# PLUTARCH AS A SOURCE OF INFORMA-
## TION ON THE GREEK THEATER

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS
AND LITERATURE, IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF GREEK)

BY

ROY CASTON FLICKINGER

CHICAGO
1904

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

# PREFACE.

My original plan was to collect and present all that Plutarch teaches us concerning the Greek drama and theater, with the secondary idea of discovering his literary method in dealing with incidents involving these subjects. It soon became apparent, however, that this was too large a theme for treatment in a doctor's dissertation. Accordingly, I have restricted myself to his testimony on the theater alone and, still more particularly, to the consideration of his value as a witness on the theater. Thus, I have in hand an abundance of material which I hope to use in further studies in Plutarch.

It is fitting in this place to express my gratitude to my teachers: to Professors Robert Baird and Daniel Bonbright, of Northwestern University, who directed my undergraduate studies in the classics; to Professor John A. Scott, of the same institution, who first encouraged me to graduate work; and to those to whom I am indebted for most of my graduate instruction, Professors Paul Shorey, William Gardner Hale, F. F. Abbott, George L. Hendrickson, and Edward Capps, of the University of Chicago, and more particularly to the last-named, who suggested this paper and has given me the benefit of his constant criticism and advice in its preparation.

ROY C. FLICKINGER.

EPWORTH UNIVERSITY,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

# INTRODUCTION.

PERHAPS the most valuable permanent results already derived
from the extensive and minute examination by competent archæ-
ologists of the numerous theater ruins which have been unearthed
in many parts of Greece during the past quarter-century are,
firstly, the recognition of the fact that all ancient theaters are no
longer to be classified under the two general Vitruvian types,
"Greek" and "Roman," but rather under a larger number of
categories, varying according to time, place, and purpose; and,
secondly, the necessity, which has arisen from the recognition of
this fact, of submitting all the evidence, and especially the literary
evidence, to a renewed critical examination.   It is not enough to
have traced the development in meaning of the various technical
terms through a series of authors chronologically arranged, valu-
able as this work is; first of all, the more important authors must
themselves be singly studied in order that the nature and the
proper application of the testimony they offer may be known.
At the present time only a beginning has been made in this
fundamental task without which a historical account of the Greek
theater cannot be written.   With the application of only such
precautions as the nature of the evidence, often vague and allusive,
often intelligible only by reference to the ruins or to later phrase-
ological usage, demands, the extant plays and the fourth-century
writers can, of course, be used unhesitatingly as witnesses for the
contemporaneous theater at Athens.   No reference in later writers,
however, can be safely applied to the Athenian theater of the
fourth and fifth centuries until such a course has been justified by
a consideration of the author's evidence in general and of the
bearing of the particular passage.   Thus, Noack,[1] for example, has
made it seem very probable that Vitruvius depended mainly upon
Asia Minor sources for his knowledge of Greek architecture, while
Rohde[2] has thrown light upon the difficult questions of the sources

[1] *Cf.* "Das Proskenion in der Theaterfrage," *Philologus*, Vol. LVIII (1899), pp. 1 ff.

[2] *Cf. De Iulii Pollucis in apparatu scaenico enarrando fontibus* (1870).

followed by Pollux.    These authorities are in a measure controlled
by the study of their sources; but for most writers the considera-
tion of the manner in which they treated their originals is equally
important.    Consequently, it is safe to say that, until the more
prominent later authors who discuss or refer to the Greek theater
shall have been critically examined in some such fashion, many of
the vexing problems of Greek scenic antiquities will obtain no
satisfactory solution.[1]

It was with the purpose of contributing somewhat to this kind of
preliminary investigation that the present study was undertaken.
Plutarch is rich in allusions to the theater.    Some of these allu-
sions, seemingly to the Athenian theater of the fourth century,
have caused no little difficulty to students of the subject.    His
works are so voluminous and so varied, range so freely in subject-
matter from the earliest times to his own day, and touch upon so
many different localities in the Græco-Roman world, that few
writers, on the one hand, have contributed more references to
scenic institutions and scenic terminology in our handbooks, while
few, on the other, need to be used with greater discrimination.
And such caution is required in a still greater degree because of
the uncertainty which necessarily attends the reconstruction of
those theater ruins to which it is generally assumed that he refers.
Whatever the age or location of the theater to which he seems to
allude, his words cannot confidently be applied, for example, either
to Dörpfeld's or to Puchstein's[2] reconstructions until the nature of
the evidence he furnishes is determined.    But once this is done,
it may become possible to test by his evidence the correctness of
the deductions which have been made from the existing ruins.
To this end it is necessary to establish criteria by which his allu-

[1] SCHULZE, "Lukianos als Quelle für die Kenntnis der Tragödie," *Jahrbücher für clas-
sische Philologie*, Vol. CXXXV (1887), pp. 117 ff., was more interested in other sides of the
question than in that involving theater construction and did not attempt to determine the
applicability to various periods of the evidence supplied by Lucian; while WALDEN,
"Stage Terms in Heliodorus's Aethiopica," *Harvard Studies*, Vol. V (1894), pp. 1 ff., gave a
bare list of material which is itself limited in scope, belongs to a period of little interest,
and involves no question of source or periods. WEISSMANN, *Neue philologische Rund-
schau* (1899), pp. 394 f., and (1903), p. 606, pointed out that a separate treatment of the
later writers was needed.   WEISSMANN'S own article, "Die scenischen Anweisungen in den
Scholien und ihre Bedeutung für die Bühnenkunde" (1896), perhaps approaches most nearly
the aim of the present paper.

[2] DÖRPFELD-REISCH, *Das griechische Theater* (1896), and PUCHSTEIN, *Die griechische
Bühne* (1901).

sions to theaters of his own day may be distinguished from those referring to earlier periods, and to consider how exactly he followed his sources when speaking of earlier theaters. We may then apply these results to the material which he provides, and in the light of his literary method may discuss more definitely the bearing of his testimony upon the terminology of the theater and upon its structural history.

# CRITERIA.

It is obvious at the start that Plutarch will convey many items of information concerning other periods than his own. It is inevitable that any writer who describes antecedent events shall employ words and phrases which have been coined and have come into general use since the events treated; *i. e.*, he necessarily modernizes his account to a greater or less degree. On the other hand, he is likely to try to retain the technical terms of the period with which he is dealing and to use them in the meanings then current. Such an attempt is more to be expected in a modern than in an ancient writer, and is seldom completely successful. How far Plutarch makes this attempt and how far he succumbs to the tendency to modernize will appear only upon examination. In the meanwhile the material must be sifted in such a manner as to avoid possible error in either direction. It is apparent that all passages taken from those writings in which Plutarch or his friends appear as participants in the dialogue, or in which contemporaneous events are described, must apply to the contemporary theater, unless the opposite is distinctly stated. Under the same category must be included also the passages which contain general allusions to the theater or its parts, or to matters involving the theater or its parts, and which are entirely independent of specific time, place, and occasion. In these passages (mostly figures of speech or parenthetical remarks) we must assume that Plutarch had in mind but one type of theater, and that, too, one which was perfectly familiar to his readers as well as to himself. Therefore, if the principles laid down are sound, information drawn from passages of these two sorts (which for convenience will hereafter be referred to as "general") should always be consistent with itself and should conform to that given us by other contemporaneous writers similarly situated. Contrariwise, all anecdotes or statements that are employed as having reference to a particular theater at a particular time or occasion before Plutarch's day, and all sayings that are given as the *bona fide*

utterances of persons antecedent to Plutarch, must be classified under a different category. Such passages (which will hereafter be referred to as "specific") may contain information relative either to the theater of Plutarch's day or to that of the period described, according to our author's habit in such matters; until that has been discovered, they must be considered separately.

# PLUTARCH'S METHOD OF DEALING WITH HIS SOURCES.

It is conceivable that Plutarch should have employed his originals in any one of four ways: (1) he may have reproduced them practically without change, as Athenaeus so often does, preserving accounts in their appropriate contemporaneous dress, or at least going astray only when his source did so likewise; (2) he may have felt free to alter his original to suit his pleasure, retaining the substance and perhaps the catchwords of the account before him, but introducing new turns of expression, and more picturesque and vivid details; (3) he may have gone still farther in his freedom of treatment and brought all technical allusions into accord with the terminology of his own day; and (4) he may have combined the last two methods, pursuing now one, now the other. On the first two hypotheses his theatrical references are to be used in explaining the theater structure and terminology contemporaneous with the event described or with the source employed, when that was not contemporaneous; on the third, they give an insight into the theater of his own time; and on the fourth, he cannot safely be quoted as a source for scenic antiquities at all, except in cases where the exact condition of the theater to which he refers is independently known.

In treating this topic there are four possible avenues of approach, viz.: by a comparison (a) of Plutarch with his source, when that is known and extant; (b) of Plutarch with himself, when he gives the same account in two or more places; (c) of Plutarch with some other writer who followed the same source; and (d) of Plutarch with other evidence which we possess, though his source is either not definitely known or not extant. It is apparent that, when it is perfectly certain what previous account Plutarch was using, (a) is the most profitable line of investigation; though unfortunately we can rarely be confident that a

particular source was in fact followed.[1]   Next in importance, and under the circumstances most satisfactory, is (b), which has never received due recognition as a criterion for use in this and many other cases where it would prove extremely important.   The least convincing method is (c), which would be valueless without the others, but is useful as lending confirmation to them; while the value of (d) varies with the circumstances of each case.

a) *Plutarch compared with his source.*[2]—There can be little

[1] *Cf.* the controversy as to whether Plutarch used directly ARISTOTLE'S *Constitution of Athens*. The early bibliography is given by Sandys. WRIGHT'S arguments (*Harvard Studies*, Vol. III [1892], pp. 25 ff.), even if accepted at full value, prove simply that Aristotle was not the *main* immediate source, and by no means that he was not an immediate source at all. His proofs are (1) that in the thirty-eight passages of the *Solon* which bear a resemblance to the *Resp. Ath.* Aristotle is mentioned but once; (2) that the resemblances, the dissimilarities, and the discrepancies alike are intelligible only on the supposition that Plutarch was transcribing from some work in which an abridgment of these parts of the *Resp. Ath.* was embodied, and that in transcribing from this abridgment he interpolated foreign matter, which is inconsistent with the unabridged Aristotle; and (3) that the omission in the *Themistocles* of the characteristic anecdote of Themistocles, Ephialtes, and the Areopagus (*Resp. Ath.*, c. 25) is unaccountable except on the hypothesis that the copy of Aristotle's work used by Plutarch did not contain this story. As regards (3), we can scarcely consider ourselves infallible judges of what stories Plutarch would consider "characteristic" and illustrative of ἦθος. Moreover, Plutarch often tells anecdotes elsewhere which do not occur in the *Life* of the hero concerned. Therefore we cannot expect that he should tell on every occasion all the appropriate stories known to him, nor yet assume that every anecdote he read or heard seemed to him equally memorable. Consequently, the omission of Aristotle's anecdote in the *Themistocles* does not warrant the hypothesis set up. As to (2), the following pages will show to a certain extent what Plutarch was capable of in the treatment of a source. Furthermore, we must allow him the privilege of *contaminatio*, and that means that the resultant fusion would almost necessarily contain items inconsistent with any one of the primary accounts. Wright's first argument ignores the fact that Plutarch habitually suppressed the authorities whom he most extensively followed (*cf.* GUDEMAN, *The Sources of Plutarch's Life of Cicero* [1902], pp. 4 f.). The same objections hold good against WILAMOWITZ'S arguments (*Aristoteles und Athen* [1893], Vol. I, pp. 299 ff.), which belong to the same three types and are not conclusive. Plutarch was probably familiar with the *Resp. Ath.* in its present form and used it on occasion. It is true that the more trivial narratives of the inferior writers supplied in greater abundance the matter he needed than did the great historians, but we need not suppose that he entirely neglected the latter for the outline of historical events or for controlling the minor authors. Failure to recognize Plutarch's entire freedom in using his sources, both in reproducing them and in fusing them, may lead us to minimize his dependence upon standard authorities. It is not unlikely that we should not find any more striking resemblances than now, even if Theopompus and the rest were extant. Even the express warning in *Nicias*, 1, has not prevented our reducing Thucydides's contribution to that *Life* to the vanishing-point (*cf.* HEIDINGSFELD, *Quomodo Plut. Thuc. usus sit in compon. Nic. vita* [1890], p. 24). Now, Plutarch was a stylist as well as a raconteur, and whenever he found a phrase that pleased him he reserved it in his memory for use. Thus the τὸ ἄλλο στράτευμα νικηθὲν κατηράχθη ἐς τὰ τειχίσματα of THUC., VII, 6, 3, reappears in *Fab. Max.*, 8, and *Sertor.*, 19, in a totally different connection, and there are enough similar instances to show that Plutarch was a close student of the historian. Hitherto the study of the relationship between Plutarch and the *Resp. Ath.* has been confined to such passages as cover the same events; I have no doubt that a broader survey would reveal many points of stylistic indebtedness.

[2] Since passages involving theatrical matters are alone sufficient and more to the point, the following examples are restricted to that field.

doubt that Plutarch's account of the bringing of the tidings of
Leuctra to Sparta was derived from Xenophon, who is indeed
mentioned in the same chapter. A comparison of the accounts,
however, removes even the slightest doubt as to the relationship.[1]

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Xen., *Hell.*, VI, 4, 16.</td><td colspan="2">*Agesilaus*,[2] 29.</td></tr>
<tr><td>a</td><td>γενομένων δὲ τούτων,</td><td>c</td><td>ἔτυχε μὲν γὰρ ἡ πόλις ἑορτὴν</td></tr>
<tr><td>b</td><td>ὁ μὲν εἰς τὴν Λακεδαίμονα ἀγγε-<br>λῶν τὸ πάθος ἀφικνεῖται</td><td></td><td>ἄγουσα καὶ ξένων οὖσα μεστή·<br>γυμνοπαιδίαι γὰρ ἦσαν,</td></tr>
<tr><td>c</td><td>γυμνοπαιδιῶν τε οὔσης τῆς τελευ-<br>ταίας καὶ</td><td>d</td><td>ἀγωνιζομένων χορῶν ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ·</td></tr>
<tr><td>d</td><td>τοῦ ἀνδρικοῦ χοροῦ ἔνδον ὄντος ·</td><td>b</td><td>παρῆσαν δ' ἀπὸ Λεύκτρων οἱ τὴν<br>συμφορὰν ἀπαγγέλλοντες.</td></tr>
<tr><td>e</td><td>οἱ δὲ ἔφοροι,</td><td>e</td><td>οἱ δὲ ἔφοροι,</td></tr>
<tr><td>f</td><td>ἐπεὶ ἤκουσαν τὸ πάθος, ἐλυποῦντο<br>μέν, ὥσπερ, οἶμαι, ἀνάγκη ·</td><td>f</td><td>καίπερ εὐθὺς ὄντος καταφανοῦς<br>ὅτι διέφθαρται τὰ πράγματα καὶ<br>τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπολωλέκασιν,</td></tr>
<tr><td>g</td><td>τὸν μέντοι χορὸν οὐκ ἐξήγαγον,</td><td>g</td><td>οὔτε χορὸν ἐξελθεῖν εἴασαν οὔτε<br>τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ἑορτῆς μεταβαλεῖν<br>τὴν πόλιν,</td></tr>
<tr><td>h</td><td>ἀλλὰ διαγωνίσασθαι εἴων.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>i</td><td>καὶ τὰ μὲν ὀνόματα πρὸς τοὺς<br>οἰκείους ἑκάστου τῶν τεθνεώτων<br>ἀπέδοσαν.</td><td>i</td><td>ἀλλὰ κατ' οἰκίαν τῶν τεθνεώτων<br>τοῖς προσήκουσι τὰ ὀνόματα<br>πέμψαντες</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>h</td><td>αὐτοὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν θέαν καὶ τὸν<br>ἀγῶνα τῶν χορῶν ἔπραττον.</td></tr>
</table>

A more detailed comparison of the corresponding sections, as
they are indicated by the letters, gives a striking glimpse of
Plutarch's method: Clause *a* is purely transitional and has no
counterpart in the biography. In *b* the singular participle is
replaced by the plural, εἰς Λακεδαίμονα by ἀπὸ Λεύκτρων, πάθος
by συμφοράν, and ἀφικνεῖται by παρῆσαν—all simple verbal
changes. In *c* Plutarch has omitted τελευταίας and has written
a prefatory statement which adds no fact except ξένων οὖσα
μεστή, which is of course too commonplace an observation to postu-
late another source. These changes also are purely verbal or in
the direction of picturesqueness. In *d* χοροῦ is replaced by the

[1] *Cf.* HEEREN, *De fontibus et auctoritate Vit. Paral. Plutarchi* (1820), p. 47, and HAUG,
*Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Lebensbeschreibungen der Griechen* (1883), p. 56.

[2] As a consideration of the genuineness of Plutarch's writings would be out of place
here, I have accepted all the *Lives*, and for the *Moralia* have followed the judgment of
Bernardakis, who in his edition rejects sixteen of the seventy-eight essays in the first six
volumes; his seventh volume (containing fragments, etc.) has nothing bearing upon the
present study. Citations are to the editions of Sintenis (2d ed.) and Bernardakis (1888-96)
respectively.

plural, ἔνδον by ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ,[1] ἀνδρικοῦ is omitted, and ἀγωνιζομέ-
νων added—all being alterations without significance. The
clauses marked e are identical. In f ὄντος καταφανοῦς is substi-
tuted for ἤκουσαν, and for ἐλυποῦντο a ὅτι clause giving the men-
tal picture that caused their λύπη. In g Plutarch employs
ἐξελθεῖν εἴασαν instead of ἐξήγαγον, and introduces the clause
τὸ . . . . πόλιν, which adds nothing to the thought. He amplifies
h by the employment of his favorite τὰ περὶ κτλ. periphrasis, but
the general meaning is the same. Finally, in i οἰκείους is replaced
by προσήκουσι, ἀπέδοσαν by πέμψαντες, and κατ' οἰκίαν, a vivid
detail, is added. In spite of all these verbal changes and this
transposition of clauses, not a single item of consequence has
escaped the biographer, while he has added several graphic
touches, and he has, moreover, retained all the catchwords of the
original; cf. ἀγγέλλω, γυμνοπαιδίαι, χορός, ἔφοροι, ἐξάγω (ἐξέρχο-
μαι), and τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν τεθνεώτων. These similarities are entirely
too close and too numerous to be explained on the hypothesis
of an intermediate source, while at the same time the variations
afford us an interesting insight into Plutarch's literary method.

It is equally certain that the description of the scene at the
proclamation of Grecian liberty at the Isthmian games is taken
from Polybius.[2]

| Polyb., XVIII, 46, 1–10 (ed. Büttner-Wobst). | | Flamininus, 10. |
|---|---|---|
| a | δοξάντων δὲ τούτων, | b | Ἰσθμίων οὖν ἀγομένων |
| b | καὶ τῆς Ἰσθμίων πανηγύρεως ἐπελθούσης, | c | πλῆθος μὲν ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ καθῆστο |
| c | καὶ σχεδὸν ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἀνδρῶν συνεληλυθότων διὰ τὴν προσδοκίαν τῶν ἀποβησομένων, | | τὸν γυμνικὸν ἀγῶνα θεωμένων, |
| d | πολλοὶ καὶ ποικίλοι καθ' ὅλην τὴν πανήγυριν ἐνέπιπτον λόγοι, τῶν μὲν ἀδύνατον εἶναι φα-σκόντων Ῥωμαίους ἐνίων ἀποστῆναι τόπων καὶ πόλεων, τῶν δὲ διοριζομένων ὅτι τῶν μὲν ἐπι-φανῶν εἶναι δοκούντων τόπων ἀποστήσονται, τοὺς δὲ φαντασίαν μὲν ἔχοντας ἐλάττω, χρείαν | d | οἷα δὴ διὰ χρόνων πε-παυμένης μὲν πολέμων τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπ' ἐλπί-σιν ἐλευθερίας, σαφεῖ δὲ εἰρήνῃ πανηγυριζού-σης, |

---

[1] There is, of course, no question of the fact; cf. HEROD., VI, 67.

[2] Cf. HEEREN, op. cit., p. 124, and H. PETER, Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Biographieen der
Römer (1865), p. 80. Inasmuch as LIVY, XXXIII, 32, gives the names in g in a much different
order, Peter uses these as test passages in establishing Plutarch's use of Polybius in this
Life.

δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν παρέχεσθαι δυναμένους καθέξουσι.
καὶ τούτους εὐθέως ἐπεδείκνυσαν αὐτοὶ καθ'
αὑτῶν διὰ τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους εὑρεσιλογίας.
τοιαύτης δ' οὔσης ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῆς ἀπορίας,

e  ἀθροισθέντος τοῦ πλήθους εἰς τὸ στάδιον ἐπὶ
τὸν ἀγῶνα,

f  προελθὼν ὁ κῆρυξ καὶ <κατα>σιωπησάμενος
τὰ πλήθη διὰ τοῦ σαλπικτοῦ τόδε <τὸ>
κήρυγμ' ἀνηγόρευσεν·

g  ἡ σύγκλητος ἡ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Τίτος Κοΐντιος
στρατηγὸς ὕπατος, καταπολεμήσαντες βασιλέα
Φίλιππον καὶ Μακεδόνας, ἀφιᾶσιν ἐλευθέρους,
ἀφρουρήτους, ἀφορολογήτους, νόμοις χρωμένους
τοῖς πατρίοις, Κορινθίους, Φωκέας, Λοκρούς,
Εὐβοεῖς, Ἀχαιοὺς τοὺς Φθιώτας, Μάγνητας,
Θετταλούς, Περραιβούς.

h  κρότου δ' ἐν ἀρχαῖς εὐθέως ἐξαισίου γενομέ-
νου, τινὲς μὲν οὐδ' ἤκουσαν τοῦ κηρύγματος,
τινὲς δὲ πάλιν ἀκούειν ἐβούλοντο. τὸ δὲ πολὺ
μέρος τῶν ἀνθρώπων διαπιστούμενον καὶ δοκοῦν
ὡς ἂν εἰ καθ' ὕπνον ἀκούειν τῶν λεγομένων διὰ τὸ
παράδοξον τοῦ συμβαίνοντος, πᾶς τις ἐξ ἄλλης
ὁρμῆς ἐβόα προάγειν τὸν κήρυκα καὶ τὸν σαλ-
πικτὴν εἰς μέσον τὸ στάδιον καὶ λέγειν πάλιν
ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν, ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, βουλο-
μένων τῶν ἀνθρώπων μὴ μόνον ἀκούειν ἀλλὰ
καὶ βλέπειν τὸν λέγοντα διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν τῶν
ἀναγορευομένων.

i  ὡς δὲ πάλιν ὁ κῆρυξ, προελθὼν εἰς τὸ μέσον
καὶ κατασιωπησάμενος διὰ τοῦ σαλπικτοῦ τὸν
θόρυβον, ἀνηγόρευσε ταὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως τοῖς
πρόσθεν, τηλικοῦτον συνέβη καταρραγῆναι τὸν
κρότον ὥστε καὶ μὴ ῥᾳδίως ἂν ὑπὸ τὴν ἔννοιαν
ἀγαγεῖν τοῖς νῦν ἀκούουσι τὸ γεγονός·

j  ὡς δέ ποτε κατέληξεν ὁ κρότος, τῶν μὲν ἀθλη-
τῶν ἁπλῶς οὐδεὶς οὐδένα λόγον εἶχεν ἔτι.

f  τῇ σάλπιγγι δὲ σιωπῆς
εἰς ἅπαντας διαδοθεί-
σης προελθὼν εἰς
μέσον ὁ κῆρυξ ἀνεῖπεν,

g  ὅτι Ῥωμαίων ἡ σύγ-
κλητος καὶ Τίτος Κοΐν-
τιος στρατηγὸς ὕπα-
τος, καταπολεμήσαν-
τες βασιλέα Φίλιππον
καὶ Μακεδόνας, ἀφιᾶ-
σιν ἀφρουρήτους καὶ
ἐλευθέρους καὶ ἀφορο-
λογήτους, νόμοις χρω-
μένους τοῖς πατρίοις,
Κορινθίους, Λοκρούς,
Φωκεῖς, Εὐβοέας,
Ἀχαιοὺς Φθιώτας,
Μάγνητας, Θετταλούς,
Περραιβούς.

h  τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον οὐ
πάνυ πάντες οὐδὲ σα-
φῶς ἐπήκουσαν, ἀλλ'
ἀνώμαλος καὶ θορυ-
βώδης κίνησις ἦν ἐν
σταδίῳ θαυμαζόντων
καὶ διαπυνθανομένων
καὶ πάλιν ἀνειπεῖν
κελευόντων·

i  ὡς δ' αὖθις ἡσυχίας
γενομένης ἀναγαγὼν ὁ
κῆρυξ τὴν φωνὴν προ-
θυμότερον εἰς ἅπαντας
ἐγεγώνει καὶ διῆλθε τὸ
κήρυγμα, κραυγὴ μὲν
ἄπιστος τὸ μέγεθος διὰ
χαρὰν ἐχώρει μέχρι
θαλάττης,

k  ὀρθὸν δὲ ἀνειστήκει τὸ
θέατρον,

j  οὐδεὶς δὲ λόγος ἦν τῶν
ἀγωνιζομένων.

The comparative compactness and vigor of the later narrative appear at a glance. Upon closer examination, however, the differences are still more striking. Clause *a* in Polybius is purely transitional, and consequently is omitted in the parallel account. In *b* the changes are verbal and in the direction of brevity. Clause *c* is pure exaggeration and rhetorical flourish, and is omitted entirely in the biographer. Clause *d* is prolix and hopelessly retards the movement; accordingly, Plutarch has entirely rewritten it in a form which preserves all the essential ideas and does not interrupt the flow of the story. Verbal changes occur in *e*, ἀθροισθέντος being replaced by καθῆστο, and ἀνθρώπων θεωμένων and γυμνικόν being added; but the result is a living picture, while the original was colorless. In *f* the words of the original are kept for the most part, though their order and grammatical forms are changed; ἀνεῖπεν replaces the longer periphrasis in Polybius. The proclamation itself (*g*) is practically identical in both accounts. In *h* τὸ πρῶτον replaces ἐν ἀρχαῖς; the lively and vivid phrase ἀνώμαλος καὶ θορυβώδης κίνησις, the commonplace κρότου . . . . γενομένου; the single participle θαυμαζόντων, the whole essence of τὸ δὲ . . . . συμβαίνοντος; and πάλιν ἀνειπεῖν κελευόντων, the tedious πᾶς . . . . αὐτῶν, which runs into ὡς . . . . ἀναγορευομένων—a sprawling parenthesis which Plutarch wisely omits entirely, together with τινὲς δὲ . . . . ἐβούλοντο above. In *i* Polybius makes an otiose repetition of the formula used in *f*, for which Plutarch simply substitutes αὖθις ἡσυχίας γενομένης; ἀναγαγὼν . . . . προθυμότερον is an amplification of ἀνηγόρευσε . . . . πρόσθεν; κραυγή replaces κρότον; ἄπιστος τὸ μέγεθος, the labored ὥστε . . . . γεγονός; and ἐχώρει, the συνέβη καταρραγῆναι of Polybius; while διὰ χαράν, and especially μέχρι θαλάττης, are points of life and interest that add in no small degree to the picture. Plutarch is alone responsible also for *k*—a realistic touch which entirely escaped the prosaic historian. Finally, in *j* the unnecessary ὡς . . . . . κρότος clause is omitted, while ἀγωνιζομένων replaces ἀθλητῶν, and the impersonal form of the verbal expression the personal.

It thus appears that Plutarch has treated this passage with even more freedom than the previous one; yet the connection

between them is shown by the ideas expressed, the general order
of their arrangement, and the use of catchwords.    Polybius
abounds in repetitions and irrelevant and parenthetical remarks
which seriously delay the recital.    Plutarch has lopped off the
unnecessary members, molded the remainder into a continuous
whole, and added several details which make the scene a living
reality, though they might have happened at any gathering at all
similar and do not presuppose an eyewitness to suggest them to
Plutarch.

The most striking, and at the same time the most certain,
instance in this category still remains to be discussed.

[Aristotle], *Probl.*, XI, 25.               *Non posse suav.*, p. 1096 AB.

διὰ τί, ὅταν ἀχυρωθῶ-          τίς χορός . . . . οὕτως εὔφρανεν Ἐπίκουρον καὶ
σιν αἱ ὀρχῆστραι, ἧττον        Μητρόδωρον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλη καὶ Θεόφραστον καὶ
οἱ χοροὶ γεγώνασιν;            Δικαίαρχον καὶ Ἱερώνυμον οἱ περὶ χορῶν λόγοι καὶ
                              διδασκαλιῶν καὶ τὰ δι' αὐλῶν προβλήματα καὶ
                              ῥυθμῶν καὶ ἁρμονιῶν; οἷον . . . . τί δήποτε τῶν
                              θεάτρων ἂν ἄχυρα τῆς ὀρχήστρας κατασκεδάσῃς ἢ
                              χοῦν, ὁ λαὸς[1] τυφλοῦται.

Plutarch was peculiarly fond of questions like this.    One of
his largest works, the *Quaestiones conviviales*, is entirely occu-
pied with them.    It is *a priori* probable, then, that he always
kept a copy of the *Problems* within easy reach and had conned it
many times.    This circumstance, together with the fact that
Aristotle is mentioned by name, argues against the use of an
intermediate source.    Yet the variations introduced are startling.
Διὰ τί is represented by a simple τί, ὅταν by ἄν, ἀχυρωθῶσιν by
ἄχυρα κατασκεδάσῃς ἢ χοῦν, αἱ ὀρχῆστραι by τῆς ὀρχήστρας τῶν

----

[1] Pal., Harleianus, and Ven.[2] read κοχάος, and the text has been suspected.  Because of
the Aristotelian original Wyttenbach suggested ὁ χορός.  Reiske proposed ὁ ἦχος and referred
to *Quaestt. conv.*, p. 721 B, where this word occurs in connection with φωνὴ τυφλοῦται.  In
accordance with his desire to emphasize the acoustic effect of a floor (*cf.* pp. 52 f., below),
PUCHSTEIN (*Griechische Bühne*, p. 41) conjectures ὁ λᾶας (sic), meaning that the presence of
chaff spoiled the resonance of the orchestra pavement.  Regardless of the interpretation,
this suggestion is unlikely, because λᾶας is a poetical word, and WYTTENBACH in his *Index
Plut.* notes not a single instance of its occurrence in Plutarch.  In fact, the conjectures are
all unnecessary, and are due to a misunderstanding regarding the application of λαός and
the meaning of τυφλόω.  Plutarch has reversed the original, changing the subject and the
point of view.  Λαός refers to the audience instead of to the chorus, and τυφλοῦται, which is
used not only of sight, but also of any of the senses, has reference to hearing.  Thus "the
people do not hear so well" has replaced "the chorus is not so easily understood."  *Cf.*
SOPH., *Oed. Rex*, 371: τυφλὸς τά τ' ὦτα τόν τε νοῦν τά τ' ὄμματα εἶ, and HESYCHIUS: τυφλός·
τίθεται καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ κωφός.

θεάτρων, ἧττον γεγώνασιν by τυφλοῦται, and οἱ χοροί by ὁ λαός. There is not a single word of the original but has been omitted or altered either in form or construction. Yet nearly every word of Plutarch echoes something in the source—a thing well-nigh impossible if an intermediary had been used. Thus, whether it be supposed that Plutarch was quoting from memory or was purposely giving a paraphrase with Aristotle before him, the departures from the original and the echoes of it are equally instructive.

b) *Plutarch compared with himself.*—Absolute certainty concerning Plutarch's sources can in most cases never be attained. Consequently, the preceding section, though only the most undoubted instances were there used, cannot be in itself conclusive. Therefore the comparison of Plutarch with himself proves of considerable value, for, though in one or two cases the divergences can be explained upon the basis of a different source, such a hypothesis becomes rapidly untenable with the multiplication of examples.

A good parallel is afforded by

| *De glor. Ath.*, p. 348 F | and *Quaestt. conv.*, p. 710 F. |
|---|---|
| a  πρὸς ἃ (the theatrical equipment just mentioned and quoted on p. 34, below) Λάκων ἀνὴρ ἀποβλέψας οὐ κακῶς εἶπεν, | a  χάριεν γάρ τοι τὸ τοῦ Λάκωνος, ὅς, 'Αθήνησι καινῶν ἀγωνιζομένων τραγῳδῶν, θεώμενος τὰς παρασκευὰς τῶν χορηγῶν καὶ τὰς σπουδὰς τῶν διδασκάλων καὶ τὴν ἄμιλλαν |
| b  ὡς ἁμαρτάνουσιν 'Αθηναῖοι μεγάλα τὴν σπουδὴν εἰς τὴν παιδιὰν καταναλίσκοντες, | b  οὐκ ἔφη σωφρονεῖν τὴν πόλιν μετὰ τοσαύτης σπουδῆς παίζουσαν. |
| c  τουτέστι μεγάλων ἀποστόλων δαπάνας καὶ στρατευμάτων ἐφόδια καταχορηγοῦντες εἰς τὸ θέατρον. | |

In a the divergences between the antecedent of ἃ and τὰς .... ἄμιλλαν are considerable, but are largely due to the different circumstances under which the story was told; the variation between ἀποβλέψας and θεώμενος is without significance, but it is noteworthy that in the first account the occasion of the remark is in no wise defined, while in the second it was "at the performance of new tragedies." *A priori* we might expect that the remark itself (b) would be reproduced without change, yet ἁμαρτάνουσιν μεγάλα

corresponds to οὐκ σωφρονεῖν and Ἀθηναῖοι to τὴν πόλιν, while εἰς .... καταναλίσκοντες and μετὰ .... παίζουσαν clearly hark back to the same original version. These changes are all verbal, it is true, but under the circumstances they are highly significant.[1] Clause c is evidently only Plutarch's own amplification of the preceding remark.

<table>
<tr><td align="center">Sulla, 2.</td><td align="center">Sulla, 36.</td></tr>
</table>

| Sulla, 2. | Sulla, 36. |
|---|---|
| Μητροβίου δὲ τῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς τινος ἐρῶν διετέλεσεν (Sulla) ἔτι νέος ὤν. | οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ τότε παρ' αὐτῷ (Sulla) δυνάμενοι μέγιστον ἦσαν .... Μητρόβιος ὁ λυσιῳδός, οὗ καίπερ ἐξώρου γενομένου διετέλει μέχρι παντὸς ἐρᾶν οὐκ ἀρνούμενος. |

It is not likely that both τῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς and λυσιῳδός occurred in the source; hence one or the other, or both, must have been added by Plutarch.

|   | Pelop., 29. |   | De Alex. fort., p. 334 A. |
|---|---|---|---|
| a | τραγῳδὸν δέ ποτε θεώμενος (Alexander of Pheræ) Εὐριπίδου Τρῳάδας ὑποκρινόμενον | a e | Ἀλέξανδρος δ' ὁ Φεραίων τύραννος (ἔδει δὲ τοῦτο μόνον αὐτὸν καλεῖσθαι καὶ μὴ καταισχύνειν τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν) |
| b | ᾤχετο ἀπιὼν ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου, | a | θεώμενος τραγῳδὸν |
| c | καὶ πέμψας πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκέλευε θαρρεῖν καὶ μηδὲν ἀγωνίζεσθαι διὰ τοῦτο χεῖρον, οὐ γὰρ ἐκείνου καταφρονῶν ἀπελθεῖν, | f | ἐμπαθέστερον ὑφ' ἡδονῆς διετέθη πρὸς τὸν οἶκτον. |
|   |   | b | ἀναπηδήσας οὖν ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου θᾶττον ἢ βάδην ἀπῄει, |
| d | ἀλλ' αἰσχυνόμενος τοὺς πολίτας, εἰ μηδένα πώποτε τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ φονευομένων ἠλεηκὼς ἐπὶ τοῖς Ἑκάβης καὶ Ἀνδρομάχης κακοῖς ὀφθήσεται δακρύων. | d | δεινὸν εἶναι λέγων, εἰ τοσούτους ἀποσφάττων πολίτας ὀφθήσεται τοῖς Ἑκάβης καὶ Πολυξένης πάθεσιν ἐπιδακρύων. |
|   |   | g | οὗτος μὲν οὖν μικροῦ καὶ δίκην ἐπράξατο τὸν τραγῳδόν, ὅτι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ καθάπερ σίδηρον ἐμάλαξεν. |

Εὐριπίδου Τρῳάδας ὑποκρινόμενον appears only in clause a of the first account, which otherwise is practically the same as the corresponding section of the second account. Clause e is purely

<hr>

[1] That Plutarch felt the same freedom in the citation of philosophical dogmas, even when they were in metrical form, has been pointed out by FAIRBANKS, *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. XXVIII (1897), pp. 75 ff.

parenthetical and is inserted in accordance with the motive of the tract, which is to exalt Alexander the Great's noble qualities at the expense of baser rulers.    Also *f* is omitted in the first account, which, however, loses nothing thereby.    In *b* ᾤχετο ἀπιών corresponds to θᾶττον ἢ βάδην ἀπῄει, and ἀναπηδήσας appears only in the second narrative.    Clause *c* in the former report corresponds in function to the entirely different clause *g* of the latter, the diversity of conclusion being due to the different use which Plutarch made of the story in each case.    In the first instance he is accentuating the tyrant's cruelty in ordinary affairs by this account of his tender-heartedness in the presence of imaginary misfortunes, while in the second he is setting off Alexander the Great's magnanimous treatment of artists of all sorts with the meanness shown them by Dionysius and other rulers.    There is thus no need of assuming another source.    It is not likely that either conclusion belonged to the original story, which probably contained no other details than that Alexander of Pheræ left a certain theatrical performance because he did not wish his subjects to see him weeping.    When other particulars were needed " to point a moral or adorn a tale," they were added according to circumstances.[1]    In *d* αἰσχυνόμενος corresponds to δεινὸν εἶναι λέγων, μηδένα . . . . ἠλεηκώς to τοσούτους ἀποσφάττων, and Ἀνδρομάχης to Πολυξένης.    These changes are purely verbal, except the last, which seems to indicate that characteristically Plutarch sought to secure vividness by introducing into the story names of persons who figured directly or indirectly in the play, and chanced to select different persons each time.[2]

  *c*) *Plutarch compared with another user of the same source.*— As I have already stated, this is the least satisfactory method of investigating Plutarch's use of his sources.    Accordingly, I shall not waste time and space in securing results that could only confirm those more certainly obtained by other means.    However, that this method leads to results which are in harmony with those reached in other ways will appear from a comparison of *Demetr.*,

  [1] For an interesting account of how ancient authors remodeled stories to suit themselves *cf.* SMITH, *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. XXIII (1902), pp. 261 ff. and 361 ff.

  [2] These examples perhaps suffice.    However, *An seni*, p. 797 D, and *Praec. ger.*, p. 806 A; *De Alex. fort.*, p. 337 E, and *An seni*, p. 791 E; *cf.* p. 33 below; and *De Alex. fort.*, p. 334 DEF, and *Alex.*, 29, may also be profitably compared.

25, and Athen., 614 E, which are quoted together for another purpose on p. 49 below.

d) *Plutarch compared with other evidence.*—The three preceding sections have given us an insight into Plutarch's manner of dealing with his sources as regards form. They show that of the four possible courses suggested Plutarch at least did not follow the first; *i. e.*, he did not preserve his originals literally. Because of our uncertainty regarding Plutarch's sources for his theatrical references, this is as far as these methods will warrant us in going, and so we appeal to (d) to inform us which one of the last three courses the biographer pursued; viz., whether he retained the contemporaneous dress of the original, always brought the description into accordance with the facts of his own day regardless of historical accuracy, or did sometimes one, sometimes the other. In other words, we shall now begin to consider his manner of dealing with his sources as regards substance.

