

# Aeschylus' *Amymone*

*Dana Ferrin Sutton*

AESCHYLUS' *Amymone* is shown to have been a satyr play by the didascalic notice *P.Oxy.* 20.2256 fr.3, according to which it was produced with the *Danaides* trilogy (*Supplices*, *Aegyptioi*, *Danaides*) no earlier than 468 B.C., as Sophocles, who began his career then, competed against this tetralogy.<sup>1</sup> The fragments of this play are meager and uninformative and scarcely permit a reconstruction.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, on the basis of versions of the myth of Amymone re-tailed by the mythographers,<sup>3</sup> we have a general idea of the contents of the play.

Poseidon, angry at Inachus, permitted the springs of Argos to grow dry. Danaus, comfortably settled in the land after the adventurous wanderings depicted in the trilogy, sent his daughter Amymone to fetch water. As the story is usually told, on the way she threw a dart at a deer but hit a sleeping satyr.<sup>4</sup> He wanted to rape, or even marry,<sup>5</sup> her, and she called out to Poseidon for help. He frightened the satyr away, and Amymone gave herself to her rescuer. From this union sprang Nauplius. When Amymone, at the command of the god, drew out his trident, which had been planted in a rock, the threefold spring at Lerna gushed out, and the drought was thus ended; in later times this spring was called "the spring of Amymone."

There is no reason to think that any mythographer's version of the Amymone myth is directly derived from Aeschylus' play, and hence one cannot pretend to any precise understanding of how Aeschylus

<sup>1</sup> The best study of this notice and the problems it presents (which do not concern the *Danaides* tetralogy) is Albin Lesky, "Die Dateriung der *Hiketiden* und der Tragiker *Mesatos*," *Gesammelte Schriften* (Bern/Munich 1967) 220-33; the best modern discussion of the trilogy is A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus' Supplices, Play and Trilogy* (Cambridge 1969) 163-233.

<sup>2</sup> Hans Joachim Mette, *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos* (Berlin 1959) 45f.

<sup>3</sup> The principal sources are Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.1.4 and Hyg. *Fab.* 169-69A (Rose). Other relevant passages are Eur. *Phoen.* 187ff; Luc. *Dial.Mar.* 6; Philostr. *Imag.* 1.8; schol. on *Il.* 4.171; Prop. 3.18.47f; Strabo at 8.6.8; Paus. 2.38.1 and 4. For the play, see Peter Guggisberg, *Das Satyrspiel* (Zürich 1947) 83f with reff., from whom the following mythological outline is adopted.

<sup>4</sup> In Hyg. *Fab.* 169A (Rose), the satyr merely surprises her while sleeping.

<sup>5</sup> Fr.131 (Mette)—"it is your fate to be my wife, mine to be your husband"—could be spoken by either Poseidon or 'the satyr' (i.e. Silenus).

dramatized the myth. Only one point can be made with assurance. In a satyr play *Amymone* would not be pursued by 'a satyr'. If the object is an enforced marriage, probably the situation would be the same as in Aeschylus' *Dictyulci*, in which Silenus, with the assistance of the Chorus of Satyrs, tries to wheedle and bully Danae into a marriage. If the object is merely rape, *Amymone* could have been threatened by a gang-rape by Silenus and the entire Chorus: that they are capable of such behavior is shown by Euripides' *Cyclops* 179–81, where this occurs to them as the fitting punishment for Helen.

Monumental evidence cannot be used to clarify this or any other problem concerning the dramaturgy of *Amymone*. There exists a series of *Amymone* satyr vases, collected and studied by Frank Brommer,<sup>6</sup> but for several reasons they do not constitute reliable evidence. First, the series begins abruptly only about 440 B.C. Even conceding that there is often an interval between the production of a play and the appearances of vases inspired by that play, this chronological discrepancy is difficult to explain if Aeschylus' play is the source of inspiration. Recognizing this, Brommer speculated that the actual source was a second, otherwise unknown, *Amymone* play.<sup>7</sup> Second, in just those particulars of greatest importance for reconstructing the play—characters, setting, etc.—the vases do not agree with each other. Hence, for example, although *Amymone* required a minimal *dramatis personae* of *Amymone*, Poseidon, Silenus and the satyrs, monumental evidence is no reliable guide to the possible presence of additional characters.<sup>8</sup>

Third, even assuming that some one or more of these vases (but which ones?) accurately reflect Aeschylus' *Amymone*, allowance must be made for artistic liberties. One vase, for example, depicts *Amymone* hotly pursued by a gang of satyrs (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Mus. iv.1011), but this warrants no conclusion about the situation in

<sup>6</sup> Frank Brommer, "Amymone," *AthMitt* 63–64 (1938–39) 171–76 with figs. 67–70.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 176.

