Miletus, was also thought to have made the journey north.<sup>182</sup> He may have travelled widely, performing in Athens, Sparta and Ephesus, where he allegedly received a commission to write a hymn to Artemis.<sup>183</sup> The visit to Macedonia fits neatly into the tradition of Timotheus as a wandering poet.

It is clear that all of these poets were enticed into travelling to Macedonia with the promise of financial rewards. Plato claims that tragic poets – and Euripides in particular – praise tyrants and in doing so solicit honour and pay.<sup>184</sup> This certainly seems to have been the case in Macedonia. Archelaus is said to have spent four thousand *minae* hiring Zeuxis to

---

<sup>178</sup> Σ Ar. *Ran.* 85a-b (Holwerda p.17); Σ Pl. *Symp.* 172a = Marsyas of Philippi *FGrHist* 135 F 8; Ael. *VH* 2.21.

<sup>179</sup> *Suda* μ 454.

<sup>180</sup> *Athen.* 345d.

<sup>181</sup> Ael. *VH* 14.17.

<sup>182</sup> Plut. *de fort. Alex.* 334b = *Reg. Apophth.* 177b = fr. 801 *PMG*; Steph. Byz. p. 453 Meineke = Anon. *FGE* 1570-1. Neither source is early or completely reliable. Plutarch's anecdote could have been derived from Timotheus' poetry with no other evidence to support it and the epitaph is unlikely to be original. See Hordern (2002) 4-5, who nevertheless does not treat a visit to Macedonia as improbable.

<sup>183</sup> Sparta: Plut. *Inst. Lac.* 238 c. This anecdote is likely to be apocryphal, however, as it is also applied to Terpander (*Inst. Lac.* 238 c) and Phrynis (*Agis* 799 f-800 a; *Apophth. Lac.* 220 c; *Prof. Virt.* 84a); Ephesus: Macrobian *Sat.* 5.22.4. However, Plutarch (*de superst.* 170 a) claims that the same work was performed in Athens.

<sup>184</sup> Pl. *Resp.* 568 c.

decorate his palace (Ael. *VH* 14.17). Plutarch alleges that Timotheus frequently asked for money, an anecdote that seems to be derived from Timotheus' poetry.<sup>185</sup> Aristotle tells us that Socrates, who had never accepted payment for his company, turned down Archelaus' invitation because he did not want the king as his benefactor.<sup>186</sup> Euripides and Agathon seem to have been less scrupulous.

Euripides would be thought of as a professional wanderer by later generations. Given that the concept of the travelling poet was well established in Euripides' day, it is quite probable that he saw himself as a wanderer and adopted the same strategies as earlier poets to avoid the charges of avarice and greed that Simonides and others had been subjected to. The fictitious letters of Euripides suggest that Archelaus was keen to act as his patron Euripides is presented as an honoured guest, who accepts payment in the form of hospitality:

ἔμοιγε μισθὸν οὐκ ἀηδῇ μὲν οὖν οὐδὲ ἄπονον δοκεῖ Ἀρχέλαος ἀναπράσσεσθαι  
τῶν τε δωρεῶν, ὧν ἔδωκέ μοι εὐθύς ἀφικομένῳ, καὶ ὅτι εἰστία με  
λαμπρότερον ἢ ἐμοὶ φίλον ἦν ἐκάστης ἡμέρας.

([Eur.] *Epist.* 5.1).<sup>187</sup>

In many of the anecdotes concerning Euripides in Macedonia, the poet also dines as a guest with Archelaus.<sup>188</sup>

In the letters, the character of Euripides seems embarrassed to receive these presents and seeks to counter any accusation that he is a paid flatterer of the king.<sup>189</sup> According to

<sup>185</sup> Plut. *de fort. Alex.* 334b = *Reg. Apophth.* 177b = fr. 801 *PMG*.

<sup>186</sup> Arist. *Rhet.* 1398a 24-7.

<sup>187</sup> For the text see Gösswein (1975) 68-79 and Kovacs (1994) 128-41. Gösswein (1975) 9-30 dates them to the first or second centuries AD.

<sup>188</sup> *nocte ab eius [sc. Archelaus] cena canibus a quodam aemulo inmissis dilaceratus est*, Gellius *NA* 15.20.9; τοῦ δ' Εὐριπίδου τὸν καλὸν Ἀγάθωνα περιλαμβάνοντος ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ, Plut. *reg. et imp. apoth.* 177a.



Plutarch (*reg. et imp. apoth.* 177a), Archelaus gave Euripides a gold cup even though it was not he but a less deserving courtier who had asked for it. However, these gifts cannot be entirely explained away: it was clear to ancient scholars that Archelaus was not just a host to these poets but also their employer. Ideally, the relationship between guest friends involves an exchange of gifts. However, in practice it is only the poor poet who receives presents from the wealthy king, thus making the poet appear to be the professional he is, or worse a flatterer. Euripides was thought to have acknowledged this himself in two lines written, according to Dicaearchus, for Archelaus:

οὐ βούλομαι πλουτοῦντι δωρεῖσθαι πένης,  
μή μ' ἄφρονα κρίνης ἢ διδοῦς αἰτεῖν δοκῶ.

(Eur. fr. 969 = Plut. *de E. apud Delph.* 384d).<sup>190</sup>

Not only can the poet not afford to give his wealthy patron gifts but it might seem as though Euripides were actually asking for something more substantial in return.

Euripides' status as a professional poet may also help to explain why a man of his age made such a journey. Sophocles was castigated by Aristophanes (*Pax* 698-9) for being willing to travel in his old age simply for the sake of gain. Aeschylus probably made his last visit to Sicily for the same reason. Phrynichus may have done the same. From an early stage poets seem to have felt that their status as professionals was ample protection for them to risk such journeys in time of war. In the fourth century, at a time at which Athens was practically in open war with Macedonia, actors such as Aristodemus and Neoptolemus were able to move freely between Athens and Philip's court. Some were even selected as ambassadors.<sup>191</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> Εὐριπίδης μὲν γὰρ ὅτι Ἀρχελάῳ μέχρι μὲν τοῦ θανάτου παρεσίτει, Lucian *de parasito* 35. On the view of Euripides presented in the *Letters*, see Hanink (2010b) 542-3.

<sup>190</sup> These lines have been plausibly attributed to the *Archelaus*, see Harder (1985) 285-6.

<sup>191</sup> Dem. 5.6; 18.21; 19.315; *arg.* 2. Dem. 5; Aeschin. 2.15-19; Σ Aeschin. 2.19 (p. 60 Dilts).

At the end of the fifth century, travel to Macedonia may have been even easier for Euripides and Agathon. Although Athens' power had declined markedly, she still had a fleet in the Aegean. In addition, Archelaus had allied himself with Athens by 407 and his agreement to supply the flagging empire with war materials would have led the way to increased traffic between Macedonia and Athens.<sup>192</sup> Like his grandfather Alexander before him, Archelaus was granted the title of *proxenos* of the Athenians, indicating a renewed and close relationship between the two powers.<sup>193</sup> And, according to the traditional view, it was about this time that Euripides made the journey north.

Although we must treat the ancient sources available with caution, there is no reason to doubt that Euripides went to Macedonia, or that the *Archelaus* was first performed at the court of the king from whom the play derived its title. The drama was part of a wider cultural programme at the centre of which was the new festival at Dion. King Archelaus clearly aimed to attract poets to compete at his festival. Archelaus was putting Macedonia on the poetic map of festivals and establishing it as a centre that could attract great poets.

#### e)      **The date of the *Archelaus***

We have seen that the *Archelaus* was certainly a Macedonian royal commission, produced in Macedonia as part of Archelaus' wider cultural programme. Euripides, like other poets of his time, almost certainly went to Macedonia in person, probably in order to appear at the new festival at Dion. When exactly did this visit take place? Euripides was thought in antiquity to have died in Macedonia in 406. The earliest account of his death is in Hermesianax (fr. 7. 65-

---

<sup>192</sup> *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 117.25-32; see M-L 277-80; Walbank (1978) 460-9.

<sup>193</sup> Archelaus: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 117.37-8; Alexander: Hdt. 8. 137-43; see Wallace (1970) 200 who argues that the proxenia dates from the 480s when Alexander probably supplied Athens with ship-building materials, just as Archelaus was to do in around 407.

8). The story, in Hermesianax and the biographical tradition, that Euripides was torn apart by dogs does not inspire much confidence. A number of possibly Hellenistic epigrams also mention his end in Macedonia. As Scullion notes, none of these sources is early or particularly reliable.<sup>194</sup> In addition, he argues, traditions concerning the burial of ancient authors are often far from sound. Herodotus for example was allegedly buried in Athens, Thurii and Pella.<sup>195</sup> In this case, ancient scholars seem not to have known of an actual tomb. They will have guessed from what was known of the life of Herodotus and from local traditions. Poets and sages seem to have conferred almost as much honour on the cities in which they died as the ones in which they were born.

However, all ancient authorities agree that Euripides was buried in Macedonia. There is admittedly some disagreement about the exact location. Although a tomb at Arethusa was identified as his grave, the *Suda* and the epigrams ascribed to Ion suggest either Pella or Pieria as alternative locations.<sup>196</sup> The discrepancy, though, is easily explained. Pella and Pieria are essentially synonyms for Macedonia as a whole, the former being its capital, at which Euripides was presumed to have stayed in his last years, the latter the Macedonian home of the Muses, an apt, if not strictly accurate final resting place for a poet. This casual attitude to geography is demonstrated by the second of the epigrams ascribed to Ion, which erroneously situates Pella ‘near’ Pieria in order to conflate the two.<sup>197</sup> Even the notice in the *Suda* that Archelaus brought the bones of Euripides to Pella is vague.<sup>198</sup> On the other hand, it

---

<sup>194</sup> Scullion (2003) 397-8.

<sup>195</sup> *Suda* η 536.

<sup>196</sup> Adaeus *Anth. Pal.* 7.51 = *GP* 11-16; Plut. *Lyc.* 31.3; Vitruv. *de archit.* 8.3.16; Plin. *NH* 31.28; Ammian. Marcell. 27.4.8. For the alternative possibility of a grave at Pella, see *Suda* ε 3695; ‘Ion’ *Anth. Pal.* 7.43.2 = *FGE* 567; 7.44.5-6 = *FGE* 574-5.

<sup>197</sup> See Page *FGE* p.158.

<sup>198</sup> τὰ ὅστ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐν Πέλλῃ μετακομίσαι τὸν βασιλέα, *Suda* ε 3695.10.

is clear that, at least by the Roman period, visitors had seen an actual tomb at Arethusa and this is the only site mentioned by the Macedonian poet Adaeus.

While a tomb was known to have existed in Macedonia, an empty monument to Euripides existed in Attica and was seen by Pausanias.<sup>199</sup> An epigram quoted by the *Vita*, which gives Macedonia as the location of Euripides' actual grave, was possibly inscribed on this cenotaph.<sup>200</sup> It may be of an early date, if the ascription of authorship to either Thucydides or Timotheus is accurate (though, as Scullion points out, this is far from certain). An empty memorial in Athens could easily have been described to tourists like Pausanias as the actual tomb of Euripides. Had the Athenians wished to dispute the Macedonian claim they could certainly have done so. An empty memorial in Athens could easily have transformed into the actual tomb of Euripides for the benefit of later tourists. The location of the burial was a source of pride for the Macedonians and of reproach for the Athenians, who had supposedly not made Euripides sufficiently welcome in his own country.<sup>201</sup> Gellius (*NA* 15.20) even claims that the Athenians despatched an embassy to Macedonia in order to recover the bones, ultimately to no avail. The fact that the Athenians never challenged the Macedonian version of events suggests that the location of Euripides' grave was never in any doubt.

There is thus no reason to doubt that Euripides died in Macedonia. Was this the first time Euripides had been there? The *Vita* implies that Euripides left Athens for the first and only time at the end of his life and never returned, which suggests that the performance of the *Archelaus* was after 408.<sup>202</sup> Scullion, however, argues that the play must have been written

---

<sup>199</sup> μνημα Εὐριπίδου κενόν, Paus. 1.2.2; cf. *Vit. Eur.* Ia 10.

<sup>200</sup> *Vit. Eur.* Ia 10; 'Thucydides or Timotheus' *Anth. Pal.* 7.45 = *FGE* 1052-5.

<sup>201</sup> E.g. Satyrus F6 (p.109 Schorn) = *P.Oxy.* 1176 fr. 39, col. 19.

<sup>202</sup> Webster (1967) 238; Harder (1985) 125; Kannicht ap. *TrGF* p. 314; Jouan and Van Looy (1998) 281; Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 109-10.

earlier than 408 and uses this as evidence against the view that Euripides ever visited Macedonia at all. I will argue that, far from remaining in Athens, Euripides in fact went to Macedonia twice.

Scullion's argument is that the opening lines of the *Archelaus* may have been quoted by Aristophanes in the *Frogs*:

Αἴγυπτος, ὥς ὁ πλεῖστος ἔσπαρται λόγος,  
ξὺν παισὶ πεντήκοντα ναυτίλῳ πλάτῃ  
Ἄργος κατασχών.

(1206-8 = fr. 846 *TrGF*)

A scholion informs us that, according to certain unnamed sources, these lines were from the beginning of the *Archelaus*.<sup>203</sup> One of these unidentified earlier scholars may have been Dicaearchus, the author of a collection of plot summaries of tragedies. The first line of each play was given at the start of each ancient hypothesis, and Dicaearchus may just have given *Frogs* 1206 as the beginning of the *Archelaus*.<sup>204</sup> The *Frogs* was produced in Athens in 405. If these lines are from the *Archelaus*, then it is likely that the Athenian audience knew the play well enough to recognise the opening lines, possibly from a recent performance in Athens. But if the *Archelaus* was produced in Macedonia in 407/6 that leaves little time for texts of the play to circulate in Athens and none at all for a posthumous re-performance.

---

<sup>203</sup> ὥς τινες ψευδῶς φασιν Σ *Ar. Ran.* 1206b (Holwerda p. 139).

<sup>204</sup> Dicaearchus' hypotheses: Sext. Emp. *Math.* 3.3; *arg. Rhés.* b 26-9. Haslam (1975) 152-6 argues that Dicaearchus was the author of the hypotheses preserved in *P.Oxy.* 2455: both they and those of Dicaearchus quoted the first line of tragedies. Cf. Liapis, (2001) and (2012) 62 and Scullion (2006) 189. Scullion notes that other authors roughly contemporary with Dicaearchus, such as Asclepiades or Philochorus, could also have been Aristarchus' source. Rusten (1982) argues against Haslam's suggestion that Dicaearchus was the author of the papyrus hypotheses.

Scullion, therefore, argues that the *Archelaus* was written before 408 and that it was performed in Athens.

I suspect that Scullion is right to claim that the opening of the *Archelaus* was quoted by Aristophanes in the *Frogs*. Most scholars, however, have concluded that fr. 846 was not the genuine prologue. First and most importantly, the scholion on *Frogs* rejects the attribution of these lines to the *Archelaus* (ὡς τινες ψευδῶς φασιν). Its author knew of an alternative opening which focused not on Aegyptus and his sons but his brother Danaus and his fugitive daughters:

Δαναὸς ὁ πεντήκοντα θυγατέρων πατήρ  
Νείλου λιπὼν κάλλιστον ἐκ γαίας ὕδωρ  
(fr. 228. 1-2 *TrGF*).<sup>205</sup>

While fr. 228 was frequently quoted in antiquity, fr. 846 was unknown elsewhere by the second century BC. According to the scholion on Aristophanes, Aristarchus was unable to find these lines in any work of Euripides then extant. As a result, all recent editors of the *Archelaus* have followed the *Frogs* scholion in regarding fr. 228 as the genuine opening of the play.<sup>206</sup>

How are we to account for the two openings? Xanthakis-Karamanos' suggestion that the two fragments both formed part of the same prologue is unlikely.<sup>207</sup> Alternatively, Harder

---

<sup>205</sup> Anonymus *FGrHist.* 647 F 1.2 and Strabo 5.2.4 attribute these lines to the *Archelaus*; Steph. Byz. 124 (p.90 Billerbeck) quotes fr. 228.4 as from the *Archelaus*; [Plut.] *X Orat.* 837e: from a Euripidean prologue. See Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 338; 351.

<sup>206</sup> See Kannicht *ap. TrGF* p.316; Austin (1968) 12-13; Harder (1985) 179-83; Jouan and Van Looy (1998) 289-90; Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 338; 351.

<sup>207</sup> Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 112-13. Aristophanes would not have quoted the lines from fr. 846 if they were not the first lines of the original text. In addition, were fr. 846 to follow fr. 228, the prologue would effectively have to start twice and the repetition would be awkward. Such an arrangement would mean giving at least ten

suggested that fr. 846 could have been the first lines of another play, which had been lost by the time of Aristarchus.<sup>208</sup> Alternatively a later actor's interpolation may be to blame: the play to which fr. 846 belonged may have made it to Alexandria but with an altered prologue. Harder suggests *Danae* or *Dictys* as possible candidates, for which a prologue concerning Aegyptus would be suitable. The similarity between the two passages may then have led to the false attribution of fr. 846 to the *Archelaus*.

However, as Scullion argues, we know of no certain instance in which a play of Euripides was lost.<sup>209</sup> It seems unlikely that even an early work of a tragedian as popular as Euripides could simply disappear in its entirety. If this lost play was quoted by Aristophanes, it was probably neither an obscure, nor an especially early composition. Furthermore, if fr. 846 had belonged to a lost play, Aristarchus would probably have known about it, since the titles of plays in ancient catalogues were generally accompanied with their first lines.<sup>210</sup> It is more likely that the first line of fr. 846 was quoted as the opening of the *Archelaus* by the ancient hypotheses attributed to Dicaearchus. Finally, if interpolation were the cause of its removal, fr. 846 could as easily have belonged to the *Archelaus* as the *Danae* or *Dictys*.

If the prologue was altered at an early stage, Aristophanes quoted the original version. All the sources for fr. 228 are later than the classical period and both they and Aristarchus may have only had the second version of the text. Aristarchus suggested that Euripides could

---

lines to a single generation and very probably more, while fr. 228b allows no more than four lines to each (if we discount the narrative on the prophecy lines 19-25, which bears upon Archelaus, the subject of the play, rather than his family). The prologue to *Wise Melanippe* (fr. 481. 3-11), which includes an extended digression on the kingdom of Aeolus and his son Xuthus in eight lines, is the closest parallel. *Or.* 4-10, by contrast, gives only six lines to Tantalus, the longest section in the Atreid genealogy; *Phoen.* 3-8 allows five to Cadmus in the Theban; *IT* 1-9 relates the entire genealogy of Iphigenia and her sacrifice in only nine lines.

<sup>208</sup> Harder (1985) 181.

<sup>209</sup> Scullion (2006) 188; such a similar scenario has been proposed for the *Rhesus*: see Ritchie (1964) 18-23; Liapis (2012) lxvii-lxviii.

<sup>210</sup> Dover (1993) 339-40.

have revised the text at a later date, replacing the lines of fr. 846 with those of fr. 228.<sup>211</sup> More probably an actor's interpolation, perhaps in the fourth century, was to blame.<sup>212</sup> Alternative prologues of Euripidean plays were common and are attested for the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, *Wise Melanippe*, *Meleager* and the, possibly inauthentic, *Rhesus*.<sup>213</sup> Additions to the prologue of the *Phoenician Women* are also probable.<sup>214</sup> Fr. 228 could have appeared an improvement on fr. 846 as it dealt with Danaus, the more famous of the two brothers, and allowed for a digression on the flooding of the Nile, the authenticity of which is doubted even by those who believe fr. 228 to be genuine.<sup>215</sup> The *Archelaus* is likely to have been a popular play – it was probably staged at Athens shortly after its appearance in Macedonia and it was certainly re-performed at least twice in the second century BC.<sup>216</sup> There would have been plenty of opportunities for the substitution. It is, therefore, likely that fr. 846 constituted the original opening of the *Archelaus* quoted by Aristophanes in 405.

Scullion suggests that the *Archelaus* was sent to Macedon and performed there in around 410, with Euripides subsequently producing it in Athens.<sup>217</sup> This is perfectly possible and further undermines the idea that Euripides only left Athens at the end of his life, intending never to return. Yet Scullion goes too far in arguing that Euripides never went to Macedonia. Such a conclusion is unjustified. It is more likely that Euripides went more than

---

<sup>211</sup> οὐ γάρ ἐστι, φησὶν Ἀρίσταρχος, τοῦ “Ἀρχελάου”, εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς μετέθηκεν ὕστερον. Σ Ar. *Ran.* 1206c (Holwerda p. 139). This suggestion was endorsed by Koster (1971).

<sup>212</sup> Scullion (2003) 394 n.30; (2006) 189-91; Dover (1993) 340; Sommerstein (1996) 265-6. Haslam (1975) 170-1 suggests a change in the prologue was necessitated by the embarrassment caused by the quotation of the prologue in the *Frogs*.

<sup>213</sup> *IA*: see Kovacs (2003) 80-3; *Wise Melanippe*: fr. 480 and 481, cf. Plut. *Amator.* 756 b; *Meleager*: fr. 515 and 516 *TrGF*, cf. Σ Ar. *Ran.* 1238 (Holwerda p. 141); *Rhes.*: *arg. Rhes.* b 26-7, Liapis (2012) 62-5; see Dover (1993) 342; Sommerstein (1996) 268; Haslam (1975) 170-1.

<sup>214</sup> See Haslam (1975).

<sup>215</sup> Fr. 228. 3-5; see Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 351.

<sup>216</sup> *IG* V<sup>2</sup> 118.

<sup>217</sup> Scullion (2003) 395.



once or at the very least, if there was only one visit, that he had had dealings with Archelaus before his departure in 408. Archelaus came to power in around 413. We know that Euripides was in Athens in the spring of 412 for the production of the *Andromeda* and *Helen*. Between 412 and the production of *Orestes* in 408 he staged at least one trilogy at Athens, that of the *Phoenissae*, *Hypsipyle* and (probably) *Antigone*, perhaps in 409.<sup>218</sup> It is not impossible that Euripides left Athens in April of 412 or later, producing the *Archelaus* in Macedonia in either the summer of 412 or in 411 or 410. In each case, it would not have been impossible for him to return to Athens in time for the Dionysia of the following year.

If we wish to be more precise, we might hazard a guess that Euripides took advantage of Archelaus' offer to avoid the temporary chaos of the oligarchic coup and the battle to restore the democracy in 411. This would leave enough time for Archelaus to have established himself firmly on the throne and for his cultural programme to be fully underway. On his return from Athens he could have staged the *Archelaus* again, possibly at the Lenaia of 410 or 409. Aeschylus re-used material in Sicily and audiences in Athens were always hungry for new works by their favourite playwrights. This scenario would also leave room for the circulation of texts of the play: Dionysus in the *Frogs* (52-3) claims to have been reading the *Andromeda* and Aristophanes may have secured a copy of the *Archelaus* by 405.

The biographers of Euripides did not want to admit the possibility of earlier and voluntary travels before 408. Had they done so, it would have detracted from the drama of the poet's departure and undermined the notion that the 'exile' was forced upon him by the ungrateful Athenians. Similarly Aeschylus' various journeys to Sicily were compressed into

---

<sup>218</sup> Σ Ar. *Ran.* 53a (Holwerda p. 12). See *Phoen. arg.* g 4-5: Snell *TrGF* DID C 16 (a) amends Ναυσικράτους ἄρχοντος to Γλαυκιππου therefore giving the date of 409. The *Oenomaus* and *Chrysippus* are given as matching plays of the *Phoenician Women* (lines 6-7). However, these plays are more probably cited as an earlier trilogy dealing with the same time period in myth, rather than plays produced in the same year as the *Phoenician Women*. See Kannicht *TrGF* V 2 pp. 591-2; Webster (1967) 102; Mastronarde (1994) 12-3 and 36-8.

one ‘exile’ at the end of Aeschylus’ life. However, ancient scholars did know of at least one other destination visited by Euripides. The *Vita* mentions that Euripides was granted *proxenia* by the Magnesians.<sup>219</sup> From what we can tell, this story does not seem to be derived from comedy or his own works and (unlike much of the tradition) has seemed far from implausible even to as sceptical a critic as Lefkowitz.<sup>220</sup> Euripides’ biographer deliberately places this incident after his final departure from Athens, but it could have happened earlier. If nothing else, the story at least indicates that the Magnesians expected Euripides to return to Athens in order to be Magnesia’s *proxenos* there.<sup>221</sup> They were also aware that the *Andromache* at least was performed outside Athens. Thus it is probable that Euripides left Athens on several occasions, and not just at the end of his life.

#### f) Euripides in Macedon: the *Temenus* and *Temenidae*

So far we have seen that the *Archelaus* was probably first performed before the spring of 408, possibly in 411/10. When Euripides returned to Macedonia after 408, what did he hope to accomplish? The *Bacchae*, *Iphigenia in Aulis* and *Alcmaeon of Corinth* were performed in Athens after his death and it is quite possible that Euripides was in the process of preparing them for the Macedonian stage shortly before his demise.<sup>222</sup> Praise of Macedonia – ‘localisation’ – is often thought to be the main reason for the complimentary references to Pieria and Lydias in the *Bacchae* (409-11; 568-75). Pieria was certainly in Macedonian

<sup>219</sup> μετέστη δὲ ἐν Μαγνησίᾳ καὶ προξενία ἐτιμήθη καὶ ἀτελείᾳ. *Vit. Eur.* Ia. 6.

<sup>220</sup> See Lefkowitz (1979) 197-8; Lesky (1963) 398 believed that the story derived from an honorary inscription; cf. Niesler (1981) 207-8; Easterling (1994) 76.

<sup>221</sup> Stevens (1956) 90-1; Niesler (1981) 208 notes that Euripides probably never had time to take up the role of *proxenos* and this may indicate a new form of purely honorary *proxenia*. However, it is more than likely that the Magnesians assumed that Euripides would return to Athens and intended for Euripides to act as their *proxenos* in the usual sense.

<sup>222</sup> Σ Ar. *Ran.* 67d (p. 14).

territory and not far from Dion, where Archelaus founded his dramatic festival.<sup>223</sup> However, Dionysus was also closely associated with the Muses and praise of Pieria is certainly not out of place within the dramatic context of the *Bacchae*.<sup>224</sup> A Macedonian performance cannot be ruled out, though it is probable that, had he lived, Euripides would have produced these plays at the Dionysia himself on his return to Athens.

Two other plays, however, demand our attention. These are the *Temenus* and *Temenidae*. We have seen that the mythical Archelaus was a Heraclid son of Temenus. As a result, it has been suggested that *Temenus*, *Temenidae* and *Archelaus* formed a Macedonian trilogy.<sup>225</sup> While the *Archelaus* dealt with the story of how the royal house of Aegae was founded, *Temenus* and *Temenidae* could have explained how the Heraclids became established in the Peloponnese and the reasons for Archelaus' banishment from Argos. However, if the *Archelaus* were the final play in a Temenid trilogy, why did Euripides need to include a lengthy genealogy in the prologue?<sup>226</sup> Furthermore, there are a number of major contradictions between what we know of the *Temenus* and *Temenidae* and the prologue of the *Archelaus*. Finally, differences in the presentation of the same myth in the *Temenus* and *Temenidae* make it probable that these two plays were performed on separate occasions and not in a single trilogy.

Let us look a little closer at what we know of the action of these two plays. A number of papyrus fragments have survived from the hypotheses of both the *Temenus* and *Temenidae*.<sup>227</sup> Unfortunately we do not know which fragments fit with which play, with the sole exception of fr. 8 which consists only of the title and first line of *Temenus*, without

---

<sup>223</sup> [Hes.] fr. 7 M-W; Thuc. 2.99.3.

<sup>224</sup> Dodds (1960a) 126; Scullion (2003) 394.

<sup>225</sup> Zielinski (1922) 305; Webster (1967) 252-4; Scullion (2006) 191-7.

<sup>226</sup> Harder (1985) 127-9.

<sup>227</sup> *P.Oxy.* 2455 frs. 8-11 and 107 = *P. Mich.* 1319. See Harder (1979) and (1991).

preserving any of the content of the hypothesis. However, two fragments (*P. Oxy.* 2455 frs. 9 and 10) concern the division of Argos, Messenia and Sparta among the victorious Heraclidae. These two fragments cannot belong to the hypothesis of the same play and therefore both dramas must to some extent have dealt with the conquest of the Peloponnese and its settlement. Descriptions of Laconia and Messenia, attributed by Strabo to Euripides, further confirm that the casting of lots for different kingdoms formed an important part of the action of these plays.<sup>228</sup> Because of the prominence of Temenus in fr. 10, Harder argues that it comes from the hypothesis of the play *Temenus*.<sup>229</sup>

The other, fr. 9, deals with the division in a much more cursory manner.<sup>230</sup> While fr. 10 covered the division in at least six lines or more, fr. 9 takes only twelve lines to cover several events. This includes the selection of Oxylus as the guide of the Heraclidae. Temenus is again one of the protagonists and seems to have played an important role in interpreting choosing Oxylus as their guide. However, while Temenus may have been the leader of the division in fr. 10, in this fragment the role is taken by Oxylus.<sup>231</sup> The name Archelaus is preserved in the final line of fr. 9. Harder joined fr. 9 to fr. 107 and *P. Mich.* 1319: two overlapping fragments involving the battle to win control of the Peloponnese.<sup>232</sup> Here again we find that Archelaus is named. Temenus, presumably now that he has laid claim to Argos through the casting of lots, promises to make the son who fights best his heir. After the battle, Archelaus, his oldest son, is chosen. Here the papyrus breaks off. This play may have gone on

---

<sup>228</sup> Fr. 727e = Strabo 8.5.6.

<sup>229</sup> Harder (1991) 123-4.

<sup>230</sup> Harder (1991) 120-1.

<sup>231</sup> Τήμενος μερι[ , fr. 10.129.

<sup>232</sup> See Harder (1979).

to explain how Archelaus was exiled, possibly through the envy of his brothers (*exsul a fratribus eiectus* Hyg. *Fab.* 219.1). This probably comprised the action of the *Temenidae*.<sup>233</sup>

Both plays, therefore, involved Temenus and the division of the Peloponnese and at least one play included Archelaus as a *dramatis persona*. Here we have Harder's main objection to linking the two plays into a trilogy with the *Archelaus*. In the prologue to the *Archelaus*, the play's hero alludes to Temenus' capture of Argos:

Τήμενος δ' Ὀλλου πατρός,  
ὅς ᾽Αργος ὤικησ' Ἡρακλέους γεγώς ἄπο.

(fr. 228a.17-18).

Archelaus goes on to describe how, lacking an heir, Temenus went to the oracle at Dodona who prophesied the birth of a son, Archelaus.<sup>234</sup> *P.Mich.* 1319. 11, which Harder placed in the hypothesis of the *Temenidae*, referred to Archelaus as the oldest of the sons of Temenus. Here the prologue of the *Archelaus* is clearly in agreement with the *Temenidae* hypothesis. However, the prologue also seems to imply that Archelaus was only born after the return of the Heraclidae, whereas in the *Temenidae* Archelaus was an adult at the time of the conquest. Harder therefore dismissed the notion that the *Archelaus*, *Temenus* and *Temenidae* formed a trilogy, both because the lengthy prologue of the *Archelaus* would have been superfluous in the final play, and because the prologue does not agree what we know of the action of the other plays.<sup>235</sup>

---

<sup>233</sup> This division of the fragments between the two hypotheses has also been adopted by Kannicht *TrGF* p. 719. On the possibility of two plays entitled *Temenidae* see Luppe (1992) 98.

<sup>234</sup> Fr. 228a.19-25.

<sup>235</sup> Although it is the majority opinion, this analysis has not gone unchallenged. See di Gregorio (1987) 288-90 and Scullion (2006) 191-7. They argue that the lines detailing the prophecy at Dodona, could still refer back to events that happened before the conquest. Such an arrangement would be very unusual. Collard, Cropp and

One final argument could be made against a trilogy of *Temenus*, *Temenidae* and *Archelaus*, which has so far been neglected. We have seen that both the *Temenus* and *Temenidae* involved the division of the Peloponnese by the casting of lots. If P.Oxy. 2455 fr. 10 does belong with the hypothesis of the *Temenus*, the casting of lots probably formed the dramatic conclusion of that play after the conquest of the Peloponnese. Both fr. 10 and fr. 8, which preserves the title of *Temenus*, are at the start of separate columns and around thirty lines are missing in between, covering the background and earlier scenes of the play. Fr. 9, however, seems to place the division before the conquest, which may have preceded the action of this play.

However, the action of the *Temenidae* certainly takes place at roughly the same time as the *Temenus*, and also covered the return of the Heraclidae. Both fr. 9 and 10 recount the division in sufficient detail to rule out either one of these plays dealing with later events concerning the Heraclid kings (such as the adventures of Temenus' daughter Hynetho). The available fragments also suggest a military setting, indicating that the battle for Argos was the setting for both dramas.<sup>236</sup> We therefore have two plays covering the same events in different ways. Euripides is unlikely to have dramatised at length the same story twice on the same day.

If the three plays were not produced together in Macedonia, then when and where? Following the traditional view that Euripides only left Athens in 408 and not before, Harder assumed that Euripides could not have produced two sets of plays on one visit. She supposed that the *Temenus* and *Temenidae* were written before 408 for an Athenian audience. This has led to the suggestion that the hero Archelaus was not in fact an invention of Euripides but had

---

Gibert (2004) 353 noted that the prologue of the *Ion* (57) contains a similar jump backwards in time, but they dismiss it because, unlike in the *Archelaus*, the time change is unambiguous.

<sup>236</sup> Fr. 728, 731, 732, 733 and 734 attributed to *Temenidae* and fr. 743, 744 *TrGF* attributed to *Temenus* are quoted as gnomic maxims on the topic of warfare.

appeared in earlier sources for the myth of the return of the Heraclidae. This myth was celebrated as much by the Spartans and Argives as by the Macedonians. Euripides had already touched on the Heraclidae in his *Cresphontes*, which dealt with the son of the Heraclid Cresphontes, who was granted Messenia in the division described in *Temenus*.

However, given what we already know about the *Archelaus*, it is unlikely that the *Temenus* and *Temenidae* were intended for performance anywhere other than Macedonia. Because at least one of these plays, probably *Temenidae*, included the character of Archelaus, it must have been a Macedonian commission. The content of the hypotheses would seem to confirm this suggestion. There was clearly a special emphasis placed on Argos and Temenus.<sup>237</sup> The division of the Peloponnese in these two plays, like the genealogy in the *Archelaus*, was designed to leave no doubt in the minds of an audience that the ancestral home of the Macedonian Temenids was Argos.

On the other hand, if Euripides was not commissioned to write the *Temenus* and *Temenidae* but produced the plays for an Athenian audience, we are faced with a number of problems. Why did he choose a Peloponnesian, and indeed Spartan founding myth? The metrical data suggest that the *Temenidae* was a late play, written at a time when Athens was at war with Sparta.<sup>238</sup> Other than the Macedonians, the Spartans had the most to gain from the propagation of the myth of the Heraclidae, which they used not only to link their royal house with Heracles, but also to justify their rule over Messenia.<sup>239</sup> No other Athenian dramatist is known to have adapted this myth for the stage. Although Euripides had touched on the return of the Heraclidae in his *Cresphontes*, that play only dealt with the Messenian kingdom at a later date and did not dramatise the myth of the division of the Peloponnese. Harder, in

---

<sup>237</sup> τῆς εἰς Ἄργος κ[αθό]δου, *P.Oxy.* 2455 fr. 9. 116; fr. 10. 129.

<sup>238</sup> See Cropp and Fick (1985) 91.

<sup>239</sup> E.g. Tyrtaeus fr. 2, 11 West; Isoc. 6. 16-22; see Nilsson (1951) 71-2.

arguing that the *Temenus* and *Temenidae* were first performed at Athens, wonders ‘what Euripides made of [a pro-Spartan myth]... [given that] Euripides and his audience must also have been aware of their topical interest’.<sup>240</sup> These difficulties vanish if we accept that Euripides’ audience was Macedonian and not Athenian.

If we are right in supposing that *Archelaus* was performed before 408, the *Temenus* and *Temenidae* could still have been performed in Macedonia, though not in a trilogy with the *Archelaus*. The most probable scenario is that the *Temenus* and *Archelaus* were performed together in Macedonia in around 411. The *Temenus* need not have included Archelaus as a character and the action of the play was probably focused on Temenus. It did not explain how Archelaus came to be exiled as the play probably culminated with the story of the division of the Peloponnese: the reasons for the exile were most probably detailed in the missing second half of the prologue of the *Archelaus*. The prologue of the *Archelaus* probably then not only made good propaganda but was actually necessary to explain how Archelaus came to be in Thrace. There is no reason why these two plays could not have been performed together in around 411.<sup>241</sup>

The *Archelaus* and *Temenus* may have been such a success that King Archelaus commissioned at least one other play: the *Temenidae*. Euripides would have then returned to perform this play in 408, shortly before he died. It was more daring in its content and its manipulation of the myth than either the *Temenus* or *Archelaus* had been. Here the comment

---

<sup>240</sup> Harder (1991) 130.

<sup>241</sup> An objection might be made that Aristophanes *Frogs* 1338 quotes a line from the *Temenidae*. The manuscripts of a scholion on the line note that, according to Apollonius, these words were from the *Eumenides* (ἐκ τῶν Ἑυμενιδῶν, Σ Ar. *Ran.* 1338 Holwerda p. 149). Because the exact line is absent from the *Eumenides*, Dobree took this as a corruption for Εὐριπίδου Τημενιδῶν. However, it is likely that Apollonius thought line 1338 was a paraphrase of *Eumenides* 1021-47, rather than a verbatim quotation: cf. Kannicht on fr. 741 *TrGF*.



of Agatharchides on Euripides' tendency to employ poetic licence in his different plays is relevant:

οὐδ' Εὐριπίδου κατηγορῶ τῷ μὲν Ἀρχελάῳ περιτεθεικός τὰς Τημένου  
πράξεις.

(Agatharchides 8.10-12 = Phot. *Bibl.* 444b 29)

In the *Temenidae*, Archelaus seems to have been instrumental in the victory of the Heraclidae and is named as Temenus' rightful heir. It may be this play that Agatharchides is referring to when he says that Euripides gives Archelaus the credit for the deeds usually performed by Temenus in other versions of the myth. Euripides also probably enlarged upon the reasons for Archelaus leaving Argos that had been skipped over in the earlier plays. Archelaus probably played the part of Deiphontes, the victorious general and son in law of Temenus, who is made Temenus' heir in preference to his sons in other versions of the myth and who, with his wife Hrynetho, is persecuted by the jealous brothers-in-law.<sup>242</sup> Something similar may have occurred in the closing scenes of *Temenidae*, the details of which are now missing from the fragmentary remains of our hypotheses.

