

## THE PLACE OF THE SATYR-PLAY IN THE TRAGIC TETRALOGY

Everyone knows that, in the fifth century BC, poets competing for the prize in tragic composition at the Dionysia produced a series of four plays, usually consisting of three tragedies and a satyr-play, and that the satyr-play was performed last. When one looks for reliable ancient evidence for the satyr-play serving as the finale, however, one is surprised to find that there is none. In the standard work on the performances at the dramatic festivals in Athens, Arthur Pickard-Cambridge writes<sup>1</sup>: “Throughout the fifth century B.C. and probably, apart from a few exceptional years, through the earlier part of the fourth century also, three tragic poets entered the contest for the prize in tragedy, and each presented four plays, of which the fourth was normally a satyric play, until at some date before 341 B.C. a single satyric play came to be presented at the beginning of the programme and each tragic poet offered at most three plays only”.

Pickard-Cambridge’s *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* is the standard work in part because it is scrupulous in documenting its assertions and, in its various editions, has been overseen and revised by such eminent scholars as T. B. L. Webster, John Gould and David Lewis. And yet no footnote accompanies the above quotation. Nor is Pickard-Cambridge alone in making such a statement about the position of the satyr-play in the tragic production and failing to cite evidence in its support. Similar statements – and similar reticence regarding the source of the information – can be found in virtually all references to the matter<sup>2</sup>.

To my knowledge, the only explicit statement in an ancient source claiming that the satyr-play came fourth in the tragic program is from Diogenes Laertius (3.56 = Dörrie-Baltes 48.1 = T22 Tarrant). For reasons which will be im-

<sup>1</sup> Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 79, repeated almost verbatim (from an earlier edition) by Trypanis 1981, 129-30. We will return below to the question of the “single satyric play... at the beginning of the programme” in the fourth century.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. FriebeL-Larsow 1837, 12 (“quartum quemque locum obtinet drama satyricum”); Pohlenz 1954, I 37 (“auf drei ernste Tragödien... ein Satyrspiel folgen sollte”); Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 62 (“last play of each group of four”); Seidensticker 1979, 204 (“Nachspiel”); Sutton 1980, 134 (“three tragedies followed by a satyr play”); Hall 1998, 20 (“the conclusion to and culmination of tragic performances”); Hall 2006, 149 (“Satyr Drama as Tragic Closure”); Lämmle 2011, 616 (“drei Tragödien gefolgt von einem Satyrspiel”); Lämmle 2013, 19 (“Auf die tragische Trilogie folgt ein Satyrspiel”); O’Sullivan-Collard 2013, 2 (“followed three tragedies as a more or less humorous postlude”); Shaw 2014, 2 (“performed after a set of three tragedies”).

mediately apparent, this statement is rarely cited in support of the notion<sup>3</sup>:

Θράσυλλος δέ φησι [*FHG* iii. 505] καὶ κατὰ τὴν τραγικὴν τετραλογίαν ἐκδοῦναι αὐτὸν [*sc.* Πλάτωνα] τοὺς διαλόγους, οἷον ἐκεῖνοι τέτρασι δράμασιν ἡγωνίζοντο – Διονυσίοις, Ληναίοις, Παναθηναίοις, Χύτροις – ὧν τὸ τέταρτον ἦν σατυρικόν.

“Thrasyllus says that Plato even published his dialogues in the manner of a tragic tetralogy, in the way that tragedians used to compete by producing four plays – at the Dionysia, the Lenaia, the Panathenaea and the Chytroi – of which the fourth was a satyr-play”.

Regardless of whether Diogenes’ Greek is intended to mean that there were four plays performed at each of the four festivals or that each festival featured one play (in which case the sequence of festivals is incorrect, as Chytroi fell between the Lenaia and the Dionysia in the Athenian calendar), the testimony is faulty, since sets of four plays were produced at the Dionysia and only at the Dionysia. Thus this evidence is of no value for the fifth century, although it suggests that at the time of Diogenes Laertius it was thought that satyr-plays at some earlier date were performed last<sup>4</sup>. The practice of producing dramas in sets of four at the Dionysia came to an end some time during the fourth century (see below), so that Thrasyllus and Diogenes Laertius, not to mention the anonymous author of the Platonic *Prolegomena*, were speaking in terms of a practice that had not been in effect for several centuries. On what, then, were they basing their assertion that the last play of a tetralogy was the satyr-play?

I suggest that they were relying on the same type of evidence that modern scholars seem to have used as the basis for their confident assertions. Only rarely do scholars make explicit the reason for their confidence. Presumably Wolfgang Aly speaks for all when he says, in his Pauly-Wissowa article (1921, 236), that the satyr-play was performed “nach den erhaltenen Didaskalien an letzter Stel-

<sup>3</sup> I am not aware of anyone using this as evidence for the satyr-play in fourth place since Schöll 1859, 85 (cf. Schöll 1839, i and 1-2).

<sup>4</sup> The whole of the text quoted cannot be assumed to derive from Thrasyllus, who lived at the time of the emperor Tiberius. What follows ἡγωνίζοντο (or what follows Διονυσίοις?) must be a later addition, since Thrasyllus’ arrangement of Plato’s dialogues (for which see below, n. 54) does not reflect any particular understanding of the place of the satyr-play. From even later we have the following statement in the anonymous 6th-century *Prolegomena Philosophiae Platonicae* 24.20-23, translated by Westerink (1962, 44): “they say that Plato published his dialogues in tetralogies in imitation of the tragic and comic [!] poets, who took part in the competition with four plays dealing with the same subject, the last in a humorous vein (ἐν δὲ τῷ τελευταίῳ εἰς ἥδονὴν κατήντων)”.

le". The *didascaliae* that Aly refers to are the official records of performances at the City Dionysia and the Lenaea, portions of which survive in inscriptions. Those inscriptions have been newly and expertly edited by Benjamin Millis and Douglas Olson (2012, 59-121) but, unfortunately, the portions that survive do not relate to the tragic competition at the Dionysia in the fifth century, so that there is no inscriptional evidence for tetralogies with their satyr-play. We do, however, find occasional notices in literary sources, in dramatic hypotheses and in the scholia that appear to derive from the same official records. The only instances in which all four plays of a tetralogy are given are the following<sup>5</sup>:

- (1) Aeschylus: *Phineus*, *Persae*, *Glaucus Potnieus*, *Prometheus* (sat.?)
- (2) Aeschylus: *Laius*, *Oedipus*, *Septem contra Thebas*, *Sphinx* sat.
- (3) Aeschylus: *Agamemnon*, *Choephoroi*, *Eumenides*, *Proteus* sat.
- (4) Aeschylus: *Edonoi*, *Bassaridae*, *Neaniskoi*, *Lycurgus* sat.
- (5) Euripides: *Cressae*, *Alcmaeon in Psophis*, *Telephus*, *Alcestis*
- (6) Euripides: *Medea*, *Philoctetes*, *Diktys*, *Theristae* sat.
- (7) Xenocles: *Oedipus*, *Lycaon*, *Bacchae*, *Athamas* sat.
- (8) Euripides: *Alexander*, *Palamedes*, *Troades*, *Sisyphus* sat.

to which may be added these partial listings:

- (9) Aristias (producing plays by Pratinas): *Perseus*, *Tantalus*, *Palaestae* sat.
- (10) Aeschylus: [ ... ] *Danaides*, *Amymone* sat.

In every case except (1) the satyr-play is identified as such and in every case the satyr-play is listed last<sup>6</sup>. In the case of Aeschylus' *Oresteia* (3) no sane per-

<sup>5</sup> The sources are: (1) arg. *Pers.*; (2) and (9) arg. *Sept.* and POxy 2256 fr. 2 (either the title of one of Aristias' tragedies has been lost or only two were staged in this posthumous production); (3) arg. Ag. and schol. Ar. *Ran.* 1124; (4) schol. Ar. *Thesm.* 135; (5) arg. *Alc.*; (6) arg. *Med.*; (7) and (8) Ael. *VH* 2.8; (10) POxy 2256 fr. 3. In addition, we are told of a *Lycurgeia* by Polyphrasmon (arg. A. *Sept.* and POxy 2256 fr. 2), a *Telepheia* by Sophocles (IG II<sup>2</sup> 3091.8) and an *Oedipodeia* by Meletus (Arist. fr. 628 Rose), but the titles of the individual plays are not recorded and we do not know whether these are the names of trilogies or tetralogies. Aristotle (fr. 619 Rose) refers to a *Pandionis* tetralogy by Philocles, of which his *Tereus* is the only play known to have been a part.

<sup>6</sup> It is nearly universally agreed that the *Prometheus* in Aeschylus' production of 472 BC is the satyr-play (*Prom. Pyrkaeus*?) of which a few fragments are preserved (204a-207a Radt): R. Garmar, N. Pechstein and R. Krumeich in Krumeich-Pechstein-Seidensticker 1999, 169-78; Podlecki 2005, 6-7; Sommerstein 2008, 210-13; O'Sullivan-Collard 2013, 282-83. No importance attaches to the fact that the play is not explicitly designated as satyric: In the Medicean catalogue of Aeschylean titles, edited on the last page of Page's OCT of the poet, only *Circe* is designated as a satyr-play, although the catalogue lists other satyr-plays, including *Sphinx*, *Lycurgus*, *Proteus* and *Amymone* (Pechstein 1998, 195-96).

son would doubt that the order in which the three tragedies is listed accurately reflects the order in which they were performed at the Dionysia in 458 BC, and it is perhaps a reasonable inference that this order of performance extends as well to the satyr-play *Proteus*. I assume that it is this reasonable inference that has led to the apparently universal view that these didascalical notices provide evidence that the satyr-play was the last item in the tragic tetralogy. The sequence given in (2) and (8) also seems faithful to the order in which the tragedies were likely performed; based on the titles and the preserved fragments, the tragedies appear to have followed a consecutive narrative like that seen in the surviving *Oresteia*. But is there reason to believe that the narrative pattern included the satyr-play as well? To begin with, it is notable that in each instance in which the tragedies are related to one another – namely, (2), (3), (4), (10) and perhaps (8) – the satyr-play is drawn from the same mythical milieu as the three tragedies. It is surely significant that Aeschylus chose not to compose his *Lycurgus* to accompany the *Oresteia* trilogy, or his *Sphinx* to complement the three tragedies concerned with the daughters of Danaus. It is reasonable to imagine, therefore, that Aeschylus, on those occasions when he composed a tetralogy consisting of related plays, intended his plays to follow a narrative sequence corresponding to the chronological development of the plot. But does that narrative sequence extend to the satyr-plays as well?

