

SATYR DRAMA AT THE LENAEA?
THE INSCRIPTION *SEG* 26, 203



ABSTRACT: This article attempts to evaluate the possibility that satyr drama was included in the Lenaeian tragic contests of the 4th century BC. This theory was supported independently by Sutton *ZPE* 37 (1980) and Luppe *APF* 55 (2009). Sutton used the inscription *SEG* 26, 203 (tragic contests of 364 and 363 BC) as evidence that each poet participated with a satyr drama and a tragedy, while Luppe revising the inscription *IG* II² 2319 col. II (tragic contests ca. 420-418 BC) argues that tragic poets presented three tragedies and a satyr drama, not two tragedies without a satyr drama, as commonly held. This claim against the *communis opinio* affects not only the reconstruction of the tragic contests at the Lenaea but also the discussion on the genre of *TrGF* adesp. fr. 667a (*Μήδεια Σατυρικὴ?*), a unique fragment, which Sutton identifies with Theodorides' *Medea* attested in the inscription *SEG* 26, 203.

SEG 26, 203 is one of the inscriptions that provide information of fundamental importance about the dramatic productions at the Lenaea. The vast majority of scholars accept the *communis opinio* that satyr drama was not included in the Lenaeian dramatic contests. This consensus was derived from the reconstruction of the festival based on the inscription *IG* II² 2319 col. II, which lists tragic contests ca. 420-418 BC,¹ and the above-mentioned *SEG*

* I am indebted to Prof. D. Haas for her help. I am also grateful to Prof. Th. K. Stephanopoulos and Prof. S. Tsitsiridis for their precious advice. I have also profited from the suggestions and comments of the “anonymous reviewer”, who improved the accuracy of the paper, though I am solely responsible for any errors that remain.

1. Mette (1977) 144-145; Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 109. For the division of *IG* II² 2319 into three columns see Millis – Olson (2012) 115-116. Contra, Summa (2015) 110-117. The text here is the version by Millis – Olson in the most recent and conservative edition on the basis of supplements, one, however, that is not without misprints; see *Ἄγα[μέμνων]*.

Εἰσ[]

ὑπε[]

ὑπο[]

26, 203 (that came to light in 1970 in the excavations of the Athenian Agora and edited by Camp in 1971),² which preserves tragic contests of 364 and 363 BC.³ A new light in the interpretation of the above-mentioned inscriptions and consequently of the dramatic contests at the Lenaea was shed by Sutton and Luppe in 1980 and 2009 respectively.⁴

-
- (420/419) ἐπὶ Ἀ[στυφίλων - - -]
 Ἄγα[μέμνωνι - - -] [sic]
 ἔπε[- - -]
 Ἥρα[- - - δεύ :]
 Θησῆ[ι - - -]
 ἔπ[ε - - -]
 ἔπο[- - - ἐνίκα]
 (419/418) ἐπὶ Ἀρχ[ίου - - -]
 Τυροῖ ΤΙ[- - -]
 ἔπε : Ἀνσικράτ[ης]
 Καλλίστρατος [δεύ]
 Ἀμφιλόχῳ Ξεῖο[νι]
 ἔπε : Καλλιπιδ[ῆς]
 [ἔπ]ο : Καλλιπιδ[ῆς] ἐνίκα
 (418/417) [ἐπὶ Ἀ]ντιφ[ῶ]ντος Σ[- - -]
2. SEG 26, 203:

- [...]·[- - -]
 ἔπε :] Ἥφαι[στίων]
 [Νε]ρόμαχος [τρέ]
 Ἀμνύωνι Τ[- - -]
 ἔπε vacat
 ἔπο : Ἥφαιστίω[ν]
 (364/3) ἐπὶ Τιμοκράτου[ς - - -]
 Οἰνοπίωνι Ἐκρ[- - -]
 ἔπε : Ἄρηξις
 Θεοδωρίδης δεύ :
 Μηδείαι Φαέθοντ[ι]
 ἔπε : Ἀνδροσθέ[νης]
 Κλεάνετος τ[ρέ]
 Ὑπιπόλημι Φ[- - -]
 ἔπε : Ἐππαρ[χος]
 ἔπο : Ἄρηξ[ις]
 (363/2) ἐπὶ Χαρίκ[λειδον - - -]

3. Camp (1971) 302-307; Mette (1977) 147; Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 73; Makres (1994) 121; Wilson (2000) 28; Millis – Olson (2012) 120; Millis in Csapo – Goette – Green – Wilson (2014) 436 n. 38.
 4. Sutton (1980) 158-160; (1987a) 9-60; Luppe (2009) 36-39.

SEG 26, 203 was re-interpreted in 1980 by Sutton, who examined the possibility of an modified tragic contest at the Lenaea in the 4th century BC including satyr dramas, on the grounds of the titles preserved (*Amy-mone*, *Oenopion*, *Hypsipyle*). This possibility turned into certainty in 1987 and formed the crucial argument for his article which discussed the genre of the *TrGF* adesp. fr. 667a (*Μήδεια Σατυρική*⁵: v. 5.2 add. p. 1137 ff. Kannicht). Sutton uses *SEG* 26, 203 as evidence that in the 4th century BC tragic poets competed at the Lenaea not with a pair of tragedies but with a satyr drama (which is not explicitly mentioned as *σατυρ*)⁵ and a tragedy each. He believes that the first play mentioned in the inscription is a satyr drama on the basis of the themes and titles preserved. In other words, *Amy-mone*, *Oenopion* and *Hypsipyle* are suitable titles for satyr dramas, so as *Medea*, in his view. This claim led Sutton to support the satirical genre of *TrGF* adesp. fr. 667a (a unique fragment attributed at various times to tragedy, comedy and satyr drama) and identify it with Theodorides' *Medea* in the above-mentioned inscription.

