Tragedy Personified

1. Visualising Tragedy

In a volume celebrating a scholar esteemed for illuminating the relationship between ancient Greek tragic drama and the visual imagination, the personification of Tragedy itself is an appropriate issue to raise. Ancient historians described events as if they were episodes in tragic drama; novelists and poets composed ekphraseis of scenes derived from tragic theatre; sculptors and potters carved and painted figures from individual tragedies. But what did Tragedy actually *look like*? There were never many attempts to personify Tragedy: just as the Muses were in general less important in literature than the self-awareness of individual poets,[1] so allegorical figures representing genres of poetry and theatre appeared less frequently than images of their composers or performers. From the late fourth century onwards most attempts to visualise Tragedy will probably have owed something to the painting *Dionysus, Tragedy and Comedy* by the influential artist Aetion (Pliny, *NH* 35.78). An approximate contemporary of Apelles, Aetion was most famous for his painting of the marriage of Alexander to Roxana (327 BCE), a work which legend held had been displayed at the Olympic Games (Lucian, *Aetion* 4-6). The motif Aetion there devised of winged Erotes playing with Alexander's armour was imitated in Roman wall paintings of Hercules and Mars. And Aetion's conception of Tragedy and Comedy, as mediated through later ancient artworks, still underlies most modern answers to the question of what Tragedy looks like (see section 5).

By the late fifth century, however, there were already word-pictures of the art of Tragedy – the *technē* which, according to Aristophanes, Euripides had inherited from Aeschylus so overweight that she needed to be treated with a purgative diet, walks and monodies (*Frogs* 939-44).[2] By the mid-fourth century Aristotle could

describe Tragedy in language suggesting an organic being who physically matures and reaches her *telos* (*Poet*. 4.1449a 9-15).[3] Both these personifications of Tragedy as a woman are technically non-mimetic, and yet still function visually by making the abstraction appear concrete before the mind's eye.[4] Such literary personifications, assembled from words rather than stone or paint, are especially rich in societies such as ancient Greece in which systematic anthropomorphism determines the conception of gods. Literary personifications accompany developed symbolic codes of visual representation in painting, sculpture, coins, and the theatre of the kind which Zeitlin has suggested typified the culture of classical Athens.[5] Personification in written discourse fascinated twentieth-century literary theorists: it was defined as a form of textually constituted anthropomorphism, which, since it posits as given 'an identification at the level of substance', is the most extreme form of figurative language.[6] But what were the substantive images of Tragedy in the cultural repertoire of Aristophanes' spectators or Aristotle's students?

Some of the earliest personifications of genres appeared on the dramatic stage itself, for example the character Iambē who may have participated in the satyr play by Sophocles named after her: in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* Iambē cheered the mourning Demeter by telling her jokes (202-5). Iambē was an aetiological figure personifying *iambos* through her association with the obscene jesting of women celebrating the Thesmophoria (Apollodorus, *Bibl.* 1.5.1).[7] Although the date of the Sophoclean *Iambe* is unknown, the other metapoetic personifications that appeared in the Athenian theatre belong to the last three decades of the fifth century, a period which 'witnessed an unparalleled burst of intensely aggressive metapoetic debate inside poetry produced in Athens'.[8] The most remarkable was the figure of *Kōmōidia* who appeared in Cratinus' comedy *Pytine* (*Wine-Flask*) in 423 BCE; this uproarious

play triumphed over the first version of Aristophanes' *Clouds*. In *Pytine* Comedy was the embittered wife of Cratinus himself. She wanted to divorce him because he was consorting with another woman, Pytine -- i.e. with drinking.[9] The comedy presented Cratinus' fondness for drink as impeding his dramatic creativity. In a comparable play by Pherecrates, entitled *Cheiron*, Mousikē herself appeared as a plaintiff; she listed the outrages inflicted upon her by poets including Timotheus, the arch-apostle of the New Music.[10] There were also two lost plays by Aristophanes (*Gērytades* and *Poiēsis*) in which Poetry may have appeared on stage.[11] In the fourth century Antiphanes followed suit with a comedy entitled *Poiēsis*.

Yet no known playwright made an actor dress up as *Tragōidia*. The sole candidate is Euripides' slovenly, dancing Muse in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, but she is no personification of Tragedy generically. Her castanets (see 1305) are reminiscent of those played by Euripides' Hypsipyle to the baby Opheltes in the lowly office of his nurse in the play named after her.[12] The Aristophanic *mousa Euripidou* is also associated with Lesbos, implying fellatio and the music of Terpander (1308); she is neither young nor attractive and her social status is low.[13] A subversive personification of an aesthetic evaluation, she is Euripides' Muse only as conceived from the biased perspective of Aristophanes' reactionary Aeschylus. She physically manifests a prejudicial judgement on an individual dramatist, rather than personifying what the classical Athenians in general imagined Tragedy looked like. The only other candidate for a staged personification of tragedy is the muse who appears in the *Rhesus* attributed to Euripides and laments *ex machina* the death of her Thracian son (890-982). But the ancient scholar who identified her as Calliope was probably correct; she is an intertextual figure, marking the relationship between the *Iliad* and her play.[14]

Perhaps *Tragōidia*'s non-appearance on stage expresses one significant generic difference between tragic and comic theatre. *Tragōidia* could scarcely appear in tragedy herself, since the poets were evoking a heroic world where drama had not yet existed; they avoided using the terminology of the theatre, its spectators, the acting profession, and the dramatic genres.[15] Although overt metatheatre has recently been sought with great enthusiasm in Athenian tragedy, it remains undeniable that the playwrights erased the anachronistic notion of theatre from their vision of bronze-age entertainments, defined in the language of choral dancing, *epos* and *melē*.[16] But Tragedy does not seem to have appeared in comedy, either. Perhaps this is because one definitive difference between fifth-century tragedy and comedy is that tragedy virtually never breaks what used to be called 'the dramatic illusion' in order directly to apostrophise its audience.[17] The comic poets could not even conceive, perhaps, of making a personification of Tragedy address the comic audience, because the closed-off characters in Tragedy's genre hardly ever do themselves.

2. Vase-Paintings of *Tragōidia*

The fine *LIMC* article on Tragoedia by Annelise Kossatz-Deissman reveals that the earliest answer to the question 'what did Tragedy look like?' is provided by a red-figured vase dated to about 440 BCE and now in The Vivenel Museum in Compiègne, France (**fig. 1**). *Tragōidia* enters the history of the visual imagination as one of the female figures – usually maenads -- named after genres who appear in Dionysiac scenes on mid-fifth-century Athenian red-figure vases. The image, painted by the unnamed hand of a member of the group of Polygnotus, is undistinguished in either conception or execution. Yet one feature is unexpected: the earliest identifiable

visualisation of Tragedy in the art of the world holds, in addition to a thyrsos, a crouching leveret (see detail, **fig. 2**).

Dionysiac imagery involving maenads was an Athenian sixth-century invention; the maenads joined the *thiasos* relatively late, at around the time when Peisistratus was encouraging the development of the Dionysia, and indeed when tragedy first began (its official inauguration is dated to 534). Subsequently, the visual experience of theatre had a crucial if unquantifiable effect on the depiction of the Dionysiac *thiasos*.[18] The scenes with maenads specifically named *Tragōidia*, however, do not appear until a century after the maenads joined the Dionysiac revel. They are preceded by satyrs named for dances, such as *Sikinnos*;[19] *Kōmōidia* is first identified as a thyrsos-bearing attendant on the mid-fifth century bell krater in the Louvre (G 421) depicting Dionysus leading Hephaestus back to Olympus, accompanied by an aulos-playing Marsyas. Although on the reverse of the Compiègne krater a certain energy characterises the satyr's pursuit of a maenad, *Tragōidia* herself appears in a much calmer, domestic tableau, one of the images of the family life of satyrs analyzed by François Lissarrague.[20]

Tragōidia stands to the left, behind the seated Dionysus. He offers wine to an infant satyr named *Kōmos*, and Ariadne, on the right, replenishes the cup from an oinochoe. *Tragōidia* apparently intends the leveret, into whose eyes she smiles playfully, to be a gift for *Kōmos*. Her presence seems to link Dionysus and Ariadne with *theatre*. Each side of the vase thus represents a different perspective on Dionysiac festivals and the dramatic competitions: the name of the satyr child, indeed, recalls both the processional revels before the plays began, and the celebrations of the victorious performers that followed them.[21] In a study of Polygnotus, Matheson calls this *Tragōidia* a 'maenad-like figure' rather than a maenad,[22] but she certainly carries

a thyrsos. She also wears a distinctive round, peaked head-dress (*sakkos*), of soft fabric, worn by maenads in thiasos scenes on other vases.[23]

The other obvious accoutrement of the Compiègne *Tragōidia* is the leveret. A fully grown hare, like a cock, can often connote a sexual advance in the form of a gift bestowed by an *Erastēs* on an *Erōmenos*, and a mildly flirtatious implication may be intended here. In non-Dionysiac scenes hares can bear other meanings: they can communicate a rural setting, or the speed of the running Boreads, or hunting (Cheiron regularly carries a fox and a hare on a stick in his role as hunter). Since hares were known only to come out of their forms to feed under cover of darkness, when hare-hunts therefore took place, their presence in art might suggest a nocturnal scene. In black-figured vases, youths wearing fillets and carrying wineskins sometimes also carry hares, apparently intended as offerings.[24] When it comes to Dionysiac scenes, adult hares sometimes appear hanging dead from pegs behind the god (e.g. ABV 63.2). Women bring hares to Dionysus on two vases by the Amasis painter.[25] One of these, dated to the 530s, is the earliest vase on which females attend Dionysus alone without satyrs, and on which a female wears a leopard skin. Dionysus stands to the left holding his kantharos and waving as two women approach.. They wear ivy wreaths and hold sprigs of ivy; one holds a hare and the other a small stag. As Carpenter says, by the time of this vase ‘women have become central to the meaning of a Dionysian scene’; it is ‘likely they had a specific inspiration’ and may represent changes, connected with theatre, in the Athenian understanding of Dionysus’ women.[26] Does this archaic hare-bearing maenad illuminate *Tragōidia*’s leveret? The Compiègne painter is aware that the hare is a traditional maenadic accoutrement, and an erotic gift, but has scaled the animal down to fit the playful, familial tone of his domestic thiasos. The earliest parallel actually occurs in a thiasos scene on a cup

by Lydos in which a small satyr leans down to pat a hare.[27] But there is no parallel to the tiny leveret sitting on an outstretched palm.

