

A COMPANION TO
*T*RAGEDY

EDITED BY REBECCA BUSHNELL

A Companion to Tragedy

Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture

This series offers comprehensive, newly written surveys of key periods and movements and certain major authors, in English literary culture and history. Extensive volumes provide new perspectives and positions on contexts and on canonical and post-canonical texts, orientating the beginning student in new fields of study and providing the experienced undergraduate and new graduate with current and new directions, as pioneered and developed by leading scholars in the field.

Published

- | | | |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | A Companion to Romanticism | <i>Edited by Duncan Wu</i> |
| 2 | A Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture | <i>Edited by Herbert F. Tucker</i> |
| 3 | A Companion to Shakespeare | <i>Edited by David Scott Kastan</i> |
| 4 | A Companion to the Gothic | <i>Edited by David Punter</i> |
| 5 | A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare | <i>Edited by Dymphna Callaghan</i> |
| 6 | A Companion to Chaucer | <i>Edited by Peter Brown</i> |
| 7 | A Companion to Literature from Milton to Blake | <i>Edited by David Womersley</i> |
| 8 | A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture | <i>Edited by Michael Hattaway</i> |
| 9 | A Companion to Milton | <i>Edited by Thomas N. Corns</i> |
| 10 | A Companion to Twentieth-Century Poetry | <i>Edited by Neil Roberts</i> |
| 11 | A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture | <i>Edited by Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Trebarne</i> |
| 12 | A Companion to Restoration Drama | <i>Edited by Susan J. Owen</i> |
| 13 | A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing | <i>Edited by Anita Pacheco</i> |
| 14 | A Companion to Renaissance Drama | <i>Edited by Arthur F. Kinney</i> |
| 15 | A Companion to Victorian Poetry | <i>Edited by Richard Cronin, Alison Chapman, and Antony H. Harrison</i> |
| 16 | A Companion to the Victorian Novel | <i>Edited by Patrick Brantlinger and William B. Thesing</i> |
| 17–20 | A Companion to Shakespeare's Works, Volumes I–IV | <i>Edited by Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard</i> |
| 21 | A Companion to the Regional Literatures of America | <i>Edited by Charles L. Crow</i> |
| 22 | A Companion to Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism | <i>Edited by Walter Jost and Wendy Olmsted</i> |
| 23 | A Companion to the Literature and Culture of the American South | <i>Edited by Richard Gray and Owen Robinson</i> |
| 24 | A Companion to American Fiction 1780–1865 | <i>Edited by Shirley Samuels</i> |
| 25 | A Companion to American Fiction 1865–1914 | <i>Edited by Robert Paul Lamb and G. R. Thompson</i> |
| 26 | A Companion to Digital Humanities | <i>Edited by Susan Schreibman, Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth</i> |
| 27 | A Companion to Romance | <i>Edited by Corinne Saunders</i> |
| 28 | A Companion to the British and Irish Novel 1945–2000 | <i>Edited by Brian W. Shaffer</i> |
| 29 | A Companion to Twentieth-Century American Drama | <i>Edited by David Krasner</i> |
| 30 | A Companion to the Eighteenth-Century Novel | <i>Edited by Paula R. Backscheider and Catherine Ingrassia</i> |
| 31 | A Companion to Old Norse-Icelandic Literature and Culture | <i>Edited by Rory McTurk</i> |
| 32 | A Companion to Tragedy | <i>Edited by Rebecca Bushnell</i> |

A COMPANION TO
*T*RAGEDY

EDITED BY REBECCA BUSHNELL

© 2005 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd
except for editorial material and organization © 2005 by Rebecca Bushnell

BLACKWELL PUBLISHING
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia

The right of Rebecca Bushnell to be identified as the Author of the Editorial Material in this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

First published 2005 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

1 2005

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A companion to tragedy / edited by Rebecca Bushnell.
p. cm. —(Blackwell companions to literature and culture ; (32)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN-13: 978-1-4051-0735-8 (alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 1-4051-0735-9 (alk. paper)

1. Tragedy—History and criticism. I. Bushnell, Rebecca W., 1952– II. Series.

PN1892.C56 2004

809.2'512—dc22

2004018066

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 11/13pt Garamond
by Kolam Information Services Pvt. Ltd, Pondicherry, India
Printed and bound in the United Kingdom
by TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

The publisher's policy is to use permanent paper from mills that operate a sustainable forestry policy, and which has been manufactured from pulp processed using acid-free and elementary chlorine-free practices. Furthermore, the publisher ensures that the text paper and cover board used have met acceptable environmental accreditation standards.

For further information on
Blackwell Publishing, visit our website:
www.blackwellpublishing.com

Contents

<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xii
Introduction <i>Rebecca Bushnell</i>	1
<i>Tragic Thought</i>	
Part I Tragedy and the Gods	5
1 Greek Tragedy and Ritual <i>Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood</i>	7
2 Tragedy and Dionysus <i>Richard Seaford</i>	25
Part II Tragedy, Philosophy, and Psychoanalysis	39
3 Aristotle's <i>Poetics</i> : A Defense of Tragic Fiction <i>Kathy Eden</i>	41
4 The Greatness and Limits of Hegel's Theory of Tragedy <i>Mark W. Roche</i>	51
5 Nietzsche and Tragedy <i>James I. Porter</i>	68
6 Tragedy and Psychoanalysis: Freud and Lacan <i>Julia Reinhard Lupton</i>	88

Part III	Tragedy and History	107
7	Tragedy and City <i>Deborah Boedeker and Kurt Raaflaub</i>	109
8	Tragedy and Materialist Thought <i>Hugh Grady</i>	128
9	Tragedy and Feminism <i>Victoria Wohl</i>	145
<i>Tragedy in History</i>		
Part IV	Tragedy in Antiquity	161
10	Tragedy and Myth <i>Alan H. Sommerstein</i>	163
11	Tragedy and Epic <i>Ruth Scodel</i>	181
12	Tragedy in Performance <i>Michael R. Halleran</i>	198
13	The Tragic Choral Group: Dramatic Roles and Social Functions <i>Claude Calame, translated by Dan Edelstein</i>	215
14	Women in Greek Tragedy <i>Sheila Murnaghan</i>	234
15	Aristophanes, Old Comedy, and Greek Tragedy <i>Ralph M. Rosen</i>	251
16	Roman Tragedy <i>Alessandro Schiesaro</i>	269
Part V	Renaissance and Baroque Tragedy	287
17	The Fall of Princes: The Classical and Medieval Roots of English Renaissance Tragedy <i>Rebecca Bushnell</i>	289
18	Something is Rotten: English Renaissance Tragedies of State <i>Matthew H. Wikander</i>	307

19	English Revenge Tragedy <i>Michael Neill</i>	328
20	Spanish Golden Age Tragedy: From Cervantes to Calderón <i>Margaret R. Greer</i>	351
Part VI Neoclassical and Romantic Tragedy		371
21	Neoclassical Dramatic Theory in Seventeenth-Century France <i>Richard E. Goodkin</i>	373
22	French Neoclassical Tragedy: Corneille/Racine <i>Mitchell Greenberg</i>	393
23	Romantic Tragic Drama and its Eighteenth-Century Precursors: Remaking British Tragedy <i>Jeffrey N. Cox</i>	411
24	German Classical Tragedy: Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Kleist, and Büchner <i>Simon Richter</i>	435
25	French Romantic Tragedy <i>Barbara T. Cooper</i>	452
Part VII Tragedy and Modernity		469
26	Modern Theater and the Tragic in Europe <i>Gail Finney</i>	471
27	Tragedy in the Modern American Theater <i>Brenda Murphy</i>	488
28	Using Tragedy against its Makers: Some African and Caribbean Instances <i>Timothy J. Reiss</i>	505
	Index	537

Notes on Contributors

Deborah Boedeker is Professor and Chair of Classics at Brown University. Her research focuses on archaic and classical Greek religion, poetry, historiography, and especially the confluences among these areas. Recent publications include essays on Euripides, Herodotus, and Simonides, as well as a number of edited volumes, including *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens* (1998, with Kurt A. Raaflaub) and *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (2001, with David Sider).

Rebecca Bushnell is a scholar of English Renaissance studies and comparative literature, and Professor of English and Dean of the College of Art and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania. Her previous books include *Propheying Tragedy: Sign and Voice in Sophocles' Theban Plays* (1988), *Tragedies of Tyrants: Political Thought and Theater in The English Renaissance* (1990), *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (1996), and *Green Desire: Imagining Early Modern English Gardens* (2003).

Claude Calame is Director of Studies at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris, and honorary professor of Greek at the University of Lausanne. His publications include *Le Récit en Grèce ancienne. Énonciations et représentations de poètes* (1986; translated as *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece*, 1995), *Mythe et histoire dans l'Antiquité grecque. La création symbolique d'une colonie* (1996; translated as *Myth and History in Ancient Greece. The Symbolic Creation of a Colony*, 2003), *L'Éros dans la Grèce antique* (1996; translated as *The Poetics of Eros in Ancient Greece*, 1999), and *Poétique des mythes dans la Grèce antique* (2000).

Barbara T. Cooper is Professor of French at the University of New Hampshire and a specialist in early nineteenth-century French theater. She has published extensively on topics including romantic drama, melodrama, vaudeville, neoclassical tragedy, theater censorship, and parody. She edited and contributed to the volume of the *Dictionary of Literary Biography* devoted to *French Dramatists, 1879–1914* and wrote the introduction and notes for a recent edition of Dumas's *The Three Musketeers* (2004).

Jeffrey N. Cox is Professor of English and of Comparative Literature and Humanities at the University of Colorado at Boulder, where he also directs the Center for Humanities and the Arts. His work on drama includes *In the Shadows of Romance: Romantic Tragic*

Drama in England, Germany, and France (1987) and the *Broadview Anthology of Romantic Drama* (2002, coedited with Michael Gamer).

Kathy Eden is Chavkin Family Professor of English and Professor of Classics at Columbia University. She is the author of *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition* (1986), *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy and Its Humanist Reception* (1997), and *Friends Hold All Things in Common: Tradition, Intellectual Property and the "Adages" of Erasmus* (2001).

Gail Finney is Professor of Comparative Literature and German at the University of California, Davis. Her publications include *The Counterfeit Idyll: The Garden Ideal and Social Reality in Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (1984), *Women in Modern Drama: Freud, Feminism, and European Theater at the Turn of the Century* (1989), *Look Who's Laughing: Gender and Comedy* (edited, 1994), and *Christa Wolf* (1999).