Surely the consistency with which the satyr-plays are recorded in last place is significant. But of what is it significant? There are two possibilities: Either, as seems always to have been assumed, satyr-plays were regularly performed last and therefore were listed last, or there was no uniform convention or requirement that satyr-plays be performed last, in which case their position in the record is due to some other reason. If in fact satyr-plays were not routinely performed last, a ready explanation is available for the fact that they were recorded following the tragedies with which they were produced. They were composed, after all, as part of an entry in a competition for *tragic* playwrights and the prize the poets hoped to win was a prize for *tragic* composition. So, for example, the surviving portion of the “Fasti” happens to record for the Dionysia of 472 BC (IG II<sup>2</sup> 2318 col. ii, 4-6) that “*for tragedy* Pericles of Cholargus was the producer and Aeschylus the director” (τραγῳδῶν Περικλῆς Χολαργ(γεὺς) ἐχορή(γει) Αἰσχύλος ἐ[δ]ίδασκε)<sup>7</sup>. The hypothesis to Aeschylus’ *Persae* displays similar

<sup>7</sup> The “Fasti” do not record titles of plays. Titles are recorded in the didascaliae (IG II<sup>2</sup> 2319-2323a and SEG XXVI 203), but the surviving portions of the inscriptions do not include records of the tragic competition at the Dionysia in the fifth century. Significantly, the surviving titles of sa-

language (ἐπὶ Μένωνος τραγῳδῶν Αἰσχύλος ἐνίκᾱ), but goes on to record the titles of the “tragedies” with which Aeschylus was victorious: Φινεῖ, Πέρσαις, Γλαύκῳ Ποτνιεῖ, Προμηθεῖ. One of those plays was not a tragedy at all but was a satyr-play, namely *Prometheus*. Peter Wiesmann (1929, 39) compares the language used in Plato’s *Symposium*, where we are told that the celebration that forms the setting of the dialogue took place “at the time when Agathon was victorious with his first tragic production” (ὅτε τῇ πρώτῃ τραγῳδίᾳ ἐνίκησεν Ἀγάθων, 173a). Wiesmann also compares the *Marmor Parium*, which records the first victories of Aeschylus and Sophocles using the same formula (FGrH 239 A 65 and 72; likewise 75 for Euripides). All these poets produced satyr-plays at the Dionysia as well, but they are identified exclusively as tragic playwrights<sup>8</sup>. Consequently, when “Euripides” brings his relative to Agathon’s house in Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazusae*, he introduces his fellow-poet as Agathon ὁ τραγῳδοποιός<sup>9</sup>. And Diodorus Siculus, describing the death of Sophocles at the age of ninety, calls him ποιητὴς τραγῳδιῶν (13.103.4). One can readily imagine, then, a circumstance in which, when the plays produced for the tragic competition were listed in the official record, the tragedies were given first and the satyr-play, if there was one, last, regardless of the order in which the four plays were actually performed. In fact, the records that survive to this day all seem to derive from Aristotle’s *Didascaliae*, a compilation itself based on Athenian public archives<sup>10</sup>. We do not know in what position the titles of satyr-plays were listed in the Athenian archives, nor do we know to what extent Aristotle may have rearranged the material that he found in his source. Aristotle ignores satyr-plays in his *Poetics* and seems to have had little interest in the genre. Consequently, in the section of his *Didascaliae* dealing with the results of the tragic competition at the Dionysia he may have relegated the titles of satyr-plays to last place, even if they appeared in a different order in the official record<sup>11</sup>.

tyr-plays derive from the *didascaliae* that recorded the results of the *tragic* competition at the Dionysia; see Millis 2014, 434-40 for a lucid and authoritative description of the nature of these inscriptions.

<sup>8</sup> Even Pratinas, whom the *Suda* (π 2230) refers to as the inventor of the satyr-play, 64% of whose plays were satyric, is identified in that compilation as ποιητὴς τραγῳδίας.

<sup>9</sup> Ar. *Thesm.* 30; that Agathon composed satyr-plays as well is lasciviously acknowledged at 157-58.

<sup>10</sup> Pfeiffer 1968, 81; Blum 1991, 24-43.

<sup>11</sup> See below for Aristotle’s indifference to satyr-play. There is a parallel to this kind of dislocation from the twentieth century. In the middle of the century in the United States it was common for movie theaters to show two films for the price of one. One was the “feature film”, a

Aeschylus' production in 472 BC, when he was victorious with *Phineus*, *Persae*, *Glaucus Potnieus* and *Prometheus*, seems to have been typical of tragic productions in the earliest period of competition at the Dionysia. That is, like his rivals on that occasion, he staged four plays, one of which was a satyr-play, unrelated to one another in plot. It is useful to remind ourselves how little we know regarding the circumstances of production in the early fifth century and regarding the records kept of those productions. When Aeschylus composed the four plays for the Dionysia celebrated during the archonship of Meno, did he have in mind a particular sequence in which the individual dramas were to be performed? Was there a thematic program, which we might have been able to discern had all four plays survived, that dictated the sequence? Or were there other considerations that determined the order in which the plays were performed (for example, a desire to give the protagonist a less strenuous role in a play following one in which great demands were made on him, or a preference for saving for last the play with the most lavish costumes)? And, whatever the sequence, what do we know about the method and the medium used to preserve a record of the production? Clearly in the case of productions like the *Oresteia* or the *Lycurgeia* it would have made sense to record the titles according to the narrative sequence followed in performance, but would it have mattered in what order the titles of Aeschylus' production in 472 BC were recorded? The characters, the time periods and the locales of the four plays were distinct from, and unrelated to, one another. If, say, Euripides' *HF*, *Electra*, *Ion* and *Phoenissae* had been presented in the same year, it is difficult to see why it would have been important to record the order in which they were performed,

big-budget production with popular stars of the cinema which was lavishly promoted by the studio and prominently advertised by the theater. The other movie came to be known as the "B film", not because it was shown second on the program but because of its lower budget and, generally, lower quality. In fact, the B film opened the program of the "double bill", although the "feature film" would invariably be listed first (and be given more space) on theater posters and in advertisements. Nevertheless, Thomas Schatz, in his history of mid-century American cinema, occasionally refers to the B film as "the second movie", as when he says that in the 1940s double features "were considered a drain on possible revenues, particularly if the second [sic] movie was a weak B film" (1999, 73; cf. 78: "the recognized lower quality of the second [sic] feature, the B picture"). One could be forgiven for reading this and thinking that B films came second on the program. That they were not is clear from what Schatz says elsewhere (76), that "a New York theater in 1941 began routinely starting the feature at 9:00 P.M. so that patrons could time their arrival and avoid the B picture if they wished".

whatever that order might have been<sup>12</sup>.

We should acknowledge that none of the questions posed in the previous paragraph can be answered with any certainty. Here are two more questions that may prove somewhat easier to answer: Is there any evidence, apart from the consistency with which satyr-plays are given last in the surviving didascalic record, that satyr-plays were in fact performed last? And, conversely, is there any reason to doubt that they were performed last? In answer to the first question, I am not aware of any such evidence. As to the second question, I should like to explore in the remainder of this paper the possibility that there may, indeed, be reason to be sceptical of the longstanding conviction that the satyr-play was the final element of the tragic production at the Dionysia. We have seen that Aeschylus (and perhaps Euripides) composed satyr-plays drawn from the same narrative context on those occasions when he produced three tragedies that dramatized a recognizable sequence within the same mythical framework. What is striking, however, is that in not one of those cases does the plot of the satyr-play belong last in the narrative sequence. On the contrary, in every case the plot of the satyr-play relates to an earlier stage of the mythical narrative. So, for example, the title-character of Aeschylus' *Sphinx* (2) is no longer a living threat to the Theban citizens in *Septem contra Thebas*, and the plot of *Proteus* (3), as it is usually reconstructed, is more or less contemporaneous with that of *Agamemnon*. We will return to this matter in greater detail below. Further, there is in fact one ancient source that has been taken by scholars to indicate that at some period satyr-plays were performed before the tragedies, a source that well illustrates the uncertain nature of the evidence on which we are forced to rely.

The entry for the proverb, Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον, in the compilation attributed to the paroemiographer Zenobius (5.40 von Leutsch-Schneidewin), reads as follows:

ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ μὴ προσήκοντα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις λεγόντων ἡ παροιμία εἴρηται. ἐπειδὴ τῶν χορῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰθισμένων διθύραμβον ᾄδειν εἰς τὸν

<sup>12</sup> Because of similar considerations, modern editors who publish collections of, e.g., Edgar Allan Poe's stories are free to exercise considerable independence in the order in which the tales are presented. The same is true, for the most part, with collections of Sherlock Holmes stories or tales from *The Thousand and One Nights*. But when there is a narrative continuity, the continuity is preserved. So, the seven voyages of Sinbad are grouped together and their sequence respected, and "The Adventure of the Empty House", in which Holmes returns, comes after his "death" at the falls of Reichenbach.

Διόνυσον, οἱ ποιηταὶ ὕστερον ἐκβάντες τὴν συνήθειαν ταύτην, Αἴαντας καὶ Κενταύρους γράφειν ἐπεχείρουν. ὅθεν οἱ θεώμενοι σκώπτοντες ἔλεγον, Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον. διὰ γοῦν τοῦτο τοὺς σατύρους ὕστερον ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς προεισάγειν, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶσιν ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ.

“The proverb is spoken in connection with those who say things not relevant to the matter at hand. For from the beginning it was customary for choruses to sing a dithyramb in honor of Dionysus, but the poets later departed from that custom and set about writing works named *Ajax* and *The Centaur*; so the spectators would say, derisively, «Nothing to do with Dionysus!». This, then, is the reason they later decided to stage satyr-plays as an opener (προεισάγειν), so that they might not seem to be unmindful of the god”.

Already in 1605 Isaac Casaubon referred to this passage, arguing that it related to the early practice of performing satyr-plays as a prelude (“praeluderent”) to the staging of tragedies<sup>13</sup>. Over two hundred years later Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker (1826, 279) was expressing the same view. In his review of Welcker, Gottfried Hermann proposed reading προ<σ>εισάγειν in Zenobius (1827, 114), to prevent the statement from conflicting with what we “know” to be the case about the place of the satyr-play at the end of the tragic production. The emendation did not find favor, however, and nineteenth-century (and some twentieth-century) scholars still considered the evidence of Zenobius to indicate that, in the earliest period, satyr-play preceded tragedy on the program, a practice that had been altered by the time of Aeschylus, when tetralogies culminating in a satyr-play became the norm<sup>14</sup>. In 1877, however, a fragmentary inscription (IG II<sup>2</sup> 2320; cf. Millis–Olson 2012, 61–69) was published which preserves a portion of the tragic didascaliae for the fourth century. It lists a single satyr-play and a single “old” tragedy, both apparently produced *hors de competition*, before recording the contests in tragic composition and tragic acting for each of the years 342 through 340 BC. Once scholars became aware of this inscription, it became possible to regard the statement in Zenobius as a

<sup>13</sup> Casaubon 1605, 23–24. By the time of Aeschylus, according to Casaubon, it had become the custom for each poet to enter a number of plays into the competition, “of which the last was always a satyr-play” (“fabulas... quarum postrema semper Satyrica erat”, 159–60). For the fundamental importance of Casaubon’s study and its influence on later scholarship see Sutton 1980, 196–97; Seidensticker 1989, 7; Seidensticker in Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999, 39–40.

<sup>14</sup> Genthe 1828, 59, repeated almost verbatim by Hintner 1871, 6; Friebe–Larsow 1837, 12; Mancini 1896, 96; Levi 1908, 222; Rossi 1989, 233–34; O’Sullivan–Collard 2013, 25 (“at least conceivable”).



reference to the supposed later practice of producing a satyr-play before the performance of tragedies<sup>15</sup>. But we do not know if those years reflect a permanent change in the program or are somehow anomalous. Nor do we know that the order of events in the inscriptional record is the same as the order in which the events took place. And yet, as with the position of satyr-plays in the *didascaliae* for the fifth century, scholars have assumed that the order recorded is the order of performance<sup>16</sup>.

It is, of course, possible, as most scholars today believe, that it became conventional at some time in the fourth century to open the tragic competition with a satyr-play whereas it had been conventional in the previous century for the satyr-play to come last in each poet's production. But it is equally possible that the sequence in the *didascalie* record is not conclusive evidence of the sequence of performance. It has always seemed to make sense that the sequence recorded for the *Oresteia* – *Agamemnon*, *Choephoroi*, *Eumenides*, *Proteus* – represents the order in which the plays were performed. We have three of the four plays and they manifestly follow the narrative sequence given in the *didascalia*<sup>17</sup>. And the same is true, at least of the tragedies, for Aeschylus' production in 467 (2) and Euripides' in 415 (8), as well as for Aeschylus' *Lycurgeia* (4), assuming that the generally agreed-upon reconstruction of that production is correct. But, as we noted above, the satyr-play in each instance does not fit into the narrative sequence established by the tragedies. Credit for recognizing this goes to Lionello Levi, who, however, like all scholars, remained convinced that the satyr-play in those productions was in fact performed last. Interestingly, Levi believed, on the basis of the entry in Zenobius (above, pp. 9-10), that satyr-plays were originally performed first, and he wonders why, around the year 475 BC, "il drama satirico fu trasportato dal principio alla fine dello spettacolo tragico, dove rimase poi durante tutto il miglior tempo della produzione drammatica"<sup>18</sup>. Levi is unable to give a satisfactory answer. He does,

<sup>15</sup> So Wilamowitz 1914, 18; Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 124-25; Podlecki 2005, 2; Janko 2011, 500; O'Sullivan-Collard 2013, 23 ("possibly").