<sup>8</sup> Most notably, one krater (Syracuse 44 291, for which cf. Beazley, ARV<sup>2</sup> 1041 no.9) adds Aphrodite and another (Rome, Vatican Mus. U 13) Hermes. Others collected by Brommer add Eros or a sister (or handmaiden) of *Amymone*. Louis Séchan, *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique*<sup>2</sup> (Paris 1967) 337, shows that a Berlin amphora (Furtwängler, *Vasensamml.* no.3257) sometimes thought to be inspired by *Amymone* is actually an illustration of the death of Hippolytus, presumably inspired by Euripides' play. For a parallel instance of a satyr added to a scene reflecting a tragedy, cf. the lost Apulian Iphigenia vase described by S. Reinach, *Répertoire des vases peints grecs et étrusques* I (Paris 1922) 133.

the play. If in *Amydone* Silenus had designs on the girl, perhaps desiring to marry her, and if he had the assistance of the Chorus, a painter might well take the liberty of translating this into a scene in which she is pursued by the satyrs indiscriminately.

Although the details of dramaturgy are beyond recall, clearly this play bears a strong resemblance to another Aeschylean satyr play, *Dictyulci*.<sup>9</sup> The general situation in both plays is the same: a woman is in distress because she is threatened with some form of sexual bondage by Silenus and the satyrs, a situation from which she is saved by a rescuer (Poseidon, Dictys). Both plays possibly concluded with a marriage between the distressed woman and her savior, so that both could have adhered to the same scheme: machinations of Silenus and satyrs . . . wrong marriage . . . rescue . . . right marriage.<sup>10</sup>

Both plays employ a remarkable reversal of rôles. The Greek satyr play is notorious for reliance on a relatively few stereotypes of subject, theme, characterization, etc.,<sup>11</sup> and apparently Silenus and the satyrs were routinely cast in the rôle of oppressed slaves, so that part of the happy endings of many satyr plays would be their regaining their freedom and being allowed to rejoin their proper master Dionysus, as in *Cyclops*.<sup>12</sup> But in these two plays they seek to reduce somebody else to bondage. Likewise in plays like *Cyclops* because they are oppressed they are presented as essentially sympathetic, for all their shortcomings, and they are allied with the sympathetic central character, such as Odysseus. This too would seem to be the usual way of presenting them, but in *Amydone* and *Dictyulci* they are the villains. In a similar inversion, in Aeschylus' satyric *Theoroi* or *Isthmiastai* they seek to escape from Dionysus, rather than back to him. The evidence is fragmentary and generalizations are dangerous, but Aeschylus is

<sup>9</sup> For this play cf. M. Werre-deHaas' *Aeschylus' Dictyulci* (Leiden 1961).

<sup>10</sup> A seeming fault of Werre-deHaas' reconstruction of *Dictyulci* (*supra* n.9) 73f, is that the possibility that the play concluded with a marriage of Dictys and Danae is not considered. To this one could respond that according to Werre-deHaas' reconstruction *Dictyulci* is already 930 lines long, and the addition of a marriage might make the play too long for a satyr play (*Cyclops* has 709 lines, Sophocles' *Ichneutai* probably had not much more than 800). But the length of Euripides' prosatyr *Alcestis* provides some sort of parallel, and one feature of *Dictyulci*'s happy ending surely was some provision for Danae's future.

<sup>11</sup> Guggisberg, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 60–73 with references to earlier observations; so also Jacqueline Duchemin, *Le Cyclope, édition critique et commentée* (Paris 1945) xv–xvii; D. J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama* (Toronto 1967) 322–26; Anne Newton Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford 1971), index s.v. "satyric motifs"; D. F. Sutton, *The Date of Euripides' Cyclops* (Ann Arbor 1974) 104–26.