Richard E. Goodkin is Professor of French at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. His books include *The Tragic Middle: Racine, Aristotle, Euripides* and *Around Proust* (both 1991), and *Birth Marks: The Tragedy of Primogeniture in Pierre Corneille, Thomas Corneille, and Jean Racine* (2000). He also edited a volume of *Yale French Studies*, *Autour de Racine: Studies in Intertextuality* (1989).

Hugh Grady is Professor of English at Arcadia University and the author of *The Modernist Shakespeare* (1991), *Shakespeare's Universal Wolf* (1996), and *Shakespeare, Machiavelli, and Montaigne* (2002).

Mitchell Greenberg is Professor and Chair of Romance Studies at Cornell University. He is the author of several books on seventeenth-century drama and culture: *Detours of Desire: Readings in the French Baroque* (1984), *Corneille, Classicism and the Ruses of Symmetry* (1986), *Subjectivity and Subjugation in 17th-Century Drama and Prose* (1992), *Canonical States, Canonical Stages* (1994; recipient of the MLA Scaglione Prize in Comparative Literature), and *Baroque Bodies: Psychoanalysis and the Culture of French Absolutism* (2001).

Margaret R. Greer is Professor of Spanish and Chair of the Department of Romance Studies at Duke University. Her publications include *The Play of Power: Mythological Court Dramas of Pedro Calderón de la Barca* (1991), *María de Zayas Tells Baroque Tales of Love and the Cruelty of Men* (2000), editions of Calderón de la Barca's plays *La estatua de Prometeo* (1986) and *Basta callar* (2000), and *Decolonizing the Middle Ages* (2000, edited with John Dagenais). Current book projects include *Approaches to Teaching Early Modern Spanish Drama* (forthcoming, with Laura Bass), a book on early modern Spanish tragedy, and a book on hunting.

Michael R. Halleran is Professor of Classics and Divisional Dean of Arts and Humanities in the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Washington. He is the author of *Stagecraft in Euripides* (1985), *Euripides: Hippolytus, with Translation and Commentary* (1995), and numerous articles and reviews on ancient Greek literature and culture.

Julia Reinhard Lupton is Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Irvine, where she has taught since 1989. She is the co-author of *After Oedipus: Shakespeare in Psychoanalysis* (with Kenneth Reinhard, 1992) and the author of *Afterlives of the Saints: Hagiography, Typology, and Renaissance Literature* (1996) and *Citizen-Saints: Shakespeare and Political Theology* (2005). She is the founding director of

Humanities Out There, a nationally recognized educational partnership between the University of California, Irvine and local schools.

Sheila Murnaghan is the Allen Memorial Professor of Greek at the University of Pennsylvania. She is the author of *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey* (1987) and the coeditor of *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations* (1998, with Sandra R. Joshel).

Brenda Murphy is Professor of English at the University of Connecticut. Among her books are *American Realism and American Drama, 1880–1940* (1987), *Tennessee Williams and Elia Kazan: A Collaboration in the Theatre* (1992), *Miller: Death of a Salesman* (1995), *Congressional Theatre: Dramatizing McCarthyism on Stage, Film, and Television* (1999), *O’Neill: Long Day’s Journey Into Night* (2001), and, as editor, *A Realist in the American Theatre: Drama Criticism by William Dean Howells* (1992) and the *Cambridge Companion to American Women Playwrights* (1999).

Michael Neill is Professor of English at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. He is the author of *Issues of Death Tragedy* (1997) and *Putting History to the Question* (2000), has edited *Anthony and Cleopatra* for the *Oxford Shakespeare* (1994), and recently finished *Othello* for the same series.

James I. Porter is Professor of Classical Studies and Comparative Literature at the University of Michigan. He is the author of *Nietzsche and the Philology of the Future* and *The Invention of Dionysus: An Essay on The Birth of Tragedy* (both 2000) and editor of *Classical Pasts: The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome* (2005), *Before Subjectivity? Lacan and the Classics* (with Mark Buchan, special issue of *Helios*, Fall 2004), and *Constructions of the Classical Body* (1999). His current projects include *The Material Sublime in Greek & Roman Aesthetics* and *Homer: The Very Idea* (both forthcoming).

Kurt Raaflaub is David Herlihy University Professor, Professor of Classics and History, and Director of the Program in Ancient Studies at Brown University. His main areas of interest are the social, political, and intellectual history of archaic and classical Greece and the Roman Republic. His most recent publications include *The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece* (2004) and two edited volumes: *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth Century Athens* (1998, with Deborah Boedeker) and *War and Society in the Ancient World* (1999, with Nathan Rosenstein). He is currently working on a history of early Greek political thought.

Timothy J. Reiss is Professor of Comparative Literature at New York University. His most recent books are *Against Autonomy: Global Dialectics of Cultural Exchange* (2002), the second, revised edition of his edited collection, *Sisyphus and Eldorado: Magical and Other Realisms in Caribbean Literature* (2002), *Mirages of the Self: Patterns of Personhood in Ancient and Early Modern Europe* (2003), and the edited collection, *Music, Writing and Cultural Unity in the Caribbean* (2004). He is currently working on an investigation of cultural change in early modern Europe, taking Descartes as its focus; on a collection on Ngugi in the Americas; and on an anthology of tragedy of the African diaspora.

Simon Richter is Associate Professor of German and Comparative Literature at the University of Pennsylvania, editor of the *Goethe Yearbook*, and author of *Laocoon’s Body and the Aesthetics of Pain* (1992).

Mark W. Roche is Dean of Arts and Letters at the University of Notre Dame and has published on literature, philosophy, film, and higher education. His books include *Tragedy and Comedy: A Systematic Study and a Critique of Hegel* (1998).

Ralph M. Rosen is Professor of Classical Studies at the University of Pennsylvania. He has published widely on archaic and classical Greek poetry, including *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition* (1988) and *Andreia: Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity* (2002, with Ineke Sluiter). He is currently completing a book on ancient poetic mockery and satire.

Alessandro Schiesaro is Professor of Latin Language and Literature at King's College, University of London. His publications include *Simulacrum et imago: gli argomenti analogici nel De rerum natura* (1990) and *The Passions in Play: Thyestes and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama* (2003).

Ruth Scodel was educated at Berkeley and Harvard, and has been on the faculty at the University of Michigan since 1984. She is the author of *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides* (1980), *Sophocles* (1984), *Credible Impossibilities: Conventions and Strategies of Verisimilitude in Homer and Greek Tragedy* (1999), *Listening to Homer* (2002), and articles on Greek literature.

Richard Seaford is Professor of Greek Literature at the University of Exeter. He is the author of numerous articles and reviews on Greek literature and religion from Homer to the New Testament, as well as *Pompeii* (1978), Commentaries on Euripides' *Cyclops* (1984) and *Bacchae* (1996), *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (1994), and *Money and the Early Greek Mind: Homer, Philosophy, Tragedy* (2004).

Alan H. Sommerstein is Professor of Greek at the University of Nottingham. His publications include *Aeschylean Tragedy* (1996), *Greek Drama and Dramatists* (2002), and editions of Aeschylus' *Eumenides* (1989) and of Aristophanes' eleven comedies (1980–2002). He is now leading a project, funded by the Leverhulme Trust, on the uses of, and thinking about, oaths in Greek society down to 322 BCE.

Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood was born in Greece in 1945 and has taught Classics at the Universities of Liverpool, Reading, and Oxford. She has written many articles on the religion, mythology, women, tragedy, comedy, and art and archeology of Greece, and also the following books: *Theseus as Son and Stepson: A Tentative Illustration of the Greek Mythological Mentality* (1979), *Studies in Girls' Transitions: Aspects of the Arkteia and Age Representation in Attic Iconography* (1988), "Reading" *Greek Culture: Texts and Images, Rituals and Myths* (1991), "Reading" *Greek Death* (1995), and *Tragedy and Athenian Religion* (2003).

Matthew H. Wikander is Professor of English at the University of Toledo. His books include *The Play of Truth and State: Historical Drama from Shakespeare to Brecht* (1986) and *Fangs of Malice: Hypocrisy, Sincerity and Acting* (2002).

Victoria Wohl is Associate Professor of Classics at Ohio State University. She is the author of *Intimate Commerce: Exchange, Gender, and Subjectivity in Greek Tragedy* (1998), and *Love Among the Ruins: The Erotics of Democracy in Classical Athens* (2003).

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my thanks to my colleagues Ralph Rosen, Sheila Murnaghan, and Phyllis Rackin, who offered invaluable advice at the beginning of this project when I was developing the proposal. Ralph Rosen, in particular, helped to shape the companion's dimensions and sustained me with his enthusiasm for the project. Thomas Lay provided excellent research assistance. Andrew McNeillie persuaded me to undertake the project, right after September 11, 2001, and Emma Bennett and Jennifer Hunt shepherded it to its conclusion.

R. B.

A Companion to Tragedy: Introduction

Rebecca Bushnell

In his searing comedy, *Frogs*, Aristophanes asked his audience which tragic playwright would be better suited to inspire Athens at a time of crisis: the heroic and stirring Aeschylus or the skeptical and emotional Euripides. Dionysus descends to Hades to satisfy his longing for Euripides, who has just died, but he stumbles into a competition between Aeschylus and Euripides for the name of the greatest tragic poet. The two tragedians battle it out over style, and both poets are mocked unmercifully, but finally Dionysus declares that what he really seeks is a poet who can serve the city. Once that end is declared, it is clear the deck is stacked: when it comes to saving cities, it appears, ironists need not apply. Aeschylus is chosen as the poet to cure the state and bring peace to Athens, and Euripides is abandoned in Hades.

The premise of *Frogs* – that the tragic playwright might indeed be able to rescue the state from disaster – is critical for understanding what tragedy might mean to us today. The increasing segregation of tragic theater from public life in our own time may have seriously diminished its claim to immediacy. But we still reach out to the idea of the tragic when confronted by horror or catastrophe. Tragedy can shape experience and history into meaning, and the shock of significance may have the power to transform us. The distinction between tragedy and the merely horrific accident or catastrophe lies in our expectation that knowledge might emerge out of the chaos of human suffering.

Of course, as Aristophanes' example of Euripides testifies, tragedy has also been thought to be able to undermine social and moral order. In *Frogs* Euripides is roundly criticized for slippery morality and dragging out the filth of real life on the stage. It was also Euripides who, through his own depictions of inexplicable human suffering, displayed the inadequacy of the consolations of divinity and justice, which were the foundations of the city-state. Tragedy can be dangerous, as much as redemptive, when it opens up sores that cannot be healed.

