
Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C.

Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B. C.

Edited by

Eric Csapo · Hans Rupprecht Goette ·
J. Richard Green · Peter Wilson

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-033748-8
e-ISBN 978-3-11-033755-6

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2014 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: Dörlemann Satz GmbH & Co. KG, Lemförde
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	VII
Abbreviations and Conventions	IX
Introduction: Old and New Perspectives on Fourth-Century Theatre	1

Section A: Theatre Sites

CHRISTINA PAPASTAMATI-VON MOOCK The Theatre of Dionysus Eleuthereus in Athens: New Data and Observations on its 'Lycurgan' Phase	15
HANS RUPPRECHT GOETTE The Archaeology of the 'Rural' Dionysia in Attica	77
JEAN-CHARLES MORETTI The Evolution of Theatre Architecture Outside Athens in the Fourth Century	107

Section B: Tragedy and Comedy

OLIVER TAPLIN How Pots and Papyri Might Prompt a Re-Evaluation of Fourth-Century Tragedy . .	141
SEBASTIANA NERVEGNA Performing Classics: The Tragic Canon in the Fourth Century and Beyond	157
JOHANNA HANINK Literary Evidence for New Tragic Production: The View from the Fourth Century	189
ANDREW HARTWIG The Evolution of Comedy in the Fourth Century	207

Section C: Performance outside Athens

EOGHAN MOLONEY <i>Philippus in acie tutior quam in theatro fuit ...</i> (Curtius 9. 6. 25): The Macedonian Kings and Greek Theatre	231
BRIGITTE LE GUEN Theatre, Religion and Politics at Alexander's Travelling Royal Court	249
VAYOS LIAPIS Cooking Up Rhesus: Literary Imitation and Its Consumers	275
ZACHARY BILES – JED THORN Rethinking Choregic Iconography in Apulia	295
EDWARD G. D. ROBINSON Greek Theatre in Non-Greek Apulia	319
J. RICHARD GREEN Regional Theatre in the Fourth Century. The Evidence of Comic Figurines of Boeotia, Corinth and Cyprus	333
DAVID BRAUND – EDITH HALL Theatre in the Fourth-Century Black Sea Region	371

Section D: Finance and Records in Athens

ERIC CSAPO – PETER WILSON The Finance and Organisation of the Athenian Theatre in the Time of Eubulus and Lycurgus	393
BENJAMIN W. MILLIS Inscribed Public Records of the Dramatic Contests at Athens: IG II ² 2318–2323a and IG II ² 2325	425
Plates	447
Illustration Credit	465
Bibliography	467
Indices	527
Museum Index	527
Index Locorum	535
General Index	556
List of Contributors	575

Acknowledgements

Over the course of three days in July 2011 (19–21) the Centre for Classical & Near Eastern Studies of Australia at the University of Sydney hosted a Colloquium, “Death of Drama or Birth of an Industry?: the Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B. C.”. That Colloquium and this volume, which derives from it, were made possible with the financial and logistical support of many individuals and institutions. We gratefully acknowledge the support we received from the Ian Potter Foundation; the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry; the Department of Classics & Ancient History (and its William Ritchie Visiting Fellowship programme) and the Department of Archaeology (at the University of Sydney); the Australian Research Council; the Centre for Classical & Near Eastern Studies of Australia (at the University of Sydney); the Australian Archaeological Institute at Athens (and its Director, Alexander Cambitoglou, its Chief Operating Officer, Wayne Mullen, and its Deputy Director, Stavros Paspalas); the Nicholson Museum (and its Senior Curator, Michael Turner); the Women’s College of the University of Sydney (and its Conference Manager, Gineke de Haan); Mr Christopher Flynn. Their generosity also made possible the attendance and participation at the Colloquium of a number of post-graduate students from Greece and the United Kingdom.

For assistance with the provision of images we would like to thank the following institutions and individuals: the Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam and W. M. van Haarlem; the National Museum, Athens and Stavros Paspalas; the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (Agora Excavations) and Robert Pitt; Art Resource and Robbi Siegel; the Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig, Basel and Andrea Bignasca; the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston and Marta Fodor; Musées royaux d’Art et d’Histoire, Brussels and Greet van Deuren; the Australian National University Classics Museum, Canberra and Elizabeth Minchin; the Nationalmuseet, Copenhagen and John Lund and Bodil Bundgaard Rasmussen; the Corinth Excavations, American School of Classical Studies at Athens and Iouliia Tzonou-Herbst; the Delphi Archaeological Museum and the First Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, Athens; the Groningen Institute of Archaeology, University of Groningen and Kirsten van der Ploeg; the Antikenmuseum of the University of Heidelberg; the Pierides – Laiki Bank Museum, Cyprus and Katerina Prodromou; the Regional Archaeological Museum ‘Luigi Bernabò Brea’, Lipari and Umberto Spigo; the British Museum, London; the German Archaeological Institute in Athens; the Bildagentur für Kunst, Kultur und Geschichte and Norbert Ludwig; the Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, Munich and Irene Bösel; the Soprintendenza Speciale per i Beni Archeologici di Napoli e Pompei and Soprintendente Teresa Elena Cinquantaquattro, Stefania Saviano and Alessandra Villone; the Bibliothèque National de France, Paris and Pascale Kahn; the Réunion de Musées Nationaux and Tiphaine Leroux; the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici della Basilicata and Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Policoro and Soprintendente Antonio De Siena; the Princeton University Art Museum, Princeton and J. Michael Padgett; the Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi di Siracusa and Angela Maria Manenti; the Tampa Museum of Art, Tampa and William Zewadski and Seth D. Pevnick;

the Martin von Wagner Museum (Antikensammlung), Würzburg and Arcangela Carbone-Gross.

The Colloquium also benefitted enormously from the contribution of three Chairs – Alastair Blanshard, Elizabeth Minchin and Frank Sear – and of a participant whose paper does not appear in this book – Robert Pitt; and from the energetic and efficient practical assistance of various kinds given by Atticus Cox, Billy Kennedy, Sophie Morton and Wendy Reade. Olivier Pollet helped to produce the map that appears in fig. 9.1; and Myriam Fincker the images in the chapter by Jean-Charles Moretti. We thank them all. Finally, we express our most sincere thanks to Sophie Morton and Andrew Hartwig for their fine editorial assistance.

Abbreviations and Conventions

Abbreviations

Journals and basic reference works are abbreviated according to the DAI List of Abbreviated Journals, Series, Lexica and Frequently Cited Works available on-line at <http://www.dainst.org/en/publication-guidelines?ft=all>. We list here the abbreviations that are most frequently used as well as abbreviations that do not appear in the DAI list.