<sup>16</sup> We should note that there is no incompatibility between the inscriptions preserving the order in which the *events* took place and disregarding the order of the entries *within* those events. After all, the poets are listed, not in the order in which their tetralogies were performed, but according to their success in the competition, that is, in order of merit.

<sup>17</sup> And in the Medicean manuscript (M = Laur. 32.9), the only manuscript in which all three plays are preserved, except that *PV* intervenes between *Choe.* and *Eum.*

<sup>18</sup> Levi 1908, 232. Levi was not concerned with fourth-century developments, as he deals only with the satyr-play up to the time of Aeschylus, otherwise he might have wondered why the satyr-

however, call welcome attention to a neglected feature of three satyr-plays belonging to tetralogies that he considers to be the work of the later years of Aeschylus' career, *Sphinx* (2), *Proteus* (3) and *Lycurgus* (4), as well as one, *Amymone* (10), that we now know to belong to this period. Levi is concerned to argue that Aeschylus began by composing tetralogies in which the plays were unconnected in subject-matter, of which the tetralogy containing *Persae* (1) is an example from 472 BC; that the connected tetralogy is a later Aeschylean development; and, most notably for our purposes, that *the satyr-play of these connected tetralogies is consistently connected chronologically with an earlier stage in the sequence of three tragedies*. Levi develops this last point at some length<sup>19</sup>, but since his article and the implications of his observation have been all but ignored in the past hundred years, I should like to draw attention to his observation and to its implications here. Although Levi recognized that the plot of the satyr-play belongs near the beginning of the tragic trilogy's narrative sequence, he held fast to the conviction that the satyr-play was performed last. If, however, we abandon that conviction and recognize how tenuous is the evidence on which it is based, we are forced to confront the possibility that the satyr-play may have been composed for performance in some position other than last, and I suggest that the evidence available to us indicates that it is at least as likely that satyr-plays in the fifth century were performed before the tragedies with which they were produced as that they were performed after them<sup>20</sup>. At the very least, we need to address the question why, if the satyr-play was in fact performed last, Aeschylus (and Euripides) consistently avoided following the narrative sequence adhered to in each tetralogy's three tragedies.

Levi begins (234-37), not unreasonably, by discussing the preserved *Oresteia*

play was later returned to its original, initial position.

<sup>19</sup> Levi 1908, 234-42, also Levi 1909. Wiesmann (1929, 29), Webster (1965, 21-23) and West (1990, 47: "About the satyr-play *Lycurgus* one can say with some confidence that it went back in time to an earlier stage in the story, as did *Sphinx* in the Oedipus tetralogy and *Proteus* in the *Oresteia*") acknowledge the existence of the feature, but without reference to Levi and without pondering its implications. Gantz (1979, 300 and 1980 passim) is one of the few scholars to refer to Levi's work. What little I have been able to discover about Levi derives from de Gubernatis 1905, 880.

<sup>20</sup> Polyxeni Strolonga has astutely suggested to me that a satyr-play preceding a tragic trilogy would be analogous to the hexameter "Homeric" hymns that served as *prooimia* to epic recitations. I find that Levi (1908, 222-23) draws the same analogy, but considers that it applies only to the period from about 490 to about 472 BC, when he considers that the satyr-play was in fact performed first.

and its lost satyr-play, *Proteus*. Like nearly all critics before and after him, Levi is convinced that the subject-matter of *Proteus* was drawn from the episode in Book 4 of the *Odyssey* in which Menelaus encounters The Old Man of the Sea and is informed by him of the murder of Agamemnon<sup>21</sup>. Decisive for Levi, as for many scholars, is the fact that Eidothea, the daughter of Proteus who assists Menelaus in Book 4, is referred to in the play, with the hypocoristic form Eido (fr. 212). Assuming, then, that Aeschylus followed closely the chronology of the *Odyssey*, the action of *Proteus* must have occurred between the time of *Agamemnon* and that of *Choephoroi*; as Levi notes, at *Od.* 4.519-37 the murder of Agamemnon is spoken of as having already occurred, and at 3.304-12 Nestor tells Telemachus that Menelaus returned to Mycenae, in the eighth year after Agamemnon's murder, on the very day that Orestes killed Aegisthus. If, then, Aeschylus has his Proteus do what Homer's Proteus had done, in the final play of the tetralogy the title-character rather awkwardly summarizes for Menelaus the action of the first play and predicts for him the action of the second and third plays, providing, as Levi puts it (236), a recapitulation of the tragic trilogy and allowing the audience to go home having had, as it were, an opportunity to take in at a glance the lengthy and complicated plot of the entire production.

It is difficult to avoid subjective judgments on matters like this, but I am sure I am not alone in thinking it unworthy of a dramatist as accomplished as Aeschylus to put on stage a character who "predicts" actions that the audience has already witnessed. If, then, *Proteus* followed the tragic trilogy and if, as Levi and most critics have assumed, the satyr-play dealt with the events of Book 4 of the *Odyssey*, it seems most unlikely that Aeschylus' Proteus predicted Orestes' matricide and pursuit by the Furies. It is equally unlikely that he recounted for Menelaus (and for the furry members of the chorus) the grisly murder and mutilation of Agamemnon, which has already been described in loving detail by Clytaemestra (*Ag.* 1379-98), lamented at length in the kommos of the *Choephoroi* and entered into evidence at the trial in *Eumenides* (458-61). But is it inevitably the case that *Proteus* is nothing more than the reheated leftovers from the Homeric feast? It has been suggested that the play included, in addition to the Homeric material, elements from the story of the phantom-Helen and from the Herodotean account of Proteus' detention of Helen in Egypt, elements that

<sup>21</sup> The exiguous fragments of *Proteus*, a mere 17 words, are 210-15 Radt. For recent reconstructions, with earlier bibliography, see Cunningham 1994; R. Germar and R. Krumeich in Krumeich-Pechstein-Seidensticker 1999, 179-81; Griffith 2002, 239-54; Sommerstein 2008, 220-23.

seem well suited to a satyr-play<sup>22</sup>. If that is the case, the plot can have concerned itself with either of two distinct time periods. It could have dealt with the reunion of Helen and Menelaus following the fall of Troy, as in Euripides' *Helen*. But it could equally well have dramatized the arrival in Egypt, ten years previously, of Paris and Helen on their way to Troy. This is the account that Herodotus gives in Book 2. Herodotus even provides an exotic villain, appropriate for a satyr-play, in the form of the overseer Thonis, who detains Paris and his ships<sup>23</sup>. The surviving fragments of *Proteus*, sparse though they are, provide some slight hints that the play may in fact have concerned events ten years before those of *Agamemnon*. Fr. 211 Radt, in its entirety, reads καὶ τὸν ἰχθύων γάρῳ. There is no context, since the sources (Herodian and Athenaeus) only cite the words to illustrate the grammatical gender of γάρῳ. Critics have considered this to be a reference to the desperation of Menelaus and his men, who are forced by circumstances to resort to an unheroic diet of fish<sup>24</sup>. But starving heroes eat fresh fish if they can get it; they do not make garum<sup>25</sup>. Herodotus tells us that, when Paris and Helen were blown off course, they arrived at the Canopic mouth of the Nile, specifically ἐς Ταριχείας (2.113.1), a "settlement named after the fish-pickling industry" (Lloyd 1988, 48). The presence of fish-sauce in Aeschylus' *Proteus* seems, then, to cast doubt on the possibility that the action of the play took place on the desolate island of Pharos; rather, it looks as though Herodotus may be following Aeschylus (or Aeschylus' source?) in locating the Egyptian landfall of Paris and Helen in the pungent neighborhood of the local fish-industry, escape from which is desirable for a number of reasons.

There is yet another detail among the meager fragments of *Proteus* that may point to the time, not following the Trojan War, but before the Greeks set sail from Aulis. Fr. 212 Radt merely tells us that in this play Aeschylus referred to

<sup>22</sup> Droysen 1832, 153-58; Valgimigli 1908; Cunningham 1994; Griffith 2002, 239-54. See also Paul Claudel's 1914 *Protée, drame satyrique en deux actes*, with incidental music by Darius Milhaud (Gumpert 2001, 296).

<sup>23</sup> Hdt. 2.115.1. Herodotus, of course, is recounting the story supposedly told to him by the Egyptian priests (2.113.1), which can be expected to reflect well upon the Egyptians. A version in which Paris and either the real or a phantom Helen must escape from the clutches of a nasty barbarian would suit a satyric plot (cf. Euripides' *Busiris*).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. H. *Od.* 4.354-69. So, e.g., Droysen 1832, 155; Valgimigli 1908, 5; Wilamowitz 1914, 330; R. Germar and R. Krumeich in Krumeich-Pechstein-Seidensticker 1999, 179; Sommerstein 2008, 221-23.

<sup>25</sup> Aeschylus and his audience did not need to refer, as I did, to Curtis 1991, 12-13 to learn that the preparation of garum requires from one to three months.

Eidothea using the form Eido. This has seemed to be conclusive proof that the plot revolved around Menelaus' encounter with The Old Man of the Sea (Levi 1908, 235), since that is the only connection in which Eidothea appears in Homer or, as far as we know, anywhere else before the time of Aeschylus. But this form of the name appears also in Euripides' *Helen*, a play which, it is true, deals with the reunion of Helen and Menelaus, but the name is there introduced in a particular manner. In the prologue, Helen informs the audience that the daughter of Proteus was called Eido as a child, "but when she arrived at the ripe age for marriage she came to be called Theonoe" (11-13). That is, Euripides goes out of his way to associate the name "Eido" not with the time of the play, immediately following the Trojan War, but with an earlier time. Further, Proteus is dead at the time of Euripides' play (60-65), so that the Homeric encounter between Menelaus and Proteus is no longer even a possibility. Of course, much of the plot of this play is free invention on the part of Euripides at his most imaginative, but his deliberate adoption of the Aeschylean form of the name, with the specification that it applies to a chronologically earlier stage of the story, may be an indication that Aeschylus' play dealt with that earlier stage.

A satyr-play involving the forced detention of Paris and a real or vaporous Helen would serve as a suitable introduction to the first play of the *Oresteia*, which takes place ten years after the event. In fact, the first word uttered by the chorus when they enter the orchestra is δέκατον (Ag. 40), as they sing of how this is now the tenth year since the Atreidae set out in pursuit of the fugitive couple. Similarly, the first words out of the herald's mouth on his entry refer to his arrival "on this day of the tenth year" (δεκάτου... ἔτους, 504). It is not surprising that frequent mention should be made in *Agamemnon* of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia at Aulis, since it is that event which motivates Clytaemestra's murder of her husband. But references to Paris and Helen and their elopement are even more prominent, especially on the part of the chorus: The Atreidae are sent, and Zeus aims his bow, ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ (61, 363); the departure of Paris and Helen and the desolation wrought by the latter's absence are sung of at great length (399-428); in the second stasimon we are again transported back in time to when Helen sailed for Troy and contracted her disastrous marriage to Paris (688-708); the chorus greet Agamemnon by drawing a contrast between their current enthusiasm and the ill will they felt when he embarked on the expedition Ἑλένης ἔνεκα (799-800); and again they draw attention to the time that has elapsed since the naval forces set sail for Troy (984-87). This emphasis – obsession, almost – with the circumstances of the elopement of Paris and Helen,

an event that motivates Agamemnon's offensive against the city of Priam but not the action of the play itself, could well be accounted for if the play that immediately preceded *Agamemnon* depicted a stage in that elopement. The passage that has been seen as anticipating a fourth-place satyr-play about Menelaus' Egyptian adventure (617 ff.), when the chorus ask the herald if Menelaus has sailed home safely, could just as well have been prepared for by a prophecy in a first-place *Proteus* predicting Menelaus' arrival in Egypt in ten years' time to claim his wife<sup>26</sup>. It is easy to appreciate the deliberate irony involved in the words of the herald in *Agamemnon* (671-75), who tells Clytaemestra that if any of the other ships survived the storm that dispersed the Greek fleet the men "surely speak of us as dead", and who reassures his queen that Menelaus is likely to have reached home safely. Mark Griffith (2002, 238) thinks that these lines "must be preparing us for the appearance of Menelaos in Egypt in the fourth play". But it seems like an instance of the tail wagging the dog if Aeschylus is seeding his most profound tragic creation with hints of what is to come in the satyr-play. The irony would be all the more effective and the proportions more appropriate if *Proteus* had been staged before *Agamemnon* and had portrayed Menelaus expressing sentiments about his brother similar to those later spoken by the herald.