On the other hand, in 2009 Luppe revised *IG* II² 2319 col. II and supported once again the possibility of a satyr play at the Lenaea. He reexamined the structure of the inscription and argued on the possibility that the tragic poets presented three tragedies and a satyr play as well. He tried to maintain 11 syllable lines in the inscription, as Wilhelm had suggested in 1906,⁶ but he claimed that the fragmentary inscription can lead to the hypothesis that the tragic poets participated probably with a tetralogy, just like at the City Dionysia. He suggested that *Εἰρ*[---] in *IG* II² 2319 col. II l. 67 should be a variant of the known satyr play *Ἴρις* (*Εἰρίς* for *Ἴρις*, cf. *IG* II² 1611 c l. 137) and he proposed a different reconstruction for the beginning of col. II with two additional lines before ll. 67-69:

[Ἀχαιὸς δέυ : one tragedy title]
 [two (longer) tragedy titles]
Εἰρ[ιδι σατ vel. σατυρι
 ὕπε[: - - -]
 ὕπο[: - - -]

5. Cf. *IG* II² 2320 col. II (Didaskaliai of the City Dionysia) for the years 341-339 BC which provides the information that a satyr drama, non competitive and always explicitly mentioned as *σατυρ*, is performed at the start of the competition.

6. Wilhelm (1906) 53.

Luppe's thesis is merely hypothetical and the suggested changes can only be considered speculative given that the inscription is too fragmentary. He adds one more line to the inscription, although Summa has calculated 19 lines in *IG II² 2319*.⁷ The name *Εἰρῖς* could be replaced by *Ἰρῖς*, but we cannot be certain whether we have to do with a title of a satyr drama or not. However, it must be taken into account that *Ἰρῖς* is a *dramatis persona* in Eur. *Heracles*. If we look closely at the titles in the same position in the inscription as the play *Εἰρῖς*, that is to say the titles listed first, we can notice that none of these are unquestionably satyrical. Nothing in the inscription proves the accuracy of Luppe's hypothesis and, as there are questions that remain open, we should probably await new findings of epigraphy to reinforce or shake our assumptions.

Consequently, in this discussion we will examine the data at hand which are interpreted by Sutton in a specific perspective. His conclusion on the inscription *SEG 26, 203* does not seem to be self-evident and by no means can be accepted without question.

It is hard to assume that the consolidation of the program of competition at the Lenaea also brought this particular codification into its epigraphic record which Sutton implies and that any explicit indication in the inscription that the first play was a satyr drama was therefore thought to be unnecessary. The contribution of the epigraphic findings is crucial: the inscription *IG II² 2320 col. II* (*Didaskaliai of the City Dionysia*) for the years 341-339 BC is, so to speak, conclusive.⁸

[ἐπὶ Σωσιγένοϋς σάτυροι] [sic] (342/1)
 [- - -]
 [παλαι]ᾶι Νε[οπτόλ]
 [Ἰφιγε]νείαι Εὐφ[ιπ]ίδου
 [ποη] : Ἀστυδάμας
 [Ἀχι]λλεῖ ὕπε : Θετταλός
 Ἀθάμαντι ὕπε : Νεοπτόλ
 [Ἀ]ργιγόννη ὕπε : Ἀθηνόδω
 [Ε]ὐάρετος δ[εὺ] : Τεύκρωι
 [ὕπ]ε : Ἀθηνόδωρος
 [Ἀχι]λλεῖ ὕ[πε] : Θετταλός

7. Summa (2015) 115.

8. Millis – Olson (2012) 65. They twice edit *σάτυροι*]. On the contrary, Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 108-110 prefers the correct *σατυροι*].

[. . .]ει ὑπ[ε : Ν]εοπτόλεμος
 [ca. 7] τρι : Πελιάσιν
 [ὑπε : Νεοπ]τόλεμος
 Ὀρέστη [ὑπε : Ἀθην]ό[δωρος]
 Αὔγη ὑπε : Θετα[λός]
 ὑπο : Νεο[π]τόλεμος ἐνίκ
 ἐπὶ Νικομάχου σάτυρι [sic] (341/0)
 Τιμοκλῆς Λυκούργωι
 παλαιῖ Νεοπτόλεμο[ς]
 Ὀρέστη Εὐριπίδο
 ποη : Αστυδάμας
 [Π]αρθενοπαίωι ὑπε : Θε[ττα]
 [Λυ]κάωνι ὑπε : Νεοπτόλε[μος]
 [. . . .]κλῆς δεύ : Φορίζωι
 [ὑπε :] Θεταλός
 Οἰδί[ποδι] ὑπε : Νεοπτόλ[εμ]
 [Εὐάρο]ετος τρι
 [Ἀλκ]μέωνι ὑπε : Θετα[λός]
 [. . . .]ηι ὑπε : Νεοπτό[λε]
 [ὑπο : Θε]τταλός ἐνίκα
 [ἐπὶ Θεο]φράστον σατυ[ρι] (340/339)
 [ca. 8] Φορκίσι[τι]
 [παλαιῖ : 3-4] ὄστρ[ατος]
 [7-8 Εὐ]ριπί[δου]
 [ποη : ca. 7]ο[...]