#### g) Other Plays? The *Andromache* and travels in Molossia

We have seen that Euripides made at least two trips to Macedonia between 413 and 406. There may have been other occasions when he left Athens. We have noted that Euripides acted as *proxenos* for the Magnesians. The *Vita* claims that Euripides received this honour *en route* to Archelaus. Magnesia is situated on the coast of Thessaly and would have made an ideal stopping point between Athens and Macedonia. We do not know how long Euripides

---

<sup>242</sup> Paus. 2.19.1 and 28.3-7.

spent in this area, but his fame must have preceeded him for the Magnesians to honour him in this way. We may also wonder whether Euripides had been there before or whether he had some connection to Magnesians visiting Athens. It is possible that he was building contacts in northern Greece for several years before he received his invitation from Archelaus. Did Euripides produce a play in Magnesia? Pindar was thought to have been similarly granted the honour of *proxenia* by the Athenians as a reward for a poem in praise of their city.<sup>243</sup>

The *Andromache* was probably performed on another northern tour. A scholion states that, because it received its first performance outside Athens, the play's date was unknown:

εἰλικρινῶς δὲ τοὺς τοῦ δράματος χρόνους οὐκ ἔστι λαβεῖν· οὐ  
δεδίδασκται γὰρ Ἀθήνησιν.

(Σ Eur. *Andr.* 445 p. 284 Schwartz)

The play and its *archon* year were not listed in the *Didascaliae*. Did the author of the scholion have independent evidence that the play was performed outside Athens?

Wilamowitz doubted that the play could have been performed outside Athens and argued the scholiast merely guessed that the play had been staged outside Attica when he failed to find any record of its first performance. Callimachus, according to the scholion, had noted that the name Democrates was ascribed to the play:

ὁ δὲ Καλλίμαχος ἐπιγραφήναι φησι τῇ τραγωδίᾳ Δημοκράτην

(Σ *Andr.* 445 = Call. fr. 451 Pfeiffer).

---

<sup>243</sup> Isoc. 15.166; cf. [Aeschin.] *Epist.* 4.2-3; Paus. 1.8.4-5. This tradition, however, may have been a fourth century invention: see Walbank (1978) 76-8; Wallace (1970) 203. Pindar, however, claims on at least one occasion to have held the office of *proxenos*, although the text is ambiguous and he could be referring to a relationship with either the Aeginetans or Epirots (Nem. 7.65 with Σ 95b (Drachmann p. 129-30); cf. *Ol.* 9.83 and *Parth.* 2.41). For other examples of poets awarded proxenia in the Hellenistic period, in many cases for performances of poetry, see Marek (1984) 209-10, 263-6, 295-6, 376-9.

Wilamowitz used this evidence to suggest that the play was performed at Athens, though with an unknown Democrates acting as *didascalos*.<sup>244</sup>

However, the scholion treats *Andromache*'s première abroad as a fact and, as Page noted, 'this is expert and unambiguous evidence'.<sup>245</sup> Moreover, an ancient scholar, faced with no evidence for the play's performance either in Athens or elsewhere, could as easily have assumed that the play was never staged.<sup>246</sup> Butrica has shown that Wilamowitz's other assertion, that the play was staged for Euripides by Democrates, is equally unlikely.<sup>247</sup> When Callimachus referred to Democrates he most probably meant that the name appeared in the *Didascaliae* as that of an actor who had re-performed the *Andromache* at the Dionysia, sometime after 386. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt that the *Andromache* was performed abroad.

The metre suggests that it was written around 425-418, meaning that it cannot have been another play written for Archelaus.<sup>248</sup> Where was it performed? Argos and Sicyon have been proposed as venues.<sup>249</sup> Taplin pointed to the 'localisation' of Thessaly in the play as possible evidence for performance there.<sup>250</sup> Yet the most likely option remains Molossia, in Epirus.<sup>251</sup> The play is set in Phthia and concerns the former wife of Hector and her son by

---

<sup>244</sup> 'docta per Democratem', Wilamowitz (1875) 148.

<sup>245</sup> Page (1936) 223; cf. Easterling (1994) 79.

<sup>246</sup> As is noted by Butrica (2001) 189; cf. Stevens (1971) 19-20; Allan (2000) 150-2.

<sup>247</sup> See Butrica (2001) 190-7.

<sup>248</sup> On metre and the dating of Euripides' plays see Zielinski (1925) 133-240; Ceadel (1941b); Ritchie (1964) 260-3; Dale (1967) xxiv-xxviii. The data is collated by Cropp and Fick (1985) 5. For a general discussion of the dating of the *Andromache* see Lloyd (1994) 12.

<sup>249</sup> Argos: Nauck (1889) I xvii n.2; Page (1936) 223-8; Sicyon: a Democrates is known from Sicyon see *TrGF* CAT A 6 = P. Tebt. 695 col. 2.7; see Lesky (1972) 338 n. 90.

<sup>250</sup> Taplin (1999) 45.

<sup>251</sup> See Robertson (1923); Nilsson (1951) 83; Allan (2000) 151-9; Butrica (2001) 189-90 and Cairns (2012) 39, who suspects that the play could have been performed first in either Molossia or Thessaly.

Neoptolemus, named in the list of *dramatis personae* as Molossus.<sup>252</sup> The boy is taken hostage by the brutal Menelaus and used to draw Andromache out from the shrine of Thetis, at which she has taken sanctuary. Mother and child are saved only just in time by Peleus. Thetis appears and delivers a prophecy concerning this boy. He will live with his mother in Molossia and his descendents will be kings in that land:

βασιλέα δ' ἐκ τοῦδε χρῆ  
 ἄλλον δι' ἄλλου διαπερᾶν Μολοσσίας  
 εὐδαιμονοῦντας·

(1247-9)

Like the *Archelaus*, the *Andromache* dramatises the events that lead up to the founding of a dynasty, linking the kings of Molossia directly to Achilles and the Aeacids. In both plays the heroes leave to establish their new kingdoms at the instigation the *deus ex machina*. Was the *Andromache* also a royal commission, this time from Molossia?

Robertson suggested king Tharyps of Molossia as a possible patron.<sup>253</sup> Thucydides (2.80) mentions Tharyps and states that he was still a minor in 429 under the guardianship of a certain Sabylinthus, who led the Molossians in support of the Peloponnesians and their allies. At a later date the Molossians appear to have switched sides. Tharyps, at any rate, seems to have been sent to Athens to be educated there and was known as the first king to reintroduce Greek customs.<sup>254</sup> These had allegedly fallen into abeyance since the time of

---

<sup>252</sup> *arg. Andr.* 28. For the founding-hero Molossus see Paus. 1.11.1-2.

<sup>253</sup> Robertson (1923).

<sup>254</sup> Plut. *Pyrr.* 1.4; Justin 17.3.

Tharyps' heroic ancestor Neoptolemus, from whom he claimed descent.<sup>255</sup> If Tharyps went to Athens as a young man for his education, as Justin claims, it is quite probable that this visit took place in around 425. And if so, he could well have brought Euripides back to Molossia. Like Archelaus over a decade later, Tharyps may have relished the opportunity to both introduce Greek poetry to his subjects and celebrate his Hellenic descent from Neoptolemus and Achilles.

#### **h) Other plays? *Melanippe Desmotis* and the Greek West**

We have seen that Euripides did not only travel at the end of his career, but could have performed the *Andromache* outside Athens as early as the 420s. The north seems to have been his main area of operation: where he gained patrons in not only Macedonia but probably also Thessaly and Epirus. Did he ever visit the Greek West? In the second half of the fifth century the tyrannies that had patronised Aeschylus and Pindar no longer existed. Nevertheless, there were still opportunities for the travelling poet: enough to draw Aeschylus back to Gela in 456. Plutarch (*Nic.* 29) claims that Athenian prisoners in Syracuse who could recite the lyrics of Euripides received better treatment from their captors. The vase evidence from southern Italy confirms that the plays of Euripides were popular in the region during his lifetime. Had Euripides ever ventured west in person, he would have been well received.

No ancient source specifically states that Euripides ever visited the Greek West in order to perform a tragedy. Aristotle's *Rhetoric* claims that Euripides gave a reply to the Syracusans, although it is uncertain whether this took place on an embassy to Sicily, as the

---

<sup>255</sup> ἀπὸ δὲ Θαρύπου ἐς Πύρρον τὸν Ἀχιλλέως πέντε ἀνδρῶν καὶ δέκα εἰς γυνεαί, Paus. 1.11.1. 5-7. Plut. *Pyrr.* 1. 4-5.

scholion claims, or in Athens.<sup>256</sup> The only other evidence of a connection is provided by the plays of Euripides themselves. Easterling suggests that Euripides might have deliberately lavished praise on certain regions and cities because he intended his plays to be re-performed there.<sup>257</sup> She notes the praise of Sicily and Italy in the first stasimon of the *Trojan Women* (220-9) and the mention of the ‘Sicilian Sea’ at the close of *Electra* (1347-8). In addition she comments on the ‘(untraditional) setting’ of Mount Etna for the action of Euripides’ *Cyclops* and the ‘insistent references’ to this location throughout. She suggests that it may have been composed for performance in Syracuse or Catana.<sup>258</sup>

It is quite likely that tragic poets did hope that their plays would be regularly re-performed across the Greek world. The problem with such references to the Greek West is that in some cases these ‘localisations’ would have made sense to an Athenian audience, given their context in the drama.<sup>259</sup> Odysseus had been associated with the Greek West before the fifth century.<sup>260</sup> Hephaestus is frequently linked with Mount Etna and the Cyclopes are thought of as the workmen of Hephaestus.<sup>261</sup> Homer does not attempt to locate the Cyclopes in any particular area, but nevertheless, given their connection with Hephaestus and their

---

<sup>256</sup> Arist. *Rhet.* 1384b 15-16.

<sup>257</sup> Easterling (1994) 73-4.

<sup>258</sup> Easterling (1994) 79. References to Sicily and Etna: *Cyc.* 20, 62, 95, 106, 114, 130, 298, 366, 395, 599, 660, 703.

<sup>259</sup> O’Sullivan (2012) 182-7, for example, claims that the references to Sicily are a negative commentary on the habits of Sicilians, and their tyrants in particular. Seaford (1982) 172 and (1998) 55 argues that the play deliberately alludes to the imprisonment of Athenians in the Syracusan stone quarries

<sup>260</sup> Hes. *Theog.* 1011-18. The authenticity of this passage has been questioned and, as a result, the date is uncertain. See West (1966) 433-6, who suggests that this passage dates from the sixth century when Greeks were increasingly coming into contact with Etruscans. Malkin (1998) 178-85, however, argues that the passage should be seen in the context of the early stages of Greek colonisation in Italy around 700 BC.

<sup>261</sup> For Hephaestus as ‘neighbour’ (γείτονος) of the Cyclopes, see 599-600; Hephaestus and Etna: Simonides fr. 552 *PMG*; [Aesch.] *PV* 366-9; Pind. *Pyth.* 1.25; cf. Thuc. 3.88 for Hephaestus and his smithy on the Aeolian Islands. Cyclopes and Hephaestus: Callim. *Hymn.* 3.46-79; Cyclopes as workmen: Hes. *Thgn.* 139-41; Bacchyl. 11. 77-8 Maehler; Σ Eur. *Or.* 965 (p. 192 Schwartz).

location in the *Odyssey* on a distant island, Sicily is an obvious setting for a drama on Polyphemus.<sup>262</sup> In addition, a play's setting need not dictate its place of performance. Only a few of the plays that appeared on the Athenian stage were actually set in or praise Athens and 'non-Athenian' plays such as the *Archelaus* and the *Aetnaeae* were probably re-performed there. The same may have been true for the plays performed outside Attica. This does not mean we should completely rule out a Sicilian performance, and localisations certainly testify to the interest of Euripides and his audience in pan-hellenic myths and exotic locations. Nevertheless, this type of evidence on its own tells us little for certain about performances of Euripides' plays in the West.

On the other hand, a tragedy containing a deliberate change in the traditional myth, such as we find in the *Archelaus*, is more likely to have been commissioned for a non-Athenian audience if it can be linked to the political aspirations of a particular city. Bearing this in mind, there is one play we could usefully add to Easterling's list, which might have been written specifically for a Western Greek audience. That is the *Captive Melanippe*. We can be more confident about this play because, like the *Archelaus* and the *Andromache*, it seems to provide a heroic ancestor for the Italian Greeks and to change or adapt older mythic traditions in order to do so. Unlike the *Archelaus* and *Andromache* we have no external evidence to suggest that the play was ever performed outside Athens. However, a comparison between these two plays and the *Captive Melanippe* suggests that we are dealing again with a play commissioned by an Italian Greek city, probably Metapontum.

Euripides wrote two plays about Melanippe: *Wise* and *Captive Melanippe*. When exactly they were staged and whether they were performed together or on separate occasions is unknown. *Wise Melanippe* was quoted by Aristophanes in 412 and *Captive Melanippe* by

---

<sup>262</sup> For the ancient tradition that the Cyclopes were from Sicily see Σ H *Od.* 9.106 and 10.1 (pp. 415 and 444 Dindorf).

Eupolis in 411.<sup>263</sup> The metrical evidence for both plays suggests a date in the mid 420s: roughly the same period in which the *Andromache* was written.<sup>264</sup> Melanippe was the daughter of Aeolus, the son of Hellen, and Hippo, the daughter of the centaur Chiron.<sup>265</sup> In *Wise Melanippe* the scene of the action is Thessaly, where Aeolus son of Hellen is established, giving the land the name Aeolian.<sup>266</sup>

Hellen had three sons: Aeolus, Xuthus – who ruled Attica after marrying Creusa – and Dorus, the ancestor of the Dorians. From these brothers, Melanippe declares in the prologue, the various branches of the Hellenic race were descended.<sup>267</sup> When the play begins, Melanippe has been raped by Poseidon in her father's absence and has given birth in secret to twins, who are later named Aeolus and Boeotus. The children are left by their mother in an ox-stall. They are later discovered by shepherds, who see the babies suckling on a cow and assume that the animal has miraculously given birth to human offspring. On Hellen's advice Aeolus plans to sacrifice his own grandchildren, but is dissuaded from doing so by a cunning speech given by Melanippe, hence the title of the play.<sup>268</sup>

The other drama, *Captive Melanippe*, takes place somewhat later in time. The plot can be roughly reconstructed from the accounts of Hyginus and Diodorus. The setting has moved to Italy.<sup>269</sup> According to Diodorus, the mother of Aeolus and Boeotus, named Arne in his

---

<sup>263</sup> *Wise Melanippe*: fr. 482 = Ar. *Lys.* 1125 = Σ 1125 (Holwerda p. 50); fr. 487 = Ar. *Thesm.* 272 = Σ *Thesm.* 272 (Holwerda p.30) = Σ *Ran.* 100a (Holwerda p.19); *Captive Melanippe*: fr.507.1 = Eupolis fr. 99.102 K–A.

<sup>264</sup> See Cropp and Fick (1985) 83–4.

<sup>265</sup> Fr. 481. 13–22.

<sup>266</sup> Eur. fr. 481.5–6; cf. [Hes.] fr. 6 M–W; Strab. 8.7.1; DS 4.67.2.

<sup>267</sup> Eur. fr. 481. 7–8; [Hes.] fr. 9 M–W.

<sup>268</sup> For the hypothesis of the play see Collard, Cropp and Lee (2009) 248. Melanippe's speech: Arist. *Poet.* 1454 a 28; Dionys. Hal. *Art Rhet.* 8.10 and 9.11.

<sup>269</sup> Antiochus Syrac. *FGrHist* 555 F 12 = Strabo 6.1.15; *Metapontus rex Icariae*, Hyg. Fab. 186.4. *Italiae*: Kannicht TrGF V/1 p.538; Collard Cropp and Lee (1995) 243. Antiochus *FGrHist* 555 F 3 = Strab. 6.1.4 included Metapontum within the bounds of 'Italia'. See Webster (1967) 150–1.



account, went into exile with a stranger from Metapontum.<sup>270</sup> This was because her father did not believe that her pregnancy was due to the god Poseidon and wished to punish her.

Hyginus has Melanippe's father – named Aeolus or Desmontes (a mistake derived from the title of Euripides' play) – imprison her.<sup>271</sup> It seems that Melanippe and her children have been separated somehow. Hyginus claims that Melanippe's twins were recovered by shepherds and have grown to manhood apart from their mother in the care of a certain king Metapontus and his wife. Here we see that Diodorus' nameless Metapontian is in fact a mistake for Metapontus, the eponymous hero of the city.

Metapontus' wife – named Siris by Euripides, Theano by Hyginus and Autolyte by Diodorus – takes the role of the evil stepmother.<sup>272</sup> Jealous of Aeolus and Boeotus, who threaten to supplant her own sons, she plots their murder. From a surviving papyrus fragment we know that her brothers attack Aeolus and Boeotus during the course of a hunting expedition, but are unsuccessful and die in the attempt.<sup>273</sup> Hyginus indicates that Poseidon came to the aid of his sons and caused the fight to go against their attackers. Siris, a similar character to Dirce in the *Antiope*, was probably also responsible for Melanippe's imprisonment. According to Hyginus, Poseidon reveals to the twins their true parentage and they take revenge on Melanippe's father. In the play it was probably the evil step-mother who was punished.<sup>274</sup> Metapontus, who has been absent, returns and brings the action to a close by marrying Melanippe.<sup>275</sup>

---

<sup>270</sup> Μεταποντίῳ ξένῳ, DS 4.67.4.

<sup>271</sup> Hyg. *Fab.* 186.1.

<sup>272</sup> Siris: Athen. 523d.

<sup>273</sup> Fr. 495 TrGF; cf. *cum in venatione exierint, eos cultris interficite*, Hyg. *Fab.* 186.6.

<sup>274</sup> βοηθοῦντες [sc. Aeolus and Boeotus] τῇ μητρὶ τὴν Ἀυτολύτην ἀνείλον, DS 4.67.5; 'Theano cultro venatorio se interfecit', Hyg. *Fab.* 186.7. See Webster (1967) 150-1.

<sup>275</sup> *Metapontus duxit coniugio Melanippen eosque sibi filios adoptavit*, Hyg. *Fab.* 185.10.

Euripides, therefore, removed Melanippe and her sons from her Thessalian homeland, the setting for the *Wise Melanippe*, and transplanted them to Italy. This was a radical step.<sup>276</sup> Euripides seems to have created the eponymous heroes Metapontus and Siris, who give their names to the southern Italian cities of Metapontum and Siris respectively. The sixth century poet Asius, by contrast, connects Melanippe with an otherwise unknown Dius, in whose halls she gave birth to Boeotus.<sup>277</sup> Asius showed no awareness of Metabos, the earlier Italian founding hero, and may have been more interested in Boeotus and Boeotia than in any connection with Italy. Antiochus, who is quoted by Strabo, therefore believed that Melanippe's connection with Metapontus was a later development.<sup>278</sup> Strabo mainly associates Metapontus with the play *Captive Melanippe*:

ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τὸν Μετάποντον μυθεύουσι καὶ τὴν Μελανίππην τὴν δεσμώτιν  
καὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς Βοιωτόν.

(Strabo 6.1.15)

The phrase 'captive Melanippe' suggests that Euripides' play was the main and possibly the earliest source. Archilochus, by contrast, understood the city of Siris to have been named after a river.<sup>279</sup> Euripides probably invented the woman Siris in order to make the connection with the local area that much more obvious. Neither Diodorus nor Hyginus use this name for Melanippe's persecutor.

What prompted Euripides to make the links with Metapontum and Siris so blatant?

The missing link is Aeolus son of Hippotes, the master of the winds, whom Odysseus visits on his travels in the tenth book of the *Odyssey*. This Aeolus has a strong connection with the

---

<sup>276</sup> See Webster (1967) 156.

<sup>277</sup> Fr. 2 *GEF* = Strabo 6.1.15.

<sup>278</sup> *FGrHist* 555 F 12.

<sup>279</sup> ὠνομάσθη δ' ἡ Σίρις, ὡς μὲν Τίμαιος φησιν καὶ Εὐριπίδης ἐν Δεσμώτιδι [ἢ] Μελανίππῃ, ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τινος Σίριδος· ὡς δ' Ἀρχίλοχος, ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ, Athen. 523 d = Archilochus fr. 22 West.

West. The floating island of the *Odyssey* (10.3) was linked to Lipari in antiquity and Aeolus was thought to have given his name to the Aeolian Islands: the setting, incidentally, for Euripides' *Aeolus*.<sup>280</sup> In the *Odyssey* (10.5-7), Aeolus has six sons and six daughters who are married incestuously to each other. Euripides used this description of the family to construct the plot of his *Aeolus*. These sons, according to Diodorus, inherited Italy and Sicily between them, much as the sons of Hellen (Aeolus, Xuthus and Dorus) had founded the three main kingdoms in Greece itself.<sup>281</sup> To add to the confusion, one of the sons of the Italian Aeolus, Xuthus, founded Xuthia in Sicily.<sup>282</sup>

Aeolus son of Hellen and Aeolus son of Hippotes seem originally to have been unconnected. However, Euripides tried to link the two by confusing Aeolus son of Poseidon and Melanippe with Aeolus son of Hippotes. A fragment from Euripides' *Aeolus* refers to Salmoneus, the son of Aeolus son of Hellen.<sup>283</sup> Presumably in that play the Italian Aeolus (the one usually termed Hippotades) was presented as a relative of Salmoneus through Melanippe. The Italian setting for the Captive Melanippe also suggests that Euripides intended to treat the two Aeoluses in that play as identical. The merging of Aeolus son of Hippotes and Aeolus son of Melanippe is attested in our later sources. Diodorus states that the Italian Aeolus who gave his name to the Aeolian Islands was in fact the brother of

---

<sup>280</sup> Αἰολίαι νῆσοι πρὸς τῇ Σικελίᾳ ζ', Σ Q *Od.* 10.1 (p.443 Dindorf); Thuc. 3.88.1; DS 5.7-8, 4.67.6; Servius in Verg. *Aen.* 1. 52.

<sup>281</sup> DS 5.8.1-2 = Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 164; see Poli-Palladini (2001) 297-300.

<sup>282</sup> On this Xuthus, who is only mentioned by Diodorus, and a possible connection to his more famous namesake see Smith (2012). Although Smith wishes to see the two as potentially interchangeable, it is likely that they were always seen as distinct individuals and never confused in quite the same way as the character of Aeolus. The founding-hero Xuthus was probably given to the little-known city in order to explain an indigenous Italian name. Because a Xuthus was known to have been a brother of Aeolus son of Hellen, it was an easy step to make the Sicilian Xuthus the son of Aeolus son of Hippotes.

<sup>283</sup> Fr. 14 = Strabo 8.3.32. Salmoneus: [Hes.] fr. 10 M-W; DS 4.68.1.

Boeotus and the son of Poseidon.<sup>284</sup> A scholion on the *Odyssey* refers to a tradition that the Italian Aeolus was the son of Hippotes and Melanippe, while another claims that he was the son of Poseidon.<sup>285</sup>

This merging of two men named Aeolus caused a great deal of confusion in antiquity. The *Odyssey* provided the biggest problems for those who wanted to identify Odysseus' Aeolus with the son of Poseidon and Melanippe, since Homer states categorically that he is the son of Hippotes. Diodorus and his sources try to make some sense out of the conflicting accounts by creating three different men called Aeolus.<sup>286</sup> According to this tradition, Hippotes was the son of Mimas, the son of Aeolus, the son of Hellen. Hippotes and Melanippe were the parents of the second Aeolus. This Aeolus had a daughter, Arne, who, impregnated by Poseidon, gave birth to the third Aeolus and his brother Boeotus. It was she who was exiled to Metapontum (thus taking the role of Melanippe in Euripides' version). Arne and Boeotus returned to Thessaly and it is from them that the Boeotians claim descent.<sup>287</sup> The third Aeolus, however, was established in the Aeolian Isles.

We cannot be certain whether it was Euripides who first caused this confusion or whether he merely contributed to it.<sup>288</sup> Nevertheless, it seems quite probable that Aeolus the son of Melanippe was presented in the play as the eponymous hero of the Aeolian Islands and

---

<sup>284</sup> DS 4.67.6; however Diodorus (5.7.6-7) also notes that the Aeolus whom Odysseus visited was the son of Hippotes.

<sup>285</sup> τρεῖς γὰρ Αἰόλους φασὶ γεννηθῆναι, πρῶτον τὸν τοῦ Ἑλλήνος, δεύτερον τὸν ἐξ Ἰππότου καὶ Μελανίππης, τρίτον τὸν ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἀρνης. πρὸς τοῦτον δὲ φησιν ὁ Ἀσκληπιάδης τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα ἐλθεῖν τὸν ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος, Σ Q *Od.* 10. 2 (p.444 Dindorf). Cf. *Aeolus Hippotae sive Iovis sive Neptuni filius*, Servius in Verg. *Aen.* 1.52.

<sup>286</sup> DS 4.67.2-6; Σ *Od.* 10. 2 (p.444 Dindorf).

<sup>287</sup> DS 4.67.6.

<sup>288</sup> Lloyd-Jones (1991) argued that *P.Oxy.* 3876, fr. 62, which is attributed by Haslam to Stesichorus, may suggest an earlier link between Aeolus Hippotades and Aeolus the son of Hellen. However, as Haslam (1991) points out, this claim rests on a number of unproven assumptions.

the father of the founding kings of Italy and Sicily, a role usually assumed by Aeolus son of Hippotes. How did Euripides get around the serious difficulty that the Aeolus in the *Odyssey* was the son of Hippotes? Little or nothing was known of Hippotes in antiquity and, were it not for the impeccable authority of Homer, his removal from the genealogy would not have presented too many difficulties.<sup>289</sup> Euripides also seems to have had a solution prepared in *Wise Melanippe*. Melanippe's mother, we will recall, was the horse-goddess Hippo, the daughter of the Chiron the centaur. Euripides may have connected Hippotes in some way with Hippo or Chiron. In addition, Poseidon was strongly associated with horses and Hippotes could be a synonym for Poseidon.<sup>290</sup>

Euripides, therefore, not only moved Melanippe to Italy for the second of his two plays on this myth. He also created two founding heroes of Greek cities in southern Italy and he linked, possibly for the first time, Aeolus Hippotades and Aeolus son of Melanippe. As a result, the ancestor of the Italian kings became the direct descendent of the father of the entire Greek race, Hellen. Boeotus, the brother of Aeolus, also provided another link back to Greece itself: with the twins representing between them the two halves of the Greek world.

Euripides, as with the Macedonians and Molossians, both created a heroic ancestry for the Italian Greeks and re-affirmed their Hellenic identity and connections with the rest of the Greek-world.

---

<sup>289</sup> Smith (2012) 117-18 claims that Hippotes, the father of Aeolus, was the same man as another Hippotes son of Phylas ([Apollod.] *Bibl.* 2.174-5 and Paus. 3.13.3-4). This Hippotes was a Heraclid who participated in the expedition of Temenus and his brothers, killing, along the way, the seer Carnus: the founder of the Carneia. However, in the tradition followed by Diodorus (4.67.3), the Italian Hippotes was the son of Mimas, not Phylas. Moreover, none of the sources Smith cites explicitly state that the Heraclid Hippotes was the father of Aeolus. Rather he is known to have fathered another son Aletes. The two are connected with the foundation of Corinth (on this myth see Robertson (1980) 4-10) and probably do not have any direct connection with the Aeolian Isles and Italy.

<sup>290</sup> Lloyd-Jones (1991) 299 = (2005) 41.

Such a play would have been in demand in Metapontum. According to Strabo (6.1.15), the Metapontians claimed descent from Nestor and the heroes of Pylos. In reality, as Antiochus related, they were Achaeans, invited to Italy by Sybaris in order to counter the growing power of Dorian Taras. These mythical ancestors provided the new city with a heroic past, useful for asserting their territorial claims against the Tarantines.<sup>291</sup> In an ode for Alexidamas, a boy athlete from Metapontum, Bacchylides stressed this connection to Nestor and the Greeks who fought at Troy.<sup>292</sup> Furthermore, he emphasises the link between Metapontum and the Peloponnese by linking two shrines of Artemis, one at Lousoi in Arcadia where the goddess releases the daughters of Proitus from their madness, and the other at Metapontum, where the victory celebrations are taking place.

Euripides' play, produced a generation later, had a similar purpose. Metapontum was an Athenian ally and would have had no difficulty in commissioning a celebrated Athenian poet.<sup>293</sup> This may have taken place in around the 420s, conceivably at the same time at which the *Andromache* was performed in Molossia, across the Ionian Sea. Italy was but a short sail from Epirus and would have made an easy detour. Euripides was indeed a friend of strangers – ξενοφιλότατος.

#### 4. Conclusion

In this chapter we have seen that Euripides, while based in Athens, was nonetheless a frequent traveller. He visited Macedonia twice, Magnesia, Molossia and possibly even the Greek West. Plays staged outside Athens included the *Archelaus*, *Temenus*, *Temenidae* and *Andromache* and *Captive Melanippe*. In all likelihood there were more. We do not know how

---

<sup>291</sup> Malkin (1998) 210-11. Mele (1998) 67 and 70-7 has similarly argued that the Melanippe myth came about as a result of this influx of Achaeans. On the colonisation of Metapontum and its identity see Carter (J.C.) (2004).

<sup>292</sup> Bacchyl. 11. 126 Maehler.

<sup>293</sup> Thuc. 7.33, 57.

many plays were staged together at the festival at Dion or elsewhere. If, as I have suggested, the *Archelaus* and *Temenus* were produced together, another unknown work could have been paired with the *Temenidae*. Like Aeschylus, Euripides may well have re-produced abroad works first staged in Athens.

The Athenian tragic poet fits seamlessly into the older mould of a Homer or a Pindar, emphasising the continuity of poetic practice into the fourth century BC. Euripides and Agathon (and to some extent Sophocles) were wandering professionals who travelled frequently in order to win money and fame. By the time of his death, Euripides may well have been famous across the Greek world. Just as the tomb of Alcestis (999-1005) advertised her excellence to passers by, so the monument of Euripides in Macedonia was said to have been all Greece (μνημα μὲν Ἑλλάς ἅπας Ἐυριπίδου).<sup>294</sup> Another epigram claims Euripides has achieved an immortal fame (κλέος ἄφθιτον) that rivals even that of Homer.<sup>295</sup> It is probable that Euripides sought to achieve this status in his own lifetime. In doing so, he made an important and early contribution to the on-going dissemination of tragedy.

---

<sup>294</sup> ‘Thucydides or Timotheus’ *Anth. Pal.* 7.45 = *FGE* 1052.

<sup>295</sup> ‘Ion’ *Anth. Pal.* 7.43 = *FGE* 568.

## 5. Non-Athenian wandering poets

### 1. Introduction: Non-Athenian Performers

In the last chapter we examined the evidence for the travels of Athenian poets outside Athens and saw how accounts of these journeys conformed to the model of the wandering professional poet. In this chapter we shall be considering the extent to which poetry moved in the opposite direction. ‘Athenocentrists’ stress that most plays were performed at Athens and that all of the poets whose works survive intact were Athenian. We know that Athenian dramatists staged plays outside Athens and aimed to attract a Panhellenic following. Did non-Athenian tragic poets ever perform at Athens? How often and what impact did they make on the genre?

‘Athenocentrists’ argue that tragedy was a political genre presented to the Athenian demos by Athenian citizens.<sup>1</sup> This view stems from the assumption that tragedy was a ‘manifestation of the city turning itself into theatre, presenting itself on stage before its assembled citizens’.<sup>2</sup> However, the presence of non-Athenians both in the audience and on stage has caused a number of scholars to question this assumption. Kaimio, in particular, has demonstrated that the dominance of citizen performers has been exaggerated.<sup>3</sup> Non-Athenian

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Cartledge (1997) 18 claims that ‘all Athenian tragedy was political, in that it was staged by and for the polis of the Athenians’. Actors, he continues, ‘had to be citizens, since they were considered to be performing a properly civic function’. Hall (1997) 95: ‘the plays were performed at festivals defined by their nature as celebrations of Athenian citizenship. The texts were mediated through performance by agents likewise sharing Athenian citizenship: the chorus-members, actors and sponsors.’

<sup>2</sup> Vernant and Vidal-Naquet (1988) 185.

<sup>3</sup> Kaimio (1999) 44.



artists could and did perform at the dramatic festivals of Attica. What does this mean for our understanding of tragedy's relationship with the Athenian state and its dissemination to cities outside Athens? Non-Athenian poets, when considered at all, are often treated merely as exceptions: tourists and interlopers in 'one of the most characteristically Athenian institutions'.<sup>4</sup> They are thought to participate in a kind of cultural exchange, where they learn of the new Athenian form of poetry as outsiders. However, there are, I believe, good reasons for not ignoring the presence of figures such as Pratinas of Phlius or Ion of Chios in Athens and for questioning the extent to which the dramatic festivals were characteristically Athenian.

I will argue that if non-Athenians were capable of putting on tragedies and even winning prizes at the Dionysia, they must have already developed a deep appreciation for the tragic art and an intimate knowledge of the practical skills necessary for success in the theatre. By ascertaining the date at which the first non-Athenian poets are attested, we can gain some idea of when tragedy might first have been known outside Athens. It may also tell us something about the manner in which tragedy was disseminated. The 'export' theory posits that, originally Athenian, drama was gradually exported in the course of the late fifth and fourth centuries. However, if non-Athenian poets were already putting on tragedies in this period, were other Greeks already aware of tragedy and even involved in the genre's development?

The mere presence of non-Athenian tragedians at Athens can only tell us so much. We need to answer a number of additional questions. a) How many were there and what impact did they make? b) Were non-Athenian poets outsiders or did they contribute to the

---

<sup>4</sup> Stevens (2007) 244. However, he qualifies this statement by noting that 'panhellenic traditions constituted a vital and shared reference point within the immediate competitive context of the Athenian dramatic festival', (p. 257). See also Swift (2010) 58 who is similarly ambivalent.

genre's development? c) Where did they learn to be tragic poets? Was it only at Athens or did they develop their skills in their native cities? What role did these cities have in the dissemination and/or development of tragedy? d) Was Athens the only place where they performed their work or did they also participate in performing tragedies outside Athens?

We shall survey the evidence for non-Athenian tragic poets and attempt to situate their activities in the context of the Dionysia: a festival that was Panhellenic and which aimed to attract not only audience members but also performers from across Greece. The evidence is too fragmentary to offer definite answers to these questions. Nevertheless, the presence of non-Athenians at the Dionysia and Lenaia should reinforce our earlier assertion that tragedy was, from the beginning, a fundamentally Greek art-form, forming an integral part of the Panhellenic 'song culture', in which it had its origins.

## **2. Other non-Athenian performers**

Before we discuss non-Athenian poets in detail, it may be useful to consider briefly the context in which they were producing their plays. The Dionysia and, to some extent the Lenaia, were Panhellenic festivals, which admitted non-Athenians, both as performers and audience members. In actual fact the only exclusively Athenian element of the Dionysia, in its membership at least, was the chorus. Along with a theatre, this was the sum of what the city provided for the performance of drama.<sup>5</sup> All the other necessary elements – the poet, aulos-player, actors and chorus trainer – either applied to the city for the right to perform or had to be enticed to compete. They could come from the ranks of the citizen body but they did not have to. Let us now look briefly at each of these groups of performers.

---

<sup>5</sup> This does not include the various other matters required for the festival as a whole, including the feast and prizes, the cost of which was far from negligible. See Wilson (2008) 96-105.

### a) Choruses and Choregoi

Only citizens, competing as members of their individual *phylae*, were admitted to the dithyrambic choruses of the Dionysia, and the same was true of their *choregoi*.<sup>6</sup> It is quite possible that the same rules applied to dramatic choruses – the scholiast on the *Wealth* does not note any exceptions – although there may have been more flexibility here given that membership was not organised on the basis of a choreut's *phyle*. Chorus members were amateurs as a rule who, rather than earning a living from the round of festivals, were ultimately tied to the city in which they owned the land or earned their main income. Although choruses could be sent abroad to represent their city in festivals, it is unlikely that they toured the circuit, like poets or actors.<sup>7</sup> Even so, non-citizens could act as chorus members and even *choregoi* at the Lenaia and rural Dionysia.<sup>8</sup>

### b) Dithyrambic Poets

Dithyrambic poets and citharodes were frequently not Athenian citizens.<sup>9</sup> Plutarch even remarks on the strange fact that Athens never raised a melic poet of equal standing to her dramatists (*de gloria Ath.* 348b). A large number of poets were required each year to supervise the performances of dithyrambs at the Dionysia, not to mention the Thargelia and

---

<sup>6</sup> οὐκ ἐξῆν δὲ ξένον χορεύειν ἐν τῷ ἀστικῷ χορῷ Σ Ar. *Plut.* 953; Dem. 21. 56; cf. *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 76-7; Kaimio (1999) 47-8.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. to Delos: Thuc. 3.104; see Wilson (2000) 44-5; Rutherford (2004) 82-6.

<sup>8</sup> Lenaia: ἐν δὲ Ἀθηναίῳ (βαλανείῳ, coniect Holwerda) ἐξῆν, Σ Ar. *Plut.* 953c (Holwerda p. 155); Lys. 12.20; see Wilson (2000) 28; Kaimio (1999) 46-8. Rural Dionysia: metic *choregoi* at Icaria: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 254.3-4; Eleusis: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1186.7,12-15; see Wilson (2010) 50-1.

<sup>9</sup> On Dithyrambic poets at the Athenian Dionysia see *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 74-9.

Panathenaea among other festivals.<sup>10</sup> Non-citizens who composed for Athenian audiences include Melanippides of Melos, who won a victory for his dithyrambs in 494/3.<sup>11</sup> Pindar wrote dithyrambs in praise of Athens.<sup>12</sup> Telestes of Selinus won a victory in 402/1.<sup>13</sup> Timotheus of Miletus was active in Athens from the late fifth to the mid fourth century.<sup>14</sup> A re-performance of his dithyramb the *Elpenor* won a victory in the late fourth century.<sup>15</sup>

These poets were not based permanently in Athens but were frequently on the move in order to gain commissions and perform at other festivals. Melanippides was a guest at the court of Perdiccas of Macedon.<sup>16</sup> We noted earlier Pindar's travels to Sicily. Telestes toured in Italy.<sup>17</sup> Timotheus is also likely to have travelled on the poetic circuit.<sup>18</sup> Many of the dithyrambic poets who appeared at the Dionysia and other Athenian festivals were, therefore, neither Athenian citizens nor resident aliens. For these poets, Athens was an important destination on a broader circuit, possibly involving city festivals as diverse as those of Macedonia and the Greek West.

### c) Aulos-players

---

<sup>10</sup> Thargelia and Panathenaea: Lys. 21. 1-2.

<sup>11</sup> Marm. Par. Ep. 47 = *FGrHist* 239 A 47.

