ABSTRACT: This article attempts to evaluate the possibility that satyr drama was included in the Lenaean 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 Lenaean but also the discussion on the genre of TrGF adesp. fr. 667a (Μήδεια Σατυρική?), 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 Lenaean. The vast majority of scholars accept the communis opinio that satyr drama was not included in the Lenaean 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 Ἀγαμέμνον.
26, 203 (that came to light in 1970 in the excavations of the Athenian Agora and edited by Camp in 1971), which preserves tragic contests of 364 and 363 BC. 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.

2. SEG 26, 203:

(420/419) ἐπὶ Ἀ[στυφίλου - - - ]
     Ἀγα[μέμνονι - - - ] [sic]
     ἔπει[- - - ]
     Ἡρα[- - - δεύ:]
     Θηρη[ι - - - ]
     ἔπι[ε - - - ]
     ἔποι[- - - ἐνίκα]

(419/418) ἐπὶ Ἀγχ[ίον - - - ]
     Τοῦτῳ Τῇ [- - - ]
     ἔπει: Λυσικράτ[ης]
     Καλλιστηρίῳ [δεύ]
     Ἀμφίλοχῳ Τήνο[ν]
     ἔπει: Καλλιπίδ[ῆς]
     [ἐπὶ]: Καλλιπίδ[ῆς] ἐνίκα

(418/417) ἐπὶ Ἀ[ντιφῶνος Σ - - - ]
     Ἀνδροσθέ[νης]
     Κλεαίνετος τ[ρί]
     Ὑψιπύλῃ Φ[- - - ]
     ἔποι: Ἐρε[χθος]

(364/3) ἐπὶ Τιμοχράτῳ[ς - - - ]
     Οἰοκτίῳ Εἰχρ [- - - ]
     ἔπει: Ἀρηξίς
     Θεοδώρῳ δεύ:
     Μηδείᾳ Φαθόντ[ι]
     ἔπει: Ανδροσθέ[νης]
     Κλεαίνετος τ[ρί]
     ἔποι: Τιμωρα[ζον]
     ἔποι: Ἀρηξίς[ε]ς

(363/2) ἐπὶ Χαρίξ[ις Λείδου - - - ]


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 (Amymone, 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?’: 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) 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, Amymone, Oenopion and Hypsipyle are suitable titles for satyr dramas, so as Medea, in his view. This claim led Sutton to support the satyrical 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, 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 Ίοις (Εἰρις for Ίρις, 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 δεύ: one tragedy title]
[two (longer) tragedy titles]
Εἰρ[ιδι σατ vel. σατυρ]
ἑπε[: - - - ]
ἐπε[: - - - ]

5. Cf. IG II² 2320 col.II (Didaskalai 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. The name Εἶρις could be replaced by Ἶρις, 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 Ἶρις is a dramatis persona in Eur. Heracles. If we look closely at the titles in the same position in the inscription as the play Εἶρις, that is to say the titles listed first, we can notice that none of these are unquestionably satirical. 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 (Didaskalaiai of the City Dionysia) for the years 341-339 BC is, so to speak, conclusive.

[ἐπὶ Σωσιγένους σάτυρι] [sic] (342/1)

[παλαι] ἰ: Νε[σπτόλ]
[Ἰρενε] νειαί Ἔφ[πη] ἄδων
[ποι]: Ἀστυδάμας
[Ἀχι]: ἱλιε ὑπε : Θετταλός
Ἀθάμαντι ὑπε : Νεοπτόλ
[Ἀ]: ντιγόνη ὑπε : Αθηρόδω
[Ἐ]: θάρετος δ[ἐ] ὑπε : Τέβχω
[ὑπ]: Αθηρόδωρος
[Ἀχι]: ἱλιε δ[πε] : Θετταλός

The indication παλαιάί, “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. In the above-mentioned didascalic 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. 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

---


the day of tragic competitions, 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. The same tendency is noted in the Didaskalíai which are embedded in Hypotheses of the plays, where the fourth play is explicitly stated as a satyr drama. 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. 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, 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.