In the West, in the centuries since Aristophanes, philosophers and poets have grappled with the question of how tragedy's formality, ethical example, and civic

role intersect – for better or for worse. Plato believed that tragedy would undermine the city-state by inciting passion and disrespect for the gods. Aristotle responded by redeeming tragedy’s emotional effect through catharsis, pulling tragedy back from the city into the mind and heart of the individual spectator. The English Renaissance poet Sir Philip Sidney reinserted tragedy into the political realm, when he asserted that the sweet violence of tragedy could make kings fear to be tyrants and tyrants abandon their cruelties; his contemporaries who opposed theater were convinced that tragedy would only drive spectators to imitate the violence they witnessed. The writers who fashioned neoclassical tragedy honed the aesthetics of tragic form, apparently severing tragedy from the welter of politics yet sending a more subtle message about social order. For Hegel and Nietzsche, in different ways, the conflicts of tragedy were to be played out in a world of spirit, more than on a civic scale, while to Freud, the tragic paradigm was the drama of the human psyche.

Tragedy can thus be construed in so many different ways – and those constructions themselves show what it means to us. It may be valued and defined in purely formal terms, or it may be understood as a spiritual or world view; it may be understood as an experience for the individual reader and thus a psychological phenomenon, or as a communal or political act, and thus an historical “event.” The premise of this companion to tragedy is that in Western culture the meaning of tragedy is inseparable from history. The dramatic genre of tragedy has its roots in the religion and politics of the Greek city-state, and it lives still as a profoundly social art. Tragedy’s subject is the relationship between the individual and the community in the face of a necessity that we may call the gods or history, and tragedy is performed to transform those who experience it. Tragedy’s original form was shaped as much by Athenian democracy as it was by ancient religion, and its survival in European and American culture has been intertwined with the fate of dynasties, revolutions, and crises of social change. Yet, at the same time, this historical approach does not in any way devalue philosophical, religious, psychoanalytic, and anthropological readings of tragedy. While these forms of reading tragedy are themselves embedded in their own historical moments, they have powerfully affected how we have understood tragedy’s cultural and ethical effects.

This companion presents tragedy as an artifact of Western culture and emphasizes its status as a dramatic genre. One could imagine composing a very different volume of chapters on the notion of the “tragic” more broadly construed, which would encompass global cultural manifestations of human suffering, especially in Asia, or one that would also extend beyond the narrower designation of tragic theater to include all performative expressions, including opera, music, film, and dance. But that is not the design of this book, which focuses on the complex *theatrical* inheritance from the Greeks to Rome and beyond, across Europe and North America, up through the twentieth century. The volume does end with an extended consideration of the appropriation and questioning of tragedy in African and Caribbean cultural traditions, where, as Timothy Reiss argues, we see how tragedy may be used against its makers.

The logic of the structure of this companion is thus twofold. The first set of chapters, on “Tragic Thought,” unfolds a variety of modes of interpreting tragedy

through different modes of thinking and experience, religious, philosophical, political, psychoanalytic, and historical. The chapters by Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood and Richard Seaford root our understanding of Greek tragedy in religion and in the practices of the worship of Dionysus, the god whose contradictions define the essence of tragic ambiguity. The contributions on tragedy, philosophy, and psychoanalysis by Kathy Eden, Mark Roche, James Porter, and Julia Reinhard Lupton take up the most important philosophical and theoretical framings of tragedy, beginning with Aristotle's extraordinarily influential *Poetics*. In different ways, Aristotle remains a point of reference for Hegel's refocusing on the tragic dialectic, Nietzsche's returning tragedy to Dionysus and redefining it as the essence of modernity, and Freud's and Lacan's reinterpretations of tragic paradigms in the psychic and symbolic orders.

The final part of this section on "Tragic Thought" takes up three ways of reading tragedy historically and politically, since recent scholarship on tragedy has turned strongly toward rooting tragic drama in the time that produced it. Deborah Boedeker and Kurt Raaflaub's chapter on tragedy and the Greek city-state complements the earlier chapters on tragedy and religion, in analyzing the function of Greek tragedy in the context of the Athenian politics. Hugh Grady looks at Marxist, cultural materialist, and new historicist interpretations of English Renaissance tragedy, while Victoria Wohl considers the evolution of feminist readings of Greek tragedy.

The second part of the companion, "Tragedy in History," follows the historical development of tragedy from classical Greece to modernity. Since the Greeks, the notion of tragedy has always been retrospective, looking backward with a sense of loss, and thus a great deal of attention is to be devoted to a fresh assessment of Greek tragedy. Rather than focusing on the individual Greek playwrights, the chapters consider issues that cross over the entire extant corpus of tragic theater. Alan Sommerstein's chapter on tragedy and myth and Ruth Scodel's on tragedy and epic explore the dimensions of Greek tragic plots and their relationship to the patterns defined by well-known stories of Greek culture. Michael Halleran discusses what we know of the performance of tragedy in ancient Greece. Claude Calame considers the unique role of the chorus, while Sheila Murnaghan uncovers the role of women in tragic drama (as an extension of the issues raised by Wohl's chapter). Ralph Rosen offers us the perspective that Old Comedy brings to fifth-century tragedy, and Alessandro Schiesaro concludes this section with a study of the Roman transformations of Greek tragedy.

The following three parts of this companion offer perspectives on critical moments in the afterlife of ancient tragic theater: the tragedies of Renaissance England and Spain; French, English, and German neoclassical and romantic tragedy; and the theatrical transformation of tragedy in the modern era. In each of these eras, we can see that writers and audiences struggled with the weight of the past. The models provided by Greek tragedy could be seen as the foundation on which a compelling new tragedy could be built, sweeping away the detritus of moribund, sentimental, or corrupt popular theatrical culture and restoring the mythic essentials of Western culture. However, classical tragedy could also be seen as the dead hand of the past, a

frozen shell of a time long gone and of a world irrelevant to present values. The chapters on English and Spanish early modern tragedy by myself, Matthew Wikander, Michael Neill, and Margaret Greer open up an immensely vital moment in the history of tragedy, when playwrights were experimenting with new classical forms and played to kings and commoners alike, staging astonishing acts of violence and passion, regicide and rebellion. The following section on neoclassical and romantic tragedy shifts the focus to France and Germany (while Jeffrey Cox's chapter considers the extension of the conflicts of English Renaissance tragedy into the following two centuries). The three chapters on French tragedy by Richard Goodkin, Mitchell Greenberg, and Barbara Cooper follow the trajectory of French tragic drama from the overthrow of sixteenth-century Baroque theater through the extraordinary and rarefied phenomenon of neoclassical tragedy to its defeat, in turn, by melodrama and romantic theater in the nineteenth century. The final section, with chapters by Gail Finney, Brenda Murphy, and Timothy Reiss, offers an overview of the canonical modern reinterpretations of tragic theater in Europe, America, Africa, and the Caribbean. None of these chapters covering the history of tragic drama was intended to be comprehensive in covering all tragic authors or plays of a particular period. Rather, they are meant to suggest to the reader the critical questions of their time: how did tragedy, at that moment, *matter*, for writers and audiences alike.

Because of the companion's breadth, the contributors recognized that the chapters must be able to speak many different disciplinary languages but also be intelligible to nonspecialists. We wanted the chapters to enlighten readers across disciplinary divides, so that, for example, experts on Greek tragedy would communicate clearly to those in modern drama, or anthropologists and philosophers to literary scholars. It is an ambitious end, but all the more critical a task, given how the practice of reading tragedy has changed in the past two decades, especially in classical and Renaissance studies. At the same time, the chapters that follow here are not uniform, whether in style, method, or critical orientation, partly because they stem from many different disciplines and critical traditions. The reader will in fact find some disagreement among scholars on several contentious issues in the history of scholarship on tragedy, and quite appropriately so. This companion is not meant to provide a single point of view or narrative, but rather to give the reader a sense of the richness of the most current scholarship on the genre as reinvented across a great span of time and space.

What the contributors do clearly share is *their* conviction that tragedy matters: that is, that at critical points in the history of Greece, western Europe, and North America, tragic theater functioned as a vehicle for the expression of the deepest fears and most radical dreams of the society and culture that engendered it. The tragic scene may be played out in a stifling drawing room or on a battlefield, but wherever it happens, the experience has the power to evoke a culture's conceptions and questions about authority and the extent to which we determine the course of our own lives.

Part I
Tragedy and the Gods

Greek Tragedy and Ritual

Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood

Greek tragedies are not timeless. They are cultural artifacts embedded in the society that generated them, for they were produced and understood through the deployment of perceptual filters shaped by the cultural assumptions of fifth-century Athens, which the tragedians shared with their contemporary audiences. Moreover, they were performed in a ritual context, and this, as will become clear in this chapter, was not an incidental aspect that can be disregarded when we consider the meanings that these tragedies had for the ancient audiences, but a central element that shaped the tragedies and the ways in which those audiences made sense of them. Nevertheless, Greek tragedies can also be made sense of through filters shaped by cultural assumptions other than those that produced them, and they do have resonances for other societies, for they articulate rich, polysemic, and multivocal meanings, and explore problems that in some respects (albeit not in others) transcend the particular cultural forms that were specific to fifth-century Athens; this is partly because the tragedies were set in the audience's past, the heroic age, when men had walked with gods, and so even topical concerns were explored in a non-moment-specific version.¹ But modern readings can be very different from those that had been constructed by the fifth-century audiences.

For example, in Sophocles' *Antigone*, Antigone's disobedience of the edict of Creon, the King of Thebes, and her burial of her brother Polynices in defiance of that edict, have been seen by many modern readers as a noble act by a courageous individual rebelling against a tyrannical state, Antigone being perceived as a heroic figure who did her familial duty and obeyed the gods, privileging family and divine law over the law of an oppressive tyrant. This had great resonance for twentieth-century readers, in whose eyes the individual with a conscience who defies the state was of paramount importance, whether or not the individual readers had themselves lived under authoritarian regimes (see, e.g., Vidal-Naquet 2002: 47–9). But for the fifth-century audience the tragedy was much less predictable, much more complex and subtle, and so also richer.² For in the eyes of the ancient audience Antigone was, above all, a

woman acting out of her proper place, in defiance of the decision of her community's leader, indeed, according to her sister Ismene, "against the will of the citizens" (v.79), at a moment when her community had just overcome a deadly danger, an attack from an invading foreign army brought against them by the traitor Polynices – and she was doing all that in the interests of that very traitor. There was no divine law that the audience knew to justify the fact that Antigone, a woman, acted out of her proper place, not only in defying her community, but also in performing a ritual act, the burial, which she was not, as a woman, supposed to perform (as opposed to lamenting, washing the corpse, and other rites which were a woman's proper role in the death ritual). Antigone, moreover, was the product of an incestuous union, the family she privileged was cursed, and her traitor brother Polynices, for whose sake she disobeyed the law, had killed their other brother, Eteocles, who had died a hero defending the city. Furthermore, in fifth-century Athenian terms Antigone's familial duty was to obey Creon, who was her uncle and became her legal guardian on the death of Eteocles.

