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](#)

The Origin of Tragedy, with Special Reference to the Greek Tragedians *The Origin of Tragedy, with special reference to the Greek Tragedians*. By William Ridgeway, Sc.D., F.B.A., etc. Cambridge University Press, 1910.

A. W. Pickard-Cambridge

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 02 / March 1912, pp 52 - 59
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00199524, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00199524

How to cite this article:

A. W. Pickard-Cambridge (1912). The Classical Review, 26, pp 52-59 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00199524

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

(3) *Epod.* ix. 16, 17.

at hinc frementis verterunt bis mille equos
Galli canentes Caesarem.

This is Keller's text. The MSS. are divided between *adhuc*, *adhuc*, *ad hunc*, *at huc*, and *at hunc*. Bentley proposed *ad hoc*, Cuningham at *hinc*, N. Heinsius *ab hoc*, Fea at *hoc*. I think the true

reading is *at hui!* The interjection is especially appropriate since Horace professes to be on shipboard at Actium and watching the battle-array in the highest excitement. Of course *hui!* occurs chiefly in the comedians and Cicero's letters, but it is by no means a vulgar or wholly comic interjection.

J. Gow.

REVIEWS

THE ORIGIN OF TRAGEDY, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE GREEK TRAGEDIANS.

The Origin of Tragedy, with special reference to the Greek Tragedians. By WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, SC.D., F.B.A., etc. Cambridge University Press, 1910.

UNTIL a few years ago, most scholars believed that Attic Tragedy was descended from a sixth-century performance, which might be indifferently called 'dithyramb' or 'satyr-play'—a performance in honour of Dionysus, mainly choral, and presented by men disguised as satyrs or 'goat-men'—(whence *τραγῳδία*). Into this performance Thespis introduced an actor distinct from the chorus. The date at which tragedy came to be completely differentiated from Satyric drama was assumed to fall with the last few decades of the sixth century. The original Satyric dithyramb was regarded as a Dorian and Peloponnesian rite. The main point of interest in Prof. Ridgeway's work is his attempt to prove that Tragedy was not originally Dionysiac or Satyric, but began in mimetic ritual performed at the tombs of deceased 'heroes,' and that this ritual was only absorbed into that of Dionysus at a comparatively late date. The performances at the hero-tombs were called 'tragic' because the performers dressed themselves in goat-skins—reverting, for ritual purposes, to the common dress of those earlier and simpler days, in which the ritual had originated. The tomb of the hero was either converted into the thymele of Dionysus, or at least the latter took its place beside the former.

The plays of Thespis belonged to hero-ritual, not to Dionysiac, and his great work was to divorce them from the sacred tomb and the annual celebration thereat, and so to create a more independent drama. The prominence in extant tragedies of tombs and lamentations, and the appearance of the ghosts of deceased heroes as characters in the play, is a survival from the original performances at the tombs. The Satyric drama, on the other hand, developed out of genuinely Dionysiac rites of an indecent and riotous kind—not out of Dorian dithyrambs, but out of a Thracian ritual designed to secure fertility.

The discussion of the rival theories turns largely on the interpretation of a number of much disputed passages, on the weighing of analogies drawn from peoples far removed from the Greeks of the Classical Age, and on the possibility of explaining the particular features in extant tragedies, which it is sought to explain, upon the older theory no less satisfactorily than upon the newer; and it is obvious that no theory can stand which rests upon interpretations that are doubtful or unwarranted, or upon analogies which when inspected do not present sufficiently strong points of resemblance to render them useful for the purpose in hand. But though I feel convinced that Prof. Ridgeway's case in regard to the origin of Tragedy is not, for the most part, a good one, either in its destructive or its constructive aspect, I gladly add my testimony to the

utility of a work, which necessitates a re-examination of evidence on fundamental points, and is bound to result in making at least some points clearer than they were. It would be a disaster, if theories so brilliantly conceived and supported were not given to the world, even if they should prove to be untenable. They challenge and compel discussion, and it is only by discussion that we get nearer the truth.

