ABSTRACT: The author attempts a combined investigation of the first components of the fellow terms κωμ-ῳδός and τραγ-ῳδός. The ancient testimonies concerning the origins of drama come generally from the context of private δείπνον, in whose second half the guests used to combine wine-drinking with singing in unison (-ῳδός, the common second component of both terms). When the drinking grew heavier, the young intoxicated diners used to sing cheerful songs, rise from their tables, and dance outdoors. This stage is called κῶμος, forming, as we know, the first component of κωμῳδός. However, as long as the drinking was restrained, the mature diners remained seated and sang serious songs. This stage of the δείπνον is named, after the items served, τραγήματα (verb τρώγω – τραγεῖν), and may well form the first component of τραγῳδός. The distinction corresponds to the modern dichotomy between table-songs and dance-songs in the folk-life of most peoples (e.g., Mod. Greek τραγούδια τῆς τάβλας – τραγούδια τοῦ χοροῦ). The terms τραγῳδοί and τραγικοί χοροί were subsequently used for choruses of solemn songs about gods or heroes in local festivals, mainly in the northeast part of the Doric Peloponnese. The festivities passed from there to Dionysiac festivals in Attic Icaria together with the τραγ- term, which in the meantime had been folk-etymologized from τράγος, a derivation that prevailed throughout antiquity and is still predominant among scholars. The he-goat was established as prize in the contests of Thespis’ invention, i.e., dithyrambic choruses with chorus-leader solo interventions. – In parallel, the author explores some new readings in the Marmor Parium Susarion and Thespis entries and criticizes M. L. West’s theory about the early chronology of Attic tragedy.

THE ETYMOLOGY

THE ORIGIN OF TRAGEDY has been one of the essential problems that occupied since antiquity most branches of Altertumswissenschaft, philolo-

* I am grateful to my colleagues G. M. Sifakis and †D. Jakob for their deft criticism and friendly encouragement already since the conception of the present article. I am also greatly indebted to Professors S. Tsitsiridis and I. M. Konstantakos who, serving as readers of Logeion, not only saved me from numerous blunders but also offered fruitful advice for a deeper insight into the problem. I acknowledge that I often differed from them, this disagreement being perhaps the reason for any faults and imperfections that remained in this study, and for which I am solely responsible.
A less tormenting problem, which usually keeps company with the first, is the origin of the word τραγῳδία. I do not propose, for the time being, to discuss meticulously the numerous proposals, some of them made by most respected figures of the classical scholarship. Only in order to show the age-old interest in the problem, I cite the relevant article of the Etymologicum Magnum (whose second part is devoted to κωμῳδία), an article that assembles material from numerous older sources, and remind that most of the proposals contained therein are still today more or less discussed by scholars:

EM 764.1 τραγῳδία: ἔστι βίων τε καὶ λόγων ἡρωϊκῶν μίμησις. κέκληται δὲ τραγῳδία, ὅτι τράγος τῇ ὄδη γὰρ ἔτιθεν· ὀδὴ γὰρ ή τραγῳδία. ὥστε τρόγχων ἠλάμβανοι οἱ νικῶντες· τρόγχων γὰρ ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸν νέον οἶνον. ὅτι τετράγωνον εἶχον οἱ χοροὶ σχήμα· ή ὅτι τὰ πολλὰ οἱ χοροὶ ἐκ σατύρων συνίσταντο· οὗς ἐκάλουν τράγους σκόττωντες· ἡ διὰ τήν τοῦ σώματος δασύτητα· διὰ τὴν περι τὰ άφροδίσια σπουδή· τοιῶντο γάρ τὸ ζώον. ἡ δὲ κωμῳδία τῶν κόμων ἀνέπλεκον· σχήμα τράγον μιμοῦντο· ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς τριγώνος τραγῳδία. ἤδε τὸ ὄνομα τῶν κοινῶν καὶ πρὸς τὴν κωμῳδίαν· ἔστιν οὕτω διεκέχομαι τὰ τῆς σκωπτοῦντος· ἡ δὲ τραγῳδία· διὰ τὴν περι τὰς κόμας· ἢ ὅτι οἱ χορευταὶ τὰς κόμας ἀνέπλεκον σχῆμα τράγων μιμοῦντο· ἢ ἀπὸ τὴς τριγώνος τραγῳδία. ἤδε τὸ ὄνομα τῶν κοινῶν καὶ πρὸς τὴν κωμῳδίαν· ἔστιν οὕτω διεκέχομαι τὰ τῆς σκωπτοῦντος· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἡ δὲ κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμῳδία· ἢ ὅτι κωμ_COMPLETED

To start with, I believe that it would misdirect our reasoning, if we disjoined the etymologies of the two terms that constitute the basic pair of the dramatic genre: τραγῳδός and κωμῳδός. No matter when each term was officially established or when each genre was first performed, in Attica or elsewhere, the naming of tragedy and comedy, whether directly or transferred from other social and linguistic areas, cannot have been made separately. Whoever decided to name the members of the comic chorus...
κωμῳδοί, should have taken account of the fact that the brother chorus was named τραγῳδοί — or the other way around. Admittedly, in the area of folklife and, particularly, of popular religion, things are not always so rational. Yet, in scholarly investigation, it would be more prudent to use up every rational possibility before proceeding to options that postulate irrationality a priori. At any rate, the second component of the two words, -ωδός or -ωδία, is common and self-evident, leading us unquestionably to singers and singing.

As regards κωμῳδός, where things are much clearer, the first component is most likely κῶμος, ‘revel, carousal, merry-making’ or ‘band of revelers’ or ‘the ode sung at one of these festive processions’, according to LSJ.² But the comedy and the comic chorus known to us have different traits. No doubt the amusing and playful character is retained, being placed, however, in a structured poetic and dramatic framework, with a plot, characters, roles, and naturally a chorus, in which the riotous and boisterous festivity implied by κῶμος is mostly preserved, sometimes in a contrived manner without being required by the comedy’s story, as if for justifying the etymology of the genre’s name. When later, in the fourth century BCE, the importance attached to the comedy fully shifted to the story’s course, the κῶμος, together with the chorus, was isolated from the rest of the comedy and was transferred to separate entr’actes. Further, whereas the κῶμος might accompany just any private drinking-party regardless of the date in a year, the comedy is strictly positioned in the programme of Dionysiac festivals. Thus, although the translation of κωμῳδοί as ‘singers on occasion of the κῶμος’ is absolutely correct,³ the occasion of the κῶμος differs significantly from the occasion of the comedy.

Unlike κωμῳδός, the first component of τραγῳδός (τράγος) does not define any social event or activity, in the frame of which a song was to be sung. We cannot claim that τράγος is used synecdochically for ‘sacrifice of a he-goat’ and that τραγῳδοί are ‘singers on occasion of the sacrifice of a he-goat’ or ‘singers on occasion of the awarding of a he-goat to be sacrificed’, because whatever singing occurred, it was made precisely for winning the award of the he-goat, naturally before the awarding and the sacrifice. To prevent the

---
² The accurate meaning of κῶμος as a term in the City Dionysia festival is contested: the whole festival, chorus, dithyrambic chorus, men’s dithyrambic chorus. The question will be discussed below.
blame of over-rationalizing, I hasten to explain that, in my view, the only definition that might be argued in this direction is the one proposed by the ancients: ‘singers on occasion of the competition for a he-goat ἱερεῖον’. Thus, however, we have a derivation entirely different from that of κωμῳδός. And, in spite of Burkert’s strenuous disagreement, I would persist with the view of Wilamowitz that the inquiry into fabricated aitia with the use of ancient etymological constructions must be faced reluctantly. It is another story that Wilamowitz himself restored an old, extremely dubious assumption made by Welcker, which, as he believed, confirmed the validity of the Aristotelian concept of the genesis of tragedy. It was based on Et. M. 764.5 ἥ ὅτι τὰ πολλὰ οἱ χοροὶ ἐκ σατύρων συνίσταντο· οὗς ἐκάλουν τράγους σκώπτοντες ἢ διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος δασύτητα ἢ διὰ τὴν περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια σπουδὴν· τοιούτων γὰρ τὸ ζῷον. Be that as it may, Aristotle (Po. 1449a 20) speaking of the origin of tragedy refers to a satyric form (ἐκ σατυρικοῦ) with brief stories and laughable diction (ἐκ μικρῶν μύθων καὶ λέξεως γελοίας) but says nothing about he-goats. There is nothing to suggest the idea that Aristotle identified satyrs and he-goats.

On the other hand, the resemblance of the term τραγῳδία with τράγος is so conspicuous, that it would be absolutely expected to have sundry ancient etymologies that not only associate the he-goat with the tragedy, but also connect the animal with the myths around the Dionysus ritual. It is wholly insignificant whether these contrivances are Alexandrian, Peripatetic, or much older, since their historical evidence is by no means proven. We are certainly destined to depend on doubtful speculations. Let these speculations, at least, not be oblivious of the fact that what we are investigating goes back to the primary origins of a genre, which obtained its definitive οἰκεία φύσις much later. Since this type of investigation was followed in the case of comedy, it might prove helpful to continue on the same track. Parallelism within the twin dramatic genre is, in my view, indispensable. It is a misfortune that Aristotle, though explicitly declaring that comedy’s early history, unlike that of tragedy, has been forgotten, yet discusses the etymological origins of comedy in reply to the Doric claims on the genre’s origin, but not of tragedy.

4. Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie, Berlin 1895, 63.
5. F. G. Welcker, Nachtrag zu der Schrift über die Aeschylische Trilogie nebst einer Abhandlung über das Satyrspiel, Frankfurt 1826, 240.
6. A comprehensive survey of the relevant literature till 1966, solely on the two derivations, the satyrs = goats theory and the he-goat prize one, is to be found in Burkert (note 3) n. 2.
7. The claim that the derivation from τράγος was so obvious that Aristotle did not bother elaborating on it seems out of character with the philosopher’s practice.
Of the several meanings of κῶμος mentioned above (‘revel, carousel, merry-making’ or ‘band of revellers’ or ‘the ode sung at one of these festive processions’), the basic one is, of course, the first, while the others project from it. This revel or merry-making is part of human life’s social functions. More precisely, it reflects one of the two basic sides of leisure activities in human life: the cheerful one. Usually, the κῶμος follows a symposion, after which the inebriated young revellers enjoy themselves, mostly out in the streets, singing, dancing, and, occasionally, with more violent manifestations of drunken behaviour. Pratinas, PMG 708.8 f. (= TrGF 4 F 3.7 f.), refers pejoratively to the aulos with the verses κώμωι μόνον θυραμάχοις τε πυγμαχίαις νέων παροίνων | ἔμμεναι στρατηλάτας — though an alternative, no doubt invented, name of the poet’s father is transmitted as Ἐγκώμιος. We shall return to Pratinas later on in this paper. At any rate, the necessary components of κῶμος are the company of young friends, the intoxication, the group singing of joyful songs in joyful music, and the dancing of lively dances, all mainly performed outdoors. The element of dancing is less highlighted in the descriptions of the κῶμος, but Hesychius κ 4840 defines κῶμος as εἶδος δραχήσεως ἢ μέλους τινός, Photius κ 1313 as εἶδος δραχήσεως, Synagoge (Ba 286.20, Photius κ 1312, Suda κ 2272, al.) gives κῶμος· ὀρχεῖσθαι· ἐξ οὗ καὶ κῶμος εἶδος ὀρχήσεως· οἱ δὲ μέλους. The same element is conspicuous in derived words, e.g. Hsch. τ 626 τετράκωμος· μέλος τι σὺν δραχήσει πεποιημένον εἰς Ἡρακλέα ἑπινίκιον.

Corresponding manifestations are met with in the folklife of most societies, regardless of region or era, unless other factors, religious or political, enforce their restriction. It seems then that this popular unorganized social activity was modulated into a structured poetic and dramatic genre, the comedy, which maintained in its structure almost every element of its source except actual drinking. Naturally, this modulation did not affect the original folklife activity, which continued its social function, with some cultural or religious adjustments, till our days.