In *Quaestt. conv.*, p. 674D, Plutarch says that, when the stewards of the Pythian celebrations had added tragedy to the three contests established from the beginning (ἐπὶ τρισὶ τοῖς καθεστῶσιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, αὐλητῇ Πυθικῷ καὶ κιθαριστῇ καὶ κιθαρῳδῷ), they were unable to oppose the admission of all sorts of entertainment. Though the phrase which Plutarch uses for the first event (Πυθικὸς αὐλητής) and its equivalent (πυθαύλης) mean exactly the same thing in connection with this festival as the simpler term αὐλητής, the two former did not come into use until imperial times, as Frei has shown.[1] In this small detail, therefore, Plutarch has frankly adopted the terminology of his own time.

| *Quaestt. conv.*, p. 724 A. | *Theseus*, 21. |
|---|---|
| καίτοι δοκῶ μοι μνημονεύειν ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς ἀνεγνωκὼς ἔναγχος ὅτι πρῶτος ἐν Δήλῳ Θησεὺς ἀγῶνα ποιῶν ἀπέσπασε κλάδον τοῦ ἱεροῦ φοίνικος. . . . . καὶ τοῦ Θησέως αὐτοῦ πυνθάνεσθαι φήσουσιν, ᾧτινι λόγῳ φοίνικος, οὐ δάφνης οὐδ' ἐλαίας, ἀπέσπασεν ἀγωνοθετῶν. | ποιῆσαι δὲ καὶ ἀγῶνά φασιν αὐτὸν (Theseus) ἐν Δήλῳ, καὶ τοῖς νικῶσι τότε πρῶτον ὑπ' ἐκείνου φοίνικα δοθῆναι. |

[1] *De certaminibus thymelicis*, pp. 60–62.

The passage from the *Life* and the first part of the quotation from the *Moralia* show that the source employed simply ἀγῶνα ποιεῖν, and that ἀγωνοθετῶν is due to Plutarch. In Plutarch's time ἀγωνοθέτης was the regular title given the directors of such festivals. Consequently, inasmuch as Theseus was the mythical founder of the celebration, Plutarch thought it not too much to give him the title that was current in his own day for its presiding officer.

<div style="display:flex">
<div>

*Pericles*, 9.

ἐλαττούμενος δὲ (Pericles) πλούτῳ καὶ χρήμασιν, ἀφ' ὧν ἐκεῖνος (Cimon) ἀνελάμβανε τοὺς πένητας δεῖπνόν τε καθ' ἡμέραν τῷ δεομένῳ παρέχων Ἀθηναίων καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἀμφιεννύων τῶν τε χωρίων τοὺς φραγμοὺς ἀφαιρῶν, ὅπως ὀπωρίζωσιν οἱ βουλόμενοι, τούτοις ὁ Περικλῆς καταδημαγωγούμενος, τρέπεται πρὸς τὴν τῶν δημοσίων διανομήν, συμβουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου τοῦ Οἴηθεν, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἱστόρηκε. καὶ ταχὺ θεωρικοῖς καὶ δικαστικοῖς λήμμασιν ἄλλαις τε μισθοφοραῖς καὶ χορηγίαις συνδεκάσας τὸ πλῆθος ἐχρῆτο κατὰ τῆς ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῆς.

</div>
<div>

Arist., *Resp. Ath.*, XXVII, 3.

ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ μισθοφόρα τὰ δικαστήρια Περικλῆς πρῶτος, ἀντιδημαγωγῶν πρὸς τὴν Κίμωνος εὐπορίαν. ὁ γὰρ Κίμων, ἅτε τυραννικὴν ἔχων οὐσίαν, πρῶτον μὲν τὰς κοινὰς λῃτουργίας ἐλῃτούργει λαμπρῶς, ἔπειτα τῶν δημοτῶν ἔτρεφε πολλούς· ἐξῆν γὰρ τῷ βουλομένῳ Λακιαδῶν καθ' ἑκάστην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐλθόντι παρ' αὐτὸν ἔχειν τὰ μέτρια, ἔτι δὲ τὰ χωρία πάντα ἄφρακτα ἦν, ὅπως ἐξῇ τῷ βουλομένῳ τῆς ὀπώρας ἀπολαύειν. πρὸς δὴ ταύτην τὴν χορηγίαν ἐπιλειπόμενος ὁ Περικλῆς τῇ οὐσίᾳ, συμβουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου τοῦ Οἴηθεν . . . . ἐπεὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις ἡττᾶτο, διδόναι τοῖς πολλοῖς τὰ αὐτῶν, κατεσκεύασε μισθοφορὰν τοῖς δικασταῖς.

</div>
</div>

On the strength of the first passage, it used to be stated in the handbooks that the theoric fund was established by Pericles (*cf.* Müller, *Bühnenalterthümer*, p. 348), but the discovery of the *Resp. Ath.* has given us the original passage which Plutarch was following (directly or indirectly) and the facts of the case, for Aristotle states explicitly (XXVIII, 3) that this fund was established by Cleophon. It is clear that Plutarch (or his intermediate source) has treated this passage in his accustomed manner, keeping many of the words of the original and the general substance of the thought, but working it all over so that the result is strictly his own. The only alteration worthy of mention is that he has

amplified μισθοφορὰν τοῖς δικασταῖς into θεωρικοῖς καὶ δικαστικοῖς λήμμασιν ἄλλαις τε μισθοφοραῖς καὶ χορηγίαις.   As these were the means used by Greek demagogues for centuries to ingratiate themselves with the people, he probably considered his expression a justifiable extension of Aristotle.   Nevertheless, it constituted an anachronism.   It is incomprehensible that he was really igno- rant of the author of the custom.[1]

The cases of anachronism just adduced,[2] together with others which are considered later on,[3] suffice to prove that Plutarch was not in the habit of merely working over his originals, retaining the technical terms appropriate to the occasion.   Although it might be reasonable on the strength of isolated instances to assume that some of these anachronisms were taken over by Plutarch along with the rest of his material, and are to be attributed to his source rather than to himself, yet the instances found in the field of scenic antiquities alone are too numerous and taken from sources too diverse to permit us to explain them all away by this hypothesis. Whether he modernized always or only occasionally will appear most clearly from a study of the "special" passages, where mod- ernization is least likely to occur.

[1] The controversy over Plutarch's use of the *Resp. Ath.* has caused me to consider these passages here rather than in (*a*) above.   If we could be sure that Plutarch was quoting Aristotle directly here, we might assume that his memory had confused the names owing to their proximity in the source.   Similarly, he assigns (*Alcib.*, 25) the murder of Phrynichus to Hermon, who is mentioned in another connection in the same chapter of Thucydides which contains an account of the murder (Thuc., VIII, 92).

[2] The naïve account in *Solon*, 29, differs from those mentioned above in that the anachronism was probably not intentional.   We cannot expect Plutarch to have known that the first actor in tragedy was not introduced until after Solon's death.   Moreover, the care with which he explains that poets used to take rôles in their own plays indicates that he is striving for historical exactness.

[3] *Cf.* pp. 24, 25, 26, 37, 38 (twice), 51 (twice), 52, 54, 56, 59, etc.

# THEATRICAL TERMS IN PLUTARCH.

WE are now in a position to examine the theatrical terms in Plutarch as they are divided into "general" and "specific" classes according to the principles above laid down. The investigation of theatrical terminology is, of course, no new subject. As early as 1870 Wieseler put the whole world of scenic investigators under obligation by his large collection of material in the *Ersch-Gruber Encyclopädie*, Vol. IV, pp. 159 ff. His classifications, however, are unacceptable today, because they are based largely upon the uncritical and unhistorical view of the Greek theater that prevailed until recent years. Since his day exhaustive treatises by Christ,[1] Müller,[2] and Reisch[3] have continued the work thus begun. No one can now labor in this field without incurring a constant indebtedness to these scholars. Nevertheless, the very comprehensiveness of their articles and the natural concentration of their attention upon the earlier periods have left room for further investigation in the later writers. It is convenient to subdivide the material into sections corresponding to the different terms.

## A. Θέατρον.[4]

This is the only theatrical term about which substantial agreement has been reached. The primary meaning of the word was (1) "spectators" or "audience;" *cf.* Herod., VI, 21: ἐς δάκρυα ἔπεσε τὸ θέητρον. The easiest transition from this meaning was to (2) "the space occupied by the audience," *i. e.*, the *cavea; cf.* Xen.,

[1] *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Vol. CXLIX (1894), pp. 27 ff.

[2] *Bühnenalterthümer* (1886) and *Philologus*, Supplementband VII (1899), pp. 3 ff. MÜLLER's article, "Die neueren Arbeiten auf dem Gebiete des griech. Bühnenwesens," *Philologus*, Vol. VI (1892), pp. 1 ff., though not an exhaustive treatise on theatrical terminology like those cited in the text, contains much that has a bearing in this field. The same remark applies to BODENSTEINER's valuable "Bericht über das antike Bühnenwesen," *Bursian's Jahresbericht*, Vol. XC (1896), pp. 1 ff. It is needless to add that Dörpfeld's excavations and his keenness in restoration and interpretation have also played a leading rôle in the critical study of the subject during the last quarter-century.

[3] *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, Vol. XXXVIII (1887), pp. 275 ff., and DÖRPFELD-REISCH, *Das griechische Theater*, pp. 283 ff.

[4] Besides the authorities just cited, *cf.* WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF, *Hermes*, Vol. XXI (1886), pp. 602 ff. The limits of space and the scope of the present article prevent a full discussion in these introductory statements.

*Hell.*, VII, 4, 31: κατεδίωξαν εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου καὶ τοῦ τῆς Ἑστίας ἱεροῦ καὶ τοῦ πρὸς ταῦτα προσήκοντος θεάτρου, referring to Olympia, which never had a theater for scenic performances, so that here the *cavea* of the stadium is evidently meant. "The whole theater structure" (3) was the next meaning developed, this usage being common in inscriptions since the middle of the fourth century; cf. *C. I. A.*, II, 573: κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας τὰς περὶ τὸ θέατρον. The meaning of a term is very easily transferred from place to that which is done in that place. Accordingly, the next signification of θέατρον was (4) "theatrical performance" or "spectacle;" cf. schol. Arist., *Vesp.*, 1291: ἐψηφίσατο ὁ Κλέων μηκέτι δεῖν κωμῳδίας ἐπὶ θεάτρων εἰσάγεσθαι (Rutherford). The last meaning was (5) "performance place;" cf. schol. *Ran.*, 209: οὐχ ὁρῶνται ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ οἱ βάτραχοι οὐδὲ ὁ χορός, ἀλλ' ἔσωθεν μιμοῦνται τοὺς βατράχους.

a) "*General*" *passages.*—Most of these meanings are found in Plutarch. An excellent instance of (1) in a "general" passage is *Quomodo adul.*, p. 63 A: ὥσπερ οἱ τραγῳδοὶ χοροῦ δέονται φίλων συναδόντων ἢ θεάτρου συνεπικροτοῦντος.[1] There happens to be no instance of (2) in a "general" statement. The most common meaning is, of course, (3); cf. *Lycurg.*, 6: προσκήνια θεάτρων. These words and their context (*cf.* p. 52, below) assume the existence of theater buildings in the time of Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver, who of course antedated the Greek drama and dithyramb and all but the crudest forms of the chorus. These words are therefore anachronistic. For another example of (3) *cf. De sollert.*, p. 974 A: παρῆν ὁ γέρων Οὐεσπασιανὸς ἐν τῷ Μαρκέλλου θεάτρῳ.[2] This meaning is also employed several times figuratively; cf. *Praec. ger.*, p. 800 B: αὐτὸς δ' (the statesman) ὥσπερ ἐν θεάτρῳ (i. e., in public life) τὸ λοιπὸν ἀναπεπταμένῳ βιωσόμενος ἐξάσκει καὶ κατακόσμει τὸν τρόπον.[3] Meaning (4) is likewise of common occurrence; cf. *De frat. amore*, p. 478 C: τὰ φανέντα παραδείγματα

---

[1] Other examples are *Vitae*, pp. 859 D, 942 B, 1031 E, etc.; *Mor.*, pp. 92 E, 575 F, 748 D, 777 F, 795 D, etc.

[2] *Cf.* also *Vitae*, pp. 7 A, 196 F, 272 C, 275 F, 338 B, 364 D, 376 E, 452 A, 856 A, 867 A, 994 A, etc.; *Mor.*, pp. 42 A, 43 F, 68 D, 71 A, 87 F, 289 D, 321 A, 338 C, 348 D, 349 A, 414 C, 417 F, 495 A, 504 B, 505 C, 521 F, 527 F, 554 B, 556 A, 705 BEF, 725 F, 749 C, 785 B, 796 F, 799 F, 823 BE, 977 D, 992 B, 998 E, 1093 A, 1096 B, 1125 E, etc. Plutarch also says explicitly that the Roman *circus* was included under this term; cf. *Vitae*, p. 272 C.

[3] *Cf.* also *Vitae*, pp. 372 E, 409 A, etc.; *Mor.*, p. 253 B, etc.

(of brotherly love) τραγῳδίαις καὶ θεάτροις ὁ βίος ἐξέδωκε.[1] Of the last meaning there is no instance in Plutarch, nor indeed anywhere else outside of the scholia, where ἐν (τῷ) θεάτρῳ occurs several times equivalent to the more common ἐπὶ (τῆς) σκηνῆς (cf. pp. 44 f., below).

b) "Specific" passages.—A "specific" instance of meaning (1) has already been quoted (Flamin., 10) on p. 14, where the word is used of an audience at the Isthmian games in 196 B. C. When a report of the Sicilian disaster reached Athens, "the assembly cried out in anger" (ὀργὴ δ᾽ οὖν καὶ βοὴ τοῦ θεάτρου, De garrul., p. 509 B). If this be taken as meaning that the assembly was held in the theater, it is probably another case of anachronism, since the theater at Athens, and presumably elsewhere, was rarely used for that purpose till the latter half of the fourth century.[2] The fact that the word does not appear in the parallel account in Nicias, 30, points in the same direction.[3] Of (2) there is perhaps one instance; cf. Aemil., 24: ἐν δὲ τῇ ῾Ρώμῃ τοῦ δήμου θεωροῦντος ἱππικοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐξαίφνης ἐνέπεσε λόγος εἰς τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ θεάτρου μέρος. Since this would be the only occurrence of this meaning in Plutarch, possibly it would be better in this case to give the term a broader significance, which would bring it under the next category. Also in the "specific" passages (3) is the most common meaning; cf. Cimon, 8: Κίμων μετὰ τῶν συστρατήγων προελθὼν εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἐποιήσατο τῷ θεῷ τὰς νενομισμένας σπονδάς.[4] A passage that has been sometimes misinterpreted is Timoleon, 34: ἀχθεὶς δὲ εἰς τὰς Συρακούσας παρελθὼν εἰς τὸν δῆμον (Mamercus) ἐπεχείρει μέν τινα . . . . λόγον . . . . διεξιέναι, θορύβοις δὲ περιπίπτων καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὁρῶν ἀπαραίτητον ἔθει ῥίψας τὸ ἱμάτιον διὰ μέσου τοῦ θεάτρου καὶ πρός τι τῶν βάθρων δρόμῳ φερόμενος συνέρρηξε τὴν κεφαλὴν ὡς ἀποθανούμενος. Wieseler (Ersch-Grub. Enc., p. 160, n. 5) gave θέατρον in this passage

---

[1] Cf. also Vitae, pp. 704 D, 709 F, 866 A, 920 A, 942 C, etc.; Mor., pp. 58 C, 341 A, 528 B, 609 AC, 706 C, 755 B, 787 B, 799 A, 818 B, 821 F, 965 A, 997 C, 1104 D, etc.

[2] Cf. WACHSMUTH, Stadt Athen im Alterthum, Vol. I, p. 647.

[3] Cf. also Vitae, pp. 309 E, 362 D, 474 B, 750 D, 867 B, 976 F, etc.; Mor., pp. 79 E, etc., for other examples of (1).

[4] Cf. also Vitae, pp. 254 E, 293 F, 309 E, 316 C, 320 C, 346 C, 362 C, 380 A, 406 F, 458 C, 483 E, 511 F, 569 F, 612 B, 640 D, 641 D, 647 A, 702 D, 755 C, 757 DE, 782 AB, 810 A, 812 E, 867 B (twice), 905 A, 944 A, 975 B, 990 B, 1030 E, 1034 D, 1037 D, etc.; Mor., pp. 22 A, 33 C, 334 A, 443 A, 458 A, 737 C, etc.

the meaning of θεαταί, and Müller (*Philologus*, Spbd. VII, p. 69)
that of *cavea*. Both apparently overlooked the context. Mamercus
was attempting to speak; he must have been standing, then, in
the orchestra, or on the stage, if the theater had one. When he
saw that his case was hopeless, he ran across the orchestra and
struck his head against one of the seats in the lowest tier. It is
impossible that he should have gone among the audience or into
the *cavea*. Such an assumption must presuppose his speaking
from among the spectators—something entirely improbable.[1]
For meaning (4) *cf. Phocion*, 19: κατεῖχε (τραγῳδός) τὸ θέατρον οὐ
βουλόμενος προελθεῖν; and *Quomodo sentiat*, p. 77 E: καὶ περὶ
Διογένους ὅμοια τοῦ Σινωπέως ἱστοροῦσιν ἀρχομένου φιλοσοφεῖν, ὡς
᾿Αθηναίοις ἦν ἑορτὴ καὶ δεῖπνα δημοτελῆ καὶ θέατρα κτλ. Since
there are no datable instances of this meaning before the Christian
era, it is generally regarded as late (Müller, *ibid.*, p. 72); therefore
the usage in these two "specific" passages is due to Plutarch, not
to a source contemporary with Phocion and Diogenes.[2]

## B. Ὀρχήστρα.

Primarily ὀρχήστρα means "dancing-place" and was the name
appropriately given κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν to the circular space reserved for
this purpose in the Greek theaters; *cf.* Isocr., *De pace*, 82:
ἐψηφίσαντο τὸ ἀργύριον εἰς τὴν ὀρχήστραν τοῖς Διονυσίοις εἰσφέρειν.
The Romans brought the word over into their own language and
applied it to the corresponding semi-circular space in their
theaters, which was, however, used for a different purpose, viz.,
for the seats of senators; *cf.* Vitruvius, V, 6, 2: *in orchestra*

---

[1] Another passage that has some bearing upon the position of the speaker in an assem-
bly is *Marcell.*, 20. Nicias, a citizen of Engyum in Sicily during the second Punic war,
opposed the majority of his fellow-citizens by advocating the Roman cause. In fear of his
life, he blasphemed the local divinities and then escaped by the following stratagem: ἦν
μὲν ἐκκλησία τῶν πολιτῶν, ὁ δὲ Νικίας μεταξύ τι λέγων καὶ συμβουλεύων πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ἐξαίφνης
ἀφῆκεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ μικρὸν διαλιπών, οἷον εἰκός, ἡσυχίας σὺν ἐκπλήξει γενομένης, τὴν
κεφαλὴν ἐπάρας καὶ περιενεγκὼν ὑποτρόμῳ φωνῇ καὶ βαρείᾳ κατὰ μικρὸν συντείνων καὶ παροξύνων τὸν
ἦχον, ὡς ἑώρα φρίκῃ καὶ σιωπῇ κατεχόμενον τὸ θέατρον, ἀπορρίψας τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ περιρρηξάμενος τὸν
χιτωνίσκον, ἡμίγυμνος ἀναπηδήσας ἔθεε πρὸς τὴν ἔξοδον τοῦ θεάτρου, βοῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ματέρων ἐλαύνεσθαι.
Whether ἀφῆκεν εἰς τὴν γῆν means that he was standing in the orchestra and sank to the
ground, was standing on the stage and fell to the orchestra, or simply collapsed upon the
floor of the stage, must from the ambiguity of the language remain uncertain, though the
first view seems most likely. *Cf.* also *Timol.*, 10 and 38.

[2] Plutarch's source for *Phocion*, 19, was probably Duris; *cf.* Fricke, *De fontibus Plut.
et Nepotis in vita Phoc.* (1883), pp. 22 f.

