Vayos Liapis and Antonis K. Petrides (eds.). ***Greek Tragedy After the Fifth Century: A Survey from ca. 400 BC to ca. AD 400.*** Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018. Pp. xiv, 415. ISBN 978-1-107-03855-4. $143.95.

This collection of essays is an exciting and valuable contribution to the fast-growing field of postclassical drama studies, with an impressive range of methodological approaches, coverage of nearly a millennium of ancient dramatic history, and attention to the full geographical scope of the Greek world. Such a collection will be of great interest to ancient historians as well as literary scholars, because the contributors situate postclassical tragedy in its socio-political contexts. The non-democratic context of postclassical tragedy, highlighted by Carter in this volume, and which Anne Duncan's forthcoming *Command Performance: Tyranny and Theater in the Ancient World* promises to address, challenges the traditional perception of drama as a fundamentally democratic institution. An attention to local history also runs through the book, particularly in the contributions of Fries on the *Rhesus* in Amphipolis, and Hornblower on the relationship between Samothrace, Troy, and Rome, expressed through a play on Dardanus.

In the first chapter, "Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Century: The Fragments" (25–65), Vayos Liapis and Theodoros K. Stephanopoulos provide a clearly organized survey of the known fourth century playwrights and their works. They make a number of interesting observations about the surviving corpus of dramatic fragments from the fourth century BCE, such as that Carcinus' output of 160 plays was perhaps made possible by the use of generic choruses in this period (39 n.68). The tragic poet Chaeremon is a particularly fascinating figure, with his elaborate use of flowers, and visual effects inspired by contemporary painting (52). These considerations of the aesthetics of fourth century drama move the study of fragments beyond the reconstruction of plot alone. The authors see fourth century drama as a "transitional period" (65) in which the corpus of fifth century drama continued to exert a strong influence, but innovative tendencies, especially those of Chaeremon, seem to look forward to Hellenistic experimentation with poetic form and language.

Almut Fries takes up the pseudo-Euripidean *Rhesus* in the second chapter (66–89), with an overview of plot, the relationship of the play to other literary treatments of the myth, structure, dramaturgy, style, authenticity and date, and ancient reception. As Fries points out, the question of authorship has dominated scholarship on this play since Scaliger in 1600 declared that it was not written by Euripides. Fries argues for a date between 390 and 370 BCE, based in part on an Apulian vase of ca. 360–340 BCE, which seems to include Rhesus' parents in the scene of his death, a detail that is not in Homer and may have come from the play.

In "Hellenistic Tragedy and Satyr-Drama; Lycophron's *Alexandra*" (90–124), Simon Hornblower includes an extended discussion of the relationship between history and drama in the Hellenistic period. A brief discussion of the potential impact

of tragic performance culture on Hellenistic historiography, including Polybius, warrants further investigation (94–95).

The most interesting arguments in this chapter concern the production of drama in relation to local history. For example, a second century BCE tragic poet, Dymas of Iasos, is attested in an inscription from Samothrace as the author of a play about Dardanus. The production of this play on Samothrace in the early second century BCE, in the wake of the Roman conquest of Greece, Hornblower suggests, had local significance and political importance. Dardanus' connection to Samothrace, by birth, and Troy, as founder, allowed the Samothracians to claim a mythical connection to Rome. He supports this argument by comparison with the surviving poem of Lycophron, *Alexandra*, of a similar date, in which Hornblower sees echoes of the contemporary war between Rome and Hannibal, and by extension, with Roman imperial expansion more broadly (112–113). Further evidence for the incorporation of local history into plays of this period is found in Coronea in Boiotia, where Zotion of Ephesus put on plays at the Athena Itonia festival celebrating the goddess and the city (93).

