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PREFACE.

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

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

Epworth University,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

Roy C. Flickinger.
INTRODUCTION.

Perhaps the most valuable permanent results already derived from the extensive and minute examination by competent archaeologists of the numerous theater ruins which have been unearthed in many parts of Greece during the past quarter-century are, firstly, the recognition of the fact that all ancient theaters are no longer to be classified under the two general Vitruvian types, "Greek" and "Roman," but rather under a larger number of categories, varying according to time, place, and purpose; and, secondly, the necessity, which has arisen from the recognition of this fact, of submitting all the evidence, and especially the literary evidence, to a renewed critical examination. It is not enough to have traced the development in meaning of the various technical terms through a series of authors chronologically arranged, valuable as this work is; first of all, the more important authors must themselves be singly studied in order that the nature and the proper application of the testimony they offer may be known. At the present time only a beginning has been made in this fundamental task without which a historical account of the Greek theater cannot be written. With the application of only such precautions as the nature of the evidence, often vague and allusive, often intelligible only by reference to the ruins or to later phraseological usage, demands, the extant plays and the fourth-century writers can, of course, be used unhesitatingly as witnesses for the contemporaneous theater at Athens. No reference in later writers, however, can be safely applied to the Athenian theater of the fourth and fifth centuries until such a course has been justified by a consideration of the author's evidence in general and of the bearing of the particular passage. Thus, Noack,¹ for example, has made it seem very probable that Vitruvius depended mainly upon Asia Minor sources for his knowledge of Greek architecture, while Rohde² has thrown light upon the difficult questions of the sources

² Cf. De Iulii Pollucis in apparatu scaenico enarrando fontibus (1870).
followed by Pollux. These authorities are in a measure controlled
by the study of their sources; but for most writers the considera-
tion of the manner in which they treated their originals is equally
important. Consequently, it is safe to say that, until the more
prominent later authors who discuss or refer to the Greek theater
shall have been critically examined in some such fashion, many of
the vexing problems of Greek scenic antiquities will obtain no
satisfactory solution.\footnote{SCHULZE, "Lukianos als Quelle für die Kenntnis der Tragödie," \textit{Jahrbücher für classische Philologie}, Vol. CXXXV (1887), pp. 117 ff., was more interested in other sides of the
question than in that involving theater construction and did not attempt to determine the
applicability to various periods of the evidence supplied by Lucian; while WALDEN,
bare list of material which is itself limited in scope, belongs to a period of little interest, and
involves no question of source or periods. WEISSMANN, \textit{Neue philologische Rund-
schau} (1899), pp. 584 ff., and (1905), p. 606, pointed out that a separate treatment of the
later writers was needed. WEISSMANN's own article, "Die scenischen Anweisungen in den
Schollen und ihre Bedeutung für die Bühnenkunde" (1896), perhaps approaches most nearly
the aim of the present paper.}

It was with the purpose of contributing somewhat to this kind of
preliminary investigation that the present study was undertaken.
Plutarch is rich in allusions to the theater. Some of these allu-
sions, seemingly to the Athenian theater of the fourth century,
have caused no little difficulty to students of the subject. His
works are so voluminous and so varied, range so freely in subject-
matter from the earliest times to his own day, and touch upon so
many different localities in the Græco-Roman world, that few
writers, on the one hand, have contributed more references to
scenic institutions and scenic terminology in our handbooks, while
few, on the other, need to be used with greater discrimination.
And such caution is required in a still greater degree because of
the uncertainty which necessarily attends the reconstruction of
those theater ruins to which it is generally assumed that he refers.
Whatever the age or location of the theater to which he seems to
allude, his words cannot confidently be applied, for example, either
to Dörpfeld's or to Puchstein's\footnote{DörPFELD-REISCH, \textit{Das griechische Theater} (1896), and PUCHSTEIN, \textit{Die griechische
Bühne} (1901).} reconstructions until the nature of the
evidence he furnishes is determined. But once this is done,
it may become possible to test by his evidence the correctness of
the deductions which have been made from the existing ruins.
To this end it is necessary to establish criteria by which his allu-
sions to theaters of his own day may be distinguished from those referring to earlier periods, and to consider how exactly he followed his sources when speaking of earlier theaters. We may then apply these results to the material which he provides, and in the light of his literary method may discuss more definitely the bearing of his testimony upon the terminology of the theater and upon its structural history.
CRITERIA.

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

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

In treating this topic there are four possible avenues of approach, viz.: by a comparison (a) of Plutarch with his source, when that is known and extant; (b) of Plutarch with himself, when he gives the same account in two or more places; (c) of Plutarch with some other writer who followed the same source; and (d) of Plutarch with other evidence which we possess, though his source is either not definitely known or not extant. It is apparent that, when it is perfectly certain what previous account Plutarch was using, (a) is the most profitable line of investigation; though unfortunately we can rarely be confident that a
particular source was in fact followed. Next in importance, and under the circumstances most satisfactory, is (b), which has never received due recognition as a criterion for use in this and many other cases where it would prove extremely important. The least convincing method is (c), which would be valueless without the others, but is useful as lending confirmation to them; while the value of (d) varies with the circumstances of each case.

a) Plutarch compared with his source.—There can be little

1 Cf. the controversy as to whether Plutarch used directly Aristotle’s Constitution of Athens. The early bibliography is given by Sandy. Wright’s arguments (Harvard Studies, Vol. III [1892], pp. 25 ff.), even if accepted at full value, prove simply that Aristotle was not the main immediate source, and by no means that he was not an immediate source at all. His proofs are (1) that in the thirty-eight passages of the Solon which bear a resemblance to the Resp. Ath. Aristotle is mentioned but once; (2) that the resemblances, the dissimilarities, and the discrepancies alike are intelligible only on the supposition that Plutarch was transcribing from some work in which an abridgment of these parts of the Resp. Ath. was embodied, and that in transcribing from this abridgment he interpolated foreign matter, which is inconsistent with the unabridged Aristotle; and (3) that the omission in the Themistocles of the characteristic anecdote of Themistocles, Ephialtes, and the Areopagus (Resp. Ath., 1. 5) is unaccountable except on the hypothesis that the copy of Aristotle’s work used by Plutarch did not contain this story. As regards (3), we can scarcely consider ourselves infallible judges of what stories Plutarch would consider “characteristic” and illustrative of 380. Moreover, Plutarch often tells anecdotes elsewhere which do not occur in the Life of the hero concerned. Therefore we cannot expect that he should tell on every occasion all the appropriate stories known to him, nor yet assume that every anecdote he read or heard seemed to him equally memorable. Consequently, the omission of Aristotle’s anecdote in the Themistocles does not warrant the hypothesis set up. As to (2), the following pages will show to a certain extent what Plutarch was capable of in the treatment of a source. Furthermore, we must allow him the privilege of contaminatio, and that means that the resultant fusion would almost necessarily contain items inconsistent with any one of the primary accounts. Wright’s first argument ignores the fact that Plutarch habitually suppressed the authorities whom he most extensively followed (cf. Gudeeman, The Sources of Plutarch’s Life of Cicero [1902], pp. 4 f.). The same objections hold good against Wilamowitz’s arguments (Aristoteles und Athen [1893], Vol. I, pp. 299 ff.), which belong to the same three types and are not conclusive. Plutarch was probably familiar with the Resp. Ath. in its present form and used it on occasion. It is true that the more trivial narratives of the inferior writers supplied in greater abundance the matter he needed than did the great historians, but we need not suppose that he entirely neglected the latter for the outline of historical events or for controlling the minor authors. Failure to recognize Plutarch’s entire freedom in using his sources, both in reproducing them and in fusing them, may lead us to minimize his dependence upon standard authorities. It is not unlikely that we should not find any more striking resemblances than now, even if Theopompus and the rest were extant. Even the express warning in Nicias, 1, has not prevented our reducing Thucydides’s contribution to that Life to the vanishing-point (cf. Heidingsfeld, Quaomodo Plut. Thuc. usus sit in compon. Nic. vita [1880], p. 24). Now, Plutarch was a stylist as well as a raconteur, and whenever he found a phrase that pleased him he reserved it in his memory for use. Thus the νῦν ἄλλα στράτευμα εἰς τὸν καταργῆς ἐστὶ τὰ πνεύματα of Thuc., VII, 6, 3, reappears in Fab. Max., 8, and Sertor., 19, in a totally different connection, and there are enough similar instances to show that Plutarch was a close student of the historian. Hitherto the study of the relationship between Plutarch and the Resp. Ath. has been confined to such passages as cover the same events; I have no doubt that a broader survey would reveal many points of stylistic indebtedness.

2 Since passages involving theatrical matters are alone sufficient and more to the point, the following examples are restricted to that field.
doubt that Plutarch’s account of the bringing of the tidings of Leuctra to Sparta was derived from Xenophon, who is indeed mentioned in the same chapter. A comparison of the accounts, however, removes even the slightest doubt as to the relationship.\footnote{Cf. HEEBER, De fontibus et auctoritate Vit. Paral. Plutarchi (1820), p. 47, and HAUG, Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Lebensbeschreibungen der Griechen (1888), p. 36.}

Xen., Hell., VI, 4, 16.

\textit{Agesilaus},\textsuperscript{2} 29.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a] γενομένων δὲ τούτων,
  \item[b] ὃ μὲν εἰς τὴν Λακεδαιμόνα ἀγγελών τὸ πάθος ἀφικνεῖται
  \item[c] γυμνοπαιδίων τε οὖσις τῆς τελευταίας καὶ
  \item[d] τοῦ ἀνδρικοῦ χοροῦ ἐνδὸν ὄντος·
  \item[e] οἱ δὲ ἐφοροί,
  \item[f] ἐπεὶ ήκουσαν τὸ πάθος, ἐλυποῦντο μὲν, ὠσπερ, οἷς, ἀνάγκη·
  \item[g] τῶν μέστων χορῶν οὐκ ἔξηγαγον,
  \item[h] ἀλλὰ διαγωνίσασθαι ἐξέω.
  \item[i] καὶ τὰ μὲν ὄνοματα πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους ἐκάστου τῶν τεθνεότων ἀπέδουσαν.
  \item[c] ἵστης καὶ ἀρχής ἐορτῆς οὕσα μεστῆς
  \item[d] ἀγωνιζομένων χορῶν ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ·
  \item[b] παρήσαν δ’ ἄπο Λεύκτρων οἱ τῆς συμφορᾶς ἀπαγγέλλοντες.
  \item[e] οἱ δὲ ἐφοροί,
  \item[f] καίπερ εἰδὺς ὄντος καταφανοῦς ὃτι διεύθυρται τὰ πράγματα καὶ
  \item[g] τῇ ἀρχῇ ἀπολογείκασιν,
  \item[i] οὕτε χορὸν ἐξέθευσεν ἔιασαν οὕτε
  \item[h] τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ἐορτῆς μεταβαλέν τὴν πόλιν,
  \item[i] ἀλλὰ καὶ οἰκίαν τῶν τεθνεότων τοῖς προσήκοντα τὰ ὄνομα 
  \item[i] ἀπέστησε τὰ περὶ τὴν θέαν καὶ τῶν ἀγώνα τῶν χορῶν ἔπρατον.
\end{itemize}

A more detailed comparison of the corresponding sections, as they are indicated by the letters, gives a striking glimpse of Plutarch’s method: Clause \textit{a} is purely transitional and has no counterpart in the biography. In \textit{b} the singular participle is replaced by the plural, \textit{eis} \textit{Lakadaimona} by \textit{apò} \textit{Lektrwn}, \textit{paðos} by \textit{symphorain}, and \textit{afikneita} by \textit{parèsan}—all simple verbal changes. In \textit{c} Plutarch has omitted \textit{teleutaias} and has written a prefatory statement which adds no fact except \textit{exénov ouåsa} \textit{mesdty}, which is of course too commonplace an observation to postulate another source. These changes also are purely verbal or in the direction of picturesque ness. In \textit{d} \textit{chorov} is replaced by the

\footnote{As a consideration of the genuineness of Plutarch’s writings would be out of place here, I have accepted all the \textit{Lives}, and for the \textit{Moralia} have followed the judgment of Bernardakis, who in his edition rejects sixteen of the seventy-eight essays in the first six volumes; his seventh volume (containing fragments, etc.) has nothing bearing upon the present study. Citations are to the editions of Sintenis (3d ed.) and Bernardakis (1888-96) respectively.}
Plutarch's method of dealing with his sources

plural, ἐνθίν by ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, ἀνδρικοῦ is omitted, and ἄγονιξομένων added—all being alterations without significance. The clauses marked e are identical. In ὁντος καταφανοῦσ is substituted for ἡκουσάν, and for ἔλυπτοντο α ὅτι clause giving the mental picture that caused their λύπη. In g Plutarch employs ἔξελθειν ἐίσαντι instead of ἐξήγαγον, and introduces the clause τὸ... τόλμη, which adds nothing to the thought. He amplifies h by the employment of his favorite τὰ περὶ κτλ. periphrasis, but the general meaning is the same. Finally, in ἵ oικεῖου is replaced by προσήκουσι, ἄπεδοσαν by πέμψαντες, and καὶ ὢικίαν, a vivid detail, is added. In spite of all these verbal changes and this transposition of clauses, not a single item of consequence has escaped the biographer, while he has added several graphic touches, and he has, moreover, retained all the catchwords of the original; cf. ἄγγελλον, γυμνοσαιδίας, χορός, ἔφορον, ἐξάγω (ἐξέρχομαι), and τὰ δυνάμα τῶν τεθνεώτων. These similarities are entirely too close and too numerous to be explained on the hypothesis of an intermediate source, while at the same time the variations afford us an interesting insight into Plutarch's literary method.