<sup>12</sup> So Guggisberg, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 62f.

notable for being the only poet who can be observed inverting such routine generic stereotypes. Possibly a Greek audience would find such inversions amusing and this kind of humor was specifically Aeschylean.<sup>13</sup>

Another striking parallel between *Amymone* and *Dictyulci* is the relationship of these two satyr plays to their respective trilogies. *Dictyulci* was almost certainly presented with a *Perseus* trilogy containing, *inter alia*, *Polydectes*. A major event in that trilogy, probably in this play, must have been Polydectes' attempt to force Perseus' mother Danae into an involuntary marriage. Werre-deHaas has pointed out that Silenus' attempt to bully Danae into an enforced marriage in *Dictyulci* is a parody of Polydectes' action in the trilogy.<sup>14</sup> The function of *Dictyulci* within its tetralogy is therefore to provide comic relief by burlesquing a situation in the preceding trilogy. This seems to fit into a more general pattern of satyr plays or other fourth-place plays parodying a tragedy with which they were produced. Sophocles' *Ichneutai* bears several striking resemblances to his *Ajax*, and especially in view of the fact that both plays are by common consent assigned to the middle or late 440's, these seem best explained according to the theory that they were written together and that *Ichneutai* was intended to parody elements in *Ajax*.<sup>15</sup> Euripides' satyric *Sisyphus* was produced with the Trojan trilogy of 415, and there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that it was contrived as a parody of a tragedy in that trilogy, *Alexander*.<sup>16</sup> Above all, there are several extremely strong resemblances between Euripides' *Cyclops* and *Hecuba*. Polymestor's blinding is paralleled by that of Polyphemus, both in point of general situation and details of diction. The theme of *nomos* and *xenia* is equally prominent, and handled in an identical way, in both plays, and both feature parallel sequences where an appeal for mercy on idealistic grounds is parried with a brutal lecture about expediency. The various arguments advanced in favor of dating

<sup>13</sup> There is a similar inversion in *Dictyulci*: our final fragment breaks off in the middle of marching anapaests of the type usually found at the end of a play, celebrating the marriage of Silenus and Danae. But this must be a false ending, and Dictys subsequently reenters to rescue Danae (Werre-deHaas, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.9] 74).

<sup>14</sup> Werre-deHaas, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.9) 74f.

<sup>15</sup> Sutton, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.11) 157-66; cf. *Arethusa* 4 (1971) 60-67.

<sup>16</sup> Gilbert Murray, "The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides," *Mélanges Glotz* II (Paris 1932) 646; John Ferguson, "Tetralogies, Divine Paternity and the Plays of 414," *TAPA* 100 (1969) 110; Sutton, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.11) 166-68.

*Cyclops* significantly later than 424 B.C., the probable date of *Hecuba* (most importantly, the higher percentage of iambic resolution in *Cyclops*) can be shown to be insufficiently cogent to pose a real obstacle to the conclusion that these two plays were written together.<sup>17</sup>

In the same way, Euripides' *Helen* and *Andromeda* were both produced in 412 B.C.,<sup>18</sup> and *Helen* goes over much the same dramaturgic and thematic material as does *Andromeda*, although in a more lighthearted spirit. This is an extremely odd relationship, and I do not know of a case in which one tragedy is written as a lighthearted equivalent, if not downright parody, of another in the same trilogy. But this relationship would be less difficult to comprehend according to the Wilamowitzian theory that *Helen* is a fourth-place prosatyr play of the *Alcestis* type, and there are several reasons for so thinking, principally because it uses a plot, themes and characterizations that are recognizably assembled out of precisely the same stereotypes that are the routine fare of satyr plays.

Situations in which a satyr play (or substitute for a satyr play) parodies a tragedy in the same set are extreme examples of the function of the satyr play, as admirably defined by Wilhelm Schmid:<sup>19</sup> "Dem ausgereiften Satyrspiel der klassischen Zeit ist der ausgesprochen humoristische und märchenhafte Charakter ohne persönliche, aggressive Satire und die parodistische Behandlung der Mythen eigen . . . das Satyrspiel ist nicht selten, vielleicht sogar regelmässig, demselben Stoffgebiet wie die vorangehende Inhaltstrilogie entnommen [wobei] sich die Tragödie gewissermassen selbst ironisiert und sich dadurch Indemnität für das Übermass der leidvollen Affekte erwirkt, die sie entfesselt hat."