The hare-bearing *Tragōidia* is not a personification in the modern sense of that term. Yet her materiality does articulate something of the relation she bears to other phenomena connected with her vase. Tragedy is part of theatre, and theatre is part of the collective ritual process of worshipping Dionysus at Athens. From this perspective the closest parallel is another cute, quasi-familial scene represented on a fragmentary vase dated to about 430 BCE; a satyr leans over the small satyr boy, between maenads who seem likely to have represented Tragedy and Comedy.[28]

The Compiègne scene also resembles two mid-fifth century vase-paintings in which nymphs attend the infant Dionysus and his father Zeus.[29] Perhaps the Compiègne artist, when wishing to incorporate Dionysus, Tragedy and the *kōmos* into a visual design, saw the relationships between these phenomena as inter-generational, and analogous to the parental and nurturing roles played in the instance of the child Dionysus by Zeus and the nymphs respectively. Yet the *Tragōidia* scene provides neither a direct allegory nor a genealogically conceived narrative of origins: it crystallises, through the use of a conventional mythical framework, a set of symbiotic and interdependent relationships operating within the drama festivals. *Tragōidia* is configured as older and more dignified than the bibulous *Kōmos*, even if her gift to him has a coy connotation.[30]

On two slightly later vases, emanating from a period when Csapo has argued that there was a strong rise in the self-conscious notion of tragedy as a performance,[31] *Tragōidia* is a wilder maenad, and her primary relationship is with an adult male in her thiasos, a sexually excited satyr. The earlier occurs on the neck of a volute-krater from Gela of about 430 BCE, now in New York (MMA 1924.97.250). On both of the

images on the neck there are thiasos-scenes; on the side without Dionysus two satyrs, both named Simos, approach maenads named *Kōmōidia* and *Tragōidia* (with thyrsos) respectively **(fig. 3).** This scene of pursuit, with its whirling clothes, speed and excitement, is related psychologically to the experience of the dancing chorus central and ancestral to all genres of drama. It is quite different from the static rural tableau of the Compiègne scene, which evokes an atmosphere nearer to that of a spoken episode separating the choruses of a satyr play, such as the hillside dialogue in the *Ichneutae* of Sophocles in which the nymph Cyllene hushes the satyrs and describes Hermes' birth to them.[32]

Of slightly later date is the famous vase in Oxford (Ashmolean 534), which depicts a satyr named Kissos priapically creeping up to a sleeping maenad named *Tragōidia*, thus configuring the relationship of satyrdom to Tragedy as one of covert sexual assault (**fig. 4**). This is a revealing way of looking at the dialectical interdependence of the two types of drama enacted sequentially at the Dionysia; it can be argued that satyr drama functioned to 'ambush' the foregoing serious drama, and reorient the tragic audiences in a collective identity founded in uproarious masculinity: as the dialogue between Agathon and Euripides' In-Law in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* comically suggests (148-58), the appropriate frame of mind in which to compose satyr drama was while enjoying penetrative sexual intercourse with another man.[33] The jolly celebration of masculinity in satyr drama was psychosocially desirable given the intense emotional identification, often with women and always with emotions socially constructed as feminine (the process Zeitlin calls 'playing the other'), which the audience had experienced in the three preceding tragedies.[34] The presentation of the relationship between the satyr and the maenad here approaches an 'allegorical' reading of the relationships between tragedy

and satyr drama; indeed, the Ashmolean Maenad has been regarded as an early example of the personification which was to become such a habitual mark of fourth-century Athenian thought; on this argument she provides a parallel with the personified Philosophy in Isocrates' *Panegyricus*, and with the personified dramatic poetry whom Plato drove from his ideal state.[35]

Tragōidia begins to appear in different guises on late fifth-century vases. The contexts, still Dionysiac, are more explicit about their status as representations of the 'real world' of the drama competitions. The relationship between *Tragōidia* and the Dionysiac thiasos becomes less abstract, less remote from the experience of the spectators, and signifies the agonistic structures and performance conventions within which drama was enjoyed. Thus on an (extremely) fragmentary Barcelona *pelikē* (Mus. Arch. 33), Apollo and Dionysus, with his thiasos, are depicted at a victory tripod. On the left flies a Nike-like figure securely named *Kōmōidia* (see the reconstruction of the painting in **fig. 5a**); the other winged figure, second from the right and between a satyr holding a jug and *Paidiá* (a personification of the playful element in the satyric revel), is therefore, probably, *Tragōidia* (**see fig. 5b**).[36] She is certainly preparing to bestow a tragic mask on the tripod. The explicit choregic context emphasises the liturgical dimension of theatre; it also shows that Tragedy herself is becoming a figure capable – like one of her actors -- of changes in costume and appearance. From serene, pursued or naked maenad she has transmuted into a triumphant winged Nike, in elaborately patterned robes. But it is also noteworthy that, for the first time, the convention of depicting Tragedy as holding an actor's mask has slipped into the iconography. *Tragōidia*'s journey from maenad to figure tied to histrionic practice is significantly advanced on this pelike.

One of the recurrent elements in the personification of Tragedy subsequently became patterned robes and accessories signifying her variegated nature. The Byzantine Michael Psellus, for example, visualises Tragedy (*tragikē poiēsis*) as 'adorned (*kosmoumenē*) with a variety of rhythms, and encompassing variegated (*poikila*) metres'.[37] These decorated robes first appear at the time of the late fifth-century metamorphosis of Tragedy which began to figure her as an actor in her own genre of theatre, a beautiful woman in an embroidered gown, presiding over a choregic revel. For the 'mystery lady' on the Pronomos vase in Naples, sitting on the couch to the right of Dionysus and Ariadne at the centre of the upper level, turning towards Himeros and holding a mask, is in my view none other than *Tragōidia* herself (**fig. 6**). This possibility, long ago envisaged by Ludwig Curtius, has not found recent support.[38] Yet the vase-painter must have been aware that *Tragōidia* could conventionally appear as an attendant of Dionysus – indeed, of Dionysus with Ariadne, as on the Compiègne vase; perhaps he could assume that viewers would identify his mysterious female as *Tragōidia*. It is most unlikely that she is the actor who played Hesione, since she inhabits the divine sphere. But it has been suggested that she is a maenad, a nymph, a personification of satyr drama, or of the training required by performing in a chorus (i.e. a form of *Paideia*).[39] Bieber was surely nearer the mark in suggesting that the woman is not exactly personified satyr drama, but rather *Paidiá*, personified (and slightly sexy) play.[40] But even this interpretation misses the point that satyr drama had not yet been separated from the tragic tetralogy at all; that step did not come until the mid-4th century (see below). The Pronomos vase may portray its chorus in the costumes that they wore for the *final* drama in the victorious group, but they had performed beforehand, in less boisterous guises, in no fewer than three successive tragedies. Satyr drama itself acquired no name with a

suffix *–ōidia*, along the lines of *Tragōidia* or *Kōmōidia*, but was always called instead just 'the satyrs' or 'satyric drama' (see e.g. Ar. *Thesm.* 157). This was because it had developed as an integral and inseparable part of the *tragic* performance. The Pronomos *Tragōidia* therefore presides appropriately over the company of actors and choreutai who have just achieved their splendid victory, in what else but the *tragic* competition. She may be, as Demetrius was later to call satyr drama, tragedy at play, *Tragōidia paizousa* (*de Eloc*. 169), but she is still *Tragōidia*.

Yet she was about to undergo the most important revolution in her history. By the late 4th century she severed the primordial cord that had always bound her to satyr drama. By 341 the satyr play had even been dropped from the tragic tetralogy at the Athenian Dionysia, creating a tragic group of three tragedies, with an entirely separate satyr play performed at the *beginning* of the festival programme. This crucial piece of information is recorded by the *Didaskaliai*, the series of fragmentary inscriptions from the south slope of the Acropolis which documented the history of drama.[41]

In fifth-century Athenian vase-painting *Tragōidia* had invariably been envisaged in a Dionysiac group including satyrs. Although paired with Comedy several times, and iconographically similar to her, the satyric ethos was ever-present. It was, however, about to disappear. New possibilities for representing tragedy generically began to be explored, perhaps including the figure labelled ΑΙΓΙΣΘΟΣ (AIGISTHOS) on the 'Choregos vase'.[42] This character, in his tragic costume, forms a contrast with the other, comic figures. Indeed, scenes on several South Italian vases of the fourth century combine comic and tragic images, sometimes giving them labels which draw more explicitly generic distinctions of tone and manner. These include the so-called New York Goose Play vase.[43] In another example, a single naked youth labelled *tragōdos* is painted on a late Apulian krater, the reverse of which portrays a

comic mask,[44] thus opposing the two major dramatic genres. Tragedy and Comedy, as equivalent presences within the sphere of Dionysus, have here transmuted into the binary, antithetical pair which is still so familiar today.