What sort of social event is reflected in the second basic side of leisure activities in folklife, the serious one? An event that might be modulated from popular unorganized social activity into the corresponding structured dramatic genre, the tragedy? In modern folklife, the traditional events are also roughly divided between these two sides. For instance, Modern Greek folk songs are broadly sorted out into these two categories: joyful and serious. The particular social activities, where folk songs are sung, are no doubt numerous, but, in the main, the songs are distinguished into two large categories:
dance songs and table songs (τραγούδια τοῦ χοροῦ – τραγούδια τῆς τάβλας). The first are usually cheerful, the second usually serious, and, as their names imply, the first are habitually danced, the second sung by singers seated at table and only exceptionally danced. If, as we did above with the κόμος, we were to define the necessary components of the modern table songs, we shall find here the company of grown-up friends, the moderate drinking, the singing of serious songs in serious music, and, in a few cases, the solemn dance. Naturally, this type of folk songs is not limited to the Greek popular tradition (τραγούδια τῆς τάβλας, τραγώδ’ τραπεζιτοί at Mariopolis, al.). Comparable ‘table songs’ are the Russian zastol’nye pesni, the Georgian sifra songs, the Jewish z’mirot in contrast to the klezmer dance songs, and many more, speaking about which I feel entirely unqualified. This category, at least in Modern Greek folklore, usually comprises narrative, historical, heroic, and gnomic songs, exceptionally even dirges (παραλογές, ακριτικά, κλέφτικα, μοιριλόγια), unlike the dance songs which have usually cheerful love themes. Understandably, it is not always easy to define strict boundaries when classifying folk songs depending on thematic considerations. As regards musical aspects, table songs present, generally speaking, a slow, stately melody, with free, unsteady rhythm, in contrast to the dance songs, which usually present lively, varied melody and strict rhythm.8

Is there anything comparable to these song categories in ancient Greek folklife that might evolve into tragedy, both socially and generically? The necessary elements described above lead us to the ancient δόρπον or δαίς, or, in the words prevailing later, δείπνον and συμπόσιον. An interesting piece of information about the prehistory of tragedy, before its official establishment, comes from Plutarch, Sol. 29.6:

δέ τὸν περὶ Θέσπιν ήδη τὴν τραγῳδίαν κινεῖν, καὶ διὰ τὴν καινότητα τοῦ πολλοῦ ἄγοντος τοῦ πράγματος, οὐ πρόεις ἀμιλλαν ἐναγώνιον ἐξηγμένον, φύσεις φιλήκοος καὶ φιλομαθὴς ὁ Σόλων, ἐτοί μᾶλλον ἐν γῇρᾳ σχολῇ καὶ παιδιᾷ καὶ καθ’ ἄλλους καὶ μονακιν παραστέμον νεωτός, ἐθεῖτο τὸν Θέσπιν αὐτὸν ὑποκρινόμενον (TrGF2 1 [Thespis] T 17), ὡσπερ ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς. μετὰ δὲ τὴν θέαν προσαγορεύσας αὐτὸν ἠρώτησεν, εἰ τοσοῦτον ἐναντίον οὐκ αἰσχύνεται τηλικαῦτα ψευδόμενος. φήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Θέσπιδος μὴ δεινὸν εἶναι τὸ μετὰ παιδιᾶς λέγειν τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ πράσσειν, σφόδρα

8. G. M. Sifakis’ valuable comments, by specifying particular songs and dances of several regions in Greece where my remarks were not or were occasionally applicable, helped me to tone down some of my initial over-confident assertions. I would also like to thank my colleague Chrysoula Hatzitaki-Kapsomenou for her decisive advice in the area of Modern Greek folk songs.
ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΙΑ – ΚΩΜΩΙΔΙΑ

τῇ βακτηρίᾳ τὴν γῆν ὁ Σόλων πατάξας ‘ταχὺ μὲντοι τὴν παιδιάν’ ἔφη ‘ταύτὴν ἐπαινοῦντες οὖν καὶ τιμῶντες εὑρήσομεν ἐν τοῖς σπουδαῖοις’.

No doubt, the account is purely anecdotal. But the important thing is not the truthfulness or the accuracy of what Solon and Thespis are reported to have said or done in the specific occasion, but what the anecdote incidentally bears witness to. Namely, where and in what circumstances τραγῳδοί were expected to perform, before tragic performances were initiated. The circumstances were σχολῇ καὶ παιδιᾷ καὶ [...], τότες καὶ μουσικῇ. This is obviously the context of δείπνων.

Another piece of information is offered by Pollux 4.123 (TrGF² 1 [Thespis] T 16), a statement widely discussed in the debate on the origins of tragedy: ἐλεὸς δ᾽ ἦν τράπεζα ἀρχαία, ἐφ᾽ ἣν πρὸ Θέσπιδος εἷς τις ἀναβὰς τοῖς χορευταῖς ἀπεκρίνετο (Charitonides; ἀπεκρίνατο Poll. codd.). ἐλεὸς is well defined by LSJ as ‘kitchen table, dresser’, but better described in Il. 9.215, where, in the meal prepared for the Achaeans, who beseeched Achilles to abandon his wrath, the hero shares out the barbecued pieces of meat that were scattered εἰν ἐλεόσιν; and similarly in Od. 14.432 the swineherds put the barbecued joints εἰν ἐλεόσιν, before Eumaeus carved them. In Ar. Eq. 152 and possibly elsewhere too (Poll. 6.90 παρὰ τοῖς πάλαι), the translation is merely τράπεζα, and in the Homeric passages, where the plural makes the literal meaning ‘chopping-blocks’ difficult (one is enough even in modern large butcher shops), the question seems to be about ordinary tables. A similar statement occurs in Orion θ 72.8 St. (cf. Et. Gen., EM 458.30) θυμέλη· παρὰ τὸ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς τίθεσθαί τὰ θυόμενα ἱερεῖα. τράπεζα δὲ ἦν πρὸ τοῦ τοῦτος, ἐφ᾽ ἣς ἐστώτες ἐν τοῖς ἄγροις ἦδον, μὴ τὰξιν λαβοῦσας τῆς τραγῳδίας (cf. TrGF² 3 [Phrynichus] F 23). The etymologist is interested in the origin of θυμέλη and in the way it came to be used in the theatre, but incidentally offers useful information about the origin of tragedy before it was regularly established. Combining the accounts given by Pollux and Orion we conclude that in the course of a meal, after the portions shared out had been consumed and the tables cleaned, the participants used to sing in unison (we need not imagine a formal chorus), while one of them standing on a table, apparently the free table on which the meat had been carved, sang in response to the other singers. The occasion might be just any unofficial feast or a private sacrifice, the usual opportunity for common people to entertain themselves. The events must have taken place mostly out of doors, as both Homeric passages indicate, while the θυμέλη was placed ἐν τοῖς ἄγροις. The two statements,
apart from adding valuable details to our knowledge about the prehistory of tragedy, may also help in detecting the etymology of τραγῳδία. For the time being, we may observe that no he-goats are expressly involved, whether as sacrificial victims or as prizes or as ritual masquerade, but only a group of singing companions at table, during or rather after the meal.

More specifically, it was not the first part of the dinner, the main course, that was fit for such presentations, but the second course, when fruits, dessert, and wine were served, and the diners were in such a state of mind that facilitated and encouraged more spiritual activities, such as debate, repartee, singing. The famous descriptions of dinners, e.g. Plato’s and Xenophon’s Συμπόσιον, Plutarch’s Συμποσιακὰ Προβλήματα and Συμπόσιον τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν, Lucian’s Συμπόσιον ἢ Λατιθάι, Athenaeus’ Δειπνοσοφισταί, may possibly misdirect us, as they refer to memorable dinners, real or fictional, occasionally combined with θεάματα καὶ ἀκροάματα, buffoonery, acrobatics, juggling, dancing, flute and lyre playing, singing, although mainly with debates on highly sophisticated subjects. We are not so much interested in such advanced shows as in their rudiments. How did simple, unpretentious Greeks use to entertain themselves in the second course of their dinners, during the early sixth century BCE or still earlier, when apparently the term τραγῳδός was established? Plutarch’s anecdote about Solon suggests music and acting. Numerous references already since Homer indicate song and dance: E.g., Od. 1.152

μολπῆ τ’ ὀρχηστός τε· τὰ γάρ τ’ ἀναθήματα (‘delights’) δαιτός.

As regards the themes of the songs sung by the ἀοιδός, in the same passage and in the context of the same dinner, it is said: Od. 1.337-8

Φήμιε, πολλὰ γὰρ ἄλλα βροτῶν θελκτήρια οἶδας, ἐγ’ ἄνθρωπον τε θεῶν τε, τὰ τε κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί, sacred, that is, and heroic themes. Lastly, regarding how traditional or novel these songs were, it is also said in the same passage: Od. 1.351-2

τὴν γὰρ ἀοιδήν μᾶλλον ἐπικλείουσ’ ἀνθρώποι, ἢ τις ἀκουόντεσσι νεωτάτη ἀμφιπέληται.

Anyhow, there is no question for the time being whether the songs mentioned are epic or melic, whether they are composed, that is, in dactylic hexameters or in lyric metres, a distinction that would have differentiated the mode of performance. What we are investigating for the time being is the
origin of the term τραγῳδός, not the origins of tragedy. In the epic, the singer at the dinner, is named simply ἄοιδός, not τραγῳδός; neither is there any κωμῳδός mentioned. Obviously, the naming of both is later.

It is not clearly perceptible why Plato repeatedly names Homer 'tragedian' and his poetry 'tragedy': *Theaet.* 152e τῶν ποιητῶν οἱ ἄκροι τῆς ποιήσεως ἐκατέρως, κωμῳδίας μὲν Ἐπίχαρμος, τραγῳδίας δὲ Ὅμηρος; *Rep.* 595c έστω μὲν γὰρ τῶν καλῶν ἀπάντων τούτων τῶν τραγικῶν πρῶτος διδάσκαλός τε καὶ ἠγεμόνις γενέσθαι (sc. Ὅμηρος); *Rep.* 598d μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπισκεπτόν τὴν τε τραγῳδίαν καὶ τὸν ἠγεμόνα αὐτῆς Ὅμηρον; *Rep.* 605c ἀκροόμενου Ὀμῆρον ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν τραγῳδοσυντών; *Rep.* 607a Ὅμηρον ποιητικῶστατον εἶναι καὶ πρῶτον τῶν τραγῳδοσυντῶν. In all these passages, Plato seems to speak literally, never figuratively. He does not even speak of an earlier form of the tragic art, but explicitly of Homer as ‘the first tragedian’. He certainly does not refer to style similarities between the two genres, whether ‘epic’ narrative in tragedy or ‘dramatic’ scenes in the epic, a question he discusses in *Rep.* 394c ff. In any case, it is clear that he takes τραγῳδία for ‘serious poetry’, τραγῳδοσυντός for ‘poet of serious poetry’, and, accordingly, τραγῳδός for ‘singer of serious songs’. Does then Plato observe some older, perhaps unknown to us, teachings on the generic classification of poetry, that divide simply into the fundamental categories of amusing and serious poetry? Aristotle, who leads the discussion into greater depth, explores in chapters 3 and 4 of the *Poetics* the element of mimesis, and, investigating the remote origins of comedy and tragedy, ends up *(Po.* 1449a 2) in iambic and epic poetry: παραφανείσης δὲ τῆς τραγῳδίας καὶ κωμῳδίας οἱ ἄοιδοι ἐκατέρων τὴν ποίησιν ὅρμωντες κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν οἱ μὲν ἀντὶ τῶν ἰάμβων κωμῳδοσυντῶν ἐγένοντο, οἱ δὲ ἀντὶ τῶν ἐπῶν τραγῳδοδιδάσκαλοι, διὰ τὸ μείζω καὶ ἐντιμότερα τὰ σχήματα εἶναι ταύτα ἐκείνων. Before that, however, he follows a distinction between ‘serious, τὰ σπουδαῖα’ and ‘amusing, τὸ γελοῖον’, naming Homer as the precursor of both, in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of tragedy, in *Margites* of comedy: 1448b 34 ὄσπερ δὲ καὶ τὰ σπουδαῖα μάλιστα ποιητής Ὅμηρος ἦν (μόνος γὰρ σοὶ ὅτι ἐν ἅλλα καὶ μιμήσεις δραματικᾶς ἐποίησεν), οὕτως καὶ τὸ τῆς κωμῳδιάς σχῆμα πρῶτος ἐπέδειξεν, οὐ γάρ γον ἅλλα τὸ γελοῖον δραματοσυντῆς.

The ancestors of the tragedians and the comedians Aristotle speaks about are easily recognizable, but if we try to trace such ancestors whether previous to Homer and Archilochus or rather in the domain of folk production, things are not as easy, not only for lack of palpable evidence but also because the distinction of genres and subgenres is unclear. For instance, Xenocritus, the seventh century poet from Epizephyrian Locri, according to Pseudo-Plutarch, *De musica,* 1134e, ἀμφισβητεῖται εἰ παιάνων ποιητής γέγονεν ἡρωϊκῶν
What is most interesting in the account is that the themes of Xenocritus’ genre ‘involved action’ (this is also the meaning in Aristotle of Homer’s μιμήσεις δραματικὰς ἐποίησεν and δραματοποιήσας), and that a heroic — and sacred, I presume — song involving action was called ‘dithyramb’. As we have already seen, it is not easy to classify songs in a strict way, traditional and folk songs especially. Such is, for instance, the case with religious or hymnic songs, which undeniably formed an important portion of what we called ‘serious’ songs (ἔργα ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε).

At any rate, the general impression is that, with the exception of τράγος, no other Greek word can function as first component of τραγῳδός. τριγῳδία, though widely discussed, is obviously a comic coinage for κωμῳδία (Ar. Ach. 499 f.) playing on τραγῳδία, and cannot serve as etymology of any one of the dramatic genres, on the one hand because the Dionysiac contests do not seem to be associated with vintage (τρύγη) or new wine (τρύξ), and on the other because the phonetic change (υ > α) is unaccountable. Still more fanciful, from every point of view, is the derivation from τετράγωνον, because of the supposedly square formation of the choruses.9

9. The Scholia to Dionysius Thrax, GG I 3.18, add τραχῳδία, ἡ τραχεῖα ᾠδή· τραχύ-τερον γάρ καὶ φευκτέον καὶ δύσβατον τὸ τῶν θρήνων εἴδος τοῦ γελωτοποιεῖν. From the numerous modern derivations, I single out J. E. Harrison’s etymology (Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, 1903, 421-6) from τράγος = ‘spelt’, because a beer-like drink was produced from the fermentation of spelt, τραγῳδοί then meaning something like ‘beer singers’ or, as Harrison renders it, ‘beanfeast-singers’; V. Pisani’s (Paideia 8, 1953, 197-8) from the Illyrian root *trgo = ‘market, marketplace’, τραγῳδοί then meaning ‘chorus of the market, i.e. of the city’ in contrast to κωμῳδοί from κώμη = ‘chorus of the village, i.e. of peasantry’; H. Kronasser’s (Kratylos 7, 1962, 162) from I.-E. *trg- = ‘stave, baton’, compared with θύρσος, τραγῳδοί then meaning the bearers of staves, like the rhapsodes; O. Szemerényi’s (‘The Origins of Roman Drama and Greek Tragedy’, Hermes 103, 1975, 300-332) from Hitt. tarkwanti-, participle of tarkwai(ı) = ‘dance’, τραγῳδοῖ then meaning ‘dancers’ and the folk-etymology including both τράγος and -ωιδοῖ; J. J. Winkler’s (‘The Ephebes’ Song: Tragōidía and Polis’, Representations 11, 1985, 26-62) from τράγος = ‘the age when change of voice and other signs of puberty appear’ and τραγίζω, τραγάω = ‘(of boys’ voices)
The only other Greek word that I know to have a root with similar phonetic features is the verb τρώγω, with weak grade stem τρᾰγ- (aor. 2 ἐτράγον). But τρώγω means ‘gnaw, crunch, munch, nibble’, is used especially of herbivorous animals (τράγος also derives from the same root), and it would be odd if τραγῳδός designated the singer who gnaws, crunches, munches or nibbles with his song. And none of these notions seems, at first sight, to be parallel, complementary, or opposite to κῶμος as first component of the twin term κωμῳδός.