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


a δοξάντον δε τούτων,

b Ἰσθμίων σινάγομένων

c καὶ τῆς Ἰσθμίων πανηγύρεως ἐπελθοῦσις,

d πλὴθος μὲν ἀνθρώπων

c καὶ σχεδόν ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἄνδρων συνεκληροθών διὰ τὴν προσωπικὰ τῶν ἄποβησιμάτων,

d πολλοὶ καὶ ποικίλοι καθ’ ἄλλην τὴν πανήγυριν

d ενέπτυσαν λόγοι, τῶν μὲν ἀδύνατον εἶναι φαντασίαν ὑπερηφάνειον Ῥωμαίους ἐνίοις ἀποτεκνά τόπων καὶ πόλεων, τῶν δὲ διορισμένων ὅτι τῶν μὲν ἐπιφανῶν εἶναι δοκούσιν τῶν ἀποτύχσαι τοὺς δὲ φαντασίαν μὲν ἔχοντας ἐλάττω, χρείαν

1 There is, of course, no question of the fact: cf. Herod., VI, 67.

2 Cf. Heerem. op. cit., p. 124, and H. Peter, Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Biographieen der Römer (1855), p. 80. Inasmuch as Livy, XXXIII, 32, gives the names in g in a much different order, Peter uses these as text passages in establishing Plutarch's use of Polybius in this Life.
δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν παρέξεσθαι δυναμένους καθέξουσι. καὶ τούτους εἰθέως ἐπεδείκνυσαν αὐτοὶ καθ’ αὐτῶν διὰ τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους εὐρεσιλογίας. τοιαύτης δ’ οὔτης ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῆς ἀπορίας, ἐδρασθέντος τοῦ πλήθους εἰς τὸ στάδιον ἐπὶ τὸν ἄγωνα,

f) προελθὼν ὁ κήρυξ καὶ <κατὰ> συνωπησάμενος τὰ πλήθη διὰ τοῦ σαλπικτοῦ τὸδε <τὸ> κῆρυγμα ἀνηγγέρτονεν.

g) ἡ σύγκλητος ἡ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Τίτος Κολιντίω στρατηγός ὑπάτος, καταπολεμήσαντες βασιλέα Φιλίππων καὶ Μακεδόνας, ἀφάσαν ἐλευθήρους, ἀφρουρίτους, ἀφορολογητοὺς, νόμους χρομένους τῶν πατρίων, Κορινθίων, Φωκείων, Λοκρίων, Εἰβοβείων, Ἀχαιούς τοὺς Φθιώτας, Μάγνητας, Θεσσαλίων, Πειραιβίων.

h) κρότου δ’ ἐν ἀρχαίς εἴθεως ἐξαιτίαν γενομένου, τινὲς μὲν οἶδ’ ἦκουσαν τοῦ κηρύγματος, τινὲς δὲ πάλιν ἄκοινεν ἐβούλουστο. τὸ δὲ πολύ μέρος τῶν ἀνθρώπων διαποτισόμενοι καὶ δικοῦν ὡς ἄν εἰ καθ’ ὑπὸν ἄκοινες τῶν λεγομένων διὰ τὸ παράδοξον τοῦ συμβαίνοντος, πᾶς τις ἐξ ἄλλης ὁμοίως ἐβάλα προάγειν τὸν κήρυκα καὶ τὸν σαλπικτὴν εἰς μέσον τὸ στάδιον καὶ λέγειν πάλιν ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν, ὡς μὲν ἔμοι δικεί, βουλομένων τῶν ἀνθρώπων μὴ μόνον ἄκοινον ἀλλὰ καὶ βλέπειν τὸν λέγοντα διὰ τὴν ἀπεστάια τῶν ἀναγροφευμένων.

i) ὡς δὲ πάλιν ὁ κήρυξ, προελθὼν εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ κατασυνηψάμενος διὰ τοῦ σαλπικτοῦ τῶν θρήσκων, ἀνήγραψεν ταύτα καὶ ὡς αὐτῶν τοῖς πρόσθεν, τηλεκοῦντι συνέβη καταρραγῆναι τὸν κρότον ὡστε καὶ μὴ ῥᾳδίως ἄν ὑπὸ τὴν ἐννοιαν ἄγαγεν τοὺς νῦν ἄκοινοι τὸ γεγονός.

j) ὡς δὲ ποτὲ κατελήξαν ὁ κρότος, τῶν μὲν ἀθλητῶν ἀπλῶς οὔδεις οὔδένα λόγον ἠχεν ἐκεῖ.

k) τῇ σάλπιγγι δὲ σιωπῆς εἰς ἀπαντᾶς διαδοθεὶς σῆς προελθὼν εἰς μέσον ὁ κήρυξ ἀνέπεσεν, ὃτι Ῥωμαίων ἡ σύγκλητος καὶ Τίτος Κολιντίω στρατηγὸς ὑπάτος, καταπολεμήσαντες βασιλέα Φιλίππων καὶ Μακεδόνας, ἀφιάσαν ἀφορολογητοὺς καὶ ἀφρουρίτους, νόμους χρομένους τῶν πατρίων, Κορινθίων, Λοκρίων, Φωκείων, Εἰβοβείων, Ἀχαιούς τοὺς Φθιώτας, Μάγνητας, Θεσσαλίων, Πειραιβίων.

l) τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον οὐ πάντας οὔδὲ σαφῶς ἐπήκουσαν, ἀλλ’ ἀνώμαλος καὶ θωρυβωδῆς κίνησις ἦν ἐν σταδίῳ θαυμαζόντων καὶ διαπνευματικῶν καὶ πάλιν ἀνείπειν κελεύοντων.

m) ως δ’ αὖθις ἰσημίας γενομένης ἀναγγείον ὁ κήρυξ τὴν φωνήν προθυμότερον εἰς ἀπαντᾶς ἐγεγόνει καὶ διήθη τὸ κήρυγμα, κρανὴς μὲν ἀπιστοῦ τὸ μέγεθος διὰ χαρὰν ἐξώριε μέχρι θαλάττης,

n) ὁρᾶν δὲ ἀνειστήκει τὸ θέατρον,

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

It thus appears that Plutarch has treated this passage with even more freedom than the previous one; yet the connection
between them is shown by the ideas expressed, the general order of their arrangement, and the use of catchwords. Polybius abounds in repetitions and irrelevant and parenthetical remarks which seriously delay the recital. Plutarch has lopped off the unnecessary members, molded the remainder into a continuous whole, and added several details which make the scene a living reality, though they might have happened at any gathering at all similar and do not presuppose an eyewitness to suggest them to Plutarch.

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

[Plutarch, Probr., XI, 25.]

Non posses suae., p. 1096AB.

"διὰ τί, ὅταν ἀχρυσθῶ- τίς χορός . . . . οὕτως εἰσέργασεν Ἑπίκουρον καὶ σιν ἢ ὧρχήστραι, ἦττον Μητρόδωρον, ὡς Ἄριστοτέλη καὶ Θεόφραστον καὶ ὁ χορός γεγώνασιν;

Δικαιώρχων καὶ Ἡρώνυμοι οἱ περὶ χορῶν ἀλογος καὶ διδασκάλιων καὶ τὰ διὰ αὐλῶν προβλήματα καὶ ἰσθμῶν καὶ ἄρμονῶν; οἴον . . . τὸ δὴποτε τῶν θεάτρων ἢ ἄγωρα τῆς ὀρχήστρας κατασκευάζης ἢ χοῦν, ὁ λαὸς τυφλοῦται.

Plutarch was peculiarly fond of questions like this. One of his largest works, the Quaestiones conviviales, is entirely occupied with them. It is a priori probable, then, that he always kept a copy of the Problems within easy reach and had conned it many times. This circumstance, together with the fact that Aristotle is mentioned by name, argues against the use of an intermediate source. Yet the variations introduced are startling. Διὰ τί is represented by a similar τί, ὅταν by ἂν, ἀχρυσθῶσιν by ἀξωρα κατασκευάζης ἢ χοῦν, ἢ ὧρχήστραι by τῆς ὀρχήστρας τῶν

1 Pal., Harleianus, and Ven. read ὑχόφος, and the text has been suspected. Because of the Aristotelian original Wytenbach suggested ὅ χορός. Reiske proposed ὅ χος and referred to Quaest. conv., p. 721 B, where this word occurs in connection with φωνὴ τυφλοῦται. In accordance with his desire to emphasize the acoustic effect of a floor (cf. pp. 527 f., below), Puchstein (Griechische Bühne, p. 41) conjectures ὅ λαος (sic), meaning that the presence of chaff spoiled the resonance of the orchestra pavement. Regardless of the interpretation, this suggestion is unlikely, because λαὸς is a poetical word, and Wyttenbach in his Index Plut. notes not a single instance of its occurrence in Plutarch. In fact, the conjectures are all unnecessary, and are due to a misunderstanding regarding the application of λαὸς and the meaning of τυφλοῦ. Plutarch has reversed the original, changing the subject and the point of view. Λαὸς refers to the audience instead of to the chorus, and τυφλαῖται, which is used not only of sight, but also of any of the senses, has reference to hearing. Thus "the people do not hear so well" has replaced "the chorus is not so easily understood." Cf. Soph., Oed. Rex, 571: τυφλὸς τά τ' ὤτα τῶν τε νοῦν τά τ' ἀμματα εἶ, and Hesychius: τυφλός οὐδέτεραι καὶ ἀντί τοῦ κωφος.
Theatrum, ἦττον γεγονασιν by τυφλοῦται, and οἷς χοροὶ by ὁ λαός. There is not a single word of the original but has been omitted or altered either in form or construction. Yet nearly every word of Plutarch echoes something in the source—a thing well-nigh impossible if an intermediary had been used. Thus, whether it be supposed that Plutarch was quoting from memory or was purposely giving a paraphrase with Aristotle before him, the departures from the original and the echoes of it are equally instructive.

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

A good parallel is afforded by

De glor. Ath., p. 348 F and Quaestt. conv., p. 710 F.

a πρὸς ἄ (the theatrical equipment just mentioned and quoted on p. 34, below) Λάκων ἀνήρ ἀποβλέψαις οὐ κακῶς ἔπειν,

b δέ ἀμαρτάνουσιν Ἄθηναίων μεγάλα τὴν στουδὴν εἰς τὴν παιδαίν καταναλίσκοντες,

c τοντάτι μεγάλον ἀποστόλων δαπάνας καὶ στρατευμάτων ἐφόδια καταχορηγοῦντες εἰς τὸ θέατρον.

In a the divergences between the antecedent of ἄ and τὰς . . . . ἀμιλλαν are considerable, but are largely due to the different circumstances under which the story was told; the variation between ἀποβλέψας and θεώμενος is without significance, but it is noteworthy that in the first account the occasion of the remark is in no wise defined, while in the second it was “at the performance of new tragedies.” A priori we might expect that the remark itself (b) would be reproduced without change, yet ἀμαρτάνουσιν μεγάλα
corresponds to οὐκ σωφρονεῖν and Ἀθηναῖοι to τήν πόλιν, while εἰς . . . καταναλίσκοντες and μετὰ . . . παῖζονταν clearly hark back to the same original version. These changes are all verbal, it is true, but under the circumstances they are highly significant. Clause c is evidently only Plutarch’s own amplification of the preceding remark.

Sulla, 2.
Μητροβίου δὲ τῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς τινος ἐρῶν διετέλεσεν (Sulla) οὕτω γὰρ ὦ τότε παρ’ αὐτῷ (Sulla) δυνάμενοι μέγιστον ἦσαν . . . Μητρόβιος ὁ λυσιφόδος, οὗ καίπερ ἐξόρον γενομένον διετέλει μέχρι παντὸς ἐρῶν οὐκ ἀρνούμενος.

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

Pelop., 29.
a τραγῳδόν δὲ ποτὲ θεώμενος (Alexander of Phææ) Εὐριπίδου Τρομάδας ὑποκρινόμενον b ἕχετο ἀπίων ἐκ τοῦ βιάτρου, c καὶ τέμπως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκέλευες θαρρεῖν καὶ μηδὲν ἀγνώφεσθαι διὰ τοῦτο χείρον, οὗ γὰρ ἐκείνου καταφρονῶν ἀπελθεῖν.
d ἀλλ’ ιασχυνόμενος τοῦς πολιτάς, εἰ μηδένα πότοπε τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ φονευμένων ἠλεημός ἐπὶ τοῖς Ἐκάβης καὶ Ἀνδρομάχης κακοῖς ὀφθήσεται δακρύων.

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

1 That Plutarch felt the same freedom in the citation of philosophical dogmas, even when they were in metrical form, has been pointed out by Fairbanks, Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XXVIII (1897), pp. 75 ff.
PLUTARCH’S METHOD OF DEALING WITH HIS SOURCES

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

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


2 These examples perhaps suffice. However, An seni, p. 797 D, and Praec. ger., p. 806 A; De Alex. fort., p. 337 E, and An seni, p. 791 E; cf. p. 33 below; and De Alex. fort., p. 334 DEF, and Alex., 29, may also be profitably compared.
25, and Athen., 614 E, which are quoted together for another purpose on p. 49 below.

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

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

Quaesst. conv., p. 724 A. 

καὶ τοίς δοκῶ μοι μνημονεύειν ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικῶς ἀνεγυμνῶς ἔναγχος ὧτι πρώτος ἐν Δήλῳ Ὀρσέως ἄγωνα ποιῶν ἀπέσπασε κλάδων τοῦ ἵεροῦ φοίνικος. . . . καὶ τοῦ Ὀρσέως αὐτοῦ πυρόθανασθαι φήσονται, ἕτερον λόγῳ φοίνικος, οὗ δάφνης οὐδ’ ἑλαια, ἀπέσπασεν ἄγωνοθητῶν.

Theseus, 21. 

ποιήσαι δὲ καὶ ἄγωνα φασιν αὐτὸν (Theseus) ἐν Δήλῳ, καὶ τοῖς νυκώσι τότε πρῶτον ὑπ’ ἑκείνον φοίνικα δοθή- 

vai.

¹ De certaminibus thymelicis, pp. 60-62.
The passage from the *Life* and the first part of the quotation from the *Moralia* show that the source employed simply ἀγώνα ποιεῖν, and that ἀγωνιθέτων is due to Plutarch. In Plutarch’s time ἀγωνιθέτης was the regular title given the directors of such festivals. Consequently, inasmuch as Theseus was the mythical founder of the celebration, Plutarch thought it not too much to give him the title that was current in his own day for its presiding officer.

*Pericles, 9.*

εὐπτομένους δὲ (Pericles) πλούσις καὶ χρήμασιν, ἢφ’ ὑμῖν ἐκάινος (Cimon) ἀνέλαβαν τοὺς πέντες δείπνια τε καθ’ ἡμέραν τῷ δεσμοῖς παρέχον 'Ἀθηναίοι καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἀμφιεστεύον τῶν τε χωρίων τοὺς φραγμοὺς ἀδαιρῶν, ὡς ὠπορίζοντος οἱ βουλόμενοι, τούτους ὁ Περικλῆs κατα- στηριγμούμενος, τρέπεται πρὸς τὴν τῶν δημοσίων διανομήν, συμβουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου τοῦ Οἰῆθεν, ὡς Ὁμιοιογενής ἱστόρηη. καὶ ταχὺ θεωρικῆς καὶ δικαστικῆς λήψεσιν ἥλιον τε μισθοφοράς καὶ χορηγίας συνδεκάς τὸ πλήθος ἐφέρτο κατὰ τὴν ἔξ’ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῆς.