3. Tragedy's Escape from Athens

By the mid-fourth century Aristotle's *Poetics* had developed a theoretical view of important disparities between tragedy and comedy: these distinguished, for example, the origins of the two types of theatre, the social class and morals of the characters, and the invented characters of comedy from the well-known families of tragic myth. Tragedy's appearance for the rest of antiquity may have been determined by whatever transformation she underwent in Aetion's famous painting of Dionysus with Comedy and Tragedy (Pliny, *NH* 35.78). It would be good to know whether it was on differences between the two handmaids of Dionysus that Aetion played, or on their similarities. Both Aristotle and Aetion were reacting to epochal shifts in the conditions under which tragedy was performed, and both reflect the divorce of tragedy from its context at the Athenian festivals of Dionysus.[45] But this process had already begun long before. The internationalisation of tragedy, which became marked towards the end of the fifth century, was facilitated by the fact that tragedy had never been quite as Athenian as other competitive choral events at Athens;[46] tragic competitions, unlike dithyrambic ones, were never organised on a tribal basis (except for the selection of judges). In this they also differed from the comic competitions, which transferred the responsibility of selecting *chorēgoi* from the *archōn basileus* to the tribes, thus lending comedy a greater sense of tribal competition.

Wealthy tyrants had long been able to commission new works from Athenian playwrights, such as the *Women of Etna* which Aeschylus wrote for Hieron of

Syracuse, in addition to soliciting the re-performance of works such as *Persians*, which the *Life of Aeschylus* reports was revived in Sicily (*Vita* 18).[47] But the situation was transformed by the end of the fifth century. Vases with scenes related to theatre found in Megale Hellas imply that plays by Euripides were being produced regularly around Herakleia in southern Italy.[48] Macedon, from the accession of Archelaus in 413 onwards, had systematically set about attracting tragedians away from Athens; when it emerged as a world power it spread drama throughout the polis-culture of the Balkans and the newly conquered areas of Asia.[49] Other cities and islands, including Rhodes, became centres of theatrical activity during the first half of the 4th century.[50]

This picture of the wholesale export of tragic drama from Athens does not tally with the narrative of terminal decline after the deaths of Euripides and Sophocles, a narrative extracted from Aristophanes' *Frogs* and widely believed until recently. Emphasis is now rightly laid on the evidence for the massive amount of tragic theatre being enjoyed in the fourth century, and in many more venues.[51] When Plato was citing tragedy, 'he was not attacking something which was dead and out of date'.[52] Tragic theatre was evolving rapidly, especially in terms of the increasing prominence of the actors. This process had started with the addition of a prize for a tragic actor to the Dionysia programme as early as 449 (or 447).[53] An actor's prize was subsequently instituted at the Lenaea, probably in 432, but certainly by 423.[54] It is symptomatic that the first tragic actor whom we can name in connection with a specific first performance of an extant tragedy is Hegelochus, the protagonist in Euripides' *Orestes* in 408 (Σ Ar. *Ran.* 303). And the earliest evidence for actors touring outside Attica comes from around the turn of the century.[55]

The raised status of the *tragic* actor is reflected in the revivals of old tragedies institutionalised at Athens in 387/6; the same practice was not initiated for comic

drama until four decades later.[56] Reperformance, which swiftly resulted in the emergence of a repertoire, had a major impact on the relative importance of the actor. Not only did it remove the poet from competition for a prize altogether, but it gave the actor independence. He could develop a touring repertoire, play at short notice, and travel freely.[57] The institution of the revival of old tragedies inevitably produced the first generation of truly international acting stars, men like the peerless *tragōidos* Theodorus (see further below), who won prizes at Athens but also performed for enormous fees in theatres across increasingly extensive areas of the Greek-speaking world.[58] The phenomenon of the itinerant star professional consolidated the inexorable trend, documented by the musical papyri, towards the performance of tragedy in the form of excerpted highlights.[59] Excerpts also could also be enjoyed in contexts, such as the symposium, removed from festival drama.[60] Reperformance also led to new plays becoming increasingly imitative of the canonical masterpieces; in the second quarter of the 4th century BC, for example, the tragic actor Androsthenes performed two plays by Theodorides called *Medea* and *Phaethon*, the titles of two famous Euripidean plays. This process is confirmed by Aristotle's observation that most of the tragedies in his day are written about just a handful of families (*Poet.* 13.1453a 18-22).[61]

These developments were accompanied by the emergence of a much greater awareness of what Tragedy might be as a generic entity. In the fifth century BCE there had been talk about the art of rhetoric, discussion of something called Poetry, and the first inklings of a need to classify sub-species of the genus Poetry according to what we call categories of genre. This period, for example, saw tragedy become central to Old Comedy, and some, at least, of its stylistic and visual effects explored in the new fashion of paratragedy.[62] But there were few signs of any attempt to define

Tragedy according to the analytical, tonal and qualitative aesthetic criteria which were to emerge in the fourth century. Most's excellent article on the idea of the tragic in antiquity argues that tragedy received the 'poetological prerogative' of being theorised earlier and more intensively than any other genre.[63] He is correct when it comes to Plato onwards, but what is his evidence for specific prose discussions of the tragic as early as the 5th century? The only candidates are Sophocles in his apocryphal prose treatise on the chorus (attested by so dubious a source as the *Suda*), and Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen*. This contains nothing which could not apply equally to the effect of Homeric epic; its points of contact with the Helen scene in Euripides' *Trojan Women* are the persuasive force of verbal rhetoric and physical beauty (8-19), rather than with anything exclusive to tragic theatre. Moreover, Ford has recently argued cogently that, far from an embryonic model of tragedy, Gorgias' *Helen* develops a scientific understanding of language which attempts to synthesise the perspectives of natural philosophy, including Democritean materialism and Anaxagorean theory of Mind.[64] Although Gorgias did famously say that Tragedy entails deceit (82 B 23 DK), a superior witness in Most's defence would be the anonymous author of the somewhat later *Dissoi Logoi*, who draws a parallel between the fictive power of painting and tragedy.[65]

It is truer to the evidence to stress how remarkably *late* it was that there arose discussions of any depth or complexity of what we would call 'literature'.[66] Nightingale has argued that it took Plato's agonistic conception of the relationship between types of discourse to elicit embryonic notions of genre.[67] Certainly, although the names of the nine muses listed in Hesiod's *Theogony* 77-9 include Thalia and Melpomene, the individual muses are given no generic specifications.[68] Indeed, the idea that each muse was responsible for a separate province of art is a later,

Hellenistic development. Plato's *Phaedrus* includes a suggestive account of the function and structure of tragedy -- its capacity to arouse pity and fear, and the need for the speeches in a tragedy to be fitted together so as to form a whole (268c). Yet the myth of the cicadas in the same dialogue (259b5 – d8), which was probably the inspiration behind the later classification of the muses,[69] fails even to mention Melpomene, who became the Hellenistic muse of tragedy; this development was connected with the old Athenian cult title of Dionysus *Melpomenos* (see Pausanias 1.2.5), under which his *technitai*, the Hellenistic guild of actors, worshipped him.[70]

Theorising Tragedy as a genre begins with Plato, at the time that Tragedy had begun to be exported from its original performance context. In discussing Hellenistic poetry, Nagy once observed that 'the very concept of *genre* only becomes necessary when the *occasion* for a given speech-act, that is, for a given poem or song, is lost'.[71] This observation has become celebrated in discussions of genre, for example the Introduction to Depew and Obbink's collection *Matrices of Genre*.[72] It can also illuminate the relationship between the transformations in the performance conditions of tragedy and in personifications of the genre.

4. From the Thiasos to Thasos

Generic discussions of Tragedy were therefore delayed until Tragedy became detached from the context in which she had originated and in which her nature and function had been self-evident. To paraphrase Nagy, the very concept of the tragic genre only became necessary when the occasion for her given nature became subject to radical change. This argument corresponds with the findings in section 2 that in late fifth-century visualisations of Tragedy she mutated from a maenad into a range of slightly different figures. She became a winged Nike, similar to a flying creature in a

tragedy; in holding a tragic mask (as she does on the Barcelona pelike and on the Promomos vase), she became more closely identified with the figure who, by the act of assuming a mask, mediated the boundary between fictive mimetic world and the real world of the spectator. That figure was of course the actor. During the rest of antiquity the ways in which Tragedy was personified become dissociated altogether from the dancer of the chorus mythically represented by satyrs and maenads, and identified with the expert professional vocalist -- the *tragōidos* who represented kings and queens and mighty heroes.

The most remarkable ancient configuration of *Tragōidia* is a marble statue in a sanctuary on the northern Aegean island of Thasos.[73] Here *Tragōidia* was personified as an imposing female holding a tragic mask. It is not, however, the conventionally lovely female mask which *Tragōidia* was holding on the Pronomos vase, but an extraordinary *prosōpon* imitating a blind male character. Beneath the statue were inscribed the words 'Tragedy, Theodorus acted (*hupekrineto*)'; the identification of Tragedy with her actor has here, for the first time, become almost complete. The statue belongs to a monument in the Thasian Dionysion. Thasos had been part of the Athenian empire, but Spartan rule lasted 405 until 389, when the Thasians reverted to their pro-Athenian stance. From 356 onwards they became pro-Macedonian. Their interest in theatre seem to have remained consistent throughout their affiliation with both Athens and Macedon: fourth-century Thasian *amphorai* sometimes bear stamps decorated with theatrical masks.[74] The view that Thasos enjoyed a vigorous performance tradition is confirmed by the beauty of its theatre, which in its present form however dates from the early third century.

