Classical Quarterly 59.1 8–29 (2009) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S00098388090000020

TRAGIC HONOURS AND DEMOCRACY: NEGLECTED EVIDENCE FOR THE POLITICS OF THE ATHENIAN DIONYSIA*

Over the course of the last decade there has been much discussion, some of it in the pages of this journal, on the nature of the relationship, if any, between tragedy and democracy; and in particular, on the question of whether the Athenian City Dionysia should rightly be described as a 'festival of the democratic *polis*'. The latter is a phrase used by Simon Goldhill in his article of 1987 – 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', which rapidly became a highly influential articulation of the position that Athens' premier dramatic festival, viewed in the round as the ensemble of its framing ceremonies and the plays performed in contest at it, reflects or indeed enacts some of the defining preoccupations and practices of the democratic city.[1] It is also a phrase – and an idea – which much recent criticism has sought to undermine.[2]

Fortunately, the fundamental questions at stake in this debate are rich enough to sustain not only a decade of productive disagreement – on top of the twenty-odd years of historicizing approaches to Greek drama that led up to it – but also, it is clear, further contributions.[3] Given the length of the debate, measured in years and pages, the suggestion that there are significant items of evidence not yet considered in it may however come as a surprise. Less surprising, given that the relevant documents are fragmentary inscriptions, a variety of evidence of which many literary students of drama are often very wary, if not simply ignorant. It is the purpose of this paper to introduce this material to the debate about the politics of the classical Dionysia. And it is hoped that this may more generally encourage a better integration of the full range of epigraphic evidence into mainstream studies of Greek drama.

* Thanks to Alastair Blanshard, Eric Csapo and an anonymous reader for extremely helfpul comments. I gratefully acknowledge the research assistance and substantive suggestions of Andrew Hartwig and, in particular, the generosity of Julia Shear for sharing work prior to its publication and discussing many points of detail. Financial assistance for this project was provided by the Australian Research Council.

[1] 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', *JHS* 107 (1987), 58–76, at 68.

[2] A small selection of items from the subsequent discussion: various contributors to J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin (edd.), *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton, 1990), which includes a corrected version of Goldhill (n. 1); W. Connor, 'City Dionysia and Athenian democracy', *C&M* 40 (1989), 7–32; C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Something to do with Athens: tragedy and ritual', in R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (edd.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis* (Oxford, 1994), 269–90; B. Goff (ed.), *History, Tragedy, Theory: Dialogues on Athenian Drama* (Austin, 1995); C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Ancient Historian* (Oxford, 1997); P. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge, 1997); P. Wilson, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City and the Stage* (Cambridge, 2000); recent criticism and response: J. Griffin, 'The social function of Attic tragedy', *CQ* 48 (1998), 39–61; S. Goldhill, 'Civic ideology and the problem of difference: the politics of Aeschylean tragedy, once again', *JHS* 120 (2000), 34–56; R. Seaford, 'The social function of Attic tragedy: a response to Jasper Griffin', *CQ* 50 (2000), 30–44; P. Rhodes, 'Nothing to do with democracy: Athenian drama and the polis', *JHS* 123 (2003), 104–19; D. Carter, 'Was Attic tragedy democratic?', *Polis* 21 (2004), 1–25.

[3] Note for instance the conference organized by David Carter at the University of Reading in September 2007, 'Why Athens?: reappraising tragic politics'. An edited volume of essays is forthcoming with Oxford University Press.

THE GREAT DIONYSIA AND CIVIC IDEOLOGY: A BLIND-SPOT

My concern is with one of the key items discussed by Goldhill – namely, the proclamation in the theatre of honours, and in particular crowns, to benefactors of the city prior to the performance of tragedy. It was Goldhill who for the first time attempted to understand this, along with other 'preplay ceremonials', as part of a larger dynamic between tragic text and context, between democratic society, politics and drama. That discussion initiated a rich debate that continues apace. But few of these contributions mention, and none discusses in any detail, the first and most striking example of the phenomenon.

Goldhill found there to be a meaningful and dynamic relation between the city's practice of awarding honours and the nature of the tragedies that followed. In other words, the decision to timetable the event thus was in his view driven not by mere convenience, nor even by the simple fact of the presence of a large international audience. He saw the ensemble of ceremonial activities that took place just prior to the performances of tragedy as powerful assertions of the norms of democratic *polis* society that were then exposed to intense scrutiny in the dramas that followed:

> in the interplay of norm and transgression enacted in the festival which both lauds the *polis* and depicts the stresses and tensions of a *polis* society in conflict, the Great Dionysia seems to me an essentially Dionysiac event.[4]

The practice evinced the authority and confidence of a city that was in a position to confer significant honour and award, and it demonstrated the collective and competitive ideology of a democracy that sought thus to encourage others to serve it in the same way.[5] By striking contrast, the scenarios of the tragedies that followed this display so often enacted the dangers of honour-seeking, the collapse of collective authority and the transgression of all communal limits.

The recent criticism directed against Goldhill's interpretation of this ceremony asserts, in the first place, a lack of evidence for it in the period from which tragedies themselves survive – namely, the fifth century. Thus David Carter writes: 'that there is no evidence for it in the fifth [century] disqualifies it from being used by Goldhill as evidence of a democratic context for the tragedy that we have'.[6] A second and more general criticism is that there is nothing distinctively democratic about these practices, that they are rather the sort of activity in which any *polis* might engage, just as tragedy – so the argument goes – is a form that appealed to and addressed the *polis* as such, rather than the democratic *polis* in particular. Well acquainted with the whole gamut of epigraphic and literary evidence, in his case against democratic interpretations of Athenian drama, Peter Rhodes sees the connection between such 'civic business' as the award of honours in the theatre and the dramas that followed as little more than 'accidental'.[7] He does cite the key item in the dossier of evidence that I shall be discussing – the fragmentary decree on stone (*IG* 1^3 102) which records the first known case of honours – but implies merely that its date late in the fifth century and the fact that it honours a foreigner, rather than a citizen, limit its relevance to the

[4] Goldhill (n. 1), 76.
[5] Goldhill (n. 1), 62–3.
[6] Carter (n. 2), 8–9, noting that Goldhill himself seems to acknowledge the lack of good evidence for it in the fifth century.
[7] His word: Rhodes (n. 2), 112.

debate. He does not mention that it honoured the men who had restored the democracy by assassinating the leader of the oligarchic régime of 411 B.C.

When *IG* 1^3 102, and a small set of its close congeners, are properly introduced to this debate, the position alters radically. These decrees reveal the appearance of a novel form of 'publication' of especially important honours awarded to its benefactors by the Athenian *dêmos* at the end of the fifth century – their announcement by means of the herald's voice at the tragic *agôn* of the City Dionysia. This innovation, which was to have a long and very rich future, needs to be seen as one response to the political trauma experienced by the democracy in the revolutions of 411 and 404 B.C. At a minimum we can therefore say that benefactors to Athens were indeed honoured at the Dionysia in the age of Sophocles and Euripides. But more importantly, if, as many hold, *IG* 1^3 102 represents not only our first evidence for the practice, but evidence for the very start of it, the circumstances of its passing throw important light on its origin and ideological matrix. It will, moreover, emerge that this particular award of honours to the saviours of democracy at the Dionysia of 409 B.C. stands in a tradition, reaching back to the start of the fifth century, of proclaiming awards to tyrant-slayers before the performance of drama at the festival (this last one pre-play ceremonial overlooked by both Goldhill and his critics).

IG 1^3 102: HONOURS FOR ASSASSINS

Consideration of the significance of this first known example of honours for benefactors announced at the Dionysia has thus been entirely absent from the debate about the Dionysia, democracy and drama. A brief discussion of this intriguing document – so familiar to students of fifth-century democracy yet never introduced into discussion of the history of the theatre – is thus in order.

IG 1^3 102 is a decree of the Athenian *dêmos*, passed in the spring of 409 B.C., that awards extensive honours to Thrasybulus of Calydon, the assassin of the oligarch Phrynichus, architect and leading agent of the anti-democratic revolution of 411 B.C. The document consists of three parts. The first is the substantive proposal of honours for Thrasybulus authored by one Erasinides, a man known to have good democratic credentials (lines 1–14).[8] There follow two amendments, the first of which (lines 14–38) grants Thrasybulus Athenian citizenship; gives him leave to seek further benefits; confers upon him a share in a property apportionment; and awards lesser honours to some seven or eight of his associates. The second (lines 38–47) establishes an enquiry by the Council into allegations that bribery had been used in order to secure an earlier decree in the same connection in favour of Apollodorus of Megara. That Apollodorus eventually had honours conferred upon him comparable to those for Thrasybulus is clear. It is a possibility that he too was honoured with a gold crown at the Dionysia of 409 B.C.[9]

Only the main decree concerns me here. Erasinides' proposal is to praise Thrasybulus of Calydon[10] for being 'a good man towards the *dêmos* of the Athenians

[8] M. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, vol. 2 (Brussels, 1982), 20.

[9] R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century*[2] (Oxford, 1969 [1988]), 263; J.L. Shear, *Polis, Demos, and Revolution: Responding to Oligarchy in Athens, 411 to 380 B.C.* (forthcoming), makes the case for the award of a crown to Apollodorus at the Dionysia.

[10] Thrasybulus' ethnic is not mentioned in the inscription and cannot easily be restored. It is relatively unusual, though not unknown (cf. e.g. *Agora* 16, 55 with M. Walbank, 'Greek inscrip-

and eager to do whatever good he can' (lines 6–8). And, 'in return for the good things he has done [for the city] and the *dêmos* of Athenians' it is proposed that he be crowned '[with a gold cr]own' (line 10), the value of which was very probably 1,000 drachmas.[11] The next and final clause of Erasinides' proposal entails the instructions for the public announcement, at a festival *agôn*, of the reasons for which the *dêmos* had awarded the crown to Thrasybulus:

IG 1^3 102,[12] lines 12–14 410/9 B.C. stoichedon 36

καὶ [ἀνειπ]-
[ὲν τὸν κήρυκα Διονυσίον ἐν τôι] ἀγôνι hôν hέν-
[εκα αὐτὸν ho δêμος ἐστεφάνοσ]ε.

12–13: [ἀνειπ]||[ὲν Διονυσίον τôν ἐν ἄστει τôι] ἀγôνι Velsen. [ἀνειπ]||[εῖν Παναθηναίον τôι γυμνικôι] ἀγôνι Dinsmoor

And at the *agôn* [of the Dionysia the herald is to announce] the reasons for which [the *dêmos* has crowned him].