<sup>12</sup> Fr. 74a-88 S-M.

<sup>13</sup> Marm Par. Ep. 65 = *FGrHist* 239 A 65.

<sup>14</sup> Plutarch (*de superst.* 170a) refers to a performance of his monodic poem the *Artemis* at Athens. For criticism on the Athenian comic stage see Pherecrates fr. 155.19-28 K-A, cf. Olson (2007) 182, 184-5; Anaxandr. fr. 6 K-A; Antiph. fr. 110 K-A ; [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1132e; see Power (2011) 516-35. He allegedly received encouragement from Euripides: Satyrus F6 (p.111 Schorn) = *P.Oxy.* 1176 fr. 39 col. 22; Plut. *an seni resp. ger. sit* 795d.

<sup>15</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3055; see Hordern (2002) 82.

<sup>16</sup> *Suda* μ 454.

<sup>17</sup> Apollon. *Hist. Mir.* 40.

<sup>18</sup> See p.159 n.182 and 183.

Aulos-players, who accompanied performances of dithyrambs and drama, were an essential element of the Athenian dramatic festivals. They were also often non-Athenians. Thebes produced a number of successful musicians who appeared at Athens.<sup>19</sup> In Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (862-9), a crowd of Theban aulos-players arrive in Athens. Pronomus was perhaps the most famous of these performers, an artist celebrated today for the superb Attic crater that takes his name and which appears to show the victory celebrations after a satyr play.<sup>20</sup> His son Oeniades played for a winning chorus at the Thargelia in 384/3.<sup>21</sup> A Theban named Timotheus was also an aulos player who successfully accompanied a performance of Timotheus of Miletus' dithyramb *Ajax*.<sup>22</sup> Ismenias, another Theban, is mentioned by Plutarch.<sup>23</sup> Other Greeks, though, could be equally proficient on the aulos. Aulos-players from cities such as Argos and Sicyon are mentioned on choregic dedications from the fourth century.<sup>24</sup> The Euboean Euio of Chalcis played for a successful chorus at Athens in 320/19.<sup>25</sup> Previous to that he had been at Babylon with Alexander the Great, where he had been shown especial favour.<sup>26</sup>

Wilson has argued that the Athenians had an ambivalent relationship with the aulos: the instrument was present everywhere at Athens and yet somehow it was seen as un-Athenian.<sup>27</sup> However, although many aulos-players were non-citizens, the instrument was certainly not alien to Athenians. Aristotle claims that after the Persian war the Athenians did

<sup>19</sup> See Plut. *Pelop.* 19.1; Polyæn. 1.10; Juba *FGrHist* 275 F 82.

<sup>20</sup> Pronomus: Ar. *Eccl.* 98; Paus. 9.12.5-6, 4.27.7; Athen. 631e; Stephanis 2149.

<sup>21</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3064; Stephanis 1932.

<sup>22</sup> Lucian *Harmon.* 1; Stephanis 2417.

<sup>23</sup> *Demetr.* 1.6; *Per.* 1.5; Stephanis 1295.

<sup>24</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3038, 3045, 3052, 3068.

<sup>25</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3056; Stephanis 952.

<sup>26</sup> Chares *FGrHist* 125 F4 = Athen. 538 f; Plut. *Eum.* 2.2; Polluc. 4.78.

<sup>27</sup> P. Wilson (1999); (2002) 47-8. E.g. Alcibiades' rejection of the *aulos*: Plut. *Alc.* 2.5-7. On the intellectual value of the aulos see Arist. *Pol.* 1341 b; Athen. 337e. Socrates bewitches his audience like an aulos player, Pl. *Symp.* 215 b-c.

indulge in playing the *aulos* but that they were to reject it later (*Pol.* 1341a). Callias son of Hipponicus and Critias were allegedly fine practitioners of the art.<sup>28</sup> Alcibiades studied the *aulos* under Pronomus.<sup>29</sup> The *aulos* was merely an instrument at which some other Greeks, the Thebans in particular, were thought to excel in playing. *Aulos*-players, however, were also professionals, and it may be that free citizens wished to keep their distance from this class of performer, especially as it included not only foreigners but even, in the context of the symposium, women and slaves.<sup>30</sup> Even the more distinguished performers, who performed at the Dionysia and other musical contests, worked for money.<sup>31</sup> Aristotle (*Pol.* 1341b 8-14) discouraged students from studying the ‘banausic’ music played by professionals at contests because it was designed only to please a paying audience. *Aulos*-players, like other groups of professionals including poets, were open to such criticism because they worked for money. And it was their desire to make money that brought so many non-Athenian musicians to Athens.

#### **d) Actors**

---

<sup>28</sup> Athen. 4. 184d; on Critias’ career as a tragic poet and the possibly questionable attribution of certain plays and fragments to him, see *TrGF* I. 43.

<sup>29</sup> Duris *FGrHist* 76 F 29.

<sup>30</sup> See Wilson (2002) 46-51. See Pl. *Symp.* 176e, 212d, 215c; Xen. *Symp.* 2.1; On *aulos*-players at symposia see Jones (1991) 190-1; on women players see Rocconi (2006). The fourth century *phiale* inscriptions preserve a record of two female metic musicians: Agora Inv. I.4763.7; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1557.63; Meyer (2010) 83-7. In addition we have the record of a metic maker of *auloi* from the same set of inscriptions (Agora Inv. I 3183 A).

<sup>31</sup> See [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1141 c-e; Athen. 617b ἀλλήτων καὶ χορευτῶν μισθοφόρων κατεχόντων τὰς ὀρχήστρας. For the hyporchema of Pratinas, which Athenaeus quotes, see 8 F 3 *TrGF* = fr. 708 *PMG*. The reference to hired choreuts has been thought to be an anachronism: Lloyd-Jones (1966) 17-18 = (1990) 229-30 argued that this fragment, falsely attributed to Pratinas, should be dated to the late fifth century. Seaford (1977-8) 81-2, however, argues that this passage is an attack on the innovations of Lasus of Hermione in the early fifth century. For further discussion of this passage see Martin (2003) 164-6.

Actors will be covered in detail in the following chapter. We need only say here that non-Athenian actors were also far from uncommon.<sup>32</sup>

### **3. Non-Athenian tragic poets: the fifth century**

#### **a) Pratinas and Aristias of Phlius**

Non-Athenians were not only watching tragedies at a time when the genre was still new at Athens; they were also actively participating in its development. Pratinas, a citizen of Phlius in the northern Peloponnese, competed against Aeschylus and Choerilus around 499 and 496.<sup>33</sup> Pratinas is therefore part of the first generation of tragic dramatists to be securely attested after the semi-legendary Thespis. Accounts of this contest may represent the earliest documentary record of the Dionysia available to ancient scholars.<sup>34</sup> This rough dating is confirmed by the performances of Pratinas' son Aristias who, in the manner of Euphorion, Iophon and the younger Sophocles, produced his father's compositions in 467 (presumably after Pratinas' death) and went onto a career of his own, gaining at least one victory.<sup>35</sup>

At an early period, therefore, we find a Peloponnesian poet and one of some talent. Where and how did Pratinas learn to produce a drama, and one that would satisfy an Athenian audience? It is uncertain whether anyone, Athenian or otherwise, really knew how to write a tragedy at this stage. The genre was in its infancy and it may be that the skills

---

<sup>32</sup> See pp. 257-8; Kaimio (1999) 50-3.

<sup>33</sup> *Suda* π 349.

<sup>34</sup> Ancient records, the *Fasti*, probably went back no further than around 500 BC (see C-S 40; Millis and Olson (2012) 141) and may, therefore, have recorded the date of Pratinas' performance. West (1989) 251 takes 499-496 as the first reliable date for drama from which later compilers of the *didascaliae* worked back to give dates for Thespis, Choerilus and Phrynichus. The precise dating of Pratinas' first performance, however, has been called into question by Scullion (2002b) 81-2. Nevertheless, it seems probable that Pratinas was operating at some point in the early fifth century.

<sup>35</sup> Performance 467BC: *arg.* Aesch. *Sept.* Aristias' later career: see *TrGF* 9 T 1-3.

required of a tragic poet were almost identical with those necessary for the composition of choral lyric. There is nothing to suggest that either he or his son were ever Athenian metics. Aristias was honoured in his home city with a memorial, suggesting that he at least retained contact with Phlius.<sup>36</sup> Like the dithyrambic poets and *aulos*-players they may have only appeared occasionally at Athens on the occasion of the great festivals.

Pratinas probably received his training in the northern Peloponnese where a musical tradition flourished. The dithyramb originated, or so it was widely believed, with Arion in Corinth.<sup>37</sup> Pseudo-Plutarch (*de Mus.* 1137f) mentions two other musical professionals from the region: Andreas of Corinth and Thrasyllus of Phlius. Pratinas (fr. 4 *TrGF*) drew attention to the Spartan choral tradition in one of his tragedies. He himself composed both dramas and lyric poetry and is unlikely to have drawn too great a distinction between the two.<sup>38</sup>

Nevertheless Pratinas was probably seen in antiquity primarily as a tragedian, rather than a foreign lyric poet who occasionally dabbled in Athenian tragedy.<sup>39</sup> It is possible that he was not the first poet from the Peloponnese to experiment with drama or tragedy. Tragic choruses (τραγικαῖσι χοροῖσι Hdt. 5.67. 5) were performed in the early sixth century at Sicyon. This city was situated on the Corinthian Gulf not far north of Phlius.<sup>40</sup> It was to raise at least one tragic poet: Neophron.<sup>41</sup> Aristarchus of Tegea, a successful poet of the next generation, would also come from the Peloponnese. The Sicyonian ‘tragic choruses’ may have been somewhere in between a dithyramb and a tragic performance. Local versions of

---

<sup>36</sup> Paus. 2.13.6.

<sup>37</sup> Dithyramb precursor of tragedy: Arist. *Poet.* 10, 1449a. Arion: Hdt. 1. 23; Pind. *Ol.* 13.17-20.

<sup>38</sup> See [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1133e; 1134c; 1146b, where he is cited primarily as an authority on lyric poetry. His largest extant fragment is described by Athenaeus (617b) as a hyporchema. Seaford (1977-8) 84-94 argued that it forms part of a chorus from a satyr play.

<sup>39</sup> ποιητῆς τραγωδίας, *Suda* π 349.

<sup>40</sup> Paus. 2.12.3.

<sup>41</sup> See pp. 217-221.



comedy are also attested for Sicyon.<sup>42</sup> These early forms of comedy may have influenced the development of satyr drama at Athens, in which Pratinas had a role.

An alternative account of the origins of drama, recorded in the *Suda* even attributes its invention not to Thespis but to a citizen of Sicyon, Epigenes.<sup>43</sup> West suggests that the source for this account may come from Heraclides Ponticus who quoted from the text of a monument in Sicyon listing early (and in some cases mythical) poets.<sup>44</sup> Another tradition makes Arion, who was closely associated with Corinth, the inventor of tragedy.<sup>45</sup> The Peloponnesian claim also appears in Aristotle's *Poetics* (1448a) based on the dubious grounds of the etymology of the word δράμα. His sources claim that this word is derived from the Doric word δράω, the Attic equivalent being πρόττω, and that this must therefore reflect a Peloponnesian theatre that predated the Athenian. Aristotle, understandably, does not endorse this theory himself (his main reason for introducing it being to show the importance of action and plot in tragedy) but neither does he find it completely incredible. While it is difficult to make the case for the actual origin of drama in Sicyon and its environs, the tradition as a whole at least helps explain Pratinas' appearance in Athens and points to non-Athenian influences in the development of tragedy.

Pratinas probably made at least one important and lasting contribution to the Athenian Dionysia: the invention of satyr plays. It is for these plays that he and Aristias were remembered by Pausanias (2.13.6). He describes them as the best after those of Aeschylus. Aristotle asserted that tragedy evolved by abandoning its earlier satyric roots (διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν, 1449a22). However it is unlikely that this refers to satyr plays: for

---

<sup>42</sup> Athen. 621f.

<sup>43</sup> *Suda* θ 282.

<sup>44</sup> [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1131f. See West (1989) 252.

<sup>45</sup> Solon fr. 30a West; *Suda* α 3885.

one thing we would expect the plural if it did.<sup>46</sup> Aristotle is probably thinking of komastic and Dionysiac elements typical of the early dithyramb, from which, he believed, tragedy developed. It is likely that actual satyr plays developed out of tragedy much as did the tragically inspired comedies of Rhinthon, and that Pratinas was the original innovator. The Athenian theatre public were indeed open to both non-citizen poets and outside influences from an early period.

#### **b) Aristarchus of Tegea and Achaëus of Eretria**

The next poet is also from the Peloponnese: Aristarchus of Tegea. We know little of this man other than what the *Suda* tells us. He was a contemporary of Euripides and Eusebius says that he produced plays in 454.<sup>47</sup> He wrote seventy plays, a respectable output next to Euripides' ninety five, and was victorious twice, with Euripides not far ahead of him with five successful entries. It was an important achievement simply to be granted a chorus.<sup>48</sup> That Aristarchus won twice indicates that he was an established and even successful tragedian. If – though this is far from certain – the number of plays given by the *Suda* is accurate, then, given the fierce competition for choruses at the Dionysia, it is possible that some were performed at the rural Dionysia or outside Attica.

Another poet active at much the same time is Achaëus of Eretria in Euboea. He is the first non-Athenian poet to come from a city allied to Athens. Euboea, like the Peloponnese, probably had a long tradition of choral and poetic competitions. Hesiod won a victory at Chalcis at the funeral games of a local noble.<sup>49</sup> More permanent festivals were established in

---

<sup>46</sup> Seaford (1998) 11.

<sup>47</sup> *Suda* α 3893; Eusebius *Chronica* Ol.81.3 (p. 110 Helm).

<sup>48</sup> Wright (2009) 158-9; cf. Stevens (1956) 91-2 on Euripides and his relatively few victories.

<sup>49</sup> Hes. *Op.* 654-7.

Eretria and Chalcis by the fourth and early third centuries.<sup>50</sup> There may well have been dramatic competitions there in the fifth century. Achaëus was not the only tragedian to come from the island: Aeschylus' actor Mynniscus and the fourth century aulos player Euïos also came from Chalcis. Both, like Achaëus, were successful at Athens. It may be that Achaëus first began to develop as a poet in Euboea before he arrived in Athens.

For information on his life we must again rely largely on the *Suda*, which places his birth in the years 484-480.<sup>51</sup> The number of his plays is variously given as forty four, thirty, or twenty four. He was victorious once. He was thus both less prolific and marginally less successful than Aristarchus in his own time, yet he is better remembered. Achaëus's plays are quoted on two occasions by Aristophanes: the first in the *Wasps* (1081) is a line from his *Momus* and the second in the *Frogs* (184) from a satyr play the *Aethon*.<sup>52</sup> From this we may infer that by the last quarter of the fifth century Athenian audiences were familiar with his works. He was certainly read and appreciated in later centuries as no fewer than twenty titles are preserved. The fourth century philosopher Menedemus (who was also from Eretria) was fond of his satyr plays, which he ranked the best bar those of Aeschylus alone.<sup>53</sup> The titles and fragments of six of these satyr plays have been preserved with two others that are less certain.<sup>54</sup> His *Athla*, if it is in fact a satyr play, may have resembled Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae* / *Theoroi* where the satyrs appear to have abandoned their usual habits in order to compete at the Isthmian Games.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> *IG* XII/9.189; *IG* XII/9.207 = Le Guen (2001) I 41-56 no. 1.

<sup>51</sup> *Suda* α 4683.

<sup>52</sup> Σ *Ar. Vesp.* 1081 (Holwerda p. 172); Σ *Ar. Ran.* 184a (Holwerda p. 31).

<sup>53</sup> *Diog. Laert.* 2.133.

<sup>54</sup> Fr. 3-5, 5a-11, 12-15, 16b-17, 19-23, 26, 27-8, 32-5 *TrGF*.

<sup>55</sup> *Athla*: 20 F 3-5 *TrGF*; *Isthmiastae*: Aesch. fr. 78-82 *TrGF*.

From the little we can tell of his other plays, we can see that they did not differ greatly in the myths from those of Athenian tragedians. Heracles appeared in all likelihood in two of his plays while the myths of the Epigoni and Alcmaeon were presumably the subject of his *Alcmaeon* and *Alphesiboa*.<sup>56</sup> He also wrote an *Oedipus*, although not much can be said of its content.<sup>57</sup> His *Philoctetes* seems to have been set at Troy rather than on Lemnos and it may have resembled Sophocles' *Philoctetes at Troy* (fr. 697-703 *TrGF*). Like the Athenian tragedians, Achaëus was probably not immune from the attentions of later biographers.<sup>58</sup> To Ovid (*Ib.* 541) he was of note for the loss of his sight after an unfortunate encounter with a swarm of bees. We may assume then, that Achaëus was a tragedian of some skill and ability whose dramas were admired both in his own time and in later periods.

### c) **Ion of Chios: Ion at Athens**

Ion of Chios was another of Euripides and Sophocles' contemporaries who met with success as a tragic poet in Athens. Recent studies have tended to assume that Ion was something of an outsider at Athens, partly on the basis of his Chian origins.<sup>59</sup> Yet he was well-known at

---

<sup>56</sup> Heracles: 20 F 26 *TrGF*, where the satyrs address Heracles. Achaëus also wrote an *Omphale* (F32-5) which may have had a similar plot to that of Ion. Alcmeon: for the story of Alcmeon as a common tragic theme see Aristotle *Poet.* 1453a. It was treated by Euripides, Sophocles, Agathon, and Astydamas. Among foreign poets Theodectas (72 F 1a-2 *TrGF*) wrote an *Alcmeon*. An unknown Timotheus, conceivably the famous lyric poet from Miletus, staged an *Alcmeon* and an *Alphesiboa*, probably in the deme of Aexion; see *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 3091.6; *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 54-6 and Csapo (2010a) 92.

<sup>57</sup> 20 F 30-1 *TrGF*.

<sup>58</sup> One thinks of the story of Aeschylus' death, killed by a turtle falling from the talons of an eagle onto his head; Sophocles choking on a grape, Euripides torn apart by dogs or Dionysius of Syracuse who drank himself to death on hearing of his victory in the Lenaia. See Lefkowitz (1985).

<sup>59</sup> See Blanshard (2007) 158 on Ion's supposed 'outsider status' as a Chian in Athens. Stevens (2007) 244-5 notes that Ion is a rare example of a foreign poet taking part in 'one of the most characteristically Athenian institutions.' However, he also notes that though tragedy was still an 'Athenian genre, [it] was in the midst of a period of artistic innovation and experimentation that led to its subsequent spread across the Greek world'.

Athens and met many of the great figures of his time, including Pericles and Socrates. His *Epidemiae* seems to have described his meetings with these men, usually in convivial surroundings. Like Achaëus he was originally from a city that owed its allegiance to Athens. Yet he was not a resident alien and although he must have visited Athens frequently he seems to have been based on Chios. Furthermore, as we will see, there is strong evidence to suggest that Ion travelled as a poet, notably visiting that other ancient poetic centre: Sparta.

He was personally attached in his youth to Cimon, with whom he dined as a young man.<sup>60</sup> This visit can be dated to the 460s, between the battle of the Eurymedon and Cimon's exile.<sup>61</sup> At that time he was an adolescent boy (μειράκιον), which means that his birth must have been at around 480 at the latest making him roughly the same age as Euripides. Two anecdotes that may have been recorded in his *Epidemiai* can also be dated to this period. The first, which may belong to the same section as the story of the dinner at Laomedon's house, is an account of the argument used by Cimon to persuade the Athenians to assist the Spartans at Ithome in 463.<sup>62</sup> In the other, he recalls a conversation with Aeschylus at the Isthmian games, which must have taken place in either 464, 462 or 460 before Aeschylus' departure for Sicily.<sup>63</sup> He returned to Athens in around 452-448, this time to produce his plays.<sup>64</sup> The hypothesis of the *Hippolytus* notes that he competed unsuccessfully against Euripides and

---

Power (2007) argues that Ion was identified with the marginalised Athenian elite who favoured esoteric music performances at exclusive symposia.

<sup>60</sup> συνδειπνήσαι δὲ τῷ Κίμωνί φησιν ὁ Ἴων παντάπασι μειράκιον ἦκων εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐκ Χίου παρὰ Λαομέδοντι, Plut. *Cim.* 9.1-5.

<sup>61</sup> Jacoby (1947) 1-2, who suggests 465 for the dinner at Laomedon's house; cf. Webster (1936) 264. Leurini p. 151, favours an earlier date around 477/6.

<sup>62</sup> *FGrHist* 392 F 14 = Leurini F107.

<sup>63</sup> Plut. *de prof. in virt.* 8.79e = Leurini T3 and F108. See West (1985) 72. Ion probably devoted a section of his *Epidemiai* to Aeschylus as he did with Sophocles. Σ Aesch. *Pers.* 429 (Dind. P.81.16) cites Ion as a source for Aeschylus' presence at the battle of Salamis.

<sup>64</sup> *Suda* ι 487.

Iophon in 428 coming third.<sup>65</sup> He won at least one victory and, in celebration, allegedly gave a present of Chian wine to the people of Athens.<sup>66</sup> He seems to have died by the time of Aristophanes' *Peace* in 421. His 'obituary' (835-7) suggests that by the time of his death he was well known to Athenian theatre audiences.<sup>67</sup> Ion not only gained instant admission to the dinner parties of the elite but also appears to have been well received by the Athenian public at large.

Ion was indeed highly regarded as a tragic poet, even if he was not quite of the first rank. To show that poets can be excellent, and yet be surpassed by the truly great masters, Longinus (*de Subl.* 33.5) uses two pairs of examples: Bacchylides and Pindar, and Ion and Sophocles. Bacchylides is the lesser of the lyric poets while Ion is the lesser of the tragedians. A similar (though more amicable) rivalry to that between Pindar and Bacchylides is imagined, perhaps inspired by the meeting between Sophocles and Ion in the *Epidemiae*.<sup>68</sup> While the comparison is in some senses critical, it also testifies to the high regard in which his plays were held. Ion takes a respectable second place behind Sophocles, just as Marlowe follows Shakespeare, Brahms follows Beethoven, Braque follows Picasso. Many would be proud of such mediocrity.

When we consider the fragments of Ion it becomes clear that he was no outsider. Ion, like the Athenian tragedians, chose myths that were distinctly panhellenic.<sup>69</sup> Far from being an interloper, Ion was informed by a shared Greek culture. The subjects favoured most by this Chian seem to be the myths of Troy and Heracles. The influence of Homer is,

---

<sup>65</sup> *Arg. Eur. Hipp.* 25-7.

<sup>66</sup> *Athen.* 13f.

<sup>67</sup> περιβόητος δὲ ἐγένετο, Σ *Ar. Pac.* 835-837b (Holwerda p. 129). According to Σ *Ran.* 1425, Aristophanes also used a line from Ion's *Phrouroi* (fr.44 *TrGF* = Leurini F 53) in his *Frogs*.

<sup>68</sup> *Athen.* 603e-604d K = *FGrHist.* 392 F6 = Leurini F101.

<sup>69</sup> As noted by Stevens (2007) 257.

unsurprisingly, as evident in these plays as it is in those of the Athenian dramatists. In a fragment of his *Agamemnon* a cup is mentioned (ἔκπωμα δακτυλωτόν, ἄχραντον πυρί). Didymus referred to the *Iliad* (ἀμφίθετον φιάλην ἀπύρωτον, 23.270) in order to explain this curious description.<sup>70</sup> Ion also wrote an *Alcmene* (as did Aeschylus and Euripides) and a *Teucer* (as did Sophocles). His *Phrouroi* possibly concerned the capture of the Palladium by Odysseus from Troy. A similar story is described in the *Rhesus* (506-7), in which Odysseus breaks into Troy and slays a number of the guards. A line preserved by the scholiast to Aristophanes' *Frogs* (σιγῇ μὲν, ἐχθαίρει δὲ, βούλεται γὰρ μὴν) is spoken by Helen to Odysseus.<sup>71</sup> The unknown person who preserves a hostile silence is possibly Hecuba. In Euripides' *Hecuba* (239-50) Odysseus is said to have begged Hecuba for her life after she discovered his identity. Ion may have put this scene on stage in his play.<sup>72</sup>

Ion's *Omphale*, though a satyr-play, seems to have dramatised Heracles' period of servitude to the Lydian queen, as detailed in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* (248-90). Modern scholars have looked enthusiastically for a link between the poetry of Sophocles and Ion.<sup>73</sup> However it is more probable that the two derived from a common source.<sup>74</sup> Ion may also have treated the same myth in his *Alcmene* and *Eurytidae*. The *Omphale* may also have resembled Euripides' satyr play *Syleus* which also presented Heracles as a slave as

---

<sup>70</sup> Athen. 468c-f; Hesych. δ 145 Latte.

<sup>71</sup> Σ *Ran.* 1425 = fr.44 *TrGF* = Leurini F 53.

<sup>72</sup> Stevens (2007) 250-8.

<sup>73</sup> See Webster (1936); Maitland (2007) 275-6. The play included a curious description of Euboea and presumably therefore Oechalia as well, which has suggested a connection with the *Trachiniae* (fr. 18 *TrGF* = Leurini F23). It is probable that in the plot of the *Omphale*, Heracles had already been on Euboea in order to compete in Eurytus' archery contest (Soph. *Trach.* 262-9).

<sup>74</sup> The myth of the archery competition and the sack of Oechalia predated the fifth century. See Davies (1991) xxii-xxvii. The earliest reference may be *Od.* 8.224-5. Bacchyl. 16.16-18 (Maehler) also alludes, like Sophocles, to the headland on Euboea where Heracles put on the poisoned cloak. Maehler (2004) 167 argues that Sophocles' version may have inspired Bacchylides.

punishment for the killing of Iphitus, the son of Eurytus.<sup>75</sup> Ion's play certainly made use of a common theme of satyr play: Heracles and his appetite. A fragment is quoted in Athenaeus' discussion of this subject, in which the hero is reported to have eaten firewood and charcoal, possibly used for cooking a sacrifice.<sup>76</sup>

Ion was principally seen as a tragic poet in antiquity, despite being a famously versatile writer. The scholion on Aristophanes' *Peace* lists an impressive number of poetic genres including epigrams, paeans, hymns, scolia, encomia, elegies and even comedies, not including his prose works. It also adds that Callimachus (fr. 203 Pfeiffer) used him as a model to justify his own versatility. Yet Ion was primarily a tragedian (Ἴωνα μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν).<sup>77</sup> Strabo also calls him 'Ion the tragedian' (Ἴων ὁ τραγικός 14.1.35). Pausanias, even when he cites the prose *Foundation of Chios*, still calls Ion a tragic poet (Ἴωνι δὲ τῶ ποιήσαντι τραγωδίαν 7.4.8). Longinus (*de Subl.* 33.5) also categorises Ion as a tragedian and not a lyric poet. Ion's tragedies seem to have been regarded as his most notable achievements. The fact that he was not an Athenian is never a cause for comment or surprise.

#### d) Ion of Chios: Ion in Sparta

Like Aristias and probably Pratinas, he was not a permanent resident in Athens. He was in Chios when Sophocles visited the island as general in 441 and seems to have preserved a distinctly Chian identity, writing a history of the island.<sup>78</sup> The character portraits of famous

---

<sup>75</sup> Eur. fr. 686-97; see hypothesis Tii *TrGF*. See Easterling (2007) 285-6.

<sup>76</sup> Fr. 29 *TrGF* = Athen. 10. 411b-c.

<sup>77</sup> *Dieg.* 9.32-38 in Callim. *Iamb.* 13 (fr.205 Pf.) = Leurini T 15a-b; see West (1985) 71.

<sup>78</sup> History of Chios: Leurini pp. 134-9; see Jacoby (1947) 4-6, Dover (1986) 32. Ion may have given a particularly Athenian spin to this work by making the founder of Chios a son of Theseus.



Athenians in the *Epidemiai* were possibly intended for a Chian audience.<sup>79</sup> Furthermore, it seems that Athens may have been part of a poetic circuit that he and other artists passed through.

Ion's famous versatility would have made it easy for him to find employment in almost any Greek city. Ion may well have travelled to other festivals besides those in Athens in order to perform his poetry. In a fragment of elegy he declares that Dionysus (and his wine) is the main reason for all kinds of learned men, panhellenic gatherings and the banquets of rulers:

αὕτη γὰρ πρόφασις παντοδαπῶν λογίων,  
αἳ τε Πανελλήνων ἀγοραὶ θαλίαι τε ἀνάκτων,

(Laurini fr. 89.2-3 = fr. 26.2-3 West).<sup>80</sup>

Did Ion himself perform at any of these types of gatherings? I suspect that he did and that, as in the case of other poets before him, international festivals and the palaces of wealthy patrons offered Ion tempting prospects in more than one location.

Ion almost certainly visited Sparta and composed poetry especially for a Spartan audience. Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. Math.* 2.23) quotes a number of lines, which seem to come from a tragedy, and which praise the Spartans for their brevity in speech and bellicose nature (fr. 63 *TrGF* = Laurini F 76). However, we cannot be certain that these lines were intended for a Peloponnesian audience or that they represent accurately the views of the poet himself.

---

<sup>79</sup> West (1985) 76. Dover (1986) 36 argues that Ion's description of Sophocles may hint at his views on the Athenian empire.

<sup>80</sup> The word λογίων could conceivably be neuter plural meaning 'learned speeches'. However, it is more likely to mean poets / sages (cf. Laurini p. 120: 'viri res gestas dicendi periti'). For such a use see Pind. *Pyth.* 1.94; *Nem.* 6.45; Hdt. 1.1.1 and 2.3.1. For further interpretations of this line see Wilamowitz (1927) 279-81 = (1967) 434-7; Katsaros (2007) 229-30.

We can be more confident, though, about the following fragment of elegy, which appears to have been written especially for a Spartan audience:

χαιρέτω ἡμέτερος βασιλεὺς σωτήρ τε πατήρ τε·  
ἡμῖν δὲ κρητῆρ' οἶνοχόοι θέραπες  
κιρνάντων προχύταισιν ἐν ἀργυρέοις· †ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς  
οἶνον ἔχων χειρῶν νιζέτω εἰς ἔδαφος.†  
σπένδοντες δ' ἀγνώσ' Ἡρακλεῖ τ' Ἀλκμήνῃ τε,  
Προκλεῖ Περσείδαις τ' ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχόμενοι  
πίνωμεν, παίζωμεν· ἴτω διὰ νυκτὸς αἰοιδή,  
ὀρχείσθω τις· ἐκὼν δ' ἄρχε φιλοφροσύνης.  
ὄντινα δ' εὐειδὴς μίμνει θήλεια πάρευνος,  
κεῖνος τῶν ἄλλων κυδρότερον πίεται.

(Laurini fr. 90 = fr. 27 West)

This elegy gives a description of a symposium, similar to that of Xenophanes (fr. 1 West): the two poems are quoted together by Athenaeus (462 c-463 a). Is Ion here a travelling poet who is lavishing praise on a royal patron? There are two reasons for suspecting that Ion's symposium is set in Sparta: first, the choice of heroes who receive libations (lines 4-5) and, second, the opening greeting to a king (line 1).<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> See Haupt (1876) 209-10; Koehler (1894); Jacoby (1947) 7-8; Huxley (1965) 31-3; West (1985) 74-5; Fisher (1989) 34-5; Bartol (2000).

The libation to Procles has unmistakable resonances with the Eurypontid house of Sparta. In fact all four libations, to Heracles, Alcmene, Procles and the sons of Perseus seem to be connected. They are related to the Heraclids who founded kingdoms in Argos, Messenia and Laconia. Procles was the son of Aristodemus, the great grandson (according to Herodotus 6.52) of Hyllus, the son of Heracles. He and his brother Eurysthenes were twins, hence the origin of the Spartan diarchy. It is quite plausible, then that Ion bids a Spartan king to rejoice in the opening line of the poem. Indeed, there are only two possible kings in Greece who could be meant: a king of Sparta or the Macedonian king and, of the two, the allusion to Procles makes Sparta the most plausible. The king who is spoken of is probably Archidamus who reigned through the better part of Ion's adult life from 469 to 428 BC.

This argument was outlined by Haupt over a century ago, yet many continue to question Ion's Spartan connection. Their objections are based on two assumptions: the first, that Ion the tragedian was too loyal to Athens to praise a Spartan king; the second, that Spartans and their kings were too austere to contemplate the sort of drinking party Ion has in mind.<sup>82</sup> It is argued that Ion is not in fact referring to a real king in the first line. Four other possibilities have been suggested: a *symposiarch*, wine, the god of wine Dionysus, and Zeus.<sup>83</sup> By briefly examining these proposed alternatives, I hope to show that Ion did indeed address a mortal ruler, Archidamas, as a guest at a Spartan royal *syssition* and in the capacity of a travelling poet.

---

<sup>82</sup> For these reasons Wilamowitz (1903) 75 n. 1 and (1927) 282-3 = (1962) 438 suspected that it might be by Ion of Samos but the attribution to the Chian Ion has been widely accepted. See West (1974) 173. Whitby (1998) has suggested for similar reasons that Ion may instead have written the poem for the court of the exiled Spartan king Demaratus in Asia Minor.

<sup>83</sup> Symposiarch: see Leurini p. 124. Wine or Dionysus: Nieberding (1836) 69; West (1974) 173; Campbell (1992) 363 n.1; Katsaros (2007) 222-3; Zeus: Whitby (1998) 210.

The first, a *symposiarch*, is least likely: the titles ‘saviour and father’ seem too strong for such an office, even though symposiasts can be addressed as ‘kings’. Wine, our second option, is more plausible. Elsewhere Ion himself refers to ‘the wine that is king’ (βασιλεὺς οἶνος fr. 26.12 West). However, the identification of wine as a king is not made explicit in this fragment and again the combination of epithets tells against this possibility. If the king of our poem is a god, then Zeus is a much more likely candidate than Dionysus. Ion, in a similar elegy, does invoke ‘father Dionysus’ (πάτερ Διόνυσε fr. 26. 13 West) where he is also styled ‘leader of the hearty symposia’ (εὐθύμων συμποσίων πρύτανι 14). However, Dionysus is not one of the gods receiving libations in line five and this combination of epithets is nowhere else applied to Dionysus.

The only god who is consistently styled king, saviour and father is Zeus. The king of the gods had a strong connection with the symposium. Three craters were generally drunk.<sup>84</sup> The first was dedicated to the Olympians, the second to the heroes and the third to Zeus the saviour (σωτήρ), which was drunk at the end of the evening before the guests retired to bed.<sup>85</sup> The first crater could also be dedicated to Zeus.<sup>86</sup> In Ion’s poem, we find that the first libation with which the symposium begins is made to Zeus (ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχόμενοι 6).

However, although gods can be addressed in the third person we might expect the second person χαῖρε as is the case in Ion’s address to Dionysus.<sup>87</sup> The imperative χαίρέτω

---

<sup>84</sup> Eubulus fr. 93 K–A; *Suda* κ 2338.

<sup>85</sup> Pind. *Isthm.* 6. 1-9; Σ *Isthm.* 6.4 (p.251 Drachmann); Aesch. fr. 55 *TrGF*; Athen. 692f-3a; *Suda* τ 1024. On libations at the end of the meal see *Od.* 7.136-7. For Zeus the saviour and the third crater in tragedy see Aesch. *Suppl.* 26; Ag. 1384-7; *Eum.* 758-9; Soph. fr. 425; Burian (1986).

<sup>86</sup> E.g. Aesch. fr. 55; Diphilus fr. 70 K–A connects the bowl of water for washing hands at the start of the meal with Zeus Soter.

<sup>87</sup> Fr. 26.15 West = Leurini 89.15. The first person is the usual form of address to gods, especially in hymns e.g. *Hom. Hymn* 7.58. Eur. *Ion* 403 is an exception.

is more often used dismissively in the sense of ‘let us leave him to rejoice.’<sup>88</sup> In addition, the possessive adjective ‘our’ (ἡμέτερος βασιλεύς 1) would be an unusual way to address Zeus, who is king and father of all gods and men.<sup>89</sup> It would be more appropriate for a mortal ruler who is compared to Zeus. Ion may have been following Tyrtaeus who described the Spartan king Theopompus as ‘our king’ (ἡμετέρῳ βασιλιῇ ἰ fr. 5.1 West).

The transference of Zeus’ epithets to a human ruler is easily explained. Monarchs are regularly compared to Zeus, who is their patron deity. In Homer kings are nurtured by Zeus, while in Hesiod kings come from Zeus.<sup>90</sup> The Muses, Hesiod says, are the gods of poets and Zeus is the god of kings. In his hymn to Zeus, Callimachus (*Hymn* 1. 79) quotes Hesiod, in order to make the same point. Mortal rulers can also be compared directly to Zeus. Cratinus compared Pericles to Zeus and Aspasia to Hera.<sup>91</sup> Satyrus interpreted a reference to Zeus in Euripides’ poetry as an allusion to Archelaus of Macedon.<sup>92</sup> Xenophon similarly conflated Zeus the King and the King of Persia in the interpretation of a dream (*Anab.* 3.1.12). Theocritus (*Id.* 17. 1-4) sets the mortal Ptolemy II next to Zeus. However, individual kings only rule over their own lands, while Zeus is unique in being the supreme ruler of the cosmos, hence the qualification of the possessive adjective. Callimachus claims different kings have more power than others. He cites Ptolemy II, who has outstripped other rulers, as proof, referring as he does so to ‘our ruler’ (ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι, *Hymn* 1.86). In this way, Callimachus’ ‘our king’ is easily identifiable as a mortal ruler.

<sup>88</sup> E.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 252; Eur. *Med.* 1048, *Cyc.* 363-4; Theoc. 16.64-7. Bartol (2000) 188-191 has understood the word in this way, meaning ‘let us stop praising the king’. He sees this as a response to an earlier sympotic offering by one of Ion’s fellow guests, presumably an encomium for Archidamus.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. ὁ δὲ πάντων τύραννος, Gorgias fr. 11.20 D-K.

<sup>90</sup> διοτρεφέων βασιλῆων, *Il.* 1.176; ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆς, Theog. 96; cf. *Hom. Hymn.* 25. 4.

<sup>91</sup> Fr. 258 K-A, cf. Plut. *Per.* 3.4; fr. 259 K-A. See Heath (1990) 148.

<sup>92</sup> Fr. 911 *TrGF*; [Z]ηὶ συμμείξων ὁρμᾶν λέγω[ν] μεταφορικῶς ἐμφαίνει τὸν μόναρχον, Satyrus F6 (p.108 Schorn) = *P.Oxy.* 1176 fr. 39 col. 18. On fr. 911 see Schorn pp. 322-4; Harder (1985) 284-5; Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 264-5.