However, only at first sight. Because τρώγω is the verb typically used of diners and their snacks in the second part of the dinner, which is exactly what we concern ourselves with in the present discussion. During the first and main part of the dinner, the guests ἔδον or Att. ἤσθιον, but, when they finished eating and wiped their hands, they passed to the second course, in which they used πίνειν and τρόγειν. What was served to accompany the drinking, is extensively discussed in Athenaeus, especially at 14.640 ff.: dried figs, walnuts, chestnuts, almonds, chickpeas, Egyptian beans, ἰτρία (cakes made of sesame seeds and honey), μελίπηκτα (honey-cakes). Pl. Rep. 372c adds myrtle berries and acorns. They were collectively named τραγήματα. Aristotle, fr. 675 Gigon (104 Rose; cf. also frs. 674, 1017 Gigon), from the lost treatise Περὶ μέθης, elucidates the matter better (Athen. 14.641d):

Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν τῷ Περὶ μέθης παραπλησίως ἡμῖν δευτέρας τραπέζας παραιτεύει ἵπτλημα παραθετήται τῷ τράγημα εἰς ὁπότεν τόν Ἐλληναν, ἐπεὶ ὅποις ἐπιδορπισμόν ἐστι τὰ τράγημα παρατίθεται, ὅποις γὰρ τὰ τραγήματα παρατίθεται. ὡς τὸν πάντων τῷ τράγημα ἐπιδορπισμόν τὸν πρώτον ἐπιδορπισμόν τὸν ἐπιδορπισμὸν τὸν τραγηματισμόν τὸν τραγηματισμόν τὸν τραγηματισμόν τὸν τραγηματισμόν τὸν τραγηματισμόν τὸν τραγηματισμόν τὸν τραγηματισμόν τὸν τραγηματισμόν τὸν τραγηματισμόν τὸν τραγηματισμόν.10

The etymological relation of τραγάλιον to τρώγειν is more transparent than that of the much commoner τράγημα, and this is why Aristotle accounts for its use by calling it a traditional word among the Greeks. τοῦτο γὰρ

break, grow rough and hoarse’ (LSJ), τραγῳδοί then meaning ‘chorus of adolescents’.

πάτριον τοῦνομα τοῖς Ἕλλησιν is obviously parenthetic, elucidating the previous word τρογαλίον. Write: ὅσον ἔδεσμα τρωγαλίου (τοῦτο γὰρ πάτριον τοῦνομα τοῖς Ἕλλησιν), ἐπεί κτλ. The text transmitted next (ἐπεὶ ἐν τραγήματι τὰ βρώματα παρατίθενται) is not clear. τὰ βρώματα cannot be used in the broad sense ‘whatever is consumed’, since in the previous sentence it is used as the term opposed to τραγήματα. Kaibel bracketing out the clearly corrupt τὰ βρώματα does not help. The drastic emendation published by Gigon gives a smoothing out sense (ἐπεὶ ἐπὶ βρώματα τὰ τραγήματα παρατίθενται), but the causal clause does not explain the statements preceding. I propose ἐπεὶ ἐν τραγήματι τὰ τρωγάλια παρατίθενται, ‘because in the course of τραγήματα Greeks use to serve the τρωγάλια’. ΤΡΩΓΑΛΙΑ might easily be corrupted into ΒΡΩΜΑΤΑ, the term mentioned right before, in Aristotle’s argument. So, the entire first course is named βρώματα, the second course τραγήματα (ἐπεὶ ἐν τραγήμασι τὰ τρωγάλια παρατίθενται). The items served in the first course of a δείπνον, i.e. in the βρώματα, are called ἐδέσματα — the regular verb is ἔσθιεν —, those served in the second, i.e. in the τραγήματα, are called τρωγάλια — the regular verb is τρώγειν. The second course is also called δευτέρα τράπεζα or δεύτεραι τράπεζαι. As for τραγηματισμός, just like ἐπιδορπισμός, it is Aristotle’s attempt to form an abstract term from ἐπιδορπισμάτα; cf. Poll. 6.79 τὰ δ᾽ ἐπιδορπισμάτα Ἀριστοφάνης (PCG fr. 819) μὲν ἐπιφορήματα καλεῖ, ὡστε εἶναι ἃ καὶ τὸ ἐπιδορπισμόν. ἧν δὲ τρωγάλια, κάρυα, μυρτίδες, μέσπιλα, ἃ καὶ ὅσα καλεῖται; Hsch. ε 5390 ἐπιφορήματα· τραγήματα μετὰ τὸ δείπνον. I doubt that the reading of Athenaeus’ Epitome (τραγισμός), though tempting, might be adopted. I would then publish the whole Aristotle fragment as follows:

τὸ μὲν οὖν ὅλον διαφέρειν τράγημα βρώματος νομιστέον ὅσον ἔδεσμα τρωγαλίου (τοῦτο γὰρ πάτριον τοῦνομα τοῖς Ἕλλησιν), ἐπεί ἐν τραγήμασι τὰ τρωγάλια παρατίθενται, διόπερ οὐ κακῶς έοικεν εἰπεῖν ὁ πρῶτος δευτέρας τράπεζας. Ὅντως γὰρ ἐπιδορπισμός τις ὅ τραγηματισμός ἤστι, καὶ δείπνον ἐτερὴν παρατίθεται τραγήματα.

τραγήματα are also connected with wine-drinking, obviously the most Dionysiac of the δείπνον activities. Apart from the numerous fragments of...

11. The word survived, through the intermediate of τραγάλιον (Theognost. Can. 125), only with narrowed sense, in Mod. Gr. στραγάλια, ‘roasted chickpeas’, folk-etymologically modified from ἀστράγαλος. στραγάλια are, even today in Greek traditional communities, a usual titbit served in cafés and tavernas for accompanying drinking, especially of distilled beverages (ouzo, tsipouro).
comedy quoted in Athenaeus, we should notice not only that Aristotle’s fragment comes from *Περὶ μὲθης*, but also Arist. *Probl.* 930b 12, διὰ τί τὰ τραγήματα ἐδεστέον; ἢ ἔνεκα τοῦ πιεῖν ἱκανόν; οὔ γὰρ μόνον ποτέον τῆς δίψης χάων τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς σιτίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ τὸ σιτίον; and Gal. 6.550, ὅρομάξω δὲ δηλονότι τραγήματα τὰ παρὰ τὸ δεῖπνον ἑσθιόμενα τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ πίνειν ἠδονῆς ἔνεκα. Other terms used for ‘second course’ is ἐπιφορήματα or ἐπιτραπεζώματα or ἐπιδορπίσματα or ἐπιδείπνια or dialectally ἐπάϊκλα / ἐπαΐκλεια or verbal forms like ἐπιδορπίζεσθαι, ἐπιδειπνεῖν, and ἐπιφορεῖσθαι. It is interesting, however, that Athenaeus mentions the ἐπι- compounds as synonyms of a basic headword, supposedly not needing any clarification: 14.640f καὶ ἐπιδορπίσασθαι δ᾽ ἐλεγον τὸ ἐντραγεῖν καὶ ἐπιδειπνῆσαι, which must be translated with mild hyperbaton ‘they used to employ for ἐντραγεῖν the verbs ἐπιδορπίσασθαι and ἐπιδειπνῆσαι’. Now, as pointed out in LSJ, ἐντραγεῖν, though properly the aorist 2 of ἐντρῶγο, is regularly used as aorist 2 of τρῶ- γω, in the sense ‘to eat dessert’.

Let us then return to our etymology. A typical δείπνον (first and second course) could end up in two different ways. If the band consisted of young men heavily drunk, the sequel might be boisterous, involving merry singing and brisk dancing often out in the streets. The event is called κώμος, and the singer singing ἐπὶ τῷ κώμῳ is called κωμῳδός. If the group, usually consisting of grown-ups, stayed at the table after the second course (the τραγήματα) was served, and continued restrainedly drinking and eating finger-food and dessert, solemnly singing and, occasionally, slowly dancing, there was no distinct event to need a special name other than the second course itself. Thus, the singer singing ἐπὶ τῷ (ἐν)τραγεῖν or ἐπὶ τῷ τραγήματι/τοῖς τραγήμασι might well be called τραγῳδός. The two correspond to the basic modern distinction of folk songs referred to above: dance songs (Mod. Gr. τραγούδια τοῦ χοροῦ) and table songs (Mod. Gr. τραγούδια τῆς τάβλας).

‘Table songs’ remind also of the terms τράπεζα and δευτέρα τράπεζα for ‘meal’ and ‘dessert’, but the similarity proves nothing, since singing during or after the meal was never doubted, in antiquity or today.

A similar etymology was proposed in an endnote of a book on tragedy, remaining there enshrouded for more than half a century. I mean the book of Carlo Del Grande, *ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΙΑ*, which was first published in 1952, and

---

12. It is an ironic turn of literary history that the Medieval and Modern Greek τραγούδω, derived from τραγῳδῶ, ‘act a tragedy, tell or sing in tragic tone’, means simply ‘sing’, thus returning to its original semantic roots. From τραγῳδῶ derives τραγούδι(ν), ‘song’. I do not dare attempt, depending on the investigation made in the present article, to overturn the accepted derivation and propound τραγῳδέω in the sense ‘sing’ as original.
appeared in second edition (Milan and Naples) in 1962. The note is found on pages 356–8 of the second edition and consists of three paragraphs included in a long addendum placed within brackets.\textsuperscript{13} To be sure, the only common element in Del Grande’s etymology and the one proposed here is the lexical root of the proposed etymon (\textit{τραγεῖν}), but the social and literary interpretation of the proposals is entirely different. Del Grande does not refer to \textit{kώμος} or to comedy, neither to the procedure of the \textit{δεῖπνον}. He assumes that the origins of tragedy are found in Dionysiac ceremonies, in which the worshippers sang in choir the god’s passions, while munching and crunching dried fruit, nuts, and sweets, which they bought from itinerant vendors, much like what happens nowadays in village religious fairs. Evidently, this is not a plausible reason for naming the choristers of a religious ceremony \textit{τραγῳδοί}, something the Italian scholar realized, and therefore opened the discussion by stating about the etymology ‘non la pongo, ma dubitosamente la espongo qui’, and closed his argumentation by declaring that all this was said ‘a titolo di curiosità’.

Yet, there seems to exist a parallel to \textit{τραγῳδός}, which possibly invalidates the proposals made above. It is the term \textit{ἀρνῳδός}, which denotes the singer who competes for the prize of a lamb. The only reference to the term to be found in Greek literature comes from Schol. Pind. \textit{N}. 2.1 (all other references stem either directly from the Scholia or from the same source: Eust. 6.25, \textit{EM} 146.55, Hsch. \textit{a} 7355, Phot. s.v. \textit{δαρῳδοί}): [\textit{Ὅθεν περ καὶ Ꭼμηρίδαι} οί δὲ (φασίν) ὅτι κατὰ μέρη πρότερον τῆς ποιήσεως διαδιδομένης, τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν ἕκαστος ὅ τι βούλοιτο μέρος ᾖδε· τοῦ δὲ ἄθλου τοῖς νικῶσιν ἄρνος ἀποδειγμένου, προσαγωγεῖται τότε μὲν ἄρνῳδους, αὕτως δὲ ἐκατέρως τῆς ποιήσεως εἰσενεχθείσης, τοὺς ἀγωνιστὰς οἷον ἄκουμένους πρὸς ἅλληλα τὰ μέρη καὶ τὴν σύμπασαν ποιῆσιν ἐπιώντας ἀρνωδοὺς προσαγωγεῖται. ταῦτά φησι Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀργεῖος (FGrHist 308 F 2). I do not know what historical validity may be assigned to the account of the otherwise unknown Dionysius of Argos. Jacoby dates him entirely speculatively in the fourth or third century BCE, and is not even certain that he is a local historian and not a grammarian. The only other fragment of his (F 1) dates the fall of Troy on the twelfth of Thargelion, in the eighteenth year of Agamemnon’s reign or the first year of Demophon’s reign in Athens. Welcker\textsuperscript{14} attempted an emendation of \textit{ἀρνῳδός}, but Burkert (note 3) 93 n. 13, vindicated the truth

\textsuperscript{13} In his first edition (\textit{non vidi}) he claimed that \textit{τράγος} must be a mournful ritual song like \textit{λίνος}, only homophonous with \textit{τράγος}, ‘goat’.

\textsuperscript{14} (Note 5 above) 241 n. 179; and later, \textit{Der epische Cycclus}, vol. I, ²1865, 338, 379.
of the account by referring to the Lex sacra of Coresos in Ceos (IG xii. 5, 647; early third century BCE) where it is stated (35-36) that the rhapsode is assigned κρεῶν μερίδα. The Lex sacra mentions, however, a public sacrifice followed by an also public ἔστίσσεις, where a portion of meat from the sacrifice is offered to all tax-paying citizens, metics, and freedmen. It also mentions athletic games on the same occasion, in which the boys winning in archery and javelin throw were assigned a prize of κρεῶν μερίς. Finally, a κρεῶν μερίς was offered to the rhapsode, who apparently was not needed to be a citizen of Coresos. The rhapsode participates in the feast, but not in the games, and the κρεῶν μερίς is offered not as prize but as payment, possibly a bonus, for his participation. I very much doubt that the account of the distribution of a piece of meat to all the citizens of a town and some more might be taken as parallel for the naming of a single winner in a contest.

