The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

A. Muller's Greek Theatre *Die Griechischen Bühnenalterthümer*. Müller Von Albert. Freiburg i. B. 1886. Pp. viii. 432. 10 Mk.

Herman Hager

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 10 / December 1887, pp 296 - 298
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184197, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184197

How to cite this article:

Herman Hager (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 296-298 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184197

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

V. 54-56. No note is offered on the personages here mentioned: nor again is any explanation given of the allusions in vv. 109-110 (*sustulit iras — aera tabificum*). 457. *Movitque Ceraunia nautis*, 'brought Ceraunia nearer to the sailors.' Hardly Latin: the Berne scholia say *quoniam montes navigantibus moveri videntur*. 795-6. *Neutergue recedens Sustinuit dixisse vale*. Rightly condemned by Kindler as absent from Montepess. and Voss. sec. (first hands), and as probably a gloss on the preceding words. VI. 382. *Bebrycio*, all the scholia. 475. *Direxit* (made straight) should certainly be written *derexit*: indeed there is some carelessness about orthography in this text, which allows *nequidquam*, *querela*, *diriguit*, *negligo*, *tentare*, and *poenitet* to survive here and there. VII. 2. The Berne scholia mention a variant *lucifugus* for *luctificus*. 141. "*Erigitur* 'is straightened.'" Surely *erigitur* cannot bear this meaning; I had conjectured *derigitur*, when I found that it was the reading of the Berne scholia. 199. Kindler reads *numen* for *lumen*, perhaps rightly. 257-8. *Haec eadem est hodie quae pignora quaeque penates Reddat, et emerito faciat vos Marte colonos*. These lines are omitted in Voss. sec. and added outside the text in Montepess. Kindler points out that *emerito Marte* is not Latin, nor the variant *emerito Marte*, and rightly condemns them. 325. Mr. Haskins translates *iugulum* 'slaughter': with what authority? It is difficult not to suppose the word to be corrupt. *Ignoti hostis* seems most naturally to mean an 'unknown,' i.e. plebeian, enemy: compare 578. *In plebem vetat ire manus monstratque senatum*; then, reading *imputet* with the Berne scholia, we get the general sense that Caesar will count the slaughter of a plebeian as a crime. 398. *Crimen civile*: not 'the guilty result of civil war,' but 'a reproach to the citizens.' 451.

Thyestes the Berne scholia, rightly. 607. The variant mentioned by the scholia, *succensor* for *successor*, should have been mentioned. VIII. 332. *Secundum Emathiam lis tanta datur* = in favour of Emathia: not 'in accordance with the verdict of Thessaly.' 474. '*Monstra*, cf. *infr.* 548'; 548. 'For *monstra* cf. 474. *supr.*' 837. '*Si saecula prima Victoris timere minas*, i.e. cum recens vicerat Caesar. Schol.' Surely the meaning must be 'if the former generations of Rome were afraid that the conqueror would violate, as he had threatened to do, the ashes of the conquered'; in allusion to such a fear, for instance, as moved Sulla to give orders for the burning of his body after death. IX. 435. *Nulla sub illa Cura Iovis terra est*: 'under that ground there is no thought of the sky': as the Berne scholia say, *non curat si non pluat*. In 437 *inmotis* seems to mean 'not stirred by cultivation.' X. 110. *Romana in saecula*: 'fashion, manners.' Can *saecula* mean this, which is usually expressed by *saeculum*? or does not *Romana saecula* rather mean 'the generations of Rome?' True, Juvenal (IV. 68) says *tua servatum consume in saecula rhombum*: 'your ages'; this, however, is the grandiose language of flattery. *Saecula* is also used as = *saeculum*, fashion, in the *Epicedion Drusi*: but this is just one of the points which make against the antiquity of that poem. 219. '*Veterum*, e.g. Euripidis.' Diels points out that the theory came from Anaxagoras, and was also known to Aeschylus.

These remarks are made in the hope that the book, which will certainly hold the field in England, and justly, for a long time to come, may be improved in a second edition. No superhuman labour would be required to this end. It is much to be wished, on all accounts, that a second edition may soon be in demand.

H. NETTLESHIP.

A. MÜLLER'S GREEK THEATRE.

Die Griechischen Bühnenalterthümer. Von ALBERT MÜLLER. Freiburg i. B. 1886. Pp. viii. 432. 10 Mk.