Given the state of the inscription (with 25 of the 36 letters of line 13 missing), and given its relatively early date and thus the lack of good parallels for various of its phrases, this part of the text of *IG* 1^3 102 should hardly be treated as definitive.[13] What can be said with certainty about this clause? In the first place, that it does indeed specify the public announcement of honours at a festival *agôn*. For even though the verb ([ἀνειπêν]) is fully restored, the reference to an *agôn*, immediately following the clause that stipulates the creation and award of a crown, ensures that it is a proclamation clause. There are numerous later parallels.[14] Indeed, this is the first in a very long line of such proclamation clauses in Athenian decrees (a point to which I shall return).

Similarly, the phrase *hôν hέν*|[εκα] (lines 11–12) without doubt refers to the decision to have the herald detail the reasons that motivated the award of the crown, rather than, as is the rule in later examples, simply to state the fact of the award. In

tions from the Athenian agora', *Hesperia* 54 [1985], 311), to omit reference to the place of origin of foreigners honoured in Athenian decrees. In this case the omission may have something to do with an earlier decree or decrees in favour of Thrasybulus, though Osborne (n. 8), 18 argues persuasively that *IG* 1^3 102 is the first or original set of honours for Thrasybulus. See also, expressing a different view on this point, A.W. Gomme, A. Andrewes and K.J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 5 (Oxford, 1981), 309–10; and C. Bearzot, 'A proposito del decreto ML 85 per Trasibulo uccisore di Frinico e i suoi complici', *Istituto Lombardo (Rend. Lett.)* 115 (1981), 289–303.

[11] lines 8–11: καὶ ἀντὶ ὅν εὖ πεπο||ίεκεν τέν τε πόλιν] καὶ τὸν δêμ[ο]ν τὸν Ἀθεναίο||ν στεφανôσαι αὐτὸν χρυσôι στε]φάνοι, ποιêσα||ι δὲ τὸν στέφανον ἀπὸ χιλίον δρ]αχμôν. Most of the restorations in this part of the decree are, in broad outline, uncontroversial.

[12] Earlier editions: *IG* 1.59+ (Velsen and Kirchhoff); *IG* 1^2 110 with add. p. 303+ (Hiller); Tod 86+; Meiggs and Lewis (n. 9), no. 85; cf. *SEG* 10 (1949), 125 (Meritt on line 13: see below); text and important discussion in M. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, vol. 1 (Brussels, 1981), 28–30; Osborne (n. 8), 16–21; see also C. Veligianni-Terzi, *Wertbegriffe in den attischen Ehrendekreten der klassischen Zeit* (Stuttgart, 1997), 31–2.

[13] Cf. Meiggs and Lewis (n. 9), 262: 'The restorations are not all certain'. In Wilson and Hartwig '*IG* I^3 102 and the tradition of announcing honours at the tragic *agon*' (forthcoming), a case is made for a number of other possible restorations for line 13, which introduce specific reference to the contest of tragedies.

[14] See esp. A. Henry, *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees* (Zürich and New York, 1983), 22–62.

effect this amounts to the specification of a text for the herald to deliver – or at least something like a set of bullet-points for the same. Though its presence and function are clear enough here, this is one feature of this early honorific decree that does not catch on.[15] The fact that it does appear here demonstrates the importance to the framer's mind of having the *reasons* for the honours for Thrasybulus fully and very publicly proclaimed, and before a larger and more diverse audience than that of the Assembly.

It has always been assumed, no doubt correctly, that the clause also envisages the actual act of crowning Thrasybulus in the theatre, and not simply the announcement of the reasons for this crowning. (In this, as in many other aspects of this decree, we might have wished for a more competent secretary than Lobon.)[16] The event is thus to be no mere report, but a live performance, complete with a script for a herald to deliver that voices the will of the *dêmos*.

Nor can it be doubted that the *agôn* in question (line 13) was part of a major Athenian *polis* festival. In fact, despite the loss of much of line 13, there is virtually no doubt that the festival in question was the City Dionysia of 410/9 B.C.[17] Only one other candidate has ever been aired – the athletic *agôn* of the Panathenaea of 409/8 B.C. This was proposed by Dinsmoor in 1931, with the following text:[18]

καὶ [ἀνειπ]-
[εῖν Παναθηναίον τôι γυμνικôι] ἀγôνι hôν hέν-
[εκα αὐτὸν ho δêμος ἐστεφάνοσ]ε.

While this does have the advantage of specifying the relevant *agôn* more clearly than other restorations, little more can be said in its favour. The fact that 409/8 B.C. was a year for the Small Panathenaea speaks very strongly against it.[19] In any case,

[15] R. Osborne, 'Inscribing performance', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge, 1999), 341–58, at 354–5. It does however also appear in the next datable example of an honorific decree with proclamation clause, *IG* 1^3 125, lines 23–9 of 405/4 B.C., on which see further below. And cf. *SEG* 29 (1979), 86 (= *IG* 2^2 20+), lines 14–17 (of 393 B.C.) with D. Lewis and R. Stroud, 'Athens honours King Euagoras of Salamis', *Hesperia* 48 (1979), 189–90: Euagoras of Salamis apparently praised and honoured as (among other things) a Hellene serving Hellas. The herald is to proclaim as much at the tragic *agôn* of the City Dionysia.

[16] Even in the majority of cases, where decrees do not, as here, specify the enumeration of reasons for the award, but simply require the herald *ἀνειπεῖν τὸν στέφανον* – 'to announce the crown' – the meaning is rightly understood to be 'to announce the award of the crown *as it is being conferred*' (assuming the honorand is present). See below on the honorific decree for Epicerdes of Cyrene, the provisions of which for the announcement of an earlier crown in addition to the current one indicate a normative association of announcing and actual crowning. This cannot have been a hard-and-fast rule, however, as the case of Callias of Sphettus shows – known not to have been in Athens when honoured: T.L. Shear, *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C. Hesperia Supplement XVII* (Princeton, 1978). Similarly, some of the many foreign honorands in later decrees are likely not to have been able to come to Athens for the scheduled ceremony.

[17] This is now the *consensus omnium*: see e.g. Meiggs and Lewis (n. 9), 263; Henry (n. 14), 30; J.L. Shear, *Polis and Panathenaia: The History and Development of Athena's Festival* (Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2001), 414.

[18] W. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens* (Cambridge, MA, 1931), 346, n. 6; *SEG* 10 (1949), 125.

[19] Although the restoration of democracy took place several months before the Great Panathenaea of 410 B.C., making that festival potentially available for this purpose, the framers of this plan to honour Thrasybulus and his associates did not bring their action forward in time to make use of that festival to proclaim the honours, probably at least in part as a matter of deliberate choice rather than through simple force of circumstance. See below p. 15.

Dinsmoor's suggestion of Athena's festival in preference to Dionysus' was motivated by a misunderstanding of the relevant calendrical circumstances. In that respect, Meritt's calculations, which take full account of the confusion that affected the prytanic year in 411 B.C., are to be preferred. These put the start of the year 410/9 B.C. on 26th Thargelion 411 B.C., thus leaving ample time for the eighth prytany to propose the decree, since the Dionysia will have begun more than twenty days into their watch.[20] In her full study of the documentary evidence for the Panathenaea over all its recorded history, Julia Shear rejects the association of *IG* 1^3 102 with the Panathenaea.[21]

Dinsmoor also proceeded in the belief that the selection of festival in such proclamation clauses was motivated by little more than accidental temporal proximity: that the next major *polis* festival to come after the decision had been passed by the Assembly (whether Dionysia or Panathenaea) was the festival for the announcement of the honours, simply because it was the next.

This belief – shared, more or less explicitly, by many scholars[22] – deserves some further consideration and critique. For it proceeds on the tacit and inherently weak assumption that the framers of such important proposals were fundamentally constrained by circumstance rather than at liberty to choose time and place. While there can be no doubt that pressure of events and questions of proximity did play some role in the timetabling of such announcements, in the case of *IG* 1^3 102, liberty rather than constraint is demonstrable. It was not by accident that the Dionysia was chosen in preference to the Panathenaea, or any other major civic occasion, as the moment at which to crown the killers of Phrynichus.

We should give more credit to the forethought of the framers of these proposals and look at the question from (as it were) the beginning, rather than the end, of the process. For it makes more sense to suggest that the timetabling of proposed honours as agenda items for the Council and Assembly was significantly influenced by the

[20] B. Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century* (Harvard, 1928), 98 and esp. Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century* (University of Michigan, 1932), 104–6. Dinsmoor calculated that the start of the prytany of Hippothontis, during which *IG* 1^3 102 was passed – the eighth of the year – was around Elaphebolion 13, the day on which the Dionysia should have ended. The place of the Hippothontid prytany is established by Meiggs and Lewis (n. 9), no. 84, line 27 (= *IG* 1^3 375).

[21] Shear (n. 17), 414; cf. also Meritt 1932 (n. 20), 105, n. 3. The proclamation of honours at the Panathenaea is only securely attested over half a century later (in 347/6 B.C.: *IG* 2^2 212, lines 20–44; P. Rhodes and R. Osborne (edd.), *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC* (Oxford, 2003), no. 64), and the Dionysia far eclipses the Panathenaea (its nearest rival) as the premier site for the announcement of such awards over the course of the entire classical period, and beyond. The honours awarded at the Panathenaea in 347/6 B.C. are for Spartocus, Paerisades, Apollonius, sons of Leucon ruler of Bosporus. This decree shows the further innovation of the repeated award of crowns at successive Great Panathenaea (lines 24–6 with Rhodes and Osborne [n. 21], 323), in full knowledge that the crowns will never leave Athens (lines 33–6). The Dionysia and Panathenaea are the two festivals at which such awards are announced with increasing frequency over the course of the following decades. The two festivals maintained this status for some two centuries, until around 220 B.C., at which time the Eleusinia and Ptolemaea joined them to form a fairly stable group: Shear (n. 17), esp. 418–19. *Agora* 16, 225, lines 9–11 (of 224–221 B.C.) is the first appearance of the quatrain of festivals. Shear (n. 17), 413–23 traces the history of the developments in the award of crowns at the Panathenaea in full, down to the first century.