ABL	C. H. E. Haspels, <i>Attic Black-Figured Lekythoi</i> (Paris 1936)
ABV	J. D. Beazley, <i>Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters</i> (Oxford 1956)
Agora 16	A. G. Woodhead, <i>Inscriptions: The Decrees, Agora XVI</i> (Princeton 1997)
Agora 19	G. V. Lalonde – M. K. Langdon – M. B. Walbank, <i>Inscriptions: Horoi, Poletai, Leases of Public Lands, Agora XIX</i> (Princeton 1991)
ARV ²	J. D. Beazley, <i>Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters</i> ² (Oxford 1963)
Beazley Addenda ²	T. H. Carpenter, <i>Beazley Addenda: Additional References to ABV, ARV² and Paralipomena</i> ² (Oxford 1989)
Beazley, Para	J. D. Beazley, <i>Paralipomena</i> (Oxford 1971)
CIRB	V. Struve, <i>Corpus Inscriptionum regni Bosporani</i> (Moscow 1965)
CVA	<i>Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum</i>
FGrHist	F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Berlin 1923–1958)
FHG	K. Müller – T. Müller, <i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> , 5 vols. (Paris 1841; repr. Cambridge 2010)
ID	<i>Inscriptions de Délos</i> (Paris 1926–1972)
IE	K. Clinton, <i>Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone: Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme</i> (Athens 2005–2008)
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>
IGBulg I ²	G. Mihailov, <i>Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae. I. Inscriptiones orae Ponti Euxini</i> ² (Sofia 1970)
IGUR	L. Moretti, <i>Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae</i> (Rome 1968)
IK Byzantion	A. Łajtar, <i>Die Inschriften von Byzantion, Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 58</i> (Bonn 2000).
IOrop.	V. C. Petrakos, <i>Οἱ ἐπιγραφές τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ</i> (Athens 1997)
IosPE I ²	B. Latyshev, <i>Inscriptiones Antiquae Orae Septentrionalis Ponti Euxeni Graecae et Latinae I</i> ² (St. Petersburg 1916)
IScM I	D. M. Pippidi, <i>Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae. I. Inscriptiones Histriae et vicinia</i> (Bucharest 1983)

IscM III	A. Avram, <i>Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae</i> 3. Callatis et territorium (Bucharest 2000)
LCS	A. D. Trendall, <i>The Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily</i> , BICS Suppl. 31 (London 1973)
Liddell – Scott – Jones	H. G. Liddell – R. Scott – H. S. Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> ⁹ (1996); Suppl. (1996)
LIMC	<i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i> 1–8 (Zürich – München 1981–1999)
MMC ³	T. B. L. Webster – J. R. Green, <i>Monuments Illustrating Old and Middle Comedy</i> , BICS Suppl. 39 ³ (London 1978)
MNC ³	T. B. L. Webster – J. R. Green – A. Seeberg, <i>Monuments Illustrating New Comedy</i> , BICS Suppl. 50 ³ (London 1995)
MO	B. Millis – S. D. Olson, <i>Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals at Athens: IG II² 2318–25 and Related Texts</i> (Leiden – Boston 2012)
MTS ²	T. B. L. Webster, <i>Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr Play</i> , BICS Suppl. 20 ² (London 1967)
PCG	R. Kassel – C. Austin, <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , currently 1–8 (Berlin – New York 1983ff.)
PhV ²	A. D. Trendall, <i>Phlyax Vases</i> , BICS Suppl. 19 ² (London 1967)
RVAp	A. D. Trendall – A. Cambitoglou, <i>Red-Figure Vases of Apulia</i> 1–2 (Oxford 1978–1982)
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>
SIG	W. Dittenberger, <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> ³ (Leipzig 1914–1924)
SNG	<i>Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum</i> (London 1931ff.).
TGR	P. Ciancio Rossetto – G. Pisani Sartorio (eds.), <i>Teatri greci e romani alle origini del linguaggio rappresentato I–III</i> (Roma 1994)
TrGF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> 1–5 (Göttingen 1971–2004)

Abbreviations for ancient Greek authors are listed as in Liddell – Scott – Jones XVI–XLV, with the exception only of Plays by Aristophanes (Ar.) and the one work of Plato (Pl.), i. e. *Laws*, capable of being rendered with a monosyllabic English title. References to scholiasts are indicated by “schol.” followed by the author-abbreviation.

Abbreviations for Latin authors follow the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Index* (1900).

Abbreviations for Papyrus collections are as they appear in Liddell – Scott – Jones XL–XLII.

Names

Like most contemporary authors we have walked the thin line between the extreme Latinisation of Greek names, and the defamiliarisation of historical figures already well-known by their Latinised names. Persons and places well enough known to head an entry in S. Hornblower – A. Spawforth (eds.), *Oxford Classical Dictionary* ³(Oxford 1996) are spelled as in that heading. Thus Socrates is the famous philosopher, but Sokrates is a less illustrious namesake. OCD’s extreme Latinism made for many uncomfortable compro-

mises. Even editors have their limits and our line was drawn at “Thoricus” and “Odeum”: the place appears here as “Thorikos” and the building as “Odeion”.

Transliteration

Other Greek words and proper names follow the currently dominant standard convention for transliteration. We employ: ch for χ; x for ξ; ph for φ; y for υ (but u in a diphthong); ai for α; oi for οι.

Dates

As a general rule all dates will be B. C. (bibliographic references of course excluded) unless otherwise specified (or blatantly obvious).

Introduction: Old and New Perspectives on Fourth-Century Theatre

Until recently the fourth-century theatre has languished in the deep shadow of its fifth-century counterpart. To understand this neglect we need to reach back more than two centuries to the very beginning of ‘modern’ scholarship on Greek drama. Friedrich and August Schlegel built upon an organic model of literary history¹. Their own model had deep and complex ideological roots in romanticism and German nationalism². It assimilated the fifth century to the bloom of the Greek spirit (of which tragedy was the highest expression), and the fourth century to its decay³.

Others built upon this binary structure. Nietzsche sharpened the apex of transition in his account of tragedy’s sudden demise in his *Birth of Tragedy*, especially in section 12 where Euripides’ aesthetic Socratism, rationalism and realism are said rather sensationally to have murdered tragedy, and in section 14 where the chorus, pictured as the religious and spiritual well-spring of tragedy, is said to have dried up. Here however the chronology is confused by the observation that the chorus began to dwindle even in Sophocles, but its collapse was accelerated through phases that “follow one another with terrifying speed in Euripides, Agathon and New Comedy”.