The indication *παλαιῖ*, “old tragedy” (i.e. revived), leads scholars to the view that we are dealing with the program of the City Dionysia, at which already in 387/6 BC (*IG* II² 2318.1010-11 = col. VIII Millis-Olson) the first presentation of an old tragedy is attested.⁹ In the above-mentioned didascallic inscription for the years 341-339 there is a satyr drama which however is at the very beginning of the program and is not in competition.¹⁰ An inevitable question arises: Is it possible that at the greatest festival of Dionysus, the City Dionysia itself, the satyr drama would be 1/11th of the program on

9. On “reperformance” from ancient times onwards see Hunter – Uhlig (2017). Especially, Hanink (2017) 21-41; Webb (2017) 262-279.

10. Maidment (1935) 2 n. 8; Hanink (2014) 215 n. 88; Millis in Csapo – Goette – Green – Wilson (2014) 435 n. 37.

the day of tragic competitions,¹¹ and at the Lenaea, if Sutton's view holds true, half of the production would be satyrical, when indeed during the 5th century BC a satyr drama wasn't even included in the program of the Lenaea, according to the *communis opinio*?

In the case of the City Dionysia's (apparently also established) program of competition in the didascalic inscription, it is always stated explicitly that the play recorded is a satyr drama.¹² The same tendency is noted in the *Didaskaliai* which are embedded in *Hypotheses* of the plays, where the fourth play is explicitly stated as a satyr drama.¹³ Eventually, if the final establishment of the Lenaean program led to the omission (in an official record) of the indication "satyr drama", one would expect a similar practice in the case of old tragedies, which, however, are always indicated as *παλαιαί*.

The interest in satyr dramas seems to have been moved chronologically to a very early date, whereas it is something which is evidenced much later. In fact, it is in 240 BC (for others, later in 237/6 BC) that satyr dramas are recorded in an inscription of the Athenian Agora (*Inscr. Agora* I 2972), although it is not certain that this inscription registers competitions as part of the City Dionysia's program.¹⁴ Even so, if we take into consideration a Tegean inscription (*Syll.*³ 1080 = *IG* V 110) which provides clear evidence of a competition in old tragedy by the later 3rd/ early 2nd century, as Summa in 2008 notes,¹⁵ the inscription I 2972 is an indication of the equal treatment of satyr dramas in relation to tragedies and comedies at that time, at least in terms of the competition for old tragedies.¹⁶

11. Easterling (1997) 216 supposes that the third actor (Athenodorus?) had broken his contract, perhaps for a better offer.

12. Satyr dramas in the inscription *IG* II² 2320 are placed first in the program of the City Dionysia and are out of competition, having more the status of an exhibition for the years 341-339 BC.

13. Ael. *VH* 2.8, see Hypoth. Aesch. *Sept.*, *Ag.*

14. The inscription lists the actors who took the first, second, third place in the production of old comedies, old satyr dramas and old tragedies. See Meritt (1938) 116-118 = Mette (1977) 149-152, who dated Alcibiades to 254 BC. Contra, Summa (2010) 126 dated to ca. 240 and Osborne (2009) 93 to 237/6 (= *SEG* 59.18).

15. Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 41 n. 11. Contra, Meritt (1938) 117 who believes that the inscription records victories at the Lenaea. A particularly strong argument that Summa (2008) 489 advances in favour of the Dionysia is the above-mentioned Tegean inscription. The monument dated to 190-170 BC was erected by an unknown actor and athlete for his 88 victories in Delphi, Samos, Dodona, Athens mostly with Euripidean tragedies (*Orestes*, *Heracles*, *Archelaus*).

16. The other events seem to have continued as before, with one new satyr drama outside of

As for the surviving titles of the inscription *SEG* 26, 203, Sutton speculates that *Medea* constitutes a satyr drama because it is found in the same position — that is to say, the first play in the list — as the plays entitled *Oenopion* (363 BC) and *Amymone* (364 BC), which, he believes, refer to a satirical treatment of the respective myth.¹⁷ He considers the play *Oenopion* a satyr drama because of the hero's close relationship with wine and Dionysus since Oenopion is believed to be the first mortal to be taught the art of wine-making by the god himself.

What other aspects of the myth are known about Oenopion? Parthenius in *Erotica Pathemata* 20.1.1-2.6 reports the injustice the hero committed against Orion.¹⁸ When Orion arrived on the island of Chios, where Oenopion ruled, in order to free him from the wild beasts that plagued the area, he wished to marry the king's daughter, Merope. Oenopion did not want to give her to him, so he got him drunk with a large quantity of wine and, when Orion fell asleep, he blinded him.

This aspect of the myth does not create direct links with Dionysus and his cult, although the issue of drunkenness and blindness refers *prima facie* to a satyric aspect of the myth (cf. blindness in Euripides' *Cyclops*). However, the myth continues with twists and turns that would be fitting to a tragedy. Orion retrieves his vision with the help of a child from the laboratory of Hephaestus named Cedalion, in a variant reported by Eratosthenes.¹⁹ Cedalion helps him and leads him to the rising sun, where Orion gets his vision back once again. When Orion seeks revenge on Oenopion, the citizens

competition, ten tragedies (one old and not competitive) and six comedies (one old and not competitive).

