

consists of the remains of an acropolis and a city which were first reported by Delacoulonche.¹² They have not been excavated. Faklaris expressed his own faith that 'future archaeological research in the area of Kopanos will bring to light the splendid edifices and royal cemetery of the first capital of the Macedonians' (616). Until that faith is proved or disproved by excavation, we must rely on the literary-cum-archaeological evidence which has led scholars to identify the site near Kopanos with the ancient city Mieza.¹³ An inscription listing Delphic *Theorodokoi* placed only one city between Beroea and Edessa, namely Mieza.¹⁴ Plutarch described the School for Alexander as 'the precinct of the Nymphs by Mieza' (περὶ Μιέζαν), 'where the stone seats and shaded walks of Alexander are still shown' (*PA* 7.4). Also 'at Mieza' there were stalactites in a cave (Pliny *NH* 31.30). The School has been identified near Kopanos. It was cleared and described by Ph. Petsas in the 1960s and by M. Siganidou and K. Trochidis in 1993, with the walks extending for some 270 m, rock-cuttings, traces of roofing and small finds 'mainly of the fourth century BC'.¹⁵ The place is called 'Izvorja' after the copious springs which are appropriate for a Nymphaeum, and there are caves in the limestone, one of which still has stalactites.

N.G.L. HAMMOND

Clare College, Cambridge

Neoptolemus and the bow: ritual *thea* and theatrical vision in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*

Much has been written in recent years on the ways in which ritual forms, patterns and sequences are remoulded into the imagery and action of classical Greek plays. A tragedy which offers exceptionally fertile ground for studies on 'ritual and drama' is Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, since theatrical and ritual strands are so intimately interwoven in its plot as to create an inextricable knot. In forthcoming work I explore in full both the ritual liminality of Philoctetes' and Neoptolemus' existence¹ as well as the subtle ways in which the vital dramatic experiences of 'acting' and 'viewing' are inherently intertwined in this play with the initiatory strands of rites of maturation.² The present note, conversely, is less ambitious in its scope, as its exclusive focus is *one* pivotal moment of the play's action, namely the dramatic exhibition of the bow to Neoptolemus' and the spectator's eyes. No matter how inherently interwoven with the action Philoctetes' bow is,³ Neoptolemus' close look, as he accepts it in his hands (*Phil.* 776), 'theatricalises' the object by converting it into a dramatic spectacle, a *thea*. But even before being formally delivered to Neoptolemus' custody (*Phil.* 762-78), the bow is prominently singled out as the prime focus of attention, becoming, as it does, a stage-prop uniquely capturing the boy's concentrated sight. As a privileged, 'internalised' onlooker,⁴ Neoptolemus lends voice to the wish of many a theatrical spectator to 'observe in close detail', to 'gaze':

ἄρ' ἔστιν ὥστε κάγγυθεν θεῶν λαβεῖν,
καὶ βαστάσαι με προσκύσαι θ' ὥσπερ θεόν;
(*Phil.* 656-7).

In other words, by highlighting the bow's dramatic function as a stage-prop, Theatre points self-reflexively to the nature of its own objects as dramatically polyvalent stage-signs.⁵ One aspect of this polyvalence, i.e. the 'sacred', 'holy' nature of the famous *toxa* (see *Phil.* 942-3 τὰ τόξα μου /τερᾶ), is implicit in the immediately ensuing verse καὶ βαστάσαι με προσκύσαι θ' ὥσπερ θεόν; (*Phil.* 657), where Neoptolemus asks

¹² *Mémoire sur le berceau de la puissance macédonienne* (Paris 1858) 98 f.

¹³ The *communis opinio* was expressed recently by E.N. Borza, *In the shadow of Olympus* (Princeton 1990) 18 and 81 'Mieza (modern Kopanos/Lefkadia below Naousa)'. For some of the reasons see *HM* i 163 and Ph. Petsas in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton 1976) 577.

¹⁴ *BCH* xlv (1921) 17 iii 59, in the form 'Meza'. This inscription militates against the doubts of Borza (n. 13) 275 'whether or not Mieza was a proper town'.

¹⁵ Reports were published by Petsas in *Praktika* 1965, 39 f., 1966, 31 f., and 1968, 65 f., and also in *Ergon* 1965 [1966] 21-8 and *Makedonika* vi (Thessaloniki 1967) 33 with Plate 50. And by M. Siganidou and K. Trochides in *AEMTh* iv (1993) 121-5. Petsas kindly showed me round the site in 1968. Nothing could be more convincing. There are rather distant photographs in *Praktika* (1965) Plates 48a and 52.