The modern history of the ancient theatre was invented under the spell of these metaphors and images. But one had to wait for German scholarship to be exported for the opposition between fifth and fourth century to become systematic enough to override the evidence itself. In the first general history of ancient Greek theatre to be written in English (1889), Arthur Haigh (drawing directly on the already extensive German scholarship) left little doubt about the social cost of a loss of empire, explaining that “in the fourth century, after the fall of the Athenian empire, the political splendour of the City Dionysia came to an end”, with the consequence that “the fourth century is a period of decay as far as tragedy is concerned⁴”. But Haigh was keen to drive the lesson home and felt the need to find an actual death for tragedy to supplement what was merely a moral death. That the fourth century theatre included revivals of fifth-century tragedy had long been recognised and immediately problematised as something that quashed originality and also encouraged the manipulation of canonical texts by actors (always, it would seem, for the worse)⁵. Haigh converted the existence of revival into a proof of the loss of vitality: “a sure symptom of decay, both in tragedy and comedy, was the tendency to fall back upon the past, and reproduce old plays ... as regards tragedy this practice had already become prevalent by the middle of the fourth-century”. But Haigh evidently wanted to suggest more than a loss

¹ F. Schlegel 1794a. 1794b. 1795–1797. 1798. 1815; A. Schlegel 1809.

² See e.g. Behler 1993, 72–130; Duff 2009.

³ The organic paradigm has mainly been of interest to Euripidean studies because initially at least Euripides (and later, late Euripides) is held

responsible for the decay: Michelini 1987, 3–11; Riley 2008, 154–174; Mastronarde 2010, 12.

⁴ Haigh 1889, 12. 27.

⁵ E.g. Grysar 1830, 2–8.

of vitality and he hints at an actual (organic!) death without actually saying so: “by the middle of the fourth century the career of Attic tragedy began to draw to a close ... there were signs of decay in productive power”.⁶

Others would follow the metaphor to its necessary conclusion, putting an end to both tragedy and comedy (and much else) and not waiting for the middle of the fourth century to let them die. Even if today we are more likely to use words like ‘decline’ rather than ‘decay’, and much less likely to express regret that the specific qualities of fourth-century theatre “grew to such a height as to become a positive vice, and to sap the military energies of the people”⁷, the biological metaphor is still alive and well, as are the ‘facts’ it generated. A rapid and casual survey of books published in the last two decades yields abundant news of tragedy’s or comedy’s death in the fourth century and even several permutations of the just-as-easily-disprovable claim that fourth-century theatre contained nothing but revivals of fifth-century classics: “With Sophocles and Euripides both dead, and leaving no successors, the fourth-century theatre contented itself with revivals” (Arnott 1989, 46); “in the fourth century new tragedies ceased to be produced and revivals of the classic works occupied the stage instead” (McNeill 1991, 262); “what is clear is how the loss of spiritual weight in the drama [after Euripides] coincided inevitably with the decline of tragedy and drama generally in an exhausted, overwrought Athens, and with it the quality of the writers drawn to the art” (Lee 2005, 197); “tragedy primarily survived in the form of revival in the fourth century” (Rogers 2007, 17); Erskine and Lebow (2012, 7) take for granted “the decline and all but disappearance of tragedy at the end of the fifth century BCE”. If any of this were true, then one could learn all one needed to know about fourth-century drama by studying the fifth-century texts, and this, it seems, is a convenience worth any rationalisation, since for the most part the fourth-century texts are just not there.

By the latter half of the twentieth century, the ideological roots of the organic model were dead, even if much of its superstructure continued to darken scholarship. A new and still more powerful paradigm appeared in the 1960s, most brilliantly in the writings of the structuralist Jean-Pierre Vernant⁸. Vernant placed the already polarised division into a binary chain that marked off the fifth century as the ‘moment’ of tragedy. Tragedy was a tool for solving problems and relieving tensions created by the transition from an ideology founded in aristocratic, agrarian, mythic and ritual values, to a new ideology of the democratic polis founded in reason. But by the fourth century (as Nietzsche had already observed) polis values were already established and the moment of tragedy was over.

The idea that tragedy (and by extension comedy) served to define the values of a democratic citizen was taken up in a somewhat reductive form as a kind of propaganda of Athenian civic self-definition, usually at the expense of some foreign ‘other’, especially in Cold-War America, Britain and France. Ancient drama took on the thought-policing role performed by the modern mass-media.

This paradigm encouraged the belief that tragedy and comedy were by Athenians, for Athenians and completely concerned with representing what it meant to be Athenian. But the fourth century just did not fit well into this paradigm. There was in the fourth century overwhelming evidence that drama was no longer uniquely Athenian: tragedy and comedy were manifestly performed elsewhere, and even in Athens foreigners were manifestly active

⁶ Haigh 1889, 32. 39.

⁷ Haigh 1889, 317.

⁸ Esp. Vernant–Vidal-Naquet 1972, chapters 1 and 2.

in the theatre. Moreover, the chorus, the surrogate of the citizen body, no longer dominated the drama. As a result little attention was spared for fourth-century development. But there was distortion, too. The paradigm was saved only at the cost of denying and repressing increasing evidence for the export or reperformance of drama even in the fifth century.

In this and many other respects the new paradigm grew complicit with the old. From at least 1830 a dogma had arisen about the ‘single performance’: Grysar wrote with confidence that: *habebant veteres Graeci iam antiquitus atque inde a cultioris tragoediae primordiis hoc institutum, ut fabulae semel in scenam productae non iterum darentur*⁹. But Grysar then went on to list a huge body of evidence to the contrary by way of exception. These exceptions were forgotten by post-war scholarship. The belief that until well into the fourth century individual dramas were normally performed only once and for an exclusively Athenian audience had until the 1990s, congealed into dogma. It received its most authoritative expression even in the most unexpected places. Webster urged that “the Greek dramatist could only be certain of a single presentation of his tragedy on the stage” (1956b, XI f.). But the subtlety of Webster’s “only certain” is lost in Pickard-Cambridge (1968, 99): “in the fifth century the only performances of old plays (with an exception to be noticed) were presentations of unsuccessful plays in a revised form”. Starr (1991, 320) says the same thing but excepts only “more successful works”. The exceptions are evidently in doubt, but the ‘rule’ was needed to save a generation of deeply Athenocentric studies of Greek theatre. By the late 1980s ancient drama was no longer ‘Greek’ but securely ‘Athenian’, a view most monumentally advertised in the edited collection by Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) with the subtitle “Athenian Drama in its Social Context”, where (394) we are urged to “remind ourselves that fifth-century plays were written for single performances”. The notion is still echoed in much more recent books and by leading experts¹⁰. Scholarship shied away from the fourth century. To say that theatre is Athenian in the fifth century but international in the fourth, and that its real function was Athenian self-definition, is effectively to say that in the fourth century it is an empty shell.