Creon, on the other hand, was constructed, in the early parts of the tragedy, as the spokesman for the city, the polis, which itself, in ancient perceptions, was not a potentially threatening "state," but the community of citizens, the guardian and sole guarantee of civilized values, in which the religious sphere was an extremely important part. Creon begins by expressing sentiments that were the epitome of democratic patriotism and were indeed so understood by the fourth-century Athenian orator Demosthenes (19.247). It is only later in the tragedy that Creon makes tyrannical statements, thus sliding away from the concept "leader of the democratic polis," toward tyranny. Moreover, the ancient audiences would have perceived Creon as believing that in denying burial to Polynices he was only applying the principle (established in Athenian law and custom) that traitors were denied burial in their native land – a negative mirror image of the public burial and glorification of the war dead. It only eventually emerged that in denying Polynices any burial Creon had made a mistake, that he had extended that principle too far; that by keeping in the world of the upper gods a corpse, which belonged to the nether gods, Creon had upset the cosmic order and offended all the gods. This made for much more complex explorations, one of the main strands of which involved the exploration of the ultimate unknowability of the will of the gods, and correlatively of the fear that the religion of the polis, which articulated and guaranteed all religious activity, may sometimes get things wrong.

This was a very important problematization that modern readers would not register, unless familiar with Greek religion. Unlike Christianity, Greek religion did not have a canonical body of belief, no divine revelation nor scriptural texts – only some marginal sects had sacred books. It also did not have a "professional" divinely anointed clergy claiming special knowledge or authority; and there was no church. Crudely put, in Greek religion the polis (or, alternatively, ethnos, tribal state) played the role which in Christianity is played by the church: it was the polis who assumed the responsibility and authority to set a religious system into place,³

structure the universe and the divine world in a religious system, articulate a pantheon with particular divine personalities; it established a system of cults, rituals, and sanctuaries, and a sacred calendar. The only guidance available was through prophecy; and, indeed, the various cities consulted the oracles on cultic matters. But while the god always spoke the truth, human fallibility could intervene and falsify the deity's words, and so the Greeks could never be certain that a particular prophecy was true.

This nature of Greek religion invited religious exploration, and so also the creation of a locus for this exploration of religious problems. I have argued that in fifth-century Athens this locus was, above all, tragedy (Sourvinou-Inwood 2003). We saw an illustration of such problematization in Sophocles' *Antigone*, where the exploration of the possibility that the polis' religious discourse may sometimes be mistaken was (as in other tragic explorations in other tragedies) distanced from the audience's realities; it was located at a safe symbolic distance through both its setting (Thebes, not Athens, the heroic age, not the present) and through Creon's tyrannical statements, which at a critical point distanced the world of the tragedy from the audience's democratic polis. When the tragedies are made sense of (as much as possible) through the (reconstructed) filters shaped by the cultural assumptions shared by the fifth-century tragedians and audiences, it becomes clear that the relationship between the world of the audience and that of the tragedy was not constant and inert, but shifting and dynamic, manipulated during the performance of each tragedy through devices that operated in interaction with those shared assumptions: "distancing devices," such as Creon's tyrannical statements, which distanced the action from the world of fifth-century Athens, sharply differentiating the two; and "zooming devices," which brought the tragic world nearer, pushed the audience into relating the play directly to their own experiences.⁴

The brief consideration of *Antigone* has illustrated how Greek tragedies can be read through filters other than those of the fifth-century Athenians and produce significant meanings, which, however, are radically different from those constructed by the ancient audiences; and also that the meanings created through the implicit deployment of modern assumptions have (naturally) more resonance for modern audiences than those reconstructed through the reconstruction of the ancient filters. Reading Greek tragedies through the (explicit or by default) deployment of modern assumptions is a legitimate part of modern theatrical discourses. But, in my view, modern readers should also take account of, and classical scholars must strongly privilege, the attempt to reconstruct as much as possible at least the parameters that had shaped the (varied) readings by the ancient audiences.

This discussion has also illustrated that an important element in the process of the construction of meanings by those audiences was the relationship between their ritual realities and the tragic rituals, for example whether the rituals enacted, or referred to in the tragedy (in *Antigone* burial by a woman, prohibition of the burial of traitors), were normative or transgressive. This element is marginalized in readings that deploy modern assumptions by default.

There is an intimate connection between fifth-century tragedy and ritual. Tragedies are articulated (some more densely than others) with the help of many rituals, such as sacrifices, prayers, and also divine epiphanies, which are not exactly rituals, but which, as we shall see, evoke rituals, and often explain and establish various cults and rites. This is one facet of that intimate connection. Another is the context of the performances: tragedies and comedies were performed during a festival of Dionysus, above all the City Dionysia, in a sanctuary, the theater in the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus underneath the Acropolis in Athens, in the presence of the statue of Dionysus.⁵

If Greek tragedy had been the cultural artifact of a newly encountered society it would have been classified, I suggest, as a type of performance which was, at the very least partly, ritual. However, historically the dominant perception of Greek tragedy has been as the literary genre which gave birth to Western theatrical tradition – which, of course it is, but this knowledge should be blocked, to avoid reading a cultural artifact through filters derived from its distant descendants, a methodologically flawed procedure when the aim is to understand how that “ancestor” artifact functioned in the society that produced it. The perception of the relationship between Greek tragedy and religion in classical scholarship has changed over the years. When the ancient Greeks were perceived to be “like us,” and the reading of texts a matter of common sense, with little or limited reflection of the ways in which meanings were inscribed and read through perceptual filters shaped by cultural assumptions, the religious dimension of Greek tragedy was generally underplayed, and the resulting readings reflected the rationality-privileging perceptions of (especially twentieth-century) Western intellectuals. In recent years there has been a much greater acceptance of the religious dimension of Greek tragedy, with the emphasis on the articulations and manipulations of rituals in the creation of tragic meanings. (Zeitlin 1965: 463–508; Vidal-Naquet 1972: 133–58; Vernant 1972: 99–131; Easterling [1988] 1991: 87–109; cf. Friedrich 1996: 269–70), and the character of the dramatic performances as part of a festival has been stressed (see Goldhill 1990: 97–129). But not everyone accepts that the ritual context of the performance and the importance of religious elements in the tragedies are connected, let alone that they may indicate something about the ways in which the ancient audiences perceived the tragic performances. (see, e.g., Heath 1987: 48).

I have recently set out (Sourvinou-Inwood 2003) a detailed case for the view that tragedies were perceived by the ancient audiences as ritual performances, not as a purely “theatrical” experience simply framed by ritual and articulated through ritual, and that the rites, gods, and other religious elements in the tragedies were perceived to be representations of parts of the audiences’ religious realities; and also that Greek tragedy was, among other things, but very importantly, also a discourse of religious exploration, one important locus where the religious discourse of the Athenian polis was explored and elaborated in the fifth century; and finally, that this religious exploration was intimately connected with the ritual context in which tragedies were performed, and within which tragedy had been generated. I am not, of course,

suggesting that tragedies were simply discourses of religious exploration, or doubting that many other important problems are also explored, or that tragedies involve emotional experiences. What I am suggesting is that the reasons why the exploration of so many human problems is closely intertwined with religion are, first, the Greek perceptions of the world, in which the mortals' interactions with the divine was of crucial importance for, and affected the course of, human lives, behavior, and relationships; and second, tragedy's nature as a ritual performance which developed out of a ritual matrix conducive to religious problematizations and exploration. I also argued that, though in the fifth century tragedy changed significantly, and came to encompass a wide variety of problematizations, it did not lose its role as a locus of religious exploration, and did not cease to be perceived as a ritual performance. Let us briefly consider some of the arguments.

I will first illustrate how densely ritual elements are deployed in, and help articulate, Greek tragedies with two examples: Aeschylus' *The Libation Bearers*, the middle play of the *Oresteia* trilogy, and Euripides' *Electra*, a later tragedy focused on the same myth, a matricide, the killing of Clytemnestra and her lover Aegisthus by Clytemnestra's son Orestes, with the help of her daughter Electra, in revenge for Clytemnestra's murder of their father Agamemnon, on the oracular advice of the god Apollo.

The first part of *The Libation Bearers* is focused on the offering of chthonic libations. The original purpose of this rite, as intended by Clytemnestra, was to placate the angry shade of Agamemnon on her behalf, but this purpose was perverted and the rite turned against her: it became the starting point for Clytemnestra's murder, and Agamemnon's shade was asked to help his children avenge him by killing their mother.

The Libation Bearers begins with a prayer, then the chorus of female slaves bearing chthonic libations enters, together with Electra; the libations are poured, and Electra invokes Hermes Chthonios (the god responsible for the passage between the world of the living and the land of the dead) and asks him to summon the infernal gods, while she pours libations as she invokes, and addresses a prayer to, her dead father and asks his help for herself and her brother and against his killers, their mother and her lover Aegisthos. This is followed by lamentations by the chorus, and then the discovery of Orestes' offering of hair to their father's tomb. Then there is another prayer, and then Orestes reports a ritual, his consultation of the Delphic oracle, and Apollo's response: the god had urged him to avenge his father by killing his murderers and had enumerated the punishments inflicted by the infernal gods to those who do not avenge their kin. This report is followed by a lament, itself followed by a segment which includes further addresses to the dead Agamemnon, and requests for his help, invocations of, and prayers to, chthonic deities, and also the recounting of Clytemnestra's prophetic dream which had motivated her to send the chthonic libations in an attempt to placate her dead husband.