¹ Elaborating on the pioneering work of Vidal-Naquet, 'Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and the *ephebeia*', in J.P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet (eds.), *Myth and tragedy in ancient Greece* (Eng. trans. J. Lloyd) (New York 1988) 161 ff. (An earlier version of Vidal-Naquet's essay first appeared in 1971, in *Annales, ESC*, 623 ff.).

² I. Lada-Richards, 'Staging the *ephebeia*: theatrical role-playing and ritual transition in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*' (forthcoming, a) and 'Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and ritual liminality' (forthcoming, b).

³ See O. Taplin, *Greek tragedy in action* (London 1985; first publ. 1978) 89, where the bow is rightly said to constitute 'a stage property which is, perhaps, the most integrally incorporated of all material objects in the Greek tragedy we have.'

⁴ For the intersection of multiple levels of viewing in this play, see I. Lada-Richards (n. 2, forthcoming a).

⁵ See C.P. Segal, *Interpreting Greek tragedy: myth, poetry, text* (Ithaca and London 1986) 121: 'No visual symbol in Sophocles has a more powerful and far-reaching ethical and psychological meaning than the bow of the *Philoctetes*.'

to see the bow in an attitude of humiliation, awe, veneration. It is the thesis of this note that for large sections of the play's first audience, i.e. those who were *memyēmenoi* in the Eleusinian initiation rites, both the dramatic framing of Neoptolemus' plea (*Phil.* 654-75) as well as the emotions registered in its verbal level would have suggested a whole string of ritual associations falling into the realm of Eleusinian mystic initiation. I believe that this small observation can contribute to the literature on *Philoctetes* in a twofold way. In the first place it can shed new light on one of the most debated scenes of the play, by suggesting that it lies at the intersection of theatrical and ritual lines which crossfertilise each other. Secondly, it enriches *Philoctetes* with a set of connotations unnoticed so far, i.e. with a layer of allusions to the cultic sequence of Eleusinian initiation.⁶

Among the ritual constituents of the Eleusinian mysteries were the '*deiknymena*', the holy things shown by a special official, the 'Hierophant' (cf. Hesychius, s.v. 'ιεροφάντης': *ιερεὺς ὁ τὰ μυστήρια δεικνύων*).⁸ Indeed, the revelation of the *sacra* was the climax of the entire ceremony, an awesome moment: *δρωμένων δὲ καὶ δεικνυμένων τῶν ἱερῶν προσέχουσιν* [i.e. the initiands] *ἤδη μετὰ φόβου καὶ σιωπῆς* (*Plut. Mor.* 81e). Contemplating (*epopteuein*) 'the great, wonderful, most perfect epoptic secret' (Hippolytus, *Ref. Haer.* v 8. 39) means to have achieved the highest possible degree of initiation.⁹ Moreover, it seems very possible that the entire Eleusinian *teletē* culminated in the staging inside the Initiation Hall (Telesterion) of Persephone's return,

⁶ This observation, of course, will be much more readily acceptable to those willingly 'initiated' into the 'mysteries' line of approach to Greek drama. It ties up well with, e.g., F.I. Zeitlin (*PCPS* n.s. xxxv [1989] 144-97), R. Seaford (*Hermes* cxvii [1994] 275-88, and *CQ* n.s. xxxi [1981] 252-75) or my own forthcoming *Initiating Dionysus: ritual and theatre in Aristophanes' Frogs* (Oxford). However, as it lies beyond the scope and ambition of a brief note to convert the non-converted, I shall assume for what follows the attention of a reader-'accomplice' rather than a reader-sceptic.

⁷ The act of showing and revealing goes back to the founders of the rites, Demeter herself who, in the *Homeric Hymn*, *δειξε* [...] *δηρσιμοσύνην θ' ἱερῶν καὶ ἐπέφραδεν δργια πάσι* (474-6). This stage of the mysteries is amply reflected in the sources (see passages assembled by N.J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* [Oxford 1974] 302), which most often use the terms *δεικνύουσι* or (*ἀνα*)*φάινειν*. In Isocrates (iv 29) the entire Eleusinian ritual is referred to as an act of *deixis* (*καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν ἐνιαυτῶν δεικνυμένων*), while the conception of the Mysteries as acts to be 'shown' pervades those texts discussing the notorious profanation of 415 BC (see, e.g. *Lys.* vi 51; *Andoc.* i 11, i 12, i 16; *Plut. Mor.* 621c; *Plut. Alc.* 22 *ἀπομμυούμενον τὰ μυστήρια καὶ δεικνύοντα τοῖς αὐτοῦ ἑταίροις ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τῆ ἑαυτοῦ, ἔχοντα στολὴν οἴανπερ ὁ ἱεροφάντης ἔχων δεικνύει τὰ ἱερά*). See further G.E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian mysteries* (Princeton 1961) 273 ff.