*autem senatorum sunt sedibus loca designata.* In Roman writers of the late imperial period the term was used as meaning "stage;" *cf.* Isid., XVIII, 43: *qui pulpitus orchestra vocabatur.* The past tense contrasted with the present at the beginning of the sentence implies that Isidore is giving the usage of other times than his own. His statement is probably due to a misunderstanding. Nevertheless, the notion grew and became current in the Greek lexicographers of the Byzantine period.[1]

a) The term occurs but twice in "general" passages. In *Non posse suav.*, p. 1096 B, Plutarch cites Aristotle's query as to the acoustic effect of chaff in the orchestra: τί δήποτε τῶν θεάτρων ἂν ἄχυρα τῆς ὀρχήστρας κατασκεδάσῃς ἢ χοῦν ὁ λαὸς τυφλοῦται. Fortunately, the original form of the question is preserved, and Plutarch has altered it enough to make it certain that he would not have retained the word ὀρχήστρα without explanation, if it had acquired a different meaning since Aristotle's day; *cf.* pp. 16 f., above. The only safe inference, then, is that its fourth-century meaning was still current. Elsewhere (*Quaestt. conv.*, p. 711 B) a sophist is asked what form of entertainment (ἀκροάματα) he considers most appropriate for a symposium, and advises: τἄλλα μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν θυμέλην καὶ τὴν ὀρχήστραν ἐξελαύνειν, εἰσάγειν δὲ . . . . τοὺς ἐλαφροτάτους (of Plato's dramatic dialogues). Ἀκροάματα was a general term for all sorts of musical entertainment, some of which were undoubtedly orchestral, so that this passage need not imply a change of application in the term under consideration. But before it can be determined what forms of amusement are included under each word, and whether each term refers to a different part of the theater or both to a single part, the meanings and development of the word θυμέλη must be considered; *cf.* pp. 28 ff., below.

b) The sole instance of ὀρχήστρα in "specific" passages is *Marcell.*, 21, where Epaminondas is said to have called the

---

[1] MÜLLER'S citations (*Philologus*, Spbd. VII, pp. 81-86) to prove that the usage came in earlier will not bear examination. DIO CASSIUS, LXII, 29 (*cf.* p. 59, n. 1, below), and LXIII, 22, are both fragments preserved in the epitome of Xiphilinus, who is known to have been careless. Schol. ARISTOPH., *Equit.*, 508, merely echoes the statements found in Tzetzes and others, and is evidently late, while the meaning of AUSONIUS, prolog. *Lud. Sept. Sapient.*, 3, is entirely too uncertain to admit of confident citation. It thus becomes unnecessary to decide whether the encroachment of the Roman stage on the orchestra or the transference of orchestral performances to the stage was the cause of this development in meaning.

Bœotian plain the "orchestra of war" (τὸ Βοιώτιον πεδίον Ἄρεως ὀρχήστραν). [Plut.] *Reg. et imp. apophth.*, p. 193 E, which repeats the apophthegm and explains the figure as due to the country's being "flat and spread out" (ὑπτίαν καὶ ἀναπεπταμένην), shows that Plutarch has preserved the original form of the statement. The metaphor itself and the adjectives used to explain it are best understood in case ὀρχήστρα had its original meaning, while the fact that Plutarch retains the term in this sense without elucidation shows that this usage had not yet become obsolete and that the meaning "stage" had not yet arisen.

## C.  Θυμέλη.[1]

Θυμέλη is probably to be derived from θύειν,[2] originally meant "altar," and was naturally applied to the altar in the center of the orchestra; cf. Eurip., *Suppl.*, 63: ἔμολον δεξιπύρους θεῶν θυμέλας. The πρεσβυτοδόκοι θυμέλαι of Æsch., *Suppl.*, 669, must also be taken to mean "altar," but not necessarily that in the theater. Now, as the orchestra and its functions centered about the θυμέλη, it was natural that this term should soon come to include the whole "orchestra" (2) (as it did the whole θόλος at Epidaurus; cf. *Ephem. Arch.*, Vol. X [1892,] p. 69, ll. 106 and 143); cf. Pratinas *apud* Athen., p. 617 C: τίς ὕβρις ἔμολεν ἐπὶ Διο-νυσιάδα πολυπάταγα θυμέλαν; Furthermore, as any name given to the altar would necessarily include the foundation, steps, or underlying platform of it, in process of time these parts singly acquired this name even in opposition to the altar itself; cf. the Delian inscription in *Bull. Cor. Hel.*, Vol. XIV (1890), p. 397: τὴν θυμέλην τοῦ βωμοῦ. No further development was then needed to permit the use of θυμέλη as a designation for any "platform" (3); cf. Plut., *Alex.*, 67: αὐτὸν μὲν οὖν (Alexander) ἵπποι σχέδην ἐκόμιζον ὀκτὼ μετὰ τῶν ἑταίρων ὑπὲρ θυμέλης ἐν ὑψηλῷ καὶ περιφανεῖ πλαισίῳ πεπηγυίας — a result toward which the popular association of

---

[1] Besides the authorities already cited, cf. also ROBERT, *Hermes*, Vol. XXXII (1897), pp. 438 ff.; FREI, *De cert. thym.*, pp. 6 f.; and the consequent debate on the subject between BETHE and DÖRPFELD, *Hermes*, Vol. XXXVI (1901), pp. 597 ff., and Vol. XXXVII (1902), pp. 249 ff. and 483 ff.

[2] Though some would connect it with τιθέναι. The uncertainty was shared by ancient authorities; cf. CRAMER, *Anecd. Oxon.*, Vol. II, p. 449: θυμέλαι, οἱ βωμοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θύεσθαι ἢ τίθεσθαι; *Etymol. Gud.*, p. 226, 44; and schol. LUCIAN, *De saltat.*, 76 (Vol. V, p. 327, Lehmann).

θυμέλη with θυμέλιον would largely contribute. As already noted, one of the easiest lines of development is from the meaning of place to that which is done in that place. Accordingly, θυμέλη came to mean also (4) "orchestral or thymelic performance;" *cf.* the epitaph by Hedylus of the third century B. C., preserved in Athen., p. 176 C: <τοῦτο> Θέων ὁ μόναυλος ὑπ' ἠρίον ὁ γλυκὺς οἰκεῖ αὐλητής, μίμων ἡ 'ν θυμέλῃσι Χάρις, where the combination of μίμων with θυμέλῃσι shows that the latter has the meaning just suggested.[1] In the Roman theater, where the orchestral space was occupied by spectators and every kind of performance was presented upon the stage, θυμέλη naturally came to mean "stage" (5). The same thing occurred in Asia Minor, where most of the thymelic performances had been elevated above the level of the orchestra; *cf.* Artemid. of Ephesus, *Onirocr.*, II, 3, p. 84: γυναικεία δὲ ἐσθὴς ἀγάμοις μόνοις συμφέρει καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ θυμέλην ἀναβαίνουσιν, the last phrase of which is explained by what immediately follows: οἱ δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ ὑποκρίσει ἔθος μεγάλας ἐργασίας καὶ μισθοὺς λήψονται. I find no evidence that the term was ever so used on the mainland of Greece.

*a*) The study of Plutarch's usage is best begun with *Quaestt. conv.*, p. 621 B: κοσμιώτατον δέ μοι δοκεῖ τοιοῦτος ὢν (such a *magister bibendi* as has just been described) τὸ συμπόσιον διαφυλάξειν ἡμῖν καὶ μὴ περιόψεσθαι νῦν μὲν ἐκκλησίαν δημοκρατικὴν νῦν δὲ σχολὴν σοφιστοῦ γενομένην αὖθις δὲ κυβευτήριον, εἶτά που σκηνὴν καὶ θυμέλην. ἢ γὰρ οὐχ ὁρᾶτε τοὺς μὲν δημαγωγοῦντας καὶ δικαζομένους παρὰ δεῖπνον, τοὺς δὲ μελετῶντας καὶ ἀναγιγνώσκοντας αὐτῶν τινα συγγράμματα, τοὺς δὲ μίμοις καὶ ὀρχησταῖς ἀγωνοθετοῦντας; The items in the first sentence balance very well with those in the second; to ἐκκλησίαν correspond δημαγωγοῦντας and δικαζομένους; to σχολὴν σοφιστοῦ, μελετῶντας and ἀναγιγνώσκοντας; to σκηνήν, μίμοις; and to θυμέλην, ὀρχησταῖς.[2] Only κυβευτήριον is without amplification, and it was too plain to need it. This passage alone, then, would inform us that there was a contrast between the σκηνή

---

[1] So far as I am aware, this meaning has never been recognized in the handbooks.

[2] Μελετάω is used of the school also in *De poet. aud.*, p. 35 F, quoted on p. 34, below, and the same contrast between σκηνή and θυμέλη, and mimes and dancing occurs also in *C. I. G.*, 6750: δόξαν φωνάεσσαν ἐνὶ σκηναῖσι λαβοῦσαν (the mime Basilla) παντοίης ἀρετῆς ἐν μείμοις, εἶτα χοροῖσι πολλάκις ἐν θυμέλαις.

and the θυμέλη, and that mimes belonged to the former and dancing to the latter; in other words, that θυμέλη still meant "orchestra."

We are now in a position to examine *Quaestt. conv.*, p. 711 B, which was held in abeyance from p. 27). It will be remembered that a sophist had been asked what form of entertainment (ἀκροάματα) he considered most appropriate for a symposium, and advised: τἄλλα μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν θυμέλην καὶ τὴν ὀρχήστραν ἐξελαύνειν, εἰσάγειν δέ (the lightest of Plato's dramatic dialogues). In the seventh *Quaestio* a visiting Stoic philosopher had enlarged upon the implied criticism in Plat., *Sympos.*, 176 E, of those who were unable to engage in edifying conversation at symposiums and had to resort to the use of flute-girls for entertainment. At the beginning of the eighth *Quaestio* Plutarch demanded of the sophist what form of entertainment he could commend, and received the answer quoted above. In the remainder of the *Quaestio* different speakers examine the suitability of various ἀκροάματα. They reject tragedy, mimes, old comedy, and the Pyladean dance, and accept new comedy, the Bathyllean dance (out of respect for Xen., *Sympos.*, II, 16), and the use of the cithara and flute. Now, ἀκροάματα is a term as broad as μουσικοί,[1] and included both scenic and thymelic performances.[2] Which of these did the sophist have in mind when he used τἄλλα? Evidently the flute (the subject of debate in the preceding *Quaestio*), and probably only such other amusements as were in common use for that purpose; for the following discussion was theoretical, and few of the items there mentioned would have occurred to him in advance under the circumstances. Now, the most usual items included under ἀκροάματα (cf. Wyttenbach, *Index Plut.*, s. v.) and the most common accompaniments of a symposium were aulodes, auletes, citharodes, citharists, etc.—i. e., thymelic performances—and the sophist need not have meant any other than these by τἄλλα. If this interpretation is correct, θυμέλη and ὀρχήστρα mean the same thing and are here an example of

---

[1] *Cf. Quaestt. conv.*, pp. 674 E and 675 C, where both names are given to the same items.

[2] *Cf. C. I. G.*, 2820: ἔν τε τοῖς θυμελικοῖς καὶ σκηνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν τὰ πρωτεύοντα ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ ἀκροάματα αὐτὴν πρώτως ἀγαγοῦσαν.

Plutarch's fondness for doublets, from which either term could be omitted without loss of sense.[1]

In thorough accord with this interpretation is *De Pyth. orac.*, p. 405 D: καὶ οὐκ ἀξιοῦμεν, ᾗ θεῶν ἄγγελοι καὶ κήρυκές εἰσι, λογικῶς ἕκαστα καὶ σαφῶς (God in making known his will) φράζειν· τὴν δὲ τῆς Πυθίας φωνὴν καὶ διάλεκτον ὥσπερ . . . . . . . . ἐκ θυμέλης, οὐκ ἀνήδυντον οὐδὲ λιτὴν ἀλλ᾽ ἐν μέτρῳ καὶ ὄγκῳ καὶ πλάσματι καὶ μεταφοραῖς ὀνομάτων καὶ μετ᾽ αὐλοῦ φθεγγομένην παρέχειν ἀξιοῦμεν. The use of διάλεκτον and μετ᾽ αὐλοῦ seems to indicate clearly enough that the chorus, and consequently the orchestra, is referred to in the simile. Bernardakis's conjecture (χορευτῶν) to fill the lacuna of eight letters found in two Parisian manuscripts, if accepted, points in the same direction.

The term is found twice more in "general" passages, which are best explained by reference to other instances, though they are not specific enough to yield a sure interpretation in themselves; cf. *De cup. divit.*, p. 527 F: τί λέγεις, ἀβέλτερ᾽, ὃς τῆς γυναικὸς ὀφείλων παρελεῖν τὴν πορφύραν καὶ τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα παύσηται τρυφῶσα καὶ ξενομανοῦσα, τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν καλλωπίζεις ὡς θέατρον ἢ θυμέλην τοῖς εἰσιοῦσι; Elsewhere Plutarch says that the poor need not be ashamed to plead their poverty as an excuse for their inability to vie with the rich at public functions. He continues (*Praec. ger.*, p. 822 F): δεῖ δὴ μάλιστα κρατεῖν ἑαυτῶν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις καὶ μήτ᾽ εἰς πεδία καταβαίνειν πεζὸν ἱππεῦσι μαχούμενον μήτ᾽ ἐπὶ στάδια καὶ θυμέλας καὶ τραπέζας πένητα πλουσίοις ὑπὲρ δόξης καὶ δυναστείας διαγωνιζόμενον. As stated, these passages are ambiguous, but probably refer to the orchestra and its splendid performances.

An excellent instance of meaning (4) is afforded by *Galba*, 14: καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα προφάσεις ἔχειν τὰ Νέρωνος ἐγκλήματα· νῦν δὲ Γάλβαν προδιδόναι, τίνα φόνον μητρὸς ἐγκαλοῦντας ἢ σφαγὴν γυναικός, ἢ ποίαν αἰδουμένους θυμέλην ἢ τραγῳδίαν τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος; The assassins of Nero claimed that they had been actuated by abhorrence of his crimes and of the way in which he had degraded his position by cithara-playing (θυμέλην) and by taking rôles in tragedies (τραγῳδίαν). Galba's murderers had no such excuses to offer.

---

[1] Cf. *De cupid. divit.*, p. 527 F: θέατρον ἢ θυμέλην; *Sulla*, 2: σκηνῆς καὶ θεάτρου; *Theseus*, 16: λογείου καὶ σκηνῆς, etc.

There is still one more example of meaning (3) in the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς θυμέλης, which has been kept till the last because its interpretation required the preliminary discussion of ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς,[1] ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς, σκηνικός, and θυμελικός.   In its original theatrical use ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς meant simply "on the playhouse side," and referred to the space before and in the vicinity of the scene building.   When first found in extant literature, however, the phrase had already become stereotyped and had no more definiteness of reference than ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ.   In at least two of the fourth-century instances of its use (Arist., Poetics, XXIV, 4 and 8) it indubitably included the chorus in its application, while it never expressly excluded it (ibid., XIII, 6; XVII, 1; and Demosth., XIX, 337).   With the development of meaning of σκηνή from "scene building" to "performance place" this enlarged, tropical meaning of the phrase was a natural result, when the "performance place" to be designated was the place for dramatic exhibition.   For any other kind of spectacle in the theater—for example, the dithyramb, in which the σκηνή structure had no part—ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς would scarcely have been an appropriate designation of the place of the performance, but rather ἐπὶ τῆς θυμέλης (i. e., ὀρχήστρας).   Consequently, οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς embraced all of the participants in a dramatic representation—ὑποκριταί, χορός, ποιητής, and διδάσκαλος—as did τραγῳδοί from an earlier period.   Now, if it were desired to distinguish between the two kinds of dramatic performers, since οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς θυμέλης was already used of the dithyrambic chorus and could not possibly under normal conditions be applied to the actors, that term would naturally be used to designate the dramatic chorus as well, and οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς would be used in the restricted sense for the actors alone.   I have already cited instances of the broader meaning of the latter phrase in Aristotle; curiously enough, the narrower sense is found in the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς[2] in the same author (Poetics, XII, 1 and 2, and Probl., XV, XXX,

[1] This expression has given rise to much discussion; besides the authorities already cited, cf. RICHARDS, Classical Review, Vol. V (1891), p. 97; REINACH, Revue critique, Vol. XXVI (1892), p. 450; JEVONS in the Gardner-Jevons Manual of Greek Antiquities (1895), p. 678; CAPPS, American Journal of Archæology, Vol. V (1901), p. 31; and FLICKINGER, University of Chicago Decennial Publications, First Series, Vol. VI (1902), pp. 13 ff.

[2] Ἀπό is, of course, only ἐπί from a different point of view; cf. GILDERSLEEVE, American Journal of Philology, Vol. XVIII (1897), p. 120.

and XLVIII). Unfortunately, no example of ἐπὶ τῆς θυμέλης occurs in the fourth century, though it may well have been current then, since we do find θυμελικός and σκηνικός (which are the equivalents of ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς θυμέλης and ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς, and followed the same line of development); cf. the words of Stratonicus (died before 310 B. C.) which are preserved by Charicles apud Athen., p. 350 C: γυμνικοὺς δὲ ἀγῶνας διατιθέτωσαν Ἠλεῖοι, Κορίνθιοι δὲ θυμελικούς, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ σκηνικούς, and Polemo apud Athen., p. 699 A: (παρῳδῶν) πρῶτος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς ἀγῶνας τοὺς θυμελικοὺς Ἡγήμων (a contemporary of Cratinus).

Plutarch employs ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς in its unrestricted Aristotelian sense; cf. An seni, p. 785 B: Φιλήμονα δὲ τὸν κωμικὸν καὶ Ἄλεξιν ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀγωνιζομένους καὶ στεφανουμένους ὁ θάνατος κατέλαβε. It has commonly been thought[1] that Plutarch meant that Alexis and Philemon actually died in the theater. In the immediate context he has been complaining that statesmen withdraw from public life much earlier than do men of other professions, and then cites the case of these two who up to the very day of their death were engaged in the active pursuit of their calling. There is, of course, no reference here to actors nor to a stage for them, but to poets who were contestants in the theater with their plays. In the case of an invitation Plutarch says that there are many things to be considered; cf. Quaestt. conv., p. 709 C: ἀλλὰ δεῖ σκοπεῖν πρῶτον τίς ὁ καλῶν ἐστιν. εἰ μὲν γὰρ οὐ σφόδρα συνήθης, ἀλλ' ἢ τῶν πλουσίων τις ἢ σατραπικῶν, ὡς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς δορυφορήματος λαμπροῦ δεόμενος ἢ πάνυ χαρίζεσθαι τῇ κλήσει πεπεισμένος καὶ τιμᾶν, ἐπάγεται, παραιτητέος εὐθύς. Cf. also De Alex. fort., p. 337 E: ἀγωνιστῇ γὰρ ἡγεμονίας ὑποκριτὴν (Aridaeus) ἐπεισήγαγε (Meleager), μᾶλλον δ' ὡς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τὸ διάδημα κωφὸν διεξῆλθε τῆς οἰκουμένης; An seni, p. 791 E: ὁ δ' (Aridaeus) ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς δορυφόρημα κωφὸν ἦν ὄνομα βασιλέως; and Demetr., 41: ὡς ἐν μόνῳ τούτῳ (Pyrrhus) τῶν βασιλέων εἴδωλον ἐνορῷτο τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τόλμης, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι, καὶ μάλιστα Δημήτριος, ὡς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τὸ βάρος ὑποκρίνοιντο καὶ τὸν ὄγκον τοῦ ἀνδρός—a characterization very suitable to the theatrical Demetrius. Now, in all these passages except the first, though perhaps

---

[1] Cf. KAIBEL, Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encycl., s. v. Alexis: "Die Anecdote, Philemon und Alexis habe der Tod überrascht ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀγωνιζομένους καὶ στεφανουμένους, verträgt keine scharfe Interpretation."

actors are more distinctly suggested by the figure than a chorus, still the particulars given are entirely too indefinite to warrant us in supposing that the latter is excluded from the application of the phrase. Ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς is likewise used in a broad meaning; cf. *Theseus*, 16: ὁ Μίνως ἀεὶ διετέλει κακῶς ἀκούων . . . . ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς θεάτροις . . . . ἀλλ᾽ ἐπικρατήσαντες οἱ τραγικοὶ πολλὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ λογείου καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀδοξίαν αὐτοῦ κατεσκέδεσαν. The same thought is presented also by Libanius, *Decl.*, Vol. III, p. 64: οὐχ ὁρᾶτε τὸν Μίνω δεινὰ πάσχοντα ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς.[1] Now, it is clear that, whatever may have been the original force of such expressions, ἐν θεάτροις, ἀπὸ τοῦ λογείου καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς, and ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς are here practically synonymous. *Amator.*, p. 757 A: οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι τῷ μὲν Ἔρωτι λοιδοροῦνταί τινες ἀπέχονται δ᾽ ἐκείνης (Aphrodite), ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ μιᾶς σκηνῆς ἀκούομεν (contradictory quotations from different tragedies). "From the same platform" is our English idiom for the thought, but of course that must not influence our interpretation of the Greek. *De poet. aud.*, p. 35 F: καὶ γὰρ δίκαιον καὶ ὠφέλιμον . . . . ὅταν τοῖς ἀπὸ σκηνῆς λεγομένοις καὶ πρὸς λύραν ᾀδομένοις καὶ μελετωμένοις ἐν διδασκαλείῳ τὰ Πυθαγόρου δόγματα καὶ τὰ Πλάτωνος ὁμολογῇ. In *De glor. Ath.*, which is a brief for the warlike accomplishments of Athens as against her intellectual triumphs, the poets and actors are represented as making a πάροδος with the symbols of their professions, in the following words (chap. 6): ἔνθεν μὲν δὴ προσίτωσαν ὑπ᾽ αὐλοῖς καὶ λύραις ποιηταὶ . . . . καὶ σκευὰς καὶ προσωπεῖα καὶ βωμοὺς καὶ μηχανὰς ἀπὸ σκηνῆς περιάκτους καὶ τρίποδας ἐπινικίους κομίζοντες· τραγικοὶ δ᾽ αὐτοῖς ὑποκριταὶ . . . . συνίτωσαν . . . . σκευῶν δὲ καὶ προσώπων καὶ ξυστίδων ἀλουργῶν καὶ μηχανῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς καὶ χοροποιῶν καὶ δορυφόρων δυσπραγμάτευτος λαὸς καὶ χορηγία πολυτελὴς παρασκευαζέσθω. "Scenic appliances" is all that the Greek demands here, and that is a colorless expression. These instances, then, are worthy successors of their prototypes in Aristotle. Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς and θυμελικοί,[2] how-

---

[1] As Libanius is not accessible to me, I am indebted to NAUCK, *Trag. Graec. Fragm.*, (2d ed.), p. 200 for the reference and text.