In one important point I am cordially in agreement with Prof. Ridgeway. Tragedy and Satyric drama are, I think, undoubtedly distinct in origin; and some of the reasons for this conclusion are well stated, for the first time in English literature, in the present work. The whole question was admirably discussed by Reisch (in the *Festschrift für Gomperz* in 1902), and it is a pity that Prof. Ridgeway shows no acquaintance with this discussion. He would have found his own conclusions anticipated in many points, some of the arguments perhaps better stated, and several others of great importance carefully worked out. Prof. Ridgeway is possibly wrong in attributing to Aristotle the theory of the origin of tragedy from Satyric play: the words of Aristotle *Poet.* iv. do not necessarily imply more than that the style of the earliest tragedy was grotesque or 'satyric'; but the point is uncertain: Aristotle may be merely theorising, and may have had little more evidence about sixth-century performances than we have. In one or two other points, the Professor's arguments seem to illustrate the possibility of drawing a true conclusion from false premises. He is probably wrong in denying the early existence of 'rude, licentious dithyrambes' among the Dorians, since it was most likely such dithyrambes (closely resembling those of which Archilochus speaks) that Arion brought into literary form (see below); though it is highly improbable that these dithyrambes were danced by satyrs; and so, even if tragedy were connected with them, its origin would not be in satyr-play. Again, when he identifies the Σάτυροι with the Thracian Σάρπαι, among whom he supposes the Satyric drama to have originated, he overlooks the fact that similar half-bestial creatures of

the imagination occur in the primitive beliefs of other Indo-European peoples, under various names, and that in these cases there is no such conveniently named tribe by which to explain them; and their 'supernatural' character (to use an inexact but intelligible expression) is less easy to understand, if they were originally simply the human worshippers of the god. Their real origin is probably to be sought much farther back than the point at which he looks for it, though the form of Dionysiac ritual with which they were connected very probably did (as he contends) enter Greece from Thrace.

The attempt to disprove the Dorian and Dionysiac character of the dithyramb, and therefore of the earliest tragedy, occupies a considerable part of Chapter I. The author is clearly right in denying that Aristotle endorses the claim of the Dorians to have originated tragedy (or dithyramb); and in rejecting their argument, quoted by Aristotle, from the word δρᾶμα. He is on much more doubtful ground when he treats as a proved truth his earlier suggestion (which, so far as I know, has found little support) that the Doric forms which occur in tragedy are really old Attic; and when he argues that 'it is difficult to believe that the Athenians would have borrowed the diction of their sacred songs from the hated Dorians, whom they would not permit to enter their sanctuaries.' As a matter of fact, the authority quoted (Herod. V. 71) only records the refusal of the priestess of Athena to allow Cleomenes to enter the ἄδντον of Athena on the Acropolis, οὐ γὰρ θεμιτὸν Δωριεῦσι παρίεναι ἐνθαῦτα—a phrase obviously unequal to the weight of so sweeping a conclusion. Again, Prof. Ridgeway reminds us that Arion, to whom the organisation of the dithyramb was ascribed, was not a Dorian, but a Lesbian. True; but it was a performance at Dorian Corinth that he organised; and Pindar distinctly treats the dithyramb as Corinthian. (It is surely wrong to interpret the ὀνομάσαντα of Herod. I. xxiii. to mean that Arion first gave the name 'dithyramb' to the performance, and so to attribute to Herodotus a statement which, as the Professor

rightly remarks, is untrue, since the name occurs in Archilochus, *ὡς Διωνύσοι' ἀνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος | οἶδα διθύραμβον οἶνφ συγκεραυνωθείς φρένας*. The word means that Archilochus gave names to his dithyrambs—making them regular compositions with definite subjects, and therefore nameable, instead of riotous performances. Similarly *ποιήσαντα* means that he composed them—made them poems—instead of leaving the words to the inspiration of the moment, when the leader was οἶνφ συγκεραυνωθείς φρένας). It is not clear whether (on p. 5) the Professor adopts the common interpretation of Suidas' notice about Arion, and regards the phrases which describe Arion as (1) the inventor of the *τραγικὸς τρόπος*, (2) the organiser of the dithyramb, (3) the introducer of satyrs speaking verses, as all referring to the same type of performance. I think it far more likely that Arion was supposed to have found three separate types of ill-organised performance in existence, and to have improved and given literary form to them all—creating the cyclic dithyramb, making the satyr-dancers speak metrically, and giving shape to a lyric performance which developed into tragedy. This interpretation would get over some serious difficulties, but this is not the place to develop this point.