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

ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ μισθοφόρα τὰ δικαστήρια Περικλῆs πρῶτος, ἀντιδημαγωγῶν πρὸς τὴν Κίμωνος εὐπορίαι. ὡς γὰρ Κίμων, ἄτε τυραννίζων ἔχων σύνην, πρῶτον μὲν τὰς κοινὰς ληστοφηγός ἐληστοφηγεῖς λαμπρῶς, ἐπειτα τῶν δημοσίων ἐτρέφει πολλοῖς· ἔξης γὰρ τὸ βουλομένῳ Δαμωνίῳ καθ’ ἐκάστην τὴν ἡμέραν ἔλθον παρ’ αὐτῶν ἔχει τὰ μέτρα, ἔτι δὲ τὰ χωρία πάντα ἀφρακτὰ ἦν, ὡς έξ’ τῷ βουλομένῳ τῆς ὑπόρας ἀπολαίειν. πρὸς δὴ ταύτην τὴν χορηγίαν ἐπελεύσομεν ὁ Περικλῆς τῇ ὑστερίᾳ, συμβουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ Δαμω- νίδου τοῦ Οἰῆθεν . . . . ἐπει τοῖς ἰδίοις ἡττᾶτο, διόδον τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν αὐτῶν, κατεσκεύασε μισθοφόραν τῶν δικαστῶν.

On the strength of the first passage, it used to be stated in the handbooks that the theoric fund was established by Pericles (cf. Müller, *Bühnenalterthümer*, p. 348), but the discovery of the *Resp. Ath.* has given us the original passage which Plutarch was following (directly or indirectly) and the facts of the case, for Aristotle states explicitly (XXVIII, 3) that this fund was established by Cleophon. It is clear that Plutarch (or his intermediate source) has treated this passage in his accustomed manner, keeping many of the words of the original and the general substance of the thought, but working it all over so that the result is strictly his own. The only alteration worthy of mention is that he has
amplified μισθοφορὰν τοῖς δικασταῖς into θεωρικοῖς καὶ δικαστικοῖς λήμμασιν ἄλλαις τε μισθοφορῶς καὶ χορηγίαις. As these were the means used by Greek demagogues for centuries to ingratiate themselves with the people, he probably considered his expression a justifiable extension of Aristotle. Nevertheless, it constituted an anachronism. It is incomprehensible that he was really ignorant of the author of the custom.¹

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

¹ The controversy over Plutarch’s use of the Resp. Ath. has caused me to consider these passages here rather than in (a) above. If we could be sure that Plutarch was quoting Aristotle directly here, we might assume that his memory had confused the names owing to their proximity in the source. Similarly, he assigns (Alecib., 25) the murder of Phrynichus to Hermon, who is mentioned in another connection in the same chapter of Thucydides which contains an account of the murder (Thuc., VIII, 62).

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

³ Cf. pp. 24, 25, 26, 37, 38 (twice), 51 (twice), 52, 54, 56, 59, etc.
THEATRICAL TERMS IN PLUTARCH.

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

A. Θήση.⁴

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

¹ Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, Vol. CXLIX (1894), pp. 27 ff.
² Bühnenaufenthämer (1886) and Philologus, Supplementband VII (1899), pp. 3 ff. MÜLLER’s article, “Die neueren Arbeiten auf dem Gebiete des griech. Bühnenwesens,” Philologus, Vol. VI (1892), pp. 1 ff., though not an exhaustive treatise on theatrical terminology like those cited in the text, contains much that has a bearing in this field. The same remark applies to BODENSTEINER’s valuable “Bericht über das antike Bühnenwesen,” Burtsch’s Jahresbericht, Vol. XC (1896), pp. 1 ff. It is needless to add that Dörpfeld’s excavations and his keenness in restoration and interpretation have also played a leading rôle in the critical study of the subject during the last quarter-century.
⁴ Besides the authorities just cited, cf. WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF, Hermes, Vol. XXI (1886), pp. 602 ff. The limits of space and the scope of the present article prevent a full discussion in these introductory statements.
Hell., VII, 4, 31: κατεδώξαν εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου καὶ τοῦ τῆς Ἐστίας ἱεροῦ καὶ τοῦ πρῶτος ταύτα προσόκουσι θεάτρου, referring to Olympia, which never had a theater for scenic performances, so that here the cavea of the stadium is evidently meant. “The whole theater structure” (3) was the next meaning developed, this usage being common in inscriptions since the middle of the fourth century; cf. C. I. A., II, 573: κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας τὰς περὶ τὸ θεάτρου. The meaning of a term is very easily transferred from place to that which is done in that place. Accordingly, the next significatio of θεάτρων was (4) “theatrical performance” or “spectacle”; cf. schol. Arist., Vesp., 1291: ἐνηπήσατο ὁ Κλέων μηκέτι δεῖν κομφοδίας ἐπὶ θεάτρων εἰςάγεσθαι (Rutherford). The last meaning was (5) “performance place”; cf. schol. Ran., 209: οὐχ ὅρθουν εἰν τῷ θεάτρῳ οἱ βάτραχοι οὐδὲ ὁ χορός, ἀλλ’ ἔσωθεν μιμοῦντα τοὺς βατράχους.

a) “General” passages.—Most of these meanings are found in Plutarch. An excellent instance of (1) in a “general” passage is Quomodo adul., p. 63 A: ὁσπερ οἱ τραγῳδιοὶ χοροῦ δεόνται φιλον συναθότων ἡ θεάτρων συνεπικροτούντος. There happens to be no instance of (2) in a “general” statement. The most common meaning is, of course, (3); cf. Lycurg., 6: προσκήμα θεάτρων. These words and their context (cf. p. 52, below) assume the existence of theater buildings in the time of Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver, who of course antedated the Greek drama and dithyramb and all but the crudest forms of the chorus. These words are therefore anachronistic. For another example of (3) cf. De sollert., p. 974 A: παρήν ὁ γέρων Οὐεσπασιανὸς ἐν τῷ Μαρκέλλου θεάτρῳ. This meaning is also employed several times figuratively; cf. Praec. ger., p. 800 B: αὐτὸς δ’ (the statesman) ὁσπερ ἐν θεάτρῳ (i. e., in public life) τὸ λουτῶν ἀναπεπταμένο ψευδόμενο ἕξασκει καὶ κατακόσμει τῶν τρόπων. Meaning (4) is likewise of common occurrence; cf. De frat. amore, p. 478 C: τὰ φανέντα παραδεῖγματα

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


3 Cf. also Vitae, pp. 372 E, 409 A, etc.; Mor., p. 253 B, etc.
(of brotherly love) τραγῳδίαις καὶ θεάτρωι ὁ βίος ἔξεδωκε. Of the last meaning there is no instance in Plutarch, nor indeed anywhere else outside of the scholia, where ἐν (τῷ) θεάτρῳ occurs several times equivalent to the more common ἐπὶ (τῆς) σκηνῆς (cf. pp. 44 f., below).

b) "Specific" passages.—A "specific" instance of meaning (1) has already been quoted (Flamin., 10) on p. 14, where the word is used of an audience at the Isthmian games in 196 B.C. When a report of the Sicilian disaster reached Athens, "the assembly cried out in anger" (ὁργῇ δὲ σω̄ν καὶ βοή τοῦ θεάτρου, De garrul., p. 509 B). If this be taken as meaning that the assembly was held in the theater, it is probably another case of anachronism, since the theater at Athens, and presumably elsewhere, was rarely used for that purpose till the latter half of the fourth century. The fact that the word does not appear in the parallel account in Nicias, 30, points in the same direction. Of (2) there is perhaps one instance; cf. Aemil., 24: ἐν δὲ τῇ Ρώμῃ τοῦ δήμου θεωροῦντο ἰππικοῦς ἀγώνας ἐξαίφνης ἐνέπεσε λόγος εἰς τὸ πρότον τοῦ θεάτρου μέρος. Since this would be the only occurrence of this meaning in Plutarch, possibly it would be better in this case to give the term a broader significance, which would bring it under the next category. Also in the "specific" passages (3) is the most common meaning; cf. Cimon, 8: Κίμων μετὰ τῶν συντριτῆγων προελθὼν εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἐποιήσατο τῷ θεῷ τὰς νευμιομένας σπονδάς. A passage that has been sometimes misinterpreted is Timoleon, 34: ἄθεις δὲ εἰς τὰς Συρακούσας παρελθὼν εἰς τὸν δήμου (Mamercus) ἐπεχείρει μὲν τινα . . . . λόγον . . . . διεξενεῖ, θορώβοις δὲ περιτίππων καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὅρων ἀπαράϊτητον ἐθεῖ μίφας τῷ ἱμάτιον διὰ μέσου τοῦ θεάτρου καὶ πρὸς τὶ τῶν βαθρῶν δρόμων συνεφηδε τὴν κεφαλήν ὡς ἀποθανούμενος. Wieseler (Ersch-Grub. Enc., p. 160, n. 5) gave θέατρον in this passage.

3 Cf. also Vittae, pp. 369 E, 362 D, 474 B, 750 D, 867 B, 976 F, etc.; Mor., pp. 79 E, etc., for other examples of (1).
the meaning of θεσταί, and Müller (Philologus, Spbd. VII, p. 69) that of cavea. Both apparently overlooked the context. Mamercus was attempting to speak; he must have been standing, then, in the orchestra, or on the stage, if the theater had one. When he saw that his case was hopeless, he ran across the orchestra and struck his head against one of the seats in the lowest tier. It is impossible that he should have gone among the audience or into the cavea. Such an assumption must presuppose his speaking from among the spectators—something entirely improbable. For meaning (4) cf. Phocion, 19: κατείχε (τραγωδός) τῷ θεάτρῳ ὅποι Βουλίμενος προειδείης; and Quinodo sentiat, p. 77 E: καὶ περὶ Διογάνδος ὁμοία τοῦ Σινωπήως ἱστοροῦσιν ἀρχομένου φιλοσοφεῖν, ὥς Ἄθηναίως ἐν ἑρτῇ καὶ δεύτη δημοτελῆ καὶ θέατρα κτλ. Since there are no datable instances of this meaning before the Christian era, it is generally regarded as late (Müller, ibid., p. 72); therefore the usage in these two “specific” passages is due to Plutarch, not to a source contemporary with Phocion and Diogenes.  

B. Ὄρχησταρα.

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

---

1 Another passage that has some bearing upon the position of the speaker in an assembly is Marcell., 20. Nicias, a citizen of Euryum in Sicily during the second Punic war, opposed the majority of his fellow-citizens by advocating the Roman cause. In fear of his life, he blasphemed the local divinities and then escaped by the following stratagem: ἐγὼ μὲν ἐκεῖσθαι τῶν πολιτῶν, ὥς νεκράς μεταξὺ τι λέγων καὶ συμβουλεύων πρὸς τὸν δήμον ἐξαιρεῖται ἄθροισι εἰς τὴν γῆν τὸ σώμα, καὶ μικρῶν διαλοιχῶν, οἷς εἰκός, ἁρεμίας τὸν ἐκπλήξει γεγομένης, τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐνάρευς καὶ περιεμνεῖσθαι ὑποτάγματι φωνῆ καὶ βαρεία κατὰ μικρὸν συντείνων καὶ παράβασιν τῶν ἄθροισιν, ὡς ἔνωσι ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας λαμβανομένοι τῷ θεάτρῳ, ἀπορρίφας τὸ ἵππον καὶ περιμερίζοντες τὸν χειρισμόν, ἴδιοις ἀνακρίβεις ἑκένθε σὺ πρὸς τὴν ἑξουσίαν τοῦ θεάτρου, βασιλεύ ὑπὸ τῶν μακρῶν ἑλκύσεως. Whether ἀθρόισι εἰς τὴν γῆν means that he was standing in the orchestra and sank to the ground, was standing on the stage and fell to the orchestra, or simply collapsed upon the floor of the stage, must from the ambiguity of the language remain uncertain, though the first view seems most likely. Cf. also Timol., 10 and 38.

2 Plutarch’s source for Phocion, 19, was probably Duris; cf. Fricke, De fontibus Plut. et Nepotis in vita Phoc. (1883), pp. 22 f.
autem senatorum sunt sedibus loca designata. In Roman writers of the late imperial period the term was used as meaning "stage;" cf. Isid., XVIII, 43: qui pulpitus orchestra vocabatur. The past tense contrasted with the present at the beginning of the sentence implies that Isidore is giving the usage of other times than his own. His statement is probably due to a misunderstanding. Nevertheless, the notion grew and became current in the Greek lexicographers of the Byzantine period.1

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

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

1 Müller's citations (Philologus, Spbd. VII, pp. 81-86) to prove that the usage came in earlier will not bear examination. Dio Cassius, LXII, 29 (cf. p. 59, n. 1, below), and LXIII, 22, are both fragments preserved in the epitome of Xiphilinus, who is known to have been careless. Schol. Aristoph., Equit., 308, merely echoes the statements found in Tzetzes and others, and is evidently late, while the meaning of Aesop., prolog. Lud. Sept. Sapient., 3, is entirely too uncertain to admit of confident citation. It thus becomes unnecessary to decide whether the encroachment of the Roman stage on the orchestra or the transference of orchestral performances to the stage was the cause of this development in meaning.
Bocotian plain the “orchestra of war” (τὸ Βοιωτίου πεδίον Ἄρεως ὀρχήστραν). [Plut.] Reg. et imp. ophiath., p. 193 E, which repeats the apophthegm and explains the figure as due to the country’s being “flat and spread out” (ὑπτίαν καὶ ἀναπεπτταμένην), shows that Plutarch has preserved the original form of the statement. The metaphor itself and the adjectives used to explain it are best understood in case ὀρχήστρα had its original meaning, while the fact that Plutarch retains the term in this sense without elucidation shows that this usage had not yet become obsolete and that the meaning “stage” had not yet arisen.