Ion's choice of epithets for the king, when taken together, suggest that a mortal ruler, Archidamus, is meant here. Is the king actually present at the symposium? The stress laid on the fact that it is 'our king' (ἡμέτερος βασιλεὺς), together with the libations referring back to the royal line, suggest that the king is understood to be very much included in the festivities. If so, this might also explain the unusual third person imperative χαίρετω as part of the series of third person imperatives that structure the poem. Ion progresses through the various stages usual in a symposium in the usual order. The servants prepare a crater, but before the guests drink, libations are poured. Then come the wine and its accompaniments: song, dancing and general merriment as the company become steadily more inebriated.

Such a use of the third person is paralleled in the wedding hymn of Sappho where it is the bridegroom whom she bids to be joyful (χαίρετω δ' ὁ γάμβρος, fr. 117 Voigt). Rather than dismissing the king, Ion may be bringing him in to the assembled company like a bridegroom who comes as the honoured guest to a wedding feast. The first thing that must happen, Ion seems to be telling us, is that the king should be welcomed into the gathering. This is appropriate to Sparta: we are told by Herodotus that the kings were always seated and served first at any public occasion:

ἦν θυσίη τις δημοτελὴς ποιῆται, πρώτους ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον ἵζειν τοὺς βασιλέας  
καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων πρώτων ἄρχεσθαι.

(Hdt. 6.57.1).

This custom would also make the references to Zeus more pertinent, as in Homer all the gods rise upon the entry of their king to the symposium on Olympus (*Il.* 1. 533-6). We may also note that the Spartan kings held hereditary priesthoods of Zeus (Hdt. 6.56).

Lines 3-4 could have made it clear whether the king was present at the symposium. Unfortunately the text is corrupt. Two interpretations are possible. First the line may refer to a servant who provides the bowl of water to wash to hands of the guests. Campbell has suggested that the omicron of οἶνον could be changed to a delta giving δῖνον (a drinking goblet). He therefore has proposed ὁ δὲ χρυσοῦν / δῖνον ἔχων χερσὶν νιζέτω εἰς ἔδαφος which he translates as ‘and let him who holds in his hands the golden jug wash our hands on to the floor’.<sup>93</sup> This is possible, although the sense is still imperfect. Second, these lines may refer back to the king from line one. In amending the text to include a golden cup, Campbell is following Haupt who went even further in restoring the line to ὁ δὲ χρυσοῦ / δῖνον ἔχων χερσὶν ἱζέτω εἰς ἔδραν.<sup>94</sup> In doing so he removes a single nu which could easily have been added by mistake after χερσὶν / χειρῶν. He has changed ἔδαφος (base or bottom) for ἔδραν (seat). Sommerstein suggested ἔδεος to me as a rare alternative word for ‘seat’ that would better explain the corruption, while fitting with the metre. The word is given by Hesychius as a gloss for ‘seat’ (θρόνος).<sup>95</sup> This would make good sense as ‘may he, holding a golden cup in his hands, take his seat’. The words ὁ δέ, then, refer back to a previous subject, the king. Ion is taking note of the Spartan custom that the king, when present, must be welcomed and seated first.

The golden cup could also be suitable for the Spartan setting. Critias noted that the Spartans had a custom of sharing a single cup.<sup>96</sup> Could the king have taken the first draught and passed it on to his honoured guests. A dinos, which was a comparatively large vessel, would be ideal for such communal dining. The comic poet Stephanus, in his play *The Man*

<sup>93</sup> Campbell (1992) 363.

<sup>94</sup> Haupt (1876) 214; χρυσοῦν West p. 80; Leurini p. 125.

<sup>95</sup> Hesych. ε 439 Latte; Hippocr. *de art.* 7.37. Latte amended the text to the more usual ἔδος. However, the word is given in a list of words beginning εδε and the original manuscript reading is likely to be correct.

<sup>96</sup> καὶ τόδ’ ἔθος Σπάρτηι μελέτημά τε κείμενόν ἐστι πίνειν τὴν αὐτὴν οἰνοφόρον κύλικα, Critias fr. B 6. 1-4 D-K. See Rabinowitz (2009).

who loved Sparta, has a character tell a story of a man granted a village by a king, possibly a king of Sparta.<sup>97</sup> The verb he uses for ‘granted’ is προέπιεν (literally ‘toasted’) and his interlocutor is confused and assumes that the village is a type of cup. He evidently has in mind a king who passes a cup to an honoured guest, and Ion may have envisaged a similar scene in this poem. Archelaus was similarly said to have bestowed a golden cup on Euripides.<sup>98</sup> Spartan kings could also have fulfilled the role of symposiarch. Plutarch tells an anecdote in which king Agesilaus himself appears in this capacity (*Apoth. Lac.* 208c). The possibility of a Spartan *symposiarch* is also mentioned by Xenophon (*An.* 6.1.30).

There is no particular reason why Ion could not have written this poem for a Spartan audience. The tradition that Spartans were moderate drinkers is not a strong objection to a Laconian setting.<sup>99</sup> Tales of Laconian austerity probably exaggerate the truth – we have seen that the Spartans certainly did not eschew wine. Fisher has suggested that the royal syssition, especially if foreign guests were present, may have been less austere than the average Spartan gathering.<sup>100</sup> It is also possible that Ion may be playing up to both Spartan and Chian stereotypes.<sup>101</sup> Chians were famed both for their skill in producing fine wine and their passion for drinking it.<sup>102</sup> Poets are also associated with wine, often either performing or writing their poetry while drunk.<sup>103</sup> The story of Ion giving the people of Athens jars of his island’s wine

---

<sup>97</sup> Stephanus fr. 1 K–A.

<sup>98</sup> Plut. *reg. et imp. apoth.* 177a.

<sup>99</sup> E.g. Xen. *Lac.* 5.4–7; Plut. *Lyc.* 15.3.

<sup>100</sup> Fisher (1989) 34–5.

<sup>101</sup> See Katsaros (2007) 223.

<sup>102</sup> E.g. Plutarch *Apoth. Lac.* 233a, where Chian visitors are found drunk in Sparta.

<sup>103</sup> E.g. Archilochus fr. 120 West; on Aeschylus and drinking see Athen. 10. 428f; cf. Paus. 1.21.2.



may have been inspired by his Chian origins or even his poetry.<sup>104</sup> Telling ascetic Spartans to drink heavily is only excusable in a Chian.

Why was Ion there? It is usually believed that he visited Sparta in the company of one of his Athenian acquaintances; either Cimon in 463 or the 450s or Thucydides son of Melesias around 440 during a period of peace between Athens and Sparta.<sup>105</sup> He could also have visited Sparta independently in his capacity as a poet. We have evidence that foreigners could be admitted as guests to *syssitia*, even by the kings themselves.<sup>106</sup> If so, there would be nothing unusual in a professional poet lavishing praise of this kind upon his new patron or host, regardless of national origins or private politics. Once again poets are required to grace the banquets of great men and are paid accordingly, in hospitality and in coin. But on every occasion they stress that they are guests. Ion, to judge from his *Epidemiae*, was often a guest and often abroad in the company of famous men. Could his experience be in part due to his standing as a poet? If so, it is quite possible that he would have been welcome at Archidamus' table.

Alternatively Ion may have been interested in visiting the various festivals in the Spartan calendar. We have seen that the Peloponnese, including Sparta, boasted a strong and venerable choral tradition. The Carneia attracted large numbers of foreigners to Sparta, which included Timotheus according to tradition (Plut. *Inst. Lac.* 238c). The same was true for the athletic games of the Gymnopaedia, at which Lichas gained fame across Greece for

---

<sup>104</sup> For example, the image of the first vine rising from the earth in another elegy (fr. 26. 4-6 West = Leurini F 89), could conceivably be understood in retrospect to have been prompted by a genuine interest in viticulture.

<sup>105</sup> Kohler (1894); Jacoby (1947) 6-8; West (1985) 74.

<sup>106</sup> Hecataeus the Sophist entertained Plut. *Lyc.* 20. 2.1-3: Ἀρχιδαμίδας δὲ μεμφομένων τινῶν Ἐκαταῖον τὸν σοφιστὴν ὅτι παραληφθεὶς εἰς τὸ συσσίτιον οὐδὲν ἔλεγεν, “Ὁ εἰδώς,” ἔφη, “λόγον καὶ καιρὸν οἶδεν.” See Fisher (1989) 34.

entertaining Sparta's visitors.<sup>107</sup> These games included choral competitions in a theatre.<sup>108</sup>

There is no evidence that competitions of tragedy were included, although performances of drama are not impossible. A Spartan form of comedy, similar to that developed at Sicyon and in the Greek West, is attested to by Athenaeus (621d). For all its Laconian severity, Sparta had in fact been an attractive destination for poets for centuries and remained so into the fifth century. Even if Ion did not produce tragedy in Sparta, as a poet he was interested in visiting other cities besides Athens. Like other wandering poets, he travelled both because of the prospect of gaining a meal at a patron's symposium and to perform in more public city festivals. Sparta may well have offered both.

Ion was a distinguished tragic poet who was not Athenian but contributed to the genre as an equal. He was qualified to perform at Athens because he was a poet and one who could produce works for a wide variety of audiences in both city festivals and symposia. However, he was also a wanderer who was not based in Athens or affiliated to Athens alone.

#### e) **Other Possibilities: Neophron of Sicyon**

Neophron of Sicyon may have been a foreign poet operating in Athens in the fifth century. The only thing we know about him was that Euripides allegedly plagiarised his version of the *Medea*. The story is an unlikely one, although, as I shall argue, Neophron probably was a minor poetic professional working in Athens during the second half of the fifth century.

Diogenes Laertius (3.134) and the *Suda* (v 218 Adler) make the claim that Euripides' *Medea* was actually by Neophron. However, a completely separate *Medea* from that written

---

<sup>107</sup>Lichas: Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.61; Plut. *Cim.* 10.

<sup>108</sup>Hdt. 6.67.3; Plut. *Ages.* 29.

by Euripides was in existence and is quoted by Stobaeus and in scholia on Euripides' text.<sup>109</sup>

It is this play that Euripides is meant to have used in the composition of his own *Medea*.<sup>110</sup>

The play's hypothesis gives the *Hypomnemata* attributed to Aristotle and Dicaearchus as its sources. By the mid-to-late fourth century, then, Neophron was known as a fifth century tragic poet operating before 431 and copies of his play were probably in circulation.

However, we know almost nothing else about Neophron, despite the *Suda*'s claim that he composed as many as one hundred and twenty plays. This would be a high number even for a star-tragedian over the course of a long career, yet Neophron does not seem to have won a single victory. Aristarchus of Tegea may have been little better known later in antiquity, but at least he was known to have won twice, information which could have been derived from ancient records.<sup>111</sup> Unlike Aristarchus, we have no other information on when Neophron was working, beyond the date of Euripides' *Medea*. The *Suda* even confuses Neophron with the fourth century poet Nearchus.

Modern scholars have suspected that the play ascribed to Neophron may have been a forgery.<sup>112</sup> Page argued that the language of the available fragments is 'artificial' and indicates a date later than 431, possibly as late as the fourth century.<sup>113</sup> It is difficult to understand why Euripides would have wanted to plagiarise the work of a lesser poet. Michelinini argued that Euripides took from Neophron a number of innovations, the most

---

<sup>109</sup> Σ *Med.* 666, 1387; Stob. 3.20.33. For the testimonia and fragments see *TrGF* vol. I 15; Mastronarde (2002) 57-60.

<sup>110</sup> *Arg. Eur. Med.* a 25-7.

<sup>111</sup> On Aristarchus as a parallel for Neophron see Thompson (1944) 11.

<sup>112</sup> See Page (1938) xxxvi; Mastronarde (2002) 60-4; Mossman (2011) 23-8.

<sup>113</sup> On style see Mossman (2011) 24 and 27-8. Linguistic and metrical difficulties include ῥυθον (fr. 1.1), which appears only in late fifth century tragedy, and φεῦ (fr. 2.13), which is the last syllable in the line and yet is preceded by a full stop. See Page (1938) xxxii-xxxvi. *Contra*, Thompson (1944) 12-13; Mastronarde (2002) 63.

radical of which was the infanticide.<sup>114</sup> However, if she is right then Euripides must have gone further, closely imitating the language of Neophron (fr. 2) in Medea's great speech (1021-80), though producing something of higher quality in the process.<sup>115</sup> It is more likely that the lesser and largely unknown poet imitated the great master, rather than the other way round.

The fragments of Neophron thus probably derived from a fourth century forgery. But who then was Neophron and how was his name attached to a fourth century play? There are a number of possibilities. First, he may, as Mastronarde argues, have been a fifth century poet, whose name was tagged on to the later play.<sup>116</sup> The author of the *Hypomnemata* and Dicaearchus, though not infallible sources, had no reason to suppose that the Neophron was writing later than Euripides. They would certainly have known if a Neophron produced plays within their lifetimes. Information of some sort induced them to believe that Neophron was active in around 431 or earlier and that the version of the *Medea* attributed to him was genuine. The author of the forgery possibly used the name of an earlier tragedian in order to publicise it as the inspiration for the great Euripides. He was able to avoid detection because Neophron was an obscure tragedian, yet one who undoubtedly belonged to the right period and whose *Medea* had either been lost or, more likely, was not recorded in the *Didascaliae*.

---

<sup>114</sup> Michelini (1989) 125-34.

<sup>115</sup> E.g. the address to her heart (θυμέ, Neophron fr. 2. 1) is found elsewhere in extant tragedy only at *Med.* 1056. For a detailed comparison between Neophron and Euripides see Mastronarde (2002) 63. Mossman (2011) 24 claims that whichever poet imitated the other did so 'slavishly'. Comparison between Neophron fr. 2 and *Med.* 1021-80 is complicated however because some of the lines have been judged to be inauthentic: see Reeve (1972). Kovacs (1986), followed by Mossman (2011) 316-17, argued for the deletion of only lines 1056-63. Michelini (1989) 117-24 has argued that lines 1056-80 should be retained in their entirety.

<sup>116</sup> Mastronarde (2002) 61.

Another possibility, raised by Sommerstein and Mossman, is that Neophron was not a fifth century tragedian at all, but rather a legendary poet from Sicyon.<sup>117</sup> We have seen that the Sicyonians claimed that they, and not the Athenians, had invented tragedy.<sup>118</sup> In some accounts Epigenes of Sicyon was the first tragedian, while Thespis was either the second or the sixteenth tragic poet after Epigenes.<sup>119</sup> Could Neophron have been one of these early tragedians who supposedly preceded Thespis? The monument in Sicyon mentioned by pseudo-Plutarch may have been the source for both Epigenes and Neophron. The later *Medea* could then have been intended as further confirmation that Sicyon was an ancient centre for tragedy before Athens and that the great Euripides was ultimately inspired by a poet from Sicyon.

This is an intriguing theory. However, I suspect that a Neophron was alive in the mid to late fifth century and that the accusation of plagiarism dates from then. The main or the indeed only evidence concerning Neophron in antiquity was probably fifth century comedy. Accusations of plagiarism were common in comedy.<sup>120</sup> Euripides was frequently accused of employing other writers to compose his tragedies. He was mocked by Aristophanes for collaborating with Cephisophon and the poet Meletus.<sup>121</sup> A version of this criticism is found in the biographical tradition where not only Cephisophon but an otherwise unknown Argive Timocrates helped him write his odes.<sup>122</sup> Other collaborators listed in the *Vita* are his kinsman Mnesilichus and Socrates. All of these collaborators were contemporaries of Euripides, and Neophron may have been as well.

---

<sup>117</sup> Mossman (2011) 25.

<sup>118</sup> See pp. 199-200.

<sup>119</sup> *Suda* θ 282.

<sup>120</sup> E.g. Ar. *Nub.* 553-6; see Heath (1990) 151-2.

<sup>121</sup> Ar. *Ran.* 944, 1301, 1408, 1452-3 with scholia.

<sup>122</sup> *Vit. Eur.* Ia 3 TrGF.

Neophron may have been satirised originally as just another ‘ghost-writer’ from the Peloponnese alongside Timocrates. A comedy or series of comedies written around 430 could have provided later scholars with two pieces of information: that some lines of the *Medea* had actually been written by Neophron and that he was from Sicyon. This information could have been the inspiration for Diogenes Laertius’ claim that Neophron was the real author of the *Medea*. The note in the *Suda* that Neophron was the first poet to introduce paedagogues and the torture of slaves may also be derived from comedy. The beating of slaves and the criticism of Euripides for introducing lower-class characters to the stage were stock jokes.<sup>123</sup> Neophron may only have been a target for satire fairly early on in Euripides’ career. The role of collaborator was later assumed by Cephisophon. In the fourth century another poet, presumably one with Sicyonian or Peloponnesian sympathies, decided to produce the tragedy that Euripides was thought to have plagiarised.

If we are right that the tradition was based largely on comedy, what does this tell us about the real Neophron? He may have been a poet, but it is unlikely that he ever met with any success. He would not have been the only minor poet to be remembered mainly for being the object of scorn on the comic stage. Philocles is credited by the *Suda* with writing almost as many plays as Neophron and yet the only things to note about him were his bitterness and a nickname. It is no surprise to find that he is mentioned unfavourably more than once by comic poets.<sup>124</sup> Neophron could also have been employed by Euripides in some capacity, especially if he was not successful enough to make it as a poet on his own. Cephisophon was jokingly referred to as Euripides’ slave.<sup>125</sup> However, in other accounts Cephisophon was a friend of Euripides, to whom the fifth letter of Euripides is addressed. According to Thomas

<sup>123</sup> Beating: e.g. Ar. *Pax* 742-7; *Vesp.* 1292-6; *Ran.* 616-17; lower-class characters: *Ran.* 947-9.

<sup>124</sup> *Suda* φ 378; Cratin. fr. 292 K-A; Ar. *Vesp.* 461; Av. 279-83, 1295; *Thesm.* 167.

<sup>125</sup> μεῖρακίσκος οἰκογενής, Satyrus F6 (p.104 Schorn) = *P.Oxy.* 1176 fr. 39 col. 12; cf. Σ Ar. *Ran.* 944a (Holwerda p. 119).

Magister he was an actor and this may well be accurate.<sup>126</sup> Was Neophron was also hired as an actor? It is quite possible, even if the *Medea* ascribed to him was a later forgery, that Neophron was indeed a poetic professional of some kind, perhaps working with or alongside Euripides in the early part of his career.

**f) Other possibilities: Meletus, Spintharus, Acestor**

Three other poets were satirised as foreign barbarians in comedy: Meletus, Spintharus and Acestor. MacDowell argued that the comic poets always had a genuine reason for calling their targets foreign.<sup>127</sup> Moreover, they not only had to be foreign but barbarian: calling someone a non-Athenian Greek was not particularly funny. However, we should be cautious about adding these poets automatically to our list of non-Athenian performers, as the evidence is open to several interpretations. 1) They were *bona fide* Athenian citizens whom the comic poets mocked as barbarians. The charge of being a false citizen was common in comedy and politics and such casual insults need not have been taken absolutely seriously. 2) They were non-Athenian Greeks who were mocked for being barbarians. Such an accusation could be made against Greeks from Macedonia, Thrace or possibly Asia Minor. 3) They were the bastard children of both Athenian and non-Athenian (barbarian?) parents and thus disenfranchised under the Periclean citizenship law.<sup>128</sup>

Let us examine each of these poets in turn. A certain Meletus is said by Aristophanes to have had Thracian connections.<sup>129</sup> Not only was he of barbarian descent but he was also a

---

<sup>126</sup> *Vit. Eur.* IV; Kovacs (1990) 16.

<sup>127</sup> MacDowell (1993) 370-1.

<sup>128</sup> See Macdowell (1993).

<sup>129</sup> Fr. 156 K–A; cf. 47 F1-2 *TrGF*.

bad poet and one of the people from whom Euripides allegedly borrows verses.<sup>130</sup> Like Neophron and Cephisophon, Meletus was probably thought of as an unsuccessful and disreputable member of Euripides' circle. However, our tragic poet is often confused with the more famous prosecutor of Socrates, who is also a poet.<sup>131</sup> The two poets named Meletus may be related – perhaps as father and son – or they could equally well be the same person. In any event, Socrates' accuser must have been a citizen, although it is possible that there might have been Thracian blood in the family. The demagogue Cleophon, who was certainly a citizen, was supposed to have had Thracian origins.<sup>132</sup> Unfortunately the question cannot be adequately resolved.

The poet Spintharus is described as a tragic poet and author of two plays: a *Heracles* and a *Semele*.<sup>133</sup> He is also a citizen of Heraclea, presumably the Greek colony on the Black Sea. If so then he may be the same Spintharus who is called a barbarian and a Phrygian in Aristophanes' *Birds* (762).<sup>134</sup> Spintharus would then be an example of a non-Athenian Greek, whose home city beyond the Bosphorus made him a target for this kind of abuse.

This identification has been disputed, however.<sup>135</sup> Two objections have been made. First, the scholion on the *Birds* does not provide any details on Spintharus and it is possible that ancient scholars did not know any more about the man mentioned by Aristophanes.<sup>136</sup> Second, it is argued that Spintharus is a nickname for a fourth century aulode Dionysius of

---

<sup>130</sup> Σ Ar. *Ran.* 1302c (Holwerda p. 146); Dover (1993) 350, doubts that the Meletus mentioned in *Frogs* is the tragic poet.

<sup>131</sup> See Σ Ar. *Ran.* 1302b (Holwerda p. 146). On Meletus as the accuser of Socrates see Pl. *Euthyphr.* 2 b, 23 b-26 e; *Suda* μ 496. See *TrGF* vol. I 47 and 48.

<sup>132</sup> Ar. *Ran.* 680-2.

<sup>133</sup> *Suda* σ 945.

<sup>134</sup> *TrGF* I 40 T 2a-b.

<sup>135</sup> See Sommerstein (1987a) 346; Dunbar (1995) 471; Kaimio (1999) 55. n. 32.

<sup>136</sup> Σ πινθαρος κωμωδεῖται ὡς βάρβαρος καὶ Φρύξ, Σ Ar. *Av.* 762b (Holwerda p.119).



Heraclea mentioned by Diogenes Laertius. This man passed off his play the *Parthenopaeus* as a work of Sophocles, convincing Heraclides Ponticus:

ἔτι καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Μεταθέμενος (ἢ Σπίνθαρος, ὡς ἔνιοι) γράψας τὸν  
Παπθενοπαιὸν ἐπέγραψε Σοφοκλέους.

(Diog. Laert. 5.92)

These objections, while serious, are not fatal. Many of the poets mocked by Aristophanes were virtually unknown to later generations. In addition, Diogenes need not be giving an alternative name for Dionysius. It is more likely that he is mentioning the suggestion that another poet from Heraclea named Spintharus was the author of the *Parthenopaeus*.

Diogenes, we should note, does not endorse this suggestion, but merely mentions it as a possibility. Furthermore, the *Parthenopaeus* is not mentioned in the list of Spintharus' plays in the *Suda* and the compilers may have been aware of Aristophanes' Spintharus from a different source. Spintharus, therefore, could quite possibly have been a Greek whose home-city was in the vicinity of barbarian Phrygia. If so, this probably led Aristophanes to characterise him as Phrygian in the *Birds*.

Finally, Acestor was another unsuccessful tragedian.<sup>137</sup> Callias says he is a poet who is detested by his choruses.<sup>138</sup> Satyrus lists Acestor among Euripides' less gifted competitors.<sup>139</sup> Acestor is commonly portrayed as a barbarian or foreigner. In Aristophanes' *Wasps*, Bdelycleon imagines a dinner party that includes fashionable young supporters of Cleon and a son of Acestor, who is described as a foreigner (ξένος τις, 1221). Acestor is himself given the name 'Sacac' by Aristophanes (Av. 31). The scholion explains this as a

---

<sup>137</sup> τραγωδοποιός, Phot. σ 497.

<sup>138</sup> ὃν οἱ χοροὶ μισοῦσι, fr. 17 K–A.

<sup>139</sup> Satyrus F6 (p.106 Schorn) = *P.Oxy.* 1776 fr. 39, col. 15.

term for foreigners from the name of a Thracian tribe.<sup>140</sup> Herodotus and Choerilus of Samos equate the Sacae with Scythians.<sup>141</sup> A scholion on Aristophanes *Wasps*, calls Acestor a Mysian (another tribe of Asiatic barbarians).<sup>142</sup> Similarly, the name Datis may have been a nickname for a ‘barbarian’ tragic poet.<sup>143</sup>

In a fragment of Eupolis’ *Flatterers* (performed a year after the *Wasps* in 421) Acestor is presented as a run-away slave and flatterer:

οἶδα δ’ Ἀκέστορ’ αὐτὸ τὸν στιγματίαν παθόντα·  
σκῶμμα γὰρ εἶπ’ ἀσελγές, εἶτ’ αὐτὸν ὁ παῖς θύραζε  
ἐξαγαγὼν ἔχοντα κλοιὸν παρέδωκεν Οἶνεϊ.

(fr. 172 K–A)

The ‘flatterers’ outline how they go about getting their meals from latching onto and entertaining wealthy men. Acestor is one of these men, but is beaten up for telling a lascivious joke. Although Eupolis does not call Acestor ‘Sacae’ he does say that he is a run-away slave (στιγματίαν). Being a slave in Athens almost automatically meant being a foreigner, since citizens could never be enslaved, and freed slaves were treated as metics and fell under the jurisdiction of the Polemarch.

Acestor, unlike the other foreign poets we have been looking at, seems to be trying to get himself accepted as an Athenian citizen. Pisetaerus complains in the *Birds* that while he and Euelpides are Athenian citizens they are wandering in the wilderness, while ‘Sacae’ (i.e. Acestor), as a non-citizen, is trying to force his way into Athenian society (ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὧν οὐκ

---

<sup>140</sup> Σ Ar. Av. 31 (Holwerda p.12).

<sup>141</sup> Hdt. 7.64; Choerilus fr. 319 SH.

<sup>142</sup> Σ Ar. Vesp. 1221 (Holwerda p. 192).

<sup>143</sup> Ar. Pax 291; Σ Ran. 86 (Holwerda p. 17).

ἀστὸς εἰσβιάζεται 32). MacDowell argued that he may have been the son of an Athenian man and a foreign woman who had been denied citizenship on the basis of Pericles' citizenship law of 450 BC.<sup>144</sup> This required both parents to be Athenian for a child to be admitted as a citizen where previous legislation had only required an Athenian father. A fragment of Metagenes, also quoted by the scholiast, has been used to suggest that Acestor at some point achieved citizenship:

ὦ πολῖται, δεινὰ πάσχω. τίς πολίτης δ' ἐστὶ  
πλὴν ἄρ' εἰ Σάκας ὁ Μυσὸς καὶ τὸ Καλλίου νόθον;  
(fr.14 K–A)

The phrase τὸ Καλλίου νόθον also seems to suggest an impostor, possibly an illegitimate son of Callias by a foreign woman.<sup>145</sup> Acestor could have been in the same position as the bastard son of Callias. It is unlikely, however, that Acestor ever gained his disputed citizenship. The joke is that 'Sacas' is not a *bona fide* citizen. The terrible things the speaker suffers stem from the realisation that there is no other citizen except (πλὴν) the fraud Acestor.

Acestor was probably never a citizen, but the illegitimate child of an Athenian man and a non-Athenian woman. He was not disqualified from a career in tragedy because he was not an Athenian. Had he been a Greek from another city, his origins would not have attracted comment. It was barbarian or servile origins that provoked hostility from the comic poets.

#### 4. Non-Athenian Tragic Poets: The Fourth Century

---

<sup>144</sup> MacDowell (1993) 366-7.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. νόθοι τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν Xen. *Hell.* 5.3.9.

During the mid to late fifth century, in a period spanning most of the careers of Sophocles and Euripides, we have evidence of three non-citizen tragedians of note at Athens:

Aristarchus, Achaëus and Ion. However, at the turn of the century we encounter a gap. At the moment when we might have expected an increase in foreign poets on the Athenian stage, we know of almost none. This should caution against the over-simplified notion of a gradual and steady spread of tragedy from Athens outwards. For whatever reason, the first quarter of the fourth century seems to have been a lean period in terms of both Athenian and non-Athenian poets alike. The first truly outstanding Athenian poets after the death of Sophocles seem to have been Astydamas, who won his first victory in 372, and the younger Carcinus, who probably preceded Astydamas in the victors' list.<sup>146</sup> The most successful tragedian before them may have been the younger Sophocles, who won seven victories, two of which are recorded in the *Fasti* for the years 387 and 375.<sup>147</sup> Not a single fragment of his work has been preserved by later generations.

From around 370, we have a series of new non-Athenian poets producing works at Athens. At the same time, several Athenian poets leave Athens to travel elsewhere. There is not a marked increase in the numbers of non-Athenian poets: again suggesting that tragedy did not become noticeably more or less Athenian as the century progressed. As was the case with Athenian poets, there is the same mix of abilities that we found in the fifth century. Some poets may have been successful in their own time but were condemned to obscurity after their deaths. Others seem to have been major figures, like Pratinas or Ion before them.

**a) Dionysius of Syracuse**

---

<sup>146</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2318.199; 2325.9; see Millis and Olson (2012) 148.

<sup>147</sup> *Suda* σ 816; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2318.199, 244.

The first non-Athenian poet of the century was the tyrant Dionysius of Syracuse. We know from Diodorus Siculus that he was victorious once *in absentia* at the Lenaia in 368/7.<sup>148</sup> This was probably not his first attempt. Tzetzes says that he had come second and third several times before he was finally victorious with his *Ransom of Hector* (*Chil.* 5. 23. 178-82). Dionysius was certainly keen to reach the largest possible audience and to do so he seems to have sent his plays on tour not just to Athens but to a number of the other great Panhellenic festivals as well.<sup>149</sup>

The little information we have on his qualities as a poet is undoubtedly affected by the ancient accounts of his reign, in which he appears as a caricature of barbarity and despotism. His severity as a tyrant and efficiency as a soldier is ludicrously juxtaposed with his passion for the poetic arts. For later authors his tragedies provided ironic reflections on the tyrant's own life. Plutarch turned against Dionysius the traditional maxim found in one of his tragedies that tyranny was the mother of injustice.<sup>150</sup> This passion is seen as eccentric in a ruler who should not have the time to be successful as a professional poet. Philip of Macedon expressed amazement that he ever found the time to write tragedies.<sup>151</sup> It was not the monarch's interest in the arts that was strange, but rather his desire to be a poet. We will not be surprised to learn, then, that the poetry of this Sicilian Nero was exceedingly, even comically, bad.<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup> DS 15.73.5.

<sup>149</sup> DS 15.7.3.

<sup>150</sup> 76 F 4 *TrGF* = Plut. *de Alex. fort.* 5. 338b. On similar expressions cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 534; Soph. *OT* 872, Eur. fr. 437.

<sup>151</sup> Plut. *Tim.* 15. 7.

<sup>152</sup> Ehippus fr. 16 K–A; Eubulus fr. 26 K–A cf. Hunter (1983) 116-7; DS 15.6.1, 7.3, 7.4; see Duncan (2012) 140.

Given this negative tradition, it is impossible to make a fair assessment of Dionysius' achievements as a poet.<sup>153</sup> Despite their poor reputation, his plays were preserved and read in later periods.<sup>154</sup> Cicero is aware of his prodigious output (*musicorum vero perstudiosum accepimus*) but does not comment on how bad or good they might be (*poetam etiam tragicum – quam bonum nihil ad rem, Tusc. 5.63*). Cicero was aware that his plays were held in low esteem, yet the main point is that any poet, however bad, can take pleasure in his own works. *De gustibus non est disputandum* seems to sum up Cicero's attitude to the works of Dionysius.

Though Dionysius was not the most talented of poets, he certainly did not lack enthusiasm. He was obsessed with poetry and tragedy in particular. He is said to have used Aeschylus' writing box in the (ultimately vain) hope that it would inspire him in his own writing.<sup>155</sup> He bought up a collection of Euripidean memorabilia from the poet's family for as much as a talent and dedicated it to the temple of the Muses.<sup>156</sup> He may have envisaged something of a shrine to tragedy and a focus for his own creative energies, similar to Aeschylus' tomb at Gela. The tyrant's passion for the works of Athenian poets was probably shared by his subjects.

Dionysius did not only look back to the great masters of the past. Performances of tragedy had been stage in Syracuse ever since the days of Hieron, and Dionysius continued this tradition by hosting the poet Antiphon.<sup>157</sup> He was one of many intellectuals drawn to the

---

<sup>153</sup> For a recent reassessment see Duncan (2012).

<sup>154</sup> See Dearden (1990) 234.

<sup>155</sup> Lucian *Adv. Indoct.* 15.

<sup>156</sup> *Vit Eur.* III 4.

<sup>157</sup> See *TrGF* I 55.

tyrant's court, including Plato and the lyric poet Philoxenus of Cythera.<sup>158</sup> He is said to have offered one poet as much as a talent for his services – although, in his usual style, he later cheated the unfortunate man of his pay.<sup>159</sup> His son, Dionysius II, was to continue this tradition: re-calling Plato and hosting, among tragic poets, the younger Carcinus.<sup>160</sup> This Athenian poet seems, like Aeschylus, to have travelled extensively in Sicily.<sup>161</sup> A tradition even developed that he was a citizen of Acragas, despite the fact that he came from a longstanding Athenian poetic family.<sup>162</sup>

Accounts of Dionysius' activities as a patron are also invariably coloured with tales of his cruelty. The poets entertained at Syracuse at this time did not only produce their own poems but also helped improve those of their employer.<sup>163</sup> In spite of this, Dionysius was incapable of enduring criticism. Antiphon was executed for passing comment on his tragedies and the lyric poet Philoxenus was thrown into the infamous stone quarries of Syracuse. Much of this is likely to be later humorous invention, although Antiphon's death at the hand of the tyrant is reliably attested by Aristotle.<sup>164</sup> The story of how Plato was sold as a slave on Aegina for offending Dionysius probably belongs to this same class of tale.<sup>165</sup>

Despite his poor reputation in antiquity, Dionysius is important for a number of reasons. He wrote tragedies and had them performed in Athens, winning at least one victory.

---

<sup>158</sup> Plato: *Pl. Epist.* 7. 326 b-328 d; Philoxenus: DS 15.6.2, *Plut. de Alex. fort.* 334c, *Lucian adv. indoct.* 15, *Suda* φ 397.

<sup>159</sup> *Plut. de fort. Alex.* 334a.

<sup>160</sup> Carcinus: *Diog. Laert.* 2.63.

<sup>161</sup> πλεονάκις ἐν ταῖς Συρακούσαις παρεπιδημηκώς, DS 5.2.5 = *Timaeus FGrHist* 566 F 164.

<sup>162</sup> *Suda* κ 394; see Davies (1971) 284.

<sup>163</sup> DS 15.6.1.

<sup>164</sup> Antiphon: *Arist. Rhet.* 1385a. Antiphon's comment on the poor quality of Dionysius' tragedies and his ill advised praise for Harmodius and Aristogeiton is not supported by any contemporary source and may be a later invention. See [*Plut.*] *X Orat.* 1. 833b and *Phil. VS* 1.15.3.

<sup>165</sup> *Plut. Dion* 5; DS 15.7.1; *Tzetzes Chil.* 23.

In doing so, though a non-Athenian, he displayed a deep and sincere enthusiasm for tragedy and poetry in general. He is unusual for being both a poet and a patron of Athenian tragic poets. Together with his son, he continued the long tradition of poetic patronage into the fourth century.

## **b) Theodectas of Phaselis**

While Dionysius' record as a poet was mixed, Theodectas of Phaselis was a more worthy successor to the likes of Ion and Achaëus. Indeed his career closely resembles that of Ion in a number of respects. Phaselis was a Dorian colony on the Lycian coast.<sup>166</sup> Besieged by Cimon, it fell under Athenian influence in the fifth century and after the battle of the Eurymedon it was established as the limit of Persian rule.<sup>167</sup> A fifth century inscription details some of the privileges Phaselis received as an ally.<sup>168</sup> In the fourth century citizens of Phaselis were to be found trading in Athens.<sup>169</sup> However, the city became increasingly aligned, possibly at the instigation of Theodectas himself, with the powerful satrap of Caria and philhellene Mausolus.<sup>170</sup>

Theodectas was active for at least part of his career in Phaselis and Caria. His native-city held him in high enough esteem to raise a statue to him in the agora after his death. This image was later festooned with garlands by Alexander the Great when he visited Phaselis in 334.<sup>171</sup> Theodectas was present at a competition held around 356-353 BC by Mausolus' wife, at which a number of the great orators and poets of the day produced works in praise of her

---

<sup>166</sup> Hdt. 2.178.

<sup>167</sup> Plut. *Cim.* 12. 3-3; DS 12.4.5; see Hornblower (1982) 122-3.

<sup>168</sup> *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 10 = M-L 66-9 no.31

<sup>169</sup> Dem. 35.1.

<sup>170</sup> Hornblower (1982) 123.

<sup>171</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 17.8.



dead husband.<sup>172</sup> For the occasion, Theodectas composed his *Mausolus*. The sources differed in antiquity as to whether Theodectas or the orator and historian Theopompus of Chios were victorious (in all likelihood there were two separate prizes for verse and prose entries).<sup>173</sup> Theodectas may have followed the precedent of Euripides' *Archelaus* in finding or inventing a mythical figure who shared his deceased patron's name.<sup>174</sup>

Theodectas was, like Ion before him, a foreign tragic poet who was not just active in Athens but elsewhere as well. He did, however, spend quite some time in Athens, eventually dying there. His tomb became a prominent landmark on the road to Eleusis.<sup>175</sup> He may have travelled to Athens originally to study rhetoric under the tutelage of Isocrates. Lacking independent means, unlike his rival Theopompus, both he and his teacher Isocrates were obliged to write speeches and take on students to support themselves.<sup>176</sup> Later it seems he turned to tragedy to provide his income.<sup>177</sup> It was presumably in Athens that he met Aristotle, although it is most unlikely that he was his pupil (his son, also called Theodectas, may have

---

<sup>172</sup> Gell. 10.18.5; *Suda* θ 138 and ι 653.

<sup>173</sup> Gell. 10.18.5; *Suda* θ 138; see Hornblower (1982) 332.

<sup>174</sup> Hornblower (1982) 335-6.

<sup>175</sup> Paus. 1.37.4; [Plut.] *X Orat.* 837c.

<sup>176</sup> Theopompus *FGrHist* 115 F 25.