Again, there is not (as Prof. Ridgeway would have us believe) any inconsistency in Aristotle's connexion of tragedy, both with Epic, and with a performance grotesque or rude in diction. As dealing with serious and heroic subjects, it was the successor of epic poetry; and it is only in this sense that Aristotle describes it as such: but this does not exclude the possibility that the language of Thespis was grotesque. The high tone of tragedy and its elevated language may well have come from the combination with the Thespian play of the tragic choruses of the Peloponnese, first organised by Arion. (In connecting tragedy with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and comedy with the *Margites*, Aristotle is certainly referring to the subjects, not, as Prof. Ridgeway states on p. 57, to the diction). Nor, because epic poems were not

written in Doric, does it follow that the Dorians had nothing to do with those lyric poems, which gave rise to tragedy on Prof. Ridgeway's theory as well as on others. The arguments that follow—that the dithyramb was not Dorian because Lasos was *probably* not Dorian, and that it was not originally Dionysiac because Lasos *may* have sung the sorrows of heroes—are very weak. Whether the dithyramb was Dorian or not, cannot be proved or disproved by reference to Lasos, who is over a century later than Arion, and in whose time the dithyramb was very widely spread, and had doubtless developed considerably. It cannot, I think, be shown conclusively either that the dithyramb was, or that it was not, Dorian in its most rudimentary form. Archilochus, in a fragment of whom we first happen to hear of it, was not a Dorian: but the best evidence we have tends to show that it was in Dorian Corinth that both it, and the tragic choruses which (as I believe) afterwards contributed to the origin of tragedy proper, and came later to be confused with dithyramb, first took literary shape. This is all that is needed to explain the Dorian tradition mentioned by Aristotle, his derivation of tragedy from 'dithyramb,' and the occurrence of certain Dorian forms in tragic lyrics.

Prof. Ridgeway's arguments against ascribing a peculiarly Dionysiac character to the earliest dithyramb are unconvincing. There is no doubt that, at the end of the sixth century B.C. and afterwards, 'dithyrambs' were composed in honour of other personages than Dionysus; just as Paeans were composed in honour of others than Apollo. But just as 'Paeon' is not a title of any but Apollo, so 'Dithyrambus' is not a title of any but Dionysus (to whom it was addressed as early as the fragment of Pratinas); and a strong presumption is afforded by these facts that 'the dithyramb' was originally a chant addressed to him. (The disintegration and alteration of the original form and application of the dithyramb seem, when once they had begun, to have gone on rapidly, as the history of the dithyramb in the fifth century shows: but this, though it accounts for a

certain looseness in the use of the word by later writers, tells us nothing of its origin.) And though it is not absolutely impossible to interpret the fragment of Archilochus and the lines of Pindar (*Ol.* xiii. 18. *ταὶ Διωνύσου πόθεν ἐξέφανεν σὺν βοηλάτῃ χάριτες διθυράμβῳ*) on the theory that the dithyramb was not primarily Dionysiac, the natural inference from the passages is certainly not in favour of that theory. (Prof. Ridgeway's interpretation of *βοηλάτῃ* seems to me to be probably right).

We need not, therefore, give up the belief that the dithyramb was Dionysiac, and probably Dorian in its first literary form; and that from it, or at least from choruses so like it as to be afterwards confused with it, tragedy partly originated; these choruses being combined in the sixth century with the rude dramatic performances brought into Athens from the Attic country districts by Thespis. The intermediate stages between the choruses which Arion composed in the *τραγικὸς τρόπος*, and those of Phrynichus and Aeschylus are no longer traceable; but the ascription of *τραγωδίαι* or *τραγικὰ δράματα* to Pindar and Simonides may give us a hint (as also may the mention of Epigenes of Sicyon¹, and of a number of tragic poets before Thespis); and it may be that, whereas no one suggests that the work of Thespis had any literary merits, Attic tragedy became, after his time, a great literary work of art, through taking into itself a great stream of lyric tragedy, which had been set flowing by Arion in Dorian Corinth. The fact recorded by Joannes Diaconus (*Comm. in Hermogenem*), that Solon in his elegies ascribed the first *δρᾶμα τῆς τραγωδίας* to Arion is very important, since Solon and Arion were contemporaries; and there is no ground

for doubting the accuracy of Joannes' statement.

But if the arguments against the Dionysiac theory of tragedy are weak, what of those which are adduced in favour of the tomb-theory?

