

also the contributions on authors and texts much lesser known to classicists than Nonnus, like the *Metaphrasis Psalmorum* (A. Faulkner, “Faith and Fidelity in Biblical Epic. The Metaphrasis Psalmorum, Nonnus and the Theory of Translation”), John of Gaza (D. Gigli Piccardi [see article mentioned above], and D. Lauritzen, “Nonnus in Gaza. The Expansion of Modern Poetry from Egypt to Palestine in the Early Sixth Century CE”), George of Pisidia (M. Whitby, “A Learned Spiritual Ladder? Towards an Interpretation of George of Pisidia’s Hexameter Poem *On Human Life*”) and the many other byzantine poets and poems discussed by C. De Stefani (“The end of the “Nonnian School”), in comparison with whom Nonnus by now has reached the celebrity status of a Hollywood star. Nonnus, in this way, may help to bridge the enormous gap that exists between the fields of Classics and Byzantine Studies.

November 2015

Berenice Verhelst  
University of Ghent (FWO Flanders)

VESA VAHTIKARI

*Tragedy Performances outside Athens  
in the Late Fifth and the Fourth Centuries BC*

Helsinki, Suomen Ateenan-Instituutin Säätiö. 2014.  
XII, 334 S. [16] Bl. Ill. Kt. Gr.–8°  
(*Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens*, 20.)

The times when studies of the ancient Greek theatre exclusively focussed on fifth century Athens are definitely past. Vesa Vahtikari’s monograph has appeared at the same time as A. Kotlińska-Toma, *Hellenistic Tragedy: Texts, Translations and a Critical Survey*, London 2015. And both volumes come hard on the heels of three important edited volumes that all share their broadened chronological and geographical remit: I. Gildenhard and M. Revermann, *Beyond the Fifth Century: Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages*, Berlin 2010; K. Bosher, *Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy*, Cambridge 2012; E. Csapo, H.-R. Goette et al., *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B. C.*, Berlin 2014. In this suddenly crowded field, V. hopes to provide answers to the following four, as of yet only partially answered, questions: Which individual tragedies were performed outside Athens? When did the spread of tragic performances begin on a wide scale? Where, in which city and on what kind of occasion were tragedies performed? And how were the arrangements for tragic performances outside Athens managed in practice? As V. himself concedes, the last question receives only a partial answer since a comprehensive investigation ‘would take things too far’; in fact, the focus of the monograph is on the first point. The guiding principles behind the presentation of the material are data-centered: V. devotes one chapter each to ‘Evidence’, ‘Known theatre performances outside

Athens’, and ‘Some tragedies which were very probably performed outside Athens’. These form the bulk of the volume; they are followed by a conclusion and three appendices. Maps, black-and-white photographs within the book, as well as 21 colour plates at the end, illustrate some of the vases discussed and thus make it possible to follow the argument more easily.

V. begins by laying out the various types of evidence at his disposal and discussing his methodological approach: he thus reviews in turn inscriptions and papyri (in particular those that might have been used by actors); tragedy-related vases; evidence internal to the plays (localizing verses, as well as actors’ interpolations); intertextual evidence, in the shape of allusions or quotations from tragedy in comic poets, Plato, Aristotle and other authors (but as these authors are mostly Athenian, this does not tell us much about performances outside Athens). As V. reasonably concludes (71), ‘perhaps not too much emphasis should be put on the sheer number of quotations from individual plays’. A list of attested theatre buildings, with helpful maps, rounds up the part on ‘evidence’.

This chapter is not meant as a systematic review of all evidence, but rather as a general discussion of the types of evidence that will then be pressed into service; there is thus a rather heavy emphasis on methodology, with numerous discussions ‘*exempli gratia*’. And yet, some of the ‘warnings’ about the evidence and its problems seem beside the point. The discussion on inscriptions opens with the statement that ‘inscriptions are the most reliable source for this study’ (11). Then, two inscriptions, IG II<sup>2</sup> 3091 and IG II<sup>2</sup> 2320, are singled out for the purpose of showing that these texts are not always easy to interpret.<sup>1</sup> But in the rest of the book, inscriptions only make rare appearances: it is indicative that while there is an index of cited authors and passages, there is no index of inscriptions. The entry ‘inscriptions’ in the ‘General index’ lists all places where the word ‘inscription’ appears, without distinguishing between inscriptions on stone and on vases. Papyri are also listed among potentially useful sources, as they attest to the popularity of a play: we are thus given the number of hits per author and per play, as resulting from searches in the Leuven database of ancient books (LDAB) and in the CEDOPAL Mertens Pack 3 online database, with the proviso that such numbers are uncertain, and that different databases yield different results (15–16, without any attempt to explain the discrepancies).