Most of the choral ode which begins at v. 783 consists of a prayer, and there is another prayer by the chorus at 855–68; at 900–2 there is a significant religious

reference that affects the course of action, a reminder to Orestes of Apollo's oracular command. The choral ode at 935–71 is a song of victory and thanksgiving sung to celebrate that Dike, the goddess who personifies justice, has come. What follows after 973 can be considered to be enacting a rite of supplication, since Orestes is holding the suppliant's bough. At 1029–39 Orestes, having mentioned that it was Apollo's inducements that led him to kill his mother, announces that, on Apollo's instructions (part of the original oracular response), he is now going to Delphi as a suppliant to be purified. At 1048 he begins to describe his vision of the Erinyes, the Furies, whom no one else sees. At 1057 he invokes Apollo, and the chorus urge him to go to the Delphic sanctuary of Apollo. He then exits, fleeing, to go to Delphi, pursued, the audience will understand, by the Erinyes.

Thus, a very considerable part of this tragedy is articulated by ritual, there are religious references everywhere, and the Delphic Apollo has a central role.

The main ritual skeleton articulating Euripides' *Electra* is focused on a ritual that is reported in detail by a messenger (vv. 783–851), the sacrifice performed by Aegisthus, in the course of which he was murdered by Orestes. This sacrifice was referred to before its description, and then again afterwards. In the description we are told (vv. 825–9) that Aegisthus had taken the omens and that the organs of the sacrificial victim were abnormal and diseased, that is, the omens were bad. The predicted misfortune came to pass when Orestes, almost immediately afterwards, killed Aegisthus. This is a sacrifice corrupted by murder.⁶ This corrupted sacrifice is part of a wider web which also includes other, associated, rites, some reported, others enacted. Thus, the messenger reports that when Orestes revealed his identity the palace servants raised the ritual cry of triumph and crowned him with a wreath. When the messenger departs the chorus performs a victory dance and invites Electra to join in the dancing and singing. Electra will fetch a wreath to crown her brother, but it is the chorus who do the singing and dancing. At vv. 874–9 the chorus – in this tragedy a chorus of young women in the heroic age – refers to its singing and dancing in a way that will have zoomed the audience's perception to their identity as a chorus of Athenian men in the present, singing in honor of Dionysus at the Dionysia in the theatre in the sanctuary of Dionysus (see Henrichs 1994/5: 87–8). I shall return to this.

The next enacted ritual, Electra's crowning of Orestes at 880–9, is a disturbing victory celebration, for the killing of Aegisthus, which could have been presented as a legitimate act of punishment, is made problematic in this tragedy through the outrage of the ritual order during the sacrifice (Easterling [1988] 1991: 101); also potentially disturbing is the fact that the corpse of Aegisthus is brought on to the stage and treated with disrespect (Easterling [1988] 1991: 107).

The murder of Clytemnestra involves a deception also centered on a ritual. At 1124–38 Electra tricks her mother by pretending to have given birth and asking her to perform the sacrifice offered on the tenth night after childbirth. Clytemnestra goes into the house believing she will perform the role of sacrificer, while in fact she will be the sacrificial victim. When, after the murder, Orestes and Electra come out of the house, appalled at their actions, they continue with religious language. At 1198–9

Electra mentions choral performances and weddings as rites from which she will be excluded. This would have evoked for the audience her earlier statement (in 309–13) that she was isolated because she was excluded from ritual, deprived of participation in festivals and dances because she avoided the group of which she was supposed to be a member, that of married women, since in reality she was a virgin. (Aegisthus had given her in marriage to a peasant, to ensure that her husband could not become a threat to him, but this peasant respected Electra and did not consummate the marriage). At 1177–93 Orestes invokes three deities to look upon his deeds, Gaia, Zeus, and Apollo. Finally, the brothers of Clytemnestra, Castor and Polydeuces, who had become gods, appear in epiphany. The epiphany of deities to mortals in the world of the tragedies corresponded to a real-life religious experience in the world of the audience; for deities, it was believed, occasionally manifested themselves to mortals and gave them instructions, as a result of which very often a cult was instituted (Versnel 1990: 190–3; Burkert 1985: 186–8; Henrichs 1996: 546). The representation of a deity by an actor evoked, for the ancient audience, the ritual impersonation of divinities by priestly personnel during certain religious ceremonies (Burkert 1985: 186, 1997: 27–8).

The following rites also helped create the ritual web that articulated the tragedy but are not part of the central segment of its main ritual skeleton. Electra's informal lament (vv. 112–66); the reference (167–97) to the forthcoming festival of Hera, aspects of which are evoked by both chorus and Electra; a double report of a ritual in the Old Man's account to Electra of his visit to the tomb of Agamemnon: he mentions his own lament and the fact that he offered a libation and deposited myrtle branches, and also reports that he saw evidence of a previous sacrifice of sheep and offering of hair; the prayer by Electra, Orestes, and the Old Man (671–82). There is also a prolonged reference to a human sacrifice, the sacrifice of Iphigenia (1011–50). The choral odes contain ritual and other religious references. At 737 ff. the chorus express their disbelief of the story that (after Atreus' faithless wife had given a golden lamb to her lover) the sun had changed its course, to the misfortune of mankind, for the sake of mortal justice, adding that frightening stories are profitable to men in furthering the service of the gods and that Clytemnestra, not remembering such stories, killed her husband. This passage affirms the gods' intervention in human affairs on the side of justice; it is this that Clytemnestra should have remembered (Stinton 1976: 79–82; cf. also Cropp 1988: 152, 743–4.) The comment concerning Clytemnestra shows that the notion of "frightening stories conducive to piety" is not presented by the chorus with a rationalist's sneer, but as something good, since they remind people of the existence of divine justice.

The corruption of two rites, Aegisthus' sacrifice and the enticing of Clytemnestra inside the house on the pretext of her participation in a ritual, helps color the two murders negatively. The corruption is less serious in the case of Clytemnestra, correlatively with the fact that matricide was in any case negatively colored. The central strand of religious problematization in this tragedy is focused on the role of Apollo in instigating murder, especially matricide. As well as deploying complex explorations of human relationships, passions, behavior patterns, and characteristics,

Electra problematizes not simply the killing of the mother to avenge the father (which involved both human relationships issues and issues involving the gods, pollution, and divine punishment), but also the notion of revenge in general, suggesting the possibility that it is in itself a corrupting act. Most importantly, this exploration problematized the role of Apollo and the Delphic oracle. However, the ancient audience would not have perceived this as a “criticism” of Apollo and his oracle, but as an illustration of the dark side of life; once one is caught up in a cycle of destruction there will be a lot of suffering. But ultimately Orestes will be saved. So, if one acts on divine instructions, even if they make no sense, or seem wrong, there may be intense suffering, but there will be an end to the suffering and an end to the self-perpetuating cycle of destruction.

Euripides’ *Electra*, then, is articulated by a dense web of ritual elements, which is intertwined with rich religious problematization; thus, for example, the corruption of a rite colors an action negatively; the oracular consultation makes clear what it is that the god advises in a particular situation.

To move on. In terms of form, Greek tragedies are structured through songs sung by the chorus. The first song, called *parodos*, is sung as the chorus enters; the others, sung while they were in the orchestra, are called *stasima*. The role of the chorus in the tragedies diminished in the course of the fifth century, as individual characters acquired greater importance. However, the terminology used by the Athenians to speak of tragedy places the chorus at the center, defines tragedy through the chorus, and the chorus remained central in the organization of the production.⁷ *Tragodoi*, “tragic singers,” continues to be used to denote tragic performances in, for example, Aristophanes, Lysias, and Plato. Clearly, this does not mean that the chorus was perceived to be dramatically more important, especially given its decreasing role within the tragedies, so this centrality may be reflecting the importance of the tragic chorus in the wider context of the festival. An explanation in terms of the ritual importance of the chorus would coincide with the ritual importance of choruses in Greek festivals in general.

The festival of the City Dionysia included sacrifices, a very elaborate procession, and competitions, elements that formed the basic template for major Greek festivals, occurring in particular variants in particular festivals, depending on the specificities of each cult. In the Dionysia the competitions were connected with Dionysiac cult in that they were dramatic and dithyrambic competitions – dithyrambs being hymns, usually to Dionysus, sung by choruses who danced in a circular formation. Another element specific to the City Dionysia was a preliminary rite: just before the festival proper started, the statue of Dionysus was removed from the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus and taken to a shrine a little outside the center of Athens, in the Academy; eventually it was ceremonially escorted back to the theatre in the sanctuary, where the performances took place in its presence.

According to the myth associated with the festival,⁸ a man from Eleutherai called Pegasos brought Dionysus’ statue to Athens, but the Athenians did not receive the god with honor. Dionysus, enraged, struck the male sexual organs with an incurable

disease. Instructed by the oracle to bring in the god with honor, the Athenians manufactured phalluses, penises made of wood and leather, and with these they honored the god, commemorating their misfortune. The City Dionysia, then, celebrated the introduction of the cult of Dionysus in Athens, and reenacted that introduction, and this is why the statue of Dionysus was removed from its sanctuary, taken to the Academy and then ceremonially escorted back, reenacting the introduction and giving the god an honored reception, both in the present, and as an reenactment of the hospitality offered him at the introduction of the cult. The festival was focused on a rite of receiving and entertaining a deity, a rite of xenismos, common in the Greek world, which involved the offering of a meal to a god or hero.⁹

The word *tragodos*, which denoted above all a member of the tragic chorus (though it was also used for the tragic poet and actor), means, according to its most widely accepted and best interpretation, either “singer at the sacrifice of a billy goat (*tragos*),” or “singer for the prize of a billy goat” – or both together, since the prize animal would have been sacrificed to Dionysus (Burkert 1990: 16–18). A singer at the sacrifice of a billy goat makes perfect sense, since in Greek ritual practice songs, hymns, were indeed sung at sacrifices.¹⁰ In at least some sacrifices in which several hymns were sung, there was a basic bipartite articulation: a processional hymn, sung as the sacrificial procession moved toward the altar, and one or more songs sung by the altar. There are good reasons for thinking that the nexus of choral songs sung at the sacrifice of a billy goat in the rite of xenismos at the early City Dionysia was articulated in this way. This reconstructed nexus of songs sung at the sacrifice of a *tragos* in that xenismos bears a striking resemblance to the articulation of choral songs in tragedy, the basic skeleton of *parodos* and *stasima*. This suggests that this schema articulating the tragic choral odes may be reflecting the ritual schema of songs that had been part of the sacrificial ritual during the xenismos of Dionysus; that those songs sung at that sacrifice had produced the template of the basic schema structuring tragedy, the *parodos* and *stasima*.