Much turns on the interpretation of Herod. V. 67. *τά τε δὲ ἄλλα οἱ Σικυνῶνιοι ἐτίμων τὸν Ἀδρηστον καὶ δὴ πρὸς τὰ πάθεα αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι ἐγέραιρον, τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον οὐ τιμῶντες, τὸν δ' Ἀδρηστον. Κλεισθένης δὲ χοροὺς μὲν τῷ Διόνυσῳ ἀπέδωκε, τὴν δ' ἄλλην θυσίην Μελανίππῳ.* Here we have a definite transference of *τραγικοὶ χοροί* from a hero to Dionysus—and we have no other; and from this (supported by other arguments to be considered below) we are asked to infer that the villages of Attica had each their own local hero, and that to *these* local festivals of the dead the worship of Dionysus became attached. It is clear that this is going far beyond the evidence. This transference, moreover, at Sicyon, was the arbitrary act of a tyrant—not a natural religious development, such as the gradual absorption of hero-cults by Dionysiac would imply; and to infer that the latter process took place generally in Greece—or took place in Attica—from this single arbitrary act at Sicyon would be most hazardous. It is not to the point to prove (as any Greek scholar can prove, and as Prof. Ridgeway proves at some length) that there were solemn lamentations, as well as various forms of contests, etc., at hero-tombs all over Greece, and that the dead were carefully propitiated, nor even to prove (and this can very rarely be done, if at all) that there were dramatic or mimetic performances at the tombs. We require some proof that the Dionysiac festivals in Athens got *their* dramatic performances from this source; and the proof offered is not sufficient. What the passage of Herodotus proves, is that at an early date in the sixth century there were solemn choruses in honour of Adrastus at Sicyon, which, so far as Herodotus (over a century later) could judge, were sufficiently like the choruses in the tragedy of his contemporaries to be called 'tragic,' and the words of which had reference to Adrastus' sufferings.

¹ There is much uncertainty as regards Epigenes; but I do not follow the Professor's argument on p. 68, that non-Dionysiac tragedy existed before the introduction of Dionysiac worship, because Epigenes was the fifteenth tragic poet before Thespis, who must have begun to perform about 570 B.C., whereas Dionysiac worship (according to the Professor) was not introduced into Sicyon before 600 B.C. There is plenty of room for fifteen poets in thirty years, as the Attic inscriptional evidence shows, even if the dates given are correct.

There is no proof that there was any dramatic representation of his sufferings. (We know that the early dithyramb was narrative, not mimetic; and the *τραγικοί χοροί* contemporary with the earliest literary dithyramb were in all probability closely allied to it.) That *τραγικός* as used by Herodotus means 'tragic' can scarcely be doubted. The word is so used by Aristophanes, *Peace* 136 (in 421 B.C., not many years after Herodotus, Book V., appears to have been written); and Herodotus, friend of Sophocles as he was, and well acquainted with Athens at the time of the great tragedians, is not likely to have used the word in any other sense: nor is there any extant instance of the word in the sense of 'goat-like' or 'in goat-costume,' until the first century A.D. (There is no occurrence of the word at all, I believe, before Herodotus and Aristophanes; but it is almost certain that Solon must have used it, and in the sense of 'tragic,' not of 'goat-like,' in his elegies: see above.) The information which Herodotus gives can quite well be explained on the Dionysiac theory of the origin of tragedy, if we suppose that the originally Dionysiac choruses soon came to be extended to non-Dionysiac themes, in the manner which the proverb *οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον* suggests. (The explanations of the proverb given by Zenobius and Suidas are confused, but all of them refer to the departure of tragedy or dithyramb from Dionysiac subjects. The innovation is variously ascribed to Epigenes, Thespis, Phrynichus and Aeschylus.) Probably the choruses in honour of Adrastus were like the many other *θρήνοι* of which we hear—none of them, so far as our information goes, mimetic or dramatic. [It may suffice to refer to the laments for Achilles in Elis (Paus. IV. xxiii. 3), at Croton (Lycophr. Alex. 859) and at Rhoeteum (Philostr. Her. 20. 22); for Medea's Children at Corinth (Philostr. Her. 20, 21; Paus. II. iii. 7; Schol. Eur. *Med.* 273, 1379, etc.), for Leucothea at Thebes (Plut. *Apophth. Lac.* p. 228 e: and for Hippolytus at Troezen.]