Why does this vision of the fourth century theatre prove so resilient in an age less driven by romantic, nationalistic or cold-war binaristic agendas? Some responsibility must be borne by the shape of the ancient evidence. In the case of tragedy, particularly, all of the weight seems to be on one side of the divide. All but (possibly) one of our complete tragedies belong to the fifth century¹¹. Our one complete satyr play is fifth-century. Most comedy is fifth-century. It is true that the best evidence for revivals of ‘old tragedy’ and ‘old comedy’ is from the fourth century. It is true that in our fourth-century dramatic texts the chorus is scarcely visible. Ancient commentators testify to the superiority of the fifth century, the most important being Aristophanes whose Dionysus complained that since the death of Euripides and Sophocles there were no more creative tragedians, even if it was a feeder for a joke; and Aristotle, the ultimate source of the biological model, himself suggested that the tragedy of his day was ‘characterless’ and elsewhere implies, or can be understood to imply,

⁹ Grysar 1830, 3: “the ancient Greeks had established from former times, and indeed from the first beginnings of tragedy’s refinement, the rule that plays once brought upon stage should never again be produced”.

¹⁰ E.g. Garland 2004, 3; Slater 2002, 54; even Calder 2006, 3 who challenges Webster’s inferences. The last two are reprints of earlier pieces.

¹¹ Even general consensus that Rhesus was fourth century was only reached after 1964 because of and despite Ritchie’s (1964) attempt to prove it Euripidean. The play only survived because in antiquity it was mistaken to be by Euripides.

that its choruses were deficient¹². It is true, finally, that the fourth century canonised the fifth, exalted its poets as culture heroes and models and that fourth-century dramatists in some (limited) ways idolised and emulated the fifth-century dramatists. To fourth-century eyes the fifth century was incomparably great in every respect but most paradigmatically in “its poets, choruses and actors¹³”. But this is the great crux and paradox of the problem. If the shape of our evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the fifth century, it is largely because the fourth century shaped it this way. In assuming the vast superiority of fifth-century theatre, we are accepting, too often without question, a fourth-century judgement.

Aristophanes and Aristotle, rightly or wrongly, could be interpreted to endorse the notion that the fourth century was all about imitation and decay. The non-survival of post-fifth century dramatic texts could be understood, rightly or wrongly, to reflect the judgement of the ages, that everything later was mediocre or merely imitative and therefore superfluous. The fourth-century canonisation of the fifth-century tragedians could be taken, not as a state of social psychology, but a confession of inferiority. But what if the discourse on ancient theatre had begun with different priorities? What if the Schlegels, instead of idolising poetry and particularly Greek tragic poetry as the highest expression of the human spirit, had fetishised some other art, or even given equal status to all the arts, or indeed all spheres of human endeavour? Would it not then have been possible, even easy, to establish the fourth-century theatre as the culminating monument of ancient culture? Almost all our Classical evidence for actors is fourth-century and even Aristotle can be cited for the proposition that the actor’s art achieved perfection in the fourth century. Music too, if one believes our ancient sources, only really became music from rather late in the fifth century. Popular enthusiasm for the theatre is best attested by our fourth-century sources, whether texts, artefacts or monuments. It is in the fourth century that at Athens the ability to attend the theatre begins most clearly to take on the definition of a civic right. From the fourth century comes a vastly greater quantity of information about theatre as an industry, managed by an increasingly complex set of officials, and crafted by an ever greater number of specialised artists. Though the Schlegels did not guess it (or care), the magnificent stone Theatre of Dionysus would be recognised already by Dörpfeld as a product of the fourth century. But most spectacular of all is the spread of drama which certainly began in the fifth but was so rapid in the fourth century that by its end there was a theatre and dramatic festival in every self-respecting city and town, not only in Greece, but throughout the Hellenised East – theatre indeed became the main vehicle of Hellenisation¹⁴. How ‘given’ is the

¹² Ar. Frogs 72; Arist. Po. 1450a 25. 1456a 25–32. Aristotle claimed that tragedy “had attained its proper nature” (Po. 1449a 15), but it was post-Schlegelian poetics that explained its decay as a result of ‘denaturing’ its proper form: see e.g. Gravenhorst who blamed the passage of the *Blütezeit* on Euripides’ failure to stick with the traditional forms “in denen sein Geist sich nicht naturgemäß bewegen konnte” (1856, 94; our emphasis). For the biological model behind the Poetics, see esp. Depew 2007.

¹³ E.g. D. 18, 317–319: δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι καὶ κατ’ ἐκείνους ἦσαν τινες, οἱ διασύροντες τοὺς ὄντας τότε τοὺς [δὲ] πρότερον γεγενημένους ἐπὶ ἡνουν, βᾶσκανον πρᾶγμα καὶ ταὐτὸ ποιῶντες σοί. εἶτα λέγεις ὡς οὐδὲν ὁμοίος εἴμι’ ἐκείνοις ἐγώ; σὺ

δ’ ὁμοίος, Αἰσχίνῃ; ὁ δ’ ἀδελφὸς ὁ σός; ἄλλος δὲ τις τῶν νῦν ῥητόρων; ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οὐδένα φημί. ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς ζῶντας, ὃ χρηστὲ, ἵνα μηδὲν ἄλλ’ εἶπω, τὸν ζῶντ’ ἐξέταξε καὶ τοὺς καθ’ αὐτόν, ὥσπερ τᾶλλα πάντα, τοὺς ποιητάς, τοὺς χοροῦς, τοὺς ἀγωνιστάς.

¹⁴ Most of this information was, of course, available to most of the scholars who shaped the decadence theory, but it only served to prove their point: these were purely ‘material’ not ‘spiritual’ developments, and were somehow, even gained at the cost of the spiritual. Haigh (1889, 206f.), for example, writes that “it was not until the fourth century that the influence of the actors became so universal as to inflict distinct injury upon the art of dramatic writing”.

inferiority of fourth-century theatre – indeed how ‘given’ is even the inferiority of fourth-century dramatic poetry?

What emerges from this is that the evidence has been shaped and reshaped for us to suit ancient and modern preoccupations and agendas, and the results can certainly be challenged. There is indeed a disturbing fluctuation even about how and where to place the dividing line between the great and the inferior age: Schlegel and many others thought Euripides the beginning of the end (but this would put the beginning of decay in about 455), or the late Euripides (but this would put the beginning of decay in about 420), or is it the death of Aristophanes (as late as 380)? Different testimonies can be privileged: despite fourth-century classicism, Aristotle cites both Carcinus and Chaeremon as often as he does Aeschylus, and Theodectes and Astydamas win his positive approval, which Euripides virtually never does; the Athenians placed a statue of Astydamas right in the theatron of the new ‘Lycurgan’ Theatre of Dionysus more than a decade before the statues of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides were erected in the parodos. But most of all, evaluations can change: the Rhesus may never be dubbed a great tragedy, but there is certainly room for a vindication of Aristophanes’ latest plays or Menander’s comedies, and a fuller appreciation of the fragmentary remains of fourth-century drama.