[22] Cf. Shear (n. 17), 414: 'the timing of the decree may have determined the festival at which the crown was announced: the Great Panathenaea of 410–9 had already been celebrated at the beginning of the year, while the City Dionysia had not'.

anticipated advent of major festivals, and to acknowledge that a large degree of choice was often open to their proposers as to when they initiated their action.

Concern for speedy proclamation of honours at a forthcoming festival gathering becomes quite unambiguous when the decrees themselves explicitly stipulate that the relevant occasion is to be 'the next' or 'the imminent' event. But even such instructions for expeditious timetabling are not evidence of constraint tying the hands of their proposers. And in fact these two similar qualifying phrases are somewhat different in function. The use of 'the imminent *agôn*' – ὁ ἀγὼν ὁ αὐτίκα μάλα – is especially striking. It appears in another early close congener to *IG* 1^3 102, and deserves brief mention here in its own right. This is the second instance surviving from the fifth century of awards proclaimed at a city festival, and follows the awards for Thrasybulus by just four years. Such public proclamations of honours were doubtless still a novelty, a high and distinct honour. This is the decree awarding honours to Epicerdes from Cyrene, dated to 405/4 B.C. (*IG* 1^3 125).[23] Epicerdes had some time earlier given the Athenians 100 minas in their hour of need to rescue Athenian soldiers from starvation in Sicily, and been granted a crown for it, though as the document makes clear, he had not actually been publicly awarded this crown. He subsequently made a further cash gift of a talent, for which, among other honours, another crown was forthcoming. The surviving decree stipulates that '[the herald] should make the announcement, with the additional proclamation at the imm[inent *agôn*] in the city (ἀνειπεῖν [δὲ καὶ τὸν κήρυκα π|ρ]οσκηρύξαντα ἐ[ν τῶι ἀγῶνι τῶι αὐτί]||κα μάλα ἐν ἄστει) [that earlier Epic]erdes of Cyrene [gav]e the Athenians [100 minas] for the rescue in return for which they [crowned him for his bravery] and good-will [to the Athenians]': lines 23–9.[24]

Like *IG* 1^3 102, this decree was probably passed some time in the eighth prytany, during which the City Dionysia fell.[25] Though precision is impossible, the 'imminent *agôn* in the city' may thus have been no more than days away. The honours publicly awarded to the Cyrenean benefactor and saviour of Athenian manpower were thus certainly publicized at the city's greatest theatrical festival. And the remains of the decree directing this show traces of the urgency with which this deadline was met. The phrase αὐτίκα μάλα clearly works as an 'URGENT BUSINESS' label.[26] But the fact

[23] Bibliography on this text, following the discovery and incorporation of a new fragment in the excavations of the Agora in 1970: B. Meritt, 'Ransom of the Athenians by Epikerdes', *Hesperia* 39 (1970), 111–14; Henry (n. 14), 30–1; W. West, 'The decrees of Demosthenes' *Against Leptines*', *ZPE* 107 (1995), 237–47, esp. 242–7; D.M. MacDowell, 'Epikerdes of Kyrene and the Athenian privilege of Ateleia', *ZPE* 150 (2004), 127–33. See also A. Bielman, *Retour à la liberté. Libération et sauvetage des prisonniers en Grèce ancienne. Recueil d'inscriptions honorant des sauveteurs et analyse critique. Études épigraphiques*, vol. 1 (Lausanne, 1994), 3–7 for text and commentary.

[24] This decree thus, unusually, directs the proclamation of a crown that had already been granted some time earlier (Meritt [n. 23], 113–14) – perhaps because Epicerdes had been unable to receive it in person at the earlier date, though it remains a possibility that he had been awarded the earlier crown but not the act of its public proclamation. The (lost) decree sanctioning the earlier crown should date to around 413–411 B.C. and would thus antedate the award for Thrasybulus by a few years. Julia Shear points out to me that the abolition of democracy late in 412 may have interrupted the award of this first crown. But whether the earlier decree offered proclamation of the crown or not, it is clear that the earlier crown was not in fact proclaimed until 404 B.C.

[25] See the calculations of Meritt (n. 23), 114, arguing for Erechtheis as the tribe in prytany.

[26] The phrase appears in various Attic inscriptions in the context of e.g. the urgent appointments of ambassadors, special commissioners and the like; important announcements by heralds; urgent elections and decisions: cf. e.g. *IG* 1^3 21, line 5 of 450/49 B.C.; *IG* 1^3 40, line 47 of

that such special instructions were stipulated to ensure that the honours for Epicerdes were proclaimed at the imminent Dionysia does not mean that this festival was chosen for nothing more than its proximity. On the contrary, the reverse is more plausible: namely that the proposal was shepherded through the Assembly and carefully formulated in this way with a view to the advent of the Dionysia. The desire for publicity at the fast-approaching festival is clearly paramount, and has created the impression of a last-minute rush in the business of the Assembly. Perhaps this usage, unique in honorific decrees, reflects a real situation not far from the imaginary one, projected on to the fifth century by Lucian, where the seven gold crowns that it is proposed be awarded to Timon of Athens are 'to be proclaimed at the Dionysia, at the time of the new tragedies, *today*'. (*Timon* 51).

IG 1^3 125 provides the only example of the use of αὐτίκα μάλα to identify a forthcoming festival in the proclamation formula of an honorific decree. It is somewhat different from the practice, attested only from the late fourth century – and then, not in the city of Athens – of specifying that such proclamations are to take place 'at the first (= next) Dionysia'.[27] As Angelos Chaniotis has recently observed of this phenomenon, '[i]t was not self-evident that the honours were to be announced on the next occasion'.[28] While evincing a concern for speedy proclamation, this usage thus also shows that there was no inherent assumption that the next urban *agôn*, whatever that might be, was the moment at which such proclamations would automatically be timetabled.[29]

The choice of festival for the announcement of honours, and of an event within a festival programme, was thus not neutral. And it certainly was not so when, as in *IG* 1^3 102, the practice was in the very earliest stages of its formation. Moreover, in her fine discussion of the decree of Demophantus and its associated oath, Julia Shear has

446/5 B.C., or indeed in *IG* 1^3 102 itself, line 23, also demonstrating its ready availability at this early period; *IG* 2^2 16, line 10 of 394/3 B.C.; *IG* 2^2 112, lines 6–7; *IG* 2^2 114, lines 6–7. However in the great majority of uses it appears as an adverbial phrase with verbs such as ἑλέσθαι, πέμψαι, εὔξασθαι, χειροτονῆσαι and not, as in *IG* 1^3 125, attributively between the repeated article τῶι and ἐν ἄστει; cf. L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions, II: Morphology* (Berlin/New York, 1996), 409.

[27] For a lively discussion of this phenomenon and further examples see now A. Chaniotis, 'Theatre rituals', in P. Wilson (ed.), *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies* (Oxford, 2007), 48–66, at 56–7. Others: Priene, *IPriene* 17, line 17; 54, line 65; 53I, line 34; 53II, line 59; 60, line 17; 61, lines 36–7 (fourth to second centuries); Cos, *SEG* 35 (1985), 912, line 5 (second century); *ED* 133, line 34 (second century); Larisa, *SEG* 26 (1976–7), 677, line 80 (second century); Magnesia, *IMagn.* 102, line 12; Lampsacus, *IK* 6, 2, 12, line 11 (second century). More elaborate variants: Colophon, *REG* 1999: 2, lines 29–32, (third century); Ephesus, *IEph.* 1390, lines 5–6. A (rare) Panathenaic example: *IMylasa* 632, lines 19–20 (second–first centuries).

[28] Chaniotis (n. 27), 56.

[29] The only (late) classical Attic example known to me is from a deme, the decree of the Aixoneis (*SEG* 36 [1986], 186, of 313/12 B.C.) which specifies as the time for the award of gold crowns to two local *chorêgoi* in the theatre 'at the comedies in the year after Theophrastus' archonship' (lines 6–7: ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι τοῖς κω|μωιδοῖς τοῖς μετὰ Θεόφραστον ἄρχοντα). This example further demonstrates the weakness of mere temporal proximity as the motivating factor for the timing of proclamations. The local Dionysia of Aixone was doubtless chosen by the Aixoneis for reasons of local pride, and because it was the one deme event that drew an audience from well beyond the deme itself. The specification of 'the comedies' (cf. *SEG* 36 [1986], 185, lines 14–15 also of 313/12 B.C.) seems to reflect a special local tradition, or the performance with which these honorands had been associated as *chorêgoi* (or both). See D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica* (Princeton, 1986), 235–42. A second Attic example is the much later *IG* 2^2 1227, lines 31–3 (of 131/0 B.C.) from Salamis: a gold crown to be awarded 'at the tragedies of the Dionysia on Salamis, when it next takes place' (ὅταν πρῶτον γίνηται).

noted that that decree was passed sufficiently early in the civic year 410/9 to have made the Great Panathenaea of 410 B.C. available for the act of collective oath-taking by the Athenians which it prescribed, but the Dionysia of 409 B.C. – the very festival at which Thrasybulus was crowned – was explicitly specified instead.[30] There could be no more pertinent example of the deliberate selection of one *polis* festival in preference to another; no better indication that simple proximity is an insufficient explanation of such timetabling; and no more compelling evidence that the collocation of such civic rituals within a festival frame can hardly be deemed 'accidental'.

'AT THE TRAGIC *AGÔN*'

It is clear that careful thought went into the plan to crown Thrasybulus at the City Dionysia of 409 B.C. But if we return to examine the phraseology of the relevant clause, the instruction that the honours for Thrasybulus be announnced 'at the *agôn* [of the Dionysia]' might seem to be rather unhelpfully vague. The programme of events of the City Dionysia in the late fifth century was after all complex, and the simple expression 'at the *agôn* of the Dionysia' is decidedly imprecise for the practical purpose of identifying a particular moment within it, with the aim of timetabling an important announcement. In 409 B.C. there were at least four *agônes* at the City Dionysia: the boy's chorus, men's chorus, comedy and tragedy. It is, none the less, clear that by this expression those who discussed and drafted *IG* 1^3 102 in fact meant to be understood, 'at the *tragic agôn* of the Dionysia'. The close association of this new practice from the outset with the performance of tragedy cannot be doubted.