<sup>1</sup> V.’s discussion of IG II<sup>2</sup> 2320, at p. 13–14, is interesting, but as long as we do not have other data, the name of the poet who came second in tragedy, for whom we have only the ending [okles, must remain [Phil]okles or [Tim]okles: it is true that in the same year the poet Timokles, as the stone informs us, presented a satyr play; yet in terms of layout on the stone, the satyr play forms a separate category: we cannot thus assume that the tragic poet who placed second in the tragic competition is the same person as the poet who presented the satyr play.

Vases are central to the argument about re-performance/performance outside Athens, and so the evidence for ‘tragedy related vases’ is examined in some detail, in the hope of producing a list of the elements that will allow us to say that a vase represents a specific performance, rather than a mythological narrative (22–23: here, V. develops ideas advanced by Roscino and Taplin).<sup>2</sup> But again, there are problems, of which V. is aware (see his comments at p. 22): the relationship between vase paintings and tragedies (I actually would say, between vase-paintings and the ‘outer world’) is an extremely complex one. It is therefore a pity that, although provenances are given (whenever possible), no real effort is made at contextualizing these vases. Pages 36–44 offer interesting remarks about gestures; but they remain at the intuitive level: looking more in depth into gestures, and more specifically into what the ancients called *schemata*, might have paid dividends.<sup>3</sup> There is however a methodological problem with using gestures as index of theatricality. Unlike actors, for whom gesture and body movements complement the dialogue or song, painters must communicate a message through images only. As a result, we must expect that typical gestures will have been a central element of the repertoire of vase-painters – but this means that gestures on vases, *schemata*, are used to express a story, any story, not necessarily a *theatrical* story: we cannot take specific gestures as indexes of theatricality. (One has only to think of Emma Hamilton’s ‘attitudes’, modelled on ancient vases, to see how things might have worked the other way round.)<sup>4</sup>

The next chapter focuses on ‘Known theatre performances outside Athens.’ It includes discussion of ‘Aeschylus in Sicily’ (performance of the *Aetnaeae*, re-performance of the *Persae*), ‘Euripides in Macedonia’ (performance of the *Archelaus*), the ‘Rural Dionysia’ and what plays might have been performed there, and ‘Alexander the Great’. This is mostly well-known mate-

rial, sometimes presented in an unnecessarily complicated way.<sup>5</sup>

The fourth chapter contains a list of ‘Tragedies which were very probably performed outside Athens’, in alphabetical order, from *Achilles Thersitoctonus* by Cheremon to *Thyestes in Sicyon* by Sophocles. For each play we get all there is to know about plays of the same name by other tragedians, allusions to it in comic plays, actors’ interpolations and localizations (if any), and theatrical vases that might refer to the play. All these are very likely indications of re-performance – with the vases providing the ‘outside Athens’ localization. The results of this survey are relatively meagre: since the vases are all South-Italian (whether Apulian, Lucanian, Campanian or Paestan) and Sicilian, if one believes that these vases were influenced by theatrical representations, it is possible to infer that the play was probably performed at some point in Magna Graecia (or Sicily) around the date of the earliest of the group of vases in question. How and in what context it was performed (if it was) remains elusive and is not discussed.