The Cold War ended in 1989, but this is only a small part of the reason why a very different conception of Greek theatre, and indeed the Greek world¹⁵, is now emerging. The current climate of free trade, the internet, and high levels of personal mobility have made scholarship much more ready to look for and accept evidence for a multicultural, interconnected and networked Mediterranean, where former generations noticed only cultural and economical isolation. We are also equipped with better tools to find evidence of interconnection. Cultural studies have become multidisciplinary, more receptive to complex models of cultural interaction, and far more sensitive to the interactivity of political, economic and cultural production. Indeed, the ancient theatre is a paradigmatic locus of both forms of interactivity, between cultures and within them.

It is, we think, no coincidence that it was in the 1990s that scholarship began to take its first serious look at fourth-century theatre. This was thanks to a number of developments in many relevant fields: literature, iconography, archaeology, and social history. But it was thanks, most of all, to interactivity between these fields.

Although Menander’s texts and his place within the history of drama have been widely studied since the first major discoveries of Menander papyri in the early twentieth century, Menander is the great exception. The other playwrights of the fourth century suffered a near complete neglect. A crucial development was the gathering and publication of the texts of the fragmentary authors in *Poetae Comici Graeci* (PCG). It was complete (apart from the volume devoted to Menander’s plays preserved on papyri) in 1991. Apart from the *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester 1953) by the intrepid pioneer T. B. L. Webster, the first comprehensive study devoted to fourth-century (Middle) comedy, by Nesselrath, appeared as recently as 1990. The first commentaries on ‘Middle Comic’ poets followed in its wake. Richard Hunter’s commentary on Eubulus, published in 1983, is an exception, but it was begun as a dissertation under Colin Austin, one of the editors of PCG. Arnott’s commentary on Alexis followed in 1996, Ben Millis’ Anaxandrides in 2001; 2008 saw the publication of Athena Papachrysostomou’s commentary on six Middle Comic poets; 2009 saw two commentaries on the

¹⁵ Morris 2003.

late fifth-/early fourth-century Strattis by Orth and Miles; the rest will follow: the Freiburg project *Kommentierung der griechischen Komödie* promises to generate commentaries on all the other fourth-century comic poets in the next few years¹⁶. Even Aristophanes' latest play, *Wealth*, after a century of neglect, received two commentaries in 2001¹⁷.

The interest in fourth-century tragedy is even more recent. The first ever monograph devoted to fourth century tragedy appeared in 1980 (by Xanthakis-Karamanos, a student of Webster)¹⁸. As with comedy, the first re-edition of the relevant fragments in nearly a century, Snell and Kannicht in vol. 1 of *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (TrGF) in 1986, was an important stimulus. Apart from one maverick article on Chaere-mon in 1970, all short studies of fourth-century tragedians and tragedies belong to the last twenty years: studies of Moschion (possibly third century) in 1996 and 1997; a study of Chaere-mon in 2001; and studies of Rhesus in 2005, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012¹⁹. 2012 saw the first ever full commentary in English on the Rhesus, another is in the works, and the first in any language since 1837 appeared in 2005²⁰. We can also date to the early 1990s the beginning of a change in the way scholarship characterises fourth-century tragedy. Xanthakis-Karamanos was criticised for being too impartial towards it: one reviewer complained that “she is oddly reluctant to admit that fourth-century tragedy represents a decline”²¹, although in fact the picture she paints is one of light entertainments for an audience that could no longer stomach “true tragedies”²². The first real challenge to an age-old prejudice against fourth-century tragedy was a short but powerful article by Pat Easterling in 1993: “for sensationalism, triviality, affectation and so on we ought perhaps to read elegance, sophistication, refinement, clarity, naturalism, polish, professionalism – a new kind of cosmopolitan sensibility deeply influenced by, and interacting with, the classical repertoire”²³. In 1995 Brigitte Le Guen tackled the theory of theatre’s ‘decline’ head on, dispelling all the clichés that sustained it: her article, aimed mainly at rehabilitating Hellenistic theatre was *a fortiori* valid for the fourth century as a whole²⁴.

The phenomenal rise of reception studies in the last two decades has also added its weight and urgency to fourth-century drama – or more particularly the much more recent extension of the concept of ‘reception’ to reception in antiquity. With the possible exception of the Homeric poems²⁵, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Menander offer the fullest and most varied body of material for the study of the ancient reception of poetry, but also performance (which is itself a concept and a perspective with a relatively recent history as we will see below). A major breakthrough in the study of the ancient reception of drama and dramatists was made at the end of the last century with pioneering essays by

¹⁶ Hunter 1983; Arnott 1996; Millis 2001; Papatrystostomou 2008.

¹⁷ Sommerstein 2001; Torchio 2001.

¹⁸ Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980.

¹⁹ Collard 1970; Stephanopoulos 1995–1996 and 1997; Morelli 2001; Liapis 2009a; Fries 2010; Papadodima 2011; Perris 2012.

²⁰ Liapis 2012. Marco Fantuzzi is working on another. In German Feickert 2005 is the first commentary since 1837.

²¹ Garvie 1983, 13.

²² Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 41; cf. Easterling 1993, 562.

²³ Easterling 1993, 568f.

²⁴ Le Guen 1995; cf. Le Guen 2007c.

²⁵ Particularly notable studies of Homeric reception are: Nagy 1990; Graziosi 2002; Kim 2010. One should note also Koning 2010 on Hesiod and Kivilo 2010 on Hesiod, Stesichorus, Archilochus, Hipponax, Terpander and Sappho.

Easterling, Revermann and Allan²⁶. With the only partial exception of Bruno Gentili's *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World*, the first books primarily dedicated to the ancient reception of tragedy were published in the twenty-first century²⁷. Several chapters of Goldenhard and Revermann's *Beyond the Fifth Century* (2010) deal with the ancient reception of tragedy. Sebastiana Nervegna's *Menander in Antiquity: the Contexts of Reception* (2013) is the first monograph dedicated to the ancient reception of a playwright. Vayos Liapis and Antonis Petrides are, as we write, orchestrating a collective volume devoted to the performance and reception of Greek Tragedy after the Fifth Century. Some of the most important work in ancient reception is focussed on the processes that led to the creation of the tragic canon in which the fourth century played a crucial role²⁸.