However, greater attention could have been paid to the epigraphical scholarship. A citation of Alessandra Manieri's landmark epigraphical study of the musical and poetic festivals of Boiotia, *Agoni poetico-musicali nella Grecia antica*, is oddly missing in the section on Coronea, although it is cited elsewhere in the book. Similarly, Hornblower's treatment of Hellenistic satyr-drama (120–123) does not reference Rebecca Lämmle's work on this topic, particularly her 2014 chapter, "Das Satyrspiel," in the *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike* (ed. B. Zimmermann and A. Rengakos), in which she collected all epigraphical evidence for the performance of satyr drama in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Certain statements about individual inscriptions are also somewhat misleading. For example, while the budget of the Sarapieia at Tanagra (*SEG* 19.335) does provide evidence of the inclusion of satyr-drama in the competitions, as Hornblower suggests (121), it would have been more sensible to cite the prizes awarded to satyr-dramatists in this inscription, rather than the money paid to the *tragikoi* and *satyroi* in line 44, who are more likely members of the tragic and satyr choruses. A minor typographical error: the date of the Battle of Actium is misprinted on p. 93 as 331 BCE.

Pierluigi Lanfranchi considers one Hellenistic tragedy in the fourth chapter, "The *Exagōgē* of Ezekiel the Tragedian" (125–146). Scholarship on Ezekiel's *Exagōgē* has focused on the extent to which it conforms to the genre of ancient tragedy. Lanfranchi argues that the *Exagōgē* was considered a tragedy in antiquity due to its reliance on this literary form, and models such as Euripides, whether or not it was performed (134). He situates the *Exagōgē* in a number of contexts, including Alexandria as a dramatic capital, a wider landscape of Greek Jewish literature, and in literary history, as an early anticipator of medieval religious dramas and passion plays. He ends with the interesting comparison with the evolution of Greek drama to

the Roman *fabulae praetextae*, suggesting that Ezekiel's drama could represent a similar evolution in the Jewish Alexandrian context (145).

One of the most impressive contributions in the book is Brigitte Le Guen, "Beyond Athens: The Expansion of Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century Onwards" (149–179), a regional epigraphical survey of the performance of postclassical drama. Le Guen shows clearly how widespread the performance of drama was in the fourth century BCE and the Hellenistic period. One strength of the chapter is the sensitivity to local variation, which is sometimes lost in attempts to define, for example, "Hellenistic drama" as a unified phenomenon. Le Guen discusses the limited evidence for the Hellenistic chorus but cautions against over-generalization, acknowledging that choruses must have varied over time and place (176). A detailed discussion of the Dionysia at Iasos, well attested epigraphically, demonstrates the benefits of considering the local history of festivals with the same attention that the festivals of Athens have received. Local political and environmental factors at Iasos in the early second century BCE, she demonstrates, led to changes to the festival, particularly in the wake of an earthquake. At this time, performers were hired, as financing an agonistic festival was impossible. In a later phase of the festival, from 185/180 to 120/115 BCE, the competitions resumed. The temporary cessation of competitions at Iasos is not, therefore, evidence of a lack of a competitive spirit in the Hellenistic world, as is often assumed in relation to the Hellenistic festivals, but must rather be viewed as a response to specific historical circumstances.

A series of tables with the names and locations of festivals that included dramatic performances either in honor of Dionysus or other deities (with citations to the relevant inscriptions) are a useful reference point for the historical study of drama (159–163). In most cases, only the dates of first attestation of drama at the festivals are given, and like the vague use of "onwards" in the title, do not give a clear indication of the later history of the dramatic festivals, after the first century BCE. For more comprehensive information about dramatic festivals in the period covered by Le Guen, interested readers may also consult Eric Csapo, Hanns Rupprecht Goette, J. Richard Green, and Peter Wilson's 2014 survey, *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century BC,* and soon, Csapo and Wilson's multi-volume *Documents for a Social and Economic History of the Theatre to 300 BC,* forthcoming from Cambridge University Press.

In the sixth chapter, "Theatre Performance after the Fifth Century" (180–203), Anne Duncan and Vayos Liapis argue that revivals of old dramas at the Dionysia contributed to the formation of a dramatic canon, which by the fourth century BCE crystallized around Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. Statues of these three tragedians were erected in the Theater of Dionysus in Athens under Lycurgus, and official copies of their plays were deposited in the state archives (182). In light of the expansion of drama outside Athens in the fourth century BCE, shown especially by Le Guen's chapter, one wonders whether these archival activities and attention to the Athenian dramatists of the fifth century BCE could be read as an effort to assert the primacy of Athens in a rapidly expanding dramatic landscape. Duncan and Liapis also

argue that the canon can be seen in vase painting, where 75% of scenes come from Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides (189). They also consider several developments in post-fifth century drama, including the internationalization of drama, the increasing importance and status of the actor, an interest in mimicry in acting style, standardization of mask types, and the use of generic choruses.