That this is so is shown in the first place by the fact that, in the overwhelming majority of references to the practice, literary and epigraphic, the additional specification of 'tragic' is in fact present.[31] Moreover, the imprecise and the specific alternatives are put to the same purpose in exactly parallel epigraphic contexts.[32] And it is further suggested by the generally high profile attaching to tragedy among the performance-genres of the festival, such as to set up a synecdochic relationship between 'the *agôn*' and 'the tragic *agôn*' of the Dionysia. Moreover in 409 B.C., and for many years before that date, a range of announcements and other activities – the 'preplay ceremonials' illuminated by Goldhill – customarily took place just prior to the start of the tragic contest of the City Dionysia, marking that point above all others as the most significant focus of collective, para-theatrical attention within the festival programme. An abbreviated reference of the sort found in *IG* 1^3 102 – 'the *agôn* of the Dionysia' – must depend on a widespread familiarity with these practices that would remove any ambiguity. The display of imperial tribute in the *orchêstra*

[30] J.L. Shear, 'The oath of Demophantos and the politics of Athenian identity', in A. Sommerstein and J. Fletcher (edd.), *Horkos: The Oath in Greek Society* (Exeter, 2007), 156. See further below p. 26 on the significant coincidence at this festival of honours for the assassin and oath-taking against anti-democrats.

[31] Wilson and Hartwig (n. 13) assembles the evidence and makes a case for a number of other possible restorations for line 13 of *IG* 1^3 102 itself, which introduce specific reference to the contest of tragedies.

[32] As an example of the imprecise usage of *agôn* – but with certain reference to the Dionysia (see above p. 14) – cf. the (securely) restored phraseology used in the decree of honours for Epicerdes, *IG* 1^3 125, lines 23–9 (405/4 B.C.): *ἀνειπεῖν* [*δὲ καὶ τὸν κήρυκα π*|*ρ*]*οσκηρύξαντα ἐ*[*ν τῶι ἀγῶνι τῶι αὐτί*]‖*κα μάλα ἐν ἄστει*. Of the numerous specific usages, cf. the honours for Asclepiades of Byzantium, to be awarded 'at the *agôn* of tragedies of the Great Dionysia': *καὶ ἀνειπεῖν τὸν στέφανον* [*Διονυσ*|*ίων τῶν*] *μεγάλων τραγωιδῶν τῶι ἀγῶν*[*ι*] (*IG* 2^2 555, lines 6–7, of 307/6 – 304/3 B.C.).

prior to the performance of tragedy very probably took place in 409 B.C., as it had done in the 420s and probably for some decades before that. In fact, Julia Shear has recently suggested that 409 B.C. was the very year in which the display of tribute was resumed after its suspension in 413 B.C.[33] Similarly, the other activities known to have taken place before the performance of tragedy in the fifth century are very likely to have been present in 409 B.C.: the parade, in armour provided by the city, of young men orphaned by war and reared by the state;[34] the pouring of libations by the ten *stratêgoi*;[35] and finally, the possible proclamation of rewards to those who murder would-be tyrants.[36] I shall return to this last item – not included in most recent discussions – shortly. For it is, I suggest, an immediate antecedent to the oath of Demophantus against anti-democrats and tyrants (assimilated clearly in that document for the first time), an oath sworn at this same festival. And the benefits the oath of Demophantus promised to political assassins were instantiated by the proclamation of honours for Thrasybulus at the same event. It should at any rate be clear that, in the epigrammatic language of the decree, 'at the *agôn* of the Dionysia' serves as shorthand for 'at the tragic *agôn* of the Dionysia'.

DEMOCRATIC HISTORY AND THEATRE HISTORY

Discussion of *IG* 1^3 102 has traditionally tended to focus on the major issues of historical significance that lie behind it. Of prime concern has been its relation to the seismic events that led to the downfall of the oligarchic rule of the Four Hundred in 411 B.C., and to the other sources that report them. And the evidence it provides for the nature of *engktêsis* (the right of a non-citizen to own real property in Attica) in the early period has loomed large in the traditions of Athenian legal and diplomatic history;[37] as have its provisions more generally for the award of honours, for this is the first known instance of the award of a gold crown to civic benefactors in *any* context.[38]

Analysis of the provisions for and significance of the announcement of Thrasybulus' crown has been limited. While their place at the very head of the long Athenian

[33] Shear (n. 30), 156. The display in the theatre is likely to date from as early as the transference of the League treasury from Delos to the Acropolis in 453 B.C., and generally to be coincident with the period of empire during which tribute-paying states were required to bring their payment to Athens at the time of the Dionysia. The best evidence associates it with the 430–420s: Ar. *Ach*. 496–508 and *Σ ad* 504; Isoc. *On the Peace* 82; [Xen.] *Ath. Pol*. 3.2; see S. Goldhill, 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', *JHS* 107 (1987), 58–76, at 60–2. That it took place just prior to the tragic *agôn* – the source which gives most precision in the issue (Isocrates) writes only 'in the *orchêstra*, at the Dionysia, when the theatre was full' – is guaranteed by its close association with the parade of war-orphans, whose reception is placed precisely 'at the time of the tragic performances in the city' by Aeschines, *In Ctes*. 154.

[34] This too is associated with the period of empire, and seen as long in the past in 330 B.C.: Aeschin. *In Ctes*. 153–4; Thuc. 2.46.1; Lys. fr. 129 (Carey): note the detail here of announcement by a herald, *ὁ κῆρυξ ἀναγορεύει*; perhaps Solonic: Diog. Laert. 1.55; cf. Rhodes (n. 2), 111.

[35] Plut. *Cim*. 8.7–9 with Goldhill (n. 1), 60; Carter (n. 2), 6.

[36] See below, p. 26 for the evidence for this last activity. It may also be relevant that, according to most reconstructions of the programme of the classical Dionysia, tragedy could be said to be the 'last' – and climactic – *agôn*, at least the last to begin (comedy perhaps having for a period also ended on the last day): E. Csapo and W. Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Michigan, 1995), 107.

[37] Meiggs and Lewis (n. 9), 262–3 with further bibliography and Osborne (n. 8), 16–21 offer the best summary of the main issues that have occupied commentators.

[38] Henry (n. 14), 30; Osborne (n. 15), 354–5; Shear (n. 17), 414.

tradition of proclaiming honours in a 'live' context beyond the Assembly has been noted, it was only in 1999 that Robin Osborne associated this apparent innovation with the particular individuals being honoured – political assassins – and with the circumstances of their honouring: 'Announcing the honouring of Thrasybulus of Calydon at the Dionysia is one of the distinctly novel, or at least new-fangled, ways in which the murderers of the oligarch Phrynikhos were praised'.[39] He did not develop the point further, however, and the politics of the theatre implied by it remain to be explored. In a fine recent study, Julia Shear has done a great deal to highlight the coincidence at this Dionysia of a number of enormously significant political events: the award of honours for Phrynichus' assassins; the taking of the oath of Demophantus; and the likely resumption of the display of tribute, after a break of some four years in the wake of the Sicilian disaster. All of this no doubt made of that festival 'a particularly charged affair'.[40]

For this famous document, of major importance to the history of Athenian democracy, has never been properly introduced into discussion of the history of the Athenian theatre. It certainly deserves a place there. The reasons for that exclusion are not hard to find. Until recently, the paths of the political history of Athens and the history of its theatre rarely met – and certainly not in the pages of Pickard-Cambridge, who paid scant attention to the proclamation of public honours prior to the performance of tragedy at the City Dionysia.[41] For that reason alone *IG* 1^3 102 never became an item in the standard portfolio of evidence for the history of the classical theatre that *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* claimed to be. That omission, and the very authority of Pickard-Cambridge, account for its having remained outside the mainstream of scholarship on the theatre, even now that studies attentive to the social and political contexts of Athenian drama have proliferated.[42]

Having taken a closer look at the relevant document, we can return to the broader question of its significance for our understanding of the politics of the festival with which I began. As Robin Osborne saw, it is clear that this new form of festival proclamation of honours for the assassin of the oligarch was an innovation tailored to the importance of the events, giving the whole practice a profoundly 'democratic' origin.[43] More can be said about this fitting of the new medium to the message of the moment. For, just as the great attention paid to the public and highly visible

[39] Osborne (n. 15), 354. See also M. Burzachechi, 'Doni ospitali (*xenia*) e corone d'oro nei decreti della Grecia antica', *Rendiconti della Accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti* 36 (1961), 103–113, at 108; M. Blech, *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen* (Berlin/New York, 1982), 156–7.

[40] Shear (n. 30), 156. Shear argues, however, that the oath associated with the decree of Demophantus was taken not in the theatre but in the Agora.

[41] His only reference to the epigraphic evidence is the comment at A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*[2] (Oxford, 1988 [1968]), 59, n. 3 (cf. 67): 'This provision occurs in many inscriptions'. H. Mette, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Griechenland* (Berlin, 1977), 94–102, improves upon Pickard-Cambridge by collecting evidence for the proclamation of honours at the Dionysia, but he too fails to include the earliest examples discussed here.

[42] A similar neglect has attended the intriguing set of inscribed decrees of the Assembly, passed at the special meeting held *ἐν Διονύσου* after the festival, and honouring foreigners for their services to the Athenian theatre. S. Lambert, 'Polis and theatre in Lykourgan Athens: the honorific decrees', in A. Matthaiou and I. Polinskaya (edd.), *ΜΙΚΡΟΣ ΙΕΡΟΜΝΗΜΩΝ: ΜΕΛΕΤΕΣ ΕΙΣ ΜΝΗΜΗΝ Michael H. Jameson* (Athens 2008), 53–85 redresses this neglect admirably. Cf. more generally P. Wilson, 'Introduction: from the ground up', in Wilson (ed.) (n. 27), 1–17.

[43] Osborne (n. 15), 354, quoted above. Cf. Burzachechi (n. 39), 109.