[2] It is noteworthy that σκηνικός occurs but twice in Plutarch: once in an untheatrical sense, *Otho*, 6, and once in the spurious treatise, *De musica*, 31. The figurative use of σύσκηνος in *De aud. poet.*, p. 27 F, is not noted in the dictionaries. It is used of Euripides, who is dubbed Sophocles's "tent-mate" with reference to their professional fellowship as poets.

ever, have taken on a mutually inclusive meaning entirely foreign
to fourth-century usage.   In *An seni* Plutarch rebukes the men of
his day for retiring from public life earlier than did not only the
generals and statesmen of antiquity, but also the poets and actors.
As examples of the latter class he cites Simonides, who won a
dithyrambic triumph in his eightieth year; Sophocles, who com-
posed the *Oedipus Coloneus* just before his death; Philemon and
Alexis, who kept up their interest in their work till death actually
came upon them; and Polus, who performed a notable feat of acting
in his seventieth year.   He continues, p. 785 C: ἀρ' οὖν οὐκ αἰσχρόν
ἐστι τῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς γερόντων τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος ἀγεννεστέρους
ὁρᾶσθαι, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐξισταμένους ἀγώνων ἀποτίθεσθαι
τὸ πολιτικὸν πρόσωπον, οὐκ οἶδ' ὁποῖον ἀντιμεταλαμβάνοντας; The
"theatrical folk" whom Plutarch had just been discussing included
tragic and comic poets, an actor, and (notably) a dithyrambic poet.
Such a breadth of application would have been impossible in the
fourth century.   The statements that are made about Sulla's boon
companions, when put together, also produce interesting results.
*Sulla*, 36: συνῆν (Sulla) μίμοις γυναιξὶ καὶ κιθαριστρίαις καὶ θυμελι-
κοῖς ἀνθρώποις . . . . οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ τότε παρ' αὐτῷ δυνάμενοι μέγιστον
ἦσαν, Ῥώσκιος ὁ κωμῳδὸς καὶ Σῶριξ ὁ ἀρχιμῖμος καὶ Μητρόβιος ὁ
λυσιῳδός.   We are surprised to find a κωμῳδός and an ἀρχιμῖμος
classified under the generic term θυμελικοί.   That the lysiode
Metrobius should be so designated is, of course, in accord with the
traditional meaning, but with this compare *ibid.*, 2: Μητροβίου δὲ
τῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς τινος ἐρῶν διετέλεσεν ἔτι νέος ὤν.   Again, in the same
chapter Plutarch says: ὥστε . . . . ἐπεὶ κύριος ἁπάντων (Sulla)
κατέστη, συναγαγόντα τῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς καὶ θεάτρου τοὺς ἰταμωτάτους
ὁσημέραι πίνειν καὶ διαπληκτίζεσθαι τοῖς σκώμμασι . . . . ὥστε
μιμῳδοῖς καὶ ὀρχησταῖς τιθασὸς εἶναι.   Surely no clearer proof that
these expressions were interchangeable, and that each included all
the particulars of the others, could well be asked for.   Therefore
θυμελικός is equivalent to μουσικός.[1]

It is now necessary to inquire the reason for the amalgamation
of meanings in the case of θυμελικός and σκηνικός, and their equiva-

[1] *Cf.* Josephus, *Antiq. Iud.*, XV, 8: τοῖς ἐν τῇ μουσικῇ διαγιγνομένοις καὶ θυμελικοῖς καλου-
μένοις.  For the fact that μουσικός always included both θυμελικός and σκηνικός *cf.* Frei,
*De cert. thym.*, p. 8.  Plutarch's usage agrees with this; *cf.* Wyttenbach, *Index Plut.*, s. vv.

lent paraphrases. *A priori*, it would seem most natural to suppose
that this was due to the fact that θυμέλη and σκηνή had both
come to mean the same thing, viz., "stage;" but, as already
shown, these terms were far from being identical and still repre-
sented a contrast. Consequently, this hypothesis is untenable.
The origin of the blending probably arose from the association of
dramatic and thymelic performances at festivals. Secondly, in
the time of the early empire the old societies of Dionysian artists,
which included both scenic and thymelic performers (*cf. Aetia
Rom.*, p. 289 CD; *De cap.*, p. 87 F; and *Aratus*, 53), were either
reorganized, or entirely disbanded and then new ones formed
under imperial auspices.[1] The names of these new associations
show much variety, but usually agree in containing the phrase
ἡ θυμελικὴ σύνοδος[2] joined with the names of Dionysus and of the
patron emperor. The earliest ruler mentioned is Nerva (*C. I. G.*,
6785), though the custom probably began somewhat before his
day. It is evident that in this title θυμελική (from the custom in
the Roman theater, where all performers stood on the same level)
included both σκηνικός and the old-fashioned θυμελικός, and that,
as these societies multiplied in every direction throughout the
Roman world, the broader meaning of the term (and of its peri-
phrasis οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς θυμέλης) drove out of use the traditional signifi-
cance of these expressions, regardless of the meaning that had
been attached, or still continued to be attached, to θυμέλη in each
locality. In consequence, σκηνικός, which now had to share its
field with θυμελικός as well as with μουσικός, disappeared (so far as
Plutarch is concerned), while its periphrasis, which always had
tended toward freedom of application, also followed the Roman
usage and became synonymous with its rival.[3]

In view of this development there is nothing surprising in the
fact that Plutarch uses ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς θυμέλης of a comic poet, though

[1] *Cf.* POLAND, *De col. artif. Dionys.*, pp. 19-21; ZIEBARTH, *Das griechische Vereinswesen*
pp. 88 ff.; and FREI, *De cert. thym.*, p. 8, n. 9.

[2] Μουσικὴ σύνοδος occurs once, *C. I. G.*, 4081.

[3] It must, of course, be kept in mind that, regardless of the common blurring of the
distinction between θυμελικός and σκηνικός, these terms could still be employed in their
earlier sense whenever it was desired to express a contrast between orchestral and dramatic
performances; *cf.* VITRUV., V, 7, 2: *tragici et comici actores in scaena peragunt, reliqui
autem artifices suas per orchestram praestant actiones itaque ex eo scaenici et thymelici
graece separatim nominantur.*

θυμέλη is itself restricted to the meaning "orchestra." In his *Life of Demetrius* he points out the difference between the conduct of Stratocles, the politician, and of Philippides, the comic poet, toward that fantastic hero. He concludes (chap. 12) his comparison with these words: τοῦτον (Philippides) μὲν οὖν ἐπίτηδες ἐκείνῳ (Stratocles) παρεθήκαμεν, τῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς θυμέλης. The fact that these words could not have occurred with this meaning in a third- or fourth-century source shows that Plutarch has added them from the terminology of his day.[1]

b) Also of this term there is but one example in a "specific" passage, viz., *Sulla*, 19: ταύτης τὰ ἐπινίκια τῆς μάχης (at Chaeronea) ἦγεν (Sulla) ἐν Θήβαις περὶ τὴν Οἰδιπόδειον κρήνην κατασκευάσας θυμέλην. Müller (*Philologus*, Spbd. VII, p. 97) thinks that, as the Romans were fonder of dramatic than of musical contests, this θυμέλη was more likely a stage or platform than an orchestra.

---

[1] I have reserved for this place my criticism of FREI's dissertation, *De certaminibus thymelicis*. From the fact that the words θυμελικός and σκηνικός do not occur till the close of the fourth century, and that μουσικός was in use from a much earlier period as a generic name for all sorts of musical entertainments, together with certain statements in Athenaeus which imply a transfer of certain performances to the theater at this period, Frei concludes that the so-called thymelic contests at Athens were held in the Odeum of Pericles till the time of Demetrius of Phalerum, who transferred them to the orchestra of the Dionysian theater; these performances were accordingly called "thymelic" because they were presented in the θυμέλη, i. e., ὀρχήστρα, in order to distinguish them from the dramatic productions, which were termed σκηνικοί, from being given on the stage (σκηνή), which he assumes that this theater possessed; and finally this transfer was not made and these distinctions did not earlier arise at Athens because (1) of the prejudice against using a precinct sacred to Dionysus for non-Dionysian purposes, and (2) because up to the time of the Lycurgus theater Athens had no other place so well fitted for such performances as the Odeum. Consequently, since (2) did not obtain elsewhere, these distinctions may have arisen somewhat earlier at other cities, e. g., Corinth. Frei's contentions are well presented and clear, but are not free from defects. In the first place, I miss a discussion of ἐπὶ (ἀπὸ) τῆς σκηνῆς and ἐπὶ (ἀπὸ) τῆς θυμέλης—phrases which in my opinion are inextricably associated with his subject. Secondly, he first accepts Bethe's hypothesis that the Lycurgus theater had a stage, and consequently concludes that the distinction of names must be explained on the basis of difference in place of performance there (p. 14: *haec ipsa certaminum in theatro editorum multitudo distinctionem expetivit, quae non e genere, sed rectius simpliciusque ex loco petenda se obtulit. Quo enim tempore musici agones in theatro omnes committi coepti sunt, orchestra non iam solus erat locus certaminum agendorum, sed scaena ludis scaenicis celebrandis separata erat;* cf. BETHE, *Prol.*, p. 274), and then uses these conclusions to prove a stage at that period (p. 15: *itaque etiam ab hac parte luce clarius apparet, tragoedias comoediasque certe inde a IV. a. Ch. n. saeculo non esse in orchestra actas, quod mirabili pertinacia iterum iterumque praedicatur*)—a notable *petitio principii*, which a study of Aristotle's use of ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς would have spared him. Furthermore, Frei's limiting the meaning of θυμέλη to "orchestra" in the derivation of θυμελικός is impossible, as appears from the resulting controversy between Dörpfeld and Bethe; cf. p. 28, n. 1, above. Lastly, he presses unduly the fact that θυμελικός and σκηνικός do not occur before the close of the fourth century, since he can quote only three instances from an earlier period of μουσικός, a term of undoubted age (cf. ARIST., *Plutus*, 1163; PLAT., *Laws*, p. 658 AB; and C. I. A., IV, 2, p. 203, No. 834b, col. ii, l. 47).

If Sulla's tastes, however, resembled Antony's, the opposite con-
clusion would be more probable; cf. Anton., 56: μία νῆσος (Samos)
ἐφ' ἡμέρας πολλὰς κατηυλεῖτο καὶ κατεψάλλετο, and ibid., 24.
Though the passage is not susceptible of definite interpretation in
itself, there is at least no reason for giving it an explanation
inconsistent with the meaning of θυμέλη elsewhere in Plutarch.

θυμελικός occurs twice in "specific" passages; cf. Fab. Max.,
4: προελθὼν δὲ ὁ δικτάτωρ (Fabius Maximus after his election) εἰς
τὸν ὄχλον εὔξατο τοῖς θεοῖς . . . . θέας μουσικὰς καὶ θυμε-
λικὰς ἄξειν. Livy (XXII, 9, 10) simply says ludos magnos.
Müller (op. cit., p. 100) and Frei (De cert. thym., p. 8, n. 9) inter-
pret θυμελικάς as meaning "dramatic," though more probably it
is simply tautological. In either case, however, the use of the
term savors of Plutarch's own day, The other instance is Cato
Min., 46: τοῦ Φαωνίου κατασταθέντος ἀγορανόμου, τά τε ἄλλα τῆς
ἀρχῆς ἐπεμελεῖτο (Cato Minor) καὶ τὰς θέας διεῖπεν ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ,
διδοὺς καὶ τοῖς θυμελικοῖς στεφάνους μὲν οὐ χρυσοῦς, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐν
Ὀλυμπίᾳ, κοτίνων . . . . ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρῳ θεάτρῳ Κουρίων ὁ Φαωνίου
συνάρχων ἐχορήγει πολυτελῶς· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον ἀπολείποντες οἱ ἄνθρω-
ποι μετέβαινον ἐνταῦθα καὶ συνέπαιζον προθύμως ὑποκρινομένῳ τῷ
Φαωνίῳ τὸν ἰδιώτην καὶ τῷ Κάτωνι τὸν ἀγωνοθέτην. From the
lack of details the precise meaning of θυμελικός here must, as Frei
(op. cit., p. 9, n. 9) says, be left in uncertainty. One thing, how-
ever, is clear—in a "specific" passage Plutarch has transferred
the language of contemporaneous Greek customs to a Roman cele-
bration to which they bore little relation.

## D.  Σκηνή.

Σκηνή is etymologically connected with σκιά, σκότος, and
σκίρον, and originally meant "booth" or "hut" for temporary use,
without regard to the materials employed. The word does not
occur in Homer, Hesiod, and the Homeric Hymns where κλισία is
used in its stead; but when the tragedians treated Homeric subjects,
they uniformly replaced the Homeric term with σκηνή. In Soph.,
Ajax, 1407, where the poet for "local color" retained κλισία,
the scholiast wrote σκηνή as its equivalent. Æschylus was the
first extant writer to use σκηνή. The most frequent application of

the term was to military quarters—a use which persisted through-
out Greek literature. But, of course, this application was not the
only one. In the earliest dramatic performances, which were
entirely choral, when no change of costume was necessary and
the audience sat on all sides of the dancing-place, the members of
the chorus came already dressed from their homes or neighboring
houses. But when the development of the choral parts or the
addition of an actor demanded a change of costume, a temporary
booth was erected near the dancing-place for this purpose. A
great step in advance was taken when the happy thought came,
whether to Æschylus himself or a contemporary, of bringing this
booth still nearer the chorus and considering it the temporary
abode of the actor.[1] In the representation of camp scenes in the
extant drama the dressing-room was so used, and its presence is
often alluded to; cf. Soph., *Ajax*, 3 and 218; Eurip., *Hec.*, 53, 99,
and 733; *Ion*, 806 and 982; *Troad.*, 139 and 176; *Iph. Aul.*, 12;
etc. So long as σκηναί was a correct untechnical designation for
the structures used as dressing-rooms, or whenever the dramatic
situation involved huts or booths, we cannot assume that the usage
had become technical, and in the passages just cited both condi-
tions obtain. Not until the dressing-rooms were built too sub-
stantially to be longer called σκηναί untechnically, and not until
they were still so designated in plays which did not depict camp
scenes, did σκηνή become a purely technical theatrical term. So
far as is now known, Aristophanes was the first to take this step;
cf. *Pac.*, 730–31:

ὡς εἰώθασι μάλιστα
περὶ τὰς σκηνὰς πλεῖστοι κλέπται κυπτάζειν καὶ κακοποιεῖν

and *Thesmoph.*, 655–58:

χρὴ . . . . περιθρέξαι
τὴν πύκνα πᾶσαν καὶ τὰς σκηνὰς καὶ τὰς διόδους διαθρῆσαι.

In neither of these plays does the scenic location demand the
presence of booths. In the second passage the mingling of the
real and imaginary situation is noteworthy. The scene buildings
and the parodoi are actually present; the Pnyx is only the imagi-

[1] *Cf.* WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF, *Hermes*, Vol. XXI (1886), pp. 597 ff., and Vol. XXXII (1897), pp. 382 ff.

nary location of the scene. Hence it is clear that σκηνή has at last attained a technical theatrical meaning, viz., "scene building" (1). This seems to have been the only meaning in the fifth century, and it persevered as long as the Greek theater.

An interesting example of this meaning is Plato, *Laws*, p. 817 C. A band of strolling actors is thought of as making application to the rulers of the ideal state for permission to perform; reply is made to them as follows: μὴ δὴ δόξητε ἡμᾶς ῥᾳδίως γε οὕτως ὑμᾶς ποτε παρ' ἡμῖν ἐάσειν σκηνάς τε πήξαντας κατ' ἀγορὰν καὶ καλλιφώνους ὑποκριτὰς εἰσαγαγομένους. Reisch (*Griechisches Theater*, p. 284) naturally explains that the actors wished to erect tents to serve as dressing-rooms, but Müller (*Philologus*, Spbd. VII, p. 13) sees a reference to a *podium*. There is, however, no reason for dissociating this passage from the ordinary idiomatic meaning of σκηνὴν πηγνύναι. The phrase is used of setting up a tent for the use of those that collect plumbago at night (Theophr., *Hist. Plant.*, IX, 19, 2); of putting up military quarters (Herod., VI, 12 and VII, 119; and Plut., *Caes.*, 52; *Demetr.*, 50; and *Ant.*, 48); and in a more general sense in Bekker's *Anecd.*, p. 302, 32—in all of which a reference to a stage is out of the question. Furthermore, in describing the same event, viz., the erection of a tent for Alcibiades at the Olympian games, [Andocides] (*Contra Alcib.*, 30) uses σκηνὴν ἔπηξαν; Plutarch (*Alcib.*, 12), σκηνὴν ἔστησαν; and Athenaeus (p. 534 D), σκηνὴν ἔπησσον. The Jewish Feast of the Tabernacles, which commemorated the forty years' wandering in the wilderness and was celebrated by the erection of booths of green boughs and leaves in which the people dwelt seven days, was called σκηνοπηγία; *cf.* John's Gospel 7:2; 1 Macc. 10:21; 2 Macc. 1:9, 18; 1 Esdr. 5:51; Septuag. Deut. 16:16; 31:10; Zech. 14:18, 19; and Josephus, *Antiq. Iud.*, IV, 8, 12. Moreover, Cleomenes III. of Sparta is said (*Cleom.*, 12) during an invasion of Megalopolis to have had a theater erected (πηξάμενος θέατρον) in hostile territory and to have held a contest of Dionysian artists for one day. It is therefore clear that in such phrases πηγνύναι means no more than ἱστάναι.