⁸ See Mylonas (n.7) 229-30, and for a very detailed study, see K. Clinton, *Trans. Amer. Philosph. Soc.* n.s. lxiv. 3 (1974) 10-47.

⁹ I.e. that of the *epoptes*; on grades in the Mysteries, see K. Dowden, 'Grades in the Eleusinian Mysteries', *RHR* cxvii (1980) 409 ff. and on Eleusinian initiation in general, see W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: the anthropology of ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth* (Engl. transl. P. Bing) (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1983) 248-97 and Burkert, *Ancient mystery cults* (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1987) esp. 89-114.

whether she emerged in flesh and blood in the person of her High Priestess or appeared as a vision or a statue in a dazzling light.¹⁰ And, even if the ritual epiphany of Core was made in a form which our perceptual filters will never enable us to reconstruct in full, it is important for my argument that from the earliest to the latest texts what captures best the essence of the mystic experience and guarantees a happy afterlife is precisely the privileged *thea* of the sacred visions (cf. Dio Chrysost. *Or.* xii 33 *πολλὰ μὲν ὀρώντα μυστικά θεάματα*). My suggestion, therefore, is that Philoctetes' revelation of the *toxa* to Neoptolemus' eyes recalled for those among the audience who were *memyēmenoi* the blessed sight and view (*Pl. Phdr.* 250b *μακαρίαν ὄψιν τε καὶ θέαν*) of the initiates, that unspeakable experience, whereby the *mystai* are *ἀπλὰ καὶ ἀτρεμῆ καὶ εὐδαίμονα φάσματα μούμενοι τε καὶ ἐποπτεύοντες* (*Pl. Phdr.* 250c).¹¹ Neoptolemus' yearning for ritual adoration of the bow bears close affinity with that memorable Platonic passage from the *Phaedrus*, where mystic language and experience are reflected and remoulded in a magisterial way:

ὁ δὲ ἀρτιτελής, ὁ τῶν τότε πολυθεάμων, ὅταν θεοειδὲς πρόσωπον ἴδῃ κάλλος εὐ μεμιμημένον ἢ τινα σώματος ἰδέαν, πρώτων μὲν ἐφρίξε ... εἶτα προσορῶν ὡς θεὸν σέβεται, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἔδεδει τὴν τῆς σφόδρα μανίας δόξαν, θύοι ἂν ὡς ἀγάλματι καὶ θεῷ τοῖς παιδικοῖς. (*Pl. Phdr.* 251a)

¹⁰ Vision: cf. *Pl. Phdr.* 250b-c *κάλλος δὲ τότε ἦν ἰδεῖν λαμπρόν, ὅτε σὺν εὐδαίμονι χορῷ μακαρίαν ὄψιν τε καὶ θέαν, ... εἰδὼν τε καὶ ἐτελοῦντο τῶν τελετῶν ἦν θέμις λέγειν μακαριωτάτην, [...] ὀλόκληρα δὲ καὶ ἀπλὰ καὶ ἀτρεμῆ καὶ εὐδαίμονα φάσματα μούμενοι τε καὶ ἐποπτεύοντες ἐν αὐγῇ καθαρᾷ ...*; *Plut. fr.* 178 Sandbach *σεμνότητος ἀκουσμάτων ἱερῶν καὶ φασμάτων ἀγίων ἔχοντες*; Proclus, *Resp.* II. 185.4 (Kroll) *φάσματα ... γαλήνης μεστά*. Zeitlin (n.6) 160-1 suggests a literary reflection of the blissful Eleusinian *phasmata* in the Dionysiac/Eleusinian scenario of Euripides' *Ion*, where the recognition of mother and son abounds in the imagery of blessed phantoms (*Ion* 1354: *ὦ μακαρία μοι φασμάτων ἡδ' ἡμέρα*; 1395 *τί δῆτα φάσμα τῶν ἀνελπίστων ὄρω*; cf. 1444). A marble votive relief from the very Telesterion of Eleusis (*LIMC*, vol. iv, s.v. 'Demeter' n. 161), dedicated to Demeter by a certain Eukrates, points towards an appearance of Core (or Demeter) as a vision. On the rectangular dedicatory plaque there is the head of a female deity (Core or Demeter) surrounded by shining rays painted in red (see *LIMC*, vol. iv, s.v. 'Demeter' n. 161, and C. Kerényi, *Eleusis: Archetypal image of mother and daughter* [Eng. trans. R. Mannheim] [London 1967] 97). Statue: cf. *Pl. Phdr.* 254b *εἶδον τὴν ὄψιν ... ἀστράπτουσαν ...*; Themistius *Or.* xx. 235a-b, where he seems to be conceiving of Eleusinian *epopteia* as a revelation of a statue, which the priest *ἐπεδέκνυε τῷ μουμένῳ μαρμαρῶσσον τε ἤδη καὶ αὐγῇ καταλαμπόμενον θεσπεσίῳ* (see C. Riedweg, *Mysterienterminologie bei Platon, Philon und Klemens von Alexandrien* [Berlin and New York 1987] 62 n. 163); cf. P. Boyancé, *REG* lxxv [1962] esp. 471-3), who defends Kern's old suggestion about the moment of the Eleusinian *epopteia* as comprising 'un dévoilement de statues qui apparaissent dans l'éblouissante clarté de la lumière' (Boyancé [*ibid.*] 464).