The centrality of the chorus in Athenian perceptions of tragedy, the fact that the terminology used by the Athenians to speak of tragedy defines tragedy through the chorus, and the fact that the chorus remained central in the organization of the production, are important not simply because they show that tragedy was perceived in ways that placed it close to its ritual roots, but also, and especially, because, I will now try to show, in the eyes of the fifth-century audiences the tragic chorus was not only perceived as a group of people in the world of the play, in the audience’s past, but also as a chorus, a group of male citizens acting as ritual performers, in the here and now, a chorus to Dionysus in the world of the present.

An element that indicates that tragic choruses were also perceived as ritual choruses in the present is the fact that the members of tragic – as well as dithyrambic – choruses had to be citizens (see, e.g., Plutarch *Phokion* 30; MacDowell 1989: 69–77; Csapo and Slater 1995: 351), and thus that they were, like other choruses, singing as representatives of the polis – while actors and poets could be foreigners. Also, as Easterling has stressed ([1988] 1991: 88–9), in tragedy the chorus is never simply a

group of bystanders or witnesses reacting and commenting; they are also a chorus ready to perform lyrics patterned on ritual song and dance and accompanied by appropriate music, for example, a paean giving thanks for victory, as in the parodos of *Antigone*.¹¹ I would take this further and suggest that, for example in the particular case of the parodos of *Antigone*, as the chorus processed in, singing a cult song the usual mode of performance of which was processional, it would have been difficult for the audience not to perceive this hymn as being sung also in the real world of here and now. Then, there are choral passages in which references to choruses amount to choral self-referentiality (Henrichs 1994/5: 56–111; Wilson and Taplin 1993: 170–4), in which choruses “draw attention to their ritual role as collective performers of the choral dance-song in the orchestra” (Henrichs 1994/5: 58). We saw an example of that in Euripides’ *Electra*.

Let us see how this self-referentiality works by considering another, striking, example (see Henrichs 1994/5: 65–73) from an ode in Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus*: in vv. 883–910 the chorus of Theban elders ask, if people act without fear of Dike, Justice, and without reverence for the gods and get away with it, “why should I dance?,” that is, why should I worship the gods through being a member of a chorus? Then they sing that they will not visit the oracles any more if oracles do not come true. Finally, they pray to Zeus not to allow this present situation to escape his power – a situation which involves Oedipus’ patricide and incest, though at this point in the tragedy neither is clear to the tragic characters, who only know of the possibility that Oedipus had killed Laios, his wife’s first husband; the fact that Laios was his father is not yet known. The verses activate the audience’s knowledge that nothing will go unpunished and that the oracles will come true in this case. Of course, the religious problematization in this ode is located above all in the world of the tragedy, but when the chorus sing “why should I sing and dance as a member of a chorus?,” in a context in which the meaning “worship the gods through being a member of a chorus” was also constructed, at the very moment when they are singing and dancing as members of a chorus, their song inevitably activated the audience’s awareness that they were at this very moment singing and dancing as members of a chorus in honor of Dionysus in the present. This activated the perception of tragedy as a ritual performance. At the same time, the complex and ambiguous relationship between the chorus’s two personae allowed the religious problematization they set out to take place at a distance, and in a context in which the audience’s knowledge about the play would lead them to give reassuring answers. The questions were articulated simultaneously in both worlds, but the audience’s knowledge allowed them to place the questions the chorus asks in the world of the play in their proper perspective, and give reassuring answers, for they know that nothing will go unpunished and that the oracles will come true. Clearly, the activation of the perception of the tragedy as a ritual performance is intertwined with religious problematization, the basic question, “if evil goes unpunished, why should we worship the gods?”

Choral self-referentiality, then, activated for the audience the chorus’s identity as chorus in the present performing in honor of Dionysus. The mask, while locating the

chorus in the other world of the heroic past, at the same time draws attention to the fact that the members of the chorus are not in fact “other,” that their otherness is constructed, and located above all in the mask, while they are also, underneath the masks, a chorus of male Athenians in the present.

Another argument for the view that the identity of the chorus as a chorus in the present was not wholly neutralized is provided by Plato (*Laws* 800C–801A). Plato expresses his disapproval of the fact that, as he puts it, after a public sacrifice many choruses, standing not far from the altars, pour blasphemies over the sacrifices by singing mournful songs and racking the souls of the listeners and making them cry. The fact that this idiosyncratic polarization about tragic choruses was possible indicates that in the Athenian assumptions, the shared assumptions that have to be taken for granted for Plato’s articulation to work, the tragic chorus was also perceived as a chorus in the present; for unless that was the case such a polarization would not make sense. The Platonic image entails that it could be presented as being the case that the world of the present could be penetrated by the world of the tragedy, that the mourning songs could be presented as constituting blasphemy within the ritual performed in the here and now.

Another argument in favor of the view that the chorus was also perceived as a chorus in the present may be provided by the tailpieces addressing Nike, the goddess of Victory, and requesting a prize in Euripides’ *Orestes*, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, and *Phoenician Women*.¹²

If tragic choruses were indeed also perceived (albeit not dominantly) as choruses for Dionysus in the present, it follows that in the fifth century tragic performances were perceived as ritual performances also in the sense that they were shot through by rituals performed as rituals in the present, since the choral songs which structured the tragedies were not only perceived as sung in the world of the tragedy but also in the here and now, by a chorus of Athenian men in honor of Dionysus at his festival in his sanctuary. This perception would inevitably have affected the perception of the tragic performances as a whole. These performances, taking place in a sanctuary, during a ritual, in the presence of a god, and involving the representation of rituals and often also of gods, and named after, and also otherwise focused upon, the one element which was also perceived to be a ritual element in the present, could not have been perceived as other than ritual performances, in the presence of the statue of Dionysus, part of the ritual entertaining Dionysus at his festival.

But, it may be asked, if the case is so clear, why did previous generations of classical scholars not perceive tragedy in this way? There are several interacting reasons why the ritual, and generally religious, dimension of tragedy was underplayed. To begin with, the implicit perception of Greek tragic performances through the filter of modern theatrical experiences led to the implicit underprivileging of their ritual context and the concentration on their content, taken in isolation, wrenched from that context. Then, the absence of awareness of the role of assumptions in the construction of meaning led to the tragedies being made sense of through the (by default) deployment of modern assumptions, especially the rationalizing filters of modern

scholars, which in turn led to the underprivileging of the importance of the religious dimension and the correlative reinterpretation of tragic religious discourses as ironic and/or critical of traditional religion – readings which could only be sustained by virtually eliding the importance of the ritual context of the tragic performances by marginalizing it as “simple” “framing.”

This process was facilitated by the influence of Aristotle’s *Poetics*, a treatise which radically underplays religion, and generally presents a perception of tragedy shaped by rigidly rationalizing filters and structured through the conceptual schemata Aristotle set out to construct, which reflected his own preoccupations and assumptions – the preoccupations and assumptions of a philosopher who was not even a participant in the culture, since he did not live in the fifth century and he was not Athenian. The distorting selectivity of Aristotle’s presentation of tragedy has been stressed in recent years (Taplin 1995: 94–6; Gould 1996: 217; Goldhill 1996: 244; Hall 1996: 295–309, esp. 296); but its influence has not entirely disappeared, or at least a conceptual bias ultimately based on that perception of tragedy has not.

The belief that some tragedies, above all by Euripides, were challenging established religion was an important element in this nexus of interacting factors that shaped earlier perceptions of tragedy in which its religious dimension was underplayed. The notion that Euripides was an atheist has been shown to be wrong;¹³ it is a modern construct produced through the deployment of modern filters and the taking at face value of what ancient audiences would have understood to be the comic distortions in Aristophanes’ comedies (Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 294–7). One of the main modalities of misreading that generated such interpretations is that which mistakes the dark problematizations in Euripidean tragedies (such as that in *Electra*) for criticisms of traditional religion. Such misreadings are produced when the tragic explorations are made sense of through modern filters shaped by assumptions which are not sympathetic to those of the Greek religious universe. I will now illustrate this, by briefly considering another instance of religious exploration and its articulation through ritual, an exploration which involves very dark problematization in Euripides’ *Orestes*, where Apollo is repeatedly criticized by the dramatic characters, blamed for Orestes’ matricide, and the notion that gods cause troubles and woes to humans is repeatedly expressed.

Euripides’ *Orestes* deals with events that took place after the events represented in Aeschylus’ *The Libation Bearers* and Euripides’ *Electra*. In *Orestes* Orestes is pursued by the Erinyes after the matricide and he has also been condemned to death by the Argives. Because his uncle Menelaus had not come to his assistance, Orestes intends to punish him by killing his wife Helen and daughter Hermione. However, the gods snatch Helen away, so Orestes threatens to kill Hermione and burn down the palace, unless Menelaus convinces the Argives to spare his life. Catastrophe is averted by Apollo, who appears in epiphany, accompanied by Helen. He announces that Helen is now deified and tells Orestes that he is to undergo purification and then rule Argos – and also that he must marry Hermione and that Orestes’ friend Pylades must marry Electra.

Many modern scholars have interpreted this ending of *Orestes* as an ironic construct, for they perceive an incongruity between this unexpected happy ending and the earlier bleakness. However, as I will now try to show, an ironic reading (besides being both a priori and culturally determined) cannot function when we deploy the (reconstructed) filters shaped by the ancient assumptions through which the tragedy was made sense of by the ancient audiences,¹⁴ in that a series of interacting factors make such an interpretation impossible. First, throughout the tragedy Apollo had been zoomed to the audience's religious realities, through references that would have evoked the audience's own consultation of the Delphic oracle, so that they would have identified the Apollo of the tragedy with their own god, not perceived him as a literary construct. Second, the epiphany of deities in the tragedies activated, and so was perceived with the help of, two religious schemata, real-life epiphany (corresponding to the perspective of the dramatic characters) and (from the perspective of the audience) "ritual impersonation of deities by priestly personnel." This also would have led the audience to perceive the god on stage as a representation of the god they worshiped, a perception further reinforced by the fact that this was a performance at a festival of Dionysus in the sanctuary of Dionysus in the presence of the statue of Dionysus, in which, moreover, the chorus was also as a chorus for Dionysus in the present – (a persona confirmed and stressed by its concluding words in which it is asking Nike for victory in the competition). All these interacting factors would inescapably have led the audience to perceive Apollo on stage as a representation of their own god, not as a theatrical device of closure constructing an ironic ending.