As already noted, the transition in meaning from place to function is one of the easiest known to semasiology. Thus

Xenophon several times uses σκηνή by synecdoche of the entertainment given in the royal quarters (*Cyrop.*, II, 3, 22 and 24; 3, 1; and VIII, 4, 27). Consequently, a similar development in the theatrical use of the term was natural. I therefore consider "dramatic performance" (2) the secondary technical meaning of σκηνή, "scenic action" and "plot" being almost synonymous meanings easily derived from this. Excellent examples are found in [Democritus] fr. 249 (Mullach): ὁ κόσμος σκηνή, ὁ βίος πάροδος· ἦλθες, εἶδες, ἀπῆλθες,[1] in Aristot., *Poetics*, XIII, 6, p. 1453a: ἐπὶ τῶν σκηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων, and in arg. Soph., *Electra* (p. 97, Papageorgius's ed. of scholia): ἡμῖν ἐν βραχεῖ δεδήλωκεν ὁ ποιητὴς τὸν τόπον τῆς σκηνῆς.[2]

Both primary and secondary meanings are found in the puzzling phrases τραγικὴ σκηνή and κωμικὴ σκηνή, which deserve a separate treatment. The first instance of the former expression is Xen., *Cyrop.*, VI, 1. 54.[3] Cyrus conceived the idea of mounting the lowest story of his siege towers upon wheels and having them drawn by eight yoke of oxen. Each tower (including the wheels) was about eighteen feet in height, was fitted with platforms and battlements, and carried a complement of twenty men. The description continues: ἐπεὶ δὲ πάντα συνειστήκει αὐτῷ τὰ περὶ τοὺς πύργους, ἐλάμβανε τοῦ ἀγωγίου πεῖραν· καὶ πολὺ ῥᾷον ἦγε τὰ ὀκτὼ ζεύγη τὸν πύργον καὶ τοὺς ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἄνδρας ἢ τὸ σκευοφορικὸν βάρος ἕκαστον τὸ ζεῦγος, σκευῶν μὲν γὰρ βάρος ἀμφὶ τὰ πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι τάλαντα ἦν ζεύγει· τοῦ δὲ πύργου, ὥσπερ τραγικῆς σκηνῆς τῶν ξύλων πάχος ἐχόντων, καὶ εἴκοσιν ἀνδρῶν καὶ

---

[1] The manuscripts assign eighty-six fragments to Democrates, whom modern scholars have been unable to identify, and therefore accredit the fragments to Democritus. This particular one DIELS, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, p. 425, considers spurious. It needs to be interpreted in connection with Palladas, *Anth. Pal.*, X, 72: σκηνὴ πᾶς ὁ βίος καὶ παίγνιον, and Shakespeare's words: "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players," etc. (*As You Like It*, II, 7, 139 ff.). Shakespeare's "world" is the actual earth upon which men and women have their exits and their entrances. The life which they live is the play on the boards—exactly the thought of ὁ βίος σκηνή, which is guarded against misapprehension by παίγνιον. Democritus's idea is similar, but not identical. According to his figure, the world (κόσμος) is a spectacle, the only means of access (πάροδος) to which is human life. Each man at birth gains admittance, views the pageant, and takes his departure. The interpretation is defined by εἶδες, which must refer to a spectator, not an actor.

[2] *Cf.* the similar use of δρᾶμα in arg. III SOPH., *Oed. Col.*: ἐπὶ τῷ λεγομένῳ ἱππίῳ Κολωνῷ τὸ δρᾶμα κεῖται.

[3] The difficulty of this passage has been recognized for some time; *cf.* WIESELER, *Ersch-Gruber Enc.*, p. 208, n. 32, and REINACH, *Revue critique*, Vol. XXVI (1892), p. 450.

ὅπλων, τούτων ἐγένετο ἔλαττον ἢ πεντεκαίδεκα τάλαντα ἑκάστῳ ζεύγει τὸ ἀγώγιον. The interpretation of the passage in detail would pass beyond the limits of this paper, and I must content myself with a mere outline. Wieseler (op. cit., pp. 208f., nn. 32 and 38) saw a reference to the μηχανή; Reisch (Griechisches Theater, p. 284, and Zeit. f. d. öst. Gym., Vol. XXXVIII, p. 276), to the uprights of the scene building; and Müller (Philologus, Spbd. VII, pp. 25 ff.), to the upper story (Oberbühne) of the stage—all interpretations inconsistent with the history of σκηνή and hard to reconcile with the meaning of the whole phrase in most of the other passages where it occurs. Σκηνή used alone in the context would naturally have been thought to refer to the σκηνὴ στρατιωτική; τραγική simply makes plain the reference. With much the same purpose τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ appears in the Delian inscription for the year 282 B. C. (Bull. Cor. Hell., Vol. XVIII [1894], p. 162). Of course, the same certainty of application might have been obtained by the use of κωμική instead of τραγική, for the same building served either purpose. "Its timbers had the thickness of those of a booth, the one used at tragedies (and comedies) I mean."[1] When we remember that most Greek buildings were made of sun-dried brick, stone, or marble, and very few entirely of wood, we shall not be surprised that in choosing some wooden structure with which to compare the tower Xenophon found nothing else with which he could assume that Greeks as a whole were so familiar as the scene building. In my opinion, then, the phrase here is simply an extension of the primary meaning of σκηνή. The difficulties involved in the small weights mentioned are no greater upon this interpretation than otherwise, and, I think, can be satisfactorily cleared up; but this must be reserved for another occasion.

From the secondary meaning of σκηνή these phrases were also equivalent to τραγῳδία and κωμῳδία. This meaning is found as far back as [Plato] Clitopho, p. 407 A: ἐγὼ γάρ, ὦ Σώκρατες, σοὶ συγγιγνόμενος πολλάκις ἐξεπληττόμην ἀκούων, καί μοι ἐδόκεις παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους κάλλιστα λέγειν, ὁπότε ἐπιτιμῶν τοῖς

---

[1] Cf. De aud. poet., p. 35 D: ὁ τραγικὸς Ἄδραστος, and De esu carn., p. 998 E: τὴν ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ-Μερόπην. Of course, τραγική may be a gloss that has supplanted θεατρική in the text of Xenophon, but such a supposition is unnecessary.

ἀνθρώποις, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς[1] τραγικῆς θεός, ὑμνεῖς λέγων· ποῖ φέρεσθε, ὤνθρωποι, κτλ.  In later times the phrase was unquestionably understood of the μηχανή.  The misinterpretation was doubtless due to passages like that just quoted, in which there is a reference to the *deus ex machina*.  In fact, it may be traced back to this very passage in the *Clitopho* with great plausibility, for Timaeus, *Plat. Lex.*, s. v. τραγικὴ σκηνή, gives the following definition: πῆγμα μετέωρον, ἐφ' οὗ ἐν θεῶν σκευῇ τινες παριόντες ἔλεγον, and this mistaken explanation Photius, s. v. τραγικὴ σκηνή, quotes word for word.  Arrian, *Dissert. Epict.*, III, 22, 26, echoing the passage under consideration, is evidently thinking of the μηχανή, but at least has the merit of retaining the correct text.

It is thus apparent that τραγικὴ σκηνή early had two meanings: (*a*) "a scene building for tragic contests," and (*b*) "tragic performance."  These meanings are easily derived and lie close to one another.  Moreover, it is easy to understand how the meaning μηχανή arose in later times.  But on Müller's supposition that it meant μηχανή, or *Oberbühne*, from the first, it is incomprehensible how the phrase came to mean τραγῳδία in *Demetr.*, 28 (quoted on p. 46 below)—the solitary instance in all Greek literature!

As the front wall of the scene building was the most conspicuous part to the audience, and as there the scenery was either applied or attached, this front wall alone, or finally the scenery itself, came to be called σκηνή (3).  When Aristotle says (*Poet.*, 4) that Sophocles introduced scenery, the term that he uses—σκηνογραφία—implies that this meaning of σκηνή was already in vogue.  This, too, is the common interpretation put upon the expressions αἱ ἐπάνω σκηναί, αἱ κάτω σκηναί, etc., in the Delian inscription

[1] The critical apparatus at my disposal does not record this variant which is mentioned by WIESELER (*Ersch-Gruber*, p. 209, n. 38) and MÜLLER (*Philologus*, Spbd. VII, p. 27).  The accepted text reads μηχανῆς.  The correct reading, however, is preserved in the *lemma* in TIMAEUS, *Lex. Plat.* (which can refer to no other passage in Plato), and Photius, and by the passage in Arrian, which is based upon this one.  Another reason for suspecting the usual reading is that ἐπὶ μηχανῆς rarely occurs, but generally ἀπὸ μηχανῆς; cf. LUCIAN, *Philops.*, 29; ARISTIDES, I, pp. 47 and 78; II, p. 190, and schol. *ad. loc.*; BEKKER's *Anecd.*, I, 208, 9; ALEXIS *apud* ATHENAEUS 326 C; and [DEMOSTH.], XL, 59, or ἐκ μηχανῆς; cf. LUCIAN, *Hermot.*, 86, and seven examples in Heliodorus; cf. WALDEN, *Harvard Studies*, Vol. V (1894), p. 43.  A parallel to the construction and meaning is found in ARISTOT., *Poetics*, XIII, 6, p. 1453*a*: ἐπὶ τῶν σκηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων.

(*Bull. Cor. Hel.*, Vol. XVIII [1894], p. 163), though I am not myself fully convinced that this and several other points in connection with the Delos theater have yet been satisfactorily explained. We must understand similarly the σκανοθήκα of the theater at Megalopolis (*Excav. at Megal.*, supplement to the *Jour. Hel. Studies* (1892), p. 140, XXVIII), though the circumstances there were exceptional. The usage appears frequently in the later literature; *cf. Dion Cass.*, LXIII, 6; *Paus.*, II, 7, 5, etc.

The phrase ἐπὶ (ἀπὸ) τῆς σκηνῆς has already been discussed in another connection (pp. 32 ff.), where it appeared that the expression had a tendency to go over to the secondary meaning of σκηνή and mean little more than "in a play." Another development in another direction has still to be noted. Many a meaning of words and phrases is entirely due to association of ideas. Thus a word may in the beginning have a certain meaning (let us call this $x$). A new meaning (let us call this $y$) may come to be associated with the original one (so that the meaning is now $x+y$). The original meaning may then be lost sight of (so that the result is simply $y$). It was precisely such a course that was pursued by this phrase in one direction. As already stated (*cf.* p. 32), it originally meant "on the playhouse side" ($x$, to apply our illustration), and often may be roughly translated so. It is easy to see how the new meaning arose. For example, *cf.* schol. Eurip., *Hippol.*, 171: ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς δείκνυται (τὸ ἐκκύκλημα) τὰ ἔνδον πραττόμενα: "The eccyclema shows 'on the playhouse side' what is done within." In this case ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς not only has its old meaning ($x$); there is also involved a strong contrast between the inner part of the scene building and those parts which were seen by the audience. The first member of the contrast was expressed by ἔνδον; the second member (at least when such a collocation of words occurred for the first time) was not clearly expressed at all, but was easily implied in ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς. When we try to give a definite expression to this latter opposing part, we can think of nothing better than "performance-place" or "scene" (4). So in such a sentence ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς by unavoidable implication meant both "on the playhouse side *and* in the performance-place" ($x+y$). It remains for us to see how the meaning ($x$) faded. A good illustration

occurs in schol. Arist., *Nub.*, 344: δῆλον οὖν ὅτι ὁπόσα ἐν τοῖς ἄνω λέλεκται χορικά, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ὄντος τοῦ χοροῦ εἴρηται, ἀλλ᾽ ἔξω ἑστῶτος καὶ κρυπτομένου . . . . οὐ γὰρ ἠδύναντο ἐντὸς εἶναι τῆς σκηνῆς αἱ μὴ καταπτᾶσαι μηδέπω: "It is evident that the choral parts were said while the chorus was not 'on the playhouse side and in the performance-place' [*x+y*], but standing outside . . . , for those that had not yet flown down could not be within the performance-place [*y*]". It is plain that the meaning (*x*) has entirely disappeared, else ἐντὸς τῆς σκηνῆς would mean "within the scene building."[1]  Once established, this new meaning spread rapidly and soon became common in many other combinations. This new development included within its scope the space occupied by both chorus and actors; *cf.* schol. Æsch., *Eumen.*, 35: παρ᾽ ὀλίγον ἔρημος ἡ σκηνὴ γίνεται, οὔτε γὰρ ὁ χορός πω πάρεστιν, ἥ τε ἱέρεια εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ναόν. The usage is especially common in the dramatic scholia, but is not infrequently found in Lucian and other late writers.

Owing to the difference of structure in the Roman theater, where the place of both actors and chorus was a raised stage, σκηνή acquired that meaning also (5); *cf.* Pollux, IV, 127.  A discussion of the many other meanings of σκηνή is not needed for understanding Plutarch's usage.

*a*) Of meaning (1) Plutarch furnishes several examples. *Quaestt. conv.*, p. 621 C, has already been quoted and discussed on p. 29, above.  Another instance is *Galba*, 16: τὰς δὲ δωρεάς, ἃς Νέρων ἔδωκε τοῖς περὶ σκηνὴν καὶ παλαίστραν κτλ.  Οἱ περὶ σκηνήν is, of course, equivalent to οἱ ἐπὶ (ἀπὸ) τῆς σκηνῆς,[2] "general" examples of which—viz., *An seni*, p. 785 C, and *Sulla*, 2 (twice)—have already been quoted on p. 35, above.  "General" instances of ἐπὶ (ἀπὸ) τῆς σκηνῆς—viz., *Quaestt. conv.*, 709 D; *An seni*, p. 785 B, and 791 E; *De Alex. fort.*, p. 337 E; *Demetr.*, 41; *Theseus*, 16; *Amator.*, p. 757 A; *De poet. aud.*, p. 35 F, and *De glor. Ath.*, p. 348 EF—have been cited on pp. 33 f., above.

The primary significance of τραγικὴ σκηνή appears in *Quomodo*

---

[1] *Cf.* schol. EURIP., *Hippol.*, 776: ἐξάγγελος δὲ ὁ τὰ πεπραγμένα ἔνδον τῆς σκηνῆς τῷ χορῷ ἀγγέλλων.

[2] *Cf. Dio* Cass., LX, 23: οἱ περὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τεχνῖται.  Παρὰ σκηνήν in *Otho*, 5, probably has no theatrical application, but is a mere reproach at the troops for being "feather-bed soldiers."

*adul.*, p. 56 F: τί δὲ Νέρωνι τραγικὴν ἐπήξατο σκηνὴν καὶ προσωπεῖα καὶ κοθόρνους περιέθηκεν; οὐχ ὁ τῶν κολακευόντων ἔπαινος; Nero's well-known pride in his tragic acting was, of course, made possible and fostered by the sycophantic praise of his courtiers; in other words, they furnished the required environment and accessories. The secondary meaning of the phrase occurs in *Demetr.*, 28: τὴν δὲ διήγησιν ὥσπερ ἐκ κωμικῆς σκηνῆς πάλιν εἰς τραγικὴν μετάγουσιν αἱ τύχαι καὶ αἱ πράξεις τοῦ ἀνδρός (Demetrius); *i. e.*, the narrative changes from a joyous theme to a tragic one. Müller (*Philologus*, Spbd. VII, p. 24) gives this same interpretation, which, as I have said before, stands out of all relation to the meanings which he assigns these phrases elsewhere.

Further instances of meaning (2) are found elsewhere; *cf.* *Praec. ger.*, p. 823 E: χρὴ . . . . μὴ ταπεινοῦσθαι μηδ' ἐκπεπλῆ- χθαι τὴν ἐκ θεάτρων καὶ ὀπτανείων καὶ πολυανδρίων προσισταμένην τοῖς ὄχλοις δόξαν, ὡς ὀλίγον χρόνον ἐπιζῶσαν καὶ τοῖς μονομάχοις καὶ ταῖς σκηναῖς ὁμοῦ συνδιαλυομένην, ἔντιμον δὲ μηδὲν μηδὲ σεμνὸν ἔχουσαν. Since the performance itself was the only thing that had as fleeting an existence as the glory gained by the donor of the spectacles, no other interpretation is possible. A similar explanation must be given a passage which has never been under- stood, *De esu carn.*, p. 996 B: τὴν δὲ μεγάλην καὶ μυστηριώδη καὶ ἄπιστον ἀνδράσι δειλοῖς, ᾗ φησιν ὁ Πλάτων, καὶ θνητὰ φρονοῦσιν ἀρχὴν τοῦ δόγματος ὀκνῶ μὲν ἔτι τῷ λόγῳ κινεῖν, ὥσπερ ναῦν ἐν χειμῶνι ναύκληρος ἢ μηχανὴν αἴρει ποιητικὸς ἀνὴρ ἐν θεάτρῳ σκηνῆς περι- φερομένης. Misled by the participle περιφερομένης, Reisch (*Griech- isches Theater*, p. 288) sees a reference to the *scaena ductilis*, and Müller (*op. cit.*, p. 16) to the *periactoi*. But since a change in the location of the scenic action does not necessitate the use of the *deus ex machina* nor *vice versa*, these suggestions are unin- telligible. It must first be noted that περιφέρεσθαι is often employed of other than literal motion. Thus it is used of the youthful Dionysius who was "dizzy" with the responsibilities of his office (*Dion*, 11: νέας ψυχῆς ἐξουσίᾳ μεγάλῃ καὶ δυνάμει περιφε- ρομένης), of Clodius Macer, who, being unable either to accept or reject the imperial dignity, was in a constant state of "wavering" (*Galba*, 6: ἐν τῷ μήτε κατέχειν μήτε ἀφιέναι τὴν ἀρχὴν δύνασθαι

περιφερόμενος), and in St. Paul's injunction to the Ephesians not
to be "carried about" with every wind of doctrine (Ephes. 4:14:
περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας); cf. also *Caesar*, 32,
and *Philop.*, 17. The parallelism of the figures must next be
observed: (*a*) Plutarch (*b*) at the critical moment in his narrative
(*c*) ὀκνεῖ ἔτι κινεῖν τὴν ἀρχήν, (*a*) the shipowner (*b*) ἐν χειμῶνι (*c*)
ὀκνεῖ κινεῖν τὴν ναῦν, and (*a*) the poet (*b*) σκηνῆς περιφερομένης (*c*)
αἴρει τὴν μηχανήν. It thus appears that ἐν χειμῶνι and σκηνῆς
περιφερομένης perform similar functions in their clauses, each
denoting that which impels the subject of the simile to a given
course of action. Now, the *deus ex machina* was employed only
when the difficulties became too great for any other solution. But
this is exactly the thought which Plutarch expresses by σκηνῆς
περιφερομένης, the choice of metaphor probably being influenced
by the preceding nautical figure. When the play was "driven
about" like a ship in a storm—*i. e.*, when the plot became tangled
beyond the possibility of disengagement by the natural action of
the characters—then the poet resorted to the only recourse left
him. The same idea is found several times elsewhere. *Cf.* the
Ποίησις of Antiphanes (Meineke, III, p. 106; Kock, II, p. 90):

> ἔπειθ' ὅταν μηδὲν δύνωντ' (tragic poets) εἰπεῖν ἔτι
> κομιδῇ δ' ἀπειρήκωσιν ἐν τοῖς δράμασιν,
> αἴρουσιν ὥσπερ δάκτυλον τὴν μηχανήν,
> καὶ τοῖς θεωμένοισιν ἀποχρώντως ἔχει,

Plato, *Cratyl.*, p. 425 D: εἰ μὴ ἄρα δή, ὥσπερ οἱ τραγῳδοποιοί,
ἐπειδάν τι ἀπορῶσιν, ἐπὶ τὰς μηχανὰς καταφεύγουσι θεοὺς αἴροντες,
and Cicero, *Nat. Deor.*, I, 20: *ut tragici poetae, cum explicare
argumenti exitum non potestis, confugitis ad deum.* How closely
σκηνή here approaches the meaning "plot" may be seen from the
fact that Cicero uses *argumentum* to express it, though Antiphanes
employs ἐν τοῖς δράμασιν.

A very clear instance of meaning (3) is *Galba*, 1: ἡ δὲ τῶν
Καισάρων ἑστία, τὸ Παλάτιον, ἐν ἐλάσσονι χρόνῳ (than ten months)
τέσσαρας αὐτοκράτορας ὑπεδέξατο, τὸν μὲν εἰσαγόντων ὥσπερ διὰ
σκηνῆς, τὸν δ' ἐξαγόντων. The subject of the participles is not
expressed; possibly they are to be thought of as θεῖα ῥήματα.
The corresponding agent in the simile is the poet. The directing

powers of the universe brought into the palace one ruler follow-
ing immediately upon the exit of his predecessor, just as a poet
has one actor make his entrance as soon as another departs.   In
this connection the verbs could only be used of passing between
scene building   and   performance place.   Several meanings of
σκηνή would be appropriate, but διά limits the application to the
front wall of the scene building or to the scenery.   Entrances and
exits were, of course, made through the doors in the front wall of
the scene building, i. e., διὰ σκηνῆς.