---

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.
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 satyrical treatment of the respective myth. 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. 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 satyrical 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. 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).


19. Hes. fr. 148a Merkelbach – West = [Eratosth.] Cat. 1, 32, 8-15: ἐλθόντα δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς Χίον Μερόπην τὴν Οἰνοπίωνος βιάσασθαι οἰνοθέτα, γνώστα δὲ τὸν Οἰνοπίωνα καὶ χαλέπως ἐγνώκτα τὴν ὄμων ἐκπρότασα αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν τῆς χώρας ἐνοπίαν ἐλθόντα δὲ εἰς Λήμνον ἀλληλότητα Ἡραίων συμμεῖα, ὃς αὐτῶν ἔλεγχος ὑπέδωκεν αὐτῶι Κηδαλίωνα τὸν αὐτοῦ [οἰκείον] οἰκέτην, ὡς δὲ ἄδημην ἢνα ἤγηται αὐτῶι· ὃν λαβὼν ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοίων ἐπερετείνεστα τὰς ὀδοὺς· ἐλθὼν δ’ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀνατολάς καὶ Ἡλίου συμμεῖας δοκεῖ ὑγιασθῆναι καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸν Οἰνοπίωνον ἐλθεῖν πάλιν, τιμωρίαν αὐτῶι ἐπιθήσατο· ὁ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν ὑπὸ γῆν ἐκέχρισε.
(who in a tragedy might have composed the Chorus) — or, according to a different version, Poseidon — hide Oenopion in an underground space.  

Although there is a satyr drama of Sophocles named Cedalion — 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, 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. Yet, this is not the only example of a blind hero in tragedy. Emblematic Oedipus, Phineus, the blind seer and Thamyris 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 παρηπάτησας, v. 12 / Μοίρας δολώσας[…]/, vv. 33-34 […]/). 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), and
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 οἶνψ (dark, cf. οἶνψ πόντος), 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 satyr Amymone of Aeschylus, attested as the fourth play in the trilogy Danaides, does not exclude the possibility that the same theme could be the subject of a tragedy. Only about one-quarter (¼) of the archaeological data illustrating this heroine (LIMC) includes Satyrs. The rest depicts Amymone either alone or with Poseidon or even with Erotes. Moreover, Poseidon does not often appear in satyr dramas (with the exception of Amymone and Aeschylus’s Theoroi or Isthmiastai). The depiction of Amymone, according to Keuls, 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).

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

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 Aesh. Amymone, Soph. Nausicaa, Ion Omphale, we could accept a satyric Medea, as well.
29. Unlike Theseus and above all Hercules, who is the emblematic hero not only in comedies but also in satyr dramas.
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).

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. Worthy of mention is Δαναίδων ὑδρεῖαι ἀτελεῖς, 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. 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 Alcmaeon and Athamas 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 Astydamas 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), Amphiaraus (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 satyr; 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 Thamyphic, 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 (Thamyris), 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, uses [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”.

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 Lykophrón’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

---

40. The intonation differs depending on the poet: Lamía (Λαμία) for Euripides, Lámia (Λάμια) for Crates.
41. Stoll in Roscher (1894-1897) 2.2: 1818-1821.
of dramas. However, no source mentions that the son of the actor Theodorus, was Theodorides. Kirchner mentions nine individuals by that name. 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. 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, Astydamas 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.

If this interpretation is correct, then the inscription SEG 26, 203 would confirm the communis opinio that no satyr play was included in the Lenaean 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[εόδ]ιωρίδης Βοιώτιος, διδάσκαλος. IG II² 3079 = Mette, II 2.2 (p. 80): Ἐδίδασκε νικητή χορό ἀνδρῶν Λεωντίδος φυλῆς στὴν Αθήνα ἐπὶ ἀρχοντος Νικίον (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 Αθμονεύς 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 Θεοδώρος), references which provide an argument calling Sutton’s conclusion into question.

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