A. MÜLLER originally intended, as we learn from his preface, to treat his subject as an appendix to the third volume of Blümner and Dittenberger's new edition of K. Fr. Hermann's standard work on *Greek Antiquities*; but as the subject required a fuller treatment than it would have been possible

to give it in this shape, he decided to publish it as part 2 of this volume. The book, which contains twenty-two illustrations and plans, is divided into three chapters; the first (p. 1 to 106) deals with the structure of the theatre; first beginnings of dramatic performances; sites and ruins of theatres; the ground-plan of a Greek theatre according to Vitruvius; stage, place of spectators, orchestra; acoustic properties; technical names for the different parts of a theatre; the

Odeion; uses to which theatres were put when not required for performances; the theatres of Athens and Attica. In the second chapter (p. 107 to 308) the parts of a performance are discussed—places of actors and chorus, decorations, doors of the stage, etc.; changes of scene, etc.; actors and acting; chorus; dresses in tragedy, satyric drama, and comedy; masks; spectators. The third chapter (p. 308 to 414) treats of the times when performances took place; the expenses of such performances; poets and instructors of the chorus; state copy of plays, etc.; proagon, judges, didascalia; dramatic performances outside Attica; *σύνοδοι τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνικῶν*. Then follow four pages of addenda and three indices. In the former Müller touches on various points raised in recent publications which he was not able to make use of for the body of the work, and which tend to upset generally received opinions. Lipsius *e.g.* has shown that the comedies were performed separately on one day before the tragedies, that the choregus in a dramatic contest competed in his own name, not in that of his *φυλή*, and that in such a contest not a tripod but a tablet was awarded as prize for the best performance. The views expressed by von Wilamowitz years ago (cf. *Hermes* 21, 4, p. 597 foll.) have been borne out by the excavations in the Dionysiac theatre at Athens, the results of which Dörpfeld has communicated to Müller; he says, before the fourth century there was only a large circular orchestra of polygonal stones, close to the old Dionysiac temple; there were no stone seats, but the spectators sat on the slopes of the Acropolis or at most on wooden benches; there was no solidly built *σκηνή*. Besides this there was a second orchestra in the market-place (to the west of the Areiopagus) which was probably built in the same way. Here it was always necessary to erect high scaffolding for seats, since there was no slope here.—Is this latter not almost certainly the *ὄρχηστρα* mentioned in Plat. *Apol.* 26 D? In Boeckh's opinion this passage refers to the sale of books in the orchestra of the Dionysiac theatre when no performances were going on; Fränkel in his edition of the *Staatshaushalt* (ii. p. 13* f.) objects to this view, and sees in the passage rather an allusion to performances in the theatre (at a drachma admission for the three days) of plays of Euripides which were saturated with the doctrines of Anaxagoras. L. C. Purser (*Class. Rev.* no. 5 and 6, p. 150), as I think, effectually meets Fränkel's objections, and A. Müller (p. 82 n.) is no doubt

right in following Schöne, who holds that the passage refers to the trade in books which was carried on in that part of the market-place called *ὄρχηστρα*; Photius has s.v. *ὄρχηστρα* *πρώτον ἐκλήθη ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ*, and Nicophon (Mein. *fr. com.* ii. 2, p. 852) points to the same locality, when he mentions the *βιβλιοπῶλαι* amongst the motley crowd of sellers of figs, leather, spoons, sieves, etc., whom we can only expect to find in the market-place. Whilst Müller's view on this point seems to me preferable to that of Fränkel, the latter (ii. p. 111* f.) is probably right in what he says about the *ἀγωνοθέτης*. If that official, who remained in office a whole year, had had to defray all the expenses of all the choruses out of his own pocket (p. 340), it would have been singularly ungracious on the part of the *δῆμος* to deprive him of the title of *χορηγός*, for *ὁ δῆμος ἐχορήγει, ἀγωνοθέτης ὁ δέεινα*, etc. (e.g. *C.I.G.* 1444) it would indeed seem that the *ἀγωνοθέτης* defrayed all the expenses, but on the other hand it is clear from an inscription from Iasus (Le Bas-Waddington, iii. no. 255) that the *ἀγωνοθέτης* there did not do so, for the names of several citizens besides the *ἀγωνοθέτης* are given as having furnished funds. Moreover we find in inscriptions the phrase *ἀγωνοθετοῦντος διὰ βίον* (Tralles, Colossae, *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* xi. p. 298, p. 354). Fränkel (ii. p. 125*), as it seems to me, is again right in following Thumser, who infers from Dem. 20, 18 foll. that metoecs could perform at Athens choregia on other festivals than that of the Lenaea; for metoec choregi in Iasus and Rhodes, see Le Bas-Waddington iii. no. 256, and Ross, *inscr. ined.* no. 278. In connexion with this question a few other points might have been touched on, such as the voluntary choregia *e.g.* of Hypereides (Ps. Plut. *vit.* x. *orat.* p. 848 E), for being trierarch at the time he was exempt; the official title *τὸ ἀγωνάρχῳ* in a Boeotian inscription (Collitz, *Samml. d. gr. Dialekt.-Inscr.* i. no. 812a). In other parts of the book too I have noticed some slight omissions; on p. 295 the *νομοφύλακες* are not mentioned as possessing *προεδρία* (*Lex. Rhet. Cantabr.* p. 673, 27 foll. *καὶ ἐν ταῖς θέαις ἐναντίον τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐκαθέζοντο* cf. Photius s.v. *οἱ νομοφύλακες τίτες*); on p. 387 an inscription from Samos giving a list of victors at the Heraea (P. Gardner, *Journ. of Hell. Stud.* vii. p. 147 foll.) is not referred to (l. 3 *ὑποκριτῆς παλαιᾶς τραγωδίας Δημήτριος*, l. 8 *τοὺς ποιητὰς τῶν καινῶν τραγωδιῶν . . . τοὺς ποιητὰς τῶν καινῶν κωμωδιῶν*); the first Amphictyonic decree (p. 394, n. 3) dates from shortly after 279 B.C., for