A similar custom is, however, described by Philochorus (FGrHist 328 F 216). At their meals, the Spartans used to sing pieces of Tyrtaeus by turns (Athen. 14.630e-f): Φιλόχορος δέ φησιν κρατήσαντα Λακεδαιμονίων Μεσσηνίων διὰ τὴν Τυρταίου στρατηγίαν ἐν ταῖς στρατείαις έθος ποιήσασθαι, ἀν δευτεροποιήσωσιν καὶ παιωνίσωσιν, ἂδειν καθ ἐν μάλιστα τὸν πολέμαρχον καὶ ἄθλον διδόναι τῷ νικῶντι κρέας. The Spartan έθος is no doubt closer to the custom mentioned by Dionysius, since it mentions a winner and a prize, but even this is placed in the frame of a communal meal, and not a rhapsodic contest.

As for ἄρνῳδός, it is, in all likelihood, a term coined secondarily as parallel to τραγῳδός. If, for some reason or other, it was easier for the community officials to be provided with sheep rather than goats in the rhapsodic contests, the contestants would naturally (and somehow playfully) be named ἄρνῳδοι. Needless to say, such a coinage or joke must have taken place after the prevalent in antiquity etymology of τραγῳδός from the he-goat prize had been established. The satyr = he-goat etymology cannot be applied, unless we posit a satyr = sheep etymology too. On the other hand, it is possible that the term might have or be thought to have as its first component ἄρνυμαι = ‘win, gain, esp. of honour or reward, [...] often with additional idea of striving’ (LSJ), so that the compound might refer to the competing singers, as mentioned twice in Dionysius’ fragment (τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν ἔκαστος – τοὺς ἀγωνιστὰς οὖν ἀκουμένους). In other words, ἄρνῳδοι would be the singers who competed for a prize. Cf. Il. 22.160 ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἱερήϊον οὐδὲ βοείν | ἀγωνιζόμενον ἀρνύσθην (imperfect, third person dual), ἄ τε ποσσὶν ἀεθλιά γίγνεται ἀνδρῶν, | ἀγῶνως ἐσπούδαζον λαβεῖν. Also, Hsch. a 7350 ἄρνυθεν· ἦγονιζοντο,
ἐνήργουν, where, most probably, the lemma was originally the Homeric verse’s ἄνυσθην, but was altered, under the influence of the plural interpretation, into third person plural passive of a non-attested aorist form, by a grammarian who did not recognize the dual imperfect form. The fact that the nasal consonant of the -νυ- suffix is retained in the derivative attests to the late date of its formation, as is the case with the late compounds μισθαρνέω and μίσθαρνος.

I tried above to reject pragmatically some of the variations of the he-goat prize etymology (τραγῳδοί = ‘singers on occasion of the sacrifice of a he-goat’ or ‘singers on occasion of the awarding of a he-goat to be sacrificed’). Linguistically, the verdict was harsher. O. Szemerényi noted that ‘there are insurmountable obstacles in the way of interpreting τραγῳδοί as “those who sing for a goat as a prize” or “those who sing at the sacrifice of a goat”. In neither case would the linguistic pattern, here the case-relationship of the two members, be able to suggest the sort of connection demanded by the drama expert.’

The second etymology, depending on the satyr = he-goat theory, formerly widely followed, seems to yield nowadays to the he-goat prize theory. Given that the image of the satyr is illustrated in a countless number of artworks, it cannot be accidental that the follower of Dionysus practically always appears, at least before the Hellenistic period, with horse tail and ears, unlike Pan (or the Roman Faunus), who is really depicted as he-goat. Further, linguistically, it is anomalous to have a determinative compound where the second part modifies or determines the first (τράγος ᾄδων); the opposite would be normal. A copulative compound (τράγος and ἀοιδός, like ἱατρόμαντις) would be curious and formed not only unlike κωμῳδός, but unlike all -ωδός compounds. A comparative compound (ὡς τράγος ᾄδων) would hardly describe the image required.

The indirect association of satyrs with he-goats that appears two or three times in satyr-plays has been widely exploited as evidence of this etymology. Basis for the argument has been the verse τράγος γένειον ἀρα πενθήσεις σύ γε, plausibly ascribed to Aeschylus’ Προμηθεὺς πυρκαεύς (TrGF III Aesch. fr. **207). The words, spoken by Prometheus, are addressed to a Satyr, who is ready to embrace and kiss the fire, the new gift of the Titan to mankind. τράγος was interpreted as a nominative for vocative, already by Epiphanius (4th cent. CE) and Eustathius. It has been, however, cogently shown that it is no more than a comparative remark, typically made with

15. Above note 9, p. 323.
16. Burkert’s account (note 3) 89-91 is clear, logical, and convincing.
reference to animals, often with an allusion to an animal myth or proverb: P. Shorey\textsuperscript{17} and R. Kassel,\textsuperscript{18} who provided numerous parallels from animal fables. Here, no animal fable has survived, and the poet may simply trade on the proverbial natural curiosity of goats. I copy from Wikipedia (art. Goat): ‘Goats have an intensely inquisitive and intelligent nature: they will explore anything new or unfamiliar in their surroundings. They do so primarily with their prehensile upper lip and tongue. This is why they investigate items such as buttons, camera cases or clothing (and many other things besides) by nibbling at them, occasionally even eating them.’ The Satyr behaves similarly at the sight of fire, an item new and unfamiliar to him, and by embracing and kissing the flame, runs the risk of burning himself ‘just like a goat’ or ‘just like the goat in the story, who burnt its beard’.\textsuperscript{19} The he-goat appears also in Soph. \textit{Ichn.} (TrGF IV, fr. 314) 366–7 ἀ[λλ’] αἰὲν ἐὰν σὺ παῖς· νέος γὰρ ὢν ἀνήρ | π[όγ] ὡς τράγος κνήκωι χλιδᾶις. The sense is not fully clear, but ὡς τράγος is obviously used comparatively, and one who prides himself like a τράγος is not a τράγος. Also, Eur. \textit{Cycl.} 78–80 ἐγὼ δ’ ὃ σὸς πρόσολος | Κύκλωσι θητεύω | τῶι μονοδέρκται δοῦλος ἀλαίνω | σὺν τᾶιδε τράγον χλαίναι μελέαι, must refer complainingly to the shepherds’ goat-skin the Satyrs were forced to wear instead of the proper fawn or leopard skin of Bacchus’ companions: Seaford ad loc. Be that as it may, these references, though not equating satyrs with he-goats, given that the etymology existed in antiquity, may perhaps latently allude to it.

In any case, though it is claimed that both etymologies are wrong, it cannot be denied that they existed already in antiquity. The only way out is, of course, resorting to folk-etymology, which, in my view, was effectuated quite early. And, as is usual with numerous religious aitia, the he-goat passed into various manifestations of the Dionysus ritual, when the serious singing activity was included in the Dionysiac festivals. Thus, I fully agree with the proposals regarding both the relation of tragedy with sacrificial ritual and the relation of the goat with Dionysus. I only believe that this relation is temporally secondary and that the primary formation of the twin terms κωμῳδός and τραγῳδός must be located in the singing and dancing manifestations of folklife.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17} ‘Aeschylus fr. 207 and the Satyr Chorus’, \textit{CPh} 4 (1909) 433–436.
\textsuperscript{19} The motif of Stith Thompson, \textit{Motif-Index of Folk-Literature}, 4, Copenhagen 1957, 60 (J 834), to which Radt refers in the apparatus of fr. 207, is an edifying commonplace that has nothing to do with goats. Much closer seems to be the English proverb ‘Curiosity killed the cat’.
\textsuperscript{20} Later is also, I believe, the extension of the etymology to τίτυρος, the satyr’s equivalent.
THE EVIDENCE – THE MARMOR PARIUM – EARLY DATES

The first reference to the practice is mentioned in Eusebius’ Chronicle: in the Latin translation of Jerome (Ol. 47.2, 100b4 Helm): *his temporibus certantibus in agone tragus id est hircus in praemiis dabatur, unde aiunt tragoedos nuncupatos;* and in Georgius Synclerus’ Greek (286.11 Moss-hammer): *τοῖς ἀγωνιζομένοις παρ’ Ἕλλησι τράγος ἐδίδοτο, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ τραγικοὶ ἐκλήθησαν.* I do not know which noun is implied in τραγικοί, whether ἀγωνισταί or χοροί, or whether Jerome’s *tragoedos* is more authentic than Synclerus’ *τραγικοί.* The date (591 BCE) need not be rejected. If we limit ourselves to Athenian events, we see that the date falls within Solon’s career. It may then well refer to Arion’s activity in Corinth (thus, e.g., Snell in *TrGF* vol. 1, DID D 3), which was mentioned in Solon’s elegies (*IEG* Solon fr. 30a). In accordance with the distinction we made above, the contestants mentioned by Eusebius must be singers of serious choral songs (τραγῳδοί), possibly dithyrambs, paeanos, prosodia, and other odes with sacred or heroic themes. The involvement of Solon in Thespis’ activities (Plut. *Sol.* 29.6-7, the anecdote mentioned above; Diog. Laert. 1.59), if true, must have taken place at a later date.

591 BCE falls, however, also within the rule of Cleisthenes, the tyrant of Sicyon. And Eusebius, significantly, speaks of Greeks, not specifically of Athenians. Hdt. 5.67 is elucidative: τά τε δὴ ἄλλα οἱ Σικυώνιοι ἐτίμων τὸν Ἀδρήστον καὶ δὴ πρὸς τὰ πάθεα αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖς χοροῖς ἐγέραιρον, τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον οὐ τιμῶντες, τὸν δὲ Ἀδρήστον. Κλεισθένης δὲ χοροὺς μὲν τῷ Διονύσῳ ἀπέδωκε, τὴν δὲ άλλην θυσίαν Μελανίππῳ. It is evident that τραγικοὶ χοροί (which possibly reinforces Synclerus’ *τραγικοί*) have nothing to do with tragedy, but only with choral songs sung in honour of gods and/or heroes. Thus, the reference to Epigenes of Sicyon in the Thespis article of *Suda* as Thespis’ predecessor, mentioning him either as first τραγῳδιοποιός or as first τραγικός, but also Themist. *or.* 27.337b καὶ τραγῳδίας εὑρεται μὲν Σικυώνιοι, τελεσιουργοί δὲ Άττικοί ποιηταί and the article οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον of Photius and *Suda* that mentions Epigenes as having composed a tragedy about Dionysus yet irrelevant to the god (i.e., without the customary revelry) must have mistaken a poet who competed with ‘tragic’ choral songs *eīs θεοὺς* for a tragedian.

We may then surmise that, whereas the ‘tragic’ choruses to Adrastus were serious (πάθεα), the ones to Dionysus prior to Epigenes were cheerful and phallic/satyric, as witnessed by the Photius and Suda article: τὸ πρόσθεν εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον γράφοντες τούτοις ἡγονύζοντο, ἀπερ καὶ σατυρικὰ ἐλέγετο. So, we might well distinguish between ‘tragic’ choruses and komoi. The choruses to Dionysus are not qualified as ‘tragic’ by Herodotus, while ‘the rest of the festival’ (τὴν δὲ ἄλλην θυσίην) was pertinent to Cleisthenes’ anti-Argive policy, since it was dedicated to the Theban hero Melanippus, whose feats against the Argive warlords in the Seven against Thebes war, were famous.

However, θυσίη implies naturally sacrifices. Can this be where the he-goat prize enters into the question? Cleisthenes’ reforms were, of course, not applicable in Periander’s Corinth, but some features could have been common in the neighbouring cities. The piece of information included in Eusebius’ Chronicle may well refer to the first occurrence of the term τραγικός (χορός) in contests, while the mention of the he-goat may be no more than a purely hypothetical interpretation of the chronicler, who was familiar with the later etymology. Because the oldest source, Pindar Ol. 13.18 f., from the 464 BCE epinician ode for Xenophon of Corinth, does not mention he-goats:

\[
\text{ταὶ Διωνύσου πόθεν ἐξέφανεν}
\]
\[
\text{σὺν βοηλάτᾳ χάριτες διθυράμβῳ;}
\]

This is interpreted in the Scholia vetera in the following way: σὺν βοηλάτᾳ: βοηλάτην τὸν διθύραμβον προσαγορεύει, ἢτοι διὰ τὸ βοῦν εἶναι τῷ νικήσαντι ἔπαθλον· ἵνα γὰρ τοῦ Διονύσου· ἢ διὰ τὸ ἔλαϊνεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ βοῆς καὶ λέγεσθαι. Also, in the next item, Χάριτες διθυράμβῳ: οὕτως ἀκουστέον· αἱ τοῦ Διονύσου διθυράμβων ἐν Κορίνθῳ ἐφάνησαν χάριτες, τούτους τὸ σπονδαίτατον τῶν Διονύσου διθυράμβων ἐν Κορίνθῳ πρῶτον ἐφάνην· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ὄραθη ὁ χορός ὁ χοροῦνς· ἠστήσες δὲ αὐτὸν πρῶτος Αρίων ὁ Μῆθυμναῖος, εἶτα Λάσος ὁ Ἐμμονεὺς. The alternative derivation of βοηλάτη from βοή is surely wrong. Burkert, (note 3) 98, discusses the Pindaric verses as a general reference to the Greek custom of awarding a bull as a prize, but does not focus on the context of the origination of dithyrambs in Corinth by Arion. Can Pindar’s verses witness also a dyad of Dionysiac events similar to the ones in Sicyon? Pindar seems to distinguish ταὶ Διωνύσου χάριτες, ‘the delights of Dionysus’, from σὺν βοηλάτᾳ διθυράμβῳ, ‘in addition to the bull driving dithyramb’. The delights of Dionysus may well refer to komos events like the well known ones of the padded dancers that are illustrated on sixth century Corinthian vases or to those mentioned in Suda a 3886, l. Αρίων, (λέγεται) καὶ Σατύρους εἰσενεγκεῖν ἐμμετρα ἔμμετρα λέγοντας. The ‘bull
driving dithyramb’, however, may denote a parallel event: formal choruses singing serious songs of individual poetry (διθύραμβον ... ποιήσαντα) with themes from the Dionysus mythology ([διθ.] ὀνομάσαντα) and participating in a contest ([διθ.] διδάξαντα), to remind the terms used by Herodotus 1.23.