Students of Aeschylus have repeatedly appreciated that, in a general way, there is a similar relationship of parody between *Amyclone* and the *Danaides* trilogy.<sup>20</sup> Both deal with the theme of *φυξανορία*, with the attempt of women to avoid sexual servitude forcibly imposed.

<sup>17</sup> This is the conclusion revived in my *Date of Euripides' Cyclops*; see Henri Grégoire, "L'Authenticité du Rhesus d'Euripide," *AntCl* 2 (1933) 131, and Eduard Delebecque, *Euripide et la Guerre du Péloponnèse* (Paris 1951) 165-77.

<sup>18</sup> Schol. on Ar. *Thesm.* 1012, 1060.

<sup>19</sup> Schmid-Stählin, *GGL* I.2.82f.

<sup>20</sup> First suggested by Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aischylos Interpretationen* (Berlin 1914) 23, and *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (Berlin 1914) 381; so also Kurt von Fritz, "Die Danaidentrilogie des Aischylos," *Philologus* 91 (1936) 268f; Schmid-Stählin, *GGL* I.2.199 n.9; Guggisberg, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 32; R. P. Winnington-Ingram, "The Danaid Trilogy of Aeschylus," *JHS* 61 (1961) 147 and 151.

But this is scarcely the only way in which contents of the trilogy are parodied in the satyr play. Even if we know little about the details of its dramaturgy, on the basis of the Amymone myth we may deduce with reasonable assurance that the play must have contained certain elements. By comparing these with the known contents of the trilogy, particularly the extant *Supplices*, one may suggest that *Amymone* parodied much more than just the general idea of *φυξανορία*.

I shall begin with points of comparison between the satyr play and the trilogy that seem sufficiently self-evident to warrant one's speaking of them with virtual certainty, and then I shall discuss other possible points of comparison in what seems a decreasing order of probability. For the sake of a complete argument, we should investigate all possible ramifications of the relationship between *Amymone* and its trilogy.

All of those who have commented on the relationship between the satyr play and the trilogy have commented on the common thematic denominator of *φυξανορία*. Curiously, the equally obvious parallel of dramatic situation has not provoked such unanimous comment. In both the satyr play and the trilogy one or more women are beset by one or more individuals who seek to reduce them to a situation of sexual bondage. In *Supplices* the Danaïds perceive their Egyptian cousins as wanton, lascivious, even subhuman,<sup>21</sup> which is of course exactly how Amymone's pursuers would be portrayed in the satyr play, a typical characterization of Silenus and the satyrs.<sup>22</sup> In the trilogy, the pursuers have a spokesman, the Egyptian Herald, who is boorishly, imperiously arrogant. He finds an obvious and exact parallel in the satyrs' spokesman, Silenus.<sup>23</sup> In the trilogy, the pursued maidens cry to the gods—above all to Zeus Protector of Suppliants—for aid, and find a protector in the king of the region, Pelagus. In the satyr play, Amymone cries to Poseidon for aid and finds a protector in the god himself. In contrast to the sexual bondage the pursuers attempt to impose, both the trilogy and the satyr play present the picture of a proper sexual relationship, based on consent rather than force (Hypermetra and Lynceus, Amymone and Poseidon).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. esp. 174f, 750–53, 757–59.

<sup>22</sup> For Silenus' typical characterization, cf. Guggisberg, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 53–56.

<sup>23</sup> That Silenus is capable of behaving in this hectoring way is shown, for instance, by Soph. *Ichn.* 130–206. The satyrs hear Hermes' lyre and are overcome with dread. Silenus tries to bully them back to work until he himself hears the lyre and becomes more panic-stricken than the Chorus.

These initial observations make clear that Aeschylus has made a remarkable choice in selecting the subject for his *Nachspiel*: a myth that is connected with that of the trilogy, and that substantially duplicates the trilogy's dramatic situation and raises very much the same thematic issues. Aeschylus' choice of subject, therefore, insures a situation in which the satyr play substantially parodies its trilogy.