¹¹ For other Platonic passages remoulding the experience of the Eleusinian supreme vision, see Riedweg (n.10) 2-3.

Moreover, Neoptolemus' wish to contemplate the bow from immediate proximity, and even touch it, recalls the personal, the 'face to face' contact which is sometimes stressed in the transmission of mystic rites (see, e.g. Eur. *Bacch.* 470 ὄρων ὄρωντα, καὶ δίδωσιν ὄργια) or the clear and close beholding of the gods, such as reflected, for example, in Lucius' initiatory experience, as related in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses: deos inferos et deos superos accessi coram et adoravi de proximo* (*Met.* xi 23).

Besides, hand in hand with my suggestion that the *thea* of the bow recalls for the *memyēmenoi* the mystic *thea* of initiation, goes the proposition that, held under Neoptolemus' gaze, the *toxon* itself can also trigger associations with the mystic *hiera*, i.e. the sacred objects which the Hierophant reveals. And, given Neoptolemus' ephebic status, further support for such a proposition can be gained from the Eleusinian ritual itself. For, as can be gleaned from inscriptional evidence, decrees from the Hellenistic and Imperial periods assign to ephebic hands not only the transportation of the Sacred Objects safely enclosed in big baskets (Plut. *Phoc.* 28.3) from Eleusis to Athens, but also their reception at the Athenian Eleusinion¹² and their processional escorting back to Eleusis on the 19th and on the 20th of the month Boedromion.¹³ To be sure, this corpus of evidence is quite late. Yet, the text of the imperial decree (*IG II²*, 1078) assigns the responsibility for the escorting of the *hiera* τῷ κοσμητῇ τῶν ἐφήβων κατὰ τὰ ἀρχαῖα νόμῳ, and, according to Pélékides, the regulations can be safely ascribed back to the classical period.¹⁴ Now, it has to be admitted that no compelling piece of evidence exists which would lend categorical support to this attractive proposition. Nevertheless, as we know that ephebes played a very prominent and significant role at many important moments of the Mysteries, such as, for example, the famous lifting of the bull for the sacrifice at the conclusion of the *teletē*,¹⁵ there is good ground for allowing the speculation that not all of these functions sprang *ex nihilo* in the Hellenistic era and beyond. Even in classical times, the Athenian youths of Neoptolemus' age may very well have been involved in some kind of experience related to the Eleusinian sacred objects.

However, it is not only the visible, 'theatrical' display of the bow to Neoptolemus, but also the verbal level of the text itself which, I suggest, can activate a set of Eleusinian connotations. While asking whether he would be allowed to touch the *toxa*, the boy phrases his plea carefully and qualifies his desire:

¹² Cf. e.g. *IG II²* 1040 of 43/2 BC (O.W. Reinmuth, *Hesperia* xxiv [1965] 255 ff.) ἐποιήσαντο δὲ καὶ τὴν ὑπαπάντησιν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐν ὄπλοις καὶ προέπεμψαν αὐτὰ καὶ τὸν Ἰακχὸν ὡσαύτως (lines 6-7). See C. Pélékides, *Histoire de l' éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1962) 221 n. 4.