17. Sutton (1987a) 29-34.

18. Wörner in Roscher (1897-1909) 3: 795-798. On the scholar and poet of the 1st century BC see Lightfoot (1999) 346. *Περὶ Λειροῦς. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ Οἰνοπίωνος καὶ νόμφης Ἑλικῆς Λειρῶ κόρη γενέσθαι. ταύτης δὲ Ὠρίωνα τὸν Ὑριέως ἐρασθέντα παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αἰτεῖσθαι τὴν κόρην, καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν τε νῆσον ἐξημερῶσαι τότε θηρίων ἀνάπλεων οὖσαν, λείαν τε πολλὴν περιελαύοντα τῶν προσχώρων ἔδνα διδόναι. τοῦ μέντοι Οἰνοπίωνος ἐκάστοτε ὑπερτιθεμένου τὸν γάμον διὰ τὸ ἀποστρυγεῖν αὐτῶι γαμβρὸν τοιοῦτον γενέσθαι, ὑπὸ μέθης ἔκφρονα γενόμενον τὸν Ὠρίωνα κατὰξαι τὸν θάλαμον, [καὶ] ἔνθα ἡ παῖς ἐκοιμᾶτο, καὶ βιαζόμενον ἐκκαῆναι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ Οἰνοπίωνος (emphasis is mine). For comment on the text see Lightfoot (1999) 493-496.*

19. Hes. fr. 148a Merkelbach – West = [Eratosth.] *Cat.* 1, 32, 8-15: *ἐλθόντα δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς Χίον Μερόπην τὴν Οἰνοπίωνος βιάσασθαι οἰνωθέντα, γνόντα δὲ τὸν Οἰνοπίωνα καὶ χαλεπῶς ἐνεγκόντα τὴν ὕβριν ἐκπυφλῶσαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκ τῆς χώρας ἐκβαλεῖν· ἐλθόντα δὲ εἰς Λήμνον ἀλγυτεύοντα Ἡφαίστωι συμμίξαι, ὃς αὐτὸν ἐλεήσας δίδωσιν αὐτῶι Κηδαλίωνα τὸν αὐτοῦ [οἰκείον] οἰκέτην, ὅπως ὀδηγήη [καὶ ἡγήηται αὐτοῦ]· ὃν λαβὼν ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων ἔφερε σημαίνοντα τὰς ὁδοὺς· ἐλθὼν δ' ἐπὶ τὰς ἀνατολὰς καὶ Ἥλιωι συμμίξας δοκεῖ ὕγιασθῆναι καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸν Οἰνοπίωνα ἐλθεῖν πάλιν, τιμωρίαν αὐτῶι ἐπιθήσων· ὃ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν ὑπὸ γῆν ἐκέκρυπτο.*

(who in a tragedy might have composed the Chorus) — or, according to a different version, Poseidon — hide Oenopion in an underground space.²⁰

Although there is a satyr drama of Sophocles named *Cedalion*²¹ — poorly preserved in 6 small fragments — the subject of blindness itself is not exclusively exploited by satyr dramas. Polymestor's blindness in Euripides' *Hecuba* confirms that the subject can be adapted to the tragic stage. The episode of Polymestor and Polydorus, considered by some scholars to be Euripides' invention,²² is linked to the legend of Orion and Oenopion (vv. 1067-8), insofar as Polymestor invokes the Sun to heal his blindness, as Synodinou has already shown.²³ Yet, this is not the only example of a blind hero in tragedy. Emblematic Oedipus, Phineus, the blind seer and Thamyras or Thamyras, who was blinded by divine punishment, are tragic heroes well known for their blindness.

In addition, the theme of drunkenness and deceit is mentioned, if only superficially, in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* and shifted to the world of the gods, since Apollo cheats the Fates through intoxication (v. 727 οἴνωι παρηπάτησας²⁴ ἀρχαίας θεάς), v. 12 / Μοίρας δολώσας[...] /, vv. 33-34 / [...]Μοίρας δολίωι /σφήλαντι τέχνηι[...] /). Although *Alcestis* incorporates comic elements in order to substantially replace a satyr drama, Euripides chooses not to emphasize this particular burlesque element of intoxication and deception.

Thus, if we look more closely at the myth of Oenopion, we could reach the conclusion that the myth *per se* could be exploited by all three genres of dramatic poetry depending on the perspective through which it is seen. Sophocles has written a satyr drama (under the title *Cedalion*),²⁵ and

20. [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 1.4.3-4: αἴθρις δὲ ἔλθὼν εἰς Χίον Μερόπην τὴν Οἰνοπίωνος ἐμνηστεύσατο. μεθύσας δὲ Οἰνοπίων αὐτὸν κοιμώμενον ἐτύφλωσε καὶ παρὰ τοῖς αἰγιαλοῖς ἔρριψεν. ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ <Ἡφαίστου> χαλκίον ἔλθὼν καὶ ἀρπάσας παῖδα ἕνα, ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων ἐπιθέμενος ἐκέλευσε ποδηγεῖν πρὸς τὰς ἀνατολάς. ἐκεῖ δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀνέβλεψεν ἦ ἔκκαεις ὑπὸ τῆς ἡλιακῆς ἀκτίνος, καὶ διὰ ταχέων ἐπὶ τὸν Οἰνοπίωνα ἔσπενδεν. ἀλλὰ τῷ μὲν Ποσειδῶν ἠφραιστότενκτον ὑπὸ γῆν κατεσκεύασεν οἶκον, Ὠρίωνος δ' Ἡὼς ἐρασθεῖσα ἤρπασε καὶ ἐκόμισεν εἰς Δῆλον.

21. *TrGF* 4 *328-333 Radt. For the plot see Pearson (1917) 2: 28-13.

22. Kaibel (1895) 84-85. Contra, Stephanopoulos (1980) 78-9 who believes that it is difficult for Euripides to have innovated such a complex plot linked to local traditional myths of the Chersonese.