After telling *Orestes* that he must go to Athens to stand trial for the matricide and that he will be victorious at this trial Apollo promises that he will reconcile him to the city of Argos, because, he says, "I forced" *Orestes* to kill his mother. Throughout the tragedy, Apollo was repeatedly blamed for the matricide, which was characterized as unholy, and for its consequences, and here he accepts that responsibility. But things are not that simple. The audience would have perceived the notion that Apollo was alone responsible for the matricide as one possible way of presenting a complex situation, but not as the whole picture. For the Greek – and tragic – perception of double motivation, divine and human, in which the gods will something but mortals' actions bring it about, would have deconstructed the notion that the god alone was responsible. More importantly, there is another recurrent theme in *Orestes*, which also deconstructs the notion of Apollo's sole responsibility: the notion that these disasters were the result of an ancestral curse, and the consequent operation of an avenging demon. This affects the way in which the audience would have made sense of the notion that Apollo had forced *Orestes* to kill his mother. Since, in the eyes of the audience, an avenging demon triggered off by the curse was operating, it was inevitable that *Orestes* should have suffered, so Apollo's command was good advice on how to deal with a dreadful situation. Apollo stresses his own responsibility, focuses on his own role, because he is stressing that *Orestes* obeyed him, a god, and he wants to marginalize *Orestes*' choice in this context, in which he is speaking of reconciling him to the people of Argos; it is as though he is presenting the case for *Orestes* that he will make to the Argives.

Consequently, the superficial impression that Apollo is to blame for Orestes' matricide was modified, for the audience, through their perception that Orestes had ultimately made his own choices, and also, very importantly, through the perception of the workings of the avenging demon. Nevertheless, Apollo was responsible; he had ordered Orestes to kill his mother. Does this entail that the audience would have perceived Apollo to have been wrong, and worthy of criticism? Surely, gods should not instigate matricide. These, I suggest, are culturally determined questions. For the ancient audience Apollo was right, in that the fact that Orestes followed his advice has led, after suffering, to the present situation, in which it is clear that order will eventually be restored, and Orestes' sufferings will come to an end. This does not alter the fact that his guidance involved the commission of an unholy deed. The themes of "vengeance" and "reaction to injustice and wrongdoing with further wrongdoing" are explored in many tragedies. The answer is not simple. The ideology of the society in which tragedy was generated led to an hierarchy of wrongness. In Greek discourse the father, and the father-son relationship, were privileged, and a woman who betrayed and killed her husband was perceived, as Clytemnestra is described in this tragedy, as a threatening figure, representing the dangers of complete disorder. But the matricide is also presented in very negative colors, and also threatens disorder. Because of this hierarchy of wrongness, order will be eventually restored after a matricide, but the other side is also strongly articulated, and the prospective happy ending does not obliterate Orestes' suffering which the audience has witnessed.

Would the audience have perceived that there were alternatives to what Apollo had advised Orestes to do? From the human perspective one character, Tyndareus, believes that there were. But in the Greek representations the human perspective is limited. So, the audience's perception, I suggest, would have been that in those circumstances, only part of which are intelligible to mortals, Apollo's command revealed what was the best way to deal with an extremely bad situation – however dreadful that remedy. So, one of the perceptions articulated in this tragedy was that the ways of the gods are unfathomable, but this is intertwined with the perception that even when people think that the gods have abandoned them, it is not true – if they have followed the gods' will; ultimately the gods help those who obey them, whatever it may look like; there is suffering, and this suffering is not annihilated by what will happen in the future, but eventually the suffering will come to an end, and things will work out. This is a reassuring message. However, this reassurance is partly deconstructed, as far as the world of the audience is concerned, by Orestes' reply. Orestes acknowledges that Apollo is a true prophet. His fear had been that it might have been a false oracle, not Apollo's voice, but an avenging demon attempting to deceive him. This would have evoked the fact that in the audience's reality people did not know if the prophecy they received was right, for there was always the danger, in their perceptions of prophecy, that human fallibility might interfere to distort the god's message. But again, the very fact that there is an order and a divine plan in the cosmos is itself reassuring. *Orestes*, then, does not criticize the gods or challenge established religion; it sets out a complex religious exploration.

Euripidean tragedies often explored problematic areas in the Greek religious system and the human relationships that were grounded in that system. They explored, among other things, the empirically observable fact that the world is cruel, and people suffer, by articulating the darkness and bleakness and offering “answers,” which were ultimately, in complex ways, reassuring.

The perception that Apollo was a representation of the audience’s god was, we saw, an important element in their reception of the religious exploration in *Orestes*. Since this perception was to a large extent constructed through the activation of ritual schemata from the audience’s lived religion, it is clear that here also the discourse of religious exploration is constructed through (among other things, but especially) the deployment of ritual. This is another illustration of the articulation of religious explorations (and the explorations of associated issues pertaining to human interactions) through the ritual web that structures the tragedies. Indeed, on my view, which I will now summarize, tragedy was generated through the interaction between ritual performance and religious exploration. The festival myth of the City Dionysia is not the only myth of resistance to the introduction of Dionysus’ cult. The best known among such myths is that of Pentheus, King of Thebes, as told in Euripides’ *Bacchae*. In this tragedy Dionysus, the divine son of Zeus and the mortal Semele, arrived at Thebes, bringing his cult; his mother’s sisters challenged his divinity and he punished them by sending them madness which drove them to the mountain where they were raving, joined by the other Theban women, to whom Dionysus had also sent frenzy. Dionysus’ cousin, Pentheus, resisted the introduction of Dionysus’ rites and imprisoned Dionysus and his followers – though they all escaped from prison miraculously. Pentheus was punished by being torn apart by his mother and the other raving women who mistook him for a mountain lion. Pentheus, and all the others who, like the Athenians, resisted the cult of Dionysus, had followed surface logic, not realizing that this stranger who brought disordered behavior was a god. On the surface the behavior of Dionysus and his retinue was wrong, mad; but in the deeper reality that was inaccessible to human logic that disorder was good. What seemed madness was right; and what had seemed right – the exclusion of disorder – turned out to be madness. For this disorder was inspired by Dionysus and opposition to it was an offense against the gods. This is a paradox, and paradox characterizes religion and the world of the gods which is unknowable to men. One of the perceptions expressed in such myths is that ultimate religious reality lies beyond the limits of human rationality. This Dionysiac challenge of human rationality invites exploration, both in itself and also insofar as it presents a polarized version of the unknowability of the divine will and so appropriate human behavior – at least in cases in which the latter is not based on customs hallowed by tradition, practices that, as the Greeks saw it, had proved their efficacy through the longevity and prosperity of the communities that practiced them.

I have argued (Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 67–200) that it was through the interaction between the myth of Athenian resistance to Dionysus, which raised complex religious problems and invited exploration, and choral performances at the sacrifice of

a goat during the rite of xenismos of Dionysus, the focus of the City Dionysia, that tragedy was generated in the particular historical circumstances of sixth-century Athens and thanks to the contribution of particular poets. For the focus of the xenismos, and so also of the hymns accompanying its sacrifice, was the festival myth, the rejection of Dionysus' cult and the realization that this was a terrible mistake, and so also the problematization of the paradox that these myths of resistance to Dionysus set out. In other words, the hymns would have implicated a subject highly conducive to religious exploration, of a type that also raised wider questions pertaining to religion in general, and this was one of the factors that led to the generation of new forms that eventually led to the emergence of tragedy. On my argument, the ritual performance and the exploration had begun by focusing on the festival myth, which involved a world that was both other, part of the heroic past, and part of the world of the present, in that it involved the introduction of the cult of Dionysus which was part of the Athenian present, as were the relationships between the god and the Athenians set up in that heroic age. Subsequently, these explorations encompassed other Dionysiac myths, comparable to the festival myth, that also invited the generation of comparable explorations. Eventually, these explorations widened their scope to take in non-Dionysiac religious matters; new forms developed, and tragedy was born.

On my thesis, tragedy in the fifth century was still a ritual performance which explored – among other things – the religious discourse of the polis. When the plague, which began at 430 BCE, brought about moral and religious “turbulence,” insecurity, anxiety, and questioning (Thucydides 2.47.4, 2. 53.4; see Parker 1996: 200) that religious exploration (in the extant Euripidean tragedies) acquired greater urgency and intensity, and set out a darker problematization, but it still offered “answers,” which were ultimately, in very complex ways, reassuring.

NOTES

- 1 I discuss the preferred setting of Greek tragedy in the heroic age and its implications in Sourvinou-Inwood (2003: 15–66).
- 2 For the detailed arguments on which what follows is based see Sourvinou-Inwood (1989: 134–48, 1990b: 11–38).
- 3 Sourvinou-Inwood (1990a: 295–322 [2000: 13–37], 1988: 259–74 [2000: 38–55]).
- 4 Sourvinou-Inwood (1989: 134–48, 2003: *passim*, esp. 15–66); cf. Pelling (1997: 217–18, 228–9, 233–4).
- 5 See Pickard-Cambridge (1968); Csapo and Slater (1995); Goldhill (1990: 97–129); Sourvinou-Inwood (2003: 67–200, cf. 40–5). They were also performed at the Lenaia, in some local communities at the Rural Dionysia, and from the late fourth century BCE at the Anthesteria. But the City Dionysia was their primary and most important context.
- 6 See Easterling ([1988] 1991: 101–8); Henrichs (1994/5: 86); cf. Cropp (1988: 153–7, 747–858).
- 7 See, e.g., Winkler (1990: 42); Wilson and Taplin (1993: 170); Wilson (2000: 54–5, 61–7).
- 8 Scholia Aristophanes *Acharnians* 243a; Pickard-Cambridge (1968: 57–8); Garland (1992: 159); Cole (1993: 26).
- 9 On this rite see Jameson (1994: 35–57); Burkert (1985: 107).

- 10 The detailed argument on which what follows is based is set out in Sourvinou-Inwood (2003: 141–200).
- 11 See Rutherford (1994/5: 127): “the parodos of the Antigone can itself be thought of as a paean, although this would be a celebratory victory paean, contrasting with the fearful and apotropaic song of Pindar.”
- 12 Especially if they were Euripidean. But even if they were actors’ interpolations they would still testify to perceptions in which the chorus was also perceived as a chorus in the present. The notion that they are post-classical is based on the circular argument that “the break of illusion is foreign to tragedy” (Mastrorarde 1994: 645, 1764–6); but
- the notion “break of illusion” is too crude a concept for the complex situation that tragic performances involved; the argument is circular because it becomes invalid if it is right that the tragic chorus was also perceived as a chorus in the present – with this part of the chorus’s persona being zoomed at the end of some tragedies (see also Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 66 n.135, and esp. 415–17).
- 13 See esp. Lefkowitz (1987: 149–66, 1989: 70–82). I added some further arguments to this discussion in Sourvinou-Inwood (2003: 291–458, 489–500).
- 14 A detailed discussion with bibliography is in Sourvinou-Inwood (2003: 386–402, 410–14).