(re-)inscription of laws in the period following the turmoil of the two oligarchic revolutions was evidently designed to bolster the authority of the democratic law-code itself,[44] so too the new and special form of non-graphic 'publication' at the Dionysia of honours that had been decreed by the *dêmos* should be seen as a way of endowing these decisions with a heightened authority that likewise takes its origins from the (first) oligarchic trauma – an authority derived moreover from a new combination of the spoken and the written words of the *dêmos*. For the announcement in the theatre freed many from the need to read the decree itself.[45]

IG 1^3 102 could hardly present a more redolent example, a more momentous set of circumstances: the action that led to the restoration of democracy after its first overthrow, a re-foundational moment in democratic history – indeed, the point at which, in the view of some, an avowedly democratic political self-consciousness was born for the first time in Athens.[46] This should be seen to confirm in spectacular fashion Goldhill's thesis of the democratic ideological frame of tragedy, for here at the very inception of the practice, we see the democratic city rewarding with significant material gifts and powerfully symbolic honour those who came to its defence, latter-day tyrant-slayers akin to those founding heroes of the fifth-century democracy, Harmodius and Aristogeiton.[47]

The international character of the Dionysia ensured that the message reached a very wide audience. The wider world was called upon to witness the democracy once again fully in charge of its own destiny, and, more specifically, letting all know that anyone who did the *dêmos* good, be they Athenian or, as with Thrasybulus, non-Athenian, would find glory and generous reward.[48] The Athenian (democratic) *dêmos*

[44] M. Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law: Law, Society and Politics in Fifth-Century Athens* (Berkeley/London 1986), 509–24; P. Liddel, *Civic Obligation and Individual Liberty in Ancient Athens* (Oxford, 2007), 80.

[45] I note that Liddel (n. 44), 172, makes a similar suggestion, to the effect that announcement of honours made them accessible to those who did not read inscriptions. J.L. Shear, 'Cultural change, space, and the politics of commemoration in Athens', in R. Osborne (ed.), *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy and Politics 430–380 B.C.* (Cambridge, 2007), 91–115, at 114 writes of Athens in 410 B.C. that 'democracy and its products had to be displayed and the city had to be made visibly democratic again'. She amply demonstrates how, in preference to the Acropolis, the Agora was newly turned to this purpose, in particular for the honouring of citizen *euergetai*. Between Acropolis and Agora, the theatre of Dionysus was in this period evidently the place of choice for honouring non-citizen *euergetai* of democratic Athens.

[46] Shear (n. 45), 114.

[47] Cf. the prominent place of the Tyrannicides in the fifth-century popular imagination as evidenced by the Harmodius *skolia* in particular, *PMG* 893–6.

[48] The debate around the announcement ceremony at the Dionysia has not always been clear as to the relevance of the distinction between awards for citizens and non-citizens. In an updated version of his influential 1987 contribution (n. 1), Goldhill (in Winkler and Zeitlin [n. 2]), 105, n. 26 very properly clarifies that 'the evidence for the presentation of the crowns to Athenian citizens in the fifth century … is much less secure than for the fourth century'. The evidence shows a complex picture, with awards to non-Athenians very much more prominent in the epigraphic record overall (see esp. Henry [n. 14]) and the question of whether Athenian citizens could legally have honours proclaimed anywhere outside the Assembly (such as at the Dionysia) becoming a key issue at stake in the legal battle between Demosthenes and Aeschines in the 330s B.C. (Aeschin. 3.32, Dem. 18.120–1). On the last point E. Harris, 'Law and oratory', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (London, 1994), 130–50, has convincingly shown that Aeschines' case against the crowning of Demosthenes was, in strictly legal terms, weak and tendentious. For the award of crowns to Athenians in the fifth century see M. Gygax, 'Plutarch on Alcibiades' return to Athens', *Mnemosyne* 59 (2006), 481–500. The very limited evidence for this includes nothing to suggest that any was proclaimed at a festival. It is relevant to the case of Thrasybulus that in the first rider of *IG* 1^3 102 (lines 15–16), he is awarded citizenship.

had regained its all-important power to thank and to confer honour. And there will also have been an important internal dynamic to the message that this proclamation sent – a clear statement to Athenian citizens, of whatever ideological persuasion, of what constituted 'doing the *dêmos* good' (more on this below).

At this point it is worth passing in review the small cluster of early congeners to *IG* 1^3 102, decrees in which the 'festival publication' formula makes its first appearance – all likewise absent from previous discussions of the politics of the theatre. For the honours for Thrasybulus are in fact the first in a small group dating to the last decade of the fifth and the first of the fourth century. The clear implication is that this was one response of the democracy to the trauma inflicted by the revolutions of the Four Hundred and Thirty – a response which took root as a habit, spread far afield, and persisted for centuries. But as I have already suggested, while the new form of proclaiming crowns and other honours at the Dionysia was indeed a likely innovation of this tumultuous period, seen in combination with the oath of Demophantus, the practice should also be understood as a form of ritual renovation, a continuity with a pre-existing practice that may date to the very first years of the democratic Dionysia, as well as an important development upon it under pressure of very particular historical and political circumstances.

The language of these early decrees, particularly that of the proclamation clauses, reveals the uncertainty of a formula in formation, even granted the extremely fragmentary nature of the relevant inscriptions.[49] Announcement 'at the *agôn* of the Dionysia' in 409 B.C is followed at a period of four years by 'at the imminent *agôn* in the city'. It is clear that this has not become in any sense a fixed phrase since only two years later we find the use of the temporal clause 'at the Dionysia, when the tragic *agôn* takes place'. A new variant on this last resurfaces in the next surviving example a decade later – 'at the *agôn* when the *tragoidoi* are in competition'.[50]

[49] See Henry (n. 14), 30–3. For convenience, I list the relevant clauses as restored in the most recent editions:

- *IG* 1^3 102, lines 12–14 (409 B.C.): *καὶ* [*ἀνειπ*|*ὲν τὸν κήρυκα Διονυσίον ἐν τôι*] *ἀγôνι*
- *IG* 1^3 125, lines 23–9 (405 B.C.): *ἀνειπεῖν* [*δὲ καὶ τὸν κήρυκα π*|*ρ*]*οσκηρύξαντα ἐ*[*ν τῶι ἀγῶνι τῶι αὐτί*]‖*κα μάλα ἐν ἄστει*
- *IG* 2^2 2 frag. b, lines 10–12 (403 B.C.): [*ἀνειπὲν δὲ τὸν* | *κήρ*]*υκα Δ*[*ιονυσίοις ὅταν* | *ἦι ὁ*] *ἀγὼ*[*ν τῶν τραγωιδῶν*]
- *SEG* 29 (1979), 86 (= *IG* 2^2 20+), lines 14–16, 29–30 (393 B.C.), slightly modified: *ἀνειπε*‖[*ὶν …*[36]*… ἀγω*]*νίζωντα*[*ι* (lines 14–16); [- - - - - - - *στεφ*]*άνωι. ὁ δὲ κῆ*[*ρυξ ἀνειπάτω τὸν στέφανον Διον*|*υσίων ἐν τῶι ἀγῶν*]*ι, ὅταν οἱ τρα*[*γωιδοὶ ἀγωνίζωνται, ὅτι στεφαν*|*οῖ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθη*]*ναίων Εὐαγόρ*[*αν τὸν Σαλαμινίων βασιλέα …*].

This improved reconstruction of the text of *SEG* 29 (1979), 86, lines 29–31 (of 393/2 B.C.) follows the recognition of Lewis and Stroud (n. 15), 189 that we have in this document a decree followed immediately by an amendment made in the Assembly, and that the language and phraseology of the text at lines 29ff. (amendment) closely echo that of lines 14ff. (proposal). Hence the introduction in line 30 of the verb *ἀγωνίζεσθαι* from line 15, in preference to the anaemic *ὅταν οἱ τρα*[*γωιδοὶ ὦσι …*] of *IG* 2^2 20, line 7. Lewis and Stroud (n. 15), 190 compare *IG* 11. 4 664, lines 11–13 (Delos, 240–230 B.C.) *ὅταν οἱ τῶν παίδων χ*[*ό*]‖*ροι ἀγωνίζωνται*, as the nearest parallel for the use of the phrase *ὅταν οἱ τρα*[*γωιδοὶ ἀγωνίζωνται*]. *IG* 11. 4 1043, lines 15–16 (also from Delos) may be superior, since it is somewhat earlier and refers specifically to tragedy.

[50] See the preceding note on *SEG* 29 (1979), 86. Henry (n. 14), 22, 31, 45, n. 2, 53, nn. 66–7 is perhaps over-sceptical with regard to *IG* 2^2 2, given the parallel (noted by Henry) in *SEG* 29 (1979), 86. Further support for the use of a temporal clause is available in the deme honorific decree of the fourth century *IG* 2^2 1210, lines 4–6: *εἶναι δὲ αὐτῶ*[*ι καὶ προεδρίαν τραγωιδῶν τῶι ἀγ*]‖*ῶνι ὅταν ποιῶ*[*σι τὰ Διονυσία καὶ καλείτω αὐτὸν ὁ δή*]‖*μαρχος εἰς τὴ*[*ν προεδρίαν.*

We wait more than sixty years for the next examples of honours proclaimed at the Dionysia.[51] It is clear that this earlier group is special. While we can say nothing much about the Boeotian father and son honoured in 403/2 B.C.,[52] the other honorands form a quite remarkable group: there is Thrasybulus (and probably Apollodorus), the liberator of the Athenian *dêmos* from 'tyranny'; the saviour of Athenian manpower, Epicerdes of Cyrene; and Euagoras king of Salamis, patron of Conon's successful arrival in Athens as a returning hero of renascent Athenian naval power – all figures key to the security and identity of the Athenian democracy across this critical period.[53] A recent study of the honours awarded the last on the list concludes that they treat him like a destroyer of tyrants.[54]

Brief consideration of this group thus leaves no doubt about the importance of the new practice of festival proclamation for Athenian democratic self-consciousness. Yet it also requires that we nuance any interpretation of the announcement of honours at the fifth-century Dionysia as above all a marker of Athenian democratic self-confidence.[55] While, as I have suggested, the granting of honours for Thrasybulus does point to a new assertiveness of the returned democracy, the act itself hardly obliterates the memory of what had given rise to it, no matter how anaemic, euphemistic or evasive its language tried to be: '… in return for the good things he has done [for the city] and the *dêmos* of Athenians …'. The award of a crown to Thrasybulus may speak a new confidence of the *dêmos* in power, but that confidence is at the same moment significantly tempered or tainted by a fragility and a sensitivity. For the very act of crowning Thrasybulus inevitably recalls the moment at which the shocking vulnerability of the *dêmos* had been exposed. Read with an understanding of its particular historical circumstances, such political self-confidence as we may find in this practice is in fact not that far from the spirit of uncertainty or heavily qualified optimism that tends to characterize the agency of the *dêmos* or *polis* in tragedy itself. To that extent, the contrast between tragic text and context may not be quite as sharp as Goldhill presents it.[56]

The proclamation of an (earlier) award of a crown to Epicerdes of Cyrene, in addition to another for a subsequent gift of emergency funds, is also especially revealing in this regard. These large cash gifts to Athens had come from this foreign *euergetês* in an hour of extreme need, for the money was used to save the lives of captured Athenian soldiers in Syracuse, in the darkest days the city had seen for a very

[51] See Henry (n. 14), 31–2. The special honours announced (for the first time) at the Panathenaea for the magnates of Bosporus date to 347/6 B.C.: *IG* 2^2 212, lines 20–44, but we must wait a further fourteen years after that for the next Dionysian example.