The monument within which the personification of *Tragōidia* stood has been compared with the choregic monuments in Athens: beyond a Doric portico, on a semi-

circular arc, stood statues representing Dionysus, alongside allegorical figures representing Tragedy, Comedy, Dithyramb, and a musical piece entitled *Nykterinos*, or ‘Nocturne’.[75] Beneath the statues were the accompanying inscriptions: ‘Dionysus’; ‘Tragedy, Theodorus acted (*hupekrineto*)’; ‘Comedy, Philemon acted’; ‘Dithyramb, Ariston of Miletus played the aulos (*ēulei*)’; ‘Nykterinos, Batalos played the aulos’.[76]

The three substantial surviving statue pieces are the long-haired head of Dionysus (now the centrepiece of the Thasos museum), a headless torso of *Kōmōidia* (**see fig. 7),** who was tall, dignified, and elaborately draped, and the mask of a blind man, part of the equipment of *Tragōidia*. The head depicted on this mask is bald, with sunken cheeks, bags under the eyes, and lines on its forehead (see **fig. 8**); the sculptor is thinking beyond the manufactured *prosōpon* worn by the actor to the acted *prosōpon* or ‘role’; the effect is more that of a blind old man than a conventional mask of one. The role was probably determined by the play Theodorus performed at the festival being commemorated: he may have worn the mask of Oedipus at Colonus, Phineus, or possibly Tiresias.

Theodorus of Athens was arguably the most famous actor in antiquity. His tomb on the Sacred Way near the Cephisus could still be visited in Pausanias’ day (1.37.3). He won at least four victories at the Athenian Lenaea, and almost certainly also at the Dionysia.[77] In the 360s BCE, he performed in the theatre in Pherae in Thessaly, and reduced the vicious local tyrant Alexander to tears by his performance as a Euripidean heroine (Aerope, Merope or Hecuba, depending on which source is to be credited); his performances in Sophocles’ *Antigone* and *Electra* were also the stuff of legend.[78] Aristotle regards him as the first actor to have spoken in a convincingly ‘realistic’ way (*Rhet*. 3.2.4). He was determined to be given the prologue in any tragedy he was to perform, on the ground that the prologist inevitably won the

audience's sympathy (Arist., *Pol.* 6.1336 b 27-31). This nonpareil had by 361 BCE already amassed a sufficient fortune to subscribe no less a sum than seventy drachmas to the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, a donation testifying to his sense of the importance, as an international celebrity, of courting public opinion.[79]

Theodorus' epigraphic presence in the Thasos monument is testimony to his visit to that island, perhaps mid-century, by which date his reputation alone would have made him a remarkably important visitor. Theodorus' fame was directly related to the establishment of the old tragedies as a regular event at the Athenian Dionysia in 387/6. The appearance of his name, along with those of Philemon, a famous comic actor of the same generation, and Batalos, an illustrious Ephesian aulete, suggests that the first editor of the inscriptions, Georges Daux, had arrived at too late a date in proposing that they originated at the beginning of the third century BC.[80] The Dionysion on Thasos was a familiar landmark in the fifth century, mentioned in the Hippocratic *Epidemics I* (2.13), but the choregic monument is probably mid-fourth-century.[81] The statues seem to have celebrated 'a particular performance at which tragedy, comedy and two kinds of choral song…were performed in honour of Dionysos';[82] they were probably commissioned by the local *chorēgos* who organised the occasion at which these famous actors and auletes performed alongside choruses consisting of Thasian amateurs.

The statue of Tragedy herself has disappeared, although the archaeological remains imply that she was similar to her counterpart, Comedy. The mask was not new in *Tragōidia*'s iconography, but, amongst the available evidence, the specificity of the blind male role, and the naming of the individual actor Theodorus, are unprecedented. Tragedy stands proud in a new island home, a dignified companion of Dionysus and Comedy, attended by other, non-theatrical genres of *mousikē*. She

proves that Tragedy has achieved both independence from satyr drama, and the generic autonomy insisted upon by the *Poetics* of Aristotle, an admirer of Theodorus from nearby Stageira, a short boat-ride away from Thasos on the easternmost promontory of Chalcidice.

5. The Future of Tragoedia

The Thasos monument represents a turning-point in the iconography of *Tragōidia* for several reasons besides its negotiation, through identification with a specific actor, of the distinction between the represented world of the stage and the world external to it. The monument is material proof of Tragedy's escape from Athens to every corner of the Hellenistic world where theatre might be enjoyed; it also represents Tragedy's escape from the specific ritual context of the Athenian Dionysia. Above all it represents Tragedy's divorce from satyr drama. In leaving the thiasos, Tragedy began consorting with other genres of literature, and she is to be found during the rest of antiquity in quite different company.

With the exception of Aristotle, the ancients struggled to analyse what they meant by Tragedy or the Tragic. But one of the ways in which they could generate meaning was by placing Tragedy in a relationship with other literary genres. Homeric epic is the important 'other' in two Hellenistic visualisations of *Tragōidia*. A curious anecdote records how the grammarian Dionysius Thrax, a student at Alexandria of the great Iliadic scholar Aristarchus, painted a picture of his teacher: because Aristarchus knew all tragedy by heart, Dionysius painted *Tragōidia* on his master's breast.[83] Tragedy is also seen as an art subsidiary to (and derivative of) Homeric epic in the so-called *Apotheosis of Homer* which Archelaus of Priene sculpted in the second century BC. This marble relief, found at Bovillae near Rome (London BM 2191), depicts a

soaring *Tragōidia* in a procession of allegorical figures saluting the supreme poet, Homer, in the presence of Time: she stands between the more diminutive *Poiēsis* and *Kōmōidia*. Like a Hellenistic tragic actor, she wears an imposing head-dress, built up over her forehead, and shoes with very thick soles.[84] By the first century BC, and the building of elaborate stone theatres with complicated staging arrangements in every corner of the Hellenistic world, the notion of the theatrical stage, the *skēnē*, even threatened to oust *Tragōidia* from visually encoded representations of the tragedian's art altogether: a remarkable marble relief sculpture from Smyrna represents Euripides seated between Dionysus on his right, and a female figure labelled ΣΚΗΝΗ (SKĒNĒ) on his left, who hands him a mask of Heracles.[85]

Although Tragedy's primordial relationship with the thiasos briefly re-emerges in Horace's *Ars Poetica*, where she is a stately matron coerced into dancing by satyrs on festal days (231-3), Horace is the only Latin author to visualise Tragedy in relationship to Satyr Play. Far more elaborate is the personification of Tragedy who appears in an elegy by Ovid (*Amores* 3.1), the only exponent of that genre known to have attempted a tragedy.[86] In a sacred grove, Ovid is visited by Tragedy and Elegy, appropriately costumed. They each woo him with a dramatic speech. Elegy appears first, her hair scented and elegantly dressed, clad in the sheerest of dresses, flashing seductive glances; she carries Venus's myrtle branch, and suffers from the elegiac malady of having one foot slightly shorter than the other (7, 9-10, 33-4). The first epithet used for Tragedy, on the other hand, is *violenta* (11), referring both to the content of tragic drama and to the imposing gait of her actors; she storms in with large strides (*ingenti…passu*, 11), a detail suggesting both buskins and the male actor beneath the costume. She is histrionically equipped with imposing hair, trailing robe,

and royal sceptre (12-14).[87] Her key gesture is a regal shaking of her head – which perhaps bears Homeric rather than tragic overtones.

Ovid's *Tragoedia* is the only surviving ancient personification of Tragedy to speak; she delivers elegiac couplets (a rare but not unprecedented metre in tragedy — see Eur. *Andr.* 103-16), but her diction is parodically elevated. This is evident in the striking apostrophe (16), 'O argumenti lente poeta tui', in which the hiatus between the 'O' and 'argumenti', the rare instance of the adjective *lentus* with a genitive, and of course the apostrophaic 'O' itself, combine to determine unmistakeably the lofty register of her speech.[88] Ovid chooses Elegy over *Tragoedia*, but only after accumulating Callimachean technical distinctions between the two, presented in anthropomorphic guise: Elegy's style, like her dress, is *tenuissima* (3.9), while Tragoedia's language is *gravis* (3.35); other key terms in ancient poetics -- *sublimis, exiguus, levis, fortis* – are also implicated in the scene. And even though Ovid chooses Elegy, it is no permanent rejection of Tragedy's call that he intends. 'Allow your priest a little time', he pleads (3.1.67-70).[89]

Lee long ago saw that the power of this episode ('quite the best piece of narrative in the *Amores*') rested on the device of treating these two personifications simultaneously as human beings and as genres.[90] Yet scholarship on the poem was long dominated by the question of its allegorical antecedents, whether Prodicus' allegory of Heracles at the Crossroads (Xen. *Mem*. 2.1.21-34), or the judgement of Paris.[91] Other scholars focused on the poem's function as 'the most complex of all Ovid's programmatic poems', and sought its ancestry in Hesiod's visitation by the Muses (*Theog.* 26), the Callimachean tradition of the *recusatio*, and above all in Propertius 3.3, where both Apollo and Calliope insist that the poet should avoid epic and stick to elegy.[92] The most sensitive interpretations have appreciated the

theatricality of the scene: Ovid, the actor for much of the *Amores*, here turns into the spectator, and there is a scenic contrast between elegy's backdrop (the door of the beloved) and tragedy's kingly, palatial setting (*regia*).[93] But the poem has never been read against the full tradition of personified literary genres, above all personifications of *Tragōidia*. Furthermore, given Ovid's interest in comedy, he may well be influenced by the juxtaposition of Tragedy and Comedy in the visual art of the fourth century, above all in Aetion's painting, a suggestion made many decades ago by Bartholomé;[94] for Ovid's personification of Elegy as erotic and light-hearted also resembles his conception of Thalia, Muse of Comedy, in the *Ars Amatoria* (1.264) and in Sappho's epistle to Phaon (*Heroides* 15.84).[95]