23. Synodinou (2005) 2: 399.

24. Page in Oxford edition (1972) 274 prefers the correction *παρηπάφησης* (Davies), although the *παρηπάτησης* appears in codices and Schol. A Eur. *Alc.* 12 οἴνωι παρηπάτησης ἀρχαίας θεάς. Contra, Sommerstein (1989) 228 = (2004) 335-336 argues for the *παρηπάτησης*.

25. Contra, Keyßner in *RE* XVII 1 (1937) 2272-75. Especially p. 2274: “[...] man dachte an das Satyrspiel des Soph. *Kedalion*, dessen erhaltene Fragmente (Soph. fig. 305-310 FTG²) freilich eine Verbindung mit O. nicht erkennen lassen. Bemerkenswert erscheint

Philetaerus a comedy (4th century BC) on Oenopion, while Alexis (4th/3rd century BC) in his comedy *Kouris* mentions Oenopion as a synonym of drunkenness. Arnott's view, however, that the connection of Oenopion's name with wine (*οἶνον πιών*) is rather a popular but incorrect derivation, and that the name is probably etymologically related to the word *οἶνοψ* (dark, cf. *οἶνοψ πόντος*),²⁶ further reinforces the possibility of the myth being tragically exploited beyond its apparent connection to wine and intoxication. Although no other well-known tragedy with the title of *Oenopion* is attested, one cannot overlook the possibility that the myth of Oenopion, despite its connection with Dionysus, provided material suitable for treatment through the tragic prism, a possibility which all scholars, with the exception of Sutton, *ex silentio* accept when they are dealing with the inscription SEG 26, 203.

If this hypothesis for the case of Oenopion is valid, it isn't difficult to imagine a tragic treatment of the Amymone myth. The fact that the only Amymone drama we know is the satyric *Amymone* of Aeschylus, attested as the fourth play in the trilogy *Danaïdes*, does not exclude the possibility that the same theme could be the subject of a tragedy.²⁷ Only about one-quarter ($\frac{1}{4}$) of the archaeological data illustrating this heroine (*LIMC*)²⁸ includes Satyrs. The rest depicts Amymone either alone or with Poseidon or even with Eros. Moreover, Poseidon does not often appear in satyr dramas (with the exception of *Amymone* and Aeschylus's *Theoroi* or *Isthmiastai*).²⁹ The depiction of Amymone, according to Keuls,³⁰ changes during the passage from the 5th to the 4th century BC, as the issue of rape recedes when Poseidon and Amymone become an archetype of a lawfully wedded couple (Taranto 124520, Apulian pelike).³¹

noch, daß nur in dieser Fassung der Sage das Trunkenheitsmotiv in einer Gestalt verwendet ist, die dem Wesen des O. entspricht".

26. Arnott (1996) 305.

27. As Slater in Harrison (2005) 85 notes, the majority of the titles ascribed to satyr dramas are names of a male or a group of chorus. But a female name in the title wouldn't be odd. In addition to Aesch. *Amymone*, Soph. *Nausicaa*, Ion *Omphale*, we could accept a satyric *Medea*, as well.

28. Simon in *LIMC* 1 (1981) 742-752 and 597-608.

29. Unlike Theseus and above all Hercules, who is the emblematic hero not only in comedies but also in satyr dramas.

30. Keuls (1985) 240-241.

31. On the representation of satyrs on vase-painting see Griffith (2015) 45: "[...] by the fifth century their sexual energies usually end up expending themselves (if at all), not on nymphs or mainads [sic] (as in the representations of the sixth century), but on animals,

Besides, the myth of Amymone could constitute a mythological framework for tragedy, just as the legend of Oedipus, a tragic myth *par excellence*, was the subject not only of a comedy by Eubulus but also of a satyr drama by Aeschylus (*Sphinx* fr. 235-37 Radt). Indeed, Hunter points out that the Sphinx's riddle fits the style of Middle Comedy (mythological themes not seen from the heroic point of view but on the basis of everyday struggle, with passages that are distinguished for their enigmatic style, just like puzzles).³² Let us note that in Euripides' *Phoenissae* vv. 186-89 Amymone is linked to the spring. Though this is admittedly a problematic text, the water-spring of Amymone, and hence her association with the liquid element, is not disputed by any tradition.

However, we should take into consideration the general mythological background of Amymone. Specifically, she is one of the fifty Danaids, who were forced to marry their first cousins but on the advice of their father, Danaus, killed their husbands on the very first night of their wedding. Hypermestra was the only one who rescued her husband, Lynceus, who became the founder of the new dynasty.³³ Worthy of mention is *Δαναΐδων ὀδρεῖται ἀπελεῖς*, the leaky hydriae of Danaids, a phrase of [Plato] *Axiochus* that recalls their *post mortem* eternal punishment. The connection to the element of water is obvious, although it is not limited strictly to Amymone.

Lindblom's thesis is indicative of this: in her study of the identity of women pursued by satyrs on Attic vase-paintings produced from 530-400 BC, Amymone, although she is approached by satyrs in four paintings, is not considered to be a heroine solely associated with Dionysus. Consequently, Lindblom does not include Amymone in her research, although there are vases presenting the heroine with a satyr. Her characteristic feature is the hydria which refers to the well-known mythological version mentioned above.³⁴

each other or solitary masturbation". On the vase of Poseidon – Amymone see Griffith (2015) 54-55.

32. See Alexis *PCG* fr. 242, 1-5 with the description of sleep, Antiphanes *PCG* fr. 194, 1-5 in the sense of 'letter'. On the riddles see Konstantakos (2003) 94-113; Konstantakos (2004) 85-137.