C. Θυμέλη.¹

Θυμέλη is probably to be derived from θύειν,² originally meant “altar,” and was naturally applied to the altar in the center of the orchestra; cf. Eurip., Suppl., 63: ἕμολον δεξιότερον θεῶν θυμέλαι. The πρεσβυτοδόκου θυμέλαι of Ἀesch., Suppl., 669, must also be taken to mean “altar,” but not necessarily that in the theater. Now, as the orchestra and its functions centered about the θυμέλη, it was natural that this term should soon come to include the whole “orchestra” (2) (as it did the whole θόλος at Epidaurus; cf. Ephem. Arch., Vol. X [1892], p. 69, ll. 106 and 143); cf. Pratinas apud Athen., p. 617 C: τις ὑβρις ἑμολευ ἐπὶ Διονυσιάδα πολυπάταγα θυμέλαι; Furthermore, as any name given to the altar would necessarily include the foundation, steps, or underlying platform of it, in process of time these parts singly acquired this name even in opposition to the altar itself; cf. the Delian inscription in Bull. Cor. Hel., Vol. XIV (1890), p. 397: τὴν θυμελήν τοῦ βωμοῦ. No further development was then needed to permit the use of θυμέλη as a designation for any “platform” (3); cf. Plut., Alex., 67: αὐτὸν μὲν οὖν (Alexander) ἵπποι σχέδην ἐκόμιζον ὀκτὼ μετὰ τῶν ἐταίρον ὑπὲρ θυμελῆς ἐν ὑφήλῳ καὶ περιφανεὶ πλαισίῳ πεπηγηνίας—a result toward which the popular association of
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θυμέλη with θυμέλαιον would largely contribute. As already noted, one of the easiest lines of development is from the meaning of place to that which is done in that place. Accordingly, θυμέλη came to mean also (4) “orchestral or thymelic performance;” cf. the epitaph by Hedylus of the third century B. C., preserved in Athen., p. 176 C: <τούτο> Θέων ὁ μόναυλος ὑπ’ ἡρίον ὁ γλυκὸς οἰκεῖ αὐλητής, μύων ἦν θυμέλησι Χάρως, where the combination of μύων with θυμέλησι shows that the latter has the meaning just suggested.1 In the Roman theater, where the orchestral space was occupied by spectators and every kind of performance was presented upon the stage, θυμέλη naturally came to mean “stage” (5). The same thing occurred in Asia Minor, where most of the thymelic performances had been elevated above the level of the orchestra; cf. Artemid. of Ephesus, Onirocr., Π, 3, p. 84: γνωακεία δὲ ἐσθής ἀγάμων μόνοις συμφέρει καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ θυμέλην ἀνα-βαίνουσιν, the last phrase of which is explained by what immediately follows: οἱ δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ ὑποκρίσει ἔθος μεγάλας ἔργασις καὶ μισθοῖς λήψονται. I find no evidence that the term was ever so used on the mainland of Greece.

a) The study of Plutarch’s usage is best begun with Quaestl. conv., p. 621 B: κοσμιώτατον δὲ μοι δοκεῖ τωντός ὄν (such a magister bibendi as has just been described) τὸ συμπόσιον δια-φυλάξειν ἡμῖν καὶ μὴ περιμφεσθαι νῦν μὲν ἐκκλησίαν δημοκρατικὴν νῦν δὲ σχολὴν σοφιστοῦ γενομένη αὖθις δὲ κυβευτήριον, εἰτά ποι τοις χηρήν καὶ θυμέλην. ἦ γὰρ οὐχ ὅρατε τοὺς μὲν δημαγωγοῦντας καὶ δικαζομέ-νους παρὰ δείπνοιν, τοὺς δὲ μελετῶντας καὶ ἀναγνώσκοντας αὐτῶν τινα συγγράμματα, τοὺς δὲ μύων καὶ ὄρχησται ἀγωνιστεύουσας; The items in the first sentence balance very well with those in the second; to ἐκκλησίαν correspond δημαγωγοῦντας and δικαζομένους; to σχολὴν σοφιστοῦ, μελετῶντας and ἀναγνώσκοντας; to σκηνῆς, μύων; and to θυμέλην, ὄρχησται.2 Only κυβευτήριον is without amplification, and it was too plain to need it. This passage alone, then, would inform us that there was a contrast between the σκηνή

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

2 Μελετῶν is used of the school also in De poet. aud., p. 35 F, quoted on p. 34, below, and the same contrast between σκηνῆ and θυμέλη, and mimes and dancing occurs also in C. I. G., 6750: δόξαν φωνάσαν εἰπὶ σκηνῶις λαβοῦσαν (the mime Basilla) παντοτῆς ἀρετῆς ἐν μείων, εἰτα χοροῖς πολλάκις ἐν θυμέλαις.
and the \( \thetaυμέλη \), and that mimes belonged to the former and dancing to the latter; in other words, that \( \thetaυμέλη \) still meant "orchestra."

We are now in a position to examine Quaestt. conv., p. 711B, which was held in abeyance from p. 27). It will be remembered that a sophist had been asked what form of entertainment (\( \acute{\alpha}κροάματα \)) he considered most appropriate for a symposium, and advised: \( \tau\acute{\alpha}λλα \mu\acute{\epsilon}ν \; \epsilon\acute{\pi} \; \tau\acute{\nu} \; \thetaυμέλην \; καί \; \tau\acute{\nu} \; \dot{\omega}ρχή\acute{\sigma}τραν \; \acute{\epsilon}ξελαινειν, \; εἰσάγειν \; \dot{\delta} \) (the lightest of Plato's dramatic dialogues). In the seventh Quaestio a visiting Stoic philosopher had enlarged upon the implied criticism in Plat., Sympnos., 176E, of those who were unable to engage in edifying conversation at symposiums and had to resort to the use of flute-girls for entertainment. At the beginning of the eighth Quaestio Plutarch demanded of the sophist what form of entertainment he could commend, and received the answer quoted above. In the remainder of the Quaestio different speakers examine the suitability of various \( \acute{\alpha}κροάματα \). They reject tragedy, mimes, old comedy, and the Pyladean dance, and accept new comedy, the Bathyleean dance (out of respect for Xen., Sympnos., II, 16), and the use of the cithara and flute. Now, \( \acute{\alpha}κροάματα \) is a term as broad as \( \mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\sigma\upsilon\omega\omicron\omicron\acute{i} \), and included both scenic and thymelic performances. Which of these did the sophist have in mind when he used \( \tau\acute{\alpha}λλα \)? Evidently the flute (the subject of debate in the preceding Quaestio), and probably only such other amusements as were in common use for that purpose; for the following discussion was theoretical, and few of the items there mentioned would have occurred to him in advance under the circumstances. Now, the most usual items included under \( \acute{\alpha}κροάματα \) (cf. Wyttenbach, Index Plut., s. v.) and the most common accompaniments of a symposium were aulodes, auletes, citharodes, citharists, etc.—i.e., thymelic performances—and the sophist need not have meant any other than these by \( \tau\acute{\alpha}λλα \). If this interpretation is correct, \( \thetaυμέλη \) and \( \dot{\omega}ρχή\acute{\sigma}τρα \) mean the same thing and are here an example of

---

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

2 Cf. C. I. G., 2820: \( \epsilon τ τ τούς \; \thetaυμελικούς \; καί \; \sigmaκηρικούς \; \acute{\alpha}γώσαν \; τά \; πρωτεύοντα \; \epsilon τ τ \; \acute{\α}\sigmaθ\; \acute{\alpha}κροάματα \; αὐτῆν \; πρώτως \; \acute{\alpha}γάγοσαν. \)
Plutarch’s fondness for doublets, from which either term could be omitted without loss of sense.¹

In thorough accord with this interpretation is De Pyth. orac., p. 405 D: καὶ οὐκ ἄξιον, ἡ θεῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ κήρυκες εἰσὶ, λογικῶς ἐκαστὰ καὶ σαφῶς (God in making known his will) φράζειν· τὴν δὲ τῆς Πυθίας φωνὴν καὶ διάλεκτον ὡσπέρ . . . . . . ἐκ θυμέλης, οὐκ ἀνήδυτον οὔδὲ λειτὸν ἄλλ’ εὐν μέτρῳ καὶ δύνκῳ καὶ πλάσματι καὶ μεταφοραῖς ὀνομάτων καὶ μετ’ αὐλοῦ φθεγγομένην παρέχειν ἄξιον. The use of διάλεκτον and μετ’ αὐλοῦ seems to indicate clearly enough that the chorus, and consequently the orchestra, is referred to in the simile. Bernardakis’s conjecture (χορευτῶν) to fill the lacuna of eight letters found in two Parisian manuscripts, if accepted, points in the same direction.

The term is found twice more in “general” passages, which are best explained by reference to other instances, though they are not specific enough to yield a sure interpretation in themselves; cf. De cup. divit., p. 527 F: τῇ λέγει, ἀβέλτερ’, δι’ τῆς γυναικὸς ὀφείλων παρελεί τὴν πορφύρα καὶ τῶν κόσμων, ἵνα παιστεῖ ται τρυφώσα καὶ ξενομανοῦσα, τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν καλλωπίζεσ φῶς θέατρον ἢ θυμέλην τῶν εἰσοδεῖ; Elsewhere Plutarch says that the poor need not be ashamed to plead their poverty as an excuse for their inability to vie with the rich at public functions. He continues (Praec. ger., p. 822 F): δεὶ δὴ μάλιστα κρατεῖν ἑαυτῶν ἐν τοῖς πολύτοις καὶ μικρ’ εἰς πεδία καταβαίνει πεζῶν ἐπενδεῖ μαχοῦμεν μικρ’ ἐπὶ στάδια καὶ θυμέλας καὶ τραπέζας πένητα πλουσίοις ὑπὲρ δόξης καὶ δυναστείας διαγωνισόμενον. As stated, these passages are ambiguous, but probably refer to the orchestra and its splendid performances.

An excellent instance of meaning (4) is afforded by Galba, 14: καὶ τὰ μὲν πρότα προφάσεως ἐχεῖν τὰ Νέρωνος ἐγκλήματα· νῦν δὲ Γάλβαν προδίδωσα, τίνα φόνον μητρὸς ἐγκαλούντος · ἄφαγήν γυναῖκας, ἡ ποιάν αἰδομένους θυμέλην ηττραγῳδίαν τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος; The assassins of Nero claimed that they had been actuated by abhorrence of his crimes and of the way in which he had degraded his position by cithara-playing (θυμέλην) and by taking roles in tragedies (τραγῳδίαν). Galba’s murderers had no such excuses to offer.

¹ Cf. De cupid. divit., p. 527 F: θεάτρων ηθυμέλην; Sulla, 2: σκηνῆς καὶ θεάτρων; Theseus, 16: λογείου καὶ σκηνῆς, etc.
There is still one more example of meaning (3) in the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς θυμέλησ, which has been kept till the last because its interpretation required the preliminary discussion of ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς,1 ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς, σκηνικός, and θυμελικός. In its original theatrical use ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς meant simply “on the playhouse side,” and referred to the space before and in the vicinity of the scene building. When first found in extant literature, however, the phrase had already become stereotyped and had no more definiteness of reference than ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ. In at least two of the fourth-century instances of its use (Arist., Poetics, XXIV, 4 and 8) it indubitably included the chorus in its application, while it never expressly excluded it (ibid., XIII, 6; XVII, 1; and Demosth., XIX, 337). With the development of meaning of σκηνή from “scene building” to “performance place” this enlarged, tropical meaning of the phrase was a natural result, when the “performance place” to be designated was the place for dramatic exhibition. For any other kind of spectacle in the theater—for example, the dithyramb, in which the σκηνή structure had no part—ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς would scarcely have been an appropriate designation of the place of the performance, but rather ἐπὶ τῆς θυμέλησ (i.e., ὀρχήστρας). Consequently, οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς embraced all of the participants in a dramatic representation—ὑποκριταί, χοροὺς, ποιητής, and διδάκταλος—as did τραγῳδοί from an earlier period. Now, if it were desired to distinguish between the two kinds of dramatic performers, since οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς θυμέλης was already used of the dithyrambic chorus and could not possibly under normal conditions be applied to the actors, that term would naturally be used to designate the dramatic chorus as well, and οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς would be used in the restricted sense for the actors alone. I have already cited instances of the broader meaning of the latter phrase in Aristotle; curiously enough, the narrower sense is found in the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς in the same author (Poetics, XII, 1 and 2, and Probl., XV, XXX,


2Ἀπὸ is, of course, only ἐπὶ from a different point of view; cf. Gildersleeve, American Journal of Philology, Vol. XVIII (1897), p. 120.
and XLVIII). Unfortunately, no example of ἔπι τῆς θυμέλης occurs in the fourth century, though it may well have been current then, since we do find θυμελικὸς and σκηνικὸς (which are the equivalents of ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς θυμέλης and ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς, and followed the same line of development); cf. the words of Stratonicus (died before 310 B. C.) which are preserved by Charicles apud Athen., p. 350 C: γυμνικοῦ δὲ ἄγωνας διατιθέτωσαν Ἡλείου, Κορώνθου δὲ θυμελικοῦ, Ἀθηναίου δὲ σκηνικοῦ, and Polemo apud Athen., p. 699 A: (παρρεῖον) πρῶτος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς ἄγωνας τοὺς θυμελικοῦ Ἡγήμων (a contemporary of Cratinus).

Plutarch employs ἔπι τῆς σκηνῆς in its unrestricted Aristotelian sense; cf. An seni, p. 785 B: Φιλήμωνα δὲ τῶν κωμικῶν καὶ Ἀλέξιου ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀγωνιζομένους καὶ στεφανομένους ὁ θάνατος κατέλαβε. It has commonly been thought⁴ that Plutarch meant that Alexis and Philemon actually died in the theater. In the immediate context he has been complaining that statesmen withdraw from public life much earlier than do men of other professions, and then cites the case of these two who up to the very day of their death were engaged in the active pursuit of their calling. There is, of course, no reference here to actors nor to a stage for them, but to poets who were contestants in the theater with their plays. In the case of an invitation Plutarch says that there are many things to be considered; cf. Quaestt. conv., p. 709 C: ἄλλα δὲ σκοτεῖν πρῶτον τῆς ὁ καλῶν ἠστιν. εἰ μὲν γὰρ οὐ σφόδρα συνήθης, ἄλλῳ ἄρτων πλούσιων τις ὁ σατραπικός, ὃς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς δορυφορήματος λαμπροῦ δεώμενος ἢ πάνυ χαρίζεται τῇ κλήσει πεπεισμένος καὶ τιμᾶν, ἐπάγεται, παρατητέω εὐθὺς. Cf. also De Alex. fort., p. 337 E: ἀγωνιστὴ γὰρ ἡγεμονίας ὑποκρητήν (Aridaeus) ἐπιστήγαγε (Meleager), μᾶλλον δ’ ὡς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τὸ διάδημα κοσφόν διεξῆλθε τῆς οἰκουμένης; An seni, p. 791 E: ὁ δ’ (Aridaeus) ὀστηρ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς δορυφόρημα κοσφόν ἦν ὅνομα βασιλεῶς; and Demettr., 41: ὡς ἐν μονῷ τούτῳ (Pyrrhus) τῶν βασιλέων ἀιδώλων ἐνορθώτω τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τόλμης, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι, καὶ μᾶλιστα Δημήτριος, ὡς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τὸ βάρος ὑποκρινόντο καὶ τὸν ὄγκον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς—a characterization very suitable to the theatrical Demetrios. Now, in all these passages except the first, though perhaps