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

- Burkert, W. (1985). *Greek Religion. Archaic and Classical*, vol. 2. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Burkert, W. (1990). *Wilder Ursprung. Opferritual und Mythos bei den Griechen* [Savage origin. Greek victim ritual and myth]. Berlin: Wagenbach.
- Burkert, W. (1997). “From Epiphany to Cult Statue: Early Greek Theos.” In *What Is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity*, ed. A. B. Lloyd. London: Duckworth, 15–34.
- Cole, S. G. (1993). “Procession and Celebration at the Dionysia.” In *Theater and Society in the Classical World*, ed. R. Scodel. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 25–38.
- Cropp, M. J. (1988). *Euripides: Electra*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Csapo, E. and Slater, W. J. (1995). *The Context of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Easterling, P. E. (1988) [1991]. “Tragedy and Ritual. ‘Cry “Woe, Woe”, but May the God Prevail.”’ *Metis* 3, 87–109.
- Friedrich, R. (1996). “Everything to Do with Dionysos? Ritualism, the Dionysiac and the Tragic.” In *Tragedy and the Tragic. Greek Theatre and Beyond*, ed. M. S. Silk. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 257–83.
- Garland, R. (1992). *Introducing New Gods. The Politics of Athenian Religion*. London: Duckworth.
- Goldhill, S. (1990). “The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology.” In *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?: Athenian Drama in Social Context*, ed. J. J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 97–129.
- Goldhill, S. (1996). “Collectivity and Otherness – The Authority of the Tragic Chorus: Response to Gould.” In *Tragedy and the Tragic. Greek Theatre and Beyond*, ed. M. S. Silk. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 244–56.
- Gould, J. (1996). “Tragedy and Collective Experience.” In *Tragedy and the Tragic. Greek Theatre and Beyond*, ed. M. S. Silk. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 217–43.
- Hall, E. (1996). “Is There a Polis in Aristotle’s Poetics?” In *Tragedy and the Tragic. Greek Theatre and Beyond*, ed. M. S. Silk. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 295–309.
- Heath, M. (1987). *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*. London: Duckworth.
- Henrichs, A. (1994/5). “Why Should I Dance?”: Choral Self-Referentiality in Greek Tragedy. In *The Chorus in Greek Tragedy and Culture, One*, ed. H. Golder and S. Scully, *Arion* 3.1, 56–111.
- Henrichs, A. (1996). “Epiphany.” In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth, 3rd edn. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 546.

- Jameson, M. H. (1994). "Theoxenia." In *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, ed. R. Hägg. Stockholm: Svenska Institut i Athen, 35–57.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. (1987). "Was Euripides an Atheist?" *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 5, 149–66.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. (1989). " 'Impiety' and 'Atheism' in Euripides' Dramas." *Classical Quarterly* 39, 70–82.
- MacDowell, D. M. (1989). "Athenian Laws about Choruses." In *Symposion 1982. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* [1982 symposium. Lectures on Greek and Hellenistic historical jurisprudence], ed. F. J. Fernandez Nieto. Cologne: Pöhlau, 65–77.
- Mastrorarde, D. J. (ed.) 1994. *Euripides*, Phoenissai. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, R. (1996). *Athenian Religion. A History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pelling, C. (1997). "Conclusion." In *Tragedy and the Historian*, ed. C. Pelling. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 213–35.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. (1968). *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, 2nd edn, revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rutherford, I. (1994/5). "Apollo in Ivy: The Tragic Paean." In *The Chorus in Greek Tragedy and Culture, One*, ed. H. Golder and S. Scully, *Arion* 3.1, 112–35.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1988). "Further Aspects of Polis Religion." *Annali Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli: Archeologia e storia antica* 10. Naples, Dipartimento del mondo classico e del mediterraneo antico, 259–74. Also in *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, ed. R. Buxton, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 38–55.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1989). "Assumptions and the Creation of Meaning: Reading Sophocles' *Antigone*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 109, 134–48.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1990a). "What is Polis Religion?" In *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, ed. O. Murray and S. Price. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 295–322. Also in *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, ed. R. Buxton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 13–37.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1990b). "Sophocles' *Antigone* as a 'Bad Woman'." In *Writing Women into History*, ed. F. Dieteren and E. Kloek. Amsterdam: Historisch Seminarium van de Universiteit van Amsterdam, 11–38.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2003). *Tragedy and Athenian Religion*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Stinton, T. C. W. (1976). " 'Si credere dignum est': Some Expressions of Disbelief in Euripides and Others." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 22, 60–89.
- Taplin, O. (1995). "Opening Performance: Closing Texts?" *Essays in Criticism* 45, 93–120.
- Vernant, J.-P. (1972). "Ambigüité et renversement. Sur la structure énigmatique de l' 'Oedipe roi' " [Ambiguity, and inversion. On the enigmatic structure of *Oedipus the King*]. In *Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne* [Myth and tragedy in ancient Greece], ed. J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet. Paris: Maspéro, 99–131.
- Versnel, H. S. (1990). *Ter Unus. Isis, Dionysos, Hermes. Three Studies in Henotheism*. Leiden: Brill.
- Vidal-Naquet, P. (1972). "Chasse et sacrifice dans l' *Oresteia* d'Eschyle" [Hunting and sacrifice in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*]. In *Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne*, ed. J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet. Paris: Belles lettres, 133–58.
- Vidal-Naquet, P. (2002). *Le miroir brisé. Tragédie athénienne et politique* [The broken mirror. Athenian and political tragedy]. Paris: Maspéro.
- Wilson, P. (2000). *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia. The Chorus, the City and the Stage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, P. and Taplin, O. (1993). "The 'Aetiology' of Tragedy in the *Oresteia*." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 39, 169–80.
- Winkler, J. J. (1990). "The Ephebes' Song: Tragoidia and Polis." In *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?*, ed. J. J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 20–62.
- Zeitlin, F. I. (1965). "The Motif of the Corrupted Sacrifice in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 96, 463–508.

Tragedy and Dionysus

Richard Seaford

In Athens of the classical period tragedy (as well as comedy and satyric drama) was performed at the theater of the god Dionysus, in his cult. A strong association of Greek drama with Dionysus persisted throughout antiquity, and it is virtually certain that drama also *originated* in Dionysiac cult. Myths were told about Dionysus, notably about his arrival in a new place where he was resisted by the local ruler, for example by Pentheus of Thebes. And yet, because most surviving tragedies and comedies dramatize stories that are not about Dionysus, it is legitimate to ask whether the cultic connection of Dionysus has any relevance to our understanding of the surviving plays. My answer – though not everybody will agree – is that it does.

The Genesis of Tragedy in Dionysiac Cult

Our most reliable source by far for the genesis of tragedy is the fourth chapter of Aristotle's *Poetics*. Though his testimony has been doubted, he could draw on research (now lost) into the early theater, and does indeed state (1449b37) that the process by which tragedy came into being is known. He makes three remarks of particular interest, that tragedy had an improvisatory beginning, that it came into being "from the leaders of the dithyramb," and that it developed *ek tou satyrikou* – that is, from something like the satyric drama. We should add the ancient tradition that, when the themes of tragedy ceased to be about Dionysus, it was decided that a satyr play was to be performed after each set ("trilogy") of three tragedies, i.e., to be a reminder of tragedy's humble origins. A satyr play was a boisterous drama, written by the author of the preceding tragedies, but with a chorus of satyrs – naked, hedonistic followers of Dionysus, with some equine characteristics. Only one satyr play survives complete, Euripides' *Cyclops*. The dithyramb was a hymn to Dionysus, probably once consisting of solo improvisation and choral refrain – sometimes sung by men dressed as satyrs – in a procession escorting Dionysus into the city.

To answer the question why it was the cult of Dionysus that produced tragedy, we must look not just at the main context for the performance of tragedy, the City Dionysia, but also at the other main polis festival of Dionysus at Athens, the “older Dionysia” (Thucydides 2.15.4), called Anthesteria. The City Dionysia (or “Great Dionysia”) was – unlike the traditional Anthesteria – created or amplified as late as the sixth century BCE. The Anthesteria, a spring festival of Dionysus, seems to have derived its name from the Greek word for flower (*anthos*). It was a festival of the whole community of Athens, lasted three days, and included the opening and drinking of the new wine, as well as various other components. I will focus on five of these components.

The first component is that during this spring festival men and boys dressed up as (and wore the masks of) *satyrs*. This belonged to the hedonistic, wine-drinking aspect of the festival.

Second, it is likely that at some point in this festival Dionysus was escorted into the city, in a cart shaped like a ship, by satyrs playing pipes.

Third, Dionysus (whether impersonated, or in the form of an image) was united with the wife of the “king” archon (magistrate), in a “sacred marriage,” as one element of female ceremonies that were celebrated in what was imagined to be the old royal dwelling, and that included mystic ritual, perhaps at the conclusion of the processional escort of Dionysus.

Fourth, these and other elements of the festival were associated with *myths*. For instance, the escort of Dionysus into the city was no doubt envisaged as a celebration or reenactment of his original arrival. The “sacred marriage” was seen as the union of Dionysus and Ariadne. The practice of drinking the new wine in silence and at separated tables was explained as a result of the hospitality once given at Athens to the polluted matricide Orestes. The story was told of Ikarios, who was given wine by Dionysus, gave it to his neighbors, and was killed by them because they became drunk and imagined that Ikarios had poisoned them. His daughter Erigone eventually found his body in a well, and hanged herself: the ritual of swinging at the Anthesteria was explained as propitiating her. And so on.

Fifth, the ritual was one in which, in a sense, the whole city took part (including children and slaves). This *inclusiveness* probably involved a sense of communality: collective wine-drinking may promote dissolution of distinctions, and in Euripides’ *Bacchae* it is explicitly stated that Dionysus wants everybody to join in his worship, and “to be magnified while distinguishing nobody” (209).

Each of these five elements of the ancient Anthesteria contributed to the genesis of drama at another Dionysiac festival at Athens, the newly founded (or reorganized) City Dionysia, in the latter half of the sixth century BCE.

First, a precondition for drama is the *transformation of identity*, such as we find in the transformation of men and boys into satyrs at the Anthesteria, as well as predramatic (sixth-century) representations of *masks* of Dionysus. That boisterous performance by satyrs played an important role in genesis of tragedy is suggested, as we have seen, by Aristotle in the *Poetics*.