Such laments Herodotus would naturally call 'tragic,' in view of their

tone and their resemblance to the 'tragic' choruses in the Attic sense of the word; but evidence that they were mimetic is entirely wanting. The case on which the argument for the belief in mimetic performances at the Tombs of heroes mainly rests is that of the ceremonies (Ridgeway, p. 37) in honour of Scephrus at Tegea, which formed part of the ritual of Apollo Agyieus. But there is nothing to indicate that these ceremonies took place at the tomb of Scephrus; and the form of ritual 'pursuit' which is recorded does not belong (so far as our evidence goes) peculiarly to hero-ritual (see Farnell, *Cults*. V. p. 231, note b; Nilsson, *Griech. Feste*, p. 166-7, has a different explanation). This instance at most goes to swell the evidence for the undisputed fact that heroes were honoured: it hardly supports the theory that they were honoured with mimetic performances, which were transferred to Dionysus.

An equally disputable argument is that which Professor Ridgeway draws (p. 50) from the Anthesteria. The argument is a little difficult to follow. It seems to be this: 'The Anthesteria was a festival of the dead, at which Cyclic choruses were performed. These Cyclic choruses were, it is true, in honour of Dionysus; but some other Cyclic choruses in Athens were not confined to him; and therefore those at the Anthesteria were not Dionysiac in origin, but existed before the worship of Dionysus was introduced.' Unless I have misrepresented the argument (and I do not think I have done so) it is entirely illogical. In addition, it is very doubtful if the initial assumption, that the Anthesteria was a festival of the dead, is correct. Prof. Ridgeway says that Miss Harrison has proved it. I have not space to argue the point, but a quite different, and, I believe, a more likely view is taken by Dr. Farnell (*Cults* v. 214 sqq.), according to whom the festival was primarily Dionysiac, and the addition to it of chthonic ritual is to be otherwise explained. (The evidence of dramatic choruses at the festival is very late and slight.)

We have next to consider Prof. Ridgeway's argument from the exist-

ence of two altars in the theatre at Athens—a fact which he takes to indicate the superimposition of one cult upon another—the Dionysiac upon the heroic. The difficulty of this argument lies in the fact that the *βωμός* on the stage, as described by Pollux iv. 123, belongs to the relatively late period in the development of tragedy, when there was a house-front as a back scene; and this *βωμός*, being 'like the conical pillars which stood in the streets before house-doors' (p. 47), not improbably appeared in the theatre along with the house-front, and was not there at all in very early times. The words of Pollux, which actually call this *βωμός* by the name *ἀγνιεύς* are most naturally interpreted in this way (ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ ἀγνιεύς ἔκειτο βωμός ὁ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν κ.τ.λ.). The end of the earlier sentence of the passage is a well-known difficulty, καὶ σκηνὴ μὲν ὑποκριτῶν ἴδιον, ἣ δὲ ὀρχήστρα τοῦ χοροῦ, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἡ θυμέλη, εἴτε βῆμά τι οὖσα εἴτε βωμός. (They mean, perhaps, that Pollux was aware that the word *θυμέλη* was applied not only to the altar, but also in a wider sense, including the raised step or platform on which—probably—the altar stood.) But Prof. Ridgeway is surely guilty of a *petitio principii* when he gives 'tomb' as an alternative translation of *βωμός*, and in supposing that the tomb, or *βωμός*, of the hero became the *θυμέλη* of Dionysus. (It is not quite clear how this suggestion is consistent with the other, that the *βωμός* on the stage and the *θυμέλη* in the orchestra respectively represent the two cults.) The record of the transference of worship at Sicyon itself tells the other way; for while Cleisthenes transferred the *χοροί* to Dionysus, Herodotus expressly states that he transferred *τὴν ἄλλην θυσίην*, not to Dionysus, but to Melanippus—another hero; so that the statement (p. 38) that 'when the tragic chorus was taken from him' (i.e., Adrastus) 'and transferred to Dionysus, the tomb round which the chorus danced now became the altar of Dionysus' is almost certainly wrong. The use of *βωμός* as applied to a tomb is found only in a very late epigram in the *Anthology* (App. p. 262), so far as I know, and

even then it is possibly half metaphorical. Such a passage as *Cho.* 198, αἰδουμένη σοι βωμόν ὡς τύμβον πατρός (quoted p. 119) of course proves nothing except that the chorus held the tomb in as great reverence as an altar—not that *βωμός* means 'tomb.'