We may then conclude that what Arion instituted in Corinth were τραγικοὶ χοροὶ (Suda loc. cit.: λέγεται καὶ τραγικοῦ τρόπου εὑρετής γενέσθαι καὶ πρώτος χορὸν στῆσαι) who sang his own entitled dithyrambs (διθύραμβον ἃσαι καὶ ὀνομάσαι τὸ ἀδόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ) and danced the circular dances (whence his father’s invented name Κυκλεύς), yet not with a he-goat prize but a bull one. Where does then τραγικός derive from in this case, if not from a root implying serious singing, as proposed above? The folk-etymology must not have been conceived yet.

Naturally, dithyrambs must have been originally folk songs addressed to Dionysus sung by inebriated revellers, members of a komos. This must have been the case with Archilochus fr. IEG 120:

öl Διωνύσου ἄνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος
οἶδα διθύραμβον οἴνωι συγκεραυωθεὶς φρένας.

No doubt the reference is not to Archilochus’ poetic products, but to his involvement in religious social events. I have elsewhere located this fragment together with 121 in the context of the war described in frs. 93a and 94 as Archilochus’ proud answers to a Parian/Thasian archon’s (most likely Amphitimus’) insulting mockeries against Archilochus’ poetic and musical engagement.22 The μέλος that Archilochus prides himself he knows how to lead when his wits are thunder-stricken with wine must be no more than a panhellenic folk song to Dionysus sung by a carousing party.23 Then, the weight attached to the references to Arion’s invention may have to shift

21. Similar must have been the case with paeans addressed to Apollon, only sung by sober singers ‘in thanksgiving for deliverance from evil’ (LSJ). Paean is witnessed already in the epic (II. 1.472–3 μολπῇ θεόν ἱλάσκοντο | καλὸν ἀείδοντες παιήονα Αχαιῶν) and in Archilochus (fr. IEG 121 αὐτὸς ἐξάρχων πρὸς αὐλὸν Λέσβιον παιήονα).


23. In addition to the Archilochus quotation, we may mention the Lesbian origin of Arion, who may have imported the rudimentary dithyramb from his homeland, and the dithyramb’s alternative places of origin mentioned by Pindar: Schöl. Pind. Ol. 13.18 (Thebes, fr. 71, Naxos, fr. 115).
somehow: Herodotus’ πρῶτον ἄνθρωπον τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν may imply the first eponymous individual poet; Schol. Pind. Ol. 13.26b τὸ σπουδαίότατον τῶν Διονύσου διθυράμβουν ἐν Κορίνθῳ πρῶτον ἐφάνη may imply not the dithyramb as a whole but the most important of its sort.

If, to this choral activity in Corinth and Sicyon, we add the references to Megarian comedy, in combination with the contested origin of Susarion from Megara, we can easily imagine an early sixth century choral activity, with songs both serious and amusing, in the north-east edge of the Doric region (Sicyon, Corinth, Megara) that borders Attica, being therefore likely to influence its religious institutions and customs.

If we recall Aristotle’s assertion that tragedy was formed ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τῶν διθυράμβουν having been adapted ἐκ σατυρικοῦ, not ἐκ σατυρικοῦ δράματος but from an indefinite satyric form (‘satyr-ish performing style’), it is natural to add to these early stages the hyporcheme of Pratinas (PMG 708 = TrGF 4 F 3; from Ath. 14.617) no doubt a quite later sample of the genre. If it is unclear what genre this hyporcheme belongs to, but, given that Aristoxenus (TrGF 4 T 4; fr. 76 Wehrli; from [Plut.] De mus. 31.1142b) mentions Pratinas among the oldest lyric poets and that the satyr chorus addresses Dionysus as (15) θριαμβοδιθύραμβε, it is natural to consider it a dithyramb. Add the διθυραμβοποιός compound words in verses 11-12 ὁλοσιαλοπάλαγον and, of course, θριαμβοδιθύραμβε. Not only does Pratinas mention τὰν ἐμὰν Δώριον χορείαν, but his origin from Doric Phlious, a Peloponnesian town close to Sicyon and Corinth, is

24. I. M. Konstantakos, “"My kids for sale”: The Megarian’s Scene in Aristophanes’ Acharnians (729–835) and Megarian Comedy’, Logeion 4 (2014), 121–166. Admittedly, no choral activity is witnessed among the scarce information provided with regard to Megarian comedy, but I cannot imagine a subgenre named κωμῳδία already in the early 5th century (Ephphantes com. fr. 3) but lacking a κῶμος and an ἀνάλογος.

25. οἴσισιαλοκάλαμον Athenaei AC, ὀλεσια κάλαμον E; editores alii alia; emendavi e Hsch. σ 558 σιαλοπάλλαγος· ὁ παράληπος καὶ ἀνόητος. Wind instruments played outdoors are usually filled with liquefied steam from the players’ blowing. The liquid produced is usually called catachrestically ‘saliva’, and the aulos thus wholly sprinkled may well be ὅλος σιάλῳ πεπαλαγμένος ὁ ὀλοσιαλοπάλλαγος. As for the Hesychius interpretation, it is also a universal concept that connects salivation with nonsense; cf., e.g., Engl. ‘drivel - dribble’, ‘driveller’.

well known. Most likely he performed such dithyrambs there before moving to Athens, and it must be from them that he formulated the dramatic subgenre of the satyr-play, which he introduced into the Attic Dionysia. Apparently, he followed Lasus of Hermione, another Doric town in Argolis of Northeast Peloponnese, who introduced the dithyramb into the programme of the Attic Dionysia during the rule of the Peisistratids. As a matter of fact, being an inventor of satyr-play means no more than adapting Thespis’ invention to the dithyrambic satyr chorus. In the frame of the present investigation, the fully formulated satyr-play concerns us less than its prehistory and the unknown ancestors of Pratinas in this province of Peloponnese. As regards the etymology of κωμῳδία versus τραγῳδία proposed here, it is important to clarify that, in Pratinas’ hyporcheme, the opposition conveyed is not with the official κῶμοι, which might well be equated with Pratinas’ dithyrambic/satyric projects, but with the employment of aulos in the ceremonial dithyrambic performances, which should be distinguished from the everyday revels of drunken youths (8–9 κῶμοι μόνον θυραμάχους τε πυγμαχίαισι νέων θέλοι παροίνων | ἔμεναι στρατηλάτας), where the aulos would be suitable. His personal relation with κῶμος choruses is possibly responsible for Ἐγκώμιος, the alternative name of his father. As for his attempt to banish the aulos, I do not know how successful it has been.

Criticizing Del Grande’s suggestion that τραγῳδός has nothing to do with τράγος, Burkert (note 3), 92 n. 12, remarks: ‘If, however, a goat was sacrificed at the Dionysia in the time of Thespis, it is difficult to believe that the Athenians would keep τραγῳδοί and τράγος apart.’ This would be surely so, but only if we were to accept as correctly published the entry about Thespis in the Marmor Parium, which is dated to epoch 43 of the Chronicle (roughly between 538–528), and also if the event in question, i.e. Thespis’ first performance and the establishment of the he-goat award, took place at the City Dionysia (ἐν ἁγίαστοι). However, the Marmor Parium inscription in the Ashmolean Museum was already since the 17th century, in very bad condition, and it is in still worse today, so that no certain text can be easily established.27 This is how the Marmor Parium text of the Thespis entry runs in one of the

27. On the desperate condition of the fragment of the Marmor Parium at the Ashmolean Museum see W. R. Connor, ‘City Dionysia and Athenian Democracy’, Classica & Mediaevalia 40 (1989) 7-32, esp. 26-27 with n. 6. I recently found out in the Web that The Institute for Digital Archaeology, Oxford and Cambridge, MA, has applied reflectance transformation imaging (RTI) on the Marmor Parium, ‘revealing significant, previously illegible text’. I am eagerly looking forward to the publication of their findings.
commonest versions, the edition of Hiller von Gaertringen (1903) at IG xii. 5, 444 (ep. 43.58b):

\[\text{ἀφ’ οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητής \[ἐπεκρόνα\] το πρώτος, δς \[δο\]α[μα ἐν ἅ]-\]
\[\text{στ[ει, καὶ \[ἐ\]τέθη ὅ [τράγος [ἀθλον], ἐτή \[ΗΗ\]^\(\text{ΔΔ}\)– }, ἄρχοντος \[Ἀθ[ή\]]|[σι] \]
\[
\text{ναῖον τοῦ πρωτέου.}
\]

Another common version, the text published by F. Jacoby, *Das Marmor Parium*, Berlin 1904, p. 14 (and FGrHist 239), only transposes ἀθλον in the gap before ἐτέθη (καὶ ἀθλον ἐτέθη) and specifies the date as \[ΗΗ\]^\(\text{ΔΔ}\)–. The same text was published by Snell in *TrGF*\(^2\) \(^1\)971, \(^2\)986[+Kannicht]) 1, DID D 1 [Marmor Parium] (p. 49), who only dotted some elsewhere invisible letters: δο[μα ἐν ἅ]στει. A few pages later (p. 61), in the Thespis Testimonia 2, δο[μα ἐν ἅ]στει appears unbracketed as a certain reading. These versions depend, however, in the main on the text restored by Boeckh (1843) in *CIG* ii. 2374:

\[\text{ἀφ’ οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητής \[ἐφάνη\], πρῶτος \[δς \[δο\]α[μα ἐν ἅ]στει, καὶ \[ἐ\]τέθη ὅ \[τράγος \[ἀθλον], ἐτή \[ΗΗ\]^\(\text{ΔΔ}\)–, ἄρχοντος \[Ἀθ[ή\]]|[σι] \]
\[
\text{ναῖον τοῦ πρωτέου.}
\]

Several editors have stressed the uncertainty of the reading (e.g. Hiller and Jacoby themselves), though they too end up with Boeckh’s text.

Lately, W. R. Connor reexamined the old editions and provided a more reliable text:\(^{28}\)

\[\text{ἀφ’ οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητής \[ἐπεκρόνα\] το πρώτος, δς \[δο\]α[μα ἐν ἅ]στει, καὶ \[ἐ\]τέθη ὅ \[τράγος \[ἐτή \[ΗΗ\]^\(\text{ΔΔ}\)–, ἄρχοντος \[Ἀθ[ή\]]|[σι] \]
\[
\text{ναῖον τοῦ πρωτέου.}
\]

Even this text was challenged by Scott Scullion, who gave ‘a clearer and slightly more cautious one’:\(^{29}\)

\[\text{ἀφ’ οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητής – c. 5-8 – πρώτος \[δς \[δο\]α\]ν \[δο\]α[μα ἐν ἅ]στει, καὶ \[ἐ\]τέθη ὅ \[τράγος \[ἐτή \[ΗΗ\]^\(\text{ΔΔ}\)–, ἄρχοντος \[Ἀθ[ή\]]|[σι] \]
\[
\text{ναῖον τοῦ πρωτέου.}
\]

\(^{28}\) Note 27 above, p. 32. His Appendix II, ‘The evidence of the Marmor Parium’, 26-32, offers a most illuminating history of the stone’s fortunes and a comprehensive description of the successive after 1628 attempts to restore the Thespis entry of the *Marmor Parium* (ep. 43). My presentation selects in the main from this description venturing to build on it.

The capitalized letters were supplemented by the first editor (Ioannes Selden, Marmor Arundelliana, London 1628) as Ἀλκηστίν.

Significantly, the lacuna between ΑΛ and ΣΤΙΝ is noted with three dots in Selden’s majuscule text, but with two in his minuscule one, where however he publishes with capital initial Ἀλκηστίν, anticipating his final proposal that appears in the Latin translation Alcestin. In 1699, the supplement was censured by Richard Bentley, first because, according to the testimony of the Rev. Dr. John Mill who examined the stone for Bentley, ΑΛ...ΣΤΙΝ could not be seen and the first letter seemed to be Ο rather than Α; second because the Marmor Parium does not mention titles of tragedies in the entries about first victories of the other tragedians; third because, as Suda states, it was Phrynichus who first introduced female characters in tragedy (TrGF² 3 [Phrynichus] T 1); and finally because one should not expect the chronicler to know of any title of a Thespis tragedy, since all titles transmitted belong to late forgeries (TrGF² 1 [Thespis] T 24).