the Phocians did not belong to the Amphictyonic confederacy from 345 to 279 B.C., and lastly, the question as to the number of choreutae who voted in the trial of Orestes might have been more fully treated (p. 202, n. 3); Müller puts little faith in the statements of scholiasts (p. 108), yet here he says, Für die Eum. sind 15 Choreuten bezeugt, (schol. Aesch. *Eum.* 585) ! did twelve vote, as O. Müller and Wecklein (*Philol.* 1884, p. 712 f.) think, or an uneven number, eleven according to Hermann, or nine, as Zawadzki (*Die Anzahl der Ariop. in Aesch. Eum.*) suggests? for, as Kirchhoff has shown, Athena as ἡγεμών of the court of Areiopagus possessed the right of voting, and the trial was looked upon as a precedent to establish the principle that even votes amounted to an acquittal. Yet these are small matters when compared with the full and lucid account Müller gives of a confessedly difficult subject.

HERMAN HAGER.

[APPENDIX TO DR. HAGER'S ARTICLE.]

It is worthy of notice that the results of the recent excavations in the Dionysiac theatre can be corroborated, in one important particular, by literary evidence. In the *Oedipus Coloneus*, when Creon lays his hand upon Antigone, and asserts his right to remove her from Colonus, the Chorus approach him with menacing gestures, saying, τάχ' εἰς βάσανον εἰ χερῶν. Creon answers, εἶργον, 'stand back!' The Chorus rejoin, σοὺ μὲν οὖ, τάδε γε μωμένον (835 f.). It is evident that the poet conceives them as standing close to him. Now, according to old notions, Creon would at this time have been on the raised λογεῖον, while the Chorus were below him in the ὀρχήστρα. The scene loses much of its natural force, if we have to imagine the Chorus as merely advancing, in an excited manner, to the foot of a platform on which Creon stands. But it becomes at once fully intelligible, if we suppose that Creon and the Chorus are standing on the same level; i.e., that the place from which

the actors spoke was in the time of Sophocles—and the *Coloneus* probably belongs to his latest years—merely a segment of the circular ὀρχήστρα. It is now believed that this ὀρχήστρα was enclosed (as noticed above), by polygonal stones, but had, as yet, no permanent σκηνή behind it. A permanent raised stage of masonry, and a permanent σκηνή, appear to have been erected for the first time under the auspices of Lycurgus, *circ.* 330 B.C. I am informed by Professor D'Ooge, late Director of the American School at Athens, that the results obtained in the Dionysiac theatre have been confirmed in some points by a recent examination of the theatres at Oropus and Sicyon. It is also said to be probable that, in the circular ὀρχήστρα of the pre-Lycurgian period, the actors used only one entrance. The traditional three doors were a later development.

Here, however, we must not forget the ἐκκύκλημα. As the recent explorers of the Dionysiac theatre doubtless remember, the use of that contrivance is not merely an inference from the tragic texts, but is proved by the two parodies in comedy,—Aristophanes using the verbs ἐκκυκλεῖν and ἐσκυκλεῖν (*Ach.* 408, *Th.* 265). It seems to have been a low stage, pushed forward through the central door. (See A. Müller, in the work noticed above, pp. 142–148.) While granting, then, that there was no permanent σκηνή in the time of Aristophanes, we must also suppose that there was some temporary screen, by which the imaginary interior of a house could be veiled from the view of the spectators. There is nothing in the recent results which excludes the use of such a temporary screen, any more than that of a θεολογεῖον for the *deus ex machina*. But it seems as if we must give up the *περίακτοι*, which can hardly have come in before the permanent σκηνή. Their case is different from those just noticed, since nothing in the texts requires them. Niejahr, indeed, had already denied the use of the *περίακτοι* in the best age (*Quaest. Arist. Scaen.*, pp. 8–12.)

R. C. JEBB.

The Gentleman's Magazine Library: Romano-British Remains. Part I, edited by G. L. GOMME, F.S.A. (Elliott Stock), pp. xxiv. 297. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FROM its foundation in 1731 till 1868 the *Gentleman's Magazine* was one of the chief archaeological journals in England. The Society of Antiquaries began its series of publications in 1770; the Archaeological Institute and Association about 1845; and since 1868 the *Gentleman's Magazine* itself has neglected antiquities. But before that date its editors included

archaeology among the many subjects which interested the cultivated gentleman, and the paper was a recognised organ, as indeed it was the only monthly organ, of those who wished to read or write about matters archaeological. Thus its volumes became a storehouse for antiquarian information of the most varied character, embracing notices of discoveries in England or abroad, descriptions of churches and old houses, and the like. The idea of collecting 'a volume of antiquities' from this valuable but unsorted treasury is no new one: it was suggested by a correspondent