¹³ For the processional escorting of the *sacra* and related events over these days, see P. Foucart, *Les mystères d'Eleusis* (Paris 1914) 299-308.

¹⁴ See Pélékides (n. 12) 220.

¹⁵ See Burkert (n. 9 *Homo Necans*) 292 n. 85 (with inscriptional evidence, dating from the first and second centuries BC).

καὶ μὴν ἐρῶ γε· τὸν δ' ἔρωθ' οὐτως ἔχω·
εἴ μοι θέμις, θέλωμι' ἄν· εἰ δὲ μή, πάρες. (660-1),

whereupon Philoctetes replies:

ὄσια τε φωνεῖς ἔστι τ', ὦ τέκνον, θέμις (662)

Now, the terms used here are not fortuitous. *Themis* has a broad range of connotations,¹⁶ but is also specifically linked with mystic language, where it applies in particular to definitions of what should or should not be done, as well as to interdictions of disclosure of the mystic secrets to those who are *amyētoi*.¹⁷ Similar is the case with ὄσια in Philoctetes' reply (662), since 'the word and its cognates seem to have been often in the mouths of the devotees of mystery cults, and to have acquired in this context a deeper and more positive significance.¹⁸ We are, therefore, once again, in the context of mystic language and imagery.¹⁹ The same holds true for the rest of Philoctetes' address to the young man, especially lines 667-9:

θάρσει, παρέσται ταῦτά σοι καὶ θιγγάνειν
καὶ δόντι δούναι κάζεπεύξασθαι βροτῶν
ἀρετῆς ἕκατι τῶνδ' ἐπιψάουσαι μόνω.

Here, I would like to single out in particular the gentle admonition 'θάρσει' (667) with which the hero encourages Neoptolemus to touch the bow and take it in his hands. The exhortation to courage (*tharsos*), after the ordeal, seems to have been an intrinsic element in a variety of initiatory sequences, at least as can be gauged from the reflection of this formula in texts. To take only two examples from the classical period, the Stranger/Dion-

¹⁶ See for a brief summary Richardson (n.7) 224.

¹⁷ See, e.g. Arist. *Thesm.* 1150-1 οὐ δὴ ἀνδράσιν οὐ θέμις εἰσορᾶν / ὄργια σεμνὰ θεοῖν; Eur. *Bacch.* 470 ff., as the Stranger skilfully excites Pentheus' curiosity about Dionysus' *orgia*: ἔχει δ' ὄνησιν τοῖσι θύουσιν τίνα; Διόν. οὐ θέμις ἀκοῦσαί σ', ἔστι δ' ἄξι' εἰδέναί (473-4; cf. 78-9); Pl. *Phdr.* 250b-c; Diod. v 48. 4; sepulchral inscription from Cumae (fifth century BC): οὐ θέμις ἐντοῦθα κείσθαι ἰ μὲ τὸν βεβαχχ-εὐμένον (see S.G. Cole, *GRBS* xxi [1980] 231).

¹⁸ E.R. Dodds, *Euripides, Bacchae²* (Oxford 1960) 119 (on *Bacch.* 370-2), referring to *Bacch.* 69-70 στόμα τ' εὐφῆ-/μον ἄπας ἐξοσιούσθω; *Bacch.* 77 ὄσοις καθαρμοῖσιν; *Bacch.* 113-14 ἀμφὶ δὲ νάρθηκας ὑβριστάς / ὄσιουσθ'; Ar. *Frogs* 327 ὄσοις εἰς θιασάτας, *Frogs* 336 ὄσοις μύσταις; H. *Orph.* lxxxiv 3 ὄσοις μύσταις; Pl. *Rep.* 363c συμπόσιον τῶν ὄστων (where it seems that *hosioi* should be understood as equivalent to initiated into Eleusinian/ Orphic (?) mysteries; see F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* [Berlin and New York 1974] 97-8); see especially Eur. fr. 472.15 Ν² Βάκχος ἐκλήθη ὄσιωθεῖς. Most importantly (although the evidence is post-classical), an entire Dionysiac cultic sect at Delphi (see Burkert [n. 9 *Homo Necans*] 125) bears the name *Hosioi*; see Plut. *Mor.* 365a καὶ θύουσιν οἱ ὄσοιοι θυσιᾶν ἀπόρρητον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος.