[52] And see n. 50 above for reference to the doubts of Henry as to whether a crown is indeed awarded, let alone proclaimed, in this fragmentary decree (*IG* 2^2 2 frag. b). M. Walbank, 'An Athenian decree reconsidered: honours for Aristoxenos and another Boiotian', *Echos du monde classique / Classical Views* 26 (1982), 259–74, argues 403/2 B.C. is not possible as a date for this inscription, and that the two fragments (a and b) do not derive from the same *stêlê*. He (tentatively) sees in frag. a a proxeny decree for the Boeotian exile Aristoxenus, dating it to 382/1 B.C. Fragment b he argues is close in date, and perhaps honours with a crown and its proclamation another Boeotian refugee who had provided funds to help the refugees from Boeotia.

[53] Euagoras had been honoured (though without proclamation) eleven years earlier by the Athenians, probably for securing their food supply: Lewis and Stroud (n. 15), 187: *SEG* 34 (1984), 24; Osborne (n. 8), 22–4 dates this decree to early 407 B.C.

[54] Shear (n. 45), 107–8.

[55] Cf. Goldhill (n. 1), 62–3, 68.

[56] Goldhill (n. 1), 68.

long time, with the threat of the extinction of democracy looming directly before it. In saving the men, Epicerdes saved the city.[57]

The practice of proclaiming crowns to benefactors at the Dionysia thus simultaneously reveals the confidence and the fragility of the democracy, dependent as it was on foreign – and in many cases, extremely wealthy and powerful – individuals, yet able, in the very act of endowing them with such ostentatious honours, to assert and enact its superior status in any relationship. The granting of citizenship as one of the relevant ensemble of honours is an especially potent gesture. This highest award was given infrequently, and can be viewed to some extent as a means of attempted honorific control, of making its recipients at least notionally conform, in the act of acceptance, to Athenian norms and standards.[58]

In recognizing this dynamic we may detect a further reason why it was the city's premier agonistic festival that was the chosen site for this practice. For the very business of awarding crowns to civic benefactors had the effect of assimilating their actions to other forms of agonistic endeavour, of making 'doing good to the Athenian *dêmos*' (euergetism) a contest like any other.[59] The decision to timetable the proclamation of the 'winners' of this special *agôn* at the very moment of the city's most prestigious cultural *agôn* (tragedy) draws attention to the implicit assimilation of civic euergetism to the long-familiar economy of the agonistic in the realm of performance – theatrical, musical and athletic.[60] As in dramatic and musical contests, non-Athenians could and did always compete alongside Athenians in this event. But most importantly of all, from the perspective of the Athenian *dêmos*, this assimilation will have served as a powerful form of honorific control. For it made of even the most critical acts, vital to the very continuity of the democracy, performances to be judged and appropriately awarded by the *dêmos*.

BETWEEN OLIGARCHY AND DEMOCRACY: THE DIONYSIA OF 410 AND 409 B.C.

The festival at which the assassins' honours were to be proclaimed is that of 410/9 B.C. This was surely an occasion of particularly strong emotions, in the aftermath of the first oligarchic revolution of 411 B.C. and the restoration of democracy. But we should first briefly consider the festival of the preceding year, 411/10 B.C. For there will have been a number of unusual circumstances attending this earlier event.

The civic year had begun under the Archonship of Mnasilochus, the oligarchs' man who almost certainly went on to become one of the Thirty seven years later.[61] Given that it was the first practical duty of the Archon on entering office ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.*

[57] In Thucydides' account (7.77.7) of the epigrammatic conclusion to the 'encouraging' speech to the soldiers in question delivered by their general Nicias, this disaster prompts a striking absolute rhetorical identification between 'men' and 'the city' that draws on a *topos* of poetic discourse: *ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλις, καὶ οὐ τείχη οὐδὲ νῆες ἀνδρῶν κεναί*. Alcaeus fr. 112, l. 19 (Lobel & Page); cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 349 and *Σ* 352; Soph. *OT* 56–7.

[58] This dynamic has been studied to good effect by A. Moreno, *Feeding the Democracy: the Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC* (Oxford, 2007), esp. 261, 268 in his analysis of the awards (though citizenship is not among them) granted by decree (*IG* 2^2 212) to the kings of Bosporus in 347/6 B.C.

[59] Thus Osborne (n. 15).

[60] Cf. Burzachechi (n. 39), 109: 'ispirato certamente dalla consuetudine dell' incoronazione agonistica'.

[61] [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 33.1 with P. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian 'Athenaion Politeia'* (Oxford 1993 [1981]), 410–11.

56.3), Mnasilochus is very likely to have appointed the *chorêgoi* for the Dionysia, and perhaps took further steps in the festival's planning. After the assassination of Phrynichus in the autumn of 411 B.C., Theopompos replaced Mnasilochus as Archon, but it is unlikely that he annulled the choregic arrangements that had been set in place. This in any case heralded the start of the period of the 'moderate oligarchy' of the Five Thousand.[62] The duration of that regime is unclear, but the restoration of full democracy is generally thought to have taken place by March or April, following the battle of Cyzicus.[63] In other words, the Dionysia of 410 took place under the Five Thousand, or just as their rule came to an end – one reason, no doubt, why it took so long for Erasinides & Co. to engineer the honours for Thrasybulus and his fellows.[64]

We happen to know something about one of the three *chorêgoi* for the tragic contest in this turbulent year. He was the extraordinary young man who commissioned Lysias' twenty-first oration – and we know that he spent half a talent in the process (21.1).[65] That sum is high and eloquent enough by itself. But, added to the list of his other known services, whose total expenditure exceeds some ten talents, it makes it as good as certain that he himself was from a family of compromised oligarchs, desperate to buy his way out of trouble. Had he been appointed to the most conspicuously prestigious choregic duty for tragedy by Mnasilochus as a promising young 'sympathiser', only to find soon after that the need to present himself well before the re-empowered *dêmos* in that capacity had become all the more urgent? It is no surprise that he describes himself as having come of age and performed this *chorêgia* in the archonship of Theopompus, (rather than Mnasilochus). This is probably an expedient licence on his part. But even if he had been appointed by Theopompus, that meant appointment by the Archon of the Five Thousand, and probably – as we have just seen – service at a festival with little by way of solid democratic credentials.

The civic year of 410/9 B.C. was treated as a new democratic beginning.[66] The very first official political business of that year was the passing of the decree of Demophantus and its accompanying oath.[67] This directed Athenian citizens to kill anyone who attempted to overturn the democracy, granting them all legal and religious impunity in doing so. It described citizens who responded to this call to defend the democracy quite explicitly as tyrant slayers, in direct analogy with *the* tyrant-slayers

[62] No democracy, *pace* G. de Ste Croix, 'The Constitution of the Five Thousand', *Historia* 5 (1956), 1–23.

[63] D. Kagan, *The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (Ithaca 1987), 247. Others place the restoration as late as June or as early as January: Meritt 1932 (n. 20), 104–14.

[64] Cf. Meiggs and Lewis (n. 9), 263; Gomme, Andrewes and Dover (n. 10), 310; Bearzot (n. 10); and esp. Osborne (n. 8), 18–20. Thucydides was unable or unwilling to name an assassin, but rather attributed the murder to a nameless attendant (*peripolos*) of the Council Chamber (8.92). And the evidence of Lysias shows that the matter was still far from settled in 400. The facts were doubtless messy. Perhaps what the motion of Erasinides shows above all is the ideological need, in the wake of this fatal breach of trust, for a single champion of democracy, a latter-day tyrant-slayer with a recognizable identity (yet the long lapse of time taken, in addition to the amendments of Diocles and Eudicus, demonstrate how difficult producing such a clear-cut hero was).

[65] He appears not to have been victorious: P. Wilson, 'Costing the Dionysia', in M. Revermann and P. Wilson (edd.), *Performance, Reception, Iconography: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford, 2008), 113.

[66] Cf. esp. Andoc. 1.96.

[67] Andoc. 1.97; M. Ostwald, 'The Athenian legislation against tyranny and subversion', *TAPhA* 86 (1955), 103–28.

Harmodius and Aristogeiton, and eliding in the process the oligarch and the tyrant.[68] Anyone who died in the attempt, along with his children, was to receive the honours accorded to them and their descendants.

It has generally been assumed (and occasionally argued) that these rewards were restricted in their application to citizens only.[69] But the language of the decree describing the slayer of the would-be destroyer of democracy is broad, doubtless deliberately so – 'he who kills one who would do these things and he who conspires to do so'.[70] While non-Athenians could hardly be bound by oath to protect Athenian democracy, they could certainly be honoured for doing so on a par with citizens. Very recent history will certainly have made the Athenians painfully aware of the value of (presumably metic) non-citizens in the defence of their democracy.[71]

The accompanying oath is to be sworn by 'all the Athenians over adult offerings, *before the Dionysia*' (Andoc. 1. 98, *πρὸ Διονυσίων*) – the Dionysia in question being that of 409 B.C. This phrase has generally been interpreted as a temporal index stipulating a deadline before which all Athenians were required to have sworn the oath.[72] I suggest that it may have a more specific meaning, namely 'just prior to the Dionysia' – and perhaps, more specifically, 'just prior to the tragic performances of the Dionysia'.[73] It thus also serves the purpose of timetabling this important action more precisely, as would be expected in a decree of this kind. In other words, we should envisage the scene of the Athenians swearing the oath of Demophantus *en masse* in the theatre, perhaps moments before the new and special honour of

[68] See esp. Shear (n. 30), 152.

[69] Shear (n. 30), 151 makes the case.