A similarly theatrical and antithetical repudiation of Tragedy occurs in a passage of Plutarch. In his epideictic oration clumsily titled *Are the Athenians More Famous for War or for Wisdom?* (= *Moralia* 345C – 351B) Plutarch proposes – apparently for the sake of argument -- that the Athenians' wars constituted a greater achievement than their literary culture. This text will always be important to the visualisation of the tragic, if only for Plutarch's remarks on the means by which the historiographer Thucydides makes his narrative 'like a painting' by 'vivid representation of emotions and characters' (347A).[96]

Emotions and characters – *pathē* and *prosōpa* – belong quite as much to tragic theatre as to tragic history, and in the following chapters Plutarch challenges the achievement of Athenian tragedy. He first points out that there was no non-dramatic genre of poetry associated with that city, and dismisses comedy as too plebeian to matter (he alleges that Areopagites were banned from writing comedy). Plutarch then proposes that he and his readers imagine that they are staging a theatrical competition between Athenian tragedy and Athenian military prowess, with figures representing

the adversarial parties entering from opposite sides of the theatre. Tragedy is represented by her poets, chanting and bearing her equipment; the tragic authors are to be accompanied by the tragic actors (including the famous Theodorus commemorated in the Dionysion at Thasos):

> …men like Nicostratus and Callipides, Mynniscus, Theodorus, and Polus, who robe Tragedy and bear her stool, as though she were some woman of wealth; or rather, let them follow on as though they were painters and gilders and dyers of statues. Let there be provided also a bounteous outlay for stage furnishings, supernumeraries, sea-purple robes, stage machinery, as well as dancing-masters and bodyguards, an intractable crowd.' (348E-F)[97]

Plutarch rhetorically paints an imposing but decadent scene – Tragedy resembles an unadorned statue waiting to be decorated, a woman rich enough to hire numerous attendants, costumiers and beauty therapists. In an elaborate gesture to the iconographic tradition (and perhaps to the distinctly tragic trope of the analogy between an artwork and a beautiful woman[98]), *Tragōidia* herself mutates into an ekphrastic work of visual art, clothed and ornamented by her performers. The individual poets (Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides) are studiously not named, which allows the less august names of the actors – albeit the most celebrated actors of the classical period -- to dominate.[99] Plutarch here exploits the lower status of actors in the Roman Empire relative to their high reputation in the 4th and 3rd centuries BC. He also invokes misogynist prejudices, as ancient as Hesiod's Pandora, against the female as an economic drain and an artificial surface, in addition to the Platonic reaction against the sophists' fascination with the power of artistic mimesis.[100] The traditional association of femininity with despotism is insinuated by the stool-bearers and bodyguards. This gaudy, extravagant, specious *Tragōidia*, with her army of lackeys, is unlikely to be preferred to the impressive opponents Plutarch marshals against her: these are Persian Wars generals, along with personifications of their

victories. Marathon leads forward the Victory of Miltiades, Salamis the Victory of Themistocles, Cimon's Nikē leads Phoenician ships from Eurymedon, and so on. Against the victors in the canonical victories won by the Athenian democracy over the barbarians, *Tragōidia* stands no chance at all.[101]

After the classical period *Tragōidia* was therefore seen as subordinate to epic, as the rival of Elegy, or as a flashy and trivial pursuit in comparison with the serious business of military history. Her meaning is everywhere constituted as the 'other' of the art form or achievement which is primarily under scrutiny. This tendency probably reflects the relative unimportance, by the Roman imperial period, of staged, spoken tragedy in comparison with the more fashionable ways of consuming tragic material. Tragedy was mostly enjoyed in the new medium of pantomime.[102] Pantomimes were danced versions of tragic myth, a type of musical theatre that emerged in Asia in the first century BC before taking the Roman Empire by storm. Its popularity is reflected in the reallocation of the Muse Pol(h)ymnia to the department of Pantomime (as on the better preserved of the two 'Muses mosaics' in Trier (Augusta Trevorum)).[103] This development ran parallel to the continuing passion for sung recitals of tragic arias, and the concomitant understanding of the name of the Muse of Tragedy, Melpomene, as the singing Muse in charge of sung – rather than fully staged – performances. The singing Melpomene who sometimes appears from Hellenistic times on coins and in statuary is identified less with star actors than with the *nonpareil* amongst canonical mythical figures of international tragedy and their props – Heracles/Hercules, complete with lionskin and club.[104] Heracles was certainly one of the characters in the repertoire of the expert singers, for Lucian remarks on the unfortunate effect when a *tragōidos* with a small, feminine voice attempts to sing in the persona of the mighty Heracles (*Nigrinus* 11). By Lucian's

day, Heracles had become a favourite role in every type of theatre; his props were synonymous with the acting profession generally.[105] But *Tragōidia* as the fourth century BCE had understood her had reached her acme in the age of the great actors catalogued by Plutarch, and was rarely to dominate either public entertainment or literary culture to the same extent again.

One exception may have been in court circles during the reign of the Emperor Hadrian (117-38 AD), a patron of Greek culture, entitled 'the new Dionysus' by the Artists of Dionysus. His villa at Tivoli demonstrates his interest in the promotion of theatre: the undercroft of the stage and the cavea bowl of the North ('Greek') Theatre, built with maximum afternoon sunlight in mind, are preserved.[106] The South Theatre (often called the 'Odeion'), with its six stairways leading to underground tunnels, may have been used for more private theatricals.[107] In the design of the villa's grounds, with their vast landscapes, terraces, and fountains, thought was put to the selection and placement of statues, about 250 of which survive (there will originally have been far more); Hadrian wanted to populate his villa with innumerable 'symbolic recollections of society's foundations',[108] including figures representative of myth, divinity, history, architectural achievements (caryatids), and imperial territories (a crocodile). This was an eclectic High Empire project expressing the cultural aspirations of the era.

Consideration was given to the arrangement of statues in pairs (for example, twinned animals), often in facing niches.[109] Perhaps the most influential of all ancient personifications of Tragedy and Comedy are the twin busts, probably of Greek provenance, discovered in 1735 by the Count Giuseppe Fede at the entrance of the North Theatre; it was however Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, the sculptor, who identified them as personifications of these genres. Cavaceppi restored ancient statues for the

Pope at his Museo Pio Clementino, which still houses these two busts.[110] Cavaceppi publicised the statues in his three-volume collection of plates illustrating the artefacts he had restored,[111] which stimulated the taste for artistic representations of Tragedy and Comedy from the late 18th century; one beautiful pair of stipple engravings by Heinrich Sintzenich, from drawings which may have been by Angelica Kauffman, were issued in mid-1777.[112] The fashion also arose for leading ladies, such as Madame Rachel, to be depicted as the Tragic Muse. The most well known is Joshua Reynolds' *Sarah Siddons as the Tragic Muse* (1784), although a stronger sense of tragic emotion emanates from Richard Cosway's *Sarah Siddons as Tragedy* (c. 1785).

Such iconic images have conditioned the form still taken by Tragedy in contemporary culture. In most of our imaginations Tragedy is still a tall, straight-featured, doleful, dark-robed female. She has long hair, either flowing in disorder or monumentally coiffed. She may wear or hold a theatrical mask; she may raise one arm in a grand histrionic gesture. She is not in the first flush of youth, and has experienced motherhood. She may be contrasted with other art forms, or intellectual abstractions. Indeed, fin-de-siècle Viennese stole, choker and hairstyle apart, she would resemble Gustav Klimt's fierce-eyed *Tragödie* of 1897, an allegorical figure he created in black crayon, pencil and wash, heightened with white and gold, as one of a set including personifications of Sculpture and Love.[113]

Yet this type of iconography originally evolved in tandem with ancient theatre practice. Surveying ancient personifications of Tragedy has shown how their evolution related subtly to shifts in the experience of theatre *in performance*. The cheerful Polygnotan maenad, with her baby hare, has little in common with the solemn statue in the Thasian Dionysion, with her ugly mask; equally, the mid-fifth century Athenian festival of Dionysus would have been almost unrecognisable to the

Tivoli spectator enjoying the Hadrianic élite revival of the classical repertoire. The stately matron of late antique sculpture herself emerged from ancient identifications of Tragedy with her actors and their elaborate costumes, masks and accoutrements. But all these figures – member of the rustic thiasos, victim of sexual assault, winged Nike, statuesque allegory and cosmetically enhanced society lady -- attest to a continuing ancient interest not only in visualising scenes that were by one definition or another tragic, but in visually personifying *Tragōidia*.[114]

---

1 Spentzou (2002), 21.

2 See Newiger (1957), 130-3.

3 See Webster (1956), 7.

4 Warner (1987), 82.

5 See Zeitlin (1994). Useful bibliography includes Aellen (1994) on personification in fourth-century vase-painting, Petersen (1939), 67-72 on Hellenistic personifications, and Paxson (1994), 13 on drama and rhetorical *prosōpopeia*. There is an excellent overview of personification in Greek art and literature offered by Stafford (2000), especially her theoretical first chapter, although none of her subsequent case studies deals with the personification of literary genres.

6 See de Man (1984), 241.

7 The sole fragment of Sophocles' *Iambe* (Sophocles fr. inc. 731 *TgrF*) has also been attributed to his *Triptolemus*: see Pearson (1917), vol. iii, 1. On Iambē see Foley (1994), 45-6.