Since such a relationship of parody is guaranteed by the use of the Amymone myth, we may at least suspect that Aeschylus exploited the inherent parody of situation and theme in writing *Amymone*. To judge by the Amymone myth, the play could well have contained three scenes parodying scenes in the *Danaïdes* trilogy.

The first is Amymone's appeal for aid. She was in fact a suppliant, and her cries for assistance could very easily have been contrived in recognizable imitation of the Danaïds' appeals in *Supplices*. More than this, the setting of *Supplices* is before an altar common to several gods (223f), at which the suppliant Danaïds take refuge. *Amymone* must have had a pastoral setting, typical of satyr plays,<sup>24</sup> and the likeliest setting might be in front of a rustic altar or shrine sacred to Poseidon.<sup>25</sup> To this, in an action parallel to that of *Supplices*, Amymone would come seeking refuge from Silenus and the satyrs. Just as the Danaïds find a protector in the region's political master, Pelasgus, so Amymone would find a protector in the tutelary god of the vicinity. So her appeal for help could imitate that of *Supplices* both in writing and in staging.

Second, *Amymone* very likely contained a scene in which Poseidon confronted Amymone's tormentors, and this would require an angry clash between Poseidon and Silenus and the satyrs, which would be cut to a pattern similar to the confrontation of Pelasgus and the Egyptian Herald in *Supplices* (911–53).

Third, thanks to fr.125 (Mette), we know that Aphrodite appeared in the last play of the trilogy, *Danaïdes*, and it is agreed that she appeared as the spokeswoman for the institution of marriage, *i.e.* of sexuality properly conducted (more about this later). In the fragment she speaks of the fructifying power of Eros (Smyth's translation):

The holy heaven yearns to wound the earth, and yearning layeth hold  
on the earth to join in wedlock; the rain, fallen from the amorous

<sup>24</sup> Vitr. *De Arch.* 5.6.9.

<sup>25</sup> For what it is worth (*cf.* the remarks on the value of monumental evidence *supra*), one Amymone satyr vase shows an altar: the Syracusan krater Syr. 44 291.

heaven, impregnates the earth, and it bringeth forth for mankind the food of flocks and herds and Demeter's gifts; and from that moist marriage-rite the woods put on their bloom. Of all these things I am the cause.

In the myth of Amymone, the consummation of the union of Poseidon and Amymone leads to the discovery of the springs of Lerna and the refertilization of Argos. Hence *Amymone*, like *Danaides*, probably contained a scene in which the ideas of proper sexuality and fruitfulness were closely conjoined.

On the thematic level, both the trilogy and the satyr play dealt with sexuality. Two sexual themes common to both are *φυξανορία* and the fertilizing powers of Eros, and we can detect a third. Both the trilogy and the satyr play presented contrasting portraits of right and wrong sexual relationships. In the lost plays of the trilogy, the Danaïds were forced to marry their cousins and killed them on the wedding night. One, Hypermestra, refused to do this and formed a genuine marriage with Lynceus. Hence the contrast between the relation of the Danaïds and the Egyptians and that of Hypermestra and Lynceus finds a parallel in the contrast of the relation of Amymone and the satyrs and Amymone and Poseidon. Winnington-Ingram has attempted to define the nature of this contrast as Eros allied with force versus Eros allied with persuasion.<sup>26</sup> This is attractive, but is probably not the only possibility. But whatever the precise thematic nature of the contrast, we may speculate that it was the same in both trilogy and satyr play.

A notorious problem concerning *Supplices* is that although the Danaïds' violent rejection of their Egyptian cousins is clear enough, their reason for it is not.<sup>27</sup> This is sometimes considered a fault of the play, but possibly their motivation was made clearer in later plays of the trilogy. Besides the passages to which I have already alluded that stress the bestial nature of the Egyptians, probably the most illuminating is 1030–42 (Smyth):

DANAÏDS: May pure Artemis look upon this band in compassion,  
and may wedlock never come through constraint of  
Cytherea. This prize be mine enemies!

<sup>26</sup> Winnington-Ingram, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.20).

<sup>27</sup> Besides Garvie, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 215–23, the best discussion is by Herbert Weir Smyth, *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Berkeley 1924) 55–58.



HAND- Yet there is no disdain of Cypris in this our friendly hymn;  
 MAIDENS: for she, together with Hera, hath power most dear to Zeus,  
 and for her august rites the goddess of varied wiles is held  
 in honour.