After discussing *Proteus* Levi next turns (237-39) to a consideration of Aeschylus' *Sphinx*, the satyr-play produced in 467 BC as part of the *Oedipodeia* (2)<sup>27</sup>. As is obvious from the title, the Sphinx was a character in the play<sup>28</sup>. Otherwise, the only hint at the play's content comes from a fragment (235) in which reference is made to a crown for "the stranger", whom Levi and most scholars take to be Oedipus, conqueror of the Sphinx<sup>29</sup>. The defeat of the Sphinx certainly took place before the time of the third tragedy in the sequence, as both Oedipus and the Sphinx have met their doom by the time of *Septem contra*

<sup>26</sup> For prophecy as a characteristic motif of satyr-play, see Lämmle 2013, 425-27.

<sup>27</sup> The fragments of *Sphinx* (another 17 words) are 235-37 Radt. For recent reconstructions, with earlier bibliography, see Hutchinson 1985, xx-xxii, xxvii-xxviii; R. Germar and R. Krumeich in Krumeich-Pechstein-Seidensticker 1999, 189-96; Sommerstein 2008, 238-43; Lämmle 2013, 428-30.

<sup>28</sup> This is apparently confirmed by the remains of two Attic vases, contemporary with Aeschylus' tetralogy, which show a chorus of satyrs confronting the Sphinx: Tiverios 2000.

<sup>29</sup> Only two other fragments of the play survive. One consists of the single word κνούς (237 Radt). The other, the dactylic fr. 236 (Σφίγγα δυσάμεριάν πρύτανιν κύνα), has been plausibly assigned rather to *Oedipus*, despite the explicit claim of its source (schol. Ar. *Ran.* 1287) that it comes ἐκ Σφίγγος Αἰσχύλου; see Näke 1872, 209-10.

*Thebas* (772-90). Not a single fragment of Aeschylus' *Oedipus* is preserved, so reconstruction of that play can only be speculative in the extreme, nor does Levi attempt one. He comes, however, to the inevitable conclusion that, like *Proteus*, the satyr-play *Sphinx* cannot represent an action that occurred later in time than that of the trilogy (239). He seems not to be troubled by the appearance in what he takes to be the tetralogy's concluding drama of two characters whose deaths had been presented to the audience earlier in the sequence. Rather, for Levi, the *Sphinx* served, like *Proteus*, as a convenient summing up of the trilogy that preceded it.

If the *Sphinx* dealt with Oedipus' encounter with the monster, it seems certain that its plot concerned an event subsequent to the plot of *Laius*<sup>30</sup>. Is it unimaginable, however, that the plot of the satyr-play involved something other than the Sphinx' defeat at the hands of Oedipus? According to Erika Simon (1982, 141), the satyrs "can be rescued from their predicament only by Oedipus". But Carl Robert had proposed a reconstruction of the play that has nothing to do with Oedipus and which could, therefore, involve a plot that belongs even earlier in the narrative sequence than *Laius*, the first of the three tragedies with which the *Sphinx* was produced. Robert (1915, I 259) refers to a fourth-century Paestan bell-krater (illustrated in Krumeich et al. 1999, Pl. 22a) showing an elderly silenus holding a bird before a seated Sphinx. He relates this to an Aesopic fable (36 Perry) in which a devious man seeks to confute the Delphic oracle by asking if he is holding something alive or dead in his cloaked hand, intending to produce either a living or dead bird depending on the response, thereby "reversing the usual situation, in which it is the Sphinx that stumps passersby with insoluble riddles" (Lissarrague 2000, 143). If Robert is correct in seeing this as representing the plot of Aeschylus' satyr-play<sup>31</sup>, the satyrs could have escaped the clutches of the monster using their own ingenuity. The reference to "a crown for the stranger" in fr. 235 might still be a reference to Oedipus, but coming from a prophetic utterance. Either Papposilenus or the Sphinx herself, who is identified in Sophocles (*OT* 1200; cf. Levi 1908, 238-39) as παρθένος χρησμοδός, will then have closed the play with a prediction about someone who will come from elsewhere to put an end to her depredations once and for all.

None of the plays of Aeschylus' Lycurgus tetralogy (4), to which Levi turns

<sup>30</sup> Levi 1908, 237-38; Guggisberg 1947, 97-99.

<sup>31</sup> The satyrs on the hydria (Würzburg ZA 20, c. 470-460 BC) discussed by Tiverios (above, n. 28), like the one on the Paestan krater, are also portrayed as elderly.

next, survives, making reconstruction of the sequence difficult<sup>32</sup>. Still, it is clear that the first of the tragedies, *Edonoi*, dealt with the hostile encounter between Lycurgus and Dionysus: The scholiast on Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* tells us explicitly that line 134 of that play (ποδαπὸς ὁ γύννις; τίς πάτρα; τίς ἡ στολή;) is a quotation from Aeschylus' *Edonoi* (= fr. 61 Radt) and that it was spoken by Lycurgus to his prisoner Dionysus. It is equally clear from the title of the satyr-play that Lycurgus was a character in that play. Whatever his fate in *Edonoi*, Lycurgus is unlikely to have survived long after mocking and locking up the god of the theater – the Homeric Diomedes expresses it delicately when he tells Glaucus that mighty Lycurgus “was not long-lived” (οὐδὲ... δὴν ἦν, *Il.* 6.130-31) – so that his survival into the time represented by *Bassaridae* and *Neaniskoi* appears questionable. Levi (240) comes to the conclusion that, as with the *Oresteia* and the *Oedipodeia*, the plot of the satyr-play involved events that took place between the time of the first and the second tragedy on the program<sup>33</sup>. If, however, Lycurgus suffered a fate in *Edonoi* like that of Pentheus in Euripides' *Bacchae*, it might be more reasonable to conclude that the plot of the satyr-play *Lycurgus* involved events that took place before the time of any of the three tragedies. In the Homeric account (*Il.* 6.130-40) Dionysus is a mere babe, who flees in terror and is taken to her bosom by Thetis when Lycurgus persecutes the god's nurses (τιθῆναι). In Aeschylus' satyr-play the role of Dionysus' nurses must have been taken by the satyrs, as it surely was in *Trophoi*, another of his satyr-plays, who were persecuted by the beer-drinking Lycurgus. However Aeschylus represented the rescue of the satyrs from their tormentor, it is clear that Lycurgus did not learn his lesson, and in what was conceivably the next play in the tetralogy, *Edonoi*, he persecuted the women followers of the adolescent Dionysus, who will have proved to be much less easily tamed than the

<sup>32</sup> Levi 1908, 239-40, supplemented by Levi 1909. For recent reconstructions and further bibliography, see West 1990, 26-50; R. Germar and R. Krumeich in Krumeich-Pechstein-Seidensticker 1999, 164-68; Sommerstein 2008, 18-23, 60-67, 126-29, 152-55; Lämmle 2013, 129-32, 280-83.

<sup>33</sup> Interestingly, the plot of the “satyr play”, *The Drunken Sisters* (1957), that Thornton Wilder wrote to follow his three-act *Alcestiad* (1955), falls chronologically between the times of Act I and Act II. Martin Blank (1996, 92), citing a notice in *The New York Times* (29 June 1957, 11), claims that *The Drunken Sisters* was actually performed between Acts I and II of *The Alcestiad* (then called *A Life in the Sun*) at the original production in Edinburgh in 1955, but this is not borne out by any of the contemporary reviews that I have been able to consult. The opening scene of Wilder's “satyr play”, with its three prophetic Fates spinning the thread of destiny, recalls the opening of *Götterdämmerung*, the fourth (and non-satyr) opera of Wagner's *Ring*.



spineless satyrs of the previous drama.

Finally, Levi briefly considers (240-41) the tetralogy of which the surviving *Supplikes* is a part (10). In common with nearly all scholars Levi regards the tetralogy to have consisted of that play along with *Danaides* and *Aegyptii*, with *Amymone* as the satyr-play<sup>34</sup>. That this was the satyr-play that accompanied *Danaides* was confirmed in 1952 with the publication of POxy 2256, which preserves a fragmentary didascalic record that includes the notice (fr. 3.2-3) ἐνίκᾱ [Αἰ]σχύλο[ς] / Δαν[αῖ]σι Ἀμυ[μώ]νη. It is not certain whether the papyrus intends *Danaides* as the name of the trilogy as a whole or, more likely, as the name of the third tragedy, in which case the titles of *Supplikes* and *Aegyptii*, in whichever order, originally appeared on the papyrus before it was damaged<sup>35</sup>. Levi, like most scholars, regards the plot of *Amymone* to be reflected in the account of Apollodorus (2.1.4; cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 169 and 169A), according to which Amymone was assaulted by a satyr when she was looking for water near Argos, but the satyr was put to flight by Poseidon, who slept with Amymone himself and revealed to her, or created for her, the springs of Lerna. Without giving any reasons, Levi considers this satyr-play to conform with the pattern that he has seen in the others, namely that the action of the play fits chronologically between the first and second play. In the absence of an agreed-upon reconstruction of the trilogy, or even a consensus regarding the order in which the first two tragedies stood, it is difficult to approve of this conclusion with any confidence. There is, however, reason to believe that the action of *Amymone* is more likely to have come early in the sequence and that it cannot have come at the end.

Dana Sutton (1974, 193), who seems to assume that in this instance Aeschylus accommodated the (fourth-place) satyr-play to the tetralogy's narrative sequence, begins his description of the plot of *Amymone* as follows: "Danaus, comfortably settled in the land after the adventurous wanderings depicted in the trilogy, sent his daughter Amymone to fetch water...". Inasmuch as the adventurous wanderings included his daughters' murder of their husbands on their wedding night one wonders how comfortable Danaus' settlement was. Be that as it may, it is legitimate to ask about the status of Amymone following the wedding night of the Danaids. There are two possibilities (Simon 1981, 742). If

<sup>34</sup> Sutton 1974; A. Wessels and R. Krumeich in Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999, 91-97; Podlecki 2005, 8-9; Garvie 2006; Sommerstein 2008, 8-11; Papadopoulou 2011, 15-24.