I do not propose to discuss Bentley’s mostly sound arguments. Based, however, on Selden’s note printed in his Errata, that no gap exists between τράγος and ἔτη, I tested, upon the IG drawing made by M. Luebke for Hiller to a great extent hypothetically on the basis of Selden’s text, in order to assess whether ἄθλον could be accommodated or not. Luebke, not taking account of the Errata, reproduced Selden’s erroneous text in his drawing (.ΡΑΓΟΣ.....Χ...ΕΤΗΗΗ). By shifting the whole phrase καὶ ἔτη τὸ τράγος to the right, so that τράγος and ἔτη might meet together, we really gain enough space to accommodate καὶ ἄθλον ἔτη. There is however a second option, namely to shift the end of the line from ἔτη on to the left. This option is the reasonable thing to do, because, whenever we discover that a scribe or an engraver has inserted by error a gap in a text, we do not move the text preceding to the right, thus filling the gap but, at the same time, creating a new one or enlarging a previous gap; on the contrary, we shift the text following to the left in order to fill the erroneous gap. In this way, the end of the line (ἔτη ΗΗΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙII

30. Selden’s majuscule text: 58 – – – ΑΦΟΥΘΕΣΠΙΣΟΠΟΙΗΤΗΣ……ΑΧΙ……ΟΣΕ-ΔΙΑΛΑΞΕΝΑΛ……ΣΤΙΝ……ΤΕΘΟ……ΡΑΓΟΣ……Χ……ΕΤΗΗΗΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙII


32. Luebke’s 24 or 25 characters following the gap in line 58 (from ETH to the end of the line) have the same length as 14, 19, 18, 16, and 15 characters respectively printed in the same space of lines 63–67 (the first five legible lines after line 58). If one believes
this test, it became clear that the space available between ΣΤΙΝ and ΤΕΘΗ cannot accommodate [καὶ ἀθλὸν ἐ], but only [καὶ .. ἐ] or [.. καὶ ἐ]. The use of τίθημι in the sense ‘set up, of the prizes in games’, without the predicative ἀθλὸν, is recorded with numerous examples in LSJ. The fact that in ep. 39.54b, concerning Susarion, we find καὶ ἀθλὸν ἐτέθη is not compelling for the present case, and what prompted the addition of the explanatory ἀθλὸν there may well be the oddity of the prize (ισχάδων ἄρσιχος καὶ οἶνου μετρητής). Since J. A. R. Munro33, examining the stone itself, asserts that Boeckh’s [ἐφάνη] ‘would only fit half the space between ποιητής καὶ πρῶτος’34 and since he also claims that ‘the vestiges give a slight preference to a word ending -το or perhaps -ατο’ (irrespective if, according to Hiller von Gaertringen, ‘Μ[unro] ...το nunc [1903] addubitavit’), Keil’s [ὑπεκρίνα] to seemed perfect. ὑπεκρίνατο πρῶτος would mean ‘was the first to perform as ὑποκριτής’; cf. TrGF 2 [Thespis] T 7 υπεκρίνατο πρῶτος ἦν τὸ τὸν χορόν, combined with T 17 τὸν Θέσπιν αὐτὸν ὑποκρινομένων, ὃς ἦν τόις παλαιοῖς.

If, however, Thespis was the ‘inventor’ of tragic acting and the specific year marked the first acting of the first actor, what purpose would setting up the he-goat prize serve? Did Thespis compete with himself to claim a preset prize? In any case, the Marmor Parium entry does not say that Thespis won the prize for acting or, what is more, that he won the first-ever prize for acting. Even in the well regulated fifth-century Dionysia contest, no prize for actors seems to have existed before the middle of the century. With [ὑπεκρίνα]-το πρῶτος the situation would be completely different from the establishment of the comic chorus (ep. 39.54b), which must have been a contest from the start (see below). After Keil’s proposal ([ὑπεκρίνα]το) prevailed, the syntax of the chronicle’s entry changed. The relative clause ὃς ἐδίδαξεν κτλ., which in Boeckh’s text was attached to πρῶτος (πρῶτος ὃς ἐδίδαξεν), was now attached...
to the subject (Θέσπις ὁ ποιητής ..., ὃς ἔδιδαξεν). The reason for the change was no doubt the verb: Boeckh’s ἐφάνη would require πρῶτον, as adverb, while Keil’s ἐπεκρίνα to would match the syntax of the following readable words: πρῶτος ὃς ἐδίδαξε. Then, I would rather propose a different verb and a different occasion for the Thespis entry: ἀφ’ οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητής [ἡγωνία] ατο πρῶτος, ὃς ἔδιδαξεν κτλ.35 The verb is still roughly double in size than ἐφάνη, as Munro suggested, and slightly larger than Scott Scullion’s ‘c. 5–8’. No longer is there reference to the first acting or the first acting prize.

I believe that what the entry of ep. 43 deals with is the first contest of ‘serious’ dithyrambic choruses, the occasion parallel to the comic choruses of ep. 39. The winner, who was awarded the first-ever he-goat prize, was Thespis, poet of the victorious dithyramb and leader of the victorious chorus, acting also as intervening exarchon. None of these assertions is explicitly mentioned, but they are only natural. If the he-goat prize was intended for the victorious chorus, it is very likely that the first official Thespis performance was not in a separate tragic play but in a choral ode, and so it would claim the prize for choruses. After all, it is a common truth that the older the tragedy, the stronger the choral element is. So, whether we speak of tragedy with the choral song in the lead or of chorall song with the chorus-leader (ἐξάρχων) intervening occasionally, it is one and the same thing. What Thespis initially ‘taught’ must have been choral singing, almost certainly dithyrambs to be performed in the Dionysus festival at Icaria, naturally on Dionysiac themes. These choral odes should have possessed not simply a narrative line but principally an action or a plot perhaps after the old example of Xenocritus, the seventh century poet who came from Epizephyrian Locri but was active in Sparta, and whose paeans or dithyrambs ‘involved action’, according to Pseudo-Plutarch De musica, as we have already seen. It was this action that accounted for the chorus-leader’s interventions. We have also seen that Dionysiac and other choruses were performed in the early sixth century in the Doric provinces bordering Attica. And, as it seems, the choruses contesting in these festivals were named τραγικοί. Possibly, what Ioannes Dicaconus (Rabe, Rh. Mus. 63, 1908, 150) means by τῆς δὲ τραγῳδίας πρῶτον δρᾶμα Ἀρίων ὁ Μηθυμναῖος εἰσήγαγεν, ascribing the information to Solon’s elegies (IEG Solon fr. 30a), is such choral odes or dithyrambs enriched with an elementary plot. We do not know Solon’s wording, but if

35. Whether ἐπεκρίνα ατο or ἡγωνία ατο, the alpha seems to be certain, because, apart from Munro’s suspicion, it appears also in Selden’s reading .. ΑΧΙ ... ΟΣΕΛΙΔΑΣΕΝ, where the number of dots preceding alpha fits exactly ἡγωνία-. It is difficult to guess where XI has arisen from.
τραγῳδία or an adjectival form stood for sacred or heroic choral ode, δράμα adds the element of action or plot. The chorus prize was set up in Icaria sometime after the establishment of the comic chorus prize, verifying Ioannes Diaconus’ piece of information: τῆς οὖν κωμῳδίας οὕτως εὑρεθείσης, ἵνα μὴ πάντῃ διάγραφες γένηται, τὴν τραγῳδίαν εὑρήκασι, τὸ συνοφρυωμένον καὶ κατηφές ἐκ ταύτης εἰσφέροντες.

It is obvious that setting up a prize presupposes many contestants. And since the object of the contest was new and unfamiliar, it should be taught to the contestants ahead of the contest. However, singing a choral ode cannot be described as a new and unfamiliar event. What was novel in the occasion and needed separate training was no doubt the intervening or responding (ὑποκρινόμενος) exarchon. It must have been this sort of training that Thespis undertook. This surmise revives Bergk’s proposal, δς ἐδίδαξεν ἄλ[λος]ς τιν[ας καὶ ἐ]τέθη ὁ τράγος. If we add to Bergk’s proposal the objection of the Rev. Dr. Mill, that he read not A but O, one might think of: δς ἐδίδαξε πολ[λος]ς τιν[ας καὶ ἐ]τέθη ὁ τράγος. II might easily be confused with N in the heavily worn away stone. I would much prefer δς ἐδίδαξε χορ[ος]ς τιν[ας καὶ ἐ]τέθη ὁ τράγος, especially if compared with ep. 46 (see below), but epigraphically it seems less likely. If we disregard Eusebius’ testimony, as we did above, this must be the first mention of the he-goat prize — and the first actual application of the folk-etymology of τραγῳδία. The anecdote about Solon and Thespis, if true, shows that Thespis had started his activity in Solon’s old age, before the year of this first official performance, but in the stage of ‘teaching others’ or ‘teaching many ones’ or, simply, ‘teaching some choruses’. Obviously, ἐδίδαξε should not be taken in the well-known technical theatrical sense ‘produced a play’, but in the usual sense ‘taught, trained’ or particularly ‘served as χορο-διδάσκαλος’. Perhaps this is what Plutarch, Sol. 29.6 (TrGF² 1 [Thespis] Τ 17) implies by διὰ τὴν καινότητα τοὺς πολλοὺς ἄγον-τος τοῦ πράγματος, “the activity enticing the public, because of its novelty”. Ath. 1.22a, ultimately from Aristoxenus, explains the nature of this private ‘training’, that was unconnected with the contests: φασὶ δὲ καὶ ὅτι οἱ ἄρχαῖοι ποιηταί, Θέσπις, Πρατίνας, {Κρατῖνος}, Φρύνιχος, ἀρχίσαντες ἐκαλοῦσιν διὰ τὸ μὴ μόνον τὰ ἑαυτῶν δράματα ἀναφέρειν εἰς δραχμὰς τοῦ χοροῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔξω τῶν ἑδίων ποιημάτων διδάσκειν τοὺς βουλομένους δραχέλλαι. In other words,

36. πρῶτος ἄεισεν Ἀριὼν may be a clipping of Solon’s hexameter, but χορικὸν (or τραγικὸν) δράμα (or in different cases, -ικοῦ, -ικοῦ, -ικίς | -ματος, -ματι, -μασι) can be accommodated only in the pentameter.

37. Griechische Literaturgeschichte III, Berlin 1884, 256 n. 15. Bergk’s other supplements cannot stand either epigraphically or philologically.
Thespis did not restrict himself to displaying his personal skill but was interested in creating an artistic tradition, eventually establishing himself as the inventor of tragedy.

I would then suggest for ep. 43:


dαφ᾽ ὀδ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητής [ἡγωνίσ]ατο πρῶτος, δός ἐδίδαξεν ἄλ[λων]ς τιν[ὰς (or δός ἐδίδαξε πολ[λῶν]ς τιν[ὰς or δός ἐδίδαξε χο[ρῶν]ς τιν[ὰς) καὶ ἦ]τθη ὁ τράγος, ἐτη ἩΗΠ[★★★], ἄρχοντος Αθήνησι(ν) | ...]ναίον τοῦ προτέρου.39

The relative clause δός ἐδίδαξε(ν) κτλ. seems to be unparalleled in the Marmor Parium, but ep. 46 is an interesting analogue both in phrasing and in subject: 46.61 ἀφ᾽ οὗ χοροὶ πρῶτον ἠγωνίσαντο ἀνδρῶν, ὃν διδάξας Ὑπόδικος ὁ Χαλκιδεὺς ἐνίκα, ἔτη ΗΗΔΔΔΔΔΙ, ἄρχοντος Αθήνησιν Λυσαγόρου.

Regardless of the syntactical incongruity (obviously, ἀφ᾽ οὗ χορῶν πρῶτον ἠγωνίσαντο ἀνδρῶν, where χορός ἀνδρῶν is the objective of the competition), the relative clause is comparable with the one of the Thespis entry. The dithyrambic choruses in question are usually placed in the introductory year of the City Dionysia, though the date of the chronicle (510/09 or 509/08) does not seem to correspond with the reconstructed first column of the Fasti.

The reliability of the Marmor Parium as regards the date of the Thespis event has been questioned.40 West noticed that the entries in the Suda for the three tragedians who antedate the contest of Pratinas, Aeschylus, and Choerilus in the 70th Olympiad (499/6) are positioned at intervals of three Olympiads: Phrynichus Ol. 67 (511/08), Choerilus Ol. 64 (523/0), Thespis Ol. 61 (535/2). The observation was really impressive, and led West to consider the dating (p. 251) ‘very much like a schematic construction designed to place the three known seniors of Aeschylus and Pratinas in their right order at suitable intervals’. Scott Scullion fully accepted West’s conclusion calling it ‘irresistible’. The most likely culprit was suggested to be Eratosthenes, who, as Scullion puts it (p. 81), ‘simply manufactured a chronological schema for the known early tragedians’. And he continues: ‘The Suda’s date for

38. The asterisks denote letter-spaces, not necessarily number of letters, since an I is necessarily narrower than, say, Δ or Γ. Cf. M. L. West, ‘The Early Chronology of Attic Tragedy’, CQ 39 (1989) 251-254, esp. 253 n. 13. In any case, Selden notes three dots not only in his majuscule text, but also in the lowercase text and the Latin translation.

39. Φρυναῖος has been proposed, and has even been established in some Athenian archon lists. By shifting the text of the end of the line to the left, there is even room for writing ἀθη[ὴνησιν], which would allow ἀθη[ναίον] in the next line. Still, neither Φρυναῖος nor ἀθη[ήριαος or any other -ναιος ὁ ὅστερος is recorded.

40. West (note 38); Scullion (note 29).
Thespis, 535–532, is roughly comparable with that of the *Marmor Parium*, sometime between 538 and 528, but West concludes that both are guesswork. Thus vanish — or ought to vanish — what have always been regarded as our only firm dates for early Athenian tragedy, and utter chronological darkness falls over the history of tragedy before c. 500’.