Much of the impetus behind the rediscovery of the fourth century came from the integration of Performance Studies with Classical Literature and Archaeology – particularly the influence of Performance Studies on Oliver Taplin and Richard (J. R.) Green. Performance Studies was in origin broadly interdisciplinary (embracing such fields as theatre, anthropology, speech-act theory) and both Taplin and Green, starting from very different positions, have dedicated much of their scholarship to reconstructing the conditions and experience of dramatic performance in antiquity. Taplin's classic studies *Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (1977) and *Greek Tragedy in Action* (1978) began by extracting clues to staging from the playtexts, but his research turned increasingly towards the material evidence, and in particular towards vase iconography. *Comic Angels* (1993) persuasively demonstrated the direct relevance of vases manufactured and painted in South Italy and Sicily to the comic drama produced in fifth- (and presumably fourth-) century Athens. *Pots and Plays* (2007) did the same for tragic drama. This spawned a new interest in fourth-century production and reception precisely because almost all of the relevant West Greek pottery was manufactured from ca. 400 to ca. 330.

J. R. Green, by contrast, began with archaeology and iconography. Green developed his interest in theatrical performance by working with the archives begun by T. B. L. Webster, producing a revised *Monuments Illustrating Old and Middle Comedy* (MMC) in 1978 and, with Axel Seeberg, a greatly revised *Monuments Illustrating New Comedy* (MNC) in 1995. For most of the twentieth century scholarly interest in theatre-related imagery, mainly in vase-painting, remained marginal to theatre studies and was mainly focussed on extracting information for reconstructing the plots of fragmentary plays²⁹. T. B. L. Webster contributed greatly to this enterprise, but his wide-ranging interests generated many pioneering studies on nearly all aspects of theatre production and history. The main burden of collecting, classifying and interpreting the theatre-related artefacts was taken up by Green. His most influential work, *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society*, published in 1994, drew upon these empirical researches to produce what is effectively the first social history of the Greek theatre. Green demonstrated how the artefacts could be used as evidence for the geographical spread of theatre, the development of masks and costume, popular percep-

²⁶ Easterling 1997c; Revermann 1999–2000; Allan 2001. The novelty of 'ancient reception' even at so recent a date is clear from the reviewer's complaint that Revermann 1999–2000, a study of the performance of Euripides in Macedon down to the third century, was not 'reception' "at all" (Craik 2001, 80). Cf. Goldenhard – Revermann 2010, 3: "reception in antiquity has only recently started to receive

sustained attention". Particularly noteworthy contributions are: Roselli 2005; Nervegna 2007.

²⁷ Gentili 1984; Battezzato 2003a; Prauscello 2006.

²⁸ Wilson 1996; Vox 2006; Hanink 2010a; Hanink 2010b.

²⁹ E.g. Séchan 1926; Kossatz-Deissmann 1978.

tions of theatre, and acting styles. For the fourth century Green used not only vase-icography, but artefacts on all other media, including the generally ignored terracotta figurines and masks, which probably originated as an Athenian souvenir industry at the close of the fifth century but rapidly came to be copied and imitated throughout the Greek world. The material evidence, once exclusively of interest to art history or literary history³⁰, came to be investigated in its social, material and institutional contexts³¹.

The influence of Webster and then also of Taplin produced some initially isolated work on 'stagecraft' such as Dearden 1976, Seale 1982, Frost 1988, but it was only in the 1990s when Taplin had become much more of an archaeologist and Green much more of a dramatist, that Taplin's and Green's approaches more nearly joined to become a mainstream preoccupation in scholarship. Ancient acting and stagecraft are now widely studied using a combination of textual and material evidence (e.g. monographs by Wiles 1991; Neiiendam 1992; Rehm 1992; Scullion 1994; Wiles 1997; Wiles 2000; Rehm 2002; Revermann 2006; Marshall 2006; Wiles 2007; Piqueux 2009; Hughes 2012). Even ancient actors have suddenly become viable subjects after long, though not total neglect³²: two books on the ancient actors' unions, the first in over a century, appeared in 2001 (Le Guen) and 2003 (Aneziri); the first ever collective volume on Greek and Roman Actors appeared in 2002 (Easterling – Hall); these were followed by monographs on the sociology of actors by Duncan (2006) and Csapo (2010). The essentially new field of acting and actors is significant for the fourth century because, despite the dearth of plays, both the textual and material evidence for acting and actors is more abundant for the fourth than any other century in antiquity. Paradoxically, relatively little of the above mentioned scholarship on acting and actors deals with the fourth century (and most of that deals with Menander at the very end of the century). Most of the observations on pre-Menandrian fourth-century acting are to be found in articles by Green and Taplin themselves³³.

The discovery of the importance of the iconographic material to theatre engendered an entirely new branch of theatrical studies, and a branch that is possibly of greatest consequence for understanding the theatre in the fourth century: namely the spread of theatre culture throughout the Greek world. Taplin's study of comic vases in West Greece and Green's more general study of the spread of theatre artefacts around the Mediterranean made it clear that what had hitherto been considered Attic drama was not only known but performed elsewhere. Since 1994 a series of studies has mapped the spread of drama, not just in the fourth century, but in the fifth³⁴. Athenocentricity is directly challenged by the title and several of the papers of a volume entitled *Why Athens? A Re-appraisal of Tragic Politics* published in 2010 (Carter). Luigi Todisco is responsible for the first volume entirely dedicated to a regional Greek theatre outside of Athens (2002); this was soon followed by Kathryn Bosher's dissertation on Sicilian theatre (2006). She has recently edited the first collective volume of essays on theatre in Sicily and South

³⁰ And still, oddly, the subjects of territorial squabbles that use precisely these exclusive terms of reference: see e.g. Small 2003.

³¹ Taplin – Wyles 2010 is paradigmatic of these new directions.

³² O'Connor 1908; Garton 1972; Ghiron-Bistagne 1976, and the hugely important Stephanis 1988.

³³ Green 1997; Green 2002; Green 2003; Green 2006; Green 2012; Taplin 2012.

³⁴ Easterling 1994; Green 1994, 64–70; Taplin 1999; Dearden 1999; Scodel 2001; Allan 2001; Moloney 2003; Zacharia 2003; Csapo 2004a; Ceccarelli–Milanezi 2007; Hall 2007b; Kowalzig 2008; Csapo 2010, 83–116. New studies challenge not just Athenocentric but also Hellenocentric assumptions: Carpenter 2003; Robinson 2004.

Italy (2012). It is now obvious that from an early date, drama had many opportunities for reperformance.

An important factor in gauging the spread of theatre throughout the Greek world is the discovery and excavation of new theatre buildings. The existence of a theatre building does not necessarily entail dramatic performance, but it is very likely to do so. The discovery of several demonstrably early theatres contributed to the new interest in study of the dissemination of drama: in particular in Attica, at Thorikos, Euonymon, Halimous, Acharnae, whose results were mainly published in the 1990s and after³⁵, and in locations as widespread as Hephaestia in Lemnos (Archontidou 2004), Elea (see Green 2008, nos. 414–419), Aegae (infra ch. 8), and Neandria (Trunk 1994).