actors are more distinctly suggested by the figure than a chorus, 
still the particulars given are entirely too indefinite to warrant us 
in supposing that the latter is excluded from the application of 
the phrase. 'Από τής σκηνής is likewise used in a broad meaning; 
cf. Theseeus, 16: ο Μίνως άεί διετέλει κακώς ἁκούν . . . . εν τοίς 
'Αττικοῖς θεάτρωις . . . . ἀλλ' ἐπικρατήσαντες οἱ τραγικοὶ πολλὴν 
ἀπὸ τοῦ λογείου καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀδοξίαν αὐτοῦ κατασκεύασαν. The 
same thought is presented also by Libanius, Decl., Vol. III, p. 64: 
οὐχ ὅρατε τὸν Μίνω δεινὰ πάσχοντα ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς.¹ Now, it is 
clear that, whatever may have been the original force of such 
expressions, ἐν θεάτρωι, ἀπὸ τοῦ λογείου καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς, and ἐπὶ τῆς 
σκηνῆς are here practically synonymous. Amator., p. 757 A: οὐδὲ 
γὰρ τούτ' ἐστιν εἰπέων, ὅτι τὸ μὲν Ἓρωτι λαοδορύθηνα τίνες ἀπέχου-
thαι δ' ἐκείνης (Aphrodite), ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μᾶς σκηνῆς ἁκούομεν (contra-
dictory quotations from different tragedies). "From the same 
platform" is our English idiom for the thought, but of course 
that must not influence our interpretation of the Greek. De poet. 
aud., p. 35 F: καὶ γὰρ δίκαιοι καὶ ὠφέλιμοι . . . . οταν τοῖς ἀπὸ 
σκηνῆς λεγομένως καὶ πρὸς λύραν ἄδομένως καὶ μελετομένοις ἐν δίδα-
σκαλεῖσι τὰ Πυθαγόρου δόγματα καὶ τὰ Πλάτωνος ὁμολογή. In De 
glor. Ath., which is a brief for the warlike accomplishments of 
Athens as against her intellectual triumphs, the poets and actors 
are represented as making a πάροδος with the symbols of their 
professions, in the following words (chap. 6): ἐνθὲν μὲν δὴ 
προσίτωσαν ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ λύραις ποιηταὶ . . . . καὶ σκευάς καὶ 
προσφοτεῖα καὶ βιομοῦ καὶ μηχανᾶς ἀπὸ σκηνῆς περάκτων καὶ 
τρίτοδας ἐπινικίους κομίζοντες· τραγικὸ δ' αὐτοῖς ὑποκριταὶ . . . . 
συνίτωσαν . . . . σκευῶν δὲ καὶ προσώπων καὶ ξυστίδων ἁλυργῶν 
καὶ μηχανῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς καὶ χοροποίων καὶ δαρυφῶν δυστραγμά-
tευτος λαὸς καὶ χοργιαὶ πολυτέλης παρασκευαζέσθω. "Scenic appli-
cances" is all that the Greek demands here, and that is a colorless 
expression. These instances, then, are worthy successors of their 
prototypes in Aristotle. Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ θυμελικοὶ,² how-

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

²It is noteworthy that σκηνός occurs but twice in Plutarch: once in an untheatrical 
sense, Otho, 6, and once in the spurious treatise, De musica, 31. The figurative use of σύσκηνος 
in De aud. poet., p. 27 F., is not noted in the dictionaries. It is used of Euripides, who is 
dubbed Sophocles's "tent-mate" with reference to their professional fellowship as poets.
ever, have taken on a mutually inclusive meaning entirely foreign to fourth-century usage. In *An seni* Plutarch rebukes the men of his day for retiring from public life earlier than did not only the generals and statesmen of antiquity, but also the poets and actors. As examples of the latter class he cites Simonides, who won a dithyrambic triumph in his eightieth year; Sophocles, who composed the *Oedipus Coloneus* just before his death; Philemon and Alexis, who kept up their interest in their work till death actually came upon them; and Polus, who performed a notable feat of acting in his seventieth year. He continues, p. 785 C: ἀρ’ οὖν οὐκ ἀιώχρον ἔστι τῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς γερῶν τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ βῆματος ἀγείνωστέρους ὀρᾶσθαι, καὶ τῶν ἰερῶν ὡς ἄληθός εξισταμένους ἀγώνων ἀποτίθεσθαι τὸ πολιτικὸν πρόσωπον, οὐκ οἴδ᾽ ὅποιον ἀντιμεταλαμβάνεται; The “theatrical folk” whom Plutarch had just been discussing included tragic and comic poets, an actor, and (notably) a dithyrambic poet. Such a breadth of application would have been impossible in the fourth century. The statements that are made about Sulla’s boon companions, when put together, also produce interesting results. *Sulla*, 36: συνήν (Sulla) μίμως γυναῖξι καὶ κιθαριστρίαις καὶ θυμελικοῖς ἀνθρώποις . . . οὗτοι γὰρ ὁ τότε παρ’ αὐτῷ δυνάμει μέγιστον ἦσαν, Ρώσκιος ὁ κομμῳδός καὶ Σώριξ ὁ ἀρχιμίμος καὶ Μητρόβιος ὁ λυσιφόδος. We are surprised to find a κομμῳδός and an ἀρχιμίμος classified under the generic term θυμελικός. That the lysiodic Metrobius should be so designated is, of course, in accord with the traditional meaning, but with this compare *ibid.*, 2: Μητροβίου δὲ τῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς τῶν ἐρῶν διετέλεσεν ἐτὶ νέον ὁν. Again, in the same chapter Plutarch says: ὡστε . . . ἐπεὶ κύριος ἀπαντῶν (Sulla) κατέστη, συναγαγόντα τῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς καὶ θεάτρου τοῖς ἰταμωτάτοις ὀσμέραι πίνειν καὶ διαπληκτίζεσθαι τοὺς σκώμμασι . . . ὡστε μιμῳδός καὶ ὅρχησταίς τιθασός εἶναι. Surely no clearer proof that these expressions were interchangeable, and that each included all the particulars of the others, could well be asked for. Therefore θυμελικός is equivalent to μουσικός.\(^1\)

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

\(^1\) *Cf.* *Josephus, Antiq. Iud.*, XV, 8; τοῖς ἐν τῇ μουσικῇ διαγιγομένοις καὶ θυμελικοῖς καλουμένοις. For the fact that μουσικός always included both θυμελικός and σκηνικός *cf.* *Frey-De cert. thym.*, p. 8. Plutarch’s usage agrees with this; *cf.* *Wyttenbach, Index Plut.*, s. u.v.
lent paraphrases. *A priori*, it would seem most natural to suppose that this was due to the fact that θυμέλη and σκηνή had both come to mean the same thing, viz., “stage;” but, as already shown, these terms were far from being identical and still represented a contrast. Consequently, this hypothesis is untenable. The origin of the blending probably arose from the association of dramatic and thymelic performances at festivals. Secondly, in the time of the early empire the old societies of Dionysian artists, which included both scenic and thymelic performers (*cf.* *Aetia Rom.*, p. 289 CD; *De cap.*, p. 87 F; and *Aratus*, 53), were either reorganized, or entirely disbanded and then new ones formed under imperial auspices.\(^1\) The names of these new associations show much variety, but usually agree in containing the phrase ἡ θυμελικὴ σύνοδος\(^2\) joined with the names of Dionysus and of the patron emperor. The earliest ruler mentioned is Nerva (*C. I. G.*, 6785), though the custom probably began somewhat before his day. It is evident that in this title θυμελικὴ (from the custom in the Roman theater, where all performers stood on the same level) included both σκηνικός and the old-fashioned θυμελικός, and that, as these societies multiplied in every direction throughout the Roman world, the broader meaning of the term (and of its periphrasis οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς θυμέλης) drove out of use the traditional significance of these expressions, regardless of the meaning that had been attached, or still continued to be attached, to θυμέλη in each locality. In consequence, σκηνικός, which now had to share its field with θυμελικός as well as with μουσικός, disappeared (so far as Plutarch is concerned), while its periphrasis, which always had tended toward freedom of application, also followed the Roman usage and became synonymous with its rival.\(^3\)

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

---


\(^2\) Μουσίκη σύνοδος occurs once, *C. I. G.*, 4081.

\(^3\) It must, of course, be kept in mind that, regardless of the common blurring of the distinction between θυμελικός and σκηνικός, these terms could still be employed in their earlier sense whenever it was desired to express a contrast between orchestral and dramatic performances; *cf.* *Vitruv*, V, 7, 2: *tragicij et comici actores in scaena peragunt, reliqui autem artifices suas per orchestram praestant actiones itaque ex eo scenici et thymelici graece separatim nominantur.*
θυμέλη is itself restricted to the meaning “orchestra.” In his Life of Demetrius he points out the difference between the conduct of Stratocles, the politician, and of Philippides, the comic poet, toward that fantastic hero. He concludes (chap. 12) his comparison with these words: τούτων (Philippides) μὲν οὖν ἐπίτηδες ἐκεῖνο (Stratocles) παρεθήκαμεν, τῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος τῷ ἀπὸ τῆς θυμέλης. The fact that these words could not have occurred with this meaning in a third- or fourth-century source shows that Plutarch has added them from the terminology of his day.¹

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

¹ I have reserved for this place my criticism of Frei’s dissertation, De certaminibus thymelicis. From the fact that the words θυμελικός and σκηνικός do not occur till the close of the fourth century, and that μονελικός was in use from a much earlier period as a generic name for all sorts of musical entertainments, together with certain statements in Athenaeus which imply a transfer of certain performances to the theater at this period, Frei concludes that the so-called thymelic contests at Athens were held in the Odeum of Pericles till the time of Demetrius of Phalerum, who transferred them to the orchestra of the Dionysian theater; these performances were accordingly called “thymelic” because they were presented in the θυμέλη, i. e., ὠρατά, in order to distinguish them from the dramatic productions, which were termed σκηνικοῦ, from being given on the stage (σκηνή), which he assumes that this theater possessed; and finally this transfer was not made and these distinctions did not earlier arise at Athens because (1) of the prejudice against using a precinct sacred to Dionysus for non-Dionysian purposes, and (2) because up to the time of the Lyceurgy theater Athens had no other place so well fitted for such performances as the Odeum. Consequently, since (2) did not obtain elsewhere, these distinctions may have arisen somewhat earlier at other cities, e. g., Corinth. Frei’s contentsions are well presented and clear, but are not free from defects. In the first place, I miss a discussion of ἵσθαι (ἵστη) τῆς σκηνῆς and ἵσθαι (ἵστη) τῆς θυμέλης—phrases which in my opinion are inextricably associated with his subject. Secondly, he first accepts Bethe’s hypothesis that the Lyceurgy theater had a stage, and consequently concludes that the distinction of names must be explained on the basis of differences in place of performance there (p. 14: hoc ipsa certamina in theatrum editorum multitudine distinctionem expetivit, quae non e genere, sed rectius simpliciusque ex loco petenda se obtulit. Quo enim tempore musici agones in theatrum omnes committere coepit sunt, orchestra non iam solus erat locus certaminum agendorum, sed scena ludis scenicae celebrandis separata erat; cf. Bethe, Prot., p. 27). and then uses these conclusions to prove a stage at that period (p. 15: itaque etiam ab hoc parte luce clarius appareat, tragedia comediaque certe inde a IV. a. Ch. n. saeculo non esse in orchestra actas, quod mirabilis pertinarit iterum iterumque praedicatur)—a notable petitio principii, which a study of Aristotle’s use of ἵσθαι τῆς σκηνῆς would have spared him. Furthermore, Frei’s limiting the meaning of θυμελικός to “orchestra” in the derivation of θυμελικός is impossible, as appears from the resulting controversy between Dörpfeld and Bethe; cf. p. 25, n. 1, above. Lastly, he presses unduly the fact that θυμελικός and σκηνικός do not occur before the close of the fourth century, since he can quote only three instances from an earlier period of μονελικός, a term of undoubted age (cf. ARIST., Plutus, 1163; PLAT., Laws, p. 658AB; and C. I. A., IV, 2, p. 208, No. 834b, col. ii, 1. 47).
If Sulla’s tastes, however, resembled Antony’s, the opposite conclusion would be more probable; cf. Anton., 56: μία νήσος (Samos) ἔφ’ ἡμέρας πολλὰς καταρακτήτω καὶ κατεψάλλετο, and ibid., 24. Though the passage is not susceptible of definite interpretation in itself, there is at least no reason for giving it an explanation inconsistent with the meaning of θυμέλη elsewhere in Plutarch.

θυμελικός occurs twice in “specific” passages; cf. Fab. Max., 4: προελθοῦν δὲ ὁ δικτάτωρ (Fabius Maximus after his election) εἰς τὸν ὀχλον εὐξατο τοῖς θεοῖς . . . . θέας μουσικῶς καὶ θυμελικῶς ἔξειν. Livy (XXII, 9, 10) simply says ludos magnos. Müller (op. cit., p. 100) and Frei (De cert. thym., p. 8, n. 9) interpret θυμελικός as meaning “dramatic,” though more probably it is simply tautological. In either case, however, the use of the term savors of Plutarch’s own day. The other instance is Cato Min., 46: τοῦ Φαωνίου κατασταθέντος ἀγορανόμου, τά τε ἄλλα τῆς ἀρχής ἐπεμελείτο (Cato Minor) καὶ τᾶς θέας διείπην ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, διδοὺ καὶ τοῖς θυμελικῶισι στεφάνων μὲν οὐ χρυσοῖς, ἀλλ’ ὀσπερ ἐν Ἀκαμπτίᾳ, κοτίνων . . . . ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρῳ θεάτρῳ Κουρίων ὁ Φαωνίου συνάρχων ἔχορηγει πολυτελῶς ἀλλ’ ἐκείνου ἀπολείποντες οἱ ἀνθρωποί μετέβαινοι ἐνταῦθα καὶ συνέπαιζον προθύμως ὑποκριμένῳ τῷ Φαωνίῳ τὸν ἰδιώτην καὶ τῷ Κάτων τὸν ἀγοροθέτην. From the lack of details the precise meaning of θυμελικός here must, as Frei (op. cit., p. 9, n. 9) says, be left in uncertainty. One thing, however, is clear—in a “specific” passage Plutarch has transferred the language of contemporaneous Greek customs to a Roman celebration to which they bore little relation.