8 Wilson (1999-2000), 431.

9 See *Pytine* T i and ii and Cratinus fragments 193-6 *PCG*, with Hall (2000), 410-11; Rosen (2000).

10 See Pherecrates fr. 155 *PCG*; Hall (2000), 414-15; Dobrov & Urios-Aparisi (1995).

11 See Hall (2000), 413-14.

12 Fr. I ii 9-16 in Cockle (1987), 59.

13 Dover (1993), 351-2.

14 The text of the play does not give the Muse a name. The author of the first hypothesis identifies her as Calliope; in the third hypothesis Aristophanes of Byzantium anachronistically suggested that she might be Terpsichore. See further Hall (1999), 97 and nn. 4-7; Ebener (1966), 114. On the Homeric echoes in the Muse scene in *Rhesus*, see Bond (1996), 263-4.

15 Easterling (1985).

16 I argue this in greater detail in Hall (forthcoming *a*), ch. 2, a discussion which depends more than I can express on Froma's work.

17 See e.g. Taplin (1986). There are isolated rule-proving exceptions, above all Electra's use of the second person plural at Eur. *Or.* 128. But there are other ways in which that play plays dangerously with subverting conventional distinctions between comedy and tragedy.

18 Schöne (1987), 190.

19 Fränkel (1912), 54. On genre labels in vase-painting in the late fifth century see Couelle (1991), some of which is reprised in Couelle (1998). On the evolution of personified abstractions more generally, see Shapiro (1983).

20 Lissarrague (2003).

21 Lissarrague (2003), 182-3.

22 Matheson (1995), 192.

23 See Galoin (2001), 151. This is also worn by a maenad on a pointed amphora by the Achilles painter, in the Cabinet des Médailles (357 = ARV^2 987.2), published by Shefton (1967). This scene portrays a night-time revel, with satyrs and maenads in different attitudes; the maenad in question holds a torch. She is the figure on the far left of the photograph reproduced in Robertson (1992), 196, fig. 206. Thanks to Oliver Dickinson for this reference.

24 See Carpenter (1986), 51-2; Koch-Harnack (1983), 63-79.

25 ABV 151.21 and 152.25.

26 Carpenter (1986), 90. Beazley (1951), 57 calls the animals borne by the women their 'pets', but the way in which they are carried suggests more violent associations, and that the women are 'sisters of the hunter-maenads described by Euripides in *Bacchae* 734-48' (Carpenter (1986), 90 n. 65).

27 London B 148, *ABV* 109.29; Tiverios (1976), plates 51a & 52a.

28 Fragments in Florence and Leipzig: *ARV*[2] 1258, 2.

29 See Fuhrmann (1950-1), 116-20. Both these 'Birth of Dionysos' vases are in Ferrara.

30 Olympio in Plautus' *Casina* fantasises about the words of affection the lovely eponymous heroine Casina will bestow on him (46-50), which he hopes will conclude 'my sparrow chick, my dove, my hare!' (*mi lepus*).

31 Csapo (2004).

32 See Sophocles *TgrF* fr. 314, especially 221-404, with Hall (1998), 16-17. The rustic setting of satyr drama was one of the most important ways in which it differed from the usual polis context of tragedy: see Vitruvius 5.6.9.

33 See Hall (1998).

34 Zeitlin (1985).

35 Webster (1956), 40-1 with n. 1.

36 See the remarks of Shapiro (1971), 185, who discusses this vase in the course of his analysis of Paidia in vases generally.

37 *Essay on Euripides and George of Pisidia* 21-4, ed. Dyck (1986).

38 Curtius (1929), 16 n. 1. The details of the vase-painting (Museo Nazionale Archeologico, 3240) can conveniently be studied in the drawing published by Bieber (1961), reproduced in one of Zeitlin's most important collaborative volumes (Winkler and Zeitlin (1990), Plate 1).

39 For discussions and bibliography see Arias and Shefton (1962), 377-80; the remarks (of Krumeich) in the archaeological section of the introduction to Krumeich, Pechstein and Seidensticker (1999), 62-5.

40 Bieber (1961), 10, followed by Froning (1971), 10.

41 *IG* II[2] 2319-23. The implications of the detachment of the satyr play are well brought out in Easterling (1997), 214-16.

42 The suggestion of Taplin (1993), 62.

43 New York, MMA 24.98.104. Taplin (1993), 62 and fig. 10.2 argued that the label *tragōidos* was attached to the small, half-naked boy, painted on a higher plane than the figures in comic costume; he may have represented a jibe at tragedy from the perspective of those keen to promote comedy. But Schmidt (1998), 26-8 has pointed out that the label can not refer to this boy, who is of a type which on vases conventionally represents the attendants of naked men at the palaestra such as the man on the bottom left of the painting. Whom or what the label 'tragode' designates therefore remains a mystery, although

Schmidt recognises that the scene must nevertheless juxtapose tragedy and comedy in a fairly sophisticated manner. Thanks to Oliver Taplin for help on this point.

44 Trendall and Cambitoglou (1983), 122, 22/563d, with plate 22.6; see Taplin (1993), 62 n. 19.

45 Xanthakis-Karamanos (1993), 121; Hall (1996).

46 Osborne (1993).

47 Taplin (1999).

48 Taplin (1993), 19.

49 Revermann (1999-2000), 456; Maloney (2003).

50 Stephanis (1988), nos. 139, 363); Csapo (2004).

51 Easterling (1993).

52 Webster (1956), 31.

53 In 449 or 447 the name of the victorious actor is added to the notice of the tragic competition in the inscription known as the *Fasti* (IG II^2 2318).

54 The precise date depends on reconciling the evidence from several inscriptions; see Csapo and Slater (1995), 227-8.

55 The Demosthenic *Against Euboulides* (13), delivered circa 345 BCE, refers to the actor Kleandros' presence in Leucas (on the route to Italy) some years subsequent to the Decelean War of 413 BCE.

56 *IG* II^2 2318, cols. viii and xii.

57 Csapo and Slater (1995), 40.

58 See Sifakis (1967), especially 75-7; Gentili (1979), 22-7; Hall (2002).

59 See Hall (2002), 13-14.

60 For further anecdotes of this nature see Hall (1999). There were already signs of tragic excerpts in venues quite other than the theatre in the 420s; Philocleon envisages the performance of speeches by the actor Oiagros in the lawcourts (*Wasps* 579-80), and Strepsiades says his son wants to perform speeches from Euripides at a symposium (*Clouds* 1371-2)

61 Stephanis (1988), no. 182; Hall (forthcoming *b*).

62 Silk (1993).

63 Most (2000), 18-19.

64 Ford (2002), 176-80.

65 90 B 3.10 DK. On the relationship between these embryonic attempts to theorise tragedy and the experience of the contemporary audience, see Finkelberg (1998), 176-81

66 Stressed by Trimpi (1983), 5.

67 Nightingale (1995), 193-5.

68 Murray (2002), 40. See Nancy (1996), ch. 1, which asks why are there several arts — and therefore eventually several Muses — and not just one?

69 Murray (2002), 40, following Grube (1965), 5-6 and n. 3.

70 See the supplemented line 28 of the Amphictyonic decree confirming the privileges of the Athenian *technitai* in Le Guen (2001), vol. 1, 92-8 (no. 11); see also vol. 2, 74 n. 2; 97 n. 468; Lightfoot (2002), 210-11, and further below.

71 Nagy (1990), 362 n. 127.

72 Depew and Obbink (2000), 3.

73 The date is a matter of controversy: see below.

74 Webster (1967), 47.

75 See the photographs in Devambez (1941), especially 94-5 figs. 1 and 2, and the diagrams in Grandjean and Salviat (2000), 92-3.

76 *IG* XII Suppl. 400; see the discussion in Salviat (1979).

77 IG II[2] 2325.262; IG II[2] 2325.31. See Stephanis (1988), no. 1157.

78 On Theodorus in Euripides see Plut. *Vit. Pelop.* 29.4-6; Aelian *VH* 14.40; Lada-Richards (2002), 414-15; Hall (2002*b*), 421-3. For his Sophoclean roles see Plut. *Symp.* 9.2.737b; Demosthenes 19.246.

79 *SIG* 239 B. On actors' consciousness of celebrity, see Artemidorus, *On Dream Interpretation* 2.30; dreaming about making public donations bodes ill for most people, but 'actors and thymelic musicians' are among the exceptions, since they win praise by making financial contributions to the public weal.

80 Daux (1926), 34-6.

81 Salviat (1979), 157; Lambin (1982); Wilson (2000), 295. Stephanis (1988), dates both Theodorus and Philemon to 375-25 BCE (nos. 1157, 2485).

82 Webster (1967) 49-50, although his caption to fig. 6 suggests uncertainty about the chronology.

83 Dionysios Thrax T 6 b in the edition of Linke (1977). Thanks to Francesca Schironi for help on this.

84 Watzinger (1903), plate I; Appendix, plate 10 in Webster (1967). The shoes give her even more height than the elevated sole on the right foot of a statue in clothing suggestive of an actor's costume, who may represent Tragedy, dating from the second-century BC on the northern periphery of the Pergamon altar. She originally held a sword, and on her preserved right foot, protruding from her long chiton, is a beautiful shoe, richly decorated with leaves and a palmette, and elevated on an unusually high sole (3.5 centimetres). See the drawing in Winter (1908), 77, who however believes she is probably Melpomene rather than Tragedy.

85 See the photograph reproduced in Moraw (2002), 123 fig. 157. On Heracles as the archetypal theatrical hero, see below and n. 105.

86 Perhaps by that time the tragic muse had indeed appeared on the ancient stage: Pollux's list of characters requiring special masks includes an unelaborated mention of 'Muses' (see Stafford (2000), 13 on this list).

87 See Davis (1989), 109 n. 11. Brandt (1991), 141 compares the term *violenta* with Horace's word for tragedy *severe* (*Odes* 2.1.9). For a discussion of the terminology in Ovid's description of Tragedy, and its parallels in other Ovidian texts, see Schrijvers (1976), 416-18; Wyke (2002), 124-5.