The architectural history of the theatre has always of course been necessarily focussed on the fourth-century remains, even if a primary agenda was to find evidence in it for reconstructing the fifth-century theatre building. Not until the 1990s, however, did scholars generally begin to take an interest in the diachronic development of theatre buildings and their importance for social and theatre history. It was only then that most architectural historians first came to terms with the vast difference in shape, scale and construction of the fifth-century theatre and hence also to gain a full sense of the originality and enterprise that went into the building of the fourth-century theatre³⁶. Critically important for understanding the history of theatre construction in Greece were a series of surveys: by Green (1989, 14–23. 2008, 30–75); by Moretti (1991. 1992a–b. 1993. 1997. 2001); by Goette (esp. 1995a. 2011); by Lohmann 1998; by Frederiksen 2002; by Junker 2004; and the complete multivolume survey of all Greco-Roman theatres by Ciancio Rossetto and Pisani Sartorio, *Teatri greci e romani alle origini del linguaggio rappresentato* (TGR), published in 1994. Most important of all has been continued work in the Theatre of Dionysus, although accurate information has only become available in the last few years³⁷.

Most interdisciplinary of all is the institutional history of the theatre, by which we mean primarily its organisation and finance, and the manner in which its organisation and finance were integrated into the political and social structure of the polis or state. Though Pickard-Cambridge's *Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (21968) was entirely concerned with theatre organisation, interest in finance and the social infrastructure of theatre are almost entirely absent. The first such institutional history of Classical theatre came only in 2000, with Peter Wilson's *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia*. Coming in the train of the New Historicism it examined the social relations of the men who funded drama, and how their motives were constructed and integrated into the broadest framework of Athenian society to serve the cultural, economic and political needs of sponsors, choreuts, and the theatre-going public³⁸. Important advances were made in understanding the importance of the Dionysia to the government, finance and social structure of the demes, notably with the books by Whitehead 1986 and Jones 2004. Richard Seaford has studied the effects of

³⁵ Thorikos: Mussche 1990; Mussche 1998; van Looy 1994; Palyvou 2001. Euonymon: Tzachou-Alexandri 1999; Tzachou-Alexandri 2007; Halimous: Kaza-Papageorgiou 1993.

³⁶ Crucial in addition to the publications of the theatres at Thorikos and Euonymon, were Gebhard 1974; Pöhlmann 1981; Goette 1995a; Moretti 2001, 121–136; Goette, in: Csapo 2007.

³⁷ Esp. Papastamati-von Moock 2007. 2012.

³⁸ For major contributions to what we call 'institutional history' relating to fourth-century theatre, see: Makres 1994; Chaniotis 1997; Slater 1997; Scholl 2002; Vierneisel – Scholl 2002; Csapo 2003; Latini 2003; Summa 2003; Csapo 2004; Milanezi 2004; Chaniotis 2007; Wilson 2008; Agelidis 2009; Wilson 2010; Ceccarelli 2010; Paga 2010; Moretti 2010; Wilson 2011b; Slater 2011; Wilson – Csapo 2012.

monetisation upon theatre and especially tragedy in several far-reaching studies (2003. 2004a. 2004b. 2012). Zachary Biles' *Aristophanes and the Poetics of Competition* (2011) studies the full impact of the competitive festival setting upon the form and contents of Old Comedy. In the same year (2011) David Roselli wrote the first monograph dedicated to the theatre audience. In addition to the ancient authors, the archaeology and the iconography, the institutional history of the theatre relies heavily on epigraphic material, and here again, the bulk of the surviving evidence favours the fourth century. Very recent advances in the editing and reconstruction of the epigraphic material, such as Stephen Lambert's new edition of the decrees from 353–321 in IG II³ 1, fascicle 2 (2012) with a series of related studies³⁹, and Ben Millis and Douglas Olson's *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens* (2010), will make this material much more accessible for future studies.

The present volume, *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B. C.*, collects new studies by the leading experts in fourth-century theatre. It differs from all other studies in offering a complete overview of all aspects of the fourth-century theatre: the new locations, the new buildings, the new dramas, the new attitudes to theatre, the new uses for theatre and the new ways of organising, funding and memorialising theatrical production. Some of the topics are old, but even these contain new evidence and new perspectives. Above all this volume offers the multidisciplinary approach that we think indispensable for the study of fourth-century theatre.

The first section (A) deals with theatre venues and theatre buildings, one of the few areas of indisputable expansion and creativity within the fourth-century theatre industry. In Chapter 1, Christina Papastamati von-Moock makes public for the first time new and often unexpected discoveries brought to light over the last sixteen years of excavation, study and reconstruction in the Theatre of Dionysus at Athens in which she played a major role. In Chapter 2, Hans R. Goette, a foremost expert on Attic topography, studies the evidence for theatre at the Rural Dionysia in Attica and asks new questions about its organisation and in particular about the sharing of resources between demes. In Chapter 3, Jean-Charles Moretti, the leading expert on Greek theatre architecture, looks at developments beyond Attica to offer a magisterial survey of the spread of theatre buildings and their development into a monumental form in the fourth century, identifying regional variations and regional contributions to the common architectural vernacular.

Section B examines fourth-century drama. Oliver Taplin, in Chapter 4, asks the recklessly unorthodox and intelligent question 'might fourth-century tragedy have been creative, innovative and even great drama?' and then from an examination of largely neglected papyrus texts and fourth-century vase paintings skilfully demonstrates that the answer may, contrary to all the most cherished assumptions of the last two hundred years of theatre history, be 'yes'. Sebastiana Nervegna, Chapter 5, for the first time, examines all the available evidence for the early canonisation of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, uncovering its causes and variations, such as the anomalously different reception of Aeschylus and Sophocles in the Greek East and West. Far from being proof of the inferiority of fourth-century tragedy, the canonisation of the fifth-century tragedians appears to emerge from the vitality, diversity and expansiveness of theatre in the fourth-century and Early Hellenistic period. Johanna Hanink, Chapter 6, similarly views the classicism of the fourth century as an index of the vitality of fourth-century tragedy. Classicism and the canonisation of the three fifth-century tragedians is a sign of the growing independence of

³⁹ Lambert 1997. 2000. 2005. 2006. 2008. 2010. 2011. 2012.

theatre as an institution, of the growing centrality of tragedy in social discourse, and of the international success of the theatre industry. Finally, Andrew Hartwig in Chapter 7, focuses on fourth-century comedy, taking issue with the general view that it is a period of decline, and gathers the evidence to show that it was a fertile and innovative period that set the comic agenda for centuries to come. What are usually identified as symptoms of collapse are more convincingly interpreted as a product of the comic theatre's expansion, growing internationalisation and pan-Hellenic values.