D. Σκηνή.

Σκηνή is etymologically connected with σκιά, σκότος, and σκίρων, and originally meant “booth” or “hut” for temporary use, without regard to the materials employed. The word does not occur in Homer, Hesiod, and the Homeric Hymns where κλισία is used in its stead; but when the tragedians treated Homeric subjects, they uniformly replaced the Homeric term with σκηνή. In Soph., Ajax, 1407, where the poet for “local color” retained κλισία, the scholiast wrote σκηνή as its equivalent. Aeschylus was the first extant writer to use σκηνή. The most frequent application of
the term was to military quarters—a use which persisted throughout Greek literature. But, of course, this application was not the only one. In the earliest dramatic performances, which were entirely choral, when no change of costume was necessary and the audience sat on all sides of the dancing-place, the members of the chorus came already dressed from their homes or neighboring houses. But when the development of the choral parts or the addition of an actor demanded a change of costume, a temporary booth was erected near the dancing-place for this purpose. A great step in advance was taken when the happy thought came, whether to Æschylus himself or a contemporary, of bringing this booth still nearer the chorus and considering it the temporary abode of the actor.¹ In the representation of camp scenes in the extant drama the dressing-room was so used, and its presence is often alluded to; cf. Soph., Ajax, 3 and 218; Eurip., Hec., 53, 99, and 733; Ion, 806 and 982; Troad., 139 and 176; Iph. Aul., 12; etc. So long as σκηναί was a correct untchnical designation for the structures used as dressing-rooms, or whenever the dramatic situation involved huts or booths, we cannot assume that the usage had become technical, and in the passages just cited both conditions obtain. Not until the dressing-rooms were built too substantially to be longer called σκηναί untechnically, and not until they were still so designated in plays which did not depict camp scenes, did σκηνή become a purely technical theatrical term. So far as is now known, Aristophanes was the first to take this step; cf. Pac., 730–31:

华尔·维·梅·洛姆·科

τῆς τὰς σκηνὰς πλείστοι κλέπται κυπτάζειν καὶ κακοποιεῖν

and Thesmoph., 655–58:

χρῆ . . . . περιβρέχαι

τὴν πόλιν πᾶσαν καὶ τὰς σκηνὰς καὶ τὰς διόδους διαθρήσκαι.

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

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

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

As already noted, the transition in meaning from place to function is one of the easiest known to semasiology. Thus
Xenophon several times uses σκηνή by synecdoche of the entertainment given in the royal quarters (Cyrop., II, 3, 22 and 24; 3, 1; and VIII, 4, 27). Consequently, a similar development in the theatrical use of the term was natural. I therefore consider “dramatic performance” (2) the secondary technical meaning of σκηνή, “scenic action” and “plot” being almost synonymous meanings easily derived from this. Excellent examples are found in [Democritus] fr. 249 (Mullach): ὁ κόσμος σκηνή, ὁ βίος πάροδος· ἡλέθες, εἰδές, ἀπερήθες,1 in Aristot., Poetics, XIII, 6, p. 1453a: ἐπὶ τῶν σκηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων, and in arg. Soph., Electra (p. 97, Papageorgi’s ed. of scholia): ἦμιν ἐν βραχεί δεδήλωκεν ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν τόπων τῆς σκηνῆς.2

Both primary and secondary meanings are found in the puzzling phrases τραγικὴ σκηνή and κωμικὴ σκηνή, which deserve a separate treatment. The first instance of the former expression is Xen., Cyrop., VI, 1. 54.3 Cyrus conceived the idea of mounting the lowest story of his siege towers upon wheels and having them drawn by eight yoke of oxen. Each tower (including the wheels) was about eighteen feet in height, was fitted with platforms and battlements, and carried a complement of twenty men. The description continues: ἐπεὶ δὲ πάντα συνειστήκει αὐτῷ τὰ περὶ τῶν πύργων, ἔλαμβαν τὸν ἀγωγὸν πείραν· καὶ πολὺ ράμων ἦγε τὰ ὑκτὸ χεύγη τῶν πύργων καὶ τοὺς ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἄνδρας ἢ τὸ σκευοφορικὸν βάρος ἐκαστον τὸ χεύγος, σκευῶν μὲν γὰρ βάρος ἁμφὶ τὰ πέντε καὶ ἐκκινεὶ τάλαντα ἥν χεύγη· τοῦ δὲ πύργου, ὥσπερ τραγικῆς σκηνῆς τῶν ξύλων πάχος ἐχόμενω, καὶ ἐκκινεῖν ἄνδρόν και

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

2 Cf. the similar use of δράμα in arg. III Soph., Oed. Col.: ἐπὶ τῷ λεγομένῳ ἵππῳ Κολωνίῳ τὸ δράμα κεῖται.

3 The difficulty of this passage has been recognized for some time; cf. Wieseler, Erscb-Gruber Enc., p. 208, n. 32, and Reinach, Revue critique, Vol. XXVI (1892), p. 459.
όπλων, τούτων ἕγενετο ἐλαττον ἡ πεντεκαίδεκα τάλαντα ἐκάστῳ ἐξεύγει τὸ ἄγωνιον. The interpretation of the passage in detail would pass beyond the limits of this paper, and I must content myself with a mere outline. Wieseler (op. cit., pp. 208f., nn. 32 and 38) saw a reference to the μηχανή; Reisch (Griechisches Theater, p. 284, and Zeit. f. d. öst. Gym., Vol. XXXVIII, p. 276), to the uprights of the scene building; and Müller (Philologus, Spbd. VII, pp. 25 ff.), to the upper story (Oberbühne) of the stage—all interpretations inconsistent with the history of σκηνή and hard to reconcile with the meaning of the whole phrase in most of the other passages where it occurs. Σκηνή used alone in the context would naturally have been thought to refer to the σκηνή στρατιωτική; τραγική simply makes plain the reference. With much the same purpose τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ appears in the Delian inscription for the year 282 B.C. (Bull. Cor. Hell., Vol. XVIII [1894], p. 162). Of course, the same certainty of application might have been obtained by the use of κομική instead of τραγική, for the same building served either purpose. “Its timbers had the thickness of those of a booth, the one used at tragedies (and comedies) I mean.”

When we remember that most Greek buildings were made of sun-dried brick, stone, or marble, and very few entirely of wood, we shall not be surprised that in choosing some wooden structure with which to compare the tower Xenophon found nothing else with which he could assume that Greeks as a whole were so familiar as the scene building. In my opinion, then, the phrase here is simply an extension of the primary meaning of σκηνή. The difficulties involved in the small weights mentioned are no greater upon this interpretation than otherwise, and, I think, can be satisfactorily cleared up; but this must be reserved for another occasion.

From the secondary meaning of σκηνή these phrases were also equivalent to τραγῳδία and κομικία. This meaning is found as far back as [Plato] Clitopho, p. 407 A: ἐγώ γὰρ, ὁ Σώκρατες, σοὶ συνηγοροῦμενος πολλάκις ἐξεπληττόμην ἀκούον, καὶ μοι ἐδόκεις παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων κάλλιστα λέγειν, ὅποτε ἐπιτιθέν τοῖς

1 Cf. De anf. poet., p. 35 D: ἡ τραγικής Ἀδραστος, and De esse anim., p. 988 Ε: τίν ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ-Μηχανῇ. Of course, τραγική may be a gloss that has supplanted θεατρική in the text of Xenophon, but such a supposition is unnecessary.
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ἀνθρώποις, ὀστερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς¹ τραγικῆς θεός, ὑμεῖς λέγων· ποί φέρεσθε, ὀνθρώπους, κτλ. In later times the phrase was unquestionably understood of the μηχανή. The misinterpretation was doubtless due to passages like that just quoted, in which there is a reference to the deus ex machina. In fact, it may be traced back to this very passage in the Cidopho with great plausibility, for Timaeus, Plat. Lex., s. v. τραγική σκηνή, gives the following definition: πήγα μετέφρα, ἐφ' οὗ ἐν θεών σκενή τινες παρώντες ἔλεγον, and this mistaken explanation Photius, s. v. τραγική σκηνή, quotes word for word. Arrian, Dissert. Epict., III, 22, 26, echoing the passage under consideration, is evidently thinking of the μηχανή, but at least has the merit of retaining the correct text.

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

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

¹The critical apparatus at my disposal does not record this variant which is mentioned by Wieseeker (Ersch-Gruber, p. 298, n. 38) and Müller (Philologus, Spbd. VII, p. 27). The accepted text reads μηχανή. The correct reading, however, is preserved in the lemma in Timaeus, Lex. Plat. (which can refer to no other passage in Plato), and Photius, and by the passage in Arrian, which is based upon this one. Another reason for suspecting the usual reading is that εἰπὶ μηχανῆς rarely occurs, but generally ἀπὸ μηχανῆς; cf. Lucian, Philopse., 29; Aristides, 1, pp. 47 and 78; II, p. 100, and schol. ad. loc.; Beckers’ Anecd., I, 208, 9; Alexis apud Athenæus 330 C; and [Demosthenes], XI, 59, or εἰ μηχανῆς; cf. Lucian, Hermot., 88, and seven examples in Hellenicus; cf. Walgen, Harvard Studies, Vol. V (1894), p. 49. A parallel to the construction and meaning is found in Aristot., Poetica, XIII, 6, p. 1453a: ἐπὶ τῶν σκηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων.
(Bull. Cor. Hel., Vol. XVIII [1894], p. 163), though I am not myself fully convinced that this and several other points in connection with the Delos theater have yet been satisfactorily explained. We must understand similarly the σκανοθήκα of the theater at Megalopolis (Excav. at Megal., supplement to the Jour. Hel. Studies (1892), p. 140, XXVIII), though the circumstances there were exceptional. The usage appears frequently in the later literature; cf. Dion Cass., LXIII, 6; Paus., II, 7, 5, etc.

The phrase ἔπι (ἀπὸ) τῆς σκηνῆς has already been discussed in another connection (pp. 32 ff.), where it appeared that the expression had a tendency to go over to the secondary meaning of σκηνή and mean little more than "in a play." Another development in another direction has still to be noted. Many a meaning of words and phrases is entirely due to association of ideas. Thus a word may in the beginning have a certain meaning (let us call this x). A new meaning (let us call this y) may come to be associated with the original one (so that the meaning is now x + y). The original meaning may then be lost sight of (so that the result is simply y). It was precisely such a course that was pursued by this phrase in one direction. As already stated (cf. p. 32), it originally meant "on the playhouse side" (x, to apply our illustration), and often may be roughly translated so. It is easy to see how the new meaning arose. For example, cf. schol. Eurip., Hippol., 171: ἔπι τῆς σκηνῆς διέκυκλωσα (τὸ ἔκκυκλημα) τὰ ἕνδον πραττόμενα: "The ecycelema shows 'on the playhouse side' what is done within." In this case ἔπι τῆς σκηνῆς not only has its old meaning (x); there is also involved a strong contrast between the inner part of the scene building and those parts which were seen by the audience. The first member of the contrast was expressed by ἕνδον; the second member (at least when such a collocation of words occurred for the first time) was not clearly expressed at all, but was easily implied in ἔπι τῆς σκηνῆς. When we try to give a definite expression to this latter opposing part, we can think of nothing better than "performance-place" or "scene" (4). So in such a sentence ἔπι τῆς σκηνῆς by unavoidable implication meant both "on the playhouse side and in the performance-place" (x + y). It remains for us to see how the meaning (x) faded. A good illustration
occurs in schol. Arist., *Nub.*, 344: δῆλον οὖν ὅτι ὅπωσα ἐν τοῖς ἄνω λέξεσται χορικά, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς δυνατὸν τοῦ χοροῦ εἶρηται, ἀλλὰ ἔξω ἐστῶτοι καὶ κρυπτομένου . . . οὐ γὰρ ἡδύνατο ἐντὸς εἶναι τῆς σκηνῆς αἰ μὴ καταπτάσαι μηδέπω: "It is evident that the choral parts were said while the chorus was not ‘on the playhouse side and in the performance-place’ [x+y], but standing outside . . . , for those that had not yet flown down could not be within the performance-place [y]". It is plain that the meaning (x) has entirely disappeared, else ἐντὸς τῆς σκηνῆς would mean “within the scene building.” Once established, this new meaning spread rapidly and soon became common in many other combinations. This new development included within its scope the space occupied by both chorus and actors; cf. schol. Εἰσχ., *Eumen.*, 35: παρ᾽ ὀλγον ἔρημος ἡ σκηνή γίνεται, οὕτε γὰρ ὁ χορός ποι πάρεστιν, ἢ τε ἰέρεια εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ναὸν. The usage is especially common in the dramatic scholia, but is not infrequently found in Lucian and other late writers.

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

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

The primary significance of τραγική σκηνή appears in *Quomodo


2Cf. *Diocass,* LX, 23: οἱ περὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τεχνίται. Παρὰ σκηνῆς in *Otho*, 5, probably has no theatrical application, but is a mere reproach at the troops for being “feather-bed soldiers.”
adul., p. 56 F: τί δὲ Νέρων τραγικῆν ἐπήξατο σκηνήν καὶ προσωπεία καὶ κοθόρνους περιέθηκεν; οὐχ ό τῶν κολακευόμενων ἐπαινός; Nero's well-known pride in his tragic acting was, of course, made possible and fostered by the sycophantic praise of his courtiers; in other words, they furnished the required environment and accessories. The secondary meaning of the phrase occurs in Demetr., 28: τὴν δὲ διήγησιν ὦστερ ἐκ κωμικῆς σκηνῆς πάλιν ἐς τραγικῆν μετάγουσιν αἳ τύχαι καὶ αἳ πράξεις τοῦ ἄνδρος (Demetrius); i. e., the narrative changes from a joyous theme to a tragic one. Müller (Philologus, Spbd. VII, p. 24) gives this same interpretation, which, as I have said before, stands out of all relation to the meanings which he assigns these phrases elsewhere.