88 See the detailed analysis in Schrijvers (1976), 418-19.

89 On the presence of Ovid's *Medea* in his other works, see Hinds (1993).

90 Lee (1962), 169.

91 For bibliography see Davis (1989), 108-9 n. 6. Wyke (2002), a revised version of an article first published in 1989, explores the implications of the correspondence between Ovid's scene and the Choice of Hercules 'for reading elegy's female forms as playful signifiers of a moral or political position' (p. 131): writing tragedy becomes equated with an Augustan version of Prodicus' vision of the pursuit of virtue.

92 Morgan (1977), 17-19. Recent scholars have intelligently discussed Ovid's personification of Elegy in *Amores* 3.1, but with less reference to her partner Tragedy, for example Sharrock (2002), 225-7.

93 Davis (1989); Brandt (1911), 143.

94 Bartholomé (1935), 45-6.

95 Elegy's affinity with Comoedia in Ovid was to have later artistic repercussions: *Amores* 3.1 was probably one of the sources, supplementing Pliny's account of Aetion's *Dionysos, Tragedy and Comedy*, for Joshua Reynolds' famous painting *Garrick between Tragedy and Comedy* (1761). See Postle (1995), 25; Wyke (2002), 120-1.

96 On this passage in Plutarch see Meijering (1987), 37.

97 Translated by Babbitt (1936), 512-13 (slightly adapted).

98 Zeitlin (1996), 53-86.

99 On this ancient 'canon' of iconic actors, see Easterling (2002).

100 At 348C Plutarch has already actually drawn attention to Gorgias 82 B 23 DK on the deceiver and the deceived (see above, section 3).

101 The discussion of Vasunia (2003), 371-5 brings out well how Plutarch's polemical agenda, and in particular his fixation on the loss of the classical Athenian Empire, entail subordinating her artistic achievements to her military exploits.

102 See Kelly (1979); Jory (1996).

103 See Hoffmann (1999), 37-8 with fig. 38. The other Trier mosaic with Muses preserves an attractive Melpomene, holding mask with high *onkos* (Hoffmann (1999), 34-6 with fig. 41).

104 See Webster (1967), 59-60.

105 *Anth. Pal.* 11.169, an epigram dedicated to the tragic actor Apollophanes, gives primacy amongst his props to the club of Heracles. See also Suetonius, *Nero* 21 on Heracles in sung tragedy; Macrobius 2.4 on pantomime.

106 MacDonald and Pinto (1995), 42. On Hadrian's revival of tragedy see Jones (1993).

107 MacDonald and Pinto (1995), 135.

108 MacDonald and Pinto (1995), 141.

109 MacDonald and Pinto (1995), 148.

110 Inv. Nr. 262, 285 (South Rotunda). See Raeder (1983), 100.

111 Cavaceppi (1768-72).

112 See Alexander (1992), 162 with figs. 136 and 137.

113 Whitford (1990), 40-41, with fig. 21. It is in the Vienna Historisches Museum. It adorns the jacket of a recent book on Greek tragedy by one of Froma's research students, Daniel Mendelsohn (2002).

114 This research for this paper has been generously supported by a grant at the Archive of Performances of Greek & Roman Drama, funded at Oxford and Durham by the AHRB. The argument has benefited from presentation at the Durham Classics Department's Research Seminar and at the Instituto Umanistici in Florence. In addition to those named in individual notes, thanks for helpful comments and advice are also due to the editors of this volume, Peter Brown, François Lissarrague, Carine Weicherding, Victoria Amengual, Pat Easterling, and especially Oliver Taplin and Eric Csapo.

References

Aellen, C. (1994), *A la recherche de l'ordre cosmique : forme et fonction des personnifications dans la céramique italiote*. Kilchberg / Zurich

Alexander, David (1992), 'Kauffman and the print market in eighteenth-century England', in Wendy Wassyng Roworth, *Angelica Kauffman: A Continental Artist in Georgian England*, 141-78. London / Brighton

Arias and Shefton (1962), *A History of Greek Vase Painting*, text and notes by P.E. Arias, translated and revised by B.B. Shefton. London

Babbitt, Frank Cole (1936, transl.), *Plutarch's Moralia*, vol. 4. Cambridge, Mass. / London

Bartholomé, H. (1935), *Ovid und die bildende Kunst*. Borna-Leipzig

Beazley, J.D. (1951), *The Development of Attic Black-Figure*. Berkeley

Bieber, M. (1961), *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater*. Second edition. Princeton

Bond, Robin Sparks (1996), 'Homeric echoes in *Rhesus*', *AJP* 117, 255-73.

Brandt, Paul (1911, ed.), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amorum Libri Tres*. Lepizig

Carpenter, Thomas H. (1986), *Dionysian Imagery in Archaic Greek Art*. Oxford

Cavaceppi, Bartolomeo (1768-72), *Raacolta d'antiche statue, busti, bassirilevi ed altre sculture, restaurate da B.C.* 3 vols. Rome

Cockle, W.E.H. (1987, ed.), *Euripides, Hypsipyle. Text and Annotation based on a Re-examination of the Papyri*. Rome

Couëlle, Columbine (1991), *Le noms de la gloire et du plaisir. Étude et fonctionnement des personages inscrit dans la céramique attique de la fin du Vème siècle av. J.-C.* Ph.D. Diss. Montpellier

---- (1998), 'Dire en toutes lettres? Allusions et sous-entendus chez le Peintre de Meidias', *Metis* 13, 135-54.

Csapo, Eric (2004), 'Some social and economic conditions behind the rise of the acting profession in the fifth and fourth centuries BC', in C. Hugoniot, F. Hurlet, and S. Milanezi (eds.), *Le statut de l'acteur dans l'Antiquité grecque et romaine*, 53-76 [= Collection Perspectives Historiques 9]. Tours

Csapo, Eric and Slater, William J. (1995), *The Context of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor, Michigan

Curtius, L. (1929), *Pentheus* [Winckelmannsprogramm der archäologischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin, 88]. Berlin

Daux, G. (1926), 'Nouvelles inscriptions de Thasos (1921-1924)', *BCH* 50, 213-49.

Davis, John T. (1989), *Fictus Adulter: Poet as Actor in the Amores*. Amsterdam
Depew, Mary and Obbink, Dirk (2000, eds.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, Society*. Cambridge, Mass. / London.
Devambez, P. (1941), 'Sculptures d'un monument chorégique a Thasos', *Monuments Piot* [= *Monuments et mémoires publiés par l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*] 38, 93-116.
Dobrov, G. and Urios-Aparisi, E. (1995), 'The maculate muse: gender and genre in the *Cheiron* of Pherecrates', in G. Dobrov (ed.), *Beyond Aristophanes*, 139-74. Atlanta, GA
Dover, K.J. (1993, ed.), *Aristophanes: Frogs*. Oxford
Dyck, Andrewe R. (1986, ed.), *Michael Psellos. The Eassays on Euripides & George of Pisidia and on Heliodorus & Achilles Tatius*. Vienna
Easterling, Pat (1985), 'Anachronism in Greek tragedy', *JHS* 105, 1-10.
----- (1993), 'The end of an era? Tragedy in the early fourth century', in Sommerstein et al (eds.), 559-69.
——- (1997), 'From repertoire to canon', in P. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, 211-27. Cambridge
----- (2002), 'Actor as icon', in Easterling and Hall, 327-41.
Easterling, P.E., and Hall, Edith (2002, eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors*. Cambridge
Ebener, D. (1966, ed.), *Rhesos. Tragödie eines unbekanntes Dichters*. Berlin
Finkelberg, Margalit (1998), *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece*. Oxford
Foley, H.P. (1999, ed.), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Princeton, NJ
Ford, Andrew (2002), *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton
Fränkel, Charlotte (1912), *Satyr- und Bakchennamen auf Vasenbildern*. Diss. Bonn
Froning, Heide (1971), *Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei in Athen*. Würzburg
Fuhrmann, Heinrich (1950-1), 'Athamas', *Jahrbuch des deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 54-5, 103-34.
Galoin, Alain (2001), *Vases Grecs: Collections des musées de Compiègne et de Laon.* Musée Antoine Vivenel Publications.
Gentili, Bruno (1979), *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World: Hellenistic and Early Roman Theatre*. Amsterdam
Goldhill, S, and Osborne, R. (1999, eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge
Grandjean, Yves, and Salviat, François (2000), *Guide de Thasos*. Second edition. French School at Athens publications
Gribbon, Deborah et. Al. (1999), *A Passion for Performance: Sarah Siddons and her Portaitists*. J. Paul Getty Museum Publications
Grube, G.M.A. (1965), *The Greek and Roman Critics*. London
Hall, Edith (1996), 'Is there a polis in Aristotle's *Poetics*?, in M.S. Silk (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Tragic*, 295-309. Oxford
----- (1998), 'Ithyphallic males behaving badly: satyr drama as gendered tragic ending', in Maria Wyke (ed.), *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Bodies of Antiquity*, 13-37. Oxford
----- (1999), 'Actor's song in tragedy', in Goldhill and Osborne, 96-122.
----- (2000), 'Female figures and metapoetry in Old Comedy', in Harvey and Wilkins, 407-18.
----- (2002*a*), 'The singing actors of antiquity', in Easterling and Hall, 1-38.
----- (2002*b*), 'The ancient actor's presence since the renaissance', in Easterling and Hall, 419-34.

----- (forthcoming *a*), *The Theatrical Cast of Athens: Roles in Ancient Greek Drama and Society*.