33. Podlecki (2005) 17; Bernhard in Roscher (1884-1890) 1.1: 949-954; Stoll in Roscher (1884-1890) 1.1: 327-328; [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 2.1.5 ff.; Σ^{MB} Eur. *Hec.* 886; Σ^{MTAB} Eur. *Or.* 872 Schwartz.

34. Lindblom (2011) 79: "Therefore I will only consider the attributes that are solely or mainly represented together with women in company with Dionysos and/or satyrs" and clarifies in n. 301: "I write 'mainly' since even attributes considered to be specific for a certain character occasionally can appear together with other figures in Attic vase-paintings.

If this line of reasoning is correct, then it could be possible to conclude that Oenopion and Amymone, though associated with Dionysus and with the satyrs respectively, are myths that lend themselves to both comic and tragic treatment. The question that arises is whether there were other myths in the broad range available to them utilized by the poets in all three dramatic genres. The case of Alcmaeon³⁵ and Athamas³⁶ is indicative of the freedom with which poets handle myth. Heroes, such as Hercules, provided material for Euripides' tragedy, for a comedy written by Anaxandrides in the 4th century BC and for a satyr drama by Sophocles and Astydamos II. Heroes such as Philoctetes (tragic by Sophocles, comic by Strattis in the 5th/4th century BC and Antiphanes in the 3rd century BC, satyric in a fragmentum adespotum), Amphiaras (probably tragic by Carcinus II in the 4th century BC, comic by Aristophanes, Philippides in the 4th/3rd century BC and Apollodorus of Carystus in the 3rd century BC and satyric by Sophocles) or Lycurgus, who is associated with Dionysus (in Aeschylus' tragic trilogy *Lycurgeia* — *Edonians*, *Bassarids*, *Neaniskoi*, *Lycurgus satyric* — but also in a comedy by Anaxandrides and a satyr drama by Timocles) were also treated similarly.

Mythical figures, whose action tends to exaggeration especially of a sexual nature, have become heroes of tragedy, e.g. Thamyris or Thamyras, a legendary musician of extraordinary beauty, who was punished with blindness and deprivation of his musical skill for wanting to have sexual union with all the Muses successively. Sophocles wrote a tragedy under this title (*Thamyras*), *TrGF* 4 fr. 237-^{*}245 Radt and Antiphanes a comedy, fr. 104 K.-A.

The suggestion that the theme of Oenopion and Amymone is purely satyric is therefore not convincing. *Mutatis mutandis* on the basis of the above examples, we cannot with certainty rule out the possibility that in the inscription *SEG* 26, 203 we have a tragic treatment of the myth of Oenopion and Amymone. Perhaps in a period of searching for unexploited myths or versions, the tragic poets aimed to bring out the tragic side of the myth of

For the polyvalent use of attributes in ancient Greek art, see Mylonopoulos 2010, 191-195. A good example is the representation of Amymone on a calyx-krater in New York, Metropolitan Mus. 52.11.18. In this scene Amymone, identified by the hydria she carries, use [sic] a thyrsus, the most specific Dionysiac attribute, to fend off the satyrs approaching her. For an image see Beazley Arch.[sic] *BAPD* no.14714".

35. Tragedy: Euripides, Astydamos II, Agathon, Theodectes, Evaretus, Timotheus, Nicomachus Alexandr.; Satyr Drama: Xenocles, Achaeus I; Comedy: Amphis, Mnesimachus.

36. Tragedy: Astydamos II. Satyr Drama: Xenocles, Comedy: Antiphanes.

Oenopion and Amymone in their attempt to innovate and impress. Exotic themes, including Medea, may have attracted their interest. The examples are not exhausted in these three myths. The myth of Adonis is a topic not widely exploited by dramatic poets but one which provides “exotic” material that could be used in a satirical framework.

The only play we know to have been written about Adonis is the tragedy of Dionysius the Tyrant, who probably innovated in his time in dealing with it. Few verses are preserved; they are however indicative of the poetic art of the Tyrant, who is famous for verbal extremities,³⁷ which foretell Lycophron’s Hellenistic technique. According to Simon, Dionysius embodies Socrates’ ideal in the Platonic *Symposium* 223d 3-5, which states that the competent poet must be able to compose both tragedies and comedies.³⁸

Another story which is not attested in any tragedy but, according to Pechstein,³⁹ has both tragic and burlesque elements is that of Lámia/Lamía.⁴⁰ She was pursued erotically by Zeus and provoked jealous Hera, who exterminated the children she was giving birth to. Lamia ended up in a cave, was transformed into a monster and, in her despair, swallowed the newborns of other mothers.⁴¹ The story of this young Libyan woman provides an exotic and idyllic environment, love, jealousy, homicide, victims and perpetrators alternating in their roles, all the elements that can be presented in a satyr play as much as in a tragedy.

Finally, given that there is no certainty that the *Medea* — if the play was in fact called *Medea* — of *TrGF* adesp. fr. 667a examined by Sutton is in fact the *Medea* of *SEG* 26, 203, a play of Theodorides for the year 363 BC, any attempt to link them and attribute the *Medea* of *TrGF* adesp. fr. 667a to Theodorides seems extremely risky, if not arbitrary.

Stefanis registers only one Theodorides from Boeotia, a *didaskalos* of the 3rd century BC. Sutton links the Theodorides of the inscription with the Athenian actor Theodorus, whose demos is not mentioned, (nr.1157 Stefanis) assuming that the son of the actor could excel at the composition

37. Suess (1966) 313.

38. Simon (1982) 482. Starting from the Platonic extract Taplin (1986) 163-174 compares tragedy to comedy in the 5th century BC.