Further instances of meaning (2) are found elsewhere; cf. Praec. ger., p. 823 E: χρή . . . μὴ ταπεινοῦσθαι μηδ’ ἐκπεπλή-χθαι τὴν ἐκ θεάτρων καὶ ὀπτανείων καὶ πολυανδρίων προσισταμένην τοῖς ὄχλοις δόξαν, ὥς ὄλγον χρόνον ἐπιξίωσαν καὶ τοῖς μονομάχοις καὶ ταῖς σκηναῖς ὅμοιοι συνδιαλυομένην, ἐντιμον δὲ μηδὲν μηδὲ σεμίνον ἐξουσιών. Since the performance itself was the only thing that had as fleeting an existence as the glory gained by the donor of the spectacles, no other interpretation is possible. A similar explanation must be given a passage which has never been understood, De esu earn., p. 996 B: τὴν δὲ μεγάλην καὶ μυστηριώδη καὶ ἀπιστον ἄνδρας δειλοῖς, ἣ φησιν ο Πλάτων, καὶ θυντα φρονοῦσιν ἄρχην τοῦ δόγματος ὅκιμο μὲν ἔτι τῷ λόγῳ κυνείν, ὡστερ ναῦν ἐν χειμών ναύκληρον ἡ μηχανή ἁρεί ποιητικός ἀνήρ ἐν θεάτρῳ σκηνής περι-φερομένης. Misled by the participle περιφερομένης, Reisch (Griech. Theater, p. 288) sees a reference to the scaena ductilis, and Müller (op. cit., p. 16) to the periactoi. But since a change in the location of the scenic action does not necessitate the use of the deus ex machina nor vice versa, these suggestions are unintelligible. It must first be noted that περιφέρεσθαι is often employed of other than literal motion. Thus it is used of the youthful Dionysius who was "dizzy" with the responsibilities of his office (Dion, 11: νέας ψυχής ἔξουσία μεγάλη καὶ δυνάμει περιφε-ρομένης), of Clodius Macer, who, being unable either to accept or reject the imperial dignity, was in a constant state of "wavering" (Galba, 6: ἐν τῷ μήτε κατέχειν μήτε ἀφεῖναι τὴν ἄρχην δύνασθαι
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περιφερόμενος), and in St. Paul’s injunction to the Ephesians not to be “carried about” with every wind of doctrine (Ephes. 4:14: περιφερόμενοι παντι ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας); cf. also Caesar, 32, and Philop., 17. The parallelism of the figures must next be observed: (a) Plutarch (b) at the critical moment in his narrative (c) ὁκνεῖ ἐτι κινεῖν τὴν ἄρχήν, (a) the shipowner (b) ἐν χειμῶν (c) ὁκνεῖ κινεῖν τὴν ναῦν, and (a) the poet (b) σκηνής περιφερομένης (c) αἰρεῖ τὴν μνημαίν. It thus appears that ἐν χειμῶν and σκηνής περιφερομένης perform similar functions in their clauses, each denoting that which impels the subject of the simile to a given course of action. Now, the deus ex machina was employed only when the difficulties became too great for any other solution. But this is exactly the thought which Plutarch expresses by σκηνής περιφερομένης, the choice of metaphor probably being influenced by the preceding nautical figure. When the play was “driven about” like a ship in a storm—i.e., when the plot became tangled beyond the possibility of disengagement by the natural action of the characters—then the poet resorted to the only recourse left him. The same idea is found several times elsewhere. Cf. the Ποίησις of Antiphanes (Meineke, ΠΙ, p. 106; Kock, ΠΙ, p. 90):

ἐστι δὲ ὅταν μὴν δύναντ’ (tragic poets) ἑπάν ἐτι
κομιδῇ δ’ ἀπειρίκοσιν ἐν τοῖς δράμασιν,
ἀγροσκόμον ὅσπερ δάκτυλον τὴν μνημαίν,
καὶ τοὺς θεομάντεις ἀποξρωτῶς ἐξει.

Plato, Cratyl., p. 425 D: εἰ μὴ ἄρα δὴ, ὡσπέρ οἱ πραγματοποιοῖ,
ἐπειδὰν τι ἀπορώσων, ἐτὶ τὰς μνημαίς καταφεύγουσι θεοὶ αἴροντες,
and Cicero, Nat. Deor., I, 20: ut tragici poetae, cum explicare argumenti exitum non potestis, confugitis ad deum. How closely σκηνή here approaches the meaning “plot” may be seen from the fact that Cicero uses argumentum to express it, though Antiphanes employs ἐν τοῖς δράμασιν.

A very clear instance of meaning (3) is Galba, 1: ἡ δὲ τῶν Καυσάρων ἐστία, τὸ Παλάτιον, ἐν ἐλάσσον χρόνῳ (than ten months) τέσσαρας αὐτοκράτορας ὑπεδέξατο, τὸν μὲν εἰσαγόντων ὡσπέρ διὰ σκηνῆς, τὸν δ’ ἐξαγόντων. The subject of the participles is not expressed; possibly they are to be thought of as θεία ρήματα. The corresponding agent in the simile is the poet. The directing
powers of the universe brought into the palace one ruler following immediately upon the exit of his predecessor, just as a poet has one actor make his entrance as soon as another departs. In this connection the verbs could only be used of passing between scene building and performance place. Several meanings of σκηνή would be appropriate, but διά limits the application to the front wall of the scene building or to the scenery. Entrances and exits were, of course, made through the doors in the front wall of the scene building, i. e., διὰ σκηνῆς.

Of meaning (4) there are several examples; cf. Amator., p. 749 A: εὐθὺς ἦ πρόφασις, ἵνα ὅρμηθησαν οἱ λόγοι, χρόνον αἰτεὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ σκηνῆς δεῖται, τά τ᾽ ἄλλα δράματος οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει. The story needed only a sympathetic audience and a place for the recital. This meaning is employed figuratively also in De facie, p. 940 F: ὁ Σύλλας ἐνοδάβων, “ἐπίσχες,” εἶπεν, “ὁ Δαμνῖα, καὶ παραβαλοῦ τὸ θυρίων τοῦ λόγου, μὴ λάθης τὸν μίθον ὡσπερ εἰς γην ἔξοικελας καὶ συγχέοις τὸ δράμα τοῦμὸν ἐτέραν ἔχον σκηνὴν καὶ διάθεσιν.” Sulla’s narrative had a location and theme at variance with what Lamprias had just been saying. Still another instance of this usage is Theseus, 29: εἰς μέντοι λόγοι περὶ γάμων Θησέως καὶ ἔτεροι, τὴν σκηνὴν διαπέφευγατε. Plutarch has just been relating Theseus’s relations with Phaedra, which had been dramatically treated by Euripides and others. He adds that Theseus had had other matrimonial experiences which had escaped representation on the scene. Of meaning (5) I find no example in Plutarch.

b) Of meaning (1), viz., “scene building,” there are several instances; cf. Aratus, 23: αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς εἰς μέσον προῆλθε; and Demetr., 34: ὅπλος μὲν σωφράξε τὴν σκηνὴν. A passage of some interest is Phocion, 5: καὶ μέντοι καὶ αὐτὸν πατὶ τὸν Φωκίωνα φασὶ πληρουμένου τοῦ θεάτρου περιπατεῖν ὑπὸ σκηνῆς αὐτὸν ὅτα πρὸς ἑαυτῷ τὴν διάνοιαν. This has usually been taken as meaning that Phocion was walking up and down “behind the scenes,” and that is undoubtedly the customary meaning of the phrase; cf. p. 50, below. Now, ὑπὸ denotes (to paraphrase Professor Gildersleeve's

1 These two passages are discussed at length on pp. 56 ff. below.
phrase concerning ἐπὶ) “characteristic infraposition.” Consequently it must usually be rendered “beneath,” but also sometimes “behind;” cf. Herod., I, 12; VII, 61; and IX, 96. This latter meaning is the one here required, but a priori the phrase might mean either behind the scene building or behind its front wall. Now, at Athens there was a colonnade behind the scene building since the time of the Lycurgus theater (Dörpfeld, Griechisches Theater, p. 60). Since this seems a more natural place for Phocion to be engaged in collecting his thoughts than behind the scenes, I prefer this interpretation. The phrase has this meaning also in Athen., p. 591 A, who mentions a statue of Eros which was ὑπὸ τὴν σκηνήν.

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


phialegelous δε ἦν καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Πολυορκητής, ὃς φησι Φύλλαρχος ἐν τῇ ἐκτῇ τῶν Ἰστορίων, δι' ὑπὸ καὶ τὴν Δυσμάχου αὐτὴν κομικῆς σκηνῆς οὔποτε διαφέρειν ἔλεγεν· εξείναι γὰρ ἄν' αὐτῆς πάντας διασυννάσσους: τὸν τε Βίθινον χλενάζον καὶ τὸν Πάραν, μεγίστους ὄντας παρὰ τῷ Δυσμάχῳ, καὶ τινας ἑτέρους τῶν φίλων· παρὰ δ' αὐτοῦ Πενεκέστας καὶ Μενελάου, ἐτι δὲ Ὄξιθέμαδα· τοῦτα δ' ἀκούν ὁ Αυσίμαχος "ἐγὼ τούτων," ἔφη, "πόρνην ἐκ τραγικῆς σκηνῆς οὐχ ἔωρακ ἔξοισαν," τὴν αὐλητρίδα Δαμίων λέγων. ἀπαγελθέντος δὲ καὶ τουτοῦ πάλιν ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Δημήτριος ἔφη· "ἐλλ' ἂν παρ' ἐμοὶ πόρνη σωφρονέτερον τῆς παρ' ἐκείνῳ Πηνελόπης ζῇ." 

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

1 A significant fact for Wright’s third argument; cf. p. 11, n. 1.
military meaning, as in the Cyropaedia passage (pp. 41 f., above), but to add point to the jest. It is, in the first place, termed κομική because of the comic names borne by Lysimachus’s friends; ¹ it is then given the epithet τραγική as an antithesis to Demetrius’s jibe, and because of his pompous manner of conducting himself; cf. Demetr., 41 (p. 33, above), and because harlots never were given a rôle in tragedy. Müller (Philologus, Spbd. VII, p. 16) and Reisch (Griechisches Theater, p. 288) see in these passages a reference to the decoration. But this interpretation gives these phrases meanings of which there are no other examples and which would stand quite apart from their significance elsewhere. Moreover, in that case we should expect, not ἔξιέναι (προέρχεσθαι) ἐκ, but διεξιέναι or ἔξιέναι διά; cf. Galba, 1, on p. 47, above. Inasmuch as Lamia cannot even figuratively be said to have come from a μηχανή, or Oberbühne (the meanings which Wieseler and Müller propose for the Cyropaedia passage; cf. p. 42, above), while she was, of course, continually coming from Demetrius’s quarters, of which “tragic” was a very appropriate epithet, it is reasonable to suppose that σκηνή has its primary meaning. We have already seen that these phrases had this meaning in Demetrius’s time, and, as Plutarch uses them without explanation, it must have been current usage in his day also.

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

¹The point of Demetrius’s remark lay in the fact that slaves, who usually had short names, played a prominent part in New Comedy; cf. BERGK, Griechische Literatur-Geschichte, Vol. IV, p. 141, n. 57, and NEIL’s edition of Arist., Equit., p. 6, n. 1.
Of (4) there are two examples. In *Aet. Rom.*, p. 289 D, Plutarch cites Cluvius Rufus in explanation of the term *histriones* : φησὶ γὰρ (Cluvius) . . . λοιμῶδη νόσον ἐν Ὄμη γενομένην (in 364 B.C.) πάντας ὁμαλός διαφθείραι τῶν ἐπὶ σκηνῆς προσχομένους· δειθείσιν ὦν αὐτοῖς (the Romans) ἐκ Τυρρηνίας ἐλθεῖν πολλοῖς καὶ ἀγαθοῖς τεχνίτασι, διὸ τὸν πρωτεύοντα δόξη καὶ χρόνου πλέοντον ἐνενημεροῦντα τῶν θεάτρων. "Ιστρον ὦνομάξεσθαι· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πάντας ἱστρίων· ἀπ’ ἐκείνου προσχωρεῖσθαι. It is clear that ἐπὶ σκηνῆς with a verb of motion is equivalent to ἐπὶ σκηνῆς with a verb of rest, and it has already been explained how the latter phrase gave rise to the meaning "performance place" or "scene." Though we are not in a position to say so positively, it is extremely doubtful whether σκηνῆ was already acquired this signification as early as 364 B.C. Incidentally, we may also point out that it is agreed that societies of Dionysian artists did not arise till considerably later than the time here mentioned.¹ A still clearer instance of modernization is *De aud. poet.*, p. 19 E: ὁ Ἐὐριπίδης εἰπεῖν λέγει τὸν τὸν Ἰξώνα λουδορούντας ἢς ἀσεβῆ καὶ μιαρόν, “οὐ μέντοι πρότερον αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐξήγαγον ἢ τὸ τροχῷ προσηλώσασι.” The context requires that ἐκ τῆς σκηνῆς here should mean either "from the scene" or "from the stage." As no instance of the latter significance occurs in Plutarch, we must choose the former. But it is certain that in Euripides’s day the phrase could have meant only "from the scene building," which is entirely inapplicable to this passage. If such a sentiment was ever actually expressed by the dramatist, he probably said ἐκ τῆς ὄρχηστρας or ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου, or employed the verb alone; cf. Xen., *Hell.*, VI, 4, 16, on p. 12, above.

E. Προσκήνιον.²

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


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

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

b) The solitary instance of προσκήνιον in a “specific” passage is Non posse suav., p. 1096 Β: καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐν Πέλλη βουλομενον σοιχαι τὸ προσκήνιον οὐκ εἶσαν ὁ τεχνίτης, ὡς διαφθεροῦντα τῶν ὑποκριτῶν τὴν φωνήν. This passage has called forth much ingenuity in the attempt to discover whether the ancients thought a background or a floor had the more effect upon a person’s voice. That they attributed influence to the latter, Puchstein, relying mostly upon [Aristot.] Probl., XI, 25

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

F. Πάροδος.

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

a) It so happens that there is no instance of this word in Plutarch in a “general” passage. The usage is, of course, not doubted; cf. Pollux, IV, 126.1

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

1The term is used of the opening chorus of a play in De glor. Ath., p. 348 E, and An sem., p. 785 A.
cf. Aratus, 23: ἐπιστήσας (Aratus) ταῖς παρόδοις ἐκατέρωθεν τοὺς Ἀχαιός, which evidently has the old meaning of orchestral entrances. The other instance is Demetr., 34: καταβάς (Demetrius), ὅσπερ οἱ τραγῳδοί, διὰ τῶν ἄνω παρόδων. Now, αἱ ἄνω πάροδοι implies αἱ κάτω πάροδοι. The latter could only be the parodoi par excellence; i.e., the entrances to the orchestra. In that case the upper parodoi may conceivably have been (1) the ramps leading from the orchestra paradoi to the logeion (i.e., of the Romanized theater with a stage; cf. Puchstein, Griechische Bühne, pp. 80 and 96), (2) the central doors in the proscenium, or (3) side entrances to the stage from the parascenion (cf. Puchstein, ibid., p. 98). Inasmuch as the ramps were scarcely the entrances κατ' ἕξωχήν for the τραγῳδοί, and the central doors could hardly be called side entrances, I incline to the last interpretation. In other words, Demetrius came from the parascenium upon the logeion (which is mentioned, in the context; cf. p. 56), and spoke thence. The very contrast between "upper" and "lower" shows that the Plutarch had a transitional type of theater in mind, since in the old style of theater all the entrances to the place of action were "lower," and in the Roman theater they were all "upper." This interpretation accords with the Nero theater of Plutarch's day, but not with the Lycurgus theater. We have, then, another case of anachronism.