<sup>35</sup> Since Amymone is one of the fifty daughters of Danaus it would be odd if the title *Danaides* was used to refer only to the trilogy and not to the tetralogy. Also, considerations of space make it more likely that the papyrus recorded the titles of four plays; see Garvie 2006, 2-3.

she married, and then butchered, one of the sons of Aegyptus, it is hard to imagine that Aeschylus represented the god Poseidon as being desirous of union with a woman guilty of so bloody a crime, no matter how well justified<sup>36</sup>. If, on the other hand, Aeschylus followed the same tradition as Pindar, according to whom two of the fifty daughters were not in need of second husbands<sup>37</sup>, Amy-mone's "marriage" to Poseidon occurred before the time covered by *Supplices*, and perhaps before the time covered by *Danaides* and *Aegyptii* as well. In the latter case, an *Amymone* that was performed after *Supplices* would, like *Proteus*, *Sphinx* and *Lycurgus*, violate the narrative sequence. The text of *Supplices* itself provides further reason to believe that that play dramatized events subsequent to the events of *Amymone*. At lines 1024-29 the chorus of Danaids sing that they will no longer praise the waters of the Nile, but will henceforth celebrate the fructifying rivers that flow through the Argive land. According to Apollodorus (2.1.4), the reason Danaus had to send Amymone for water in the first place was that the land was parched, Poseidon having dried up the springs in anger at Inachus (cf. Paus. 2.15.4), a distant ancestor of the Danaids. Poseidon's union with Amymone served as the aition for the end of Argos' waterless state; the end of that state must have occurred before the chorus of *Supplices* could celebrate the bountiful waterways of the land of Argos. Because of the damaged state of POxy 2256, on which only the titles of *Danaides* and *Amymone* are now preserved, we do not know in what order the titles of *Supplices* and *Aegyptii* were recorded in the didascaliae. There is, therefore, uncertainty concerning the order in which the first two tragedies were performed, and some scholars have expressed the view that *Aegyptii* was the first play in the sequence and that it was set in Egypt, in which case the action would necessarily have preceded Amymone's search for water in thirsty Argos. The majority view, however, is that *Aegyptii* followed *Supplices*<sup>38</sup>. Whichever is the case, it appears that the plot of the satyr-play belongs to the period before either the first or the second play

<sup>36</sup> The product of Poseidon's union with Amymone was Nauplius. Gods tend to be sexually attracted to virgins, rather than to previously married women, even those who are not polluted by murder. On the other hand, mortal women who have borne children to a god sometimes subsequently take a mortal husband: Creusa, Cyrene, Danae.

<sup>37</sup> At *Pyth.* 9.112-17 (474 BC) Danaus is said to have established a foot-race as a means of finding quick husbands for his 48 maiden daughters (παρθένοισι). Presumably the other two were Hypermetra and Amymone (so the scholiast), neither of whom was now a maiden.

<sup>38</sup> For the issues involved and bibliography see Garvie 2006, xvii-xix; Papadopoulou 2011, 18-19.

of the trilogy.

In all four cases, then, it seems certain that the satyr-play is related to the plot of the three tragedies that it accompanies, and in every instance the satyr-play would be out of place in the narrative sequence if it were performed last. We must, then, ask ourselves why Aeschylus has gone out of his way to include the satyr-play in the mythical context of the three tragedies on those occasions when the tragedies themselves form a coherent narrative sequence, only to compose, as a pendant to those tragedies, a satyr-play that violates that sequence. No plausible answer suggests itself. On the other hand, as we have seen, it is possible to reconstruct the plots of those satyr-plays, all of which have, unfortunately, been lost, in such a way as to accommodate them at or near the beginning of the narrative sequence. We should at least acknowledge the possibility that these satyr-plays were performed before the first, or perhaps before the second, of the three tragedies.

As it happens, there is additional evidence for this pattern that we have not yet examined. Because he was concerned solely with the early fifth century, Levi did not consider the only other satyr-play that we know to have been performed with a connected trilogy, namely Euripides' *Sisyphus* (8). We are fortunate in being able to reconstruct the trilogy with some confidence, since *Troades* is extant and enough survives of *Alexander* and *Palamedes* to be quite certain of their general outlines<sup>39</sup>. As with the *Oedipodeia* and the *Oresteia*, it is unimaginable that the three tragedies were performed in any sequence other than that recorded in our source, here Aelian *VH* 2.8, namely *Alexander*, *Palamedes* and *Troades*, the first play dealing with the antecedents to the Trojan War, the second dramatizing an event during the war and the third portraying the war's immediate aftermath. The content of the satyr-play *Sisyphus*, however, is uncertain in the extreme<sup>40</sup>. One thing we can be sure of is that Sisyphus and Heracles were characters, since the latter is addressed directly in one of the two fragments (673 Kannicht) securely assigned to the play. Whatever they were represented as doing, their actions surely took place well before the birth of Paris, since they

<sup>39</sup> See most fully Scodel 1980. In the case of *Alexander* we even have an almost complete ancient hypothesis (POxy 3650 = (3) test. iii Kannicht); for this play see now Di Giuseppe 2012.

<sup>40</sup> See the exhaustive treatment in Pechstein 1998, 185-217. For the notorious TrGF 43 F 19, which is either by Euripides or by Critias and which may or may not be satyric, see Pechstein 289-343 and O'Sullivan-Collard 2013, 440-47, with earlier bibliography. It has even been questioned whether Euripides' *Sisyphus* was a satyr-play, given that POxy 2456 col. ii, 6 omits the designation σατυρικός following the title in a list of Euripidean plays (but cf. above, n. 6).

both belong to an earlier generation: Heracles is associated with a previous assault on Troy (H. *Il.* 5.635-51) while Sisyphus' great-great-grandson Glaucus was a combatant in the Trojan War and claims him as his ancestor (*Il.* 6.153-55 and 196-206). No known myth connects Sisyphus and Heracles, and so Pechstein (1998, 214-17) proposes that the setting of the play, perhaps like that of Aeschylus' *Sisyphus Petrokylistes*, was in the Underworld, "der einzige Ort, an dem sich Herakles und Sisyphos mit Sicherheit begegnen konnten", the encounter occurring either when the living Heracles went to Hades' abode, that is, before the Trojan War, or after Heracles' death, in which case it could be accommodated anywhere in the chronological sequence, even following *Troades*<sup>41</sup>. In the latter instance, however, it is difficult to see what connection there might have been with the Trojan War and even more difficult to imagine who could have rescued the chorus or how the trepid satyrs managed to find themselves in the land of the dead in the first place.

It emerges, then, that in all five of the tetralogies that we know or can be reasonably certain represented a clear sequence of related events, namely (2), (3), (4), (8) and (10), none of the satyr-plays certainly portrayed the last event in the series and in every case a reconstruction of the tetralogy is possible in which it portrayed the first. We have confined ourselves to considering only those tetralogies that are explicitly attested and have ignored the many attempts to reconstruct groupings based on apparent similarity of theme or content. Scholars have been willing to construct tetralogies that follow the pattern we have documented, even while adhering to the conviction that the satyr-play must have been performed last. So, for example, Aeschylus' satyr-play *Dictyulci* is often considered to belong to an otherwise unattested tetralogy along with *Phorcides* and *Polydectes*<sup>42</sup>. It has seemed tempting to group these plays together as they all deal with incidents in the life of Perseus. But Perseus is an infant in the satyr-play, so if *Dictyulci* was indeed part of a tetralogy that documented the life of the hero, the satyr-play can only have come first in the narrative sequence. And, since satyr-plays often concern the childhood or infancy of a hero, the same will have been the case with any connected tetralogy containing such a satyr-play<sup>43</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> Pechstein acknowledges (212) that this is a consideration, but does not regard it as decisive.

<sup>42</sup> E.g. Guggisberg 1947, 85, 98-99; Gantz 1980, 149-51; Sutton 1980, 20; Goins 1997; A. Wessels and R. Krumeich in Krumeich-Pechstein-Seidensticker 1999, 107; Podlecki 2005, 11; Sommerstein 2008, 42; O'Sullivan-Collard 2013, 257.

<sup>43</sup> For "the birth, childhood, and upbringing of gods and heroes" as a characteristic theme of satyr-plays, see Sutton 1980, 153; Seaford 1984, 38; Krumeich et al. 1999, 666; Lämmle 2013,

Another tetralogy whose hypothetical reconstruction has met with widespread favor is the one to which Aeschylus' satyr-play *Circe* supposedly belonged. Scholars tend to consider this play to belong with *Psychagogoi*, *Penelope* and *Ostologoi*<sup>44</sup>. If so, and if the generally accepted reconstructions of those tragedies are correct, the satyr-play will have presented "a light-hearted moment from Odysseus' earlier adventures" (Gantz 1980, 153). Given that Homer's *Circe* gives Odysseus detailed instructions before he leaves her island (*Od.* 10.490-540), including the need to secure further instructions from Teiresias (537-40), it would not be unreasonable to assume that this feature was taken over in Aeschylus' play and that it served to forecast the action of the tragedies to follow.

At the Dionysia in the fifth century the tragedies were the featured event on three of the five days and the satyr-play, although a regular component of the tragic production, was manifestly of lesser importance. Even if the satyr-play was performed, say, first, it is not hard to see how the convention would have arisen to list it after the tragedies. When official records began to be kept, it appears that the four plays produced by each poet were unrelated to one another in plot and followed no necessary narrative sequence. At some point, however, someone, perhaps Aeschylus himself, began producing a sequence of plays that cohered dramatically and that required to be performed in a particular order. As we have seen, in those cases the satyr-play was included in that sequence. Now for the first time it would have been meaningful to record the titles in the order in which the plays were actually performed and, as far as we can tell from the available evidence, that was done in the case of the three tragedies. But if it had earlier been the practice to list the satyr-play last, it would have been natural to continue that practice, especially since a connected tetralogy like, say, the *Oresteia* would have been entered into competition against one or two other productions that consisted of plays that were unrelated to one another and would have had their satyr-plays listed last. Indeed, this was the case in both 467 and 415 BC. In the former year Aeschylus was victorious with his *Oedipus* tetralogy

402-10; O'Sullivan-Collard 2013, 38. As Hall 1998, 16 notes, "The temporal location of satyr drama is early mythical time, for it often portrays the infancy of gods and heroes". Satyr-play titles include Aeschylus' *Trophoi* and Sophocles' *Achilleos Erastai*, *Dionysiscus* and *Heracleiscus*. As we have seen (p. 18), Dionysus is likely to have been a baby at the time of Aeschylus' *Lycurgus*.

<sup>44</sup> So Guggisberg 1947, 90; Gantz 1980, 151-53 ("Admittedly this is the weakest of the 'more probable' category"); A. Wessels and R. Krumeich in Krumeich-Pechstein-Seidensticker 1999, 157; Podlecki 2005, 5.

(2), defeating the *Lycurgeia* of Polyphrasmon and a production of Aristias (9) in which the *Perseus*, *Tantalus* and the satyric *Palaestae* of Aristias' father Pratinas were performed<sup>45</sup>. In 415 Euripides' Trojan tetralogy (8) was defeated by Xenocles' miscellany (7) consisting of *Oedipus*, *Lycaon*, *Bacchae* and the satyric *Athamas*.

Between the time of Euripides' Trojan tetralogy and the year 341 BC the practice of requiring tragic poets to produce four plays each at the Dionysia ceased, thereby ending the tradition of composing a satyr-play as part of an entry in the tragic competition<sup>46</sup>. While individual satyr-plays continued to be written and produced at the Dionysia, apparently no longer as part of a competition, there was no longer a living performance tradition involving tragic tetralogies<sup>47</sup>. When fifth-century tragedies were revived, those tragedies that had originally been staged in groups of four were performed only as individual dramas<sup>48</sup>. Consequently, knowledge of the order in which plays had originally been performed could only be inferred from the order in which they were listed in the *Didascaliae*. By the time Aristotle began compiling his *Didascaliae* (frs. 618-30 Rose), based upon the same official records used for the monumental inscriptions<sup>49</sup>, the practice of producing a satyr-play along with three tragedies had ended. In the

<sup>45</sup> This information is preserved in the hypothesis to Aesch. *Sept.* and in POxy 2256 fr. 2, from a hypothesis to the lost *Laius*, dated by Lobel "Late 2nd–Early 3rd cent. (?)"; for the text, see Zuntz 1981, 81-83. Note that, unlike the hypothesis to *Sept.*, the papyrus does not record Pratinas' titles, saying that Aristias came in second "with his father's *tragedies*", although we know that one of those plays was not a tragedy. Neither source records the individual titles of Polyphrasmon's production, identified in both sources as a "tetralogy". Presumably they had been given in the official record and, subsequently, in Aristotle's *Didascaliae*.

<sup>46</sup> Easterling 1997a, 40.