[70] *ὁ δὲ ἀποκτείνας τὸν ταῦτα ποιήσαντα καὶ ὁ συμβουλεύσας*. The Athenians could obviously legislate for non-citizens, including metics, within their territory, and in the absence of further specification it is, I believe, preferable to assume that *ὁ ἀποκτείνας* includes citizens and non-citizens alike. If however Shear (n. 30), 151 is right in arguing that non-citizens are not included in these potential rewards, it makes the extremism of the oath all the more forceful. The way it binds all citizens to become assassins under such terms takes shape in light of the fact that the Athenians had evidently depended on foreigners to save them from oligarchy in 411.

[71] The account recorded by Thucydides (8.92) is usually interpreted as suggesting that the killer of Phrynichus was in fact an Athenian, for the unnamed *peripolos* is said to have had an Argive accomplice, implying that the killer himself was Athenian: Gomme, Andrewes and Dover (n. 10), 310. If there had been a potential Athenian candidate for the assassin, there must have been powerful reasons why this account did not take root. One such reason would be that the assassination of Phrynichus was in fact the product of in-fighting among the oligarchs rather than noble resistance to their tyranny – a version of events that the restored democracy would be eager to obliterate. Bearzot (n. 10) makes some interesting arguments along these lines; cf. esp. her conclusion at 298: 'La congiura contro Frinico nasce dall'interno della cercia degli oligarchi'. Note also the point made above about the controlled – and controlling – award of citizenship to foreign benefactors, including Thrasybulus.

[72] D. MacDowell, *Andocides: On the Mysteries* (Oxford, 1962), 136 inclines to the view that the expression works only to stipulate a deadline for making the oath. But at the same time, he is struck by the unusually lengthy 'period of grace allowed for the taking of the oath … the surprisingly long one of about nine months'.

[73] See above p. 16 on the evidence for the placement of such activities at this moment within the festival programme and below n. 77 for evidence that the phrase could be used with this more specific meaning. I am delighted to see that Julia Shear (n. 30), 153–8 recently arrived at the same conclusion quite independently, although her interpretation differs from mine in locating the oath-taking in the Agora rather than the theatre, and in placing the taking of the oath in the days leading up to the festival proper. I refer to her excellent analysis, in which she further notes, for instance, that the stipulation that all Athenians swear the oath 'by tribe and by deme' is without earlier parallel, and has a full discussion of the regular epigraphic usage of the preposition *πρό* in the sense of 'just before' which complements my own.

bestowing a gold crown before the same theatrical audience on one who had enacted the spirit of Demophantus' decree *avant la lettre*.[74]

There is no other example of *πρὸ + Διονυσίων* in the surviving corpus of Attic inscriptions.[75] And there is just a single instance of *πρὸ + Παναθηναίων*. In the honorific decree *IG* 2^2 351, lines 19–20 (330/29 B.C.), Eudemus of Plataea is praised for the following: 'he has donated a thousand (days of labour of) yoke of oxen for the construction of the stadium and the Panathenaic *theatron*, and has sent them all before the Panathenaea, as he promised …' (*καὶ ταῦτα πέπομφεν ἅπαντα π[ρὸ Π]αναθηναίων καθὰ ὑπέσ[χετο …]*)'[76] While this may look rather more like an instance of the 'deadline before which' usage of *πρό* + festival, it also demonstrates the special purposefulness that motivates the selection of the festival mentioned in such phrases – for there is no doubt that the oxen provided by Eudemus were to be employed for heavy haulage and construction-work on the stadium and *theatron* needing to be readied for use at the next Panathenaea.

Moreover, the epigraphic examples cited by Shear (n. 30), 155–6 in reference to events or festivals other than the Dionysia demonstrate more fully that *πρό* in the sense of 'just before' was a familiar usage. Among these, the direction to proclaim honours awarded by the Mesogeioi is especially illuminating. These are to be announced 'in the sanctuary of [Heracles at the festival], just before the sacrifice' (*[ἀνειπεῖν δὲ τὰς | δωρε]ὰς ἐν τῶι Ἡρακλε[ίωι τῆι ἑορτ|ῆ]ι πρὸ τῆς θυσ[ίας·*) *IG* 2^2 1244, lines 3–5.

In addition, the single literary example of *πρὸ τῶν Διονυσίων* generated by a textual search of the *TLG* confirms the view that in the decree of Demophantus the phrase should mean 'just prior to the Dionysia'. This is the account given by Aelian of the young Plato, on his way to the theatre to compete with a tragic tetralogy that he had composed, only to hear and forever be distracted by Socrates: *πρὸ τῶν Διονυσίων παρελθὼν ἤκουσε Σωκράτους* … 'passing by just before the Dionysia he heard Socrates …', *VH* 2.29.[77]

[74] The interpretation of the phrase I propose ('all the Athenians are to swear it … just prior to the Dionysia') effectively includes the purpose of the more general interpretation as deadline ('all the Athenians are to swear it before the date of the Dionysia'), on the assumption (easy enough in terms of ordinary Athenian ideological identifications: see esp. Dem. 21.18 with P. Wilson, 'Demosthenes 21, *Against Meidias*: democratic abuse', *PCPS* 37 [1991], 164, 187–8; Shear [n. 30], 156) that 'all the Athenians' are present for the Dionysia and swear the oath before it begins in earnest. If it did take place in the theatre – using an altar in the *orchêstra*, or perhaps by filing into the sanctuary – the requirement in Andoc. 1.97 that the oath be sworn *κατὰ φυλὰς καὶ κατὰ δήμους* has intriguing and hitherto neglected consequences for the (or at least one possible) disposition of the audience.

[75] Nor is the Dionysia used in the way the Panathenaic quadrennium functions, to divide civic time into blocks *ἐκ Παναθηναίων εἰς Παναθήναια*: e.g. *Ath. Pol.* 43.1; *IG* 1^3 52, A lines 27–8, b. line 28; *IG* 1^3 292, line 3; *IG* 1^3 300, line 2; *IG* 1^3 317, lines 1–2, etc.

[76] On this inscription see Lambert (n. 42). The recognition that *ζεῦγος* = day equivalence goes back to A. Wilhelm, 'Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde', *SAWW* 166 (1911), 1–63, at 49. This amounts to a commitment to supply the necessary thousand days of labour before the festival. Given that Eudemus' offer was made (according to the decree) on or near 11th Thargelion, the next Panathenaea was only about eight or nine weeks away. The thousand days of promised labour are therefore, I suggest, very likely to represent something like fifty calendar days of work with twenty pair of oxen. My thanks to William Slater for discussion of this point.

[77] This use of *πρὸ (τῶν) Διονυσίων* also shows that the phrase could mean 'before the theatrical performances of the Dionysia' rather than, as strict logic might seem to require, 'before the start of the festival of Dionysus'. If the latter were the required meaning of *πρὸ Διονυσίων* in the decree of Demophantus, as Shear (n. 30), 157 suggests, it points to Elaphebolion 9 as the day

It is thus highly likely that the collective Athenian enunciation of the important oath of Demophantus against anti-democrats is to be placed among the very special set of pre-tragic ceremonies that took place at the City Dionysia of 409 B.C. Moreover, the evidence of Aristophanes' *Birds* (1074–5) suggests that in 414 B.C. a practice had long been in place for the announcement in the theatre, prior to the performance of drama, of awards for the murder of aspiring tyrants.[78] If Demophantus' oath was indeed proclaimed collectively by the Athenians in the theatre 'just prior to the Dionysia' of 409 B.C., it presents itself as an updating of this older practice in light of recent experience.[79] So, whether we are to imagine the new oath of Demophantus or the old announcement of awards for the slayers of would-be tyrants as the accompaniment to the proclamation of the gold crown for Thrasybulus, the Dionysia of 409 B.C. saw an extraordinary agglomeration of rituals shoring up and shaping democratic ideology.[80]

Indeed, as I have already indicated, the existence, from perhaps as early as the beginning of the fifth century, of this proclamation at the Dionysia of rewards for tyrant-slayers forms a neglected element in the portfolio of evidence for the politics of the theatre, and more particularly for discussion of the relation between tragedy and its festival frame.[81] In instituting the practice of awarding and proclaiming crowns for benefactors at the tragic contest of the City Dionysia in the tumultuous final decade

for the oath, since the Dionysia officially began on or around Elaphebolion 10 with the *pompê*, with the dramatic contests starting on the 11th: Csapo and Slater (n. 36), 106–7. Elaphebolion 9 is a day for which meetings of the Assembly are known: J. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton, 1975), 123–30, 137. It is true that much the more usual way to refer to the moment of the pre-performance ceremonials is by use of a dative (*Διονυσίοις*, *Διονυσίων τοῖς τραγωιδοῖς*, etc.). I would therefore not insist that *πρὸ Διονυσίων* has precisely the same meaning here. It is possible that the variation is rather intended to place the hugely important activity of oath-swearing at the very beginning of the sequence of various pre-performance ceremonials. But even if the phrase was not intended to tie the oath-taking physically to the theatre, the underlying politics of its association with the Dionysia remain unchanged.

[78] *τῆιδε μέντοι θἠμέραι μάλιστ' ἐπαναγορεύεται, / … ἤν τε τῶν τυράννων τίς τινα / τῶν τεθνηκότων ἀποκτείνηι, τάλαντον λαμβάνειν*. N. Dunbar, *Aristophanes: Birds* (Oxford, 1995), 581 especially on the question as to whether this was confined to the first day of the Dionysia or took place on each day. See further K. Raaflaub, 'Stick and glue: the function of tyranny in fifth-century Athenian democracy', in K. Morgan (ed.), *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece* (Austin, 2003), 59–93, at 69–70, who accepts the evidence for the practice and Seaford (n. 2), 34–6.

[79] Cf. Raaflaub (n. 78), 70.

[80] The combination of a decree about tyrant-slaying and an ideologically charged act of crowning that we find at the Dionysia of 409 B.C. reappears in an intriguing manner in the law of Eucrates of 337/6 B.C. (*SEG* 12 [1955], 87), which clearly looks back to Demophantus' provisions. Whereas in 409 B.C. the decree and crowning were separate acts, the two are collapsed into one on the stone of the later law, as relief carving (*Dêmokratia* crowns *Dêmos*) and accompanying law. I thank Alastair Blanshard for this observation and refer to his fine study of the Eucrates monument: A. Blanshard, 'Depicting democracy: an exploration of art and text in the law of Eukrates', *JHS* 124 (2004), 1–15.