----- (forthcoming *b*), 'Greek Tragedy 431-380 BCE', in Robin Osborne (ed.), *Anatomy of a Cultural Revolution*.

Harvey, David and Wilkins, John (2002, eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes*. Exeter

Hinds, S. (1993), 'Medea in Ovid: Scenes from the Life of an inter- textual heroine', *Materiali e Discussioni* 30, 9-47.

Hoffmann, Peter (1999), *Römische Mosaike im rheinischen Landesmuseum Trier*. Trier

Jones, C.P. (1993), 'Greek drama in the Roman empire', in R. Scodel (ed.), *Theater and Society in the Classical World*, 39-52. Ann Arbor, MN

Jory J. (1996), 'The drama of the dance: prolegomena to an iconography of Imperial Pantomime', in W.J. Slater (ed.), *Roman Theatre and Society*, 1-27. Ann Arbor

Kelly, H.A. (1979), 'Tragedy and the performance of tragedy in late Roman antiquity', *Traditio* 35, 21-44.

Koch-Harnack, Gundel (1983), *Knabenliebe und Tiergeschenke: Ihre Bedeutung im päderastischen Erziehungssytem Athens*. Berlin

Kossatz-Deissmann, A. (1997), 'Tragodia', *LIMC* 8.1, 48-50.

Krumeich, R., Pechstein, N., and Seidensticker, B. (1999, eds.), *Das griechische Satyrspiel*. Darmstadt

Kuch, Heinrich (1993), 'Continuity and change in Greek tragedy under postclassical conditions', in Sommerstein et al.(eds.), 545-57.

Lada-Richards, Ismene (2002), 'The subjectivity of Greek performance', in Easterling and Hall, 395-418.

Lambin, G. (1982), 'Le surnom Βάταλος et les mots de cette familie', *RPH* 56, 249-63.

Le Guen, B. (2001), *Les associations de technites dionysiaques à l'époque hélleni-stique*. Two volumes. Nancy

Lee, A.G. (1962), 'Tenerorum lusor amorum', in J.P. Sullivan (ed.), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature*, 149-79. London

Lightfoot, Jane L. (2002), 'Nothing to do with the *technitai* of Dionysus?', in Easterling and Hall, 209-24.

Linke, K. (1977, ed.), *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax*, in *Samm-lung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker* vol. 3. Berlin / New York

Lissarrague, François (2003), 'Satiri tra le donne', in Paul Veyne, François Lissarrague, and Françoise Frontisi-Ducroux, *I misteri del gineceo*, 171-90. Editori Laterza, Rome / Bari. [Translation by Barbara Gregori of original French edition, *Les Mystères du gynécée*, Éditions Gallimard (1998)].

MacDonald, William L, and Pinto, John A. (1995), *Hadrian's Villa and its Legacy*. New Haven / London

Maloney, E.P. (2003), 'Theatre for a new age. Macedonia and Ancient Greek drama', Ph.D. Diss., Cambridge

Manakidou, Flora (1993), *Beschreibung von Kunstwerken in der hellenistischen Dichtung*. Stuttgart

Matheson, Susan (1995), *Polygnotus and Vase Painting in Classical Athens*. Madison / London

Meijering, Roos (1987), *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia*. Groningen

Mendelsohn, D. (2002), *Gender and the City in Euripides' Political Plays*. Oxford

Moraw, Susanne (2002), 'Die grossen Dramatiker', in S. Moraw and E. Nölle (eds.), *Die Geburt des Theaters in der griechischen Antike*, 119-27.
Morgan, Kathleen (1977), *Ovid's Art of Imitation: Propertius in the Amores*. Leiden
Most, G. W. (2000), 'Generating genres: the idea of the tragic', in Depew and Obbink (eds.), ***
Murray, Penelope (2002), 'Plato's Muses: the goddesses that endure', in Spentzou and Fowler (eds.), 29-46.
Nagy, Gregory (1990), *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore, MD
Nancy, Jean-Luc (1996), *The Muses*. English translation by Peggy Kamuf of original French edition (1994). Stanford CA
Nightingale, Andrea Wilson (1995), *Genres in Dialogue: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy*. Cambridge
Osborne, Robin (1993), 'Competitive festivals and the polis: a context for dramatic festivals at Athens', in Sommerstein et al (eds.), 21-37.
Pearson, A.C. (1917, ed.), *The Fragments of Sophocles*. Cambridge
Postle, M. (1995), *Sir Joshua Reynolds. The Subject Pictures*. Cambridge
Radford, Robert Somerville (1901), *Personification and the Use of Abstract Subjects in the Attic Orators and Thukydides.* Ph.D. Diss., Johns Hopkins
Raeder, Joachim (1983), *Die statuarische Ausstattung der Villa Hadriana bei Tivoli*. Peter Lang. Frankfurt am Mein / Bern
Revermann, Martin (1999-2000), 'Euripides, tragedy and Macedon: some conditions of reception', *ICS* 24-5, 451-67
Robertson, Martin (1992), *The Art of Vase-Painting in Classical Athens*. Cambridge
Rosen, Ralph (2000), 'Cratinus' *Pytine* and the construction of the comic self', in Harvey and Wilkins, 23-39.
Salviat, François (1979), 'Vedettes de la scène en province: signification et date des monuments chorégiques de Thasos', *Thasiaca* [= *BCH* suppl. 5], 155-67.
Schmidt, Margot (1998), 'Komische arme Teufel und andere Gesellen auf der griechischen Komödienbühne', *Antike Kunst* 41, 17-32.
Schöne, Angelika (1987), *Der Thiasos: eine Ikonographische Untersuchung über das Gefolge des Dionysos in der attischen Vasenmalerei des 6. und 5. Jhs v. Chr.* Göteborg, Sweden
Schrijvers, P.H. (1976), 'O Tragoedia tu labor aeternus: etude sur l'élégie III,1 des *Amores* d'Ovide', in J.M. Bremer, S.L. Radt, C.J. Ruijgh (eds.), *Miscellanea Tragica in honorem J.C. Kamerbeek,* 405-24.
Shapiro, H.A. (1983), *Personification of Abstract Concepts in Greek Art and Literature to the End of the Fifth Century BC.* Michigan
Sharrock, Alison (2002), 'An A-musing tale: gender, genre, and Ovid's battle with inspiration in the *Metamorphoses*, in Spentzou and Fowler (eds.), 207-27.
Shefton, B.B. (1967), 'Attisches Meisterwerk und etruskische Kopie', *WZUR* 16 (1967), 529-37.
Sifakis, G.M. (1967), *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama*. London /Toronto / New York
Silk, Michael (1993), 'Aristophanic paratragedy', in Sommerstein et al., 477-504.
Sommerstein, Alan, Halliwell, Stephen, Henderson, Jeffrey and Zimmermann, Bernhard (1993, eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis: Papers from the Greek Drama Conference, Nottingham, 18-20 July 1990.* Bari
Spentzou, E. (2002), 'Introduction: secularizing the Muse', in Spentzou and Fowler (eds.), 1-28.

Spentzou, E. and Fowler, D. (2002, eds.), *Cultivating the Muses: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Greek Literature*. Oxford
Stafford, E. (2000), *Worshipping Virtues: Personification and the Divine in Ancient Greece*. London
Stephanis, I. (1988), *Dionysiakoi Technitai*. Heracleion
Taplin, Oliver (1986), 'Fifth-century tragedy and comedy: a synkrisis', *JHS* 106, 163-74.
----- (1993), *Comic Angels and Other Approaches to Greek Drama through Vase-Painting*. Oxford. Clarendon Press
----- (1999), 'Spreading the word through performance', in Goldhill and Osborne, 33-57.
Tiverios, M.A. (1976), *Ho Lydos Kai To Ergou tou*. Athens
Trendall, A.D. and Cambitoglou, A. (1983), *The Red-Figured Vases of Apulia* suppl. I (= *BICS* suppl. 42). London
Trimpi, Wesley (1983), *Muses of One Mind: The Literary Analysis of Experience and its Continuity*. Princeton, NJ
Vasunia, P. (2003), 'Plutarch and the return of the archaic', in A.J. Boyle and W.J. Domink (eds.), *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*, 369-89. Leiden
Warner, M. (1987), *Monuments and Maidens: The Allegory of the Female Form*. London
Watzinger, Carl (1903), *Das Relief des Archelaos von Priene*. Berlin
Webster, T.B.L. (1956), *Art and Literature in Fourth Century Athens*. London.
----- (1967), *Hellenistic Art*. London
Whitford, Frank (1990), *Klimt*. London
Wilson, Peter (1999-2000), 'Euripides' tragic muse', *ICS* 24-5, 427-49.
----- (2000), *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia.* Cambridge
----- (2002), 'The musicians among the actors', in Easterling and Hall, 39-68.
Winkler, J., and Zeitlin, F.I. (1990, eds.), *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*. Princeton
Winter, Franz (1908), *Altertümer von Pergamon. Die Skulpturen mit Ausnahme der Altarreliefs*. Berlin
Wyke, Maria (2002), 'Reading female flesh: Ovid *Amores* 3.1', in *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations*, 115-54. Oxford
Xanthakis-Karamanis, G. (1980)*, Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy*. Athens
----- (1996), 'Hellenistic drama: studies in form and performance', *Platon* 45, 117-32.
Zeitlin, F.I. (1985), 'Playing the other: theater, theatricality, and the feminine in Greek drama', *Representations* 11, 63-96.
----- (1994), 'The artful eye: vision, ekphrasis and spectacle in Euripidean theatre', in S. Goldhill and R.Osborne (eds.), *Art and Text in Aancient Greek Culture*, 138-96. Cambridge
----- (1996), *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*. Chicago / London