Prof. Ridgeway's suggestion that the plays of Thespis were not Dionysiac, but heroic, and that the innovation made by him, and objected to by Solon, consisted in the removal of these plays from the hero-tomb does not appear to be justified by the evidence. Of the titles of the plays (if indeed they are genuine) some can be interpreted as Dionysiac, one probably cannot. This implies of course that the subjects of his plays were not exclusively Dionysiac, but not that the performance which he brought into Athens from Icaria was not originally so. And we are expressly told by Plutarch what it was that in fact angered Solon, viz., that Thespis told so many falsehoods before so great a crowd. There is not a shadow of evidence for the statement (p. 61) that 'a performance which he would have regarded as fit and proper when enacted in some shrine of the gods or at a hero's tomb, not unnaturally roused his indignation when the exhibition was merely for sport . . . and not at some hallowed spot.' What entitled Thespis to be called by many the 'inventor' of tragedy was almost certainly (as appears from Aristotle,¹ quoted by Themistius *Or.* xxvi. p. 316 d, and Diogenes Laertius III. lvi.) his introduction of a separate actor who made set speeches (and could take different parts); whereas the person who had mounted on the *ἔλεος* and talked with the chorus *πρὸ Θεσπίδος* (Pollux iv. 123) was probably one of the choreutae themselves, or—if he was not—had at least no set speeches or dramatic part to undertake.

The ritual performances of various non-Hellenic races which Prof. Ridgeway adduces in order to show that dramatic performances in honour of the

¹ Prof. Ridgeway, p. 57, states that Aristotle ignored Thespis. He does not mention him in the *Poetics*; but Themistius' reference shows that Aristotle attached some importance to him.

dead are a world-wide practice are not very convincing, because they may for the most part be otherwise interpreted. The end of *Beowulf* only tells of a lament and a solemn ride round the grave. The Tibetan play presents the dangers of the soul and its delivery from them (as a medieval mystery might), but cannot be shown with any certainty to have anything to do with the worship of the dead. The play of the Veddas seems to be a piece of magic designed to secure good hunting by a representation of a good hunt, and to be in no way parallel to the Greek drama. But I must leave the discussion of these and other cases to more expert anthropologists than myself.

The most impressive evidence in favour of the origin of tragedy in hero-worship consists doubtless in the occurrence in many plays of scenes in which tomb-ritual and lamentations are performed; and (in a few plays only) scenes in which ghosts appear. These latter ought perhaps to be disregarded. They are very few; the imagination of the poet was certainly equal to inventing them, without the assistance of grave-ritual; and we have no independent evidence of dramatic grave-ritual in Greece in which the spirit of the deceased appeared as a character. (The appearance of Clytemnestra in the *Eumenides* does not actually take place in response to, or in connexion with, any grave-ritual in the play.) And as to the scenes of lamentations and worship at the graveside, these, surely, are amply explained by the nature of the stories (which were mostly taken from Epic poetry, with such modifications as were necessary for dramatic purposes, for the presentation of character, and for the suggestion of moral lessons), in conjunction with the love which Greek writers everywhere show for aetiology. Stories turning upon disaster and death naturally involve scenes of mourning, and wherever such scenes occur they arise quite naturally out of the plot. These scenes of mourning, and particularly the *κομμός*, of course took their form from the kind of mourning which was actually in vogue in contemporary Greek life (and is foreshadowed in the Homeric

poems); and this kind of mourning was most probably employed also in the ritual mournings at the tombs of heroes. But this does not mean that the whole play is simply an expansion of such ritual mournings. The Greek drama may perfectly well have been Dionysiac in origin and yet have adopted, in scenes of mourning, those forms of mourning with which the Greeks were familiar (as Synge uses the 'keening' in his *Riders to the Sea*): it would have been strange if it had been otherwise; and we require no more than this to explain the facts. When there existed (as, e.g., in the case of Hippolytus) actual rites at tombs of heroes, the tragedies dealing with these heroes naturally mentioned the supposed *αἵτιον* of these, just as other tragedies gave the *αἴτια* of other things—the four Ionian tribes, the powers of the Areopagus, the torch race at Colonus, and other ceremonies quite unconnected with heroes. But of course hero-rites were the things most often explained, because the deaths of heroes were the subject of tragedy. If space allowed, it would be possible to take play by play, and to show that in some there is no allusion to hero-rites, and that in others the allusion to it or the representation of it on the stage does not require Prof. Ridgeway's theory to explain it, and is more naturally explained otherwise; as well as to discuss a number of extremely disputable points in his treatment of the several plays in Chap. iv.; but under the circumstances a general statement must suffice.