¹⁹ Cf. e.g. how Pausanias excuses himself for not being able to describe the Dionysiac mysteries at the bottomless pool of Lerna in Argolis: τὰ δὲ ἐς αὐτὴν Διονύσῳ δρώμενα ἐν νυκτὶ κατὰ ἔτος ἕκαστον οὐχ ὄσιον ἐς ἀπαντας ἦν μοι γράψαι (Paus. ii 37.6).

ysus attempts to reassure the Chorus after their terror at the 'stage-miracle' of the palace's collapse in *Bacchae* 606-7 *ἀλλ' ἐξανίστατε / σώμα καὶ θαρσεῖτε σαρκὸς ἐξαμεψάσασα τρόμον*, while Xanthias mockingly calls Dionysus back to his senses at *Frogs* 302 *θάρρει-πᾶντ' ἀγαθὰ πεπράγαμεν*, after the terrifying initiatory ordeal of the encounter with Empusa.²⁰ Furthermore, in the perspective of fifth-century initiates, a ritual patina could have been detectable in Philoctetes' assertion *ἄρετῆς ἕκατι* (669), a wording probably remoulding such ritual language as *ὀσίης ἕκατι*, that we find merged with cultic aetiology in Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Tauris* 1461 *ὀσίως ἕκατι θεᾷ θ' ὄπως τιμᾶς ἐχη*.²¹ Finally, Philoctetes' *καὶ δόντι δούναι* (668) not only recalls an almost 'technical' term in initiation language, that is, the expression *paradosis/paradidonai* of the *teletē, mysteria, sacra*, etc.,²² but also carries an unmistakable mystic ring through its clear intimation of a strong personal relation and contact, such as the bond uniting initiator and neophyte. One may compare, again, Euripides' *Bacchae* 470 *ὄρων ὄρωντα, καὶ δίδωσιν ὄργια*, where the intimacy of the communication between initiator and recipient of the Bacchic *teletai* is conveyed precisely through the juxtaposition of two forms of the same participle: *ὄρων ὄρωντα*.

The display of the *toxon* to Neoptolemus' sight, then, fuses in one single dramatic act both a ritual and a purely theatrical dimension of experience. If *thea*, the wondrous sight of sacred things, is a key notion in ritual initiation,²³ it is also the *sine qua non* theatrical action, since theatre comes into existence only with the split of the community into performers and spectators, i.e. non-participants into the action, who join in only vicariously and who have come to enjoy the sight. Besides, the very expression Neoptolemus uses, i.e. *théan labein*, recalls the almost technical term of '*théan echein*' in the theatre,²⁴ which designates the spectator's gazing at the dramatic action. Now, of course, such a fusion of ritual and theatrical emotion is certainly not unique in Greek

tragedy.²⁵ Yet, if the *Philoctetes* scene amalgamates the theatrical dimension with the blissful, benign side of an initiatory experience (in Eleusinian terms, the *epopteia*), other scenes in Greek drama bind together the tragic *thea* of a pathetic spectacle with the 'negative' ritual emotion of fearful shudder, *phrikē*.²⁶ No example of this latter case is more appropriate than the Chorus' emotional and intellectual 'frisson' at the sight of Oedipus' blinded face (a mask with 'dark eye-sockets with streams of blood running down from them')²⁷ in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*:

Χο. ὦ δεινὸν ἰδεῖν πάθος ἀνθρώποις,
ὦ δεινότατον πάντων ὄσ' ἐγὼ
προσέκυρσ' ἦδη.
[...]
φεῦ φεῦ δύστην', ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἰσιδεῖν
δύναμαί σ', ἐθέλων πόλλ' ἀνέρεσθαι,
πολλὰ πυθέσθαι, πολλὰ δ' ἀβήρησαι.
τοῖαν φρικὴν παρέχεις μοι.
(Soph. *OT* 1297-1306)

Here, the Chorus' response gains very much in depth through its powerful fusion of the very theatrical, Aristotelian experiences of *eleos* (1299 ὦ τλήμων; 1303 δύστην'; cf. 1296 ἐπουκτίσαι) and *phobos* with feelings essential in ritual initiations,²⁸ i.e. terror/awe and *phrikē*.²⁹ Finally, in a larger ritual-and-theatrical scheme, one could find no better (dark-side) parallel than the repulsive sight of the severed head of Pentheus in Agave's hands in Euripides' *Bacchae*. Emphatically pointed out as a spectacle (1200-1 δειξὸν νυν .../ ἀστοῖσιν; 1203 ἔλθεθ' ὡς ἴδητε ...; 1238) and as a glorious trophy to be passed on to the king's hands (1240 σὺ δέ, πάτερ, δέξαι χερσῶν), Pentheus' ritually hunted *prosōpon* becomes the focus of Agave's close, fixed theatrical gaze:

Κα. σκέψαι νυν ὀρθῶς· βραχὺς ὁ μῆθος εἰσιδεῖν.
Αγ. ἔα, τί λεύσσω; τί βέρομαι τόδ' ἐν χερσῶν;
Κα. ἄβρησον αὐτό καὶ σαφέστερον μᾶθε.
(1279-81)

²⁰ Among post-classical material, note the much quoted Firm. Mat. *Err. Prof. Rel.* 22 *θαρρεῖτε μύσται, τοῦ θεοῦ σεσωσμένου. / ἔσται γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐκ πόνων σωτηρία*. For possible reflections of the exhortation-formula in Plato, see R. Joly, *REG* lxxviii (1955); for an interpretation of Euripides' passage in this light, see R.S. Seaford (*CQ* n.s. xxxi [1981] 258), who does not, however, mention the comic reflection in the *Frogs* (for the latter, see I. Lada-Richards [n. 6]). See now also Seaford, *Reciprocity and ritual: Homer and tragedy in the developing city-state* (Oxford 1994) 379 n. 48 (on Eur. *Her.* 624-7).

²¹ See also Hom. *h. Dem.* 211 *ὀσίης ἔνεκεν* (with Richardson [n. 7] 225 *ad loc.*); cf. an Eleusinian inscription (third century BC) (Clinton [n. 8] 23) honouring an hierophant *ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν / καὶ εὐσεβείας / καὶ φιλοτιμίας*.

²² See Riedweg (n.10) 6-7, citing passages from Diodorus (e.g. v 77. 3 *τῆν τε γὰρ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἐν Ἐλευσίνι γινομένην τελετήν, [...] μυστικῶς παραδίδοσθαι*), Hippolytus, *Ref. Haer.* (e.g. v 2 *οἱ τὰ μυστικὰ παραδόντες*), Cicero *Tusc.* i 29, Apuleius (*Met.* xi 29 *sacrorum traditio*), Clement, *et al.*

²³ On the mystic initiatory *epopteia*, see above n.10.

²⁴ See, e.g. Plut. *Flam.* xix 4 *θέαν ἔχοντος ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ; Aeschines* ii 55 *θέαν εἰς τὰ Διονύσια καταναίμει τοῖς πρέσβεσιν ...*, etc.

²⁵ See, most recently, Seaford's (n.6 [1994] 285) impressive argument on the Chorus' much discussed exclamation in Sophocles' *Ajax* 694 *ἔφριξ' ἔρωτι ...*, as suggesting 'the contradictory emotions of mystic initiation', i.e. the shuddering of fear mixed with joy and eager expectation, desire.

²⁶ Cf. T. Gould, *The ancient quarrel between poetry and philosophy* (Princeton 1990). One of the main theses sustained in this kaleidoscopic book is that at many climactic moments of the tragic *pathos*, the emotional 'thrill experienced by the audience is most likely to have been akin to that which they knew from their initiatory rites' (28); at such moments, words denoting 'sight', whether wonderful or terrible, are found in close proximity with *pathos*.

²⁷ Taplin (n. 3) 89.

²⁸ See Gould's (n. 25) 47 important suggestion that Sophocles in the *OT* 'puts the dancers in the position of worshippers or initiates at a holy *pathos*'. Gould's findings tally very well with Winkler's ('The Ephebes' song: *tragōidia* and the *polis*', in Winkler and Zeitlin [eds.], *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian drama in its social context* [Princeton 1990] 20 ff.) general hypothesis for the ephebic status of Choral performers, but although this thesis opens up a great range of interpretative possibilities, it can by no means be unequivocally accepted.

However, rather than dissolving into blissful admiration, Agave's 'ritual' gaze dramatised in the scenic space of the theatre of Athens, breeds excruciating emotional torment:

Αγ. ὀρώ μέγιστον ἄλγος ἢ τάλαιν' ἐγώ
(1282; cf. 1260: ἀλγήσειτ' ἄλγος δεινόν).