<sup>47</sup> Shaw 2014, 141-48. As we have seen (p. 10), IG II<sup>2</sup> 2320 lists the satyr-play before the tragedies that were entered in the competition for the years 342 through 340 BC. If this reflects the order in which the events took place, as most scholars assume, it may be seen as evidence for a persistent tradition of producing satyr-plays first. For if it had been usual in the fifth century for satyr-plays to follow tragedies, it is difficult to see why in the fourth century a change was made so that the satyr-play was, as Shaw puts it (2014, 11), "relegated to an opening act".

<sup>48</sup> An *Iphigenia* of Euripides was revived at the Dionysia in 341 BC and his *Orestes* the following year: IG II<sup>2</sup> 2320 col. ii; see Millis–Olson 2012, 65; Easterling 1997b, 214-15.

<sup>49</sup> See Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 70-71; Blum 1991, 24-43; Sickinger 1999, 43-47. Sickinger (46) presents good arguments in favor of the need for official preservation of records documenting past performance by poets, actors and choregoi, but is silent on the matter of recording titles. Nor is it clear what the importance of recording titles, especially the *sequence* of titles, might have been.

*Poetics* Aristotle discusses only individual tragedies (not satyr-plays), including *Choephoroi* and *Troades*<sup>50</sup>, plays that Aristotle would have known as written texts rather than as the second or third element of a complex theatrical production. In fact Aristotle never mentions satyr-play in the *Poetics*, unless that is what he is referring to with his mysterious comments about τὸ σατυρικόν at 1449a20-22. Nor does he mention satyr-plays anywhere else in his writings, except to record their titles in his *Didascaliae*. Among the scores of quotations from the tragic poets in Aristotle's large corpus I have been unable to find one that is demonstrably from a satyr-play<sup>51</sup>.

In the generations following Aristotle the connection between fifth-century satyr-plays and the tragedies with which they were originally performed seems to have faded still further<sup>52</sup>. This is illustrated by an important notice in the scholia to Aristophanes (*Ran.* 1124), which records the titles of the four plays comprising the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus, using the word "tetralogy", but then goes on to note that "Aristarchus and Apollonius use the term 'trilogy,' without satyr-plays"<sup>53</sup>. According to Dana Sutton (1980, 135), "Probably this notice means no more than that Aristarchus and Appollonius [sic] were observed to use the term *Oresteia* in alluding to the three tragedies of the trilogy, as do modern writers". But modern writers do not have the luxury of access to a text of *Proteus*. Further, the scholiast uses the plural τῶν σατυρικῶν, rather than the singular that August Nauck wished to read, which suggests that the reference is more general. Even Hermann Usener (1914, 161), who emends to σατύρων (which Sutton prefers), thinks the reference is not just to *Proteus*, saying, "Denn trotz der Didaskalien gab es für Apollonius Rhodius [sic], Aristophanes and Aristarch

<sup>50</sup> 1455a4 and 1459b7. Note that Aristophanes (*Ran.* 1124) refers to the opening lines of *Choephoroi* as the prologue ἐξ Ὀρεστείας, whereas Aristotle names the individual play.

<sup>51</sup> The same is true for Plato, whose references to Eur. *Alc.* (Sansone 1996, 46-51, 63) are not evidence to the contrary.

<sup>52</sup> Note the alphabetic arrangement, regardless of tetralogic connections and including satyr-plays, of the second-century AD collection of Euripidean hypotheses (POxy 2455) and list of Euripidean titles (POxy 2456), and the first- or second-century AD list of Euripidean titles (IGUR IV 1508), as well as the later Medicean list of Aeschylean titles (above, n. 6). The only satyr-play preserved in its entirety owes its survival to the fact that its title begins with the letter kappa (Seaford 1984, 59).

<sup>53</sup> Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος τριλογίαν λέγουσι, χωρὶς τῶν σατυρικῶν (τῶν σατύρων Usener: τοῦ σατυρικοῦ Nauck). Schol. Theocr. 10.18e credits Aristarchus (v.l. Aristophanes) with a hypomnema on Aeschylus' *Lycurgus*, but Welcker (1824, 325 and 1826, 103) is probably correct to assume that the reference is to a treatise on the trilogy as a whole rather than on the satyr-play.

nur Trilogien attischer Tragödien: die Satyrdramen, größtenteils verloren, wurden nicht in Betracht gezogen". The Apollonius referred to in the scholion is surely the follower of Aristarchus (= RE no. 77, BNP no. 8), not the poet of the *Argonautica*, and Aristophanes is Aristophanes of Byzantium, the teacher of Aristarchus. Usener mentions these three Hellenistic scholars in connection with his discussion of the transmission, not of dramatic texts, but of the text of Plato. For Diogenes Laertius, after describing the Thrasyllan arrangement of Plato's dialogues into tetralogies, says, "But some, including Aristophanes the *grammatikos*, impose an organization into trilogies on the dialogues"<sup>54</sup>. This statement has been taken by some to indicate that Aristophanes was reacting against an earlier arrangement according tetralogies<sup>55</sup>. But Friedrich Solmsen argues that there was "no standard grouping" of the dialogues before Aristophanes and that Diogenes' language (ἔλκουσι) merely "reflects the perspective of the second century, when tetralogies were the normal arrangement"<sup>56</sup>. More recently, Francesca Schironi (2005) has made a convincing case for the existence of an "Alexandrian" edition of Plato, arranged into trilogies by Aristophanes and with a grammatical commentary by Aristarchus, *parallel* to the "Academic" edition arranged by tetralogies and serving a more philosophical purpose. Thus, regardless of the priority of the tetralogic or trilogic arrangement of the Platonic dialogues, what we see is that a closely connected group of three Hellenistic literary scholars living in the third and second centuries BC thought of the Platonic dialogues (Aristophanes) and the plays of the Attic tragedians (Aristarchus and Apollonius) in terms of

<sup>54</sup> D.L. 3.61: ἔνιοι δέ, ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός [fr. 403 Slater], εἰς τριλογίας ἔλκουσι τοὺς διαλόγους. For Thrasyllus (D.L. 3.58), the first "tetralogy" of Plato consisted of *Euthyphro*, *Apology*, *Crito* and *Phaedo*, in this, the proper narrative order. Did Thrasyllus regard either *Euthyphro* or *Phaedo* as equivalent to a satyr-play and, if so, which? *Symposium*, which surely has as good a claim on satyric status as any Platonic dialogue (Shaw 2014, 19-21), is neither first nor last, but occupies the third position in Thrasyllus' third tetralogy. This suggests that the arrangement by tetralogies was no more concerned with satyr-play than the arrangement by trilogies.

<sup>55</sup> So most recently Lucarini 2011; cf. Pfeiffer 1968, 196-97, "The most probable interpretation of the passage is that some scholars, including Aristophanes in his supplement to the *Pinakes*, criticized the tetralogies of an edition, perhaps of the Academy, and put forward the case for trilogies".

<sup>56</sup> Solmsen 1981, 106 with 110 n. 21. Cf. Irwin 2008, 69, "The terminus post quem for the tetralogies seems to be the lifetime of Aristophanes of Byzantium, who proposed an arrangement in trilogies... It is difficult to see why he would have tried it if he was reading a Platonic Corpus already ordered in tetralogies". Similarly Mansfeld 1994, 58-107; but note Mansfeld's acknowledgment (65) that Thrasyllus may have "revised and amplified an earlier tetralogic arrangement".



groups of three, ignoring the satyr-play entirely<sup>57</sup>.

By the time of the Alexandrian scholars, then, the only connection between fifth-century satyr-plays and the tragedies with which they were originally produced was the listing of titles in the didascaliae, which must have given the impression that they were performed as a sort of postlude to a sequence of three tragedies. This will have given rise to the curious notice in Diogenes Laertius (3.56; see above, p. 4) that the satyr-play was performed last, apparently at the Chytroi after the three tragedies had been staged, each at a different festival. It will also have given rise to the much more influential treatment of satyr-play in Horace's *Ars poetica*. For Horace clearly regards satyr-play as following tragedy, referring to tragic characters, who had just before (*nuper*, 228) been seen clothed in gold and purple finery, being found in dingy huts speaking in ordinary language. Already Isaac Casaubon (1605, 129-30) had cited this passage in connection with the conviction that the satyr-play was the last item on the dramatic program, suggesting that Horace was here following Neoptolemus of Parium. But this passage is only evidence that Horace, or his Hellenistic source, believed that satyr-plays followed tragedies. Horace (and his Hellenistic source?) also believed that satyr-play developed later than tragedy, a notion that rests on no reliable foundation<sup>58</sup>. The most we can say is that it appears to have been commonly believed in the Hellenistic period that satyr-plays used to follow tragedies on the dramatic program and, as we have seen, that belief can be accounted for, in the absence of a continuing performance tradition, by the listing of satyr-plays last in the didascalie record. In Horace's case, that belief would have been reinforced by the Roman practice of staging *exodia* following more serious dramatic pieces<sup>59</sup>.

We have seen, then, that the widespread conviction that satyr-plays were performed after the tragedies at the Dionysia in fifth-century Athens has no direct support in the ancient evidence. If we are to persist in that conviction we

<sup>57</sup> Compare the second-century AD POxy 2506, a commentary on lyric poetry, which refers to the *Oresteia* (fr. 26 col. ii, 7-11), naming the three tragedies and apparently calling the work a trilogy ("8-9 τριλογία seems obvious, although the trace does not suggest γ", Page *ad loc.*).

<sup>58</sup> See *Ars* 221-22: *mox etiam agrestes Satyros nudauit* [sc. the tragic poet], *et asper / incolumi grauitati iocum temptauit*. As Brink (1971, 278) notes, *temptauit* excludes the possibility that Horace is referring merely to the idea that satyrs followed tragic actors on the stage. By contrast, Dioscorides, two hundred years before Horace, followed Aristotle in the belief that tragedy developed out of satyric drama (*AP* 7.37); see Gow and Page 1965, II 255.

<sup>59</sup> For *exodia*, see Manuwald 2011, 170.

will have to account for (1) why it was felt important to preserve a record of the order in which plays were performed; (2) the fact that all the satyr-plays we know of from connected tetralogies would violate the narrative sequence if they were performed last on the program; and (3) the apparent change in the fourth century to a practice of performing a single satyr-play before the start of the tragic competition. It is perhaps safer to abandon the conviction and to assume that satyr-plays were rarely, if ever, performed last. (One wonders, for example, whether Euripides' audience in 415 BC was in the mood for light entertainment after having sat through a trilogy culminating in *Troades*.) It is conceivable that there was no fixed place for the satyr-play; if the playwright consistently adhered to the narrative sequence, as we have seen, the satyr-play will usually have come early in the sequence, perhaps regularly as the first item on the tragic program. If this view is correct it will have the additional benefit of allowing us to dispose, once and for all, of the controversy over the supposed "pro-satyrical" nature of Euripides' *Alcestis*<sup>60</sup>. According to the hypothesis to the play preserved in the Vatican manuscript (Vat. gr. 909), *Alcestis* "has a dénouement more in the comic manner", and the play itself is described as "having a more satyric character, since it ends, contrary to the tragic manner, in joy and satisfaction"<sup>61</sup>. The hypothesis also gives us full didascalical information, telling us that the play was produced in the archonship of Glaucinus and listing Euripides' four tragedies, the last being *Alcestis*. We do not know in what order the four plays were performed. Perhaps they were performed in the order listed. In any event, the tradition of listing the satyr-play – when there was one – last is all that is needed to account for the tendency, on the part of Hellenistic and some modern critics, to discover "satyric" and "comic" elements in this play. *Helen* and *IT* likewise end in joy and satisfaction, so that *Alcestis* is not the only one of Euripides' tragedies to end contrary to the alleged tragic manner<sup>62</sup>.

If we acknowledge that it is as likely that the fifth-century satyr-play pre-

<sup>60</sup> Markantonatos 2013, 92 n. 10 supplies a convenient bibliography of the controversy.