Be that as it may, isn’t it too hasty to promote an argument from reasonable suspicion to firm certitude? Things are not so clear. For instance, one wonders why the fabricator of the chronological schema should also invent different occasions to correspond to each fake date: Thespis and Choerilus ‘produced a play’, but Phrynichus ‘won a victory’. The 33-year generation period presumed by West as employed by Eratosthenes in ‘the conversion-formula “33 years before = the ninth Olympiad before”’ may really lead us by a blind reckoning from Ol. 70 back to Ol. 61. However, as West notes (in his n. 15), if the reckoning started from Ol. 70.2 (498), which is the independently known exact date of the Pratinas-Aeschylus-Choerilus contest, it would only have reached back to Ol. 62.1 (531). Still, even without taking Ol. 70.2 as the starting date, the back reckoning would be valid only for the period from Ol. 70.1 (499) to Ol. 61.4 (532), and, as the latter date is excluded (see below), so is also the whole Ol. 61 (535/2), i.e. the date mentioned in the *Suda*. Finally, the 33-year generation unit that is usually employed for father-son or teacher-pupil successions, is not used, to the best of my knowledge, for the span of three or four successive poets. Even accepting the falsehood, the most practicable way to place four unknown points in a regular order would not be to multiply an arbitrary unit by three and reach blindly a random starting point, but to start from two firm ends and divide the intervening period by three. The firm ends here should be Ol. 70 and Ol. 61, the first falling within the period recorded in the *Fasti*, the second a prominent date marking not only Thespis’ *première* but mainly what was considered the official commencement of dramatic performances in Greece and therefore likely to have been recorded in any conceivable source. The end result would be the same as the one produced by the *Suda* dates, but at least we would be trustful of two dates, not merely one. Whether the dates for Choerilus and Phrynichus are then arbitrary or not, I do not know, but the fact that a different occasion is attached to each date rather speaks for their authenticity. Most surprising is, however, the attribution of these highly imprecise calculations and fabricated reckonings to Eratosthenes, a scholar not only given to attaining accuracy in resolving much more difficult problems, such as the measurement of the Earth’s circumference and of its axial tilt, but also endeavouring to achieve time precision, for instance, by inventing the leap day.
Furthermore, why should the supposedly fabricated Olympiadic date of the *Suda* for Thespis affect the *Marmor Parium* date? The comparable dates (*Suda* 535–532 ~ *Marmor Parium* 514/3 + ***, but between entries of 541/0 and 520/19 or, as scholars calculate, between 538 and 528) recorded in two completely independent sources should normally validate each other’s authenticity. And since the *Suda* date fully survives, I do not see why we should exceed the limits of this date by exploiting the various possibilities the worn down area of the stone offers. In any case, Ol. 61.4 (= 533/2) is excluded, because the archon name is different (*Θηρικλῆς*, not -ναιος ὁ πρῶτερος; D.H. 4.41.2; cf. D.S. 10.3.1). Besides, if the three letter-spaces in the *Marmor* gap are certain, Ol. 61.4 should be anyway excluded, since the figures needed to supplement the surviving *ΙΗ*** would be either two, ΔΔurtles, or six, ΔΔΙΙΙ. In strict reckoning, the figures needed to fill the three letter-spaces should be either ΔΔΙ or ΔΔΙΙ, i.e. either 535/4 or 534/3.

The entry about Thespis (ep. 43) is to some extent coupled with the one about comic chorus and Susarion (ep. 39.54b):

ἀφ᾽ οὗ ἐν Ἀθήναις κωμῳδιῶν χορὸς ἐτέθη, ..., καὶ ἀθλὸν ἐτέθη

Initially, the formulation ἀφ᾽ οὗ ... χορὸς ἐτέθη, ..., καὶ ἀθλὸν ἐτέθη is, to say the least, worrying. I also observe in Luebke’s drawing, which here follows Selden’s majuscule text, that the lacuna between χορὸς and ἐτέθη is shorter than what is required for the supplement accepted, whereas the lacuna between ἐτέθη and [στή]σάν [τῶν πρῶτων] ἱσχάδων[v] ἀρσιχο[ς] [και οἴνου] με[τ]ητής, [ἐτή ΗΗ***, ἄφοιον] ο[ς [Ἀθήνησιν] | – –. 41

Keeping to J. A. R. Munro’s warning in *CR* 19 (1905) 268, against counting Selden’s dots, ‘at all events [not] beyond three or four’, I venture a different proposal, in which Selden’s dots are almost steadily one dot more than what the size of the gaps allows:

ἀφ᾽ οὗ ἐν Ἀθήναις κωμῳδιῶν χορὸς ἐτέθη καὶ ἀθλὸν ἐτέθη


42. Selden’s text: (54) ΑΦΟΥΕΝΑΘ…ΑΙΣΚΩΜΩ…Ρ…ΕΘΗ……ΣΑΝΙ|(55)...ΤΩ-ΝΙΚΑΡΙΕΩΝΗΥΡΟΝΤΟΣΟΥΣΑΡΙΩΝΟΣΚΑΙΔΟΛΟΝ…ΤΕΘ..ΠΠΩΤΟΝΙΣΧΑΛ……ΑΡΣΙΧΟ…..ΝΟΙΝΟΥ….ΕΡ….ΟΣ…|(56). Some portions of the
Here, ἐν Ἀθήναις should not mislead us into believing that the City Dionysia are meant. We are still at the Athenian deme of Icaria. The entry, dated between 581/0 and 562/1, does not refer to the establishment of Athenian comedy but only of contests of komos choruses who sang and danced without actor, an event introduced by Susarion and first tested in Icaria, a well-known centre of Dionysiac ritual, where Thespis will also be the first to perform as acting exarchon of the dithyrambic chorus. That Susarion’s komoi were cheerful and amusing is inferred from the unanimous testimony of later sources. We can add that the komoi must not differ much from what we saw in Corinth and Sicyon.

So far as the prize is considered to be the derivation root of the genre name — as is the case with the he-goat prize —, wine and figs, the Susarion prizes, are, as we have seen, the principal constituents of the komos and the τραγήματα, in other words of the second course of a deipnon, irrespective of how boisterous or restrained it is. Komos presupposes young people drunk, whereas, in the words of Arist. Probl. and Galen quoted above, the τραγήματα are the pretext for drinking wine, and we have seen that dried figs are one of the main items of the τραγήματα. However, whereas figs and wine are the prize for komos chorus contests, τραγήματα are the derivation root for τραγικοὶ χοροὶ. There is no contradiction whatsoever if we stop considering 591 BCE the date fixed in Eusebius’ Chronicle for the introduction of the he-goat prize and designate it as the date of establishment of the ‘tragic’ choruses contests. καὶ ἐτέθη ὁ τράγος in the Thespis entry of the Marmor Parium marks, as proposed above, the first actual application of the folk-etymology, but the folk-etymology itself might predate its application by Thespis.

The events in Icaria being related to Dionysus, therefore initially satyr-ic and cheerful, were named κῶμοι. Thus, κῶμος was established as the traditional term for the choruses (naturally of men, since choruses of boys were instituted later), but also for the entire Dionysiac festival, which at the time comprised these choruses and nothing more — hence, the common κῶμος and τραγήματα prizes. This is why even the non-satyric Dionysiac dithyrambs seem to have been included in the κῶμος. The mutilated heading of the Fasti (IG ii2 2318) may probably refer to this naming: [πχω]τον κῶμοι ἤσαν τ[ῷ διονύσ]ιοι τραγῳδοὶ δ[. So is also the law of Euegorus: Dem. 21 (Mid.). 10 Ἐν θήγορος εἶπεν ὅταν ἡ πομπὴ ἡ τῷ Διονύσῳ ... καί τοῖς ἐν ἀστεί Διονυσίοις ἡ πομπὴ καὶ οἱ παῖδες καὶ ἐκ κῶμος καὶ ἐκ κωμῳδοῦ καὶ ἐκ τραγῳδοῦ,
... μὴ ἐξεῖναι μήτε ἐνεχυράσαι μήτε λαμβάνειν ἕτερον ἑτέρου κτλ. Possibly, the metaphorical use of κῶμος for the triumph procession and song in Pindar (Ol. 4.9, Pyth. 5.100, al.), which has been compared, is transferred from the Dionysiac κῶμος. I suppose that Aristotle, when speaking of the origin of tragedy from a satyr form with brief stories and laughable diction (Po. 1449a 20), refers to this pre-Thespian phase of κῶμος, principally in Icaria.

I do not know whether the supplements in the Parian chronicle proposed here and the speculations made in accordance with these supplements add to the confusion assumed by J. Rusten or not, but they fully agree with his conclusion that '[o]ur only independent source for Susarion is the Parian marble, which [...] deserves to be considered independently because of its age, its use of fifth- and fourth-century sources, and the character of its other entries on literary history'. Accordingly, we should expect that the Parian marble makes use of the original terms found in its sources, so that κώμων χορός need not contradict κωμωιδία, which is found in almost every subsequent source (Susario test. 2–10).

As for the name of Σουσαρίων, also widely discussed, I believe that it is a generic name for a type of performer, as was, of course, also the name of his tragic peer, Θέσπις — a well-known practice of professional nicknaming resulting into naming both in the mythical and the historic world; e.g. Δαίδαλος, Φήμιος, Τέρπανδρος, Στησίχορος, Θεόφραστος; also Κυκλεύς, Μινύρας, and Εγκώμιος, supposed father names of Arion, Phrynichus, and Pratinas. Σουσαρίων must be a jocular formation after the manner of diminutives, but not itself a diminutive. The name (or nickname) is formed much like Σαννυρίων, name of a fifth century comic poet, or Βουταλίων, proverbial name of an idiot. The first must derive from the contracted form of σεύμαι, σου- or σουσ-, ‘run, rush’. No original form Σόσαριος has to be looked for nor has Ἁριων anything to do with the name. The second name must derive from σάννας, ‘idiot, buffoon’. The third derives from βούτης, ‘herdsman, boorish, ἄγροικος’; Αγροίκος ἢ Βουταλίων, title of a Middle comedy play by Antiphanes. All refer to stereotypical funny features, later typified into comic stock characters: (servus) currens, (servus) stultus, sannio, parasitus. Naturally, the pre-comedy Σουσαρίων is only a lively comast/dancer, but the fifth and fourth century Σαννυρίων and Βουταλίων are comic characters.

44. J. Rusten (note 43) 42 f.
believe \( \sigma \alpha \nu \nu \nu \gamma \iota \sigma \nu \) to have been a comic poet and actor, whose principal role name, apparently a character \( \sigma \alpha \nu \nu \nu \gamma \iota \sigma \nu \)\(\gamma \omicron \omicron \omicron \), ‘stupidly flattering’, i.e. parasite, prevailed over his real name, a tradition practiced even today; e.g., Bébé (Fr. ‘sexually attractive girl’) for Brigitte Bardot, Totò (It. baby-word for ‘blow, smack’, i.e. a figurative ‘punching bag’) for Antonio de Curtis, etc.46

Be that as it may, the Marmor Parium mentions an opinion widely accepted in antiquity, and it would be of little importance to date precisely the he-goat prize or the derivation from a he-goat prize. Popular customs and religious dromena deriving from folk-etymologies and concomitant mythological aitia cannot be limited temporally or locally, much more cannot be arranged in a neat historical order. An already established term \( \tau \rho \alpha \gamma \omega \iota \delta \omicron \delta \omicron \) for the singer of table songs might at any time be folk-etymologized from \( \tau \rho \alpha \gamma \omicron \sigma \), the he-goat prize might at any time derive from the folk-etymology, and the he-goat might at any time after the folk-etymology make its way into the Dionysus mythology.

Eratosthenes’ verse, Coll. Alex. fr. 22,

\[
\text{Ἰκαριοῖ, τόθι πρῶτα περί τράγον ὑνόχρησαντο,}
\]

from Hygin. Astr. 2.4.2.1, transmits the long established in the 3rd century BCE piece of information, though the aition expounded by Hyginus associates the etymology with the custom of \( \alpha \sigma \kappa \omega \lambda \iota \sigma \mu \omicron \sigma \)\(\omicron \mu \omicron \sigma \). Herod. 8 (Ἐνύπνιον) also of the 3rd century describes an imaginary \( \alpha \sigma \kappa \omega \lambda \iota \sigma \mu \omicron \sigma \) associating it with a Dionysiac poetic event, though not a traditional dramatic contest but rather one in choliambic mime.