Mark Griffith, in the seventh chapter, “Music and Dance in Tragedy after the Fifth Century” (204–242) argues against the claim that Greek tragedy became less musical over time. He seeks to address three central issues, on the quantity of music and dance in post-fifth century tragedy, harmodic and melodic developments, and music and dance in reperformance. He observes that the quotability of iambic trimeters explains their over-representation in the fragments, and cautions against viewing this as evidence for a lack of lyricism. The survival of lyric fragments on papyri back up this claim (211). Visual evidence such as wall paintings of scenes from Menander also suggest that music and dancing remained an important part of dramatic performance (214). Griffith’s suggestion that Hellenistic productions relied on local choruses makes sense of the generic chorus, as traveling performers would have limited time to rehearse with the choruses in each city (220–221).

In chapter eight, “The Fifth Century and After: (Dis)Continuities in Greek Tragedy” (243–269), Francis Dunn suggests that an over-emphasis on continuity, in response to the earlier decline narrative of post-classical drama, has led to a reductive understanding of dramatic history. He addresses changes to drama in five key areas: song, plot, naturalism, self-consciousness, and ethical contingency. Actors, he finds, sing more in the late fifth century, choruses less. There is a trend towards naturalism, with the exception of Euripides’ *Helen* and *Iphigeneia among the Taurians*, and increasingly secular content. Self-consciousness rises, with choral self-referentiality and use of metatheatrical elements, especially in *Bacchae* and *Oedipus at Colonus.* Dunn’s observations concern primarily the late fifth century, and as he explicitly resists a narrative of continuity, it is not clear how they ought to inform the study of drama after the fifth century.

D.M. Carter, “Society and Politics in Post-Fifth Century Tragedy” (270–293) considers how the political contexts of the fourth century BCE contributed to developments in drama. Although tragedy already had a pan-Hellenic outlook in the mid-fifth century BCE, according to Carter, the weakening of democratic institutions in Athens contributed to a universalizing effect in drama in the fourth century. Tragedy also became more rhetorical, seen in the work of Moschion.

While most of the book focus on the fourth century and the Hellenistic period, Ruth Webb pushes the study of drama after the fifth century into the Roman era in the tenth chapter, “Attitudes Towards Tragedy from the Second Sophistic to Late Antiquity” (297–323). As she points out, the performance of tragedy is documented epigraphically well into the Roman period, and in literary and visual sources even into the early sixth century, with tragic actors in their tall boots, *cothurni*, appearing

on the consular diptych of Anastasius in Constantinople in 517 CE. She suggests that the performance of rhetoric in the Second Sophistic should be considered in this wider context of theatrical performance, which included not only tragedy and comedy but mime and pantomime (316). Another interesting observation is that in the time of the Second Sophistic and Late Antiquity, tragedy was a way of mediating between the present and the past, reaching back both to a heroic past and to classical Athens. This chapter is a valuable contribution to the book, as the only one to deal in a sustained way with the last centuries of the performance of drama in antiquity, but more explicit attention could have been paid to the important changes to the performance culture of drama in Late Antiquity. For example, the *Technitai* of Dionysus are last attested in 299 CE, and yet, dramatic performance does seem to have outlasted this organization. Who, then, were the *tragoidoi* performing in Constantinople in 517 CE?

Johanna Hanink concludes with a chapter on "Scholars and Scholarship on Tragedy" (324–349), which tracks record-keeping, archival activities, and scholarship on tragedy, from the compilation of the *Fasti* in Athens in the fourth century BCE, the display of which Hanink views as an attempt "to curate the city's theatrical heritage" (327), to the Museum of Alexandria, to Crates' writings on dramatic vocabulary in Rome, to the scholia tradition. Hanink shows how deeply Greek drama was implicated in intellectual culture for the long span of its existence, a fitting end to this most engaging and erudite volume.

DR. MALI SKOTHEIM
THE WARBURG INSTITUTE, LONDON