Of meaning (4) there are several examples; cf. Amator., p.
749 A: εὐθὺς ἡ πρόφασις, ἐξ ἧς ὡρμήθησαν οἱ λόγοι, χορὸν αἰτεῖ
τῷ πάθει καὶ σκηνῆς δεῖται, τά τ' ἄλλα δράματος οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει.
The story needed only a sympathetic audience and a place for the
recital.   This meaning is employed figuratively also in De facie,
p. 940 F: ὁ Σύλλας ὑπολαβών, "ἐπίσχες," εἶπεν, "ὦ Λαμπρία, καὶ
παραβαλοῦ τὸ θυρίον τοῦ λόγου, μὴ λάθῃς τὸν μῦθον ὥσπερ εἰς γῆν
ἐξοκείλας καὶ συγχέῃς τὸ δρᾶμα τοὐμὸν ἑτέραν ἔχον σκηνὴν καὶ
διάθεσιν."   Sulla's narrative had a location and theme at variance
with what Lamprias had just been saying.   Still another
instance of this usage is Theseus, 29: εἰσὶ μέντοι λόγοι περὶ
γάμων Θησέως καὶ ἕτεροι, τὴν σκηνὴν διαπεφευγότες.   Plutarch
has just been relating Theseus's relations with Phædra, which
had been dramatically treated by Euripides and others.   He adds
that Theseus had had other matrimonial experiences which had
escaped representation on the scene.   Of meaning (5) I find no
example in Plutarch.

b) Of meaning (1), viz., "scene building," there are several
instances; cf. Aratus, 23: αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς εἰς μέσον προῆλθε;
and Demetr., 34: ὅπλοις μὲν συνέφραξε τὴν σκηνήν.[1]   A passage of
some interest is Phocion, 5: καὶ μέντοι καὶ αὐτόν ποτε τὸν Φωκίωνά
φασι πληρουμένου τοῦ θεάτρου περιπατεῖν ὑπὸ σκηνὴν αὐτὸν ὄντα πρὸς
ἑαυτῷ τὴν διάνοιαν.   This has usually been taken as meaning that
Phocion was walking up and down "behind the scenes,"[2] and that
is undoubtedly the customary meaning of the phrase; cf. p. 50,
below.   Now, ὑπό denotes (to paraphrase Professor Gildersleeve's

---

[1] These two passages are discussed at length on pp. 56 ff. below.

[2] Cf. LANGHORNE's and CLOUGH's translations, and MÜLLER, Philologus, Spbd. VII, p. 15.

phrase concerning ἐπί) "characteristic infraposition." Consequently it must usually be rendered "beneath," but also sometimes "behind;" cf. Herod., I, 12; VII, 61; and IX, 96. This latter meaning is the one here required, but a priori the phrase might mean either behind the scene building or behind its front wall. Now, at Athens there was a colonnade behind the scene building since the time of the Lycurgus theater (Dörpfeld, *Griechisches Theater*, p. 60). Since this seems a more natural place for Phocion to be engaged in collecting his thoughts than behind the scenes, I prefer this interpretation. The phrase has this meaning also in Athen., p. 591 A, who mentions a statue of Eros which was ὑπὸ τὴν σκηνήν.

The primary significance of τραγικὴ σκηνή appears in *Demetr.*, 25, which is given in more detail by Athenaeus.

| Phylarchus *apud* Athen., p. 614 E. | Demetr., 25. |
|---|---|
| φιλόγελως δὲ ἦν καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Πολιορκητής, ὥς φησι Φύλαρχος ἐν τῇ ἕκτῃ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν, ὅς γε καὶ τὴν Λυσιμάχου αὐλὴν κωμικῆς σκηνῆς οὐδὲν διαφέρειν ἔλεγεν· ἐξιέναι γὰρ ἀπ' αὐτῆς πάντας δισυλλάβους· τόν τε Βίθυν χλευάζων καὶ τὸν Πάριν, μεγίστους ὄντας παρὰ τῷ Λυσιμάχῳ, καί τινας ἑτέρους τῶν φίλων· παρὰ δ' αὐτοῦ Πευκέστας καὶ Μενελάους, ἔτι δὲ Ὀξυθέμιδας. ταῦτα δ' ἀκούων ὁ Λυσίμαχος "ἐγὼ τοίνυν," ἔφη, "πόρνην ἐκ τραγικῆς σκηνῆς οὐχ ἑώρακα ἐξιοῦσαν," τὴν αὐλητρίδα Λαμίαν λέγων. ἀπαγγελθέντος δὲ καὶ τούτου πάλιν ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Δημήτριος ἔφη· "ἀλλ' ἡ παρ' ἐμοὶ πόρνη σωφρονέστερον τῆς παρ' ἐκείνῳ Πηνελόπης ζῇ." | ἦν δὲ καὶ πάντων ἀπεχθέστατος ὁ Λυσίμαχος αὐτῷ (Demetrius), καὶ λοιδορῶν εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα τῆς Λαμίας ἔλεγε νῦν πρῶτον ἑωρακέναι πόρνην προερχομένην ἐκ τραγικῆς σκηνῆς· ὁ δὲ Δημήτριος ἔφη τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόρνην σωφρονεστέραν εἶναι τῆς ἐκείνου Πηνελόπης. |

It is likely that Phylarchus was Plutarch's source in this place (cf. Haug, *Quellen Plutarchs*, p. 74), and consequently the minor divergences such as προερχομένην for ἐξιοῦσαν, must be due to the latter. It is curious, however, that the biographer omits the first remark of Demetrius which led to the whole controversy, since he is usually fond of such things.[1] Τραγικὴ σκηνή is opposed to κωμικὴ σκηνή, which evidently must refer ·to a building of some sort because it is itself compared to an αὐλή. The adjectives are used not simply to show that σκηνή has a theatrical rather than a

---

[1] A significant fact for Wright's third argument; cf. p. 11, n. 1.

military meaning, as in the *Cyropaedia* passage (pp. 41 f., above), but to add point to the jest.    It is, in the first place, termed κωμική because of the comic names borne by Lysimachus's friends;[1] it is then given the epithet τραγική as an antithesis to Demetrius's jibe, and because of his pompous manner of conducting himself; *cf.* *Demetr.*, 41 (p. 33, above), and because harlots never were given a rôle in tragedy.    Müller (*Philologus*, Spbd. VII, p. 16) and Reisch (*Griechisches Theater*, p. 288) see in these passages a reference to the decoration.    But this interpretation gives these phrases meanings of which there are no other examples and which would stand quite apart from their significance elsewhere.    Moreover, in that case we should expect, not ἐξιέναι (προέρχεσθαι) ἐκ, but διεξιέναι or ἐξιέναι διά; *cf.* *Galba*, 1, on p. 47, above.    Inasmuch as Lamia cannot even figuratively be said to have come from a μηχανή, or *Oberbühne* (the meanings which Wieseler and Müller propose for the *Cyropaedia* passage; *cf.* p. 42, above), while she was, of course, continually coming from Demetrius's quarters, of which "tragic" was a very appropriate epithet, it is reasonable to suppose that σκηνή has its primary meaning.    We have already seen that these phrases had this meaning in Demetrius's time, and, as Plutarch uses them without explanation, it must have been current usage in his day also.

Of meaning (2) there happens to be no instance in "specific" passages.    For (3) *cf.* *Aratus*, 15: πρότερον . . . . τὸν Αἰγύπτιον ἐθαύμαζε (Aratus) πλοῦτον . . . . νυνὶ δὲ ὑπὸ σκηνὴν ἑωρακὼς πάντα τὰ ἐκεῖ πράγματα τραγῳδίαν ὄντα καὶ σκηνογραφίαν ὅλος ἡμῖν προσκεχώρηκεν— words which are put in the mouth of King Antigonus. As just stated, this phrase means either "behind the scene building" or "behind its front wall."    The latter is evidently the meaning here employed and is the more common; *cf.* schol. Arist., *Nub.*, 294; schol. *Ran.*, 257; schol. Aesch., *Eumen.*, 47; and Lucian, *Nero*, 9.    The phrase has a stereotyped meaning "behind the scenes," and is often opposed to ἐπὶ (τῆς) σκηνῆς, "before the scenes;" *cf.* Philost., *Vit. Soph.*, I, 9, 1: οἷς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τε καὶ ὑπὸ σκηνῆς χρὴ πράττειν.

---

[1] The point of Demetrius's remark lay in the fact that slaves, who usually had short names, played a prominent part in New Comedy; *cf.* BERGK, *Griechische Literatur-Ge schichte*, Vol. IV, p. 141, n. 57, and NEIL's edition of ARIST., *Equit.*, p. 6, n. 1.

Of (4) there are two examples. In *Aet. Rom.*, p. 289 D, Plutarch cites Cluvius Rufus in explanation of the term *histriones*: φησὶ γὰρ (Cluvius) . . . . λοιμώδη νόσον ἐν Ῥώμῃ γενομένην (in 364 B. C.) πάντας ὁμαλῶς διαφθεῖραι τοὺς ἐπὶ σκηνὴν προερχομένους· δεηθεῖσιν οὖν αὐτοῖς (the Romans) ἐκ Τυρρηνίας ἐλθεῖν πολλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς τεχνίτας, ὧν τὸν πρωτεύοντα δόξῃ καὶ χρόνον πλεῖστον ἐνευημεροῦντα τοῖς θεάτροις Ἵστρον ὀνομάζεσθαι· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πάντας ἱστρίωνας᾽ ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνου προσαγορεύεσθαι. It is clear that ἐπὶ σκηνήν with a verb of motion is equivalent to ἐπὶ σκηνῆς with a verb of rest, and it has already been explained how the latter phrase gave rise to the meaning "performance place" or "scene." Though we are not in a position to say so positively, it is extremely doubtful whether σκηνή had already acquired this signification as early as 364 B. C. Incidentally, we may also point out that it is agreed that societies of Dionysian artists did not arise till considerably later than the time here mentioned.[1] A still clearer instance of modernization is *De aud. poet.*, p. 19 E: ὁ Εὐριπίδης εἰπεῖν λέγεται πρὸς τοὺς τὸν Ἰξίονα λοιδοροῦντας ὡς ἀσεβῆ καὶ μιαρόν, "οὐ μέντοι πρότερον αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐξήγαγον ἢ τῷ τροχῷ προσηλῶσαι." The context requires that ἐκ τῆς σκηνῆς here should mean either "from the scene" or "from the stage." As no instance of the latter significance occurs in Plutarch, we must choose the former. But it is certain that in Euripides's day the phrase could have meant only "from the scene building," which is entirely inapplicable to this passage. If such a sentiment was ever actually expressed by the dramatist, he probably said ἐκ τῆς ὀρχήστρας or ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου, or employed the verb alone; *cf.* Xen., *Hell.*, VI, 4, 16, on p. 12, above.

## E. Προσκήνιον.[2]

The etymological meaning of προσκήνιον is "the front part of the σκηνή" or "the structure in front of the σκηνή." The name is specifically attached to the colonnade in front of the scene building in the theater at Oropos by an inscription on the architrave (Dörpfeld, *Griechisches Theater*, p. 105; the dedica-

---

[1] *Cf.* POLAND, *De col. artif. Dion.*, p. 9, and ZIEBARTH, *Gr. Vereinswesen*, p. 78. For the whole story *cf.* LIVY, VII, 2.

[2] Besides the authorities already cited *cf.* NOACK, *Philologus*, Vol. LVIII (1899), pp. 1 ff., and PUCHSTEIN, *Griechische Bühne*, pp. 40–43.

tion belongs to the first or second century B. C.). Similar
inscriptions are found at Kalymna (*Inscriptions in the British
Museum*, II, 231) and elsewhere. It is equally certain that in
the Roman theaters the name was applied to the whole stage
structure in front of the *scaena; cf.* Vitruv., V, 6, 1: *linea
ducatur, quae disiungat proscaenii pulpitum* [ = stage] *et orches-
trae regionem.* Whether in the Greek theaters προσκήνιον ever
was used of the top of the stone colonnade which replaced the
earlier wooden structure is a mooted question and too involved
for the present discussion. There is reason to believe that Plu-
tarch at least never so employed it, and in my opinion his usage
is in conformity with Greek usage in general.

  *a*) An unusually clear case is found in *Lycurg.*, 6: οὐθὲν γὰρ
ᾤετο (Lycurgus) ταῦτα (ornamental buildings) πρὸς εὐβουλίαν
εἶναι, μᾶλλον δὲ βλάπτειν, φλυαρώδεις ἀπεργαζόμενα καὶ χαύνους
φρονήματι κενῷ τὰς διανοίας τῶν συμπορευομένων, ὅταν εἰς ἀγάλματα
καὶ γραφὰς ἢ προσκήνια θεάτρων ἢ στέγας βουλευτηρίων ἠσκημένας
περιττῶς ἐκκλησιάζοντες ἀποβλέπωσι. The language is manifestly
perfectly general, being an explanation of Lycurgus's enactment
that Spartan assemblies should be held in places free of buildings.
The only possible meaning for προσκήνιον here is that it was that
part of the theater which the assembly looked at; *i. e.*, the front
wall. Plutarch has committed two anachronisms: he assumes that
Lycurgus was familiar with a fully developed theater building,
and that it had already come to be used elsewhere as the meeting-
place of the popular assembly. It is, of course, impossible that
he should ever have seen any kind of a theater, with or without a
proscenium; *cf.* p. 24, above.

  *b*) The solitary instance of προσκήνιον in a "specific" passage
is *Non posse suav.*, p. 1096 B: καὶ ⟨τί⟩[1] χαλκοῦν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐν
Πέλλῃ βουλόμενον ποιῆσαι τὸ προσκήνιον οὐκ εἴασεν ὁ τεχνίτης, ὡς
διαφθεροῦντα τῶν ὑποκριτῶν τὴν φωνήν. This passage has called
forth much ingenuity in the attempt to discover whether the
ancients thought a background or a floor had the more effect
upon a person's voice. That they attributed influence to the
latter, Puchstein, relying mostly upon [Aristot.] *Probl.*, XI, 25

---

[1] The addition is mine. The sentence stands in a series of five questions, each of which,
with this exception, is introduced by τί or διὰ τί; manifestly they ought all to be alike.

(p. 16, above), has shown. That the influence also of the former was recognized, however, cannot be denied. Too little attention has been paid to the fact that the inquiries as to the effect of chaff in an orchestra and of a brass proscenium are cited as examples of the questions which interested Aristotle, Theophrastus, Dicaearchus, and Hieronymus. Apparently the underlying principles were not known to everyone; these cases required more than the generally-known theories of sound. It is clear that the objection to a brass proscenium did not present itself to Alexander in advance, though he had the best of teachers, and had received instruction in this particular branch as well; cf. Alex., 7. That Puchstein can cite more passages on the effect of a floor than on the effect of a background is a simple matter; the latter was a commonplace, while the former was not. Furthermore, we do not know whether the ancients considered the architect's objection valid. The upshot of the whole matter is that this passage cannot be quoted as evidence one way or the other. Consequently, there is no reason for an interpretation inconsistent with the meaning for the term in Plutarch which we have already established.

### F. Πάροδος.

In the fifth century the passages leading along the scene building and into the orchestra were known as δίοδοι; cf. Arist., Thesm., 658, on p. 39, above; or εἴσοδοι; cf. idem, Nub., 326; Av., 296, and fr. 388, 2 (Kock). Later they received the name πάροδοι; cf. Aristot. Eth. Nic., IV, 6, p. 1123a and [Democritus] fr. 249 on p. 41, above, and this name alone persisted. In theaters of the Romanized (Asia Minor) type the old πάροδοι led to the stage (by means of ramps) as well as to the orchestra. The designation was employed also of the entrances to the stage from the side wings.

a) It so happens that there is no instance of this word in Plutarch in a "general" passage. The usage is, of course, not doubted; cf. Pollux, IV, 126.[1]

b) Two examples of πάροδος are found in "specific" passages;

[1] The term is used of the opening chorus of a play in De glor. Ath., p. 348 E, and An seni, p. 785 A.

*cf. Aratus*, 23: ἐπιστήσας (Aratus) ταῖς παρόδοις ἐκατέρωθεν τοὺς Ἀχαιούς, which evidently has the old meaning of orchestral entrances.   The other instance is *Demetr.*, 34: καταβάς (Demetrius), ὥσπερ οἱ τραγῳδοί, διὰ τῶν ἄνω παρόδων.   Now, αἱ ἄνω πάροδοι implies αἱ κάτω πάροδοι.   The latter could only be the parodoi *par excellence; i. e.*, the entrances to the orchestra.   In that case the upper paradoi may conceivably have been (1) the ramps leading from the orchestra paradoi to the logeion (*i. e.* of the Romanized theater with a stage; *cf.* Puchstein, *Griechische Bühne*, pp. 80 and 96), (2) the central doors in the proscenium, or (3) side entrances to the stage from the parascenia (*cf.* Puchstein, *ibid.*, p. 98).   Inasmuch as the ramps were scarcely the entrances κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν for the τραγῳδοί, and the central doors could hardly be called *side* entrances, I incline to the last interpretation. In other words, Demetrius came from the parascenium upon the logeion (which is mentioned in the context; *cf.* p. 56), and spoke thence.   The very contrast between "upper" and "lower" shows that the Plutarch had a transitional type of theater in mind, since in the old style of theater all the entrances to the place of action were "lower," and in the Roman theater they were all "upper."   This interpretation accords with the Nero theater of Plutarch's day, but not with the Lycurgus theater.   We have, then, another case of anachronism.

## G.  Λογεῖον.

Etymologically λογεῖον means "speaking-place," and it seems during its whole history to have been the *vox propria* for the place occupied by the speakers in the public assemblies—a fact which clearly appears from *Praec. ger.*, p. 823 B: διαλλακτὴν . . . . παρέχων ἑαυτὸν οὐ μικρὸν ἡμέρας μέρος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἢ τοῦ λογείου πολιτευόμενος.   The good citizen must spend much of his time in the law courts and the public assemblies.   Here any reference to the λογεῖον as the actors' place is, of course, out of the question.   The sophist Phrynichus (p. 250, Rutherford's ed.), whose carefulness would scarcely allow us to suppose him mistaken concerning the usage of his own time, states that tragic and comic actors performed in the logeion: σὺ μέντοι, ἔνθα μὲν κωμῳδοὶ

καὶ τραγῳδοὶ ἀγωνίζονται, λογεῖον ἐρεῖς · ἔνθα δὲ οἱ αὐληταὶ καὶ οἱ χοροί, ὀρχήστραν καὶ μὴ θυμέλην. Additional information for the same general period is afforded by the words βῆμα θεήτρου which appear in an inscription on the highest of the steps leading to the Phædrus stage of the theater at Athens (C. I. A., III, 239). The conclusion that this stage was the speaking-place of the actors and orators in the third or fourth century A. D.—i. e., was the λογεῖον—is inevitable. An inscription from Patara for the year 147 A. D. carries us back a century or more—C. I. G., 4283: Οὐειλία . . . . Πρόκλα Παταρὶς ἀνέθηκεν καὶ καθιέρωσεν . . . . τὴν τοῦ λογείου κατασκευὴν καὶ πλάκωσιν—words which can hardly be understood of any other meaning that has ever been proposed for λογεῖον than "stage." Moreover, Vitruvius, V, 7, 2, supplies similar testimony for the beginning of the imperial period: habent . . . . Graeci . . . . pulpitum, quod λογεῖον appellant.[1] On the other hand, there is good reason for believing that at Athens from the earliest times the orchestra served as the place of the speaker in assemblies which were held in the theater. Thus, from Isocr., De pace, 82 (p. 26, above), and Aesch., Ctes., 156, 176, and 230, it appears that crowning and other public business was done in the orchestra. The latest reference occurs in Athenaeus, who preserves the contemporaneous account by Posidonius of the rise of Athenion to a tyranny at Athens in 88 B. C.; cf. Athen., p. 213 E: οἱ ὄχλοι συνδραμόντες εἰς τὸ θέατρον εἵλοντο τὸν Ἀθηνίωνα στρατηγὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων. καὶ παρελθὼν ὁ περιπατητικὸς εἰς τὴν ὀρχήστραν . . . . εὐχαρίστησέ τε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ ἔφη κτλ. It thus seems that about the beginning of the Christian era the speakers in the Greek assemblies, when held in the theater, were transferred from the orchestra to a raised platform, which was known as λογεῖον. A difficulty arises, however, from the fact that λογεῖον appears upon Delian inscriptions long before this. Thus for the year 279 B. C. (Bull. Cor. Hel., Vol. XVIII [1894], p. 162) occurs: εἰς τὸ λο[γε]ῖον[2] τῆς σκηνῆς . . . μον τετράπηχυν;

[1] The term occurs also in the scholia to ARIST., Ran., 181 and 297, and Equit., 149, the writers of which must have had this same (Romanized) type of theater in mind.