To conclude, then: I hope that, using as an example the theatrical display of the *toxon* in the Sophoclean *Philoctetes*, this note has drawn attention to some of the ways in which classical Greek drama 'theatricalises' its ritual subject-matter. For the revelation of the bow to the 'internalised' spectator's sight, as well as the solemnity of its transmission to the boy's hands, is one among the many illustrations of drama self-consciously turning its ritual component³⁰ into theatre, that is, transmuting the ritual forms it integrates and the ritual emotions it appropriates into civic spectacle.³¹

ISMENE LADA-RICHARDS

University of Nottingham

Spectator sport or serious politics? οἱ περιεστηκότες and the Athenian lawcourts

In his tract *A Rationale of Judicial Evidence*, Jeremy Bentham repeatedly refers to the courtroom as the 'theatre of justice'. Bentham's description has been borne out by recent scholarship on Athenian law. As a form of civic space, the Athenian lawcourts were similar to the Theatre of Dionysos in many respects:¹ litigants faced each other in a competitive *agon*, delivering lines written for them by logographers² to a mass audience which would range, ordinarily, from 200 to 1500 jurors. Moreover, modern scholars have drawn on the notion of 'social drama' introduced by the anthropologist Victor Turner to describe the Athenian lawcourts as an arena for socially constructive feuding behaviour,³ as a public stage for the social élite to compete for prestige,⁴ or as a forum for ongoing communication between élite litigants and mass jurors 'in a context which made explicit the power of the masses to judge the actions and behavior of élite individuals'.⁵

Scholars writing about the Athenian lawcourts have rarely mentioned and have never discussed in detail a key element in the court's cast of characters: οἱ περιεστηκότες, the spectators who stand at the edges of the courtroom watching and listening to the cases. This phenomenon, referred to by the Romans as the *corona*,⁶ may at first seem marginal, both literally and figuratively, but this paper will argue that the spectators played a crucial role in the social dynamic of the courts and had an important effect both on the litigants' arguments and on the jurors' decisions. Further, evidence drawn from both lawcourt speeches⁷ and philosophical texts indicates that the *corona* helped to rectify one of the perceived institutional weaknesses of the Athenian democracy, the immunity of its mass juries from formal accountability.

¹ J. Ober and B.S. Strauss, 'Drama, political rhetoric, and the discourse of Athenian Democracy' in *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian drama in its social context*, edited by J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin (Princeton 1990) 238; E. Hall, 'Lawcourt dramas: the power of performance in Greek forensic oratory' *BICS* xl (1995) 39-52.

² It is of course possible that some spoke with no 'professional' assistance.

³ D. Cohen, *Law, violence, and community in classical Athens* (Cambridge 1995).

⁴ R.G. Osborne, 'Law in action in classical Athens' *JHS* cv (1985) 52.

⁵ J. Ober, *Mass and elite in democratic Athens: rhetoric, ideology, and the power of the people* (Princeton 1989) 145. However, C. Carey has pointed out the dangers of overemphasising the alien elements in Athenian law and of oversimplifying the Athenian system: 'Legal space in classical Athens' *G&R* xli (1994) 172-86.

⁶ E.g., Cic. *Flac.* 69; *Brut.* 289-90; *Caecin.* 28. For discussion of the Roman *corona* see B.W. Frier, *The rise of the Roman jurists* (Princeton 1985) 235 ff.

⁷ A word should be said about the evidentiary value of the speeches. We can very seldom adduce any external evidence to verify or falsify a speaker's claims, including any description he offers of the circumstances of a trial. Given this limitation, my method is to assume that anything a speaker says about the bystanders would, at the very least, fall within the range of credibility.

²⁹ See Richardson (n. 7) 306-7.

³⁰ The fusion of ephebic and mystic frameworks implied throughout this note need not surprise. Rather than being inflexible, dramatically recast initiation frames can freely interact with one another, since a fictive creation, whether literary or pictorial, is not a sacred document: drawing on a common cluster of cultural assumptions with his addressees, the artist combines his building blocks at will, without being haunted by the fear of inconsistency or inaccuracy. Perhaps the most well-known example of such a cross-institutional fusion of data is the Aeschylean *Oresteia*: although it dramatises an archetypal scenario of ephebic initiation, i.e. Orestes' transition to manhood, it is also a storehouse of Eleusinian language and imagery, as was argued in detail by Tierney and Thomson as early as the first decades of our century. See G. Thomson, *JHS* lv (1935) 20 ff.; M. Tierney, *JHS* lvii (1937) 11 ff.; W.G. Headlam and G. Thomson, *The Oresteia of Aeschylus*² (Amsterdam 1966; first publ. Cambridge 1938).

³¹ Warmest thanks to Richard Hunter, who has kindly read and commented on earlier versions of this note, and especially to Pat Easterling for having patiently discussed my work on *Philoctetes*, provided innumerable suggestions, and saved me from many errors.