G. Λογείον.

Etymologically λογείον means "speaking-place," and it seems during its whole history to have been the vox propria for the place occupied by the speakers in the public assemblies—a fact which clearly appears from Praec. ger., p. 823 B: διαλακτήν . . . παρέχων ἑαυτῶν οὖ μικρὸν ἡμέρας μέρος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἦ τοῦ λογείου πολιτευόμενος. The good citizen must spend much of his time in the law courts and the public assemblies. Here any reference to the λογείον as the actors' place is, of course, out of the question. The sophist Phrynichus (p. 250, Rutherford's ed.), whose carefulness would scarcely allow us to suppose him mistaken concerning the usage of his own time, states that tragic and comic actors performed in the logeion: σὺ μέντοι, ἐνθα μὲν κωμῳδοῖ
καὶ τραγωδοὶ ἄγωνιζονται, λογεῖον ἐρεῖς· ἐνθα δὲ οἱ αἰσθαναὶ καὶ οἱ χοροί, ὀρχήστραν καὶ μὴ θυμέληρ. Additional information for the same general period is afforded by the words βῆμα θετροῦ which appear in an inscription on the highest of the steps leading to the Phaedrus stage of the theater at Athens (C. I. A., III, 239). The conclusion that this stage was the speaking-place of the actors and orators in the third or fourth century A. D.—i. e., was the λογεῖον— is inevitable. An inscription from Patara for the year 147 A. D. carries us back a century or more—C. I. G., 4283: Οὐελία . . . . Πρόκλα Παταρίς ἀνέθηκεν καὶ καθίερσεν . . . τὴν τοῦ λογείου κατασκευὴν καὶ πλαίσιον—words which can hardly be understood of any other meaning that has ever been proposed for λογεῖον than “stage.” Moreover, Vitruvius, V, 7, 2, supplies similar testimony for the beginning of the imperial period: habent . . . . Graeci . . . . pulpitum, quod λογεῖον appellant.¹

On the other hand, there is good reason for believing that at Athens from the earliest times the orchestra served as the place of the speaker in assemblies which were held in the theater. Thus, from Isocr., De pace, 82 (p. 26, above), and Aesch., Ctes., 156, 176, and 230, it appears that crowning and other public business was done in the orchestra. The latest reference occurs in Athenaeus, who preserves the contemporaneous account by Posidonius of the rise of Athenion to a tyranny at Athens in 88 B. C.; cf. Athen., p. 213 E: οἱ ὅχλοι συνδραμότες εἰς τὸ θέατρον εἴλοντο τὸν Ἀθηνίωνα στρατηγὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ὄπλων καὶ παρελθὼν ὁ περιπατητικός εἰς τὴν ὀρχήστραν . . . . εἰχαρίστησε τε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ ἐφῇ κτλ. It thus seems that about the beginning of the Christian era the speakers in the Greek assemblies, when held in the theater, were transferred from the orchestra to a raised platform, which was known as λογεῖον. A difficulty arises, however, from the fact that λογεῖον appears upon Delian inscriptions long before this. Thus for the year 279 B. C. (Bull. Cor. Hel., Vol. XVIII [1894], p. 162) occurs: εἰς τὸ λο[γεῖον] τῆς σκηνῆς . . . μοι τετράπτηχων;

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

²The restoration has been doubted by Reisch and others on the ground that there is not room at the beginning of the line for these letters; but Dörpfeld accepts it; cf. Gr. Theat., pp. 148 and 302. Homolle gave the reading λ[ογεῖον in his first publication of the stone and λο[γεῖον in his second; cf. Bull. Cor. Hel., Vol. XIV (1890), p. 401, and Vol. XVIII
and for 180 B. C. (ibid., p. 165): [ξύλον . . . . κατεχρήσθη εἰς] τὴν κατασκευὴν τῶν πτέρακων τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ λογεῖον. The dilemma thus arising has so far baffled everyone. To suppose that the orators occupied a different place at Delos than at Athens is highly improbable. The only hypothesis consistent with the known facts is that the term suffered a change of meaning (so Reisch, Griechisches Theater, p. 302), but precisely what its earlier meaning was has not yet been made out.

a) Besides the instance already quoted (p. 54), λογεῖον occurs but once in “general” passages; cf. Theseus, 16: ἐπεκρατήσαντες οἱ τραγῳδοὶ πολλὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ λογείου καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀδοξίαν αὐτοῦ (Minos) κατεσκέδασαν. The collocation of words is similar to that in Pliny, Ep., IV, 25: ludibria scena et pulpitum digna; and it is fairly certain that λογεῖον here means “stage.” Though the statement is not “specific,” yet, inasmuch as in the immediate context Plutarch has twice quoted Euripides as to the nature of the Minotaur, and Minos is known to have been treated dramatically by Sophocles in the Δαιδάλος and in the Καμμοί (identified by some with the Μίνως), and by Euripides in the Κρήτης, it is evident that Plutarch has the latter half of the fifth century in mind and has assumed the presence of a logeion in that period. Such an assumption, however, is highly improbable upon any theory of the term’s history.\(^1\)

b) Λογεῖον occurs but once in a “specific” passage; cf. Demetr., 34: οὖτως ὁν τῆς πόλεως (Athens) ἔχουσης εἰσελθὼν ὁ Δημήτριος καὶ κελέσας εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἀδροισθήναι πάντας, ὑποτιμὸν μὲν συνεφραξε τὴν σκηνήν καὶ δορυφόρους το λογεῖον περελαβεν, αὐτὸς δὲ καταβάς, ὡσπερ οἱ τραγῳδοί, διὰ τὸν ἄνω παρόνων, ἐτὶ μᾶλλον ἐκπεπληγμένων τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ λόγου πέρας ἐποίησατο τοῦ δέονς αὐτῶν. The plan here described was a favorite in antiquity and is often mentioned; cf. Aratus, 23: ἐπεί δὲ ἀσφαλὸς ἐδόκει πάντα ἔχειν, κατέβαινεν εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκρας,

\(^{1}\) The fact that λογεῖον and σκηνῇ do not occur in [PLAT.] Μίνως, pp. 319 B-321 A, to which Plutarch is at least ultimately indebted for the thought, lends color to the supposition that he has added these details from the theater of his day.
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πλήθους ἀπείρου συνρέοντος ἐπιθυμία τῆς τε ὄψεως αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν λόγων, οἷς ἔμελλε χρῆσαι πρὸς τοὺς Κοριθίους. ἐπιστήμης δὲ ταῖς παροδοῖς ἐκατέρωθεν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς εἰς μέσου προῆλθε, . . . . διεξῆλθε λόγον, and also Pelop., 29; Polyb., XI, 27, 6; and Polyain., Strateg., VI, 10. Now, in the Demetrius passage it is apparent that ὅπλως συνέφραξε τὴν σκηνήν καὶ τὸ λογεῖον περιέλαβεν is merely an amplification of the ἐπιστήμης ταῖς παροδοῖς ἐκατέρωθεν of the Aratus episode, while the reference to the upper parodoi and the τραγῳδοί shows that λογεῖον means "stage." The guards, then, were stationed in front of the stage, along the parodoi, and about the front of the scene building—a description which ignores the fact that the Athenian theater had other entrances to the auditorium than those leading to the orchestra. The manner of Demetrius’s appearance is mooted. He is said to have "come down through the upper parodoi like the tragic actors." We have already (p. 54) seen reasons for believing that these αἱ ἀνω πάροδοι were passages from the parascenia opening upon the logeion. Demetrius, then, came from the parascenium upon the logeion and spoke thence. The expression used of Aratus (ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς εἰς μέσου προῆλθε) is colorless, and might mean that he came from the scene building either upon the logeion or into the orchestra. It is reasonable, however, to explain the one passage by the other. But this whole interpretation is liable to one objection—the word καταβάς. In theatrical usage this word is said to have meant ἀπαλλάττεσθαι.  


2 This point is entirely overlooked by ROBERT in his discussion of the passage, Hermes, Vol. XXXII (1897), pp. 448 ff.
the orchestra. Against this view several objections must be urged: (1) these steps were in no sense side entrances; (2) we have reason to believe that there was only one such flight, and therefore Plutarch would have used the singular (διὰ τῆς ἄνω παρόδου) rather than the plural; (3) in theaters which had a stage, that was the more natural place for speaking; and (4) the phrase ὃσπερ οἱ τραγῳδοὶ is inconsistent with this explanation. An examination of the Aratus episode reveals what I conceive to be the true interpretation. There occurs the expression κατέβαινε εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἀπὸ τῆς ἄκρας, of which I think καταβάς is a condensation. The original account probably told how Demetrius entered the city and made his headquarters on the acropolis, whence, his preparations completed, he descended to the theater. Plutarch retained the rest, but omitted the second item, without which καταβάς is ambiguous.\(^1\) Κατελθείν and καταβάσεστε are only slightly less indefinite in Solon, 12: τοὺς συνωμότας τοῦ Κύλωνος ἰκετεύοντας τὴν θεῶν Μεγακλῆς ὁ ἄρχων ἐπὶ δίκη κατελθείν ἐπεισεν ἐξάφαντας δὲ τοῦ ἔδους κράκην κλαστὴν καὶ ταῦτης ἐκμενούς, ὥς ἑγένοντο περὶ τὰς σεμνὰς θέας καταβαίνοντες, αὐτομάτως τῆς κράκης ῥαγείας, δρύμητε συλλαμβάνειν οἱ Μεγακλῆς καὶ οἱ συνάρχοντες. The conspirators, as we know from other sources,\(^2\) were descending from the Acropolis; and yet this is far from being explicitly stated in our text. Similarly, ἄνω is employed meaning “on the Pnyx” in Nicias, 7: λέγεται γὰρ ἐκλησίας ποτὲ ὀνήμα τὸν μὲν δῆμον καθήμενον ἄνω περιμένειν πολὺν χρόνον. If this explanation is correct, only the final stage of the action described by the participle is included in the following simile: “Upon descending from the acropolis (κατά-) Demetrius came (βᾶς) through the upper parodos like the tragic actors.” As he could

1 Notice the pregnant use of the word in Pyrr., 12: ἀναβάς εἰς τὴν ἄκροπολιν καὶ θύεις τῇ θεῷ καὶ καταβάς.

2 Cf. Herod., V, 71; Thuc., I, 126, 10, 11; and especially schoel. Arist., Eupol., 445: οἱ συγκατα-
κλεωθείτε τῷ Κύλῳ εἰς τῇ ἄκροπολει εἰς τὴν κρίσιν κατέβησαν εἰς ἀρείῳ πάγῳ. For other cases of careless transcription cf. Themist., 10, where it is said that in 480 B. C. the Athenians sailed εἰς τὴν νῆσον, meaning Salamin, though that does not appear from the context; and Pericles, 13, where we are told the musical contests were held καὶ τότε καὶ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον in the Odeum of Pericles. Now, Fossi (De cert. thym., p. 12) has shown that toward the close of the fourth century these contests were transferred to the Dionysian theater. Plutarch’s source here is Ephorus (cf. Fowler, Harvard Studies, Vol. XII [1901], pp. 212 f., who gives the bibliography), who must have written this portion of his history before the transfer was effected.
have passed through only one of the parochoi, we must suppose
that the plural is either a *pluralis maiestatis* or is due to the
plural τραγῳδοί. Such I conceive to be the meaning of Plu-
tarch’s words,1 and it accords perfectly with all we know of the
theater of his time. Is it also a picture of what actually hap-
pened in the fourth century?

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

---

1 I know of but one other case of this verb’s being used in such a context; cf. Dio Cass.,
LXII, 29 (Xiphilinus): καὶ τοις καὶ ἐπὶ τῆν τοῦ θεάτρου ὄρχησταν ἐν παιδήματι τείχῃ κατέβη (Nero)
καὶ ἄνευ τῶν ἱματίων τοῦ ἱεροῦ ταῦτα, where the epitomizing process has left both the place
and the circumstances uncertain. Dion’s own account would, I think, be in harmony with
the explanation given in the text.

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

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

\(^1\text{ Cf. the introduction to the SIEFERT-BLAS edition of \textit{Pericles}, p. 85.}\)
that thymelic performers belonged to the σύνοδοι of Dionysian artists during the Hellenistic period; and Peric., 9 (ibid., p. 348), to prove that the theoric fund was established by Pericles (cf. pp. 21 f., above). Similarly, Haigh (Attic Theatre, p. 76, 2d ed.) uses Phoc., 31, to show that the agonothesia was instituted in 319 B. C. And again, Robert (Hermes, Vol. XXXII (1897), pp. 448 ff.) and Müller (Philologus, Supplementband VII, p. 52) employ Demetr., 34, to prove the existence of a stage in the Lycurgus theater at Athens. Some of these contentions are demonstrably wrong, others are undoubtedly correct. The point which I wish to make is that conclusions concerning theatrical matters cannot thus be drawn from Plutarch's incidental allusions to the customs and institutions of preceding periods. On the other hand, recognition of this rule will result in a qualification of the strictures that have often been passed upon the biographer. Plutarch had little confidence in the results attained in the field of chronology, and still less use for them.\footnote{Cf. Willamowitz-Mollendorff, Aristoteles und Athen, Vol. II, p. 290: "Plutarch ist ein stilistisch hervorragender, historisch urteilsloser, chronologisch unbekümmrter Mann."} His aim was not the discovery of the historical sequence of events so much as the portrayal of praiseworthy qualities. Consequently, the appositeness of a story to the character under consideration (cf. πρέποντα τῷ ἠθει and context in Solon, 27) always seemed more important to him than the mere fact that the story was declared chronologically impossible. And in this it has remained for a modern historian\footnote{Cf. Freeman, Historical Essays, Second Series, p. 278: "He might even have gone on to say that an apocryphal anecdote often throws as much light on a man's character as an authentic one; current stories about people are often, perhaps generally, exaggerated; but the peculiar qualities which are picked out for exaggeration are pretty sure to show what a man's character really is."} to vindicate his point of view and justify the place which he assigned to apocryphal anecdote. In addition to this, we find that he deliberately sought vividness of presentation by modernizing his accounts and picturing his scenes amid the familiar surroundings of contemporaneous life. Thus, his temperament, purpose, and artistic sense combined to lead him from the straight path of historical exactness. The knowledge that this was conscious and intentional, and not due to ignorance, should do much to clear his reputation.
It has already been said (p. 8) above, that in the "general" passages Plutarch must have had in mind one particular type of theater, and that, too, one which was as familiar to his readers as to himself; and that all information concerning it in such passages should be consistent with itself. Now, it results from Plutarch's modernizing tendency that all this must be equally true of the "specific" passages as well. And that they are in perfect agreement with the "general" passages and with information furnished by other contemporaneous writers similarly situated has already appeared. In other words, all theatrical information in Plutarch refers to a single well-known type of theater.

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

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

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

¹Cf. Dorpfeld, Griechisches Theater, pp. 82 ff., and Puchstein, Griechische Bühne, pp. 100 ff.

²I note a few cases in point. In the conversation between Solon and Anacharsis (at Athens about 592 B. C.) Lucian causes it to appear that theaters were already used for public ceremonies and gymnastic contests (Anachars., 10 and 38), that public dramatic performances were already held and associated with Dionysian festivals (ibid., 22, 23), and that the κομιδοὶ and τραγῳδοὶ already wore thick-soled boots (ibid., 23 and 32).
results changing somewhat with each. Thus the main aim of this paper has been to present a concrete illustration of a method which should prove serviceable in controlling most of these latter writers. In other words, it offers not only an examination of Plutarch's literary method, but also a study in methodology as a suggestion for further investigation.