39. Pechstein & Krumeich in Krumeich – Pechstein – Seidensticker (1999) 475: “Die Figur Lamia zeigt sowohl tragische als auch burleske Züge”.

40. The intonation differs depending on the poet: Lámia (*Λαμία*) for Euripides, Lámia (*Λάμια*) for Crates.

41. Stoll in Roscher (1894-1897) 2.2: 1818-1821.

of dramas.⁴² However, no source mentions that the son of the actor Theodorus, was Theodorides.⁴³ Kirchner mentions nine individuals by that name.⁴⁴ Among them, only Theodorides Theodorou from the Cecropis phyle lived in the middle of the 4th century BC (II 1007 col. II 4), about whom unfortunately no further information is known.

In conclusion, given that there are many recordings of the same name but in a different demos, we cannot dispute Kirchner's information that the actor Theodorus of the Cecropis phyle had a son named Theodorides, but we cannot accept that the son of Theodorus was a poet and indeed participated with the play *Medea* in the Lenaea in 363 BC, as Sutton claims.⁴⁵ According to the testimonies it was common for the son of a poet to carry on the family tradition and to pursue a career as a poet (e.g. Aeschylus' sons Euphorion and Euaion, Sophocles' son Iophon, Astydamos I the son of Morsimus the son of Philocles, tragic poets both of them), or less often as a dancer (Carcinus' son, Xenotimus), but not vice versa. We don't assume that poetic talent was some kind of birthright which goes from father to son but, as Sutton has already noticed studying the evidence for theatrical families, it was the educational influence which created the appropriate conditions for a playwright or an actor to work in and benefit from the family experience.⁴⁶

If this interpretation is correct, then the inscription *SEG* 26, 203 would confirm the *communis opinio* that no satyr play was included in the Lenaeian tragic competitions of the 4th century BC and, consequently, would provide a means of enriching our understanding of *TrGF* adesp. fr. 667a, on the basis of its genre.

42. Stefanis (1988) 209 nr. 1150: “Θ[εοδ]ωρίδης Βοιώτιος, διδάσκαλος. *IG* II² 3079 = Mette, II 2.2 (p. 80): Ἐδίδασκε νικητὴ χορὸ ἀνδρῶν Λεωντίδος φυλῆς στὴν Ἀθήνα ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Νικίου (282/1 π.Χ.).”

43. Diehl in *RE* VA 2 (1934) 1808-9; Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 329; Stefanis (1988) 210-212; Davies (1971) 220, who considers that Theodorides of the Cecropis phyle was related to Theodorides Athmoneus, and that both were of a wealthy family, without mentioning any theatrical activity.

44. Kirchner (1901) 442.

45. In *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* of Fraser – Matthews – Osborne – Byrne (1994) 215 Θεοδωρίδης Θεοδώρου Ἀθμονεύς in the 4th century BC is mentioned on the basis of the inscription *IG* II² 2385, 25. In this specific inscription other persons under the name Θεόδωρος are mentioned, with different sons (l. 11 Σίμων Θεοδώρου, l. 105 Θεότιμος Θεοδώρο[]), references which provide an argument calling Sutton's conclusion into question.

46. Sutton (1987b) 9: “Once playwrighting, acting, or both, became a ‘family business’, such skills would be transmitted within families”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnott, W. G. (ed.) (1996), *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary*, Cambridge.
- Bernhard, J. (1884-1890), “*Danaiden – Danaos*”, in Roscher 1.1, 949-954.
- Camp, J. McK. (1971), “Greek Inscriptions: Tragedies Presented at the Lenaia of 364/3 B.C.”, *Hesperia* 40, 302-307.
- Davies, J.K. (1971), *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford.
- Diehl, E. (1934), “Theodoros”, *RE* VA 2, 1808-9.
- Easterling, P. E. (ed.) (1997), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge.
- Fraser, P. M. – Matthews, E. – Osborne, M. J. – Byrne, S. G. (1994), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, v. 2: *Attica*, Oxford.
- Ghiron-Bistagne, P. (1976), *Recherches sur les acteurs dans la Grèce antique*, Paris.
- Griffith, M. (2015), *Greek Satyr Play. Five Studies*, Berkeley, California.
- Hanink, J. (2014), *Lycurgan Athens and the Making of Classical Tragedy*, Cambridge.
- Hanink, J. (2017), “Archives, Repertoires, Bodies and Bones: Thoughts on Re-performance for Classicists”, in R. Hunter – A. Uhlig (eds.), *Imagining Reperformance in Ancient Culture*, Cambridge, 21-41.
- Hunter, R. – Uhlig, A. (eds) (2017), *Imagining Reperformance in Ancient Culture*, Cambridge.
- Kaibel, G. (1895), “Kratinos’ *Ὀδυσσοῆς* und Euripides’ *Κόκλωψ*”, *Hermes* 30, 71-89.
- Keuls, E. C. (1985), *The Reign of the Phallus. Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London.
- Keyßner, K. (1937), “Oinopion”, *RE* XVII 1, 2272-2275.
- Kirchner, I. (1901), *Prosopographia Attica*, v. 1, Berlin.
- Konstantakos, I.M. (2003), “Riddles, Philosophers and Fishes: Aesop and the *θαλάσσιον πρόβατον* (*Vita Aesopi* W 24, G 47)”, *Eranos* 101, 94-113.
- Konstantakos, I. M. (2004), “Trial by Riddle: The Testing of the Counsellor and the Contest of Kings in the Legend of Amasis and Bias”, *Classica et Mediaevalia* 55, 85-137.
- Krumeich, R. – Pechstein, N. – Seidensticker, B. (hrsg.) (1999), *Das Griechische Satyrspiel*, Darmstadt.
- Lightfoot, J. L. (ed.) (1999), *Parthenius of Nicaea. The Poetical Fragments and the Ἐρωτικά παθήματα*, Oxford.
- Lindblom, A. (2011), *Take a Walk on the Wild Side. The Behaviour, Attitude and Identity of Women Approached by Satyrs on Attic Red-Figure Vases from 530 to 400 B.C.*, Diss., Stockholm University.
- Luppe W. (2009), “Zur Anzahl der an den Lenäen von den Tragikern aufgeführten Dramen”, *APF* 55, 36-39.