But though I find great difficulty in accepting most of the author's arguments, I do not feel satisfied with our scanty knowledge of the early history of tragedy. We know very little of the steps by which the early Dionysiac ritual came into Attica and the Peloponnesus. We can see it at Corinth and Icaria, and the elements of Attic tragedy were probably derived from these two sources, and were combined, about the third quarter of the sixth century, in such a way as to lead to the tragedy of Phrynichus and Aeschylus. We can see it in another form at Phlius, whence Pratinas brought the Satyric drama (perhaps Thracian in origin) to Athens. We have perhaps a

trace of it at Eleutherae. Beyond this nearly everything is uncertain. There is, I think, some prospect of a solution on somewhat different lines from those upon which Prof. Ridgeway works—the consideration of the character of the Dionysiac worship itself in its chthonic aspect and of the ritual with which Dionysus may have been worshipped (or the more vaguely conceived power which afterwards came to be called Dionysus) as a chthonic power. Dieterich's suggestions (which Prof. Ridgeway does not notice) do not indeed commend themselves as they stand, but other scholars are following up the hints which his invaluable paper contains (*Archiv. für Religionswissenschaft*, xi. 2, 3, July, 1908); and it is possible that some hypothesis consistent with all the available evidence may be found; and few, if any, of the objections which hold good against Prof. Ridgeway's theory would necessarily hold good against this.

A few minor points may be noted: (1) Since the interpretation of *τραγῳδία* as the 'song of the men in goat-costume' must be given up, the word can be interpreted as the song 'around' or 'for the goat'—whether the goat be sacrifice or prize. Thespis won a goat as a prize, and Eratosthenes describes Icaria as the place *τόθι πρῶτα περὶ τράγον ὠρχήσαντο*. (2) The inferences to be drawn from the Thracian carnival described by Mr. Dawkins, and from similar performances, is very uncertain; but many points seem to be more closely paralleled in ancient Comedy than in ancient Tragedy. (3) Prof. Ridgeway cites a number of cases of superimposition of divine upon heroic cults; but in all or nearly all of these we can see more unmistakeable traces

of the original distinctness than in the case of the supposed superimposition of Dionysus upon the heroes. (4) The argument, from the fact that Thespis first disguised his face with white lead, that his play was a hero-play (I suppose, a ghost-play) seems highly speculative; but it is not possible to discuss it adequately without a minute examination of questions affecting the Titans and Kouretes. (5) *Bassaricae* (p. 24) is probably a misprint for *Bassarae* or *Bassarides*; and the rendering of *λευστήρα*, p. 27, by 'stone-breaker' is perhaps more than doubtful. (6) It is very unfortunate that in discussing Dr. Farnell's suggestions, Prof. Ridgeway should not have referred to Dr. Farnell's full presentation of them in his *Cults of the Greek States*, published many months before the *Origin of Tragedy*. Whether these suggestions are right or wrong, they do not get fair treatment. But Dr. Farnell can take care of himself, and therefore I do not pursue the subject.

I have no space to discuss the concluding chapter, in which the author describes the expansion of tragedy, particularly in the hands of Aeschylus. I feel sure that the explanation of certain features of the *Supplices* and *Eumenides* by a supposed survival of matriarchal ideas in Athens down to a late date cannot be sustained. Apart from this, the chapter, like the rest of the work, contains many good things.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

Balliol College, Oxford.

[Since the above was written, I have read Nilsson's most interesting article, *Neue Jahrbücher*, xxvii. pp. 609 *sqq.*, and am glad to find my opinion confirmed on a number of points.]

DE VETERUM, IMPRIMIS ROMANORUM STUDIIS ETYMOLOGICIS.

De Veterum Imprimis Romanorum Studiis Etymologicis. Specimen litterarium inaugurale pro gradu doctoratus in Academia Rhenotraiectina submittit FREDERICUS MULLER. I vol. 8vo. Pp. v+268. Traiecti ad Rhenum: A. Oosthoek. April, 1910.

BEFORE turning to the Roman Etymologists Dr. Muller discusses briefly the study of words among the Greeks. After dealing with the etymology of the Cratylus and the dialect forms mentioned in it, he comes to Aristotle. Aristotle's classification of sounds into voiced,