<sup>177</sup> Θεοδέκτης ὁ Φασηλῖτης ὁ τὰς τραγωδίας ὕστερον γράψας, [Plut.] *X Orat.* 837c.

been).<sup>178</sup> Highly rhetorical speeches were in vogue among fourth century theatre audiences and the transition from orator to poet was probably a simple one.<sup>179</sup>

Despite the fact that he began his career as an orator, Theodectas was certainly an important figure at the Athenian dramatic festivals during the second quarter of the fourth century. If his name is restored to the list of victors at the Dionysia after Astydamas, he gained his first victory, out of a future total of seven, around 370.<sup>180</sup> The epitaph on his tomb noted that on eight occasions he won first prize out of thirteen competitions: a high success rate and one comparable to that of Aeschylus and Sophocles.<sup>181</sup> Though Theodectas was a prose writer of distinction, like Ion he saw himself primarily as a tragic poet and celebrated his achievements on the stage above all. Theodectas' epitaph may also echo the two written for Euripides and ascribed to Ion.<sup>182</sup> There though Euripides, the Athenian poet, has died in the neighbourhood of the Muses in Pieria and is their servant. Theodectas is on the opposite trajectory: a non-Athenian who finds, in death, a place in a different home of the Muses, Athens.

### c) Other Fourth Century Tragedians

---

<sup>178</sup> Cicero (*Orat.* 172) believed that Theodectas had studied with Aristotle and there is a story that Aristotle angered Isocrates by luring Theodectas away to his school (*arg.* Isoc. 13). However, Theodectas must have been at least the same age as Aristotle, if not considerably older if we assume that he won a tragic victory around 370 BC (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325.11). Plutarch (*Alex* 17.8) is probably suggesting that Alexander knew of Theodectas' work through Aristotle rather than that they were fellow pupils of Aristotle: οὐκ ἄχαριν ἀποδιδούς ἐν παιδιᾷ τιμὴν τῇ γενομένη δι' Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ὁμιλίᾳ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα (sc. Theodectas). See Webster (1954) 303.

<sup>179</sup> Arist. *Poet.* 6. 1450b 4-8. The influence of rhetoric is perhaps suggested by accounts of a debate in his *Ajax*: see Arist. *Rhet.* 1399b 28 and 1400a27, cf. 1416b12; Xanthakis-Karamanos (1979).

<sup>180</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325.11; see Millis and Olson (2012) 148-9.

<sup>181</sup> Steph. Byz. *Ethnica* 660 Meineke = *FGE* 1572-5.

<sup>182</sup> *Anth. Pal.* 7.43-4 = *FGE* 566-75.

Six other tragedians conclude this survey of the century and they can be dealt with briefly in passing. Two Sicilians attest to that island's continuing fascination with tragedy. A second Achaëus, this time from Syracuse, won a victory at the Lenaia in around 356.<sup>183</sup> Sosiphanes, also from Syracuse, whose career spanned the reigns of Philip and Alexander, is said to have written as many as seventy three plays and to have won seven victories.<sup>184</sup> His death in 313/2 is recorded by the Parian marble.<sup>185</sup> We have only a single fragment from his play *Meleager*.<sup>186</sup> A Patrocles is said to have come from Thurii in Italy, although another poet of the same name is recorded as an Athenian.<sup>187</sup> Thurii was an Athenian colony and if the two are the same man Patrocles may have been a first or second generation immigrant from Athens. Python of Catana or Byzantium may have produced a satyr play for Alexander, although it is unknown whether he performed at Athens on other occasions.<sup>188</sup>

Apollodorus of Tarsus is attested by the *Suda* and he may be the poet who won five victories at the Lenaia from around 380.<sup>189</sup> Another poet from Asia Minor, Phanostratus of Halicarnassus, was active at the end of the fourth and the start of the third century. He won a victory at Athens in 307.<sup>190</sup> His name has been restored to a list of *proxenoi* of the Delians from the start of the third century, indicating that he may have travelled widely.<sup>191</sup> He may have continued the tradition of performances in Asia Minor that is first attested to Theodectas. Little is known about any of these men. However, despite this it seems that they

---

<sup>183</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325.242; *Suda* α 4682; see Millis and Olson (2012) 206-7.

<sup>184</sup> *Suda* σ 863.

<sup>185</sup> *FGrHist* 239 B 15.

<sup>186</sup> Fr. 1 *TrGF*.

<sup>187</sup> *TrGF* I 57.

<sup>188</sup> Athen. 586d; 595d.

<sup>189</sup> *Suda* α 3406; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325.236.

<sup>190</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3073; cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2794.

<sup>191</sup> *IG* XI/4.528.

were all relatively successful in their own time, though none of them were to achieve the lasting fame of Theodectas or Athenian tragedians such as Astydamas.

## 5. Other Possibilities

A final category is that of individuals who were probably not tragic poets, but who are credited with writing tragedies. They are of two sorts. First, the lyric poets Arion, Simonides, Pindar and Mimnermus are alleged to have written tragedies.<sup>192</sup> This shows once again the close connection between tragedians and poets writing in other genres. Although it is unlikely that either Simonides or Pindar ever wrote a tragedy, the Greeks believed that it would have been perfectly possible and natural for them to have done so.

Second, sophists and philosophers are thought to have written tragedies. These include Hippias of Elis, Empedocles of Acragas and Heraclides Ponticus.<sup>193</sup> The case of Hippias of Elis, in particular, is most intriguing. In Plato we have our only, and yet fairly early source for Hippias' activities as a tragic poet. Socrates claims that Hippias visited Olympia and with various poems including tragedies. It is unlikely that Plato imagined that Hippias was intending to give a formal theatrical performance. Instead he had in mind a more informal recital. Hippias was nevertheless actively engaged in disseminating tragedy to an international audience. In this group we can also include the Cynics Diogenes of Sinope and Crates of Thebes.<sup>194</sup> The authorship of their works was questioned in antiquity and they were ascribed instead to Philiscus of Aegina. Philiscus was, like Theodectas, a student of Isocrates. Though non-Athenians, intellectuals living in Athens from all parts of Greece seem to have a

---

<sup>192</sup> See *TrGF* I 227, 246, 260, 263.

<sup>193</sup> Hippias: Pl. *Hipp. Min.* 368 b; Empedocles: *Suda* ε 1001, Diog. Laert. 8.57; Heraclides: Diog. Laert. 5.92

<sup>194</sup> Diog. Laert. 6.80; 6.97; see *TrGF* I 88 and 89.

detailed knowledge of tragedy. Once again we see the connection between other poets and tragedians and that between the wandering sage and the tragic poet.

## 6. Conclusion

The evidence concerning both Athenian and non-Athenian tragic poets is far from adequate. However, we have seen that non-Athenian poets start to appear early on in the history of tragic theatre. They continue to be a significant minority in the fourth century. It is impossible to know quite what proportion they made up of the tragedians in Athens. Taplin notes that over ten per cent of the ninety four fifth and fourth century poets listed in *TrGF* are foreign.<sup>195</sup> However, these are only the poets who are explicitly named as non-Athenians. There are a number of minor poets about whose nationalities our sources make no mention, especially when the only record is an inscription. If we exclude these and some uncertain cases such as Datis, Meletus and Patrocles, we have fifty five tragedians, of whom thirty four were certainly Athenian and twenty one (38%) non-Athenian. If we exclude the dubious cases (Neophron, Acestor, Python, Empedocles, Hippias, Diogenes, Crates and Heraclides) the figure is still as high as 27%. This included both genuinely successful poets, such as Ion and Theodectas, and those on the fringes of the theatrical world, such as Neophron. The same was true of Athenian poets, many of whom rarely appeared at the Dionysia and, if we believe the comic poets, were less than inspiring when they did. There was not a noticeable increase in the number of non-Athenian poets over time (nine in the fifth century to twelve in the fourth or five to eight). This suggests that the common notion that tragedy was exported abroad only at the end of the fifth century needs to be revised.

---

<sup>195</sup> Taplin (1999) 35.

There is no indication that a foreign tragic poet was ever seen as something particularly unusual in Athens or worthy of comment. Nor is there anything to suggest that non-Athenians saw tragedy as an alien or especially Athenian genre. Athenian and non-Athenian poets shared a common heritage and drew on the same myths and poetic traditions. Some non-Athenian poets were successful in Athens and were certainly judged capable of competing with honour against the likes of Sophocles and Euripides. Poets such as Ion and Theodectas were well-regarded both in their own time and in later periods. Pratinas may have even made a considerable contribution to the development of satyr drama. Other poets faded into obscurity despite obtaining choruses and winning victories.

A visit to Athens was, as Plato (*Lach.* 183a-b) makes clear, an essential step in advancing the career of the professional tragic poet. Athens was the most important centre for tragedy throughout antiquity, but not the only one. Nor was tragedy fundamentally or exclusively the property of Athenians. It is likely that any lyric poet experienced in directing large choruses could have easily employed knowledge and experience gained elsewhere to produce a winning tragedy at Athens. Other cities, such as Sicyon, had a long tradition of producing large scale choral works, some of which may have resembled tragic performances. Furthermore, as Bosher and others have argued, a distinctive theatrical culture had developed in the Greek West in parallel to Athenian drama.<sup>196</sup> Non-Athenian poets, therefore, did not need to be permanent residents at Athens or from states allied to Athens. Non-Athenian poets probably also produced tragedies outside Athens. We know that Theodectas certainly did so. Ion is likely to have written poetry specifically for a Spartan audience. Once again, the professional poet sees himself as a wanderer on a wide circuit.

---

<sup>196</sup> See Bosher (2012a).

## 6. Wandering Actors

### 1. Introduction

We have seen that poets were wanderers from an early period, travelling in search of both reputation and income. The tragic poets were no different. They too travelled, with the exception of Sophocles, and saw themselves as wandering professionals. We have now come to the final stage of this enquiry, which concerns the wandering actor. This chapter will look at the acting profession in detail to establish whether there is a connection between wandering poets and actors. Did actors behave in a similar way and what impact did they have on the dissemination of tragedy? It is known from inscriptions that the actors of the Hellenistic era were travellers, appearing in festivals across the Greek world.<sup>1</sup> Was the same true for the actors of the classical period?

An understanding of the acting profession may also help us to date the progress of tragedy's dissemination. The appearance of troupes of travelling players has been seen as one of the catalysts for the spread of tragedy.<sup>2</sup> Scholars have tended to date the emergence of professional actors to the late fifth or early fourth centuries. They emphasise the new and radical nature of this event, transforming theatre from a primarily Athenian and political ritual into mass entertainment, which could be sold to new audiences outside Attica. This idea has helped foster the belief that the dissemination of tragedy only occurred at a late stage in the development of drama. In this chapter, I will argue that the professional actor, in bringing tragedy to new and diverse audiences, was far from an innovator. Instead, he would continue

---

<sup>1</sup> Aneziri (2009) and pp. 257-9.

<sup>2</sup> See Dearden (1999) 225-6; 234; Csapo (2010a) 83-107; Taplin (2012) 237-8. Csapo (2004a) 54-6 sees the spread of theatre in the late fifth century as an important pre-condition for the development of the acting profession.

the tradition of performances outside Athens, which began at the start of the fifth century. Though the circuit on which he travelled might expand, the nature of this travel remained unchanged.

The idea that fourth century tragedy was a different entity from what it had been in the glory-days of the fifth is not new. Many have seen the fourth century as a period of decline, the early symptoms of which, it is believed, can be detected even in the last plays of Euripides.<sup>3</sup> The great masters of the art were dead; those who remained could do little more concentrate on new musical techniques, melodramatic plots and rhetorical effects to attract and excite audiences.<sup>4</sup> In recent years some have viewed this later period in a more positive light. Studies of fourth century and Hellenistic drama have demonstrated that there is evidence of substantial innovation and growth in this period.<sup>5</sup> Rather than showing any sign of decline, tragedy in fact became more popular and better known to Greeks outside Athens.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Nietzsche (1872) was perhaps the earliest and most influential proponent of the notion of the 'death of tragedy'. Kitto (1939) 401 claimed that tragedy 'came home to die' with Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* in 405; cf. Schwartz (1985) 185. Kolb (1979) 516-17; Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980) 3-5; and Kuch (1993) 547 argued that serious theatre declined as a result of Athens' defeat in the Peloponnesian War. Cf. Junker (2011) 147, who suggests that late fifth century vase painting provides a 'testimony to and symptom of a great change or even a crisis in Athenian theatre culture'. See also the studies assembled by Markantonatos and Zimmerman (2012). For recent discussions on the role of Euripides in this decline see e.g. Gregory (2005b) 252-6 and Gakopoulou (2012).

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Gentili (1979) 22 characterises later theatre as 'a theatre of entertainment, largely expressionist and concerned above all with musical *mimesis* . . . [and one which had] assumed forms and functions quite different from its original ones of the fifth century'. On rhetoric in fourth century tragedy see Xanthakis Karamanos (1979). *Contra*: Webster (1954) who denied that the fourth century was a period of decline, while admitting that fourth century drama was characterised by its derivative nature and interest in rhetoric.

<sup>5</sup> See Easterling (1993) and Le Guen (1995). A recent conference, entitled 'Death of drama or birth of an industry? The Greek theatre in the fourth century BC' and organised by Csapo and Wilson, was held on this subject in July 2011 in Sydney. A published volume is expected soon, which is likely to be critical of the notion of the 'death of drama'.

<sup>6</sup> Expansion: Easterling (1993) 563 and 569 who points to a 'new kind of cosmopolitan sensibility' in theatre as a factor for change; cf. Easterling (2002) 331, where she notes the 'development of a competitive market for touring performers' during the fourth century. Michelini (1999-2000) speaks of 'the fourth century's focus on



Yet it is still widely believed that tragedy, as it gained a larger following, was gradually separated from its original context, the Athenian Dionysia, and thus lost its early political essence. Kaimio, for instance, has claimed that ‘in the cultural environment which . . . developed [from the fourth century] the social function of theatre was naturally different from that found in the fifth-century city state of Athens.’<sup>7</sup>

The expansion and de-politicisation of tragedy is commonly linked to the growing importance of the acting profession with the emergence of international acting icons.<sup>8</sup> Due to the ready availability of tragic texts and the establishment of a theatrical repertoire, poets were no longer as indispensable as they once had been. Actors began to be recognised as artists in their own right, especially for the realistic outpourings of emotion with which they moved the crowds.<sup>9</sup> A supposed side effect of this development was that the actor was now free to travel to multiple venues, since all he now required to exploit this growing market for tragedy was a text, a small number of assistants and the other portable impedimenta of his trade. In the words of Hall: ‘tragedy [came] to be identified less with the poet than with the

---

private relations and Panhellenic masses’; cf. C–S 223-4 and Csapo (2010a) 103-4 who argues that opportunities for actors doubled at the end of the fifth century. Aneziri (2009) 217 argues that there was ‘an explosion in festival culture that took place at the beginning of the Hellenistic period’. On new festivals see Parker (2004). On theatre numbers see Frederikson (2002) 69-76.

<sup>7</sup> Kaimio (1999) 45; cf. Kuch (1993) 550: ‘fourth century tragedy had obviously more the intention to entertain . . . than promote self-understanding according to the standards of the fifth century *polis* democracy’. See Rhem (2007) 191-2 and Ceccarelli (2010) 146 on the supposed ‘death’ of theatre and the *polis*; *contra*: Le Guen (1995); (2001) II 9-11. Hall (2007b) 278 argues that tragedy became less ‘Athenocentric’ but not less political between 430 and 380 BC.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Wise (2008) 397 ‘the rise of the celebrity actor was accompanied by significant changes in the nature of tragic competition.’ International actors: see Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 136: ‘Au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle, on voit surgir une génération d’artistes dont l’activité rayonne bien au-delà des limites de l’Attique. Certains deviennent de véritables “vedettes” internationales.’ Cf. Easterling (2002) and Csapo (2010a) on acting ‘icons’.

<sup>9</sup> On realism see Caspo (2002). On emotive acting styles see Wise (2008) 404-5. Ancient sources (e.g. Pl. *Leg.* 800d-e; Xen. *Symp.* 3.11) indicate that actors took pride in their ability to make an audience cry.

actor who could carry his masks to every *polis* that could accommodate his performance'.<sup>10</sup>

This internationalisation and de-politicisation of tragedy, it is often believed, coincided with the new professionalism in the theatre and music in general.<sup>11</sup> According to this view, poets and actors were now more interested in pleasing a paying audience and gradually abandoned their former role as teachers of the *polis*.

Aristotle's *Poetics* is often cited as an example of this emerging trend. The work contains no affirmation of the central importance to tragedy of either Athens or democratic politics. This argument holds that Aristotle could not have been ignorant of such a defining characteristic of tragedy, unless tragedy had changed significantly by the fourth century.<sup>12</sup> Aristotle is thought to typify the new audience of tragedy: non-Athenian with no interest in democratic politics, believing instead in the primary importance of plot and aesthetic quality. And it is the professional actors who, according to Wise, are largely to blame for this change: causing Aristotle and his contemporaries to mistake 'a celebratory political art for a weepy and histrionic one.'<sup>13</sup>

In this final chapter we will question the extent to which the travelling actor was a new phenomenon. We will see that the lead actor of a travelling troupe assumed the role and the status of the poet, scarcely altering the essential nature of the circuit upon which poetic

---

<sup>10</sup> Hall (2007b) 284. Cf. Easterling (1999) 164-5, who also links the emergence of the acting profession with the expansion of theatre and increased reperformances in the fourth century. She nevertheless gives a more nuanced view than Hall, questioning whether 'actors [were not] merely the latest recruits in a tradition of travelling virtuosi [dating] back to the archaic period?'

<sup>11</sup> See Csapo (2004b); Wilson (2003a) 181-6, (2004); Power (2010) 475-535. Cf. Csapo (2004a) 68-9, who sees the development of the art of acting as part of this late trend towards further professionalism.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις οὐχ ἡ αὐτὴ ὀρθότης ἐστὶν τῆς πολιτικῆς καὶ τῆς ποιητικῆς οὐδὲ ἄλλης τέχνης καὶ ποιητικῆς, Arist. *Poet.* 1460b13-15. See Hall (1996b); Wise (2008); Griffith and Carter (2011) 5; Hanink (2011) 321-3. See also Deper (2007) 146-7 who argues that Aristotle dissociated tragedy from its origins in civic ritual. Heath (2009) 472-3, however, rightly questions Hall's assumption that tragedy was necessarily Athenian.

<sup>13</sup> Wise (2008) 384.

professionals had travelled for centuries. If so, this is further confirmation that the tragedy was being disseminated from the earliest period. Though the opportunities for poets and actors increased as tragedy became more popular, the theatre did not become any more or less Athenian. We should not be surprised then if Aristotle's *Poetics* or any other ancient source fails to mention Athens or Athenian politics.<sup>14</sup> Aristotle knew more about fifth century tragedians and their works than we do today. If he did not mention or notice a connection between tragedy and Athenian politics, it is unlikely that any Greek before him ever had. Instead, tragedy had grown out of the broader Hellenic 'song-culture', and in the process was gradually disseminated across all of Greece.

## **2. Signs of Continuity: The birth of the acting profession**

### **a) The fifth century: actors as employees of the poet**

Actors were essential to drama pretty much from the moment Thespis stepped out of the chorus line. Yet it is only in the second half of the fifth century that we find the earliest indications that actors had begun to assert a status similar to that of poets. In 449 a prize for actors was established alongside the award given to the victorious poet.<sup>15</sup> An actor called Heraclides, who was victor in 447, was both the first recipient of the prize in 449 and the first

---

<sup>14</sup> Heath (2009) 472-3 questions Hall's assumption that tragedy was necessarily Athenian. Hall (1996b) 298-9 cites *Pol.* 1276b4-7 and 1284b11-13 in an attempt to show that Aristotle was aware of an Athenian social context for the performances of tragedy. However, the passages she cites are comparisons made to illustrate a particular aspect of government. E.g. 1276b uses the notion that a chorus can change from a comic to a tragic chorus while still being made up of the same members, to show how a state can change government without altering it *in toto*. A chorus is only like a government in this one way; it does not follow that Aristotle understood a chorus to be political. Heath (2009) 469 argues that Aristotle means 'not that [tragedy and politics] are not connected but that they are not co-extensive'. Tragedy, like politics, dealt with ethics but it had its own sphere of competence.

<sup>15</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325 and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2318. See O'Connor (1908) 46-7; *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 104; C-S 226-7; Millis and Olson (2012) 13.

actor to be named on any surviving inscription.<sup>16</sup> In addition to the victors' lists, comedy furnishes us with some isolated details for this period.<sup>17</sup> Aristophanes in his *Wasps*, produced 422 BC, describes a son of an unknown Automenes as an actor (ὑποκριτὴν 1279) suggesting a permanent rather than a temporary occupation. The actor Mynniscus, who was well known in the second half of the fifth century, was mocked by Plato Comicus, suggesting that there were at least a few actors prominent enough to merit such abuse.<sup>18</sup> However, though his satire of tragic poets is superbly detailed, Aristophanes makes only a few references to actors. There is little or no discussion of acting style or of the qualities of individual performers. The debate on poetry in the *Frogs* centres entirely upon the poets, suggesting that even by 405 actors remained the junior members of the overall performance troupe.

Where we do find discussions of early actors and their styles of acting, it seems that they were judged by the standards which audiences applied to poets. This is perhaps suggested by an anecdote recorded by Aristotle, in which Mynniscus, Aeschylus' second actor, called his younger contemporary Callipides a monkey.<sup>19</sup> These two actors, who were both active in the final quarter of the fifth century, were among the earliest actors we know of to have attained a 'celebrity' status similar to that of a successful poet.<sup>20</sup> The Greeks thought

<sup>16</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2318.70 and 2325.22; Stephanis 1074.

<sup>17</sup> ὑποκριτής, *Ar. Vesp.* 1279; τραγῳδός, *Thesm.* 391; see also the use of the term in *Wasps* 1498, 1505 describing the sons of Carcinus who were probably actors in their father's troupe (ὑποκριτὰ ὀξυφωνότατοι, Σ Tzetz. *Ar. Nub.* 1261 (Holwerda p. 663)). On the terminology for actors see O'Connor (1908) 1-37; Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 115-25 and *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 127-36. Aristophanes referred to some known individual actors: e.g. Hagelochos who mispronounced Eur. *Or.* 269; cf. Σ *Ar. Ran.* 303 (Holwerda pp. 50-1). Σ *Nub.* 1267 (Holwerda p. 176-7) suggests that a Tlempolemus may have been an actor. Cleidemedes, mentioned in *Frogs*, may have been one of Sophocles' actors (Σ *Ran.* 791 Holwerda p. 104-5); see C-S 226.

<sup>18</sup> Fr. 175 K-A; Stephanis 1757; see p.244 n.20.

<sup>19</sup> ὥς λίαν γὰρ ὑπερβάλλοντα πίθηκον ὁ Μυννίσκος τὸν Καλλιπιδὴν ἐκάλει, *Arist. Poet.* 1416b34-5.

<sup>20</sup> A Mynniscus was hired by Aeschylus according to the *Vita* (15) and there is no reason to believe he is not the same actor as the one mentioned by Aristotle. Mynniscus appears third in the list of victorious actors at the Dionysia (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325.24), suggesting that he won the prize in the 440s. Mynniscus could easily then have been

of the monkey, or Barbary ape, as an inherently amusing animal because of its ugly form and mischievous nature.<sup>21</sup> Mynniscus is commenting on Callippides' style and suggesting that the younger actor's exaggerated performances are more bathetic than tragic. However, as Csapo has shown, Mynniscus calls Callippides this not because he uses excessive gesture, but because he acts too much (λίαν γὰρ ὑπερβάλλοντα) and too accurately: he shows things as they are not how they should be.<sup>22</sup> The general picture is that Callippides specialised in melodramatic roles and parts involving a certain tasteless realism: leading to the unwelcome claim that he acted like an ape.

Similar criticisms were levelled against the younger generation of poets, Euripides first among them. Aristophanes has his Aeschylus criticise Euripides for bringing lewd and common characters onto the stage: what Euripides himself calls 'homely matters' (οἰκεῖα πράγματα *Ran.* 959). Euripides implies that his portrayal is realistic, against Aeschylus' assertion that the poet should not represent anything ignoble, whether it is true to life or not.<sup>23</sup> The younger actors are thus characterised in the same way as the second generation of poets. It is not surprising then that it is Mynniscus, Aeschylus' actor, who dubs Callippides the ape.

---

a young man in 458, whose career continued after Aeschylus' death. He was successful again in 422 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2318.119), a period at which Callippides must also have been active, by which time Mynniscus was probably around sixty years old and at the end of his career. Callippides won a victory at the Lenaia in 418 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2319.82) and, if his name has been correctly restored to the victors' list (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325.252), this was only one of five victories and possibly not the first. Xenophon cites him as an accomplished performer in his *Symposium* (3.11), which is set in around the same period. For further references and analysis see O'Connor (1908) 107-9 no. 279 and 117-18 no. 351; Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 142-4; Kaimio (1999) 51-2; Stephanis 1348, 1757; Millis and Olson (2012) 154.

<sup>21</sup> On the naturally comical appearance of the monkey see Athen. 613d. On the monkey in comedy see McDermott (1935) 170-4; Lilja (1980) and Finglass (2012c).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1462a 9-10; cf. Ar. fr. 490 K-A, where Callippides was mocked for sitting in the dirt, possibly in the part of Telephus or Odysseus; see Csapo (2002) 128-31 = (2010a) 119-20.

<sup>23</sup> μὰ Δί', ἀλλ' ὄντ' ἀλλ' ἀποκρύπτειν χρὴ τὸ πονηρὸν τὸν γε ποιητήν, 1053. Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1404b22-5; *Poet.* 1460b34.

Mynniscus is given the same grandeur and perhaps pomposity as his employer Aeschylus in the *Frogs*.

The iconographic evidence for the fifth century is not much better. Performers posing with masks before or after their appearance on stage were a popular subject. However, Csapo has argued that most, if not all, of these early depictions represent chorus-members rather than actors.<sup>24</sup> The marble ‘Actors’ relief<sup>25</sup> from the Piraeus, which is dated to around 410, is perhaps the best example.<sup>25</sup> A troupe of three men, in identical female dress and either wearing or carrying masks, appear reverently before a couch on which a maenad and a man are seated. The number of the devotees prompted Slater to conclude that these were a troupe of actors approaching a benefactor.<sup>26</sup> However, Csapo notes the tympana and the identical costume of the men to support his assertion that these are in fact chorus members.<sup>27</sup> He also notes the similarities between this relief and other choregic dedications, which can depict entire choruses before a reclining Dionysus.<sup>28</sup> It is probable that the three men, far from being an acting troupe, merely stand for a victorious chorus and that the seated figure, rather than being a theatrical angel, is instead the god of theatre himself.

---

<sup>24</sup> See Csapo (2010a) 14-20; Csapo (2010b) 80-95.

<sup>25</sup> Athens NM 1500.

<sup>26</sup> Slater (1985) 333-40 and especially 339. Cf. Froning (2002) 77, who prefers to see the relief as the private dedication of an acting family to Dionysus. The maenad suggests that the seated figure is Dionysus. Comparison with other choregic dedications makes this identification almost certain. E.g. Cagliari 10918 is a dedication to Dionysus of c.360 BC, which originally featured a reclining Dionysus and seated female figure holding a tragic mask. See Webster (1963) 33; Csapo (2010b) 90-1. A similar arrangement is present on the Pronomos Vase, where a seated woman is depicted next to Dionysus and Ariadne. She has been identified as tragedy personified: Hall (2007a) 223-37; (2007b) 266-7; cf. Griffith (2010) 60 who favours Aphrodite.

<sup>27</sup> Csapo (2010a) 22.

<sup>28</sup> An Attic relief from Corope (Athens NM S2098), dated to the late fourth century, shows a group of sixteen men, perhaps a chorus and *choregos*, in the presence of a giant divinity, probably Dionysus. Another dedication from Icarion (Athens NM 3078) appears to depict a group of fourteen or fifteen choreuts. See Csapo (2010b) 86-9.

On the Pronomos Vase, which is dated to around 400 BC, we have another ‘adoration scene’, similar to the Piraeus ‘Actors’ Relief’. A chorus of satyrs celebrate their victory in the presence of the seated Dionysus. On this vase we also have perhaps our earliest certain depictions of actors: one is dressed as Heracles and another as Silenus, standing together to the right of the couch of Dionysus. A third may be standing with a mask to the left. These figures, however, are not named, except with the names of the characters they play.<sup>29</sup> Yet they are certainly actors and not the actual mythological heroes because they are holding their masks in their hands. By contrast the chorus members, the poet (an otherwise unknown Demetrius) and the aulos-player (the famous Pronomos) are all given their own individual names.

This suggests that even in the late fifth century, after the introduction of the actors’ prize, actors were not yet celebrated as stars in their own right. Instead, it is the poets who are named and who bear the greatest responsibility for the success or failure of a tragic performance. The same pattern is found in fifth century choregic inscriptions where the poet and sometimes even the chorus members are named, without any mention of the actors.<sup>30</sup> Even aulos-players attracted more attention than actors, perhaps because they were independent from the direct control of the poet. The hyporchema of Pratinas indicates that, by the early fifth century, this class of performer was no longer prepared to merely be a ‘servant’ to the poet and his chorus.<sup>31</sup> Fifth century actors, however, are not singled out in the same way, either in choregic inscriptions or art.

Why were fifth century actors placed in a secondary position to poets and even aulos-players and choreuts? The answer lies in the fact that actors were at first merely the

---

<sup>29</sup> Csapo (2010a) 21.

<sup>30</sup> A list of chorus members is given by *IG I<sup>3</sup> 969*, an inscription probably commemorating a victory at the rural Dionysia; see Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 119-21; *DFA<sup>2</sup>* 361; Wilson (2000) 131-3; Csapo (2004a) 60.

<sup>31</sup> ὁ δ’ αὐλὸς / ὕστερον χορευέτω· καὶ γὰρ ἔσθ’ ὑπηρέτας. fr. 708.6-7 *PMG*; cf. [Plut.] de Mus. 1141d.

employees of poets. Plato claims that poets expelled from the ideal city will go elsewhere, hiring actors to perform their poetry.<sup>32</sup> The third century BC scholar Ister held that Sophocles had written his parts especially for his actors, suggesting that actors could have long-standing contracts with particular poets.<sup>33</sup> Sophocles and Euripides (as well as Aeschylus) were thought to have had actors in their personal employ and their names in some cases have survived.<sup>34</sup> Actors were not the responsibility of the *archon* but that of the poet. Ancient authors refer to poets being given or refused a chorus but not actors.<sup>35</sup> The poet headed the ancient acting troupe and the actors merely spoke for him. Even though it was the actors who appeared on stage, the poet was the only named individual and the public face of the theatrical team. Indeed, early actors were almost extensions of the poet.

That this was so is easily comprehensible when we remember that poets had always been performers by trade and were originally the lead performers in the troupes.<sup>36</sup> Even a poet such as Pindar, who claims to send texts of his works abroad and whose odes were probably sung by a chorus, envisages himself as the performer even when he is physically absent. Tragic poets could be visible figures on certain occasions, such as the *proagon*, at which the various play-wrights, accompanied by their actors, announced their forthcoming plays in the Odeon.<sup>37</sup> Socrates vividly recalls the moment in the proagon of the Lenaia at which the poet Agathon appeared in public with his actors before the assembled audience.<sup>38</sup> The tragic poet was not merely a literary figure and on occasions a clear distinction between

---

<sup>32</sup> καλὰς φωνὰς καὶ μεγάλας καὶ πιθανὰς μισθωσάμενοι, *Resp.* 568c.

<sup>33</sup> *Vit. Soph.* 6 = *FGrHist* 334 F 36.

<sup>34</sup> On Sophocles see n. 2. Thomas Magister (= *Vit. Eur.* III.12) describes Ctesiphon as his actor. Elsewhere he is thought of as his servant. See Kovacs (1990), who thinks it most plausible that he was an actor, for a discussion of the *testimonia*.

<sup>35</sup> E.g. Ar. fr. 56.27 K–A, Cratinus fr. 17 K–A; Pl. *Resp.* 383d, *Leg.* 817d; Arist. *Poet.* 1449b.

<sup>36</sup> On the links between early poetry and acting see Herington (1985) 10–39.

<sup>37</sup> See Aeschin. 3.66–8 with scholia; *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 67–8.

<sup>38</sup> Pl. *Symp.* 194b.



writer and player was lacking.<sup>39</sup> Both imitate imaginary characters and their emotions. Plato describes poets as those who are trained to impersonate many characters.<sup>40</sup> Dramatic poets would attempt methods similar to emotion-memory or method acting to get them into character for writing particular parts. In comedy the poet Agathon dresses as a woman for just such a reason, a comic exaggeration of a method of composition recommended by Aristotle.<sup>41</sup>

Moreover, the first actors seem to have been poets. Thespis is supposed to have invented tragedy by responding to the chorus in his own works, allegedly to give the chorus a breather.<sup>42</sup> Not only has he given his name to the acting profession, but Plutarch claims Solon saw him perform.<sup>43</sup> Yet he is more usually called a poet and the *Suda* lists the titles of his plays. Aristotle claims that the first poets acted (Arist. *Rhet.* 1403b23) and the first poet we are told who gave up the stage was Sophocles (*Vit. Soph.* 4). A poet was not merely the author of the script; he was also the lead performer.

Aristotle claims that it was the poets who were responsible for hiring additional actors as the genre developed:

καὶ τό τε τῶν ὑποκριτῶν πλῆθος ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς δύο πρῶτος Αἰσχύλος ἤγαγε καὶ τὰ τοῦ χοροῦ ἡλάττωσε καὶ τὸν λόγον πρωταγωνιστεῖν παρεσκεύασεν· τρεῖς δὲ καὶ σκηνογραφίαν Σοφοκλῆς.

(*Poet.* 1449a 15-19)

---

<sup>39</sup> See Sifakis (2002) 161-2 on the close connection between tragic writing and delivery.

<sup>40</sup> δυνάμενον ὑπὸ σοφίας παντοδαπὸν γίγνεσθαι καὶ μιμεῖσθαι πάντα χρήματα *Resp.* 398.

<sup>41</sup> Ar. *Thesm.* 148-51; cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1455a; on Agathon's methods of composition in Aristophanes see Sommerstein (1994) 168.

<sup>42</sup> *Suda* θ 282; Diog. Laert. 3.56.

<sup>43</sup> Plut. *Sol.* 29; this is very unlikely given the date of Solon's archonship in 594/3.

It is uncertain whether they were being hired to second the poet in the acting. If the biographical tradition is right that Sophocles was the last poet to act then Aeschylus was hiring a second actor to assist him in his performance. The life of Aeschylus gives us the names of the actors hired by Aeschylus:

ἐχρήσατο δὲ ὑποκριτῇ πρώτῳ μὲν Κλεάνδρῳ, ἔπειτα δὲ τὸν δεύτερον αὐτῷ  
προσῆψε Μυωνίσκον τὸν Χαλδικέα.

(*Vit. Aesch.* 15)

It has been suggested that these men with the addition of Aeschylus formed the three man cast of the *Oresteia*.<sup>44</sup> However the *Vita* also claims that Aeschylus may have invented a third actor which would exclude Aeschylus from acting.<sup>45</sup> Even if we cannot be certain whether Aeschylus combined his role as a poet with acting, we can see that by the mid fifth century the acting troupe of two to three actors had developed with the poet at his head.

Troupes could also be organised along family lines with the father of the family employing his sons as actors. The clearest example is the case of the sons of Carcinus, who seem to have been employed by their father to perform in his plays. They appear on stage with Carcinus as tragic dancers at the end of Aristophanes' *Wasps* (1497-1537), performed in 422. Carcinus' most famous son was Xenocles, who had some success as a tragic poet, defeating Euripides in 415 BC (Ael. *VH* 2.8). He is not mentioned by name in comedy until after his victory.<sup>46</sup> Xenocles was probably only in the junior position of actor in his father's

---

<sup>44</sup> Else (1945) 7.

<sup>45</sup> Else (1945) claims that by ὑποκριτής Aristotle means an actor in addition to the poet/actor, which he terms τραγωδός, making Aeschylus the first to introduce three people on the stage. Pickard-Cambridge (*DFA*<sup>2</sup> 132-3) argued that this is unlikely, especially as Aristotle's aim here is to sketch the key formative stages of tragedy, the first of which (the one introduced by Aeschylus) is the use of two people in addition to the chorus to provide dialogue.

<sup>46</sup> *Thesm.* (441) dated to around 411 BC and *Ran.* (86) of 405 BC.

troupe until he set himself up as an independent poet in around 415.<sup>47</sup> There may have been other similar cases. Opinions were divided in antiquity over whether the Cleidemedes mentioned in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (791) was Sophocles' son or his actor.<sup>48</sup> Euripides' son Mnesilochus was an actor, although we do not know whether he performed in any of his father's plays.<sup>49</sup> Sutton even suggests that the sons of Aeschylus, Euphorion and Euaeon, may have been actors.<sup>50</sup> Sons frequently opened their careers by producing the works of their fathers.<sup>51</sup> It is possible that they also learned their trade as actors before graduating to the position of poet.

#### **b) Actors as *technitai*: The development of the acting profession**

Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1403b) claims that the separate art of acting was only appreciated at a fairly late stage. It was at this point that actors ceased to be the junior employees of the poets and became artists on an equal footing. This process, however, was a gradual one.<sup>52</sup> We have seen that, although an actors' prize had been offered at the Dionysia from as early as 449, actors remained junior members of the poetic profession throughout the second half of the fifth century. Where actors are mentioned, they are viewed almost as an extension of the poet, representing his employer as a member of his troupe. The poet headed the bill and in some

---

<sup>47</sup> See Stewart (forthcoming). Ar. *Pax* 775-80 and 795-6 present Carcinus as a poet working with his sons. This is partly confirmed by Σ Ar. *Pac.* 789d-e (Holwerda p. 123). For the traditional view that Ar. *Vesp.* 1511 refers to Xenocles see Σ Ar. *Vesp.* 1502c and 1509 (Holwerda pp.233-4); MacDowell (1971) 329. Rothwell (1994) argues that Carcinus was a comic rather than a tragic poet, but this is refuted by Olson (1997).

<sup>48</sup> Σ *Ran.* 791 (Holwerda p. 104-5); see O'Connor (1908) 111, no. 295; Sutton (1987) 15.

<sup>49</sup> *Vit. Eur.* Ia 8; see Sutton (1987) 17.

<sup>50</sup> Sutton (1987) 12.

<sup>51</sup> Euphorion produced the plays of Aeschylus (*Suda* ε 3800), as did Aristias with those of Pratinas (*P.Oxy.* 2256 fr. 2) and Iophon with those of Sophocles (*Suda* ι 451; Σ Ar. *Ran.* 78 Holwerda p.15). The younger Euripides put on a performance of the *Bacchae* and its attendant plays after his father's death (Σ *Ran* 67 Holwerda p. 14).

<sup>52</sup> See Slater (1990) 394-5.

cases performed himself. We will see that this arrangement would not change, except in one respect. By the fourth century, the poet, as he became increasingly less likely to perform, was gradually separated from the troupe itself. The tragic protagonist would then take on the role that the poet had up until then been discharging, that of the star performer.