<sup>61</sup> Arg. *Alc.* (a) 19 and 24-25 Diggle: κωμικωτέραν ἔχει τὴν καταστροφὴν and σατυρικώτερον, ὅτι εἰς χαρὰν καὶ ἡδονὴν καταστρέφει; compare the language of the anonymous 6th-century *Prolegomena Philosophiae Platonicae* (above, n. 4). Likewise, the hypothesis to *Orestes* says of that play (32 Diggle): κωμικωτέραν ἔχει τὴν καταστροφὴν. Was it too, like *Alcestis*, listed in the didascalical as the last of four tragedies?

<sup>62</sup> Nor is it the only one to display a substantial number of "satyric" characteristics: Sansone 1978. Fantuzzi 2014 has plausibly argued that comments in the scholia and hypotheses regarding the comic or satyric character of certain fifth-century tragedies are likely to have arisen in the wake of, and influenced by, Aristotle's literary pronouncements.

ceded the three tragedies with which it was produced as that it followed, we will have to re-evaluate a number of claims that have been made regarding the performance of fifth-century drama. To give one example, Niall Slater notes the common assumption that Aeschylus took advantage of the supposed fact that his *Agamemnon* began the day's program to integrate the opening scene of that play into the early-morning ambiance surrounding the spectators in the Theater of Dionysus, so that "The signal fire that the watchman on the roof spies is the sun rising above the horizon to the east of Athens"<sup>63</sup>. Slater uses this observation in connection with his argument that the opening soliloquy of Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*, which likewise begins at daybreak, was re-written after the poet learned that his play was to be performed first. We know that this play was first on the program, since the leader of the chorus alludes to the disadvantage of having been chosen by lot to go first (1158-59). Tragedians, of course, were not subject to the capriciousness of a lottery and could plan in advance which of their dramas opened and which closed the day's program. As it happens, a number of tragedies other than *Agamemnon* begin early in the morning<sup>64</sup>. *Ajax*, *Antigone* (see 100-5), *Phaethon* (see Diggle 1970, 98) and *IA* all begin in the early hours, and *Rhesus* even takes place entirely during the nighttime. A common feature of tragic openings is a prominent reference to a dream that had occurred during the previous night, suggesting that the play is set early in the day, for example, *IT*, *Hecuba*, *Choephoroi* and *Persae*. We can be confident that *Choephoroi* was not first on the program and *Persae* is listed second in the didascalic record. Even *Eumenides*, the last play of its trilogy, begins with the opening of the temple, with the Furies fast asleep, presumably first thing in the morning<sup>65</sup>. We may conclude that the fiction of a new day dawning was created

<sup>63</sup> Slater 1997, 124 n. 6. In any event, surely the first play on the day's schedule did not begin at the crack of dawn; audience members had to travel from various locations in Attica and there were preliminary rituals before the dramatic performances could begin (Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 67).

<sup>64</sup> As do nearly half of Aristophanes' comedies. In addition to *Eccl.*, the following also begin early in the day: *Nub.*, *Vesp.*, *Lys.* and *Thesm.*

<sup>65</sup> *Eum.* ends with a torch-lit procession. The conviction that it was followed by a satyr-play seems to have inhibited scholars from suggesting that the torches allude to the coming of nightfall in the Theater of Dionysus. Torches feature also in the finale of Eur. *Tro.* (1256-62), a play that likewise concluded its trilogy and, if the satyr-play was performed before the tragedies, its tetralogy. Along with *Sept.*, the original ending of which is missing, these are the only surviving tragedies we know to have been third in their trilogy. (Euripides' *Cyclops* does not end with a torch-lit procession.)

by the poet precisely in order to expunge from the audience's consciousness the setting of the previous play, if there was one. This would be especially useful in the case of the comic competition, in which the playwright was more than likely to have his play immediately follow a play composed by someone else. It would also be desirable for tragedians if the play preceding the opening of a tragic trilogy was a satyr-drama.

To conclude, then, we have seen that the universally held view that the satyr-play was the last of the four dramas that comprise the tetralogy presented by fifth-century tragic poets is not supported by any explicit ancient evidence and, further, that the existence of that view can be accounted for as arising from the practice of listing satyr-plays last in the didascalic record. As far as we can tell, the plots of those satyr-plays that accompanied connected trilogies consistently avoided dramatizing events subsequent to the last tragedy in the sequence. By contrast, the events depicted in those satyr-plays belong near, or even before, the narrative time of the first tragedy, which raises the awkward question of why tragedians composed in this manner if, as is generally believed, the satyr-play was the last to be performed. It is hoped that this paper will provoke the discussion that this matter deserves. For we do not know for sure what place the satyr-play held in the tragic tetralogy – that is almost all that we can truly say.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

DAVID SANSONE

#### Appendix: The Pronomos Vase

A word should be said here about the Pronomos Vase, a fascinating Attic volute krater dating to a time very close to 400 BC which appears to be celebrating a victory in the tragic competition. The vase has recently been the subject of a splendid volume (Taplin-Wyles 2010) consisting of contributions by leading experts in the fields of iconography and theater production. Depicted on the vase are eleven actors dressed in satyr costumes, all but two of whom are holding their masks in their hand; an actor dressed as Papposilenus, also holding his mask; three actors in tragic costume, one of whom is identified as Heracles, all holding their masks; the poet, identified as Demetrius; the aulos-player, identified as Pronomos; and a lyre-player, identified as Charinus. In their midst are seated Dionysus and a woman, thought to be Ariadne. The scene is flanked by tripods that are decorated with fillets, clearly symbolizing victory in the competition. Although the scene is dominated by the presence of actors depicting satyrs – and “real” satyrs in the wild appear on the other side of the vase, with maenads, vegetation and a panther – it is surely the case that what is

being celebrated is an entire tragic production, of which the satyr-play was only one element<sup>66</sup>.

The prominence of satyrs in a monument celebrating a “tragic” victory is not surprising. The epigram of Dioscorides referred to above (n. 58) purports to quote the words of a satyr who is depicted on the tomb of the tragedian Sophocles, and satyrs, as the intimates of Dionysus, are shown on monuments celebrating comic (Wilson 2000, 239, Fig. 22) and dithyrambic contests as well (Csapo 2010, 82, 125). Still, the conviction that satyr-plays came at the end of the tragic production has persuaded some contributors to the Taplin–Wyles volume that the reason the Pronomos Vase shows the chorus in satyr-costume is that the troupe is depicted after the final curtain, as it were, not yet having changed out of their stage costumes. So Oliver Taplin, in his essay that serves as a summing up of the volume, concludes (256), “The Pronomos scene is set, then, at an imprecise juncture, after the end of the plays, when the chorus (and actors) are still in costume, but before they change into civvies and embark on the serious partying”. Taplin’s discomfort with this description is clear from his reference to “an imprecise juncture”, combined with his description of a seemingly precise point in time. A certain ambivalence similarly characterizes Mark Griffith’s statement: “Because every tragic performance (at least at the City Dionysia in Athens, during the fifth century) routinely ended with a satyr play, it would presumably be customary for a tragic troupe of performers to be seen, or imagined, as celebrating its victorious achievement with the chorus still dressed as half-naked, phallic satyrs”<sup>67</sup>. The reason for the hesitancy is surely the fact, noted by Eric Csapo (2010, 109), that none of the participants in the scene is shown drinking wine, which, as we may infer from Plato’s *Symposium* (176a-b), was the appropriate means of celebrating a tragic victory. The only figure on the entire vase who even holds a drinking vessel is one of the “real” satyrs on side B. Even Dionysus, who is shown on both sides of the vase, is not drinking. In any event, the victory would not be announced immediately after the performance, while the performers were still in costume; all three dramatists

<sup>66</sup> Taplin (2010, 255) notes that it “is accepted almost universally in this volume” that “we have here the chorus and artistic ‘personnel’ of an entire tragic set, that is three tragedies and a satyr play, not just of the satyr play”. See especially Griffith 2010, 48-52; Hall 2010, 163.

<sup>67</sup> Griffith 2010, 51. Elsewhere Griffith entertains at least the possibility that the performers are depicted “at the moment *just before* or just after their victorious presentation” (54, with my emphasis), and he refers (54-55) to the “theatre-rehearsal scene” and to the performers as possibly “rehearsing for” a staged performance.

would first have to have their plays produced, the judges would have to reach their decision and the judges' decision would have to be announced. And on average only once in three years would that announcement even have been made on the same day as the winning performance, so that victorious performers would rarely, if ever, celebrate their triumph while still in costume.

And yet, this is clearly a celebration of a victory, as is indicated by the tripods and the crowns worn by many of the figures<sup>68</sup>. This is not, however, decisive and does not guarantee that what is depicted is the victorious cast after the performance has ended. Crowns and tripods are often depicted in connection with athletic and equestrian competitions as well. Sometimes it is clear that what is depicted is the conferral of the prize on the victor<sup>69</sup>. But very often these tokens of victory are shown while the competition is still in progress. In the case of tripods this can be explained "realistically" by assuming that the artist is showing the prize in the background as that for which the entrants are contending. So, for example, the François Vase shows a chariot-race in progress with a prize cauldron and tripod in the background (Simon 1976, Pl. 55) and an early fifth-century coin from Cos has on the obverse a discus-thrower in action beside a tripod (Miller 2004, Fig. 284). Crowns of vegetation, however, are another matter. It is by no means unusual to see athletes in vase-paintings wearing crowns while throwing a javelin or a discus or engaged in the long-jump<sup>70</sup>. Sometimes it is clear from the presence of a trainer or the appearance of a strigil hanging on a wall that the athlete is depicted as practicing for, rather than engaged in, competition. Significantly, when artists show combat sports or foot-races in progress the athletes are not crowned, because one or more of the figures in the scene is certain to be deprived of victory. What the crown denotes is that this is a successful athlete, an athlete who has in the past been victorious or who is sure to be victorious in the future.

<sup>68</sup> So Calame 2010, 66 and 75; Taplin 2010, 255-56.

<sup>69</sup> See, for example, the Panathenaic amphora, BM 1849.11-22.1/B144, from the last half of the sixth century, showing a horse and rider followed by a groom holding a crown and carrying a tripod while a herald proclaims, "The horse of Dysneiktos is victorious", and the red-figure cup by Douris, BM 1843.11-3.53/E52, from the first half of the fifth century, showing a naked athlete holding fronds and being crowned with fillets. The scenes are illustrated in Swaddling 2008, 88 and 91.

<sup>70</sup> See, e.g., Miller 2004, figs. 7, 41, 104, 108, 114, 123, 127, 131, 135-37, 271, 273. Since there was no separate competition for the javelin- or discus-throw or the long-jump these athletes are to be imagined as being victorious in the pentathlon, so that the discus-thrower, like the actor in a satyr-play, is depicted as participating in only one component of a multi-phase competition.

Likewise, the figures on the Pronomos Vase are wearing crowns because they are participants in a successful dramatic production and are therefore worthy of the artist's care and attention. The crowns do not necessarily imply that they are imagined as being represented after the performance or after the victory has been announced. In fact, one of the satyrs is shown wearing his mask and dancing, while the seated aulos-player is engaged in playing his instrument<sup>71</sup>. Surely it is at least as likely that the actors on the Pronomos Vase are imagined to be rehearsing or warming up for the performance in which they are going to win the prize. And the prize they will win is a prize for tragedy, just as a crowned discus-thrower will win a prize in the pentathlon. That the actors are wearing the costumes appropriate to satyr-play may, therefore, be seen as alluding to the fact that the satyr-play was the first item on the program of the tragic competition. The scene would thus encompass the entirety of the tragic production, from the preliminaries before the satyr-play that opened the proceedings to the recognition of victory following the conclusion of the tragic trilogy.