[81] It is difficult to imagine an historical context other than that around 500 B.C. which would have given rise to the institution of the proclamation in favour of tyrant-slayers at the Dionysia. The lines from the *Birds* play on the idea that tyrants are a thing of the distant past. This might in itself be taken to suggest an awareness that the measure was of very long standing. More salient, however, is the fact that it draws its humour from a deliberate misrecognition of the way the Athenians re-figured the tyrant over the course of the fifth century. While affecting to present 'tyrants' as a thing of the distant past, it draws its impact from a no doubt keen awareness that, in 414 B.C., in the wake of the mutilation of the Herms and profanation of the Mysteries, and all that those acts portended, fear of tyranny was a reality in the city once more.

of the fifth century, in close association with the decree and oath of Demophantus, the Athenians were thus activating the perhaps largely dormant potential of a ritual proclamation the democratic orientation of which is beyond doubt. That ritual, the mentalities that underpinned it, and the ease with which it was renovated and rearticulated for the special conditions that afflicted the democratic city in 410 B.C. show that the tragic contest of the Dionysia had been the natural home for such democratic expression for the whole period from which our surviving dramas derive, and that we are surely right to continue, with Goldhill, to think of the institutional framework within which drama was performed at Athens as fundamentally democratic, rather than simply 'a *polis* framework'.[82]

The theatre came to this role in 409 B.C. with its own history. Indeed, we might say that the theatre itself had been a protagonist in recent political history, and that the attention devoted to the site in the aftermath of 411 B.C. to some extent reflects and refers to the role it had played. For Thucydides makes it clear that the two principal theatrical spaces of Athens – that at Munichia in Piraeus and the urban theatre by the Acropolis – were the chosen sites of democratic resurgence and formal decision-making during the short period of oligarchic rule. In an important sense, in this period the theatre served as a shadow-site of the abolished democratic Assembly. The one in the Piraeus was where the first concerted action of the *dêmos* under arms took place, in the wake of the murder of Phrynichus. The hoplites stockpiled weapons there and held an assembly in which they resolved to march on the city. Once there, the theatre of Dionysus on the slopes of the Acropolis became the site chosen for the meeting of the hoplite assembly 'on a fixed day, to discuss *homonoia*'. That meeting never took place, but the plan suggests a propensity on the part of the anti-oligarchs to turn to that space in the hard journey towards political resolution.[83]

The rich young speaker of Lysias 21, of uncertain political allegiance, offers a point of striking continuity between the two successive Dionysia following the oligarchic revolution of 411 B.C. For he appears once again at the festival of 409 B.C., where the tragic contest was certainly preceded by the announcement of honours for Thrasybulus and his fellows, and the placing of a gold crown on the head of an Athenian euergete for the very first time – and one who had in effect 'liberated' the *dêmos*. And by a rare and happy coincidence of available evidence, we know that the winner of this tragic *agôn* was none other than Sophocles, with the set of dramas that included the *Philoctetes*.[84] It is worth recalling the poet's own recent very direct involvement in the events that led to the abolition of full democracy, as one of the *probouloi* who voted for the Four Hundred; and noting that this evidently did not tarnish his reputation with the Archon Glaucippus, or with the judges of the tragic *agôn* of that year.[85]

[82] Rhodes (n. 2), 119.

[83] Thuc. 8.93.1, 8.93.3, 8.94.1. See Gomme, Andrewes and Dover (n. 10), 316; N. Loraux, *La Voix endeuillée: essai sur la tragédie grecque* (Paris, 1999).

[84] Prose hypothesis Soph. *Phil*. The proximity of these major theatrical and political events at the Dionysia of 409 B.C. has never, to my knowledge, been noted by Sophoclean critics or historians of the theatre (however see now Shear [n. 30]). There is for instance nothing in C. Greengard, *Theatre in Crisis: Sophocles' Reconstruction of Genre and Politics in Philoctetes* (Amsterdam, 1987), a work which 'argues for a much closer relation of the drama to its historical setting than is normally accorded these "timeless" dramas'. (p. 8).

[85] Sophocles as *proboulos*: Arist. *Rh*. 3, 18, 1419a25 = *TrGF* 4 T Gd 27. Cf. M. Jameson, 'Politics and the *Philoctetes*', *CPh* 51 (1956), 217–27, esp. 217–18. Without entering into the debate as to whether the praise of Colonus in the *OC* (668–719) – the place where a meeting of

The choice of role made by the young liturgist of Lysias 21 at the Dionysia of 409 B.C. is particularly interesting. This time he served as *chorêgos* for the men's chorus of his tribe (Lys. 21.2), and this time he spent the vast sum of 5,000 drachmas – 'including the erection of the tripod', this last phrase indicating that his chorus was successful in the *agôn*. He will certainly have volunteered for this task, as his tragic *chorêgia* in the immediately preceding year gave him automatic exemption from any such obligation.[86] His decision to support his tribe, and to do so in so lavish a fashion, may have been motivated in part at least by a wish to identify himself with the more 'democratically' configured performance category of the men's chorus. It could thus be seen as an act of symbolic identification with the restored regime at a time when reprisals against those who had been implicated with the rule of the Four Hundred were widening in scope.[87] The sheer scale of his expenditure is striking. There are many practical reasons that might make one expect a larger outlay on the men's chorus than tragedy or comedy – the fact that the former had fifty to tragedy's fifteen singer-dancers prominent among them. But in this case we may suspect a wish, or indeed a need, on the part of this *chorêgos*, to be able to say that his expenditure on the performance with a greater collective affiliation and at a festival with no shadow cast over its organization had far outweighed that on tragedy in the previous year. This has the air of a compromised individual buying the charisma and *charis* of victory in the newly democratically sanctioned festival at any cost.

As victorious *chorêgos* for the men's chorus he too will have been crowned – with ivy rather than gold – at the end of the proceedings in the theatre that began with another, very special crowning. How did this rich young man, seated in a prominent proedric seat as one of the year's *chorêgoi*, 'hear' the announcement of these honours for the democratic assassins at the Dionysia, as he saw the gold crown placed on the head of Thrasybulus, *euergetês* of the Athenian *dêmos*? The internal dynamic of this message was surely intended above all for him and his kind – a wealthy citizen who, while perhaps no fervent oligarch (witness his service at Aegospotami and his employment of Lysias, no friend of tyrants), all the same found no difficulty being complicit with an oligarchic regime (as his prominence under the Thirty, and his very presence in the city in Hecatombaion 403 B.C. show). The question of whether the *chorêgoi* for the Dionysia of 410 B.C. had indeed been appointed by the oligarchic Archon Mnasilochus becomes highly charged when we reflect on the fact that the oath of Demophantus explicitly included among those who were thereafter to be piously assassinated 'anyone who holds office after the democracy has been over-

the Assembly under Peisander was held – reflects a partisan or apologetic oligarchic view on the part of the poet (see e.g. J. Wilson, *The Hero and the City: An Interpretation of Sophocles' 'Oedipus at Colonus'* [Michigan, 1997], 198–9; L. Edmunds, *Theatrical Space and Historical Space in Sophocles' 'Oedipus at Colonus'* [Lanham/London, 1996], 91–110), it is worth observing the contrast between that Assembly, held in the sanctuary of Poseidon Hippius at Colonus, and the ones held in the theatre(s) of Dionysus during the oligarchy, but also thereafter, to foreswear oligarchs and tyrants. For further bibliography and a balanced discussion of political readings of Sophocles' *OC* see A. Markantonatos, *Oedipus at Colonus: Sophocles, Athens, and the World* (Berlin/New York, 2007), 12–15.

[86] Dem. 20.8; 21.155; 50.9; *Ath. Pol.* 56.3. Isoc. 7.38 implies that an exemption period of two years may have operated in an earlier time: MacDowell (n. 23), 127, n. 3. It is not inconceivable that choregic appointments made by Mnasilochus for 410 B.C. were subsequently deemed formally invalid, at least in respect of attracting exemption to their holders. Such a deduction should not, however, be made solely on the basis of Lys. 21, for its speaker repeatedly ignored the availability to him of liturgical exemption over the course of several years.

[87] Wilson (n. 2), 90.

thrown' (*καὶ ἐάν τις ἄρξῃ τιν' ἀρχὴν καταλελυμένης τῆς δημοκρατίας τὸ λοιπόν*, Andoc. 1.97). *Chorêgoi* were not *archontes* – but they were sufficiently indistinct from them to prompt a discussion of the question from Aristotle (*Politics* 1299a15–20).[88] And the *chorêgoi* of the Dionysia in 410 B.C. had, strictly speaking, probably only served under a narrowly oligarchic regime for a brief period – and under the Five Thousand for a further four or five months. But the situation was doubtless close enough to make this an uncomfortable moment for this young man.

The decision to present Thrasybulus before the panhellenic audience of the Dionysia at the tragic *agôn* of 409 B.C. can hardly have been merely a matter of convenience. If, as is likely, *IG* 1^3 102 represents the first use of the festival in this way, it is important to reflect on the fact that the practice was designed for and initiated in this context – the desire to honour the first historical saviour of the developed democracy.

But it is also important to recognize that this innovation itself represents a continuity, the development of a long-familiar association between the tragic contest of the Dionysia and the defining co-ordinates of democracy. This is not the first, nor will it be the last, example of Dionysiac ritual moulded to meet the needs of a society articulating its sense of political liberty.[89]

University of Sydney PETER WILSON
peter.wilson@usyd.edu.au

[88] Wilson (n. 54), 169–70.

[89] See Connor (n. 2). Another Athenian example: Philippides, comic poet and statesman, as agonothete for the City Dionysia in 287 B.C. 'was the first to arrange an extra *agôn* for Demeter and Kore as a reminder of the [liberation] of the *dêmos*' (*IG* 2^2 657, lines 43–5); and cf. also the Eretrian decree of around 309 B.C. (12. 9 192 = *LSCGSuppl*. 46) which prescribes *inter alia* the wearing of ivy crowns at the *pompê* of Dionysus by all, citizens and metics, as a memorial of the day 'when during the *pompê* of Dionysus the [Macedonian] garrison departed, the *dêmos* was liberated … and reintroduced democracy' (lines 3–5) with A. Jacottet, 'Le lierre de la liberté', *ZPE* 90 (1990), 150–6; P. Wilson, 'The politics of dance: dithyrambic contest and social order in Greece', in D. Phillips and D. Pritchard (edd.), *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea/London, 2003), 165–98, at 180–1.