There were probably two reasons for this. First, as a corpus of tragic dramas developed over time, and as scripts became more readily available, the poet became less indispensable to the troupe. Second, and perhaps more importantly, acting became an art (*techne*) worthy of recognition. Actors were now artists on an equal footing. The entry in the *Didascaliae* for 341 BC shows that by this time acting troupes were no longer intimately connected with one poet.<sup>53</sup> Instead each poet had a different protagonist for each of his plays. At some stage the *archon* at Athens must have become responsible for actors as well as choruses. The Byzantine lexicographers suggest that actors were assigned to poets by lot.<sup>54</sup> Leading actors were now competing for themselves as well as for their poets. However, again it is likely that this process of change was a gradual one and it is unlikely that this practise was universal or that it was introduced at Athens much before 350. Plato, writing in the fourth century, can envisage poets applying to the archons for a chorus but setting up stages and bringing in the actors themselves.<sup>55</sup>

The new art of the actor was principally that of delivery (ὑπόκρισις). The proper and effective use of one's voice, once but one of the skills required for a successful poet, was now a skill worthy of study all on its own and prized equally by rhapsode, actor and orator.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2320.20-9; cf. Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 36-8; *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 93-4; C-S 228-9; Millis and Olson (2012) 62.

<sup>54</sup> Photius 293. 24-7 = Hesychius ν 286 = *Suda* ν 178.

<sup>55</sup> σκηνὰς τε πῆξαντας κατ' ἀγορὰν καὶ καλλιφώνους ὑποκριτὰς εἰσαγαγομένους, Pl. *Leg.* 817c; cf. *Resp.* 568c.

<sup>56</sup> See Sifakis (2002) 160-1.

Actors were viewed as experts at elocution and may have even been hired to coach orators.<sup>57</sup>

This development is attested by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1403b20-1404a), who claims that delivery was originally a lesser poetic concern and that the first orators, such as Gorgias, made their speeches as poetic as possible following their example. But he adds that although delivery began with the poets, it was only fully developed later with the emergence of those men, the rhapsodes and actors, who made its study their principal business (1404a 20-5). In fact he can claim, somewhat paradoxically, that delivery only made its appearance late in the day in tragedy (καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὴν τραγικὴν καὶ ῥαψωδίαν ὁψὲ παρῆλθεν 1403b 22). Hence, his claim that it was the poets who first acted.

Although delivery was practiced by poets and had its beginning with poetry, these men were not specialists nor was delivery an art (*techne*) in its early stages. It is tragedy as a whole and not delivery on its own that is described as a *techne* by Aristophanes at the end of the fifth century (*Ran.* 761) the main representative of which was the poet.<sup>58</sup> It was the growing appreciation of delivery by the audiences of Aristotle's day who, he says, made the actor rather than the poet the star performer of the day (μειζον δύνανται νῦν τῶν ποιητῶν οἱ ὑποκριταί 1403b 33). They were now artists numbered among men possessed of poetic *techne* (delivery), termed *technitai* in the guilds of Dionysus that would start to emerge in the third century.

As a result, during the late fifth and early fourth centuries, audiences began to pay more attention to actors, some of whom would gain an iconic status that would rival that of the most successful poets.<sup>59</sup> We can chart this development in the iconography: by the mid

---

<sup>57</sup> Plut. *Dem.* 7; [Plut.] *X. Orat.* 844f, 845a; Anon. *Rhet.* 6; [Plut.] *X. Orat.* 848b.

<sup>58</sup> Lightfoot (2002) 209.

<sup>59</sup> See Easterling (1999) 164-6; (2002) and (2004).

fourth century definite depictions of individual actors become more common.<sup>60</sup> The best example of such an image is a fragment of an Apulian vase from around 340 BC, which depicts a man in high boots and with a cloak and sword considering a mask of an older and bearded character.<sup>61</sup> The costume and props, together with the fact that this figure is depicted on his own, mark him out as an actor. The names of actors from this period also begin to appear alongside those of the poets in literary sources. Plutarch sets late fifth or fourth century actors next to poets in accompanying a personified tragedy:

τραγικοὶ δ' αὐτοῖς (i.e. Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides) ὑποκριταὶ καὶ  
 Νικόστρατοι καὶ Καλλιππίδαι καὶ Μηνίσκοι καὶ Θεόδωροι καὶ Πῶλοι  
 συνίτωσαν, ὥσπερ γυναικὸς πολυτελοῦς τῆς τραγωδίας κομμωταὶ καὶ  
 διφροφόροι.

(*de Gloria Ath.* 348e)

By Plutarch's day a clutch of famous names had developed who were canonised as the great actors next to the three great tragedians. To later writers these names were akin to Garrick or Irvine, Terry or Bernhardt : acting legends that defined for later generations the stage of their day.

The protagonist gradually adopted the position of troupe leader, which the poet had, until then, assumed. Aeschines seems to have served under a number of different protagonists, including the great Theodorus and Aristodemus.<sup>62</sup> While Demosthenes alleges that, while employed as an actor, Aeschines lived at the expense of the choragic system (2. 199), he also claims that he hired himself out to a troupe of actors (μισθώσας σαυτὸν τοῖς

<sup>60</sup> See Green (2002) 99-102. This is also true of comedy, where figurines of actors are common from the end of the fifth century: see Green (1994) 34-5.

<sup>61</sup> Würzburg H4600 (L832) = *MTS*<sup>2</sup> GV3 p.80; Small (2003) 60-1; Csapo (2010a) 75-6.

<sup>62</sup> Dem. 19. 246; cf. Demochares FGrHist 75 F 6a = *Vit. Aeschin.* 7; Stephanis 90; 332; 1157.

βαρυστόνοις ἐπικαλουμένοις ἐκείνοις ὑποκριταῖς Σιμύκῃ καὶ Σωκράτει 18. 262). The protagonist may have supported his followers out of what the *choregos* provided him and a similar arrangement may have been followed when a poet was included in the troupe.

Previously productions of tragedy had almost been treated as the performance of the poet alone, even though it was his assistants, the actors, who in fact were seen on stage. Now, as the protagonist took on some of the roles previously discharged by the poet, the performance of the entire acting troupe was similarly treated as the performance of the lead actor alone.<sup>63</sup> After 449 it was the protagonist alone who claimed the victory in the acting contest, regardless of the contributions made by the other actors. Because actors wore masks and changed parts frequently it was difficult to differentiate between the protagonist and his two seconds. Modern scholars have often been unnecessarily troubled by the notion that audiences were unable to recognise their favourite stars.<sup>64</sup> To a certain extent it must have been clear from the parts each actor played: protagonists preferring tragic heroes and heroines. The third actor, by contrast, usually took the parts of tyrants.<sup>65</sup> But in a play such as Sophocles' *Antigone* it is a moot point as to whether Antigone or the tyrant Creon is the more tragic or interesting a role.

It has also been suggested that audiences were capable of recognising their favourite actor's voice.<sup>66</sup> According to this view our texts preserve evidence of the skilful distribution of parts to utilise the particular voice or that actors were given parts with similar characters, though vastly different in age or sex. However, this theory falls down with a play such as the

---

<sup>63</sup> See Sifakis (1995) 16: 'the protagonist was recognised as the only player of a tragedy, as if he alone *acted the play* [his emphasis] while the other two actors, necessary though they were for the production of a play, assisted and (literally as well as metaphorically) worked for him.'

<sup>64</sup> E.g. Damen (1989) 318.

<sup>65</sup> Dem. 18.247; Plut. *Lys.* 23.4.

<sup>66</sup> Pavlovskis (1977) and Damen (1989); *contra* Csapo (2002) 136-7 = (2010a) 126-7. On the importance of the actor's voice see Easterling (1999); Sifakis (2002).

*Trachiniae*, where the actor who was expected to play the timid Deianeira had then the part of the monstrous Heracles. The *Oedipus at Colonus* may have required two actors to play the one part of Theseus, and if so, the actors would have probably tried to hide the change.<sup>67</sup> In fact versatility was required absolutely of any actor, and it is for this quality that Plutarch claims Polus was to be especially praised (*de amicit.* 7). Aristotle praises the actor Theodorus specifically for the realism of his voice.<sup>68</sup> The mimetic ability of the actor was what chiefly distinguished him from the chorus.<sup>69</sup> Furthermore, the actor would become an easy simile for someone who deceives others or makes a pretence at being something he is not.<sup>70</sup> Actors would have tried as much as possible to conceal their natural voice.

It is more likely that audiences were only aware of the particular contribution of the lead actor part of the time, if at all: hence the great importance of the lead actor or poet who topped the bill. Ancient audiences seem to have understood the performance of the entire troupe as the performance of the leading performer. This explains why the actor Theodorus never let any other actor go on stage before him:

οὐθενὶ γὰρ πώποτε παρήκεν ἑαυτοῦ προεισάγειν, οὐδὲ τῶν εὐτελῶν  
ὑποκριτῶν, ὥς οἰκειομένων τῶν θεατῶν ταῖς πρώταις ἀκοαῖς·

(Arist. *Pol.* 1336b28-31)

The most important thing was for the audience to hear the voice of the protagonist first because the audience would automatically associate this voice with the name of the lead actor. The other actors were required to enhance the main performance, nothing more. This

<sup>67</sup> On the distribution of actors see Ceadel (1941a); *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 138-48; Marshall (2003) 257.

<sup>68</sup> *Rhet.* 1404 b 22-3; cf. Plut. *quomodo adul.* 18c. For examples of mimicry of female voices see Ar. *Thesm.* 267 and *Eccl.* 149.

<sup>69</sup> [Arist.] *Prob.* 918b.

<sup>70</sup> E.g. Xen. *Mem.* 2.2.9; Arist. *E N* 1147a23; Plut. *Demetr.* 34, *De Gloria Ath.* 345e; Diog. Laert. 7.160; Lucian *Apologia* 5, *Necyom.* 16; Basilius Caesariensis 1.31.165.



further explains why the poets were unwilling to expand the acting troupes to a greater number than three.<sup>71</sup> Had they done so, the lead performer might have been completely lost in the expanded cast. While in the past tragedies were thought of as performances by the poet and his anonymous assistants, now the name and face of the troupe was that of the protagonist.

The growing importance of the actor was a major development. By the fourth century we can be certain that actors and poets had developed into two separate professions, where once it was difficult to differentiate them. It was, however, not a radical change, and it cannot by itself explain the dissemination of tragedy. The lead actor merely took on the role and responsibilities of the poet. If actors were travellers and international icons in the fourth century, as has been supposed, it is likely that they were already travelling in the fifth, and in the company of their employers, the poets.

### **3. Wandering Players: Aspects of the Acting Profession**

#### **a) Travel**

Actors began to be seen as equals in an expanded poetic industry, and, moreover, one that was peripatetic from the beginning. One of the first actors ever recorded on the Athenian stage was a foreigner, Mynniscus of Chalcis, and he was not the last. Polus was said to be from Aegina while his mentor, Archias, was from Thurii.<sup>72</sup> Another famous fourth century actor was Aristodemus who was said to have been from Metapontum originally, although if this is the same actor as the one on the embassy to Philip in 346 he may have been granted

---

<sup>71</sup> Sifakis (1995); cf. C–S 222. Other suggested reasons include the expense of additional actors or the shortage of trained performers. See Knox (1972) 105–6 = (1979) 39–40.

<sup>72</sup> Plut. *Dem.* 1, 28; O'Connor (1908) 86–7 no. 87; 128–30 no. 421; Stephanis 439; 2187.

Athenian citizenship before then.<sup>73</sup> Neoptolemus of Scyros was another non-Athenian actor of this period both active in Athens and Macedonia.<sup>74</sup> Many of the actors known from inscriptions to have appeared in Athens at the beginning of the third century were also non-Athenian.<sup>75</sup> One, the comic actor Cephisius of Histiaia, performed in Athens in 284 BC and then in Delos in 282.<sup>76</sup> A tragic actor Heraclitus of Argos, who performed in Delphi, was also a victor at the Lenaia in 260/59, while another named Alexander, who won a victory at the Lenaia, also appeared at both Delphi and Delos in the first half of the third century.<sup>77</sup>

Kaimio has supposed that actors in Athens, at least in the fifth century, must have either been citizens or metics, since ‘it was impossible to learn the necessary skills elsewhere than in Athens.’<sup>78</sup> This assumption is unjustified: most of the non-citizen poets appearing in Athens were not metics. Could they have hired or trained actors from their own cities? Furthermore, if actors were originally in the direct employ of poets, it is likely that they travelled with their poets. The acting troupe formed a compact and self-sufficient unit, capable of travelling long distances between the various festivals at which it would compete.

By the fourth century actors were travelling independently within a network of festivals. We know that at this time numerous cities were issuing contracts to actors in advance, with fines agreed to compensate for their non-appearance. When the actor Aristodemus was appointed to Philocrates’ embassy to Philip in 346, messengers were sent to persuade the cities that had hired Aristodemus to waive the fines incurred for failing to

---

<sup>73</sup> Σ Aeschin. 2.15 (p.59 Dilts); O’Connor (1908) 82; MacDowell (2000) 210; Stephanis 332.

<sup>74</sup> See Dem. 5.6 with scholia; O’Connor (1908) 119-20.

<sup>75</sup> See Aneziri (2003) 440-2.

<sup>76</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2319.64, XI/2 106.17; see Sifakis (1967) 148; Stephanis 1392.

<sup>77</sup> Heraclitus: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325.304; Sifakis (1967) 157; Stephanis 1098; Alexander: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325.305, *IG* XI/2 112.18-20. See Sifakis (1967) 150 and 164; Stephanis 112.

<sup>78</sup> Kaimio (1999) 51.

honour his contract.<sup>79</sup> The fine consisted of double the original deposit given to Aristodemus to secure his performance.<sup>80</sup> The number of cities is not given, but we can see that Aristodemus originally intended to tour through several in the course of only one year. As one of the cities on the circuit, Athens was not immune from such problems and imposed its own fines. Athenodorus was fined by the Athenians for failing to appear at the Dionysia, when he performed for Alexander in Phoenicia in 331.<sup>81</sup> Dramatic festivals were big business, widespread and carefully organised.

Macedonia had emerged as a major destination for performing artists during the reign of Archelaus, with the establishment of the festival of Olympia at Dion.<sup>82</sup> After the capture of Olynthus in 348, we are told by Demosthenes that Philip sought out artists to perform at the Olympia (εἰς δὲ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὴν πανήγυριν πάντας τοὺς τεχνίτας συνήγαγεν, Dem. 19.192.5-6). This is the earliest use of the word *technitae* to refer to actors and other poetic professionals. Neoptolemus would settle in Macedonia.<sup>83</sup> The actor Theodorus was thought to have performed for Alexander of Pherae, although the sources for this anecdote are late and the details confused.<sup>84</sup> Corinth may have been another possible destination for actors. We know of artists who spent prolonged periods of time there, such as the actor Hipparchus and the poet Xenocleides who availed themselves of the courtesan Neaera's services during their stay.<sup>85</sup> Another was the actor Thessalus, who was brought in chains from Corinth to Macedonia after helping the young Alexander foil an attempt to marry

---

<sup>79</sup> Aeschin. 2.19.4-5.

<sup>80</sup> Σ Aeschin. 2.19 (p.60 Dilts).

<sup>81</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 29.

<sup>82</sup> DS 17.4; Arr. *Anab.* 1.11.1.

<sup>83</sup> Dem. 5.8; DS 16.92.3; Stob. 4.34.70; Stephanis 1797.

<sup>84</sup> Ael. *VH* 14.40; cf. Plut. *Pelop.* 29; *de Alex. magn. fort.* 334a.

<sup>85</sup> [Dem.] *in Neaeram* 26.

off his brother to the daughter of a Carian satrap.<sup>86</sup> The existence of a theatre at Corinth in the fourth century is attested by Xenophon (*Hell.* 4.4.3). It is possible that both of these actors travelled to Corinth in order to perform.

In the late fourth century the number of inscriptions outside Athens increases. We can see that, in this period, tragic competitions were held at a number of festivals in the Aegean – on Euboea, Samos, Lemnos and at Byzantium.<sup>87</sup> By the third century, we have considerably more detailed evidence for the travels of actors. Drakon of Taras performed in Delphi in the mid third century and can also be placed on Delos in 279BC.<sup>88</sup> Our tragic actor from Tegea was even more prolific, performing at Athens, Delphi, Argos and Dodona, to name only the most prestigious victories and not counting his boxing victory at Alexandria.<sup>89</sup> Festivals sought to attract both performers and audience members from right across the Greek world. The numbers of festivals steadily increased over time; yet travel was by no means a new experience, either for actors or poets.<sup>90</sup>

In order to facilitate these journeys, actors in the fourth century had already started to assert the rights of security and freedom of movement (ἀσυλία καὶ ἀτέλεια). These would be the main demands of the later Hellenistic guilds for their members.<sup>91</sup> The reverence for an actor's *technē* allowed him to travel through and perform in enemy territory. The actor

---

<sup>86</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 10.

<sup>87</sup> Euboea: *IG* XII/9. 207 (c. 292-288 BC) = Le Guen (2001) I 41-56 no. 1; Samos: *IG* XII/6 56 = *SEG* I 362 (306 BC); Lemnos: *IG* XII/8.4; Byzantium: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 555 (c.305 BC).

<sup>88</sup> *IG* XI 108; Sifakis (1967) 149 and 160; Stephanis 802.

<sup>89</sup> *IG* V 118.

<sup>90</sup> As is noted by Parker (2004) 13-14. Rutherford (2009) 286 has remarked that, 'one might ask to what extent the behaviour of poets like Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides might be thought of as resembling the Hellenistic data'. We could add Aeschylus and Euripides to his list.

<sup>91</sup> Sifakis (1967) 100-102 lists the relevant inscriptions relating to Delos and Delphi. See also *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 288-91, C-S 243-4. In the early third century, for example, the Delphic Amphictyons granted the Athenian artists freedom from harassment and taxation (ἀσυλία καὶ ἀτέλεια). See *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1132.1-39 = *FD* III 2.68.65-94; Le Guen (2001) I 57-61 no. 2; Aneziri (2003) 347-50 no. A5A; *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 308.

Aristodemus was sent as an ambassador to Philip because of his easy access to the king (διὰ τὴν γνῶσιν καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν τῆς τέχνης, Aeschin. 2.15.8-9). Neoptolemus was another actor who enjoyed safe conduct on account of his profession. And when Alexander was looking for an agent who could make the journey to Caria to secretly negotiate on his behalf against the wishes of his father, he chose the actor Thettalus. This tendency for actors to be selected as ambassadors is due to their professional habit of travelling and the unique protection that they had secured to enable them to do so.

Actors were able to secure freedom of movement on religious grounds. Actors and poets were performing at festivals of the gods and poetry was an offering to the gods as part of that festival. The gift of Theodorus towards the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo at Delphi in 363 may have been designed to demonstrate his piety.<sup>92</sup> From an early stage wandering performers and sages had identified themselves with Apollo and Delphi.<sup>93</sup> Later *technitai* styled themselves as the artists of Dionysus (among other titles) and would at times cover the cost of a festival from their common funds as a demonstration of their piety.<sup>94</sup> Their inscriptions stress both the piety of the members of the guilds and their benefactors and, in the process, justify their privileges.<sup>95</sup> Poets had originally claimed a close relationship with the Muses and the gods in general. This not only enhanced their status but also aided them in obtaining good treatment on their travels.

Those who harmed or hindered travelling artists risked divine anger. According to Aelian, the Spartan Pantacles once prevented a group of artists of Dionysus from travelling

---

<sup>92</sup> *FD* III 5.3.67.

<sup>93</sup> See Tell (2007) 265-7.

<sup>94</sup> See Aneziri (2007) 73-4.

<sup>95</sup> E.g. *FD* III 2.68.73-7. The piety of the Athenian *synodos* is stressed in a late second century inscription from Delphi (τιμῶσα μὲν καὶ σεβομένα τὸ θεῖον διὰ / [π]αντός, *FD* III 2. 47. 1-2 = Le Guen (2001) I 88-91 no. 10). Cf. Le Guen (2001) I 61, II 91; Lightfoot (2002) 216-21.

through Sparta to reach Cythera.<sup>96</sup> Later, while holding the office of ephor, he was torn apart by dogs (ὑπὸ κυνῶν διεσπάρθη). The origins of this story may date to the fifth century. We only know of one Spartan Pantacles and he is recorded as ephor in 407.<sup>97</sup> His fate was a poetic invention, similar to the stories concerning Arion and Ibycus, designed to show the protection offered by Dionysus to his followers. The dismemberment also paradoxically associates Pantacles with drama and Euripides or even the victims of Dionysus' maenads, Pentheus and Orpheus.

The identity of the tragic performer as a wanderer was nothing new. Like the fifth century poets before them, the *technitai* were interested in ensuring their ability to travel and safety on their journeys. The later guilds were designed to guarantee these privileges. We shall now look at some of the motives for travel. These are broadly the same as for the earlier poets. The circuit had expanded but performers were still driven to travel for much the same reasons as before: fame and money.

## **b) Motives for Travel: Fame and Money**

We have seen that the acting 'icon' or 'star' first appears in the late fifth century. Like poets, actors sought wide recognition for their achievements. A case in point is Callippides.<sup>98</sup> An anecdote recorded by Plutarch suggests that by the early fourth century his fame was widely spread. Callippides thrust himself upon King Agesilaus at the Isthmian games, at a time when the Spartan ruler was at the height of his power.<sup>99</sup> The dour Spartan treated this impudence

---

<sup>96</sup> Ael. *NA*.11.19; see N. Wilson (1999).

<sup>97</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 1.3.1 and 2.3.10. The text is suspect. However, if these passages are interpolations, as Wilson points out, they are likely to be ancient and their content may well be based on a genuine list of ephors.

<sup>98</sup> See above p.244 n.20.

<sup>99</sup> Plut. *Ages.* 21.4 = *Apophth. Lac.* 212 e.

with praiseworthy contempt. This story is designed to illustrate Agesilaus' lack of interest in the objects of popular fascination and his attitude is exceptional. Plutarch tells us why:

Callippides was universally famous among all Greeks (ὄνομα καὶ δόξαν ἔχων ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησι καὶ σπουδαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων, 21.4.3). Aulus Gellius would describe Polus in much the same way (*histrion in terra Graecia fuit fama celebri*, 6.5). The great panhellenic gatherings, such as the Isthmian Games, remained important events for actors as well as poets to publicise their work and achievements.

It is likely that actors aimed for an international reputation relatively early on in the history of the profession and this aspiration would be carried on into later generations. This ambition, and its achievement, is proudly stated by the Ionian Guild of *technitai* in the second century BC.<sup>100</sup> Its members, it declares are those whom *all* the Greeks honour. The inscription mentions a number of festivals at which the Ionian *technitai* compete. They declare that the artists and judges at these competitions are the most pious *of the Greeks*.<sup>101</sup> These festivals are not confined to the guild's centres in Asia Minor, but include the Pythia and Soteria at Delphi, the Mouseia at Thespieae and the Heraclea at Thebes.

As well as their fame, actors, like their poetic colleagues, earned their living through the festival circuit. The same practical considerations that were to affect poets were therefore likely to influence their actors from an early stage. If individual cities could only afford to put on one or two festivals a year, actors had to travel between them. Philip feasted all the competitors at the Olympia and awarded crowns to the victors (ἐστιῶν δ' αὐτοὺς καὶ στεφανῶν τοὺς νενικηκότας, Dem. 19.193.1). In addition he offered them the chance to

---

<sup>100</sup> οὗς καὶ θεοὶ καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ πάντες Ἕλληγες τιμῶσιν, *IG XI/4* 1061.12-13; *DFA*<sup>2</sup> 314-15; Le Guen (2001) I 231-3 no. 45; Aneziri (2003) 383-5 no. D10.

<sup>101</sup> 16-17 οἱ ἐκ πάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων εὐσεβέστατοι.

ask him for a personal reward. It is a relationship that closely parallels that of the poet with his patron, where the poet could expect rewards both in coin and a place at his patron's table.

There is here the same emphasis on feasting and *xenia* that we find in the works of the fifth century poets. Diodorus in fact, pointing both to the varied origins of the performers and possibly also pointing to this relationship, calls those present *xenoi*:

πανήγυριν δὲ μεγάλην συστησάμενος καὶ λαμπροὺς ἀγῶνας ποιήσας πολλοὺς  
τῶν ἐπιδημούντων ξένων ἐπὶ τὰς ἐστιάσεις παρελάμβανε

(16.55.1-2).

The artist was in theory a guest, not an employee, a careful distinction that the Hellenistic artists would continue to stress in their inscriptions.<sup>102</sup> Here, however, in the mid fourth century it is not a poet but the comic actor Satyrus (τὸν κωμικὸν ὑποκριτὴν, Aeschin. 2.156) who asks for the unusual reward of the release of the daughters of his friend Apollophanes, who had been captured in the fall of Olynthus.

We know from later inscriptional evidence that prizes for victorious actors were generous.<sup>103</sup> The early third century Chalcis inscription shows that, in addition to prizes and pay in coin, *technitai*, including tragic actors, received food and even clothing as an allowance for expenses throughout the course of the festival.<sup>104</sup> A star actor, such as Polus, could command high fees. He was honoured by Samos in 305 for performing at a lower rate than usual. Even so, Polus still took the takings raised from the theatre (τὰ ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου γενόμενα) and expected the Samians to pay the outstanding fees in time.<sup>105</sup> Another source of income may have come from gifts of money or crowns awarded to *technitai* for their

---

<sup>102</sup> See Slater (2004).

<sup>103</sup> See Lightfoot (2002) 214-15.

<sup>104</sup> *IG* XII/9 207.16-23. Cf. Le Guen (2001) II 72-3.

<sup>105</sup> *IG* XII/6 56.9-14 = *SEG* I.362; cf. C-S 242-3.



services by the cities they travelled through. A large corpus of Hellenistic inscriptions detail honours granted travelling poetic professionals, whom Guarducci termed ‘poeti vaganti’.<sup>106</sup> These inscriptions, like earlier literary sources, tend to be reticent concerning prizes or awards of money to poets at festivals. If cities wished to confer a valuable prize, a crown is preferred to money, although there are a few exceptions.<sup>107</sup>

Many of the best actors and performers were wealthy. The actor Theodorus gave seventy drachmas towards the temple of Apollo at Delphi in 363, the largest donation recorded on that inscription.<sup>108</sup> Neoptolemus made a contribution towards the renovation of Athens’ defences and offered golden cups as dedications on the Acropolis.<sup>109</sup> Various other stories may hint at the size of this actor’s fees. Neoptolemus is said to have been offered as much as ten thousand drachmas by Demosthenes to train his voice.<sup>110</sup> We cannot be certain that all this money was earned by appearing on the stage. However, it seems likely that actors, like the fifth century poets, depended in many cases entirely upon what they could earn from performing.

Aeschines’ foray into acting, in any case, was supposedly only one of the (rather lowly) jobs he undertook to earn a living.<sup>111</sup> Demosthenes tries to portray Aeschines in the character of the flatterer, a type associated with earlier poets. Similarly Aristotle claims the insult ‘Dionysus-flatterers’ is an alternative term for *technitai*:

---

<sup>106</sup> See Guarducci (1929).

<sup>107</sup> The tragic poet Dymas of Iasos, for instance, was honoured at the end of the third century with a gold crown: *I.Iasos* 153.24-5 and Rutherford (2007a) 291-3. A mid second century BC stele from Boeotia honours the tragic poet Zotion with a cash reward of seventy drachmas. For a text of the inscription and other parallels see Schachter and Slater (2007) 83 and 88-95. On the reluctance of our sources to discuss cash payments to artists see Le Guen (2001) II 71 and Slater (2004).

<sup>108</sup> *FD* III 5.3.67.

<sup>109</sup> Dem. 18.114; Athen. 472c.

<sup>110</sup> [Plut.] *X Orat.* 844f.

<sup>111</sup> Dem. 18. 258-62.

καὶ ὁ μὲν διονυσόκολακας, αὐτοὶ δ' αὐτοὺς τεχνίτας καλοῦσιν (ταῦτα δ' ἄμφω μεταφορά, ἢ μὲν ῥυπαινόντων ἢ δὲ τούναντίον)

(Arist. *Rhet.* 1405 a 23)

The Aristotelian *Problems* goes even further:

διὰ τί οἱ Διονυσιακοὶ τεχνῖται ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ πονηροὶ εἰσιν; ἢ ὅτι ἥκιστα λόγου σοφίας κοινωνοῦσι διὰ τὸ περὶ τὰς ἀναγκαίας τέχνας τὸ πολὺ μέρος τοῦ βίου εἶναι, καὶ ὅτι ἐν ἀκрасίαις τὸ πολὺ τοῦ βίου εἰσίν, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν ἀπορίαις; ἀμφοτέρω δὲ φαυλότητος παρασκευαστικά.

(*Probl.* 956 b)

The *technitae* of Dionysus have no certain guaranteed income or private means. They either stand to make a great deal of money or starve. They are professionals, dependent entirely on festivals in the hope of securing their next meal. This lack of means transforms the actor into the flatterer: obsequious, fickle and mercenary. It is exactly this kind of image that Demosthenes wishes to evoke in his portrait of Aeschines the actor.

Actors, like poets, were professionals and travel was an essential part of their work. There is evidence to show that actors earned food, board and money from appearing at international festivals from the fourth century, if not earlier. We can also see that, as in the case of poets, there was an attempt to disguise these earnings as guest-gifts or suitable offerings due to the sacred representatives of Dionysus.

#### 4. Conclusion

Three main points are made here concerning ancient actors. Firstly, that their profession grew directly out of the work of poets and was initially seen as belonging to the profession of the poet. With the increasing regard for the art of the actor, and delivery in particular, a separate

acting profession developed that was to have equal status with that of the poets and was to form part of a larger body of travelling artists. This was a steady evolution of performers stretching back all the way to the poets of the archaic period. Secondly, from the earliest days of the profession actors continually moved between festivals. This travel, motivated by the desire on the part of actors to win both fame and fortune, played an important part in continuing the dissemination of tragedy. Finally, tragedy's panhellenic audience was not a late development. The ancient actor was, from his earliest beginnings, a travelling player and the stage he moved on was a wide and universal one.

## 7. Conclusion

In this study I have attempted to show that tragedy was essentially Panhellenic from the beginning: both in the sense that it grew out of a shared Greek ‘song-culture’ and because tragedians and their actors were always concerned to reach out to or attract new audiences. Tragic drama’s ‘dissemination’ should be seen not as a late Athenian export, but rather as a crucial part of the genre’s development, by which it became part of the overall Greek literary canon. I have thus argued that tragedy was a genre of Greek poetry at which Athenians excelled, rather than an Athenian cultural product exported abroad. The theatre of the Athenians was essentially Panhellenic, open to all Greeks, whether audience members or performers, and informed by poetic traditions that were known and shared by all Greeks.

In coming to this conclusion, we need not downplay the importance of Athens nor imagine that the Athenians were possessed of a generous or self-effacing disposition. They believed, with some justification, that their city was the greatest *in all Greece* and that their dramatists and festivals were finer than those of any other city. One of the main reasons why tragedy and the Dionysia were inherently Panhellenic was precisely because Athenian dramatists wished *all Greece* to know that they were the best. Athens is different from other Greek cities only in that it outperforms those cities in areas where all Greeks compete. A truly Athenocentric theatre would not have been in their interest, because it would have meant an unacceptable restriction on their claims to supremacy. Ironically the proponents of the historicist approach, who most strongly advocate the restoration of tragedy to its original context, have conjured up an Athens which, I suspect, would have been unrecognisable to the ancient Athenian. Athens never made any claim to exclusive ‘ownership’ of tragedy simply because this would never have occurred to an ancient Greek.

From the earliest period, both Athenian and non-Athenian tragedians aimed to establish their art form as the equivalent of epic or choral lyric. Over the course of the fifth and fourth centuries we see the gradual addition of tragedy to the festival programmes of Greek cities. Athens undoubtedly led the way and with her sizeable resources she was better able than any other city to invest in dramatic festivals and nurture local talent. However, it is unlikely that other Greeks saw these new competitions as a foreign import, but rather as a new development in the common Greek culture. Moreover, by the time of the first performances of tragedy at Athens, drama was simultaneously developing in other parts of the Greek world, such as the Peloponnese and the Greek West and non-Athenian tragedians were already producing their plays at Athens.

We saw that the evidence of vase painting helped illustrate this entry of tragedy into the broader literary canon. In the fifth century, few of the mythological scenes on vases produced in Attica show any signs of being influenced by tragedy. This was not because Athenian potters did not know about tragedy or consciously avoided tragic themes. Rather, it was because tragedy had not yet fully impacted on the pool of myths and images from which painters took their inspiration. By the fourth century, depictions of myth inspired by tragedy appear in art in both southern Italy and Attica. This was not the result of a late fifth century export of tragedy from Athens. Were that the case we would expect to see more fifth century Athenian vases displaying the influence of the theatre. Instead it shows that tragedy became a canonical part of Greek literature only by the end of the fifth century, and that this development took place simultaneously in both Attica and the wider Greek world.

In the following chapters, we noted that the poets themselves were largely responsible for this early dissemination. Travel and the other activities calculated to gain a wide audience was an essential and traditional part of the poet's work. The tragedians were no different: they also travelled, sometimes to the same festivals, and shared many of the same patrons as

other poets. Tragedy was itself to form part of the broader song-culture, which was founded upon a network of festivals and patrons: one of the many networks that united the Greeks as a people.

All poets travelled for two main reasons. First, poets were professionals and they needed to earn a living from appearing at festivals and working for wealthy patrons. Poets were able to accept money because they were wanderers and thus able to claim hospitality as strangers (*xenoi*). Most cities could not support a poet for long and he would have to travel on to the next festival. On the other hand, a greater audience was both a measure of success, and a potential source for new commissions. In spite of the fact that Attica offered more opportunities for poets than anywhere else in Greece, Sophocles is the only poet we know to have chosen to remain permanently in Athens.

Second, poets, aimed to win glory through travel. The ambition to win universal fame was inspired by the accounts of the deeds of mythical heroes told by poets. Winning at festivals was an important way in which a poet could achieve this heroic goal. It was also the best way to publicise their work and ensure future performances. Furthermore the desire for glory made a poet's professional status more palatable. Poets, like athletes, could claim that they competed for fame, rather than pay and prizes.

The broader context of Greek tragedy is in need of further study and reassessment. Once we accept that tragedy was not solely the product of fifth century Athenian democracy or civic ritual, we begin to understand the ways in which tragedy developed alongside other poetic genres and how the Dionysia functioned as part of a network of musical competitions. Epic, the dithyramb, choral and monodic lyric all formed the cultural background for drama, while tragic poets worked alongside and in competition with actors, rhapsodes, citharodes, aulodes, and all forms of poets. These individuals shared common aims and a common

outlook even in the classical period and were united officially with the establishment of the Hellenistic guilds of *technitae*. To truly understand the context of drama we need to understand tragedians as part of an overall poetic profession.

We should also consider the place of poetry, including tragedy, within Greek culture in general: that web of interconnecting myths, identities, relationships and networks, which served to link disparate Hellenic communities from Asia Minor to Italy. The tendency to travel was not unique to poets alone, nor was the manner in which they presented themselves as wandering sages. Poets were linked to other professional groups, who played different roles in the creation and propagation of this overall Panhellenic culture. We have noted that poets and athletes, though pursuing ostensibly different ends, were influenced by a similar ideology and acted under the same social and economic pressures. In particular, both athletes and poets travel because they were professionals. The same was true of sophists and others who earned a living from a skill or ability. An examination of the overall phenomenon of ancient professionalism will reveal more about these groups and the reactions they provoked in antiquity than we might expect by studying each one in isolation. Such an approach has the potential to provide a fresh perspective on the ideologies informing the tragic texts and one that goes beyond Athenian politics and class conflict between mass and elite.

## Bibliography

### Abbreviations

- ARV<sup>2</sup> J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*<sup>2</sup>, 3 vols. (Oxford 1963).
- Billerbeck M. Billerbeck, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, 2 vols. to date (Berlin and New York 2006-).
- C–S E. Csapo and W.J. Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Ann Arbor 1995).
- de Marco V. de Marco, *Scholia in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum* (Rome 1952).
- DFA<sup>2</sup> A.W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*<sup>2</sup> (revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis; Oxford 1988).
- Dilts M.R. Dilts, *Scholia in Aeschinem* (1992 Leipzig).
- Dindorf W. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam ex codicibus aucta et emendata*, 2 vols. (Oxford 1855).
- D–K H. Diels (ed.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*<sup>6</sup>, 3 vols., rev. W. Kranz (Berlin 1951-2).
- Drachmann A.B. Drachmann, (ed.) *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1903-27)
- Ebert J. Ebert, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* (Berlin 1972).
- FD III.2 *Fouilles de Delphes Épigraphie. Fascicule II. Inscriptions du Trésor des Athéniens* (Paris 1909-13).



<i>FD III.5</i>	<i>Fouilles de Delphes Épigraphie. Fascicule V. Les Comptes du IV<sup>e</sup> Siècle</i> (Paris 1932).
<i>FGE</i>	D.L. Page, (ed.) <i>Further Greek Epigrams</i> (Cambridge 1981).
<i>FGrHist</i>	F. Jacoby <i>et al.</i> (eds.) <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (1923–).
<i>GEF</i>	M. L. West (ed.), <i>Greek Epic Fragments</i> (London and Cambridge, Mass. 2003).
<i>GP</i>	A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (eds.), <i>The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams</i> , 2 vols. (Cambridge 1968).
<i>HE</i>	A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (eds.), <i>The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams</i> , 2 vols. (Cambridge 1965).
Holwerda	D. Holwerda and W.J.W. Koster (eds.), <i>Scholia in Aristophanem</i> , 4 parts (Groningen 1960-).
<i>IG I<sup>3</sup></i>	D. M. Lewis <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno anteriores</i> , 3 vols. (Berlin and New York 1981-98).
<i>IG II-III<sup>2</sup></i>	J. Kirchner (ed.), <i>Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores</i> , 4 vols. (Berlin 1913-40).
<i>IG V</i>	F. Hiller (ed.), <i>Incriptiones Laconiae, Messeniae, Arcadiae. Fasciculus Alter: Inscriptiones Arcadiae</i> (Berlin 1913)

<i>IG XI/2</i>	P. Hiller (ed.) <i>Inscriptiones Graecae. Volumen XI. Fasciculi Tertii Tabulae</i> (Berlin 1927).
<i>IG XI/4</i>	P. Roussel (ed.), <i>Inscriptiones Deli. Fasciculus IV</i> (Berlin 1914).
<i>IG XII/6</i>	K. Hallof and A. P. Matthaiou (eds.), <i>Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum Maris Aegaei praeter Delum. Fasciculus VI: Inscriptiones Chii et Sami cum Corassiis Icariaque</i> , 2 vols. to date (Berlin and New York 2000–).
<i>IG XII/8</i>	C. Friedrich (ed.), <i>Inscriptiones Insularum Maris Thracici</i> (Berlin 1909).
<i>IG XII/9</i>	E. Ziebarth (ed.), <i>Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum Maris Aegaei praeter Delum. Fasciculus IX: Inscriptiones Euboeae Insulae</i> (Berlin 1915).
<i>Iasos</i>	W. Blümel (ed.), <i>Die Inschriften von Iasos</i> , 2 vols. (Bonn 1985).
<i>K–A</i>	R. Kassel and C. F. L. Austin (eds.), <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , 8 vols. to date (Berlin and New York 1983–).
<i>LCS</i>	A.D. Trendall, <i>The Red Figure Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily</i> , 2 vols. (Oxford 1967).
<i>LCS Suppl. II</i>	A.D. Trendall, <i>The Red Figure Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily. Second Supplement</i> . (BICS suppl. 31; London 1973).