And in the train of their mother are Desire and she to  
 whom nothing is denied, even winning Persuasion; and to  
 Harmonia hath been given a share of Aphrodite, and to the  
 whispering dalliances of the Loves.

Is it possible that in the latter plays of the trilogy there was some special connection between the Danaïds and Artemis, and a conflict between the claims of the two divinities Artemis and Aphrodite?

On the admittedly slender basis of the version of the myth of the Danaïds given by Pausanias at 2.19.6, many think that the trilogy concluded with a trial, although opinion is divided about who was on trial for what. Either the Danaïds are on trial for murder with Aphrodite prosecuting, or Hypermestra is on trial for refusing to act with her sisters and Aphrodite is defending.<sup>28</sup> Both possibilities present difficulties, and one can easily imagine a satisfying, dramatically powerful conclusion with no trial.<sup>29</sup>

But, *argumenti causa*, let us assume a trial scene. *Eumenides* is a doubtful guide to the possible substance of such a trial, but a more reliable guide to its format, being an index of Aeschylus' understanding of the judicial process and how to translate it into theatrical terms. For such a trial would only succeed in the theater under certain conditions. A theatrical trial scene is only interesting if it is suspenseful, if there is something to be said (no matter how tendentious) for each side, and if the sides are reasonably well matched; and it provides a satisfying conclusion only if it genuinely resolves the issues at stake.

For these reasons, if *Danaides* ended with a trial, two divinities probably participated. Any trial in which a divinity upholds one position and mere mortals the other would not be dramatically interesting because the sides would be too unbalanced. And if one divinity were

<sup>28</sup> Garvie, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 204–11; D. J. Robertson, "The End of the *Supplices* Trilogy of Aeschylus," *CR* 38 (1924) 51–53, remains provocative.

<sup>29</sup> Assuming that the Egyptians were killed at the end of the second play or near the beginning of the third, Hypermestra could refuse to participate in the murder and stand by Lynceus; her sisters and their father turn on her and threaten to lynch her; she appeals to Aphrodite and there is a fine irony in the fact that the former suppliants are now the pursuers; Aphrodite appears in a final theophany, rescues her, and lays down a theodicy about the institution of marriage, of which fr.125 (Mette) is a part.

onstage representing, indeed personifying, one opposing principle, balance could be achieved only by having a second divinity representing the other. If this is true and *Danaides* numbered two divinities among its *dramatis personae*, the second would surely be Artemis.<sup>30</sup> Hence *Supplices* 1030–42 is possibly a prefiguration of a conflict appearing later in the trilogy, in the same way that mention of the Erinyes in *Agamemnon* foreshadows later developments in the *Oresteia*.

This is relevant to our inquiry because there is reason for thinking Amymone might have been presented as a devotee of Artemis in the satyr play, so that something of the same conflict between the claims of Artemis and Aphrodite would reappear in the satyr play. One cannot prove that Aeschylus followed the commonest form of the Amymone myth, according to which she caught the attention of 'the satyr' by hitting him with a misaimed dart while hunting a deer; but if this were the case she would probably have been characterized as a sort of Amazon,<sup>31</sup> and consequently as a special devotee of Artemis.

To sum up, by the very act of employing the myth of Amymone as his subject Aeschylus created a situation in which the satyr play was bound to parody the accompanying theme in terms of both theme and dramatic action. The principal area of uncertainty is to what extent he made this parody all the more explicit by carrying it down to the level of dramaturgic detail. Even assuming that he made no such effort, which is scarcely likely, the audience no doubt recognized and appreciated the fact that important elements of the trilogy reappeared in the satyr play in humorous form.

CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

January, 1974

<sup>30</sup> This is all the more possible because the tetralogy is conceivably written late enough to employ the third actor introduced by Sophocles. If there was a trial scene, who was the jury? The likeliest answer is the *demos* of Argos, not because of the analogy of *Eumenides*, but because of the situation in *Supplices*, in which the *demos*, not Pelasgus, ultimately decides to receive the suppliants. Cf. Anthony J. Podlecki, *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy* (Ann Arbor 1966) 45–52. This would provide a nice and (I think Podlecki would concur in saying) politically significant balance.