[2] The restoration has been doubted by Reisch and others on the ground that there is not room at the beginning of the line for these letters; but Dörpfeld accepts it; cf. Gr. Theat., pp. 148 and 302. HOMOLLE gave the reading λ[ογε]ῖον in his first publication of the stone and [λογε]ῖον in his second; cf. Bull. Cor. Hel., Vol. XIV (1890), p. 401, and Vol. XVIII

and for 180 B. C. (*ibid.*, p. 165): [ξύλον . . . . κατεχρήσθη εἰς]
τὴν κατασκευὴν τῶν πινάκων τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ λογεῖον. The dilemma
thus arising has so far baffled everyone. To suppose that the
orators occupied a different place at Delos than at Athens is
highly improbable. The only hypothesis consistent with the
known facts is that the term suffered a change of meaning (so
Reisch, *Griechisches Theater*, p. 302), but precisely what its
earlier meaning was has not yet been made out.

a) Besides the instance already quoted (p. 54), λογεῖον occurs
but once in "general" passages; cf. *Theseus*, 16: ἐπικρατήσαντες
οἱ τραγικοὶ πολλὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ λογείου καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀδοξίαν αὐτοῦ
(Minos) κατεσκέδεσαν. The collocation of words is similar to that
in Pliny, *Ep.*, IV, 25: *ludibria scaena et pulpito digna;* and it
is fairly certain that λογεῖον here means "stage." Though the
statement is not "specific," yet, inasmuch as in the immediate
context Plutarch has twice quoted Euripides as to the nature of
the Minotaur, and Minos is known to have been treated dramat-
ically by Sophocles in the Δαίδαλος and in the Καμικοί (identi-
fied by some with the Μίνως), and by Euripides in the Κρῆτες, it
is evident that Plutarch has the latter half of the fifth century in
mind and has assumed the presence of a logeion in that period.
Such an assumption, however, is highly improbable upon any
theory of the term's history.[1]

b) Λογεῖον occurs but once in a "specific" passage; cf. *Demetr.*,
34: οὕτως οὖν τῆς πόλεως (Athens) ἐχούσης εἰσελθὼν ὁ Δημήτριος
καὶ κελεύσας εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἀθροισθῆναι πάντας, ὅπλοις μὲν συνέ-
φραξε τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ δορυφόροις τὸ λογεῖον περιέλαβεν, αὐτὸς δὲ
καταβάς, ὥσπερ οἱ τραγῳδοί, διὰ τῶν ἄνω παρόδων, ἔτι μᾶλλον
ἐκπεπληγμένων τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ λόγου πέρας ἐποιήσατο
τοῦ δέους αὐτῶν. The plan here described was a favorite in
antiquity and is often mentioned; cf. *Aratus*, 23: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀσφα-
λῶς ἐδόκει πάντα ἔχειν, κατέβαινεν εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἀπὸ τῆς ἄκρας,

(1894), p. 162. The text above is due to MR. D. M. ROBINSON, who has recently examined the
stone and will soon publish his readings in an article in the *American Journal of Philology*.
He kindly allows me to announce that λ᾽ appears at the end of the preceding line, and that
consequently there is ample space for two letters (of which traces can be seen) at the begin-
ning of the second line. There is thus no reason to suspect the restoration.

[1] The fact that λογεῖον and σκηνή do not occur in [PLAT.] *Minos*, pp. 319 B–321 A, to which
Plutarch is at least ultimately indebted for the thought, lends color to the supposition that
he has added these details from the theater of his day.

πλήθους ἀπείρου συρρέοντος ἐπιθυμίᾳ τῆς τε ὄψεως αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν λόγων, οἷς ἔμελλε χρῆσθαι πρὸς τοὺς Κορινθίους. ἐπιστήσας δὲ ταῖς παρόδοις ἑκατέρωθεν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς εἰς μέσον προῆλθε, . . . . διεξῆλθε λόγον, and also *Pelop.*, 29; Polyb., XI, 27, 6; and Polyaen., *Strateg.*, VI, 10. Now, in the Demetrius passage it is apparent that ὅπλοις συνέφραξε τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ τὸ λογεῖον περιέλαβεν is merely an amplification of the ἐπιστήσας ταῖς παρόδοις ἑκατέρωθεν of the Aratus episode, while the reference to the upper parodoi and the τραγῳδοί shows that λογεῖον means "stage." The guards, then, were stationed in front of the stage, along the parodoi, and about the front of the scene building—a description which ignores the fact that the Athenian theater had other entrances to the auditorium than those leading to the orchestra. The manner of Demetrius's appearance is mooted. He is said to have "come down through the upper parodoi like the tragic actors." We have already (p. 54) seen reasons for believing that these αἱ ἄνω πάροδοι were passages from the parascenia opening upon the logeion. Demetrius, then, came from the parascenium upon the logeion and spoke thence. The expression used of Aratus (ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς εἰς μέσον προῆλθε) is colorless, and might mean that he came from the scene building either upon the logeion or into the orchestra. It is reasonable, however, to explain the one passage by the other. But this whole interpretation is liable to one objection—the word καταβάς. In theatrical usage this word is said to have meant ἀπαλλάττε- σθαι.[1] This explanation must be considered doubtful, however; and, furthermore, we have here a case, not of exit, but of entrance. On the other hand, the literal meaning of the term is inapplicable, since the passing from the scene building to the logeion involved no difference in level.[2] To obviate this difficulty Müller (*Phi- lologus*, Supplementband VII, pp. 52 f.) maintains that Deme- trius descended the flight of steps that led from the logeion to

---

[1] *Cf.* schol. ARIST., *Equit.*, 148. But see the comments thereon by WHITE, "The 'Stage' in Aristophanes," *Harvard Studies*, Vol. II (1891), pp. 164 ff.; by CAPPS, "The Stage in the Greek Theater according to the Extant Dramas," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. XXII (1891), pp. 64 ff.; and especially by BODENSTEINER, "Szenische Fra- gen," *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Supplementband XIX (1893), p. 700.

[2] This point is entirely overlooked by ROBERT in his discussion of the passage, *Hermes*, Vol. XXXII (1897), pp. 448 ff.

the orchestra.  Against this view several objections must be urged: (1) these steps were in no sense *side* entrances; (2) we have reason to believe that there was only one such flight, and therefore Plutarch would have used the singular (διὰ τῆς ἄνω παρόδου) rather than the plural; (3) in theaters which had a stage, that was the more natural place for speaking; and (4) the phrase ὥσπερ οἱ τραγῳδοί is inconsistent with this explanation.  An examination of the Aratus episode reveals what I conceive to be the true interpretation.  There occurs the expression κατέβαινε εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἀπὸ τῆς ἄκρας, of which I think καταβάς is a condensation.  The original account probably told how Demetrius entered the city and made his headquarters on the acropolis, whence, his preparations completed, he descended to the theater. Plutarch retained the rest, but omitted the second item, without which καταβάς is ambiguous.[1]  Κατελθεῖν and καταβαίνοντες are only slightly less indefinite in *Solon*, 12: τοὺς συνωμότας τοῦ Κύλωνος ἱκετεύοντας τὴν θεὸν Μεγακλῆς ὁ ἄρχων ἐπὶ δίκῃ κατελθεῖν ἔπεισεν· ἐξάψαντας δὲ τοῦ ἕδους κρόκην κλωστὴν καὶ ταύτης ἐχομένους, ὡς ἐγένοντο περὶ τὰς σεμνὰς θεὰς καταβαίνοντες, αὐτομάτως τῆς κρόκης ῥαγείσης, ὥρμησε συλλαμβάνειν ὁ Μεγακλῆς καὶ οἱ συνάρχοντες.  The conspirators, as we know from other sources,[2] were descending from the Acropolis; and yet this is far from being explicitly stated in our text.  Similarly, ἄνω is employed meaning "on the Pnyx" in *Nicias*, 7: λέγεται γὰρ ἐκκλησίας ποτὲ οὔσης τὸν μὲν δῆμον καθήμενον ἄνω περιμένειν πολὺν χρόνον.  If this explanation is correct, only the final stage of the action described by the participle is included in the following simile:  "Upon descending from the acropolis (κατά-) Demetrius came (-βάς) through the upper parodos like the tragic actors."  As he could

[1] Notice the pregnant use of the word in *Pyrr.*, 12: ἀναβὰς εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν καὶ θύσας τῇ θεῷ καὶ καταβάς.

[2] *Cf.* Herod., V, 71; Thuc., I, 126, 10, 11; and especially schol. Arist., *Equit.*, 445: οἱ συγκατακλεισθέντες τῷ Κύλωνι ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει εἰς τὶν κρίσιν κατέβησαν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ.  For other cases of careless transcription *cf. Themist.*, 10, where it is said that in 480 B. C. the Athenians sailed εἰς τὴν νῆσον, meaning Salamis, though that does not appear from the context; and *Pericles*, 13, where we are told the musical contests were held καὶ τότε καὶ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον in the Odeum of Pericles.  Now, Frei (*De cert. thym.*, p. 12) has shown that toward the close of the fourth century these contests were transferred to the Dionysian theater.  Plutarch's source here is Ephorus (*cf.* Fowler, *Harvard Studies*, Vol. XII [1901], pp. 212 f., who gives the bibliography), who must have written this portion of his history before the transfer was effected.

have passed through only one of the parodoi, we must suppose that the plural is either a *pluralis maiestatis* or is due to the plural τραγῳδοί. Such I conceive to be the meaning of Plutarch's words,[1] and it accords perfectly with all we know of the theater of his time. Is it also a picture of what actually happened in the fourth century?

The uncertainty concerning the history and meaning of λογεῖον and concerning the fourth-century theater forbids a positive answer. Müller (*Philologus*, Supplementband VII, p. 53) and Robert (*Hermes*, Vol. XXXII [1897], p. 447) reply affirmatively and cite this account to prove the existence of a stage in the Lycurgus theater, while Reisch (*Griechisches Theater*, pp. 302 and 281), Dörpfeld (*ibid.*, pp. 348 and 395), and Noack (*Philologus*, Vol. LVIII [1899], pp. 20 ff.) explain it away. To any believer in the Dörpfeld theory the passage must seem anachronistic. Of course, the fact that λογεῖον occurs in inscriptions as early as 279 B. C. shows that it may have been current (with some meaning other than "stage") at Athens a quarter of a century earlier, and so may possibly have been in Plutarch's source. In that case he simply retained the word in a different sense and added the "upper parodoi" and the rest. In view of my study of Plutarch's methods, however, and of his comparative fondness for using λογεῖον,[2] I consider this supposition unnecessary. The case is strikingly like *Theseus*, 16 (*cf.* p. 56 and n. 1, above), where the preservation of the source clearly shows the operation of the modernizing process.

[1] I know of but one other case of this verb's being used in such a context; *cf.* Dio Cass., LXII, 29 (Xiphilinus): καί ποτε καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ θεάτρου ὀρχήστραν ἐν πανδήμῳ τινὶ θέᾳ κατέβη (Nero) καὶ ἀνέγνω Τρωικά τινα ἑαυτοῦ ποιήματα, where the epitomizing process has left both the place and the circumstances uncertain. Dion's own account would, I think, be in harmony with the explanation given in the text.

[2] Plutarch seems to use λογεῖον more than any other Greek writer.

# CONCLUSION.

FROM the preceding study it is clear that Plutarch modernized
not only in vague and indefinite allusions to past events (*i. e.*, in
"general" passages), where nearly everyone occasionally lapses,
but that also in specific references to a particular event at a par-
ticular time and place in the past (*i. e.*, in "specific" passages)
there are not a few instances where he has translated the account
into the terms of his own day, while in no case has he preserved an
obsolete word or meaning (unexplained) for the sake of historical
accuracy. The conclusion is irresistible that in theatrical matters
it was his invariable habit to modernize. This rule is, of course,
subject to obvious modifications; *e. g.*, when he professedly gives
a piece of antiquarian information, he states the facts regardless
of later usage, and follows his source more closely.[1] Thus, when
he says that in the time of Pericles musical contests were held in
the Odeum (*Peric.*, 13; *cf.* p. 58, n. 2, above), his statement is at
variance with the practice of his time. Again, he often uses an
unfamiliar or obsolete word and adds an explanation of it (*cf.* his
elucidation of δεικηλίκτας in *Ages.*, 21). Still again, he often
retains vague and indefinite expressions which could be used with
almost equal propriety of any type of theater (*cf.* the ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς
εἰς μέσον προῆλθε of *Aratus*, 23, on p. 57, above), and sometimes
did this without noticing that, if such a phrase were pressed, it
would prove at variance with the theater of his day (*cf.* the ἀφῆκεν
εἰς τὴν γῆν τὸ σῶμα of *Marcellus*, 20, in p. 26, n. 1, above). But
after all due allowances have been made, the fact remains that,
whenever theatrical terms and institutions are mentioned inci-
dentally and without explanation, and are not themselves the
subject of discussion, he always adapts his authorities to current
usage. Ignorance of this rule has caused an improper use of
many passages in Plutarch. Thus, Müller (*Bühnenalterthümer*,
p. 74) cites *Phoc.*, 34, to prove that assemblies were held in the
theater in the fourth century; *Aratus*, 53 (*ibid.*, p. 403), to prove

[1] *Cf.* the introduction to the SIEFERT-BLASS edition of *Pericles*, p. 65.

that thymelic performers belonged to the σύνοδοι of Dionysian artists during the Hellenistic period; and *Peric.*, 9 (*ibid.*, p. 348), to prove that the theoric fund was established by Pericles (*cf.* pp. 21 f., above). Similarly, Haigh (*Attic Theatre*, p. 76, 2d ed.) uses *Phoc.*, 31, to show that the agonothesia was instituted in 319 B. C. And again, Robert (*Hermes*, Vol. XXXII (1897), pp. 448 ff.) and Müller (*Philologus*, Supplementband VII, p. 52) employ *Demetr.*, 34, to prove the existence of a stage in the Lycurgus theater at Athens. Some of these contentions are demonstrably wrong, others are undoubtedly correct. The point which I wish to make is that conclusions concerning theatrical matters cannot thus be drawn from Plutarch's incidental allusions to the customs and institutions of preceding periods. On the other hand, recognition of this rule will result in a qualification of the strictures that have often been passed upon the biographer. Plutarch had little confidence in the results attained in the field of chronology, and still less use for them.[1] His aim was not the discovery of the historical sequence of events so much as the portrayal of praiseworthy qualities. Consequently, the appositeness of a story to the character under consideration (*cf.* πρέποντα τῷ ἤθει and context in *Solon*, 27) always seemed more important to him than the mere fact that the story was declared chronologically impossible. And in this it has remained for a modern historian[2] to vindicate his point of view and justify the place which he assigned to apocryphal anecdote. In addition to this, we find that he deliberately sought vividness of presentation by modernizing his accounts and picturing his scenes amid the familiar surroundings of contemporaneous life. Thus, his temperament, purpose, and artistic sense combined to lead him from the straight path of historical exactness. The knowledge that this was conscious and intentional, and not due to ignorance, should do much to clear his reputation.

---

[1] *Cf.* WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF, *Aristoteles und Athen*, Vol. II, p. 290: "Plutarch ist ein stilistisch hervorragender, historisch urteilsloser, chronologisch unbekümmerter Mann."

[2] *Cf.* FREEMAN, *Historical Essays*, Second Series, p. 276: "He might even have gone on to say that an apocryphal anecdote often throws as much light on a man's character as an authentic one; current stories about people are often, perhaps generally, exaggerated; but the peculiar qualities which are picked out for exaggeration are pretty sure to show what a man's character really is."

It has already been said (p. 8) above, that in the "general" passages Plutarch must have had in mind one particular type of theater, and that, too, one which was as familiar to his readers as to himself; and that all information concerning it in such passages should be consistent with itself. Now, it results from Plutarch's modernizing tendency that all this must be equally true of the "specific" passages as well. And that they are in perfect agreement with the "general" passages and with information furnished by other contemporaneous writers similarly situated has already appeared. In other words, all theatrical information in Plutarch refers to a single well-known type of theater.

At this point it is well to recall what public Plutarch had in mind and with what theaters it was most familiar. The friends to whom he dedicated his works and who figure in his dialogues are all Greeks and Romans of more or less prominence.[1] We can assume, then, that by residence or travel they were all acquainted with the so-called Nero theater at Athens, and nearly all with the Pompey theater at Rome. Inasmuch as Plutarch expressly says (*Pomp.*, 42) that the latter was of the Asia Minor type, and as the former was a Romanized form of the Greek (mainland) type, they may both be taken as examples of the same style. Exactly what information, then, does Plutarch give regarding these theaters? In the first place, they had a scene building or dressing-room (σκηνή), the wall or colonnade in front of which was known as the προσκήνιον. This σκηνή was furnished with a stage (λογεῖον), where stood the speakers in the public assemblies, the actors, mimes, etc.; while in the orchestra (ὀρχήστρα or θυμέλη) the dithyrambic choruses, dancers, aulodes, etc., performed. There were upper and lower sets of entrances (πάροδοι), the former probably leading from the side wings upon the stage and the latter to the logeion and into the orchestra. These results, though not startling, are of value because they are certain, since based upon a method which eliminates all doubt as to the use which can be made of Plutarch as a source of information in theatrical matters, while

[1] *Cf.* VOLKMANN, *Leben, Schriften und Philosophie des Plutarch* (1869), Vol. I, pp. 38-64; and MUHL, *Plutarchische Studien* (1885), pp. 32-90.

the proper restoration of the theater ruins belonging to this period is still disputed.[1]

In conclusion, it may be in place to review the purpose of the preceding pages. Although we have gained a new interpretation of not a few obscure passages and have obtained a glimpse of first-century technical terminology, as pictured in Plutarch, which may prove useful in interpreting the remains, these are side issues and incidental. We have learned the use which can be made of Plutarch as a source of information in a particular field, and this is something which must be determined for several other authors before the statements in our handbooks will be guarded against every avoidable error. The application of the same method will, of course, vary with the circumstances of each case. Thus, Lucian can be treated most like Plutarch, for while he offers few instances of what I have called "specific" passages, and while his aims were widely different from Plutarch's, he resembled him by being equally complaisant in his treatment of historical fact.[2] Whether he modernized always or occasionally will, of course, appear only upon examination, At the opposite extreme stand professed antiquarians like Athenaeus (in certain parts of his work) and Pollux, who consulted handbooks of antiquities in the fields which interested them. Here there is little to learn but the degree of exactness and intelligence with which they reproduced their sources. The latter, it is true, added his own knowledge to what he derived from his handbooks, so that in the result notices belonging to entirely different periods are inextricably commingled; but with both authors conscious modernization is clearly out of the question. Somewhere between these extremes belong writers like Pausanias, whose personal observations must be accepted at full value, but whose conclusions regarding what he saw and heard and read well deserve a critical study. And so each author will fit into the scale somewhere, the problems, precise methods, and

---

[1] *Cf.* DÖRPFELD, *Griechisches Theater*, pp. 82 ff., and PUCHSTEIN, *Griechische Bühne*, pp. 100 ff.

[2] I note a few cases in point. In the conversation between Solon and Anacharsis (at Athens about 592 B. C.) Lucian causes it to appear that theaters were already used for public ceremonies and gymnastic contests (*Anachar.*, 10 and 38), that public dramatic performances were already held and associated with Dionysian festivals (*ibid.*, 22, 23), and that the κωμῳδοί and τραγῳδοί already wore thick-soled boots (*ibid.*, 23 and 32).

results changing somewhat with each. Thus the main aim of this paper has been to present a concrete illustration of a method which should prove serviceable in controlling most of these latter writers. In other words, it offers not only an examination of Plutarch's literary method, but also a study in methodology as a suggestion for further investigation.