<i>LCS Suppl. III</i>	A.D. Trendall, <i>The Red Figure Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily. Third Supplement (Consolidated)</i> . (BICS suppl. 41; London 1983).
Leurini	A. Leurini, <i>Ionis chii. Testimonia et Fragmenta</i> (Amsterdam 1992).
<i>LIMC</i>	L. Kahil (ed.), <i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i> , 8 vols. (Munich 1981-99).
Maehler	H. Maehler, <i>Die Lieder des Bakchylides</i> , 2 vols. (Leiden 1982).
Meineke	A. Meineke <i>Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt</i> (Graz 1958). [1 <sup>st</sup> ed. 1849]
M–L	R. Meiggs, and D. Lewis <i>A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions</i> , (Oxford 1988). [1 <sup>st</sup> edition 1969]
<i>MOMC</i> <sup>3</sup>	T. B. L. Webster, and J. R. Green <i>Monuments illustrating Old and Middle Comedy</i> <sup>3</sup> (BICS suppl. 39; London 1978). [1 <sup>st</sup> ed. 1960]
<i>MTS</i> <sup>2</sup>	T. B. L. Webster <i>Monuments illustrating tragedy and satyr play</i> <sup>2</sup> (BICS Suppl. 20; London 1967). [1 <sup>st</sup> ed. 1962]
M–W	R. Merkelbach, and M.L. West <i>Fragmenta Hesiodica</i> (Oxford 1967).
<i>PMG</i>	D.L. Page, <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> (Oxford 1962).

<i>PMGF</i>	M. Davies (ed.) <i>Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> (1 vol. to date; Oxford 1991–).
<i>P.Oxy.</i>	B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt <i>et al.</i> (eds.) <i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> (London 1898–).
<i>PV</i> <sup>2</sup>	A.D. Trendall, <i>Phlyax Vases</i> (BICS Suppl. 19; London 1967). [1 <sup>st</sup> ed. 1959].
<i>R–O</i>	P. J. Rhodes, and R. Osborne, <i>Greek historical inscriptions 404-323 BC</i> (Oxford, 2003).
<i>RVAp</i>	A.D. Trendall, and A. Cambitoglou, <i>The Red-Figured Vases of Apulia</i> , 2 vols. (Oxford 1978-82).
<i>RVAp Supp. II</i>	A.D. Trendall, and A. Cambitoglou, <i>Second Supplement to The Red-Figured Vases of Apulia</i> , 2 vols. (BICS Suppl. 60, London 1991-2).
<i>RVP</i>	A.D. Trendall, <i>The Red-Figured Vases of Paestum</i> (Rome 1987).
Schorn	S. Schorn, <i>Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar</i> (Basel 2004).
Schwartz	E. Schwartz, <i>Scholia in Euripidem</i> (Berlin 1887-91)
<i>SEG</i>	J. J. E. Hondius <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> , 55 vols. to date (Leiden 1923).
<i>SH</i>	P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones and P. J. Parsons (eds.), <i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> (Texte und Kommentare 11; Berlin and New York 1983).

<i>SIG</i> <sup>3</sup>	W. Dittenberger (ed.), <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> <sup>3</sup> (Leipzig 1915-24)
S–M	B. Snell and H. Maehler (eds.), <i>Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis</i> , 2 vols. (Leipzig 1987-9) and <i>Bacchylides</i> (Leipzig 1970).
Stephanis	I.E. Stephanis, Διονυσιακοὶ Τεχνῖται (Heracleion 1988).
<i>TrGF</i>	B. Snell, R. Kannicht, and S. Radt (eds.), <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , 5 vols. (Göttingen 1971-).
Voigt	E.-M. Voigt (ed.), <i>Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta</i> (Amsterdam 1971).
West	M.L. West (ed.), <i>Iambi et elegi graeci ante Alexandrum cantati</i> <sup>2</sup> , 2 vols (Oxford 1989-92). [1 <sup>st</sup> edition 1971-2]

## Bibliography

- Alexopoulou, M. (2009) *The Theme of Returning Home in Ancient Greek Literature*. (Lewiston).
- Allan, W. (2000) *The Andromache and Euripidean Tragedy* (Oxford).
- (2001) 'Euripides in *Megale Hellas*. Some aspects of the early reception of tragedy', *GR*, 48: 67-86.
- Aneziri, S. (2003) *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart).

- (2007) 'The organisation of music contests in the Hellenistic period and artists' participation. An attempt at classification', in Wilson (2007) (ed.) 67-84.
- (2009) 'World travellers. The associations of Artists of Dionysus', in Hunter and Rutherford (2009a) (eds.) 217-36.
- Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. (2011) (eds.) *Archaic and Classical Choral Song. Performance, Politics and Dissemination* (Berlin).
- Austin, C. (1968) *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris Repertis* (Berlin).
- Austin, C. and Olson, S.D. (2004) *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazousae* (Oxford).
- Bailey, C., Bowra, C.M., Barber, E.A., Denniston, J.D., Page, D.L. (1936) (eds.) *Greek Poetry and Life* (Oxford).
- Bakogianni, A. (2011) *Electra, ancient and modern. Aspects of the reception of the tragic heroine* (BICS Suppl. London).
- Barringer, J. (2008) *Art, Myth and Ritual in Classical Greece* (Cambridge).
- Barron, J.P. (1961) 'The son of Hyllis', *CR* 11: 185-7.
- Bartol, K. (2000) 'Ion of Chios and the King', *Mnem.* 53: 185-92.
- Beazley, J.D. (1952) 'The New York 'Phlyax-Vase'', *AJA* 56: 193-5.
- (1955) 'Hydria fragments in Corinth', *Hesperia* 24: 302-19.
- Beecroft, A.J. (2008) 'Nine fragments in search of an author. Poetic lines attributed to Terpander', *CJ* 103: 225-41.
- Bees, R. (1993) *Zur Datierung des Prometheus Desmotes* (Stuttgart).
- Bell, J.M. (1978) 'Κίμβλιξ καὶ σοφός: Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition', *QUCC* 28: 29-86.
- Bergmann, B. and Kondoleon, C. (1999) (eds.) *The Art of Ancient Spectacle* (Washington).
- Bieber, M. (1941) 'A tragic chorus on a vase of 475BC', *AJA* 45: 529-36.
- (1961) *The History of the Greek and Roman Theatre* (Princeton).

- Biles, Z.P. (2006) 'Aeschylus' afterlife: re-performance by decree in fifth century Athens?' *ICS* 31-2: 206-42.
- Blanshard, A. (2007) 'Trapped between Athens and Chios. A relationship in fragments', in Jennings and Katsaros (2007) (eds.) 155-75.
- Block, E. (1985) 'Clothing makes the man. A pattern in the *Odyssey*', *TAPA* 115: 1-11.
- Blundell, M.W. (1993) 'The ideal of Athens in Oedipus at Colonus', in Sommerstein *et.al.* (1993) (eds.) 287-306.
- Boardman, J. and Vaphopoulou-Richardson, C.E. (1986) (eds.) *Chios. A Conference at the Homereion in Chios (1984)* (Oxford).
- Boedeker, D. and Raaflaub, K. A. (1998) (eds.) *Democracy, Empire and the Arts in Fifth Century Athens* (Cambridge Mass. and London).
- Borza E.N. (1982) 'Athenians, Macedonians and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House', *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History, and Topography (Hesperia Supplement 19)*: 7-13.
- Bosher, K. (2012a) (ed.) *Theater Outside Athens. Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy* (Cambridge).
- (2012b) 'Introduction', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 1-16.
- (2012c) 'Hieron's Aeschylus', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 97-111.
- Bosworth, A.B. (1996) 'Alexander, Euripides and Dionysus', in Wallace and Harris (1996) (eds.) 140-66.
- Bowie, E. (2009) 'Wandering Poets, archaic style', in Hunter and Rutherford (2009a) (eds.) 105-36.
- Bowra, M. (1934) 'Stesichorus in the Peloponnese', *CQ* 28: 115-19.
- (1960) 'Euripides' Epinician for Alcibiades', *ZPE* 9: 68-79.
- (1964) *Pindar* (Oxford).

- Bradshaw, D.J. (1991) 'The Ajax myth and the polis. Old values and new', in Pozzi and Wickersham (1991) (eds.) 99-125.
- Brandt, J.R., and Iddeng, J.W. (2012) (eds.) *Greek and Roman Festivals* (Oxford).
- Braswell, B.K. (1992) *A commentary on Pindar Nemean One* (Freiburg).
- (1998) *A commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Berlin and New York).
- Bremer, J.M. (1991) 'Poets and their patrons', in Hofmann and Harder (1991) (eds.) 39-60.
- Brock, R., and Hodkinson, S. (2000) (eds.) *Alternatives to Athens. Varieties of Political Organisation and Community in Ancient Greece* (Oxford).
- Brooks, C. (1955) (ed.) *Tragic Themes in Western Literature* (New Haven)
- Brown, A.L. (1990) 'Prometheus Pyrphoros', *BICS* 37: 50-6.
- Burian, P. (1986) 'ΖΕΥΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ ΤΡΙΤΟΣ and some triads in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', *AJP* 107: 332-42.
- (2011) 'Athenian Tragedy as democratic discourse', in Carter (2011a) (ed.) 95-117.
- Burkert, W. (1985) *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Burnett, A.P. (1988) 'Jocasta in the West. The Lille Stesichorus', *CA* 7: 107-54.
- (1989) 'Performing Pindar's Odes', *CP* 84: 283-93.
- Butrica, J.L. (2001) 'Democrates and Euripides *Andromache* (Σ *andr.* 445 = Callimachus fr. 451 Pfeiffer)', *Hermes* 129: 188-97.
- Cahn, H.A. and Simon, E. (1980) (eds.) *Tainia. Festschrift für Roland Hempe* (Mainz).
- Cairns, D. and Liapis, V. (2006) (eds.) *Dionysalexandros* (Swansea).
- Cairns, F (1998) (ed.) *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar. Tenth Volume* (Leeds).
- (2011) 'Money and the poet. The first stasimon of Pindar *Isthmian* 2', *Mnem.* 64:21-36.



- (2012) 'Pyrrich dancing and politics in Euripides' *Andromache*, *QUCC* 100: 31- 47.
- Cameron, A. (1965) 'Wandering Poets. A literary movement in Byzantine Egypt', *Historia* 14: 470-509.
- Camp, J.M. (2001) *The Archaeology of Athens* (New Haven and London).
- Campbell, D.A. (1967) *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Selection* (London).
- (1988) *Greek Lyric II* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- (1992) *Greek Lyric IV* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- Carey, C. (1989) 'The performance of the victory ode', *AJP* 110: 545-65.
- (1991) 'The victory ode in performance. The case for the chorus', *CP* 86: 192-200.
- (2007) 'Pindar, place and performance', in Hornblower and Morgan (eds.) (2007) 199-210.
- Carpenter, T.H. (1991) *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece* (London).
- Carter, D.M. (2004) 'Was Attic Tragedy democratic?', *Polis* 21:1-25.
- (2007) *The Politics of Greek Tragedy* (Bristol).
- (2011a) (ed.) *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics* (Oxford).
- (2011b) 'Plato, drama and rhetoric', in Carter (2011a) (ed.) 45-67.
- Carter, J.C. (2004) 'The Greek identity at Metaponto', in Lomas (2004) (ed.) 363-90.
- Cartledge, P. (1997) 'Deep plays: theatre as process in Greek civic life', in Easterling (1997) (ed.) 3-35.
- Caspers, C.L. (2006) 'The loves of the poets. Allusions in Hermesianax fr. 7 Powell', in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (2006) (eds.) 21-42.
- Ceadel, E.B. (1941a) 'The division of parts among the actors in Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*', *JHS* 45: 139-47.
- (1941b) 'Resolved feet in the trimeters of Euripides and the chronology of the plays', *CQ* 35: 66-89.

- Ceccarelli, P. (2010) 'Changing contexts. Tragedy in the civic and cultural life of Hellenistic city-states', in Gildenhard and Revermann (2010) (eds.) 99-150.
- Clauss, J.J. and Johnston, S.I. (1997) (eds.) *Medea. Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy and Art* (Princeton).
- Clay, D. (2004) *Archilochus Heros. The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Clay, J.S. (1999) 'Pindar's Sympotic Epinicia', *QUCC* 62: 25-34.
- (2006) *The Politics of Olympus* (London).
- Collard, C., Cropp, M.J. and Lee, K.H. (2009) *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays Volume I* (Warminster). [1<sup>st</sup> edition 1995].
- Collard, C., Cropp, M.J. and Gibert, J. (2004) *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays Volume II* (Oxford).
- Compton, T. (2006) *Victim of the muses. Poet as scapegoat, warrior, and hero in Greco-Roman and Indo-European myth and history* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- Connolly, A. (1998) 'Was Sophocles Heroised as Dexion?', *JHS* 118: 1-21.
- Connor, W.R. (1990) 'City Dionysia and Athenian democracy', in Connor *et al.* (1990) (eds.) 7-32.
- Connor, W. R., Hansen, M.H., Raaflaub, K.A. and Strauss, B.S. (1990) (eds.) *Aspects of Athenian Democracy* (Copenhagen).
- Cousland, J.R.C. and Hume, J.R. (2009) (eds.) *The Play of Texts and Fragments* (Leiden and Boston).
- Croally, N.T. (1994) *Euripidean Polemic* (Cambridge).
- (2005) 'Tragedy's Teaching', in Gregory (2005) (ed.) 56-82.
- Croon, J.H. (1952) 'The Palici. An autochthonous cult in ancient Sicily', *Mnem.* 5: 116-29.
- Cropp, M. and Fick, G. (1985) *Resolutions and chronology in Euripides. The fragmentary tragedies (BICS Suppl. 43, London).*

- Cropp, M., Lee K., and Sansone, D. (2000) (eds.) *Euripides and Tragic Theatre in the Late Fifth Century* (Champaign).
- Crowther, C. (2007) 'The Dionysia at Iasos. Its artists, patrons and audience', in Wilson (2007) (ed.) 294-332.
- Csapo, E. (1986) 'A Note on the Würzburg Bell-Crater H5697 ('Telephus Travestitus')', *Phoenix* 4: 379-92.
- (2001) 'The first artistic representations of theatre. Dramatic illusion and dramatic performance in Attic and South Italian art', in Sanguinetti Katz *et.al.* (2001) (eds.) 17-38.
- (2002) 'Kallipides and the floor sweepings. The limits of realism in classical acting and performance styles', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 127-47. [= Csapo (2010a) 117-39]
- (2004a) 'Some social and economic conditions behind the rise of the acting profession in the fifth and fourth centuries BC', in Hugoniot et al. (2004) (eds.) 53-76.
- (2004b) 'The politics of the New Music', in Murray and Wilson (2004) (eds.) 207-48.
- (2007) 'The men who built the theatres. *Theatropolai, theatrotonai* and *arkhitektones*', in Wilson (2007) (ed.) 87-121.
- (2010a) *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theatre* (Chichester).
- (2010b) 'The context of choregic dedications', in Taplin and Wyles (2010) (eds.) 79-130.
- Csapo, E. and Miller, M.C. (2007) (eds.) *The Origins of Theatre in Ancient Greece and Beyond. From Ritual to Drama* (Cambridge).
- Currie, B. (2002) 'Euthymos of Locri. A case study in heroization in the Classical period', *JHS* 122: 24-44.
- (2004) 'Reperformance scenarios for Pindar's odes', in Mackie (2004) (ed.)

49-69.

(2005) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).

(2011) 'Epinician *choregia*. Funding a Pindaric chorus', in Athanassaki and Bowie

(2011) (eds.) 269-310.

Dąbrowa, E. (1998) (ed.) *Ancient Iran and the Mediterranean world* (Krakow).

Dale, A.M. (1967) *Euripides Helen* (Oxford).

Damen, M. (1989) 'Actor and character in Greek Tragedy', *Theatre Journal* 41: 316-40.

D'Angour, A. (2006) 'The new music. So what's new?', in Goldhill and Osborne (2006)

(eds.) 264-83.

(2007) 'The sound of mousiké. Reflections on aural change in ancient Greece', in

Osborne (2007) (ed.) 288-300.

Davidson, J. (2003) 'Olympia and the chariot race of Pelops', in Phillips and Pritchard

(2003) (eds.) 101-122.

Davidson, J. and Rosenbloom, D. (2012) (eds.) *Greek Drama IV* (Oxford).

Davies, J.K. (1971) *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford).

Davies, M. (1988) 'Monody, choral lyric and the tyranny of the handbook', *CQ* 38: 52-64.

(1991) *Sophocles Trachiniae* (Oxford).

Davies, M. and Finglass, P.J. (forthcoming) *Stesichorus*.

Davies, M.I. (1969) 'Thoughts on the *Oresteia* before Aeschylus', *Belletín de*

*correspondence hellénique* 93: 214-60.

Dawe, R.D., Diggle, J. and Easterling, P.E. (1978) (eds.) *Dionysiaca* (Cambridge).

Dearden, C.W. (1990) 'Fourth century drama in Sicily. Athenian or Sicilian?', in

Descoeudres (1990) (ed.) 231-42.

(1999) 'Plays for export', *Phoenix* 53: 222-48.

Denyer, N. (2008) *Plato Protagoras* (Cambridge).

- Deper, D. (2007) 'From hymn to tragedy. Aristotle's genealogy of poetic kinds', in Csapo and Miller (2007) (eds.) 126-49.
- Descoeudres, J.P. (1990) (ed.) *Greek Colonists and Native Populations* (Oxford and Canberra)
- Diggle, J. (2004) *Theophrastus Characters* (Cambridge).
- Di Gregorio, L. (1987) 'L' "Archelao" di Euripide nei suoi rapporti con il "Temenos" e i "Temenidi"', *Civiltà Class. e Christ.* 8: 279-318.
- (1988) 'L' *Archelao* di Euripide: tentativo di ricostruzione', *Aevum* 62: 16-49.
- Dilke, O.A.W. (1950) 'Details and chronology of the Greek theatre caveas', *ABA* 45: 20-62.
- Dodds, E.R. (1959) *Plato Gorgias* (Oxford).
- (1960a) *Euripides Bacchae* (Oxford). [1<sup>st</sup> edition 1944]
- (1960b) 'Morals and poetics in the *Oresteia*', *PCPS* 6: 19-31. [= Lloyd (2007) (ed.) 245-64]
- Dörpfeld, W. and Reisch, E. (1896) *Das griechische Theater* (Athens).
- Dougherty, C. (1992) 'Linguistic Colonialism in Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae*', *GRBS* 33: 119-32.
- Dougherty, C. and, Kurke, L. (1993) (eds.) *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece* (Cambridge).
- (2003) (eds.) *The Cultures within Ancient Culture. Contact, Conflict, Collaboration* (Cambridge).
- Dover, K. (1968) *Aristophanes Clouds* (Oxford).
- (1972) *Aristophanic Comedy* (London).
- (1986) 'Ion of Chios. His place in the history of Greek literature', in Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (1986) (eds.) 27-37.
- (1993) *Aristophanes. Frogs* (Oxford).
- Dunbar, N. (1995) *Aristophanes. Birds* (Oxford).

- Duncan, A. (2011) 'Nothing to do with Athens. Tragedians at the courts of tyrants', in Carter (2011a) (ed.) 69-91.
- (2012) 'A Theseus outside Athens. Dionysius I of Syracuse and tragic self-presentation', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 137-55.
- Easterling, P.E. (1993) 'The end of an era? Tragedy in the early fourth century' in Sommerstein *et al.* (1993) (eds.) 559-69.
- (1994) 'Euripides outside Athens: a speculative note', *ICS* 19: 73-80.
- (1997) (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- (1999) 'Actors and voices. Reading between the lines in Aeschines and Demosthenes' in Goldhill and Osborne (1999) (eds.) 154-66.
- (2002) 'Actor as Icon', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 327-41.
- (2004) 'À propos du statut symbolique des acteurs', in Hugoniot *et al.* (2004) (eds.) 43-52.
- (2007) 'Looking for Omphale', in Jennings and Katasaros (2007) (eds.) 282-90.
- Easterling, P. E., and Hall, E. M. (2002) (eds.) *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession* (Cambridge).
- Egan, R.B. (1983) 'On the relevance of Orestes in Pindar's Eleventh *Pythian*', *Phoenix* 37: 189-200.
- Ekroth, G. (2012) 'Pelops joins the party. Transformations of a hero cult within the festival at Olympia', in Brandt and Iddeng (2012) (eds.) 95-137.
- Else, G. (1945) 'The case of the third actor', *TAPA* 76: 1-10.
- Elsner, J. B. and Rutherford, I. (2005) (eds.) *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and early Christian antiquity. Seeing the gods* (Oxford).
- Epstein, S. (2008) 'Why did Attic building projects employ free labourers rather than slaves?', *ZPE* 166: 108-12.

- Euben, J.P. (1986) (ed.) *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley).
- Fairweather, J. (1974) 'Fiction in the biographies of ancient writers', *Ancient Society* 5: 231-76.
- Finglass, P.J. (2005) 'Is there a polis in Sophocles *Electra*?', *Phoenix* 59: 199-209.
- (2007a) *Sophocles Electra* (Cambridge).
- (2007b) *Pindar Pythian Eleven* (Cambridge).
- (2011) *Sophocles Ajax* (Cambridge).
- (2012a) 'Sophocles' Theseus', in Markantonatos and Zimmermann (2012) (eds.) 41-53.
- (2012b) 'Ethnic Identity in Stesichorus', *ZPE* 182: 39-44.
- (2012c) 'Epicharmus' Monkey', *ZPE* 180: 51-2.
- Fisher, N.R.E. (1989) 'Drink, hybris and the promotion of harmony in Sparta' in Powell (1989) (ed.) 26-50.
- Focke, F. (1930) 'Aischylos' *Prometheus*', *Hermes* 65: 259-304.
- Fraenkel, E. (1954) 'Vermutungen zum Aetna-Festspiel des Aeschylus', *Eranos* 52: 61-75.
- [= (1964) 249-62]
- (1964) *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie. Erster Band* (Rome).
- (1965) 'The Authenticity of the *Rhesus* by Euripides by William Richie', *Gnomon* 37: 228-41.
- Fraenkel, H. (1962) *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums. Eine Geschichte der griechischen Epik, Lyrik und Prosa bis zur Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts* (Munich).
- Frederiksen, R. (2002) 'The Greek theatre. A typical building in the urban centre of the polis', in Nielson (2002) (ed.) 65-124.
- Friedrich, F. (1996) 'Everything to do with Dionysos? Ritualism, the dionysiac and the tragic,' in Silk (1996) (ed.) 257-83.

- Froning, H. (2002) 'Masken und Kostüme', in Marow and Nölle (2002) (eds.) 70-95.
- Gakopoulou, K. (2012) 'Euripides' *Bacchae*. The end of an era or the beginning of a new one?', in Markantonatos and Zimmermann (2012) (eds.) 163-180.
- Gardiner, N.E. (1930) *Athletics of the Ancient World* (Oxford).
- Garvie, A. F. (2009) *Aeschylus Persae* (Oxford).
- Gebhard, E. (1973) *The Theatre at Isthmia* (Chicago).
- Gentili, B. (1979) *Theatrical performances in the ancient world. Hellenistic and early Roman theatre* (Amsterdam).
- Gerber, D.E. (1982) *Pindar's Olympian One. A Commentary* (Toronto).
- Ghiron-Bistagne, P. (1976) *Recherches sur les acteurs dans la Grèce antique* (Paris).
- Ghiron-Bistagne, P., Moreau, A., Turpin, J-C., (1993) (eds.) *Les "Perses" d'Eschyle* (Montpellier).
- Gibert, J. (2011) 'Hellenicity in later Euripidean tragedy', in Carter (2011) (ed.) 383-401.
- Gildenhard, I. and Revermann, M. (2010) (eds.) *Beyond the Fifth Century. Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages* (Berlin and New York).
- Gilula, D. (1995) 'The Choregoi Vase. Comic yes, but Angels?', *ZPE* 109: 5-10.
- Giuliani, L. (1995) *Tragik, Trauer und Trost. Bildervasen für eine Apulisch Totenfeier* (Hannover).
- (1996) 'Rhesus between dream and death: on the relation of image to literature in Apulian vase painting', *BICS* 41: 71-86.
- (2001) 'Sleeping Furies. Allegory, narration and the impact of texts in Apulian vase painting', *SCI* 20: 17-38.
- Goff, B. (1995) (ed.) *History, Tragedy, Theory* (Austin).
- Gold, B.K. (1987) *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome* (Chapel Hill and London).



- Golden, M. (1998) *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).
- (2008) *Greek Sport and Social Status* (Austin).
- (2011) 'War and peace in the ancient and modern Olympics', *GR* 58:1-13.
- Goldhill, S. (1987) 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', *JHS* 107: 39-61. [Revised in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.) 97-129]
- (1994) 'Representing democracy. Women at the Great Dionysia', in Osborne and Hornblower (1994) (eds.) 347-69.
- (1996) 'Collectivity and otherness. The authority of the tragic chorus: response to Gould,' in Silk (1996) (ed.) 244-256.
- (1997) 'The audience in Athenian tragedy', in Easterling (1997) (ed.) 54-68.
- (1999) 'Programme notes', in Goldhill and Osborne (1999) (eds.) 1-29.
- (2000) 'Civic ideology and the problem of difference: the politics of Aeschylean tragedy once again', *JHS* 120: 34-56.
- (2007) *How to Stage Greek Tragedy Today* (Chicago).
- (2009), "The audience on stage: rhetoric, emotion and judgement in Sophoclean theatre" in Goldhill and Hall (2009) (eds.) 27-47.
- Goldhill, S., and Hall, E. (2009) (eds.) *Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition* (Cambridge).
- Goldhill, S., and Osborne, R. (1999) (eds.) *Performance, Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge).
- Goldhill, S., and Osborne, R. (2006) (eds.) *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).
- Gösswein, H.-U. (1975) *Die Briefe des Euripides* (Meisenheim am Glan).
- Gould, J. (1996) 'Tragedy and Collective Experience', in Silk (1996) (ed.) 217-243 [= (2001) 378-404].

- (2001) *Myth, Ritual, Memory and Exchange* (Oxford).
- Greco, E. (1998) (ed.) *Siritide e Metapontino: storie di due territori coloniali* (Naples).
- Green, J.R. (1991a) 'Notes on phryx vases', *Num. Ant. Cl.* 20: 49-56.
- (1991b) 'On seeing and depicting the theatre in classical Athens', *GRBS* 32: 15-50.
- (1994) *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society* (London).
- (1999) 'Tragedy and the spectacle of the mind. Messenger speeches, actors, narrative and audience imagination in fourth century BCE vase painting', in Bergmann and Kondoleon (1999) (eds.) 37-63.
- (2002) 'Towards a reconstruction of performance style' in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 93-126.
- Greenwalt W. (1985) 'The introduction of Caranus into the Argead king list', *GRBS* 26: 43-9.
- Gregory, J. (2005a) (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Malden, MA).
- (2005b) 'Euripidean Tragedy', in Gregory (2005a) 251-70.
- Griffin, J. (1998) 'The social function of Attic tragedy', *CQ* 48: 39-61.
- (1999a) (ed.) *Sophocles Revisited* (Oxford).
- (1999b) 'Sophocles and the democratic city' in Griffin (1999a) 73-94.
- Griffith, A. (1995) (ed.) *Stage Directions* (London).
- Griffith, M. (1977) *The Authenticity of Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge).
- (1978) 'Aeschylus, Sicily and Prometheus', in Dawe, Diggle and Easterling (1978) (eds.) 105-139.
- (1995) 'Brilliant Dynasts. Power and politics in the *Oresteia*', *CA* 14: 62-129.
- (2010) 'Satyr play and tragedy, face to face', in Taplin and Wyles (2010) (eds.) 47-63.
- Griffith, M. and Carter, D.M. (2011) 'Introduction' in Carter (2011) 1-16.

- Guarducci, M. (1929), *Poeti vaganti e conferenzieri dell'eta ellenistica : ricerche di epigrafia greca nel campo della letteratura e del costume* (Atti della Reale Accademia nazionale dei Lincei; Rome).
- Hall, E. (1996a) *Aeschylus Persians* (Warminster).
- (1996b) 'Is there a *polis* in Aristotle's Poetics?' in Silk (1996) (ed.) 295-309.
- (1997) 'The sociology of Athenian tragedy' in Easterling (1997) (ed.) 93-126.
- (2002) 'The singing actors of antiquity', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 3-38.
- (2006) *The Theatrical Cast of Athens. Interactions between Ancient Greek Drama and Society* (Oxford).
- (2007a) 'Tragedy Personified', in Kraus *et.al.* (2007) (eds.) 221-56.
- (2007b) 'Greek Tragedy 430-380 BC', in Osborne (2007) (ed.) 264-87.
- Hall, E., Macintosh, F., and Taplin, O. (2000) (eds.) *Medea in performance 1500-2000* (Oxford).
- Hall, J.M. (2001) 'Contested ethnicities: perceptions of Macedonia within evolving definitions of Greek identity' in Malkin (2001) (ed.) 156-86.
- Hammond, N.G.L., and Griffith, G.T. (1979) *A History of Macedonia. Volume 2. 550-336 BC* (Oxford).
- Hanink, J. (2008) 'Literary politics and the Euripidean Vita', *CJ* 54: 115-135.
- (2010a) 'The classical tragedians from Athenian idols to wandering poets', in Gildenhard and Revermann (2010) (eds.) 39-68.
- (2010b) 'The life of the author in the "letters" of Euripides', *GRBS* 50: 537-64.
- (2011) 'Aristotle and the tragic theatre in the fourth century BC. A response to Jennifer Wise', *Arethusa* 44: 311-28.
- Harder, A. (1979) 'A new identification in *P.Oxy.* 2455?', *ZPE* 35: 7-14.
- (1985) *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos. Introduction, text and*

- commentary (*Mnem. Suppl.* 87, Leiden).
- (1991) 'Euripides' *Temenus* and *Temenidai*', in Hoffman and Harder (1991) (eds.) 117-135.
- Harder, A., Regtuit, R. F. & Wakker, G. C. (2006) (eds.) *Beyond the canon* (Leuven).
- Harris, H.A. (1964) *Greek athletes and athletics* (London).
- Harrison, G.W.M. (2005) (ed.) *Satyr Drama. Tragedy at Play* (Swansea).
- Harvey, D. (2000) 'Phrynichus and his Muses', in Harvey and Wilkins (2000) (eds.) 91-134.
- Harvey, D. and Wilkins, J. (2000) (eds.) *The Rivals of Aristophanes* (Swansea).
- Haslam, M.W. (1975) 'The authenticity of Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1-2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1', *GRBS* 16: 149-74.
- (1991) 'Aiolos' cousin', *ZPE* 88: 297-9. [= Lloyd-Jones (2005) 42-5]
- Hatzopoulos, M. B. (1996) *Macedonian institutions under the kings* (Athens and Paris).
- Haupt, M. (1875) *Opuscula* (Leipzig).
- Heath, M. (1987) *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*, (London).
- (1988) 'Receiving the κῶμος' *AJP* 109: 180-95.
- (1990) 'Aristophanes and his rivals', *G&R* 37: 143-58.
- (2006) 'The social function of tragedy. Clarifications and questions', in Cairns and Liapis (2006) (eds.) 253-82.
- (2009) 'Should there have been a polis in Aristotle's *Poetics*', *CQ* 59: 468-85.
- (2011) 'Response to Burian, Hesk, and Barker', in Carter (2011) (ed.) 163-71.
- Heath, M. and Lefkowitz, M. (1991) 'Epinician performance' *CP* 86: 173-91.
- Henderson, J. (1991) 'Women and the Athenian dramatic festivals', *TAPA* 121: 133-47.
- Herington, C.J. (1965) 'Aeschylus. The last phase', *Arion* 4: 387-403.
- (1967) 'Aeschylus in Sicily', *JHS* 87: 74-85.

- (1970) *The Author of the Prometheus Bound* (Austin and London).
- (1985) *Poetry into Drama. Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley and London).
- Hickmann, E., Both, A.A. and Eichmann, R. (2006) (eds.) *Studien zur Musikarchäologie V. Musikarchäologie im Kontext.* (Rahden).
- Hodkinson, S. (2009) (ed.) *Sparta. Comparative Approaches* (Swansea).
- Hofman, M. and Harder, A. (1991) (eds.) *Fragmenta Dramatica. Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte* (Göttingen).
- Horden, P. and Purcell, N. (2000) *The Corrupting Sea. A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford).
- Hordern, J.H. (2002) *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus* (Oxford).
- Horky, P.S. (2009) 'Persian cosmos and Greek philosophy. Plato's associates and the Zoroastrian *magoi*', in Inwood (2009) (ed.) 47-103.
- Hornblower, S. (1982) *Mausolus* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S., and Morgan, C. (2007a) (eds.) *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford).
- (2007b) 'Introduction', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007a) (eds.) 1-43.
- Hubbard, T.K. (2004) 'The dissemination of epinician lyric. Pan-hellenism, re-performance, written texts', in Mackie (2004) (ed.) 71-93.
- (2011) 'The dissemination of Pindar's non-epinician choral lyric', in Athenassaki and Bowie (2011) (eds.) 347-63.
- Huddilston, J.H. (1898) *Greek Tragedy in the Light of Vase Paintings* (New York and London).
- Hugoniot, C., Hurlet, F. and Milanezi, S. (2004) (eds.) *Le statut de l'acteur dans l'antiquité grecque et romaine* (Tours).

- Hunter, R.L. (1983) *Eubulus* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R.L. and Rutherford, I. (2009a) (eds.) *Wandering poets in ancient Greek culture. Travel, locality and pan-hellenism* (Cambridge).
- (2009b) 'Introduction' in Hunter and Rutherford (2009a) (eds.) 1-22.
- Hutchinson, G.O. (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford).
- Huxley, G. (1965) 'Ion of Chios', *GRBS* 6: 29-46.
- Huys, M. (1997) 'The *Fabulae* of Ps.-Hyginus: a source for the reconstruction of Euripides' lost tragedies?: Part II', *Archiv fur Papyrus Forschung und Verwandte Gebiete* 43: 11-30.
- Inwood, B. (2009) (ed.) *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy XXXVII* (Oxford).
- Ippolito, A. 'De Aeschlyli deperdita fabula quae Αἰτναῖαι inscribitur', *Latinitas* 45 (1997) 2-12.
- Isler, H.P. (1999) 'Bericht über die Arbeiten im Theater von Eretria', *AK* 42: 116-18.
- Jacoby, F. (1947) 'Some remarks on Ion of Chios', *CQ* 41: 1-17.
- Jeffery, L. (1990) *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford). [1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1961]
- Jennings, V. and Katsaros, A. (2007) (eds.) *The World of Ion of Chios (Mnem. Suppl. 288* Leiden).
- Jones, C.P. (1991) 'Dinner Theatre', in Slater (1991) (ed.) 185-98.
- Jouan, F. and Van Looy, H. (1998) *Euripide. Tome VIII Fragments* (Paris).
- Jordan, D. (2000) 'A personal letter found in the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia* 69: 91-103.
- (2007) 'An opisthographic lead tablet from Sicily with a financial document and a curse concerning *choregoi*', in Wilson (2007) (ed.) 335-50.
- Junker, K. (2011) 'The transformation of Athenian theatre culture around 400 BC', in Taplin and Wyles (2011) (eds.) 131-48.

- Kaimio, M. (1999) 'The citizenship of the theatre-makers in Athens', *WJA* 23: 43-61.
- Katsaros, A. (2007) 'Staging Empire and other in Ion's Sympotica', in Jennings and Katsaros (2007) (eds.) 217-60.
- Kerkhof, R. (2001) *Dorische Posse, Epicharm und Attische Komödie* (Leipzig).
- Kitto, H.D.F. (1939) *Greek Tragedy. A Literary Study* (London).
- Kivilo, M. (2010) *Early Greek Poets' Lives. The Shaping of the Tradition* (Leiden).
- Klee, T. (1918) *Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone an griechischen Festen* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Knox, B. (1954) 'Why is Oedipus called Tyrannos', *CJ* 3: 97-130. [= Knox (1979) 87-95]
- (1964), *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Berkeley).
- (1972) 'Aeschylus and the third actor,' *AJP* 93: 104-24. [= (1979) 39-55]
- (1979) *Word and Action: Essays on the Ancient Theatre* (Baltimore).
- (1998) *Oedipus at Thebes: Sophocles' Tragic Hero and his Time* (New Haven). [1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1957]
- Koehler, U. (1894) 'Aus dem Leben des Dichters Ion', *Hermes* 29: 156-8.
- Kolb, F. (1979) 'Polis und Theater', in Seeck (1979) (ed.) 504-45.
- König, J. (2010) (ed.) *Greek Athletics* (Edinburgh).
- Kossatz-Diessmann, A. (1980) 'Telephus Transvestitus', in Cahn and Simon (1980) (eds.) 281-90.
- Koster, W.J.W. (1971) 'de prologo "Archelai" Euripidis', *Mnem.* 24: 88-90.
- Kovacs, D. (1986) 'On Medea's great monologue (E. *Med.* 1021-80)', *CQ* 36: 343-52.
- (1990) 'De Ctesiphonte verna, ut perhibent, Euripidis', *ZPE* 84: 15-18.
- (1994) *Euripidea* (Leiden).
- (1995) 'Paralipomena Euripidea', *Mnemosyne* 48: 565-70.