- Maidment, K. J. (1935), "The Later Comic Chorus", *CQ* 29, 1-24.
- Makres, A. (1994), *The Institution of Choregia in Classical Athens*, PhD Diss., Oxford University.
- Meritt, B. D. (1938), "Greek Inscriptions", *Hesperia* 7, 77-160.
- Mette, H. J. (1977), *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Griechenland*, Berlin/New York.
- Millis, B. W. (2014), "Inscribed Public Records of the Dramatic Contests at Athens", in E. Csapo – H. R. Goette – J. R. Green – P. Wilson (eds.), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C.*, Berlin/Boston, 425-445.
- Millis, B. W. – Olson, S.D. (2012), *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens. IG II² 2318-2325 and Related Texts*, Leiden/Boston.
- Mylonopoulos, J. (ed.) (2010), *Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Leiden/Boston.
- Osborne, M. J. (2009), "The Archons of Athens 300/299-228/7", *ZPE* 171, 83-99.
- Pearson, A. C. (1917), *The Fragments of Sophocles*, v. 2, Cambridge.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1988), *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, revised by J. Gould – D. M. Lewis, Oxford.
- Podlecki, A. J. (2005), "Aischylos Satyrikos", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Satyr Drama. Tragedy at Play*, Swansea, 1-19.
- Roscher, W. H. (ed.) (1884-1937), *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, v. 1-6, Leipzig.
- Simon, E. (1981), "Amymone", *LIMC* 1.1, 742-752 and 1.2, 597-608.
- Simon, E. (1982), "Dramen des Älteren Dionysios auf Italiotischen Vasen", in *ΑΠ-ΑΡΧΑΙ. Nuove ricerche e studi sulla Magna Grecia e la Sicilia antica in onore di Paolo Enrico Arias*, Pisa, 479-482.
- Slater, N. W. (2005), "Nothing To Do With Satyrs? *Alcestis* and the Concept of Prosatyric Drama", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Satyr Drama. Tragedy at Play*, Swansea, 83-101.
- Sommerstein, A.H. (1989), *Aeschylus: Eumenides*, Cambridge.
- Stefanis, I. E. (1988), *Διονυσιακοί τεχνίται: Συμβολές στην προσωπογραφία του θεάτρον και τῆς μουσικῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων Ἑλλήνων*, Heraklion.
- Stephanopoulos, Th. K. (1980), *Umgestaltung des Mythos durch Euripides*, Athen.
- Stephanopoulos, Th. K. (2014), "Marginalia Tragica II", *Logeion* 4, 193-200.
- Stoll, H.W. (1884-1890), "Amymone", in Roscher 1.1, 327-328.
- Stoll, H.W. (1894-1897), "Lamia", in Roscher 2.2, 1818-1821.
- Suess, W. (1966), "Der Ältere Dionys als Tragiker", *RhM* 109, 299-318.
- Summa, D. (2008), "Un Concours de Drames 'Anciens' à Athènes", *REG* 121, 479-496.
- Summa, D. (2010), "Das Athenische Theater und die Didaskalien", in H. Lohmann – T. Mattern (eds.), *Attika: Archäologie einer "zentralen" Kulturlandschaft: Akten der internationalen Tagung vom 18.20 Mai 2007 in Marburg*, Wiesbaden, 121-30.
- Summa, D. (2015), "New Light on IG II/III² 2319, the Fragment of the Athenian Didascaliae Transcribed by Michel Fourmont", *ZPE* 193, 110-117.
- Sutton, D. F. (1980), "Satyr Plays at the Lenaia?", *ZPE* 37, 158-160.

- Sutton, D. F. (1987a), "P.Lit.Lond. 77: A Post-Classical Satyr-Play", in id., *Papyrological Studies in Dionysiac Literature*, Oak Park, 9-60.
- Sutton, D. F. (1987b), "The Theatrical Families of Athens", *AJPh* 108, 9-26.
- Synodinou, K. (2005), *Ευρωπαϊδης: Εξάβη*, v. 1-2, Athens.
- Taplin, O. (1986), "Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy: A Synkrisis", *JHS* 106, 163-174.
- Tracy, S. V. (2015), "The Dramatic Festival Inscriptions of Athens: The Inscribers and Phases of Inscribing", *Hesperia* 84, 553-581.
- Webb, R. (2017), "Reperformance and Embodied Knowledge in Roman Pantomime", in R. Hunter – A. Uhlig (eds.), *Imagining Reperformance in Ancient Culture*, Cambridge, 262-279.
- Wilson, P. (2000), *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia. The Chorus, the City and the Stage*, Cambridge.
- Wilhem, A. (1906), *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen*, Wien.
- Wörner, E. (1897-1909), "Oinopion", in *Roscher* 3, 795-798.

PATRAS / GREECE
nmpiliani@yahoo.gr