D. S.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- W. Aly, *Satyrspiel*, RE IIA.1, 1921, 235-47.  
 M. Blank, *The Alceiad: The Play and Opera*, in M. Blank (ed.), *Critical Essays on Thornton Wilder*, New York 1996, 88-98.  
 R. Blum, *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, Engl. transl., Madison 1991.  
 C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry: The 'Ars Poetica'*, Cambridge 1971.  
 C. Calame, *Aetiological Performance and Consecration in the Sanctuary of Dionysos*, in Taplin-Wyles 2010, 65-78.  
 I. Casaubon, *De satyrica Graecorum poesi, & Romanorum satira libri duo*, Paris 1605 [cited from the facsimile ed., Delmar, NY 1973].  
 E. Csapo, *The Context of Choregic Dedications*, in Taplin-Wyles 2010, 79-130.  
 M. Cunningham, *Thoughts on Aeschylus: The Satyr-Play Proteus-The Ending of the Oresteia*, "LCM" 19, 1994, 67-68.  
 R. I. Curtis, *Garum and Salsamenta: Production and Commerce in Materia Medica*, Leiden 1991.  
 J. Diggle (ed.), *Euripides: Phaethon*, Cambridge 1970.  
 L. Di Giuseppe (ed.), *Euripide: Alessandro*, Lecce 2012.

<sup>71</sup> By contrast, the aulos-player on a fragmentary red-figure volute krater in Würzburg (H4781, c. 400 BC), who is accompanied by unmasked members of a *tragic* chorus, is shown with the two pieces of his aulos held separately in his hands at his side; see Csapo 2010, 110-13, with Fig. 7.14.

- J. G. Droysen (transl.), *Des Aischylos Werke*, vol. 1, Berlin 1832.
- P. E. Easterling, *A Show for Dionysus*, in P. E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge 1997, 36-53.
- P. E. Easterling, *From Repertoire to Canon*, in: *The Cambridge Companion*, 211-27.
- M. Fantuzzi, *Tragic Smiles: When Tragedy Gets Too Comic for Aristotle and Later Hellenistic Readers*, in R. Hunter et al. (eds.), *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts*, Berlin 2014, 215-33.
- K. Friebe-F. Larsow (eds.), *Graecorum satyrorum fragmenta exceptis iis quae sunt Aeschyli, Sophoclis, Euripidis*, Berlin 1837.
- T. Gantz, *The Aeschylean Tetralogy: Prolegomena*, "CJ" 74, 1979, 289-304.
- T. Gantz, *The Aeschylean Tetralogy: Attested and Conjectured Groups*, "AJP" 101, 1980, 133-64.
- A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilogy*, Exeter 2006<sup>2</sup>.
- W. Genthe, *Der Kyklops: Ein Satyrspiel des Euripides, nebst einer ästhetischen Abhandlung über das Satyrspiel*, Halle-Leipzig 1828.
- S. E. Goins, *The Date of Aeschylus' Perseus Tetralogy*, "RhMus" 140, 1997, 193-210.
- A. S. F. Gow-D. L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1965.
- M. Griffith, *Slaves of Dionysos: Satyrs, Audience, and the Ends of the Oresteia*, "CIAnt" 21, 2002, 195-258.
- M. Griffith, *Satyr Play and Tragedy, Face to Face*, in Taplin-Wyles 2010, 47-63.
- A. de Gubernatis, *Dictionnaire international des écrivains du monde latin*, Rome-Florence 1905.
- P. Guggisberg, *Das Satyrspiel*, diss. Zurich 1947.
- M. Gumpert, *Grafting Helen: The Abduction of the Classical Past*, Madison 2001.
- E. Hall, *Ithyphallic Males Behaving Badly; or, Satyr Drama as Gendered Tragic Ending*, in M. Wyke (ed.), *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Bodies of Antiquity*, Oxford 1998, 13-37.
- E. Hall, *The Theatrical Cast of Athens: Interactions between Ancient Greek Drama and Society*, Oxford 2006.
- E. Hall, *Tragic Theatre: Demetrios' Rolls and Dionysos' Other Woman*, in Taplin-Wyles 2010, 159-79.
- G. Hermann, review of Welcker 1826, "Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung" nos. 13-15, 1827, 97-116.
- V. Hintner, *Euripides' Kyklops im Versmasse des Originals übertragen, mit einer Einleitung über das Satyrdrama und kurzen erläuternden Bemerkungen*, Progr. Czernowitz 1871.
- G. O. Hutchinson (ed.), *Aeschylus: Septem contra Thebas*, Oxford 1985.
- T. H. Irwin, *The Platonic Corpus*, in G. Fine (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Plato*, Oxford 2008, 63-87.
- R. Janko (ed.), *Philodemus On Poems Books 3-4 with the Fragments of Aristotle On Poets*, Oxford 2011.
- R. Krumeich-N. Pechstein-B. Seidensticker (eds.), *Das griechische Satyrspiel*, Darmstadt 1999.
- R. Lämmle, *Das Satyrspiel*, in B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike*, vol. 1: *Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit*, Munich 2011, 611-63.
- R. Lämmle, *Poetik des Satyrspiels*, Heidelberg 2013.
- L. Levi, *Intorno al drama satirico*, "Rivista di storia antica" 12, 1908, 201-42.
- L. Levi, *Il 'Licurgo' di Eschilo*, "Atene e Roma" 12, 1909, 241-47.
- F. Lissarrague, *Aesop, Between Man and Beast: Ancient Portraits and Illustrations*, in B. Cohen



- (ed.), *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*, Leiden 2000, 132-49.
- A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II: Commentary 99-182*, Leiden 1988.
- C. M. Lucarini, *Osservazioni sulla prima circolazione delle opere di Platone e sulle trilogiae di Aristofane di Bisanzio* (D. L. 3, 56-66), "Hyperboreus" 17, 2011, 346-61.
- A. Mancini, *Il dramma satirico greco*, "Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore" 11.5, Pisa 1896.
- J. Mansfeld, *Prolegomena: Questions to be Settled before the Study of an Author, or a Text*, Leiden 1994.
- G. Manuwald, *Roman Republican Theatre*, Cambridge 2011.
- A. Markantonatos, *Euripides' Alcestis: Narrative, Myth, and Religion*, Berlin 2013.
- S. G. Miller, *Ancient Greek Athletics*, New Haven 2004.
- B. W. Millis, *Inscribed Public Records of the Dramatic Contests at Athens: IG II<sup>2</sup> 2318-2323a and IG II<sup>2</sup> 2325*, in E. Csapo et al. (eds.), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C.*, Berlin-Boston 2014, 425-45.
- B. W. Millis-S. D. Olson (eds.), *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens: IG II<sup>2</sup> 2318-2325 and Related Texts*, Leiden 2012.
- A. F. Näke, *Ueber die thebanische Tetralogie des Aeschylus*, ed. by F. Ritschl, "RhMus" 27, 1872, 193-214.
- P. O'Sullivan-C. Collard (eds.), *Euripides, Cyclops, and Major Fragments of Greek Satyric Drama*, Oxford 2013.
- T. Papadopoulou, *Aeschylus: Suppliants*, London-New York 2011.
- N. Pechstein, *Euripides Satyrographos: Ein Kommentar zu den Euripideischen Satyrspielfragmenten*, Stuttgart 1998.
- R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.
- A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, 2nd ed. revised by T. B. L. Webster, Oxford 1962.
- A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, 2nd ed. revised by John Gould and D. M. Lewis, Oxford 1988.
- A. J. Podlecki, *Aischylos satyrikos*, in G. W. M. Harrison (ed.), *Satyr Drama: Tragedy at Play*, Swansea 2005, 1-19.
- M. Pohlenz, *Die griechische Tragödie*, 2 vols., Göttingen 1954<sup>2</sup>.
- C. Robert, *Oidipus: Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum*, 2 vols., Berlin 1915.
- L. E. Rossi, *Das attische Satyrspiel*, in Seidensticker 1989, 222-51 [originally 1972, in Italian].
- D. Sansone, *The Bacchae as Satyr-Play?* "ICS" 3, 1978, 40-46.
- D. Sansone, *Plato and Euripides*, "ICS" 21, 1996, 35-67.
- T. Schatz, *Boom and Bust: American Cinema in the 1940s*, Berkeley 1999.
- F. Schironi, *Plato at Alexandria: Aristophanes, Aristarchus, and the 'Philological Tradition' of a Philosopher*, "CQ" 55, 2005, 423-34.
- A. Schöll, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Poesie*, Berlin 1839.
- A. Schöll, *Gründlicher unterricht über die Tetralogie des attischen Theaters, und die Kompositionsweise des Sophokles*, Leipzig 1859.

- R. Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides*, Göttingen 1980.
- R. Seaford (ed.), *Euripides: Cyclops*, Oxford 1984.
- B. Seidensticker, *Das Satyrspiel*, in G. A. Seeck (ed.), *Das griechische Drama*, Darmstadt 1979, 204-57.
- B. Seidensticker (ed.), *Satyrspiel*, Darmstadt 1989.
- C. A. Shaw, *Satyr Play: The Evolution of Greek Comedy and Satyr Drama*, Oxford 2014.
- J. P. Sickinger, *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens*, Chapel Hill 1999.
- E. Simon, *Die griechischen Vasen*, Munich 1976.
- E. Simon, *Amynone*, LIMC 1.1, 1981, 742-52.
- E. Simon, *Satyr-Plays on Vases in the Time of Aeschylus*, in D. Kurtz–B. Sparkes (eds.), *The Eye of Greece: Studies in the Art of Athens*, Cambridge 1982, 123-48.
- N. W. Slater, *Waiting in the Wings: Aristophanes' Ecclesiazusae*, "Arion" 5.1, 1997, 97-129.
- F. Solmsen, *The Academic and the Alexandrian Editions of Plato's Works*, "ICS" 6, 1981, 102-11.
- A. H. Sommerstein (ed. and transl.), *Aeschylus: Fragments*, Cambridge, MA–London 2008.
- D. F. Sutton, *Aeschylus' Amynone*, "GRBS" 15, 1974, 193-202.
- D. F. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, Meisenheim am Glan 1980.
- J. Swaddling, *The Ancient Olympic Games*, 2nd ed. rev. and updated, Austin 2008.
- O. Taplin, *A Curtain Call?* in Taplin–Wyles 2010, 255-63.
- O. Taplin–R. Wyles (eds.), *The Pronomos Vase and its Context*, Oxford 2010.
- H. Tarrant, *Thrasyllan Platonism*, Ithaca NY 1993.
- M. Tiverios, *The Satyr-Play 'Sphinx' of Aischylos Again*, in *ἀγαθὸς δαίμων. Mythes et cultes: Etudes d'iconographie en l'honneur de Lilly Kahil*, Athens 2000, 477-87.
- C. A. Trypanis, *Greek Poetry from Homer to Seferis*, Chicago 1981.
- H. Usener, *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 3, Leipzig 1914.
- M. Valgimigli, *De fabula Aeschyli satyrica quae Proteus inscribitur*, "Classici e Neolatini" 4.1, 1908, 1-8.
- T. B. L. Webster, *The Order of Tragedies at the Great Dionysia*, "Hermathena" 100, 1965, 21-28.
- F. G. Welcker, *Die Aeschylische Trilogie Prometheus und die Kabirenweihe zu Lemnos nebst Winken über die Trilogie des Aeschylus überhaupt*, Darmstadt 1824.
- F. G. Welcker, *Nachtrag zu der Schrift über die Aeschylische Trilogie, nebst einer Abhandlung über das Satyrspiel*, Frankfurt am Main 1826.
- M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus*, Stuttgart 1990.
- L. G. Westerink (ed.), *Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy*, Amsterdam 1962.
- P. Wiesmann, *Das Problem der tragischen Tetralogie*, diss. Zurich 1929.
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (ed.), *Aeschyli tragoediae*, Berlin 1914.
- P. Wilson, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City and the Stage*, Cambridge 2000.
- G. Zuntz, *Notes on Some Passages in Aeschylus' Septem*, "PCPhS" 27, 1981, 81-95.

#### ABSTRACT:

Ancient evidence suggests that it is as likely that the fifth-century satyr-play was performed at the start of the tragic tetralogy as at the end.

#### KEYWORDS:

satyr-play, tetralogy, Dionysia, didascaliae, Aeschylus