The conclusions sum up the picture drawn so far, but also add to it. Under the heading ‘Some poets and their tragedies’, we are told that the plays of some other tragedians too (Phrynichus, Dionysius, Carcinus II, Antiphon, Mamerus) might have been performed in Sicily – but we have no evidence for such performances. Under the heading ‘some painters and their vases’, some painters (e. g. the Darius painter) are singled out as likely to have witnessed numerous performances of tragedies, because of the number of their vases that can be related to a theatrical theme. Five pages attempt to relate the provenance of the vases to possible venues for the performance of tragedy in Sicily and Magna Graecia. An examination of the tragic myth cycles probably performed outside Athens and of their main themes shows that they ‘do not seem to differ’ from the myth cycles and themes of the tragedies performed in Athens (208–211). V. then attempts an answer to the question of ‘How did the classics become classics?’ but the discussion remains somewhat superficial, and V. acknowledges the danger of circular reasoning in his argumentation (215).<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> C. Roscino, ‘L’immagine della tragedia: elementi di caratterizzazione teatrale e iconografia nella ceramica italiota e siceliota’, in L. Todisco (ed.), *La ceramica figurata a soggetto tragico in Magna Grecia e Sicilia*, Rome 2003, 223–259; O. Taplin, *Pots and Plays. Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase-Painting of the Fourth Century BC*, Los Angeles 2007.

<sup>3</sup> See e. g. M. L. Catoni, *Schemata: comunicazione non verbale nella Grecia antica*, Pisa 2005; for a fascinating explication of gestures on ancient vases see also A. de Jorio, *Gesture in Naples and Gesture in Classical Antiquity*, Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by A. Kendon, Bloomington 2000.

<sup>4</sup> A detail: the ‘Goose play’ vase (on which see now M. Denoyelle and F. Silvestrelli, ‘From Tarporley to Dolon: The Reattribution of the Early South Italian “New York” Goose Vase’, *The Metropolitan Museum Journal* 48, 2013, 59–71) is discussed at p. 50 as an example of dramatic dialogue within a vase. Clearly this is not a vase representing tragedy; but as V. is interested in tragic (re)performances outside Athens, the presence of the inscription ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΙΟΣ besides the figure at the upper left of face A might have been mentioned, either here, or at p. 51, under ‘name labels on figures’.

<sup>5</sup> B. Le Guen’s paper on Alexander, ‘Theatre, religion and politics at Alexander the Great’s travelling royal court’, and E. Moloney’s on ‘The Macedonian kings and Greek theatre’, both in *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B. C.*, 231–248 and 249–274, appeared too late for V., but should now be consulted; for the Agen, besides P. Cipolla, *Poeti minori del dramma satiresco*, Amsterdam 2003, 336–361, see now C. B. Shaw, *Satyrical play. The evolution of Greek Comedy and Satyr Drama*, Oxford 2014, 123–129.

<sup>6</sup> S. Nervegna, ‘Performing classics: the tragic canon in the fourth century and beyond’, in *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B. C.*, 157–87, with its interesting idea of a divided reception, appeared too late for V. But J. Hanink’s ‘The classical tragedians, from Athenian idols to wandering poets’, in *Beyond the Fifth Century*, 39–67, might have been mentioned (see now her *Lycurgan Athens and the Making of Classical Tragedy*, Cambridge 2014).

Three Appendices close the volume: the first one contains an annotated list of further plays that were 'probably or possibly' (as opposed to the 'very probably' of ch. 4) performed outside Athens; the second is a detailed list of all the 619 vases with theatrical subject (the printed version is arranged alphabetically by title of the play; but there is an online excel version that allows ordering through other criteria, such as fabric, shape, provenance, painter, date). A bibliography and 'iconographic elements' complete the information given for each vase. The third appendix lists, again as a table and in chronological order, the plays certainly performed outside Athens (coded red), the plays very probably performed outside Athens (yellow), the plays probably performed outside Athens (green), the plays possibly performed outside Athens (blue), and all other plays known. For each play we are given the number of references to it by comic poets and other authors, the number of vases related to the play and their fabric, the name of famous actors who performed it, inscriptions and/or papyri mentioning it, Roman tragedians having written homonymous plays, and peculiarities of the staging.

The abundance of lists and the emphasis on methodology stand in contrast to the limited conclusions. This might have to do with the nature of the evidence, and with the wide scope of the work; but undeniably, V. has sifted through a huge mass of material, trying to present it in the most useful way, and for that we must be grateful.

November 2015

Paola Ceccarelli  
Newnham College, Cambridge

LIEVE VAN HOOF – PETER VAN NUFFELEN, Hrsgg.

*Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD.  
Performing Paideia, Constructing the Present,  
Presenting the Self*

Leiden/Boston, Brill. 2015. X, 247 S. Gr.-8°  
(*Mnemosyne Supplements*, 373.)