- (2003) 'Toward a reconstruction of "Iphigenia Aulidensis"', *JHS* 123: 77-103.
- Kowalzig, B. (2005) 'Mapping out *Communitas*. Performances of *Theoria* in their sacred and political context', in Elsner and Rutherford (2005) (eds.) 41-72.
- (2008) 'Nothing to do with Demeter? Something to do with Sicily! Theatre and society in the early fifth century west', in Revermann, and Wilson (2008) (eds.) 128-57.
- Kraus, C., Foley, H.P., Goldhill, S. and Elsner, J. (2007) (eds.) *Visualising the Tragic* (Oxford).
- Kuch, H. (1993) 'Continuity and change in Greek tragedy under postclassical conditions', in Sommerstein *et al.* (1993) (ed.) 545-57.
- Kurke, L. (1991) *The Traffic in Praise. Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca and London).
- (1993) 'The economy of Kudos' in Kurke and Dougherty (1993) (eds.) 131-163. [= König (2010) (ed.) 204-37]
- (1997) 'The cultural impact of (on) democracy: decentering tragedy,' in Morris and Raaflaub (1997) (eds.) 155-69.
- Kyle, D. G. (2007) *Sport and spectacle in the ancient world* (Malden, MA and Oxford).
- Lämmer, M. (1982-3) 'The so-called Olympic peace in ancient Greece', *Stadion* 8-9: 47-83. [= König (2010) (ed.) 36-60]
- Lane Fox, R. (2008) *Travelling Heroes. Greeks and their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer* (London).
- Larmour, D.H.J. (1999) *Stage and Stadium* (Hildesheim).
- La Rosa, V. (1974) 'Le Etnee di Eschilo e l'identificazione di Xouthia', *Archivio Storico per la Sicilia Orientale* 70: 151-63.
- Lattimore, R. L. (1943) 'Aeschylus on the defeat of Xerxes', in Oldfather (1943) 82-93.



- Lefèvre, E. (2003) *Studien zu den Quellen und zum Verständnis des Prometheus Desmotes* (Göttingen).
- Lefkowitz, M.R. (1963) 'The first person in Pindar', *Harvard Studies in Philology* 67: 177-253. [= (1991) 1-71]
- (1978) 'The poet as hero. Fifth century autobiography and subsequent biographical fiction', *CQ* 28: 459-469. [= (1991) 111-26]
- (1979) 'The Euripides Vita', *GRBS* 20: 187-210.
- (1981) *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London).
- (1988) 'Who sang Pindar's victory odes?', *AJP* 109: 1-11. [= (1991) 191-201]
- (1984) 'The poet as athlete', *Journal of Sport History* 11: 18-24. [= (1991) 161-8]
- (1991) *First Person Fictions. Pindar's Poetic 'I'* (Oxford).
- Le Guen, B. (1995) 'Théâtre et cités à l'époque Hellénistique. "Mort de la cite" – "Mort du theatre"?'', *REG* 108: 59-90.
- (2001) *Les Associations de Technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique. Vol. 1, Corpus documentaire; vol. 2, Synthèse* (Nancy).
- (2010) (ed.) *L'argent dans les concours du monde grec* (Saint-Denis).
- Lesky, A. (1963) *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Bern and Munich).
- (1972) *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen* (Göttingen). [1<sup>st</sup> edition 1956]
- Liapis, V. (2001) 'An ancient hypothesis to *Rhesus*, and Dicaearchus' Hypotheseis', *GRBS* 23: 356-67.
- (2009a) '*Rhesus* revisited. The case for a fourth century Macedonian context', *JHS* 129: 71-88.
- (2009b) 'Rhesus. Myth and iconography', in Cousland and Hume (2009) (eds.) 273-91.
- (2012) *A Commentary on the Rhesus attributed to Euripides* (Oxford).

- Lightfoot, J.L. (2002) 'Nothing to do with the *technitai* of Dionysus?', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 209-24.
- Lilja, S. (1980) 'The ape in ancient comedy', *Arctos* 14: 31-8.
- Lissarrague, F. (2008) 'Image and representation in the pottery of Magna Graecia', in Revermann, and Wilson (2008) (eds.) 438-49.
- Lloyd, M. (1994) *Euripides Andromache* (Warminster).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1966) 'Problems of early Greek tragedy: Pratinas, Phrynichus, the Gyges fragment', *Estudios sobre la tragedia Griega. Cuadernos de la Fundación Pastor* 13: 11-33. [= (1990) 225-37]
- (1983) *The Justice of Zeus* (Berkeley). [1<sup>st</sup> edition 1971]
- (1990) *Greek Lyric, Epic, and Tragedy. The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford)
- (1991) 'The cousin of Aiolos Hippotades (Stesichorus (?), *P. Oxy.* 3876. Fr. 62)', *ZPE* 87: 297-300. [= (2005) 39-42]
- (2003) 'Zeus, Prometheus and Greek Ethics', *HSCP* 101: 49-72. [= (2005) 181-202]
- (2005) *The Further Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- Lomas, K. (2004) (ed.) *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean* (Leiden and Boston).
- Longo, O. (1990) 'The theatre of the polis', in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.) 12-19.
- Lopez Férez, J.A. (1998) (ed.) *La Comedia griega y su influencia en la literatura española* (Madrid).
- Lowenstam, S. (1992) 'The uses of vase depictions in Homeric studies', *TAPA* 122: 165-98.
- (1997) 'Talking Vases. The relationship between the Homeric poems and Archaic representations of epic myth', *TAPA* 127: 21-76.
- Luppe, W. (1992) '*Resolutions and chronology in Euripides: the fragmentary tragedies* by M. Cropp and G. Fick', *Mnem.* 45: 96-8.

- MacDowell, D.M. (1971) *Aristophanes Wasps* (Oxford).
- (1993) 'Foreign birth and Athenian citizenship in Aristophanes', in Sommerstein *et al.* (1993) (ed.) 359-71.
- (2000) *Demosthenes On the false embassy* (oration 19) (Oxford).
- Mackie, C.J. (2004) (ed.) *Oral Performance and its Context* (Leiden).
- Macintosh, F. (2005) (ed.) *Agamemnon in performance 458 BC to AD 2004* (Oxford).
- MacLachlan, B. (1993) *The Age of Grace. Charis in Early Greek Poetry* (Princeton).
- Macleod, C.W. (1982) 'Politics and the *Oresteia*', *JHS* 102: 124-44. [= Lloyd (2007) (ed.) 265-301].
- Maehler, H. (2002) 'Bakchylides and the Polyzalos Inscription', *ZPE* 139: 19-21.
- (2004) *Bacchylides. A Selection* (Cambridge).
- Maitland, J. (2007) 'Ion of Chios, Sophocles and myth', in Jennings and Katasaros (2007) (eds.) 266-80.
- Malkin, I. (1998) *The returns of Odysseus. Colonization and ethnicity* (Berkeley and London).
- (2001) (ed.) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (2011) *A small Greek world. Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford).
- Malkin, I., Constantakopoulou, C. and Panagopoulou K. (2009) (eds.) *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean* (London).
- Marek, C. (1984) *Die Proxenie* (Frankfurt).
- Markantonatos, A. and Zimmermann, B. (2012) (eds.) *Crisis on Stage. Tragedy and Comedy in late fifth century Athens* (Berlin).
- Markianos, S.S. (1974) 'The Chronology of the Herodotean Solon', *Historia* 23: 1-20.
- Marow, S. and Nölle, E. (2002) (eds.) *Die Geburt des Theaters in der griechischen Antike* (Mainz).

- Marshall, C.W. (2003) 'Casting the *Oresteia*', *CJ* 98: 257-74.
- Martin, R.P. (2003) 'The Pipes are brawling. Conceptualising musical performance in Athens', in Dougherty and Kurke (2003) (eds.) 153-180.
- (2009) 'Read on arrival' in Hunter and Rutherford (eds.) (2009a) 80-104.
- Mastronarde, D.J. (1994) *Euripides Phoenissae* (Cambridge).
- (2002) *Euripides Medea* (Cambridge).
- McDermott, W.C. (1935) 'The Ape in Greek Literature', *TAPA* 66: 165-76.
- McDonald, M., and Walton, M. (2007) (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre* (Cambridge).
- Meier, C. (1993) *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- Mele, A. (1998) 'Culti e Miti nella storia di Metaponto', in Greco (1998) (ed.) 67-90.
- Meyer, E.A. (2010) *Metics and the Athenian Phialai-inscriptions. A study in Athenian epigraphy and law* (Stuttgart).
- Michelakis, P. (2002) *Achilles in Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- Michellini, A.N. (1989) 'Neophron and Euripides' *Medeia*', *TAPA* 119: 115-35.
- (1999-2000) 'The expansion of myth in late Euripides: *Iphigenia at Aulis*', in Cropp, Lee and Sansone (1999-2000) (eds.) 41-57.
- Miller, S.G. (2004) *Ancient Greek Athletics* (New Haven and London).
- Millett, P. (1989) 'Patronage and its avoidance in classical Athens', in Wallace-Hadrill (1989) (ed.) 15-47.
- Millis, B.W. and Olson, D. (2012) *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens. IG II<sup>2</sup> 2318-2325 and Related Texts* (Leiden and Boston).
- Mills, S. (1997) *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford).
- Mitchell, A.G. (2009) *Greek Vase Painting and the Origins of Visual Humour* (Cambridge).
- Montiglio, S. (2000) 'Wandering Philosophers in Classical Greece', *JHS* 120: 86-105.

- (2005) *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture* (Chicago and London).
- Moreau, A.M. (1992/3) 'La tétralogie des Perses a-t-elle une unite?', in Ghiron-Bistagne *et al.* (1993) (eds.) 119-44.
- Morgan, K. A. (1993) 'Pindar the professional and the rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ', *CP* 88, 1-15.
- (2007) 'Debating patronage. Argos and Corinth,' in Hornblower and Morgan (2007) (eds.) 213-63.
- (2012) 'A prolegomenon to performance in the West', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 35-55.
- Morris, I and Raaflaub, K. (1997) (eds.) *Democracy 2500. Questions and Challenges* (Boston).
- Morwood, J. (2009) 'Euripides and the demagogues', *CQ* 59: 353-63.
- Mossman, J. (2011) *Euripides Medea* (Oxford).
- Murnaghan, S. (2011) 'Choroi achoroi. The Athenian politics of tragic choral identity', in Carter (2011) 245-67.
- Murray, O. and Price, S.R.F. (1990) (eds.) *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford).
- Murray, P. and Wilson, P. (2004) (eds.) *Music and the Muses. The Culture of Music in the Classical Athenian City* (Oxford).
- Nagy, G. (1990) *Pindar's Homer. The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore and London).
- Nauck, A. (1889) *Euripidis Tragoediae* (Leipzig).
- Nervegna, S. (2007) 'Staging scenes or plays? Theatrical revivals of 'old' Greek drama in antiquity', *ZPE* 162: 14-42.
- (2013) *Menander in Antiquity. The Contexts of Reception* (Cambridge).
- Nicholson, N.J. (2005) *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical*

- Greece* (Cambridge).
- Nieberding, K. (1836) *de Ionis Chii vita moriis studiis doctrinae scripsit* (Leipzig).
- Nielson, T.H. (2002) (ed.) *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart).
- Niesler, J. (1981) *Proxenos und Proxenie in frühen literarischen und epigraphischen Zeugnissen* (Munich).
- Nietzsche, F. W. (1872) *Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik* (Leipzig).
- Nilsson, M.P. (1951) *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund).
- O'Connor, J.B. (1908) *Chapters in the History of Actors and Acting in Ancient Greece* (Chicago).
- Oldfather, W. A. (1943) *Classical Studies in honor of William Abbott Oldfather* (Urbana).
- Olson, S.D. (1997) 'Was Carcinus a tragic playwright? A response', *CP* 92: 258-60.
- (2007) *Broken Laughter. Select Fragments of Greek Comedy* (Oxford).
- Osborne, R. (1993) 'Competitive festivals and the polis. A context for dramatic festivals at Athens', in Sommerstein et al. (1993) (eds.) 21-38.
- (1994) 'Athenian democracy. Something to celebrate?', *Dialogos* 1: 48-58. [= (2010) 27-38]
- (1997) 'The ecstasy and the tragedy. Varieties of religious experience in art, drama and society', in Pelling (1997) (ed.) 187-211. [= (2010) 368-404]
- (2007) (ed.) *Debating the Cultural Revolution. Art, Literature, Philosophy and Politics 430-380 BC* (Cambridge).
- (2009) *Greece in the making, 1200-469 B.C* (London). [1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1996]
- (2010) *Athens and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge).
- Osborne, R. and Hornblower, S. (1994) (eds.) *Ritual, Finance, Politics* (Oxford).
- O' Sullivan, P. (2003) 'Victory statue, victory song. Pindar's agonistic poetics and its legacy', in Phillips and Pritchard (2003) (eds.) 75-100.

- (2012) 'Dionysos, Polyphemos and the idea of Sicily in Euripides' *Cyclops*', in Davidson and Rosenbloom (2012) (eds.) 169-89.
- Page, D.L. (1936) 'The Elegiacs in Euripides' *Andromache*' in Bailey *et al.* (1936) (eds.) 206-30.
- (1938) *Euripides Medea* (Oxford).
- Papenfuss, D., and Strocka, V.M. (2001) (eds.) *Gab es das griechische Wunder?* (Mainz).
- Parker, R. (1983) *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford).
- (2004) 'New 'panhellenic' festivals in Hellenistic Greece', in Schlesier and Zellmann (2004) (eds.) 9-22.
- Pavlovskis, Z. (1977) 'The voice of the actor in Greek Tragedy', *CW* 71: 113-123.
- Pelling, C. (1997) (ed.) *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford).
- Phillips, D.J. (2003) 'Athenian political history. A Panathenaic perspective' in Phillips and Pritchard (eds.) (2003) 197-232.
- Phillips, D.J., and Pritchard, D. (2003) *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea).
- Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. (1949) 'South Italian Vases and Attic Drama', *CQ* 43: 57.
- Pleket, H.W. (1974) 'Zur Soziologie des antiken Sports', *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome* 36: 56-87.
- (1976) 'Games, prizes, athletes and ideology', *Stadion* 1: 49-89. [= König (2010) (ed.) 145-74]
- Podlecki, A.J. (1966) *The political background of Aeschylean tragedy* (Ann Arbor).
- (1986) 'Polis and monarchy in early Attic tragedy', in Euben (1986) (ed.) 76-100.
- Polacco, L. and Anti, C. (1981) *Il teatro antico di Siracusa* (Rimini).
- Poli-Palladini, L. (2001) 'Some reflections on Aeschylus' *Aetnae(ae)*', *RhM* 144: 287-325.
- Powell, A. (1989) (ed.) *Classical Sparta: Techniques behind her success* (London).

- Power, T. (2010) *The Culture of Kitharodia* (Washington DC).
- Pozzi, D. C. and Wickersham, J. M. (1991) (eds.) *Myth and the Polis* (Ithaca).
- Prag, A.J.N.W. (1985) *The Oresteia. Iconographic and Narrative Tradition* (Warminster).
- Purcell, N. (1990) 'Mobility and the polis' in Murray and Price (1990) (eds.) *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford) 29-58.
- Raaflaub, K.A. (1990) 'Contemporary perceptions of democracy in fifth century Athens', in Connor *et al.* (1990) (eds.) 33-70.
- Rabinowitz, A. (2009) 'Drinking from the same cup. Sparta and late archaic commensality', in Hodkinson (2009) (ed.) 113-91.
- Rabinowitz, N.S. (2008) *Greek tragedy* (Oxford).
- Radt, S.L. (1966) 'Pindars *erste Nemeische Ode*. Versuch einer interpretation', *Mnem.* 19: 148-74.
- Randall, R.H. (1953) 'The Erechtheum Workmen', *AJA* 58: 199-210.
- Rawles, R. (forthcoming) *Simonides and Simonidea. A study in tradition*.
- Reece, S. (1993) *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene* (Ann Arbor).
- Reeve, M.D. (1972) 'Euripides *Medea* 1056-80', *CQ* 22: 51-61.
- Rehm, R. (1989) 'Aeschylus in Syracuse. The commerce of tragedy and politics,' in Wescoat (1989) (ed.) 31-4.
- (2007) 'Festivals and audiences in Athens and Rome', in McDonald and Walton (2007) (eds.) 184-201.
- Revermann, M. (2000) 'Euripides, tragedy and Macedon. Some conditions of reception', in Cropp, Lee and Sansone (2000) (eds.) 45-67.
- (2005) 'The "Cleveland Medea" calyx crater and the iconography of ancient Greek theatre', *Theatre Research International* 30: 3-18.



- (2006a) *Comic Business. Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts of Aristophanic Comedy* (Oxford).
- (2006b) 'The competence of theatre audiences in fifth and fourth century Athens', *JHS* 123: 104-119.
- (2010) 'Situating the gaze of the recipient(s). Theatre-related vase painting and their contexts of reception', in Gildenhard and Revermann (2010) (eds.) 69-97.
- Revermann, M., and Wilson, P. (2008) (eds.) *Performance, Iconography, Reception* (Oxford).
- Rhodes, P.J. (2000) 'Oligarchs in Athens', in Brock and Hodkinson (2000) (eds.) 119-36.
- (2003) 'Nothing to do with democracy. Athenian drama and the *polis*', *JHS* 123: 104-119.
- (2011) 'The Dionysia and democracy again', *CQ* 61: 71-4.
- Richardson, N. (2010) *Three Homeric Hymns. To Apollo, Hermes and Aphrodite* (Cambridge).
- Ridgeway, W. (1926) 'Euripides in Macedon', *CA* 20: 1-19.
- Ritchie, W. (1964) *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge).
- Robert, C. (1881) *Bild und Lied* (Berlin).
- Robertson, D.S. (1923) 'Euripides and Tharyps', *CR* 37: 58-60.
- Robertson, N. (1980) 'The Dorian migration and Corinthian ritual', *CP* 75: 1-22.
- Rocconi, E. (2006) 'Women players in ancient Greece. The context of the symposia and the social-cultural position of psaltria and auletrides in the classical world', in Hickmann et al. (2006) (eds.) 335-44.
- Rose, P.W. (1974) 'The myth of Pindar's first *Nemean*', *HSCP* 78: 145-75.
- (1995) 'Historicising Sophocles' Ajax', in Goff (1995) (ed.) 59-90.
- Roselli, D.K. (2011) *Theatre of the People. Spectators and Society in Ancient Athens*

- (Austin).
- Rosenbloom, D. (2011) 'The panhellenism of Athenian tragedy', in Carter (2011) (ed.) 353-81
- (2012) 'Athenian drama and democratic political culture', in Davidson and Rosenbloom (2012) (eds.) 270-99.
- Rothwell, K.S. (1994) 'Was Carcinus a tragic playwright?', *CP* 89: 241-5.
- Rusten, J.S. (1980) 'The return of the Heracleidae', *ZPE* 40: 39-42.
- (1982) 'Dicaearchus and the *Tales of Euripides*', *GRBS* 23: 357-67.
- (2006) 'Who 'invented' comedy? The ancient candidates for the origins of ccomedy and the visual evidence', *AJP* 127: 37-66.
- Rutherford, I. (1998) 'Theoria as theatre. Pilgrimage in Greek drama', in Cairns (1998) (ed.) 131-56.
- (2001) *Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford).
- (2004) '*Khoros heis ek tes poleos*. State-pilgrimage and song dance in Athens,' in Murray and Wilson (2004) (eds.) 67-90.
- (2005) 'Down stream to the cat goddess. Herodotus on Egyptian pilgrimage', in Elsner and Rutherford (2005) (eds.) 131-50.
- (2007a) 'Theoria and Theatre at Samothrace. The *Dardanos* of Dymas", in Wilson (2007) (ed.) 279-293.
- (2007b) 'Network Theory and Theoric Networks', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22: 23-37 [= Malkin et.al. (2009) (eds.) 24-38]
- (2009) 'Aristodama and the Aetolians. An itinerant poetess and her agenda', in Hunter and Rutherford (2009a) (eds.) 237-48.
- Säflund, M.L. (1970) *The East Pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia* (Göteborg).

- Said, S. (1998) 'Tragedy and politics', in Boedeker and Raaflaub (1998) (eds.) 275-95.
- Sanguinetti Katz, G., Golini, V. and Pietropaolo, D. (2001) (eds.) *Theatre and the Visual Arts* (New York, Ottawa and Toronto)
- Scaparro, M., de Septis, F., Rossetto, P.C. and Sartorio, G.P. (1994) (eds.) *Teatri greci e romani* 3 vols. (Rome).
- Schachter, A. (1986) *Cults of Boiotia. Vol. 2 Heracles to Poseidon* (BICS Suppl. 38.2, London).
- Schachter, A. and Slater, W. J. (2007) 'A proxeny decree from Coroneia, Boiotia, in honour of Zotion, son of Zotion of Ephesus', *ZPE* 163: 81-95.
- Schechner and Appel (1990) (eds.) *By means of Performance. Intercultural Studies of Theatre and Ritual* (Cambridge).
- Schlesier, R. and Zellmann, U. (2004) (eds.) *Mobility and travel in the Mediterranean from antiquity to the Middle Ages* (Münster and London).
- Schwartz, J.D. (1986) 'Human action and political action in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*', in Euben (1986) (ed.) 183-209.
- Scodel, R. (2001) 'The poet's career, the rise of tragedy and Athenian cultural hegemony', in Papenfuss and Strocka (2001) (eds.) 215-27.
- (2003) 'The politics of Sophocles' *Ajax*', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 22: 31-42.
- Scullion, S. (1994) *Three Studies in Athenian Dramaturgy* (Stuttgart).
- (2002a) "'Nothing to do with Dionysus". Tragedy misconceived as ritual', *CQ* 52: 102-37.
- (2002b) 'Tragic dates', *CQ* 51: 81-101.
- (2003) 'Euripides and Macedon, or the silence of the *Frogs*', *CQ* 53: 389-400.
- (2006) 'The opening of Euripides' *Archelaus*', in Cairns and Liapis (2006) (eds.) 185-200.

- Seaford, R. (1977-8) 'The "hyporchema" of Pratinas', *Maia* 29-30: 81-94.
- (1982) 'The date of Euripides' *Cyclops*', *JHS* 102: 161-72.
- (1993) 'Dionysus as destroyer of the household. Homer, Tragedy and the *Polis*', in Carpenter and Faraone (1993) (eds.) 115-146.
- (1994) *Reciprocity and Ritual* (Oxford).
- (1996) 'Something to do with Dionysus. Tragedy and the Dionysiac: response to Freidrich', in Silk (1996) (ed.) 284-294.
- (1998) *The Cyclops of Euripides* (Bristol). [1<sup>st</sup> edition 1984]
- (2000) 'The social function of Attic tragedy. A response to Jasper Griffin', *CQ* 50: 30-44.
- (2004) *Money and the Early Greek Mind* (Cambridge).
- (2011) 'Response to Wilson, Carter and Duncan', in Carter (2011) (ed.) 85-91.
- Seeck, G.-A. (1979) (ed.) *Das Griechische Drama* (Darmstadt).
- Segal, C. (1982) *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides' Bacchae* (Princeton).
- (1995) *Sophocles' Tragic World* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Shapiro, H.A. (1993) 'Hipparchus and the rhapsodes', in Dougherty and Kurke (1993) (eds.) 92-107.
- (1994) *Myth into Art. Poet and Painter in Classical Greece* (London and New York).
- Shear, J.L. (2003) 'Prizes from Athens. The list of Panathenaic prizes and the sacred oil', *ZPE* 142: 87-108.
- Sider, D. (1980) 'Plato's Symposium as Dionysian Festival', *QUCC* 4: 41-56.
- Sifakis, G.M. (1967) *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama* (London).
- (1995) 'The one actor rule in Greek tragedy', in Griffiths (1995) (ed.) 13-24.

- (2002) 'Looking for the actor's art in Aristotle' in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 148-64.
- Slater, N.W. (1985) 'Vanished players. Two classical reliefs and theatre history', *GRBS* 26: 333-44.
- (1990) 'The idea of the actor', in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.) 385-95.
- (2005) 'Nothing to do with satyrs? Alcestis and the concept of prosatyrlic drama', in Harrison (2005) (ed.) 83-101.
- Slater, W.J. (1972) 'Simonides' house', *Phoenix* 26: 232-240.
- (1991) (ed.) *Dining in a Classical Context* (Ann Arbor).
- (2004) 'Where are the actors?', in Hugoniot *et al.* (2004) (eds.) 143-60.
- Silk, M.S. (1996) (ed.) *Tragedy and the Tragic. Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford).
- Small, J. P. (2003) *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Text* (Cambridge).
- (2005) 'Pictures of tragedy', in Gregory (2005) (ed.) 103-118.
- Smith, D.G. (2012) 'Sicily and the Identities of Xuthus. Stesichorus, Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae* and Euripides' *Ion*,' in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 112-36.
- Smith, R.R.R. (2007) 'Pindar, athletes and the early Greek statue habit', in Hornblower, and Morgan (2007) (eds.) 83-139.
- Snodgrass, A. (1998) *Homer and the Artists. Text and Picture in Early Greek Art* (Cambridge).
- Sommerstein, A. (1987a) *Aristophanes Birds* (Warminster).
- (1987b) 'Phrynichus the dancer', *Phoenix* 41: 189-90.
- (1989) *Aeschylus Eumenides* (Cambridge).
- (1994) *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazousae* (Warminster).
- (1996) *Aristophanes Frogs* (Warminster).
- (1998) 'The theatre audience, the demos and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus', in Lopez

- Férez (1998) (ed.) 43-62. [= (2010a) 118-42]
- (2003) (ed.) *Shards from Colonus. Studies in Sophoclean Fragments* (Bari)
- (2008) *Aeschylus Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- (2010a) *The Tangled Ways of Zeus* (Oxford).
- (2010b) *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Bari). [2<sup>nd</sup> ed.]
- (2010c) 'Notes on Aeschylean Fragments', *Prometheus* 36: 193-212.
- (2012) 'The Persian war tetralogy of Aeschylus', in Davidson and Rosenbloom (2012) (eds.) 95-107.
- Sommerstein, A.H., Halliwell, S., Henderson, J., and Zimmermann, B. (1993) (eds.) *Tragedy Comedy and the Polis* (Bari).
- Sommerstein, A.H. and Talbot, T.H. (2012) *Sophocles. Selected Fragmentary Plays Volume II* (Oxford).
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1997) 'Medea at a shifting distance. Images and Euripidean Tragedy', in Clauss and Johnston (1997) (eds.) 253-96.
- (2003) *Tragedy and Athenian religion* (Oxford).
- Sparkes, B.A. (1967) 'The taste of the Boeotian Pig', *JHS* 87: 116-30.
- Stafford, E. (2012) *Herakles* (London).
- Stanford, W.B. (1937/8) 'Traces of Sicilian Influence in Aeschylus', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 44: 229-40.
- Steiner, D. (1986) *The Crown of Song. Metaphor in Pindar* (London).
- (1998) 'Moving images. Fifth-century victory monuments and the athlete's allure', *CA* 17: 123-50.
- Stevens, A. (2007) 'Ion of Chios. Tragedy as commodity and Athenian exchange', in Jennings and Katsaros (2007) (eds.) 243-65.
- Stevens, P.T. (1956) 'Euripides and the Athenians', *JHS* 76: 87-94.

- (1971) *Euripides Andromache* (Oxford).
- Stewart, E.J. (forthcoming) 'Evidence for a theatre dynasty. The sons of Carcinus in Aristophanes' *Wasps* 1497-1537'.
- Storey, I.C. (2003) *Eupolis. Poet of Old Comedy* (Oxford).
- Suksi, A. (2001) 'The poet at Colonus. Nightingales in Sophocles', *Mnem.* 54: 646-57.
- Sutton, D.F. (1983) 'A possible subject for Aeschylus' "*Dike Play*", *ZPE* 51: 19-24.
- (1987) 'The theatrical families of Athens', *AJP* 108: 9-26.
- Swift, L.A. (2010) *The Hidden Chorus. Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric* (Oxford).
- Taplin, O. (1977) *The Stage Craft of Aeschylus* (Oxford).
- (1978) *Greek Tragedy in Action* (London).
- (1993) *Comic Angels and Other Approaches to Greek Drama through Vase Painting* (Oxford).
- (1997) 'The pictorial record' in Easterling (1997) (ed.) 69-90.
- (1998) 'Narrative variation in vase painting and tragedy. The example of Dirke', *AK* 41: 33-9.
- (1999) 'Spreading the word through performance' in Goldhill and Osborne (1999) (eds.) 33-57.
- (2006) 'Aeschylus' *Persai*. The entry of tragedy into the celebration culture of the 470s', in Cairns and Liapis (2006) (eds.) 1-10.
- (2007) *Pots and Plays. Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase Painting of the Fourth Century BC* (Los Angeles).
- (2009) 'Hector's helmet glinting in a fourth century tragedy', in Goldhill and Hall (2009) (eds.) 251-63.
- (2012) 'How was Athenian tragedy played in the Greek West?', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 226-50.

- Taplin, O. and Wyles, R. (2010) (eds.) *The Pronomos Vase and its Context* (Oxford).
- Tell, H. (2007) 'Sages at the games. Intellectual displays and dissemination of wisdom in ancient Greece', *CA* 26: 249-275.
- (2009) 'Wisdom for sale? The sophists and money', *CP* 104: 13-33.
- Thomas, R. (2007) 'Fame, memorial and choral poetry. The origins of epinician poetry: a historical study', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007) (eds.) 141-66.
- Thompson, E.A. (1944) 'Neophron and Euripides' *Medea*', *CQ* 38: 10-14.
- Todisco, L. (2012) 'Myth and tragedy: red-figure pottery and verbal communication in central and northern Apulia in the later fourth century BC', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 251-71.
- Trendall, A.D. (1989) *Red Figure Vases of South Italy and Sicily. A Handbook* (New York).
- (1990) 'On the divergence of south Italian from Attic red-figure vase painting' in Descoeudres (1990) (ed.) 217-230.
- Trendall, A.D. and Webster, T.B.L. (1971) *Illustrations of Greek Drama* (London).
- Turner, V. (1982) *From Ritual to Theatre* (New York).
- Valakas, K. (2009) 'Theoretical views of Athenian tragedy in the fifth century', in Goldhill and Hall (2009) (eds.) 179-207.
- van Leeuwen, J. (1890) 'Quaestiones ad Historiam Scenicam pertinentes', *Mnem.* 18: 68-75.
- Vassallo, S. (2012) 'The Theatre of Montagna dei Cavalli–Hippana', in Bosher (2012) (ed.) 208-225.
- Vermeule, E. (1966) 'The Boston *Oresteia* Crater', *AJA* 70: 1-22.
- Vernant, J.-P. and Vidal-Naquet, P. (1988) *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece* (New York).
- Visvardi, E. (2011) 'Pity and panhellenic politics. Choral emotion in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Trojan Women*', in Carter (2011) (ed.) 269-92.



- Vlassopoulos, K. (forthcoming) *Greeks and Barbarians*.
- Walbank, M.B. (1978) *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century BC* (Toronto and Sarasota).
- Walcot, P. (1976) *Greek Drama in its Theatrical and Social Context* (London).
- Walker, H.J. (1995) *Theseus and Athens* (Oxford).
- Wallace, M.B. (1970) 'Early Greek "Proxenoï"', *Phoenix* 24: 189-208.
- Wallace, R.W. and Harris, E.M. (1996) (eds.) *Transitions to Empire in Greco-Roman History 360-146 BC* (Norman).
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1989) (ed.) *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London and New York).
- Walsh, D. (2009) *Distorted Ideals in Greek Vase Painting. The world of Mythological Burlesque* (Cambridge).
- Walters, H.B. (1892-3) 'Odysseus and Kirke on a Boeotian Vase', *JHS* 13: 77-87.
- Webster, T.B.L. (1936) 'Sophocles and Ion of Chios', *Hermes* 71: 263-74.
- (1948) 'South Italian vases and Attic drama', *CQ* 42: 15-27.
- (1954) 'Fourth century Tragedy and poetics', *Hermes* 82: 294-308.
- (1960) 'Greek dramatic monuments from the Athenian Agora and the Pnyx', *Hesperia* 29: 254-284.
- (1967) *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London).
- Wescoat, B.D. (1989) (ed.) *Syracuse, the fairest Greek city* (Rome).
- West, M.L. (1966) *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford).
- (1970) 'Melica', *CQ* 20: 205-15.
- (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin and New York).
- (1975) 'Cnaitheus's Hymn to Apollo', *CQ* 25: 116-70. [= (2011a) 329-43]
- (1979) 'The Prometheus Trilogy', *JHS* 99: 130-48. [= Lloyd (2007) (ed.) 359-396]
- (1982) *Greek Music* (Oxford).

- (1985) 'Ion of Chios', *BICS* 32: 71-8.
- (1989) 'The early chronology of Greek Tragedy', *CQ* 39: 251-4.
- (1990) *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart).
- (1997) *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
- (1999) 'The invention of Homer', *CQ* 49: 364-382. [= (2011a) 408-36]
- (2002) "'Eumelos". A Corinthian epic cycle', *JHS* 122: 109-33. [= (2011a) 353-91]
- (2003a) 'Iliad and Aethiopis', *CQ* 53: 1-14. [= (2011a) 242-64]
- (2003b) *Homeric hymns, Homeric apocrypha, lives of Homer* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- (2005) 'Odyssey and Argonautica', *CQ* 55: 39-64.
- (2007) 'A new musical papyrus. Carcinus' *Medea*', *ZPE* 161: 1-10.
- (2011a) *Hellenica. Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought. Volume I: Epic* (Oxford).
- (2011b) 'Mages of Smyrna. A Greek poet at the court of Gyges', in West (2011a) 344-52.
- West, S. (1974) 'Satyrus: Peripatetic or Alexandrian', *GRBS* 15: 284-5.
- Westlake, H.D. (1953) 'Euripides' *Troades* 205-229', *Mnem.* 6: 181-191.
- Whitby, M. (1998) 'An international symposium? Ion of Chios fr. 27 and the margins of the Delian League', in Dąbrowa (1998) (ed.) 207-224.
- Whitehead, D. (1975) 'Aristotle the metic,' *PCPS* 21: 94-9.
- (1977) *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic* (Cambridge).
- (1986) *The Demes of Attica 508/7-ca. 250 B.C.. A political and social study* (Princeton).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U.von. (1875) *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin).

- (1897) 'Die Perser des Aischylos', *Hermes* 32: 382-98.
- (1903) *Timotheos. Die Perser. Aus einem Papyrus von Abusir* (Leipzig).
- (1922) *Pindaros* (Berlin).
- (1927) 'Lesefrüchte', *Hermes* 62: 276-98. [= (1962) 431-53]
- (1962) *Kleine Schriften IV* (Berlin).
- Wiles, D. (1997) *Tragedy in Athens. Performance Space and Theatrical Meaning* (Cambridge).
- Willi, A. (2008) *Sikelismos. Sprache, Literatur und Gesellschaft im griechischen Sizilien* (8.-5. Jh. v. Chr.) (Basel).
- Williams, D. (1999) *Greek Vases* (London). [1<sup>st</sup> edition 1985]
- Willink, C.W. (1986) *Euripides Orestes* (Oxford).
- Wilson, N.G. (1999) 'Travelling actors in the fifth century?', *CQ* 49: 625.
- Wilson, P. (1996) 'Tragic rhetoric. The use of tragedy and the tragic in the fourth century BC' in Silk (1996) (ed.) 310-32.
- (1997) 'Leading the tragic Khoros. Tragic prestige in the democratic city', in Pelling (1997) (ed.) 81-108.
- (1999) 'The *aulos* in Athens', in Goldhill and Osborne (1999) (eds.) 58-95.
- (2000) *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia* (Cambridge).
- (2002) 'The musicians among the actors', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 39-68.
- (2003a) 'The sound of cultural conflict. Kritias and the culture of *mousikê* in Athens', in Dougherty and Kurke (2003) (eds.) 181-206.
- (2003b) 'The politics of dance. Dithyrambic contest and social order in ancient Greece' in Phillips and Pritchard (2003) (eds.) 163-196.
- (2004) 'Athenian Strings', in Murray and Wilson (2004) (eds.) 269-306.
- (2007a) (ed.) *The Greek Theatre and Festivals* (Oxford)

- (2007b) 'Sicilian Choruses' in Wilson (2007a) (ed.) 351-377.
- (2008) 'Costing the Dionysia', in Revermann and Wilson (2008) (eds.) 88-127.
- (2009a) 'Tragic honours and the democracy. Neglected evidence for the politics of the Athenian Dionysia', *CQ* 59: 8-24.
- (2009b) 'Thamyris the Thracian. The archetypal wandering poet?' in Hunter and Rutherford (2009a) (eds.) 46-79.
- (2010) 'How did the Athenian demes fund their theatre?', in Le Guen (2010) (ed.) 37-82.
- (2011) 'The glue of democracy? Tragic structure and finance', in Carter (2011) (ed.) 19-43.
- Wilson, P. and Hartwig, A. (2009) 'IG I<sup>3</sup> 102 and the tradition of proclaiming honours at the tragic agon of the Athenian city Dionysia', *ZPE* 169: 17-27.
- Winkler, J. (1990) 'The ephebes' song. *Tragoidia* and *polis*', in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.) 20-62.
- Winkler, J. and Zeitlin, F. (1990) (eds.) *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton).
- Wise, J. (2008) 'Tragedy as an "augury of a happy life"', *Arethusa* 41: 381-410.
- Woodbury, L. (1968) 'Pindar and the mercenary Muse', *TAPA* 99: 527-42.
- Wright, M. (2009) 'Literary prizes and literary criticism in antiquity', *CA* 28: 138-77.
- Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. (1979) 'The influence of rhetoric on fourth century tragedy', *CQ* 29: 66-76.
- (1980) *Studies in Fourth Century Tragedy* (Athens).
- (2012) 'The Archelaus of Euripides. Reconstruction and Motifs', in Davidson and Rosenbloom (2012) (eds.) 108-26.
- Young, D.C. (1968) *Three Odes of Pindar. A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3 and*

- Olympian 7 (Leiden).
- (1984) *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics* (Chicago).
- (1996) 'First with the most. Greek athletic records and "specialisation"', *Nikephoros* 9: 175-97. [= König (2010) (ed.) 267-97]
- Yunis, H. (2001) *Demosthenes. On the Crown* (Cambridge).
- Zacharia, K. (2003) 'Sophocles and the west. The evidence of the fragments', in Sommerstein (2003) (ed.) 57-76.
- Zeitlin, F.I. (1986) 'Thebes. The theatre of self, and society in Athenian drama', in Euben (1986) (ed.) 104-41. [= Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.) 130-67]
- (1990) 'Playing the other. Theatre, theatricality and the feminine' in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.) 63-86.
- (1993) 'Staging Dionysus between Thebes and Athens' in Carpenter and Faraone (1993) (eds.) 147-82.
- Zielinski, T. (1922) 'De Alcmeonis Corinthii fabula Euripidea', *Mnem.* 50: 305-27.
- (1925) *Tragodumenon Libri Tres* (Cracow).
- Zuntz, G. (1983) 'Αἰσχύλου Προμηθεύς', *Hermes* 111: 498-9.
- (1993) 'Aeschyli Prometheus', *HSCP* 95: 107-111.