Dioscorides’ mock epitaph on Thespis (AP 7.410), also of the 3rd century BCE, seems to follow an evolution approach not much dissimilar from the Parian chronicle.

\[
\text{Θέσπις ὅδε, τραγικὴν δὸς ἀνέπλασα πρῶτος ἀοιδὴν κωμῆταις νεαρὰς καινοτομῶν χάριτας,}
\]

\[
† \text{Βάρχος ὁτε τριτθὺν κατάγοι χορὸν ὅτι τράγος ἀθλόν χόττικος ἦν σίκων ἄθροιχος ἀθλός ἄτι.†}
\]

5  εἰ δὲ μεταπλάσσουσι νέοι τάδε, μνησάς αἰών 

poola προσευρήσει χάτερα· τάμα δ᾽ ἐμά.

\[\]

\[1 \text{ἀνέπλασα Salmasius, -σε P} \hspace{1cm} 3 \text{τριτθύν (alt. supra i corrector) P} \hspace{1cm} 4 \text{ἀθλός P, -ος Heinsius} \\
5 \text{εἰ δὲ Desrousseaux, οἱ δὲ P} \hspace{1cm} 6 \text{προσευρήσει Reiske, ποῦ σεῦ φήσει P | τάμα Meineke, τά-} \\
\text{λα P (τ”άλλα corr.)}
\]

Dioscorides considers both the τράγος and the σύκων ἄρριχος as pre-Thespian (ὅτε – ἔτι) prizes for an unclear Bacchic chorus. The incomprehensible ὅτε τριτθύν κατάγοι χορόν ὁι τράγος ἄθλων is still puzzling scholars. If τριθύν or τριτύν was corrupted from βριθύν (Tucker), ‘weighty, grave, severe’, it would exclude amusing songs, for which the basket of figs should have been intended; if from τριττόν/τρισσόν (Bentley), referring to the triple Dionysus festival, i.e. City, Rural, Lenaea, it would antedate the whole festival structure before Thespis; if from τριέτη (Wil.), it would move the question to a different Dionysiac cult context than the one expected in the Thespis milieu. τρυγικόν (Jacobs) would be acceptable, given that an identical expression occurs in Ar. Ach. 628 and that the particular etymology (Ath. 2.40b) was established among several in the 3rd century BCE, had it not been so remote from the transmitted τριτθύν. Confidently enough, I propose

Βάκχος ὅτε τριττύν κατάγοι χορὸν ὃι τράγος ἄθλων
χωττικός ήν σύκων ἄρριχος ἄθλος ἔτι,

“when Bacchus used to engage in contest a triad of chorus, for which the prize was still a wretched he-goat and the Attic basket of figs”. The triad of dithyrambic, comic, and tragic chorus obviously follows the later pro-


48. χωττικός ... σύκων ἄρριχος: the article is involved in the hypallage: καὶ δ Ἀττικός ... ἄρριχος σύκων = καὶ ἄρριχος τῶν ἀττικῶν σύκων. What the poet intends by the definite article (by no means out of place, as claimed in Gow-Page) is to stress the autochthonous nature of the prize and, hence, of the contest and the genre contesting. Apart from the significance of fig-trees and figs for the Athenians (RE art. ‘Feige’, vol. 6.2, 1909, col. 2100-2151, passim) and the fact that a variety of figs was named Ἀττικά (now named βασιλικὰ σῦκα Ἀττικῆς), fig-trees are believed to originate from the ἱερὰ συκῆ that Demeter donated to Phytalos and was planted close to Eleusis (Paus. 1.37.2, Plut. 703c), a tree that signalled the start of civilized life (Ath. 3.74d). On the other hand, Peloponnnesians had discovered a closer relationship, since the Lacedaemonians attributed the finding of the fig-tree to Dionysus and worhipped Συκίτης Διόνυσος (Ath. 3.78c, Sosib. FGrHist 595 F 10). Paus. 4.20.2 mentions that Messenians named the fig-tree (ἐρινεός, ὀλύνθη) τράγος.
gramme of the City Dionysia, after comedy and tragedy had obtained their autonomy, often alien to the Dionysiac concept of the festival, and so the clearly Dionysiac dithyrambic chorus had to sustain the whole burden for the consistency with the festival. However, the disagreement of the triad of choruses with the dyad of prizes must be a reminiscence of the original structure. In the schema followed by Dioscorides the triad was prior to Thespis’ first performance. Sometime in the past, the three choruses led by Bacchus entered the contest, in other words, were introduced in connection with Bacchic activities, the last two, however, not in the sense of dramatic performances, but of cheerful and serious choral singing of Dionysiac odes.

Line 4 ἔτι shows that the award of the he-goat and the basket of figs was discontinued, we do not know when. Plut. 527d (De cupiditate divitiarum) includes in the Dionysia procession the prizes for tragedy and comedy together with other Dionysus attributes, but though he mentions ἡ πάτριος τῶν Διονυσίων ἑορτή τὸ παλαιόν, he does not specify how old the procession described was: ἡ πάτριος τῶν Διονυσίων ἑορτή τὸ παλαιόν ἐπέμετε τῷ δημοτικῷ καὶ μεταφράστε τὸν τράγον τῷ θείῳ, ἄλλος ἰχθύς ἔρχεται κοσμοὺς, ἔπαυσε δ’ ὁ φαλλός, ἀλλὰ νῦν ταῦτα παρεώρισε καὶ ἴσχυρόν τε παραφερομένων καὶ παραπληθένων καὶ ζευγῶν ἐλαυνομένων καὶ προσωπειῶν. The Marmor Parium entry about Susarion locates the officialization of the komos/cheerful choruses, and I propose that the same development took place sometime later for the tragic/serious choruses. In any case, it is this vulgar entertainment with low-grade prizes, a wretched he-goat and a basket of dried figs, that, according to Dioscorides, Thespis found and upgraded by his remodelling of τραγικὴ ἀοιδή. Even he, however, did not manage to promote his ἀνάπλασις to a civic activity. What Aeschylus inherited from Thespis, according to Dioscorides’ next epigram (AP 7.411), were ἀγροιῶτιν ἀν’ ὕλαν παίγνια καὶ κώμους, which Aeschylus elevated to a lofty dramatic genre at the city festivals of Dionysus. The same tone is found in Horace, A.P. 275: ignotum tragicae genus invenisse Camenae | dicitur ... Thespis, I guess with ignotum in the sense ‘lowborn’ and ‘vulgar’ rather than ‘unknown’, as in the accepted interpretation.

In any case, though our sources on the dramatic festivals in Athens are numerous, thorough, and extensive, no historical piece of evidence whatsoever has reached us about a he-goat prize in the tragic contests of the Dionysia. Not that any argument regarding the etymology would need to change, if such a piece of evidence happened to be discovered, but the fact is that it is not. The supposedly detailed evidence of the Latin grammarians (Diomedes, Gramm. Lat. I 487 = Suetonius p. 16 ff. Reifferscheid; Evanthius
in Donatus, Commentum Terenti I 13 Wessner), regardless of their possible sources, being no more than somewhat graphic accounts of the he-goat prize etymology, are by no means historical evidence.

To sum up with a rough outline, I believe that the terms κωμῳδός and τραγῳδός were originally coined, possibly in the second half of the seventh century, in the context of δεῖπνον, for the ἄοιδός ἐπὶ τῷ κωμᾶν and ἐπὶ τῷ (ἐν)τραγεῖν respectively. Not much later, in the turn of the century, originally perhaps outside Attica (Corinth, Sicyon), τραγῳδός must have been employed for the participant in contests of choruses (τραγικοὶ χοροί) singing odes for gods and local heroes, usually paens and/or dithyrambs involving action, the prize being a bull to be sacrificed. In Attic Icaria, during festivals of Dionysus, phallic satyr choruses are instituted singing vulgar songs with brief stories and ludicrous diction. Sometime in the 70s or 60s of the sixth century in the same place, Susarion organized a contest of such choruses, setting up a prize of wine and figs. In 535–533, also in Icaria during festivals of Dionysus, Thespis, a poet of dithyrambs, instituted non-satyr choral contests, himself serving as an intervening solo ἐξάρχων of the chorus, thus initiating drama performance in Greece. Following the folk-etymology of τραγικός from τράγος, the he-goat was introduced into the Dionysus ritual in Attic Icaria as prize of chorus performances and sacrificial victim, as well as into the Dionysus mythology.

Be that as it may, it would verge on hubris to claim that the mist covering the early history of drama has now cleared. On the contrary, things may have become more obscured because of the fluid character of the terminology, at the time when private choral song, public choral song, choral song with elementary plot, choral song with elementary plot and chorus-leader solo interventions, and tragedy proper, were still in constant and unstable development. It is also uncertain which stages of the drama development took place in Icaria and which in Athens. To assume that archives existed at so old ages is certainly insecure, and the seeming paradox that the genres of both comedy and tragedy were born in the same insignificant village gives rise to reasonable doubts. However, before yielding to these doubts, it would be better to see whether this insignificant village was already in the sixth century a centre of the Dionysus worship in Attica and whether the festivals connected with this worship might account for the production of a religious literature, which latter developed into the established genres of comedy and tragedy, although not

49. Burkert (note 3) p. 93 n. 14; p. 97 n. 21.
50. West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus, 183-184.
all stages of this development were necessarily carried out at the same place. For instance, two more Attic demes, also religious centres, Eleusis in Western Attica and Phlya in Eastern Attica, the first being centre of the mystery cult of the two goddesses, the second of more deities, were also centres of religious literature, the so-called Orphic poetry. As for the archives question, we know that seventh- or sixth-century historically important events were dated by synchronization with other dated events, but we also know that several Panhellenic hiera were archived, especially when, in parallel to the cult, they held contests. Was the Icaria cult and contest of Panhellenic character? The question is unanswerable, though Hipponax, sometime in the second half of the sixth century BCE, satirizes an Ephesian itinerant μητραγύρτης and βωμολόχος (Cicon?), who, among his visits to other hiera, sails to Kantharos, the harbour of the not yet founded port of Piraeus, in the month when the Dionysus feast was celebrated (Hipp. IEG fr. 78.12)—but in Icaria or in Athens?51
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51. K. Tsantsanoglou, ‘Hipponactea’, Eikasmos 21 (2010) 15-28. The month was probably Ion. Αγριών = Att. Έλαφηβολιών, when the Dionysiac festival Αγριώνια vel sim. were celebrated in several places, and Διονύσια τὰ μεγάλα in Athens.
**MARMOR PARIUM**

*Epoch 39: Sousarion, κωμῳδοί*

Fr. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* xii. 5, 444 (1903):

54b ἀφ’ οὗ ἐν Ἀθήναις κωμὼν χορὸν ἔθη, καὶ ἀθλὸν ἐτέθη πρώτον ἵσχάδῳ[v] ἄφισιν[z] καὶ οἶνον με[τ]ητής, [ἐτη ΗΗ*** ἄφχοντος Αθήνησιν] |56 [– –].


54b ἀφ’ οὗ ἐν Ἀθήναις κωμων χορὸν ἔθη, καὶ ἀθλὸν ἐτέθη πρώτον ἵσχάδῳ[v] ἄφισιν[z] καὶ οἶνον με[τ]ητής, [ἐτη ΗΗ*** ἄφχοντος Αθήνησιν] |56 [– –].

*Epoch 43: Thespis and goats*

J. Selden, *Marmora Arundelliana* (1628):

58b ΑΦΟΥΘΕΣΠΙΣΟΠΗΤΗΣ......ΑΧΙ...ΟΣΕΔΙΔΑΞΕΝΑΛ...
ΣΤΙΝ.....ΤΕΘΗΟ..ΡΑΓΟΣ.....Χ...ΕΤΗΗΗ 𐅄...
ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣΑΘ.....[59....
ΝΑΙΟΥΤΟΠΡΟΤΕΡΟΥ (*Typorum Errata*, p. 207): ΡΑΓΟΣ ΕΤΗ.

H. Prideaux, *Marmora Oxoniensia* (1676):

58b ἀφ’ οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς ἐξ ἁμάξης πρῶτος ἐδίδαξεν Ἀλκηστιν, καὶ ἐτέθη ὁ τράγος ἀθλὸν νενικηκότι, ἔτη ΗΗ 𐅄ΔΔΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Ἀλκαίου τοῦ προτέρου.

R. Chandler, *Marmora Oxoniensia* (1763):

58b ἀφ’ οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς ἐφάνη, πρῶτος ὃς ἐδίδαξε δράμα με ἄστει, καὶ ἐτέθη ὁ τράγος, ἔτη ΗΗ 𐅄ΔΔΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Αθήνησιν Ἀλκαίου τοῦ προτέρου.

A. Boeckh, *CIG* ii. 2374 (1843):

58b ἀφ’ οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς ἐφάνη, πρῶτος ὃς ἐδίδαξε δράμα ἐν ἄστει, καὶ ἐτέθη ὁ τράγος ἀθλὸν ἀθροκτόνως, ἔτη ΗΗ 𐅄ΔΔΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Αθήνησιν Ἀλκαίου τοῦ προτέρου.

Fr. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* xii. 5, 444 (1903):

58b ἀφ’ οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπεκφώνατο τράγος, ὃς ἐδίδαξε δράμα ἐν ἄστει, καὶ ἐτέθη ὁ τράγος ἀθλὸν ἀθροκτόνως, ἔτη ΗΗ 𐅄ΔΔΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Αθήνησιν Ἀλκαίου τοῦ προτέρου.

F. Jacoby, *Das Marmor Parium*, (1904), p. 14, and FGrHist 239:

58b ἀφ’ οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπεκφώνατο τράγος, ὃς ἐδίδαξε δράμα ἐν ἄστει,
καὶ ἄθλον ἐ]τέθη ὁ τράγος, ἔτη ΗΗ[ΔΔ.], ἀφ' ὁποιοῦ Ἀθ[ήνη] |59 | ...]|ναίον τοῦ προτέρου.

B. SNELL, TrGF² (1971, 1986 [+Kannicht]) 1, DID D 1 [Marmor Parium]:
58b ἄφ’ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς [ὑπεκρινά] κτο πρῶτος, δι εἴδιδαξε δούμι[a ἐν ἄ]στει, καὶ ἄθλον ἐ]τέθη ὁ τράγος, ἔτη ΗΗ[ΔΔ.], ἀφ' ὁποιοῦ Ἀθ[ήνη] ...]|ναίον τοῦ προτέρου.

W. R. CONNOR, ‘City Dionysia and Athenian Democracy’, Classica et Mediaevalia 40 (1989), 7-32:

S. SCULLION, ‘Tragic Dates’, CQ 52 (2002) 81 n. 4:
58 b ἄφ’ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς – c. 5-8 – πρῶτος [δε?] εἴδιδαξεΝΑΛ – c. 3 – ΣΤΙΝ [καὶ ἄθλον ἐ]τέθη ὁ τράγος, ἔτη ΗΗ[ΔΔ] –3- ἀφ' ὁποιοῦ Ἀθ[ήνη]–c. 3–]|ναίον τοῦ προτέρου.

K. TSANTSANOGLOU, Logeion 5 (2015):
M. Luebke’s 1903 drawing of the middle section of the Marmor Parium kept in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, (the upper part has been destroyed, the lower part is kept in Paros), published in IG xii. 5, 444. The designer was based on the existing stone, but depended on J. Selden’s 1628 text wherever the words on the stone were illegible. The entry on Susarion (epocha 39) can be seen in lines 54b-56, the one on Thespis (ep. 43) in lines 58b-59. The present desperate condition of the stone is visible in the next photograph.