Unter den Bedingungen eines ökonomisierten akademischen Betriebs samt Publikationsdruck schwillt die Flut von Tagungsbänden stetig an, und Wissenschaftler fühlen sich bemüßigt, Veröffentlichungen durch die Betonung der Originalität zu legitimieren. Dieser allzu verständlichen Versuchung sind auch die Herausgeber dieses Sammelbands erlegen. Das Thema der Beiträge zu griechischen und lateinischen Texten der Spätantike ist die Wechselbeziehung zwischen Literatur und Gesellschaft im 4. Jh. n. Chr. Die Autoren wollen der gesellschaftlichen Rolle der Literatur gerecht werden, indem sie fragen, wie Texte auf die Gesellschaft einwirkten und wie dieser Einfluss von den literarisch Tätigen genutzt wurde (4). Außerdem beabsichtigen sie zu untersuchen, ob Literatur in der ausgehenden Antike noch Ort für soziale Debatten und ein Instru-

ment des sozialen Aufstiegs gewesen sei, wie es in der Zweiten Sophistik der Fall war (10). Mit dem Hinweis auf die Rhetorik der Zweiten Sophistik geben die Herausgeber das Programm vor: Sie betonen die Kontinuität in der gesellschaftlichen Funktion der Literatur von der Kaiserzeit bis in die Spätantike und wollen daher dieselben Methoden anwenden, die an der Zweiten Sophistik erprobt worden sind. Dieser Ansatz soll helfen, das angeblich in der Forschung weit verbreitete Bild einer wirkungslosen Schulrhetorik in dieser Epoche zu korrigieren. Unverkennbar orientieren sich auch die drei Leitkategorien des Bandes an Studien zum 1. und 2. Jh. n. Chr.: Die Aufsätze wollen die Interaktion zwischen Redner und Publikum, die Selbstinszenierung der Autoren sowie die rhetorische Konstruktion der Realität beleuchten (10 f.).

Wie die Einleitung ausführt, erheben die Herausgeber den Anspruch, drei Schwächen der bisherigen Forschung zu beheben (4–8). Erstens werde unter dem Paradigma der Christianisierung in der Spätantike strikt zwischen paganer und christlicher Literatur geschieden, obwohl in der Realität die Gemeinsamkeiten überwogen hätten und die Religionsfrage nicht immer entscheidend gewesen sei. Zweitens habe man hauptsächlich auf die literarische Auseinandersetzung mit der klassischen Tradition geachtet, um Kontinuität und Transformation zu ermessen. Dadurch sei der soziale Kontext in Vergessenheit geraten. Und drittens konzentriere sich die philologische Forschung auf die dichterische Produktion, während Prosaliteratur primär als historische Quelle ausgewertet werde. Mit diesem Porträt bieten die Herausgeber freilich ein stark überzeichnetes Bild, um ihre eigene Publikation vorteilhaft zu positionieren. Dass die benannten Tendenzen in der Tat in Monographien und Aufsätzen zu finden sind, soll nicht bestritten werden. Gleichwohl liegen genügend Arbeiten vor, die diese Perspektive hinter sich gelassen haben. Abgesehen davon, dass im Bereich der griechischen Literatur schon lange die umfangreiche Prosa Forschungsgegenstand gewesen ist, sind in den letzten Jahren Arbeiten erschienen, die sowohl genaue Lektüren einzelner Texte präsentieren als auch nach deren sozialen Funktionen fragen. So sind die Selbstinszenierung von Autoren ebenso untersucht worden wie die Rolle der *paideia* in der spätantiken Gesellschaft, die soziale Interaktion zwischen Predigern und ihrem Publikum ebenso wie politische Intentionen rhetorischer und philosophischer Texte.<sup>1</sup> Und auch wenn Einzelarbeiten sich entweder paganen oder christlichen Autoren widmen, wird damit keineswegs überall eine hermetische Trennung nach der

<sup>1</sup> J. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2006. I. Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2007. J. Stenger, *Hellenische Identität in der Spätantike*, Berlin 2009. R. Criboire, *Libanius the Sophist*, Ithaca 2013. C. Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, Berkeley 2014.