Section C explores aspects of theatre's expansion throughout the Greek world and indeed beyond. There has been much fruitful discussion in the past two decades about fifth- and fourth-century theatre in the Greek West⁴⁰. We turn our attention instead to six largely unexplored areas of fourth-century expansion. Indeed the performance of Greek theatre in non-Greek realms has scarcely been studied as a phenomenon, and yet one non-Greek nation arguably had as great an impact upon fourth-century theatre history as Athens itself. Macedonian theatre can no longer be viewed as cultural transfer from an active Athenian centre to a passive semi-barbarian periphery. Eoghan Moloney in Chapter 8 explores the way that Archelaus and Philip II reconfigured theatre to suit their need to organise and maintain power in the Macedonian state; and many of these transformations changed Greek theatre even sooner than Macedonian power could change the general configuration of the Greek world. Brigitte Le Guen, in Chapter 9, explores the crucial role played by Alexander in spreading theatre to other non-Greek cities throughout the Middle East, West Asia and Egypt. This was doubtless the most significant event in fourth-century theatre history, as it made theatre the main vehicle for linguistic and cultural Hellenisation (and hence a core element within the cultural education of the administrative and ruling classes of the Hellenistic kingdoms), with the result that the demand for theatre, in the years following Alexander, increased possibly a hundredfold by the end of the century. And yet, contrary to the long-standing bias of decay theorists that fourth-century theatre had become secularised (and Hellenistic theatre still more so), Le Guen shows that Alexander maintained theatre's traditional religious and festival structures. Vayos Liapis' Chapter 10 studies the peculiarities of the one surviving fourth-century tragedy, the *Rhesus*, a tragedy that has long stood as a proof of the inferiority of post-Euripidean tragic production. He makes a case for supposing the *Rhesus* atypical of mainstream fourth-century production, and argues that it may have been composed with a Macedonian audience in mind.

In Chapter 11, Zachary Biles and Jed Thorn take a close look at the reception of theatre-iconography among the non-Greek communities of Southern Italy, especially the Italic people who inhabited the region of Peucetia. They were the main consumers of the Apulian-made red-figured pottery that is so rich in theatrical motifs, and also importers of much of the finest theatre-related Attic pottery to survive till the present. Theirs is the first fully contextual study of the theatre-related pottery in native Italy and their observations indicate that the funerary symbolism of Dionysian iconography was a more important factor in its reception than the theatrical subjects. Even if the non-Greek populations of South Italy were primarily attracted to the funerary symbolism of what we have come to think of as 'theatre-related' vase-paintings, Edward G. D. Robinson in Chapter 12 gives strong arguments for concluding that the theatrical motifs on West Greek pottery were appreciated

⁴⁰ See esp. Taplin 1993; Boshier 2006; Taplin 2006; Wilson 2007d; Kowalzig 2008; Boshier 2012.

for more than just generic Dionysian content. Robinson challenges the presupposition that the native populations in the hinterland of Taras were necessarily alien to Greek culture and ignorant of theatre. We have, after all, incontrovertible evidence that non-Greek inhabitants of the Italian peninsula were watching (and even adapting and performing) Greek drama in the third century, and that non-Greek populations elsewhere (especially Macedon) were avid consumers of Greek theatre already in the fifth century. Robinson offers the very first serious attempt to throw light upon the spread of theatre culture through non-Greek Italy in the century and a half before history can verify that Greek drama reached Rome.

J. Richard Green, in Chapter 13, takes a first look at what the iconographic evidence can tell us about Greek regional theatre. This has been well studied for Sicily, particularly in Bosher 2012, but Green's is the very first consideration of regional styles in Boeotia, Corinth, and Cyprus. Another first is Chapter 14 by Edith Hall and David Braund. From the Black Sea comes one of our most startling early testimonia for the spread of literary culture. On the very eve of the fourth century (400) Xenophon tells us that among the wreckage of ships on the Thracian Pontus he saw "couches, boxes, written books" (An. 7, 5, 14). It has long been supposed that drama was one of the staples of the early book trade and it has startled many scholars to think that it was one of the cargoes traded in the Black Sea. To date no scholar has researched the question of the fourth-century reception of theatre and theatre culture in this area. This is partly due to the difficulty of accessing information about the material remains, both because they are published in eastern European or Asian languages, and because much of the research was done in former East Block countries with poor communication with outside scholarship. Hall and Braund offer the first general survey of theatre around the Black Sea.

Section D contains two contributions to the institutional history of the theatre. In Chapter 15 Eric Csapo and Peter Wilson study the financial innovations of Eubulus and Lycurgus in the third quarter of the fourth century, to show how versatile, subtle, but also teatrocentric they were. In Chapter 16 Benjamin Millis studies the different characters and functions of the enormously important series of inscribed public records for the Athenian dramatic contests: the Fasti, Didascaliae and Victors Lists. Although some of these were created in the third century, the first, the Fasti, and with it the very idea of a public commemoration of civic victors, is a product of the Eubulan era.

The Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B. C. brings together the various strands of contemporary scholarship that permit, for the first time, a holistic image of the Greek theatre in the age of its greatest growth and maturity. It attempts to regard fourth-century theatre in its own light, not overshadowed by the grandeur of the fifth-century theatre. Indeed it could be said with some justice that fourth-century theatre was the parent of its parent. It selected, shaped and cultivated 'fifth-century theatre' precisely to serve as the greatest cultural bloom of the Classical era, and so we have received it. That it could do so is testimony to the immense power and importance of theatre in the fourth century. The way it did so is testimony to the ideals and values of fourth-century theatre, for fifth-century theatre is in an important sense, an artefact of the fourth century and cannot properly be understood unless we moderns acknowledge that, at least from our perspective, the shadow falls the other way.

- [download online The D Programming Language](#)
- [Confessions From an Arranged Marriage \(The Burgundy Club, Book 4\) pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub](#)
- [Mother Earth News \(February & March 2012\) here](#)
- [read online Les Sept jours du talion pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)

- <http://academialanguagebar.com/?ebooks/The-Christian-Delusion--Why-Faith-Fails.pdf>
- <http://flog.co.id/library/Together-Alone--Personal-Relationships-in-Public-Places.pdf>
- <http://jaythebody.com/freebooks/Microsoft-System-Center-2012-Service-Manager-Cookbook.pdf>
- <http://www.experienceolvera.co.uk/library/Les-Sept-jours-du-talion.pdf>