ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXV

HELSINKI 2001

INDEX

METATHEATRICALITY IN THE GREEK SATYR-PLAY

MAARIT KAIMIO *ET ALII*[*]

In a famous fragment of Pratinas, described as a *hyporchema* by Athenaeus (4 F 3, Athen. 14,617b), a chorus of satyrs pours a torrent of indignation on the increasing role of the music of *aulos* in a choral performance. The exact target of their hostility, the literary genre of the poem and the identity of the Pratinas in question are under scholarly debate.[1] One argument for the view that the fragment cannot be from a satyr-play, let alone from an early one, has been the metatheatrical theme of the song: open discussion among the performers of the suitability of their music to the context of performance. Similar arguments have been expressed in connection with a late satyr-play, too: In a fragment of the satyric *Heracles* by the fourth-century author Astydamas, we find a discussion of the "varied feast" which a good poet must offer to his spectators (Astydamas II 60 F 4, Athen. 10,411a). This kind of metatheatrical discussion is seen to be influenced by the *parabasis* of Old

---

[*] This paper is written by a team studying satyr-play in the University of Helsinki spring 2001 under the guidance of Maarit Kaimio. The other contributors are Marke Ahonen, Matias Buchholz, Pirkko Haikala, Saara Kauppinen, Sanna Kittelä, Päivi Lammi, Essi Miettinen, Nicola Nykopp, Kirsi Sysmäläinen and Vesa Vahtikari.

[1] Opposite views have been presented lately by R. Seaford, *Maia* 29/30 (1977/78) 81–94, and B. Zimmermann, *MH* 43:3 (1986) 145–154. Seaford considers that the fragment comes from a satyr-play of Pratinas and reflects opposition against the dithyrambic style of Lasus of Hermione, while Zimmermann sees in the song an example of the neo-Attic dithyramb from the second half of the fifth century, supposing another, later poet by the same name. See the discussion by J. Schloemann in R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein and B. Seidensticker (eds.), *Das griechische Satyrspiel*, Darmstadt 1999, 83–87 (hereafter: *GS*), who takes a cautious stand against the origin of the fragment in a satyr-play. However, it is generally admitted that the speaker of the lines must be a chorus of satyrs (Zimmermann 1986, 151–152 denies this, but relaxes his position in his book *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung*, Göttingen 1992, 126 n. 27). For literature on the discussion of the genre of the fragment, see now *GS* 84 n.17; 86 nn. 32, 33.

Comedy.[2] Metatheatricality is thus seen as foreign to the character of the Greek satyr-play.

The concept of metatheatre – or metatheatricality, metatragedy – and its application to Greek drama have themselves been much discussed lately. Such theatrical self-reference, in the form of expressions referring to different aspects of the context of the actual performance in the festival, has generally been recognized as a characteristic feature of Old Comedy, and it has been seen as one of the distinguishing marks between Greek tragedy and comedy.[3] Recently, possible metatheatrical references in tragedy have been much discussed, especially the interpretation of passages connected with the god Dionysus himself.[4] Anton Bierl has emphasized the lack of clarity of the concept of metatheatre as the main reason behind the sharp oppositions. As the concept has been transferred, in the realm of Greek literature, from comedy to tragedy, it has often been interpreted as bringing with it notions of the rupture of illusion or conscious play with fictionality, sometimes with anachronistic reference to the *Verfremdungseffekt* of Bertold Brecht.[5] In his recent book about the chorus of Greek comedy, Bierl urges that a more clear distinction be made between the concepts of self-referentiality and meta-theatre: the former should be used of the self-referential act of speech, where the speaker (mostly the chorus) refers to its own acting (often in a ritual act) during the here and now of the performance, while the latter refers to the problematizing, reflexive speech in the theatre about the aesthetic

---

[2] D. Bain, *CQ* 25 (1975) 24–25; T. Günther, *GS* 572–73. On the fragment of Astydamas, see below pp. 59–60.

[3] See especially Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 13–25; idem, *Actors and Audience: A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama*, Oxford 1977; O. Taplin, *JHS* 106 (1986) 163–174. Both have later somewhat softened their original contrasting of the two genres, Bain in *BICS* 34 (1988) 1–14, Taplin in *Comic Angels and Other Approaches to Greek Drama through Vase-Painting*, Oxford 1993, 26. On satyr-play, cf. F. Lissarrague: "None of this [sc. play with theatrical illusion as in comedy] appears in satyric drama, which follows tragedy in its complete respect for the fiction of the stage" (in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin [eds.], *Nothing to Do with Dionysus? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*, Princeton 1990, 236).

[4] See especially C. Segal, *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides' Bacchae*, Princeton 1982, ch. 7, and the chapter "Metatragedy" in the Afterword of its new edition 1997, 369–378, followed by the review article by R. Seaford, *BMCRev* 98.3.10 and Segal's reply *BMCRev* 98.5.26.

[5] See A. Bierl, *Dionysus und die griechische Tragödie: Politische und 'metatheatralische' Aspekte im Text*, Tübingen 1991, 115–16.

phenomenon of theatre.[6] The conceptual distinction, however, is not easy to keep in the realm of Greek drama, nor is it in our opinion necessary. As Bierl himself continues, both concepts overlap, and it depends on the point of view, which of them is preferable in a certain context. As the reason for this, Bierl sees the fluctuating boundaries of ritual and theatre. In his recent book on the metafictional poetics of Greek drama, G. W. Dobrov[7] emphasizes that both Greek tragedy and comedy fundamentally employ the same phenomenal modes to reveal their own theatricality, though the openness and measure in which these 'figures of play' are employed may differ from one genre to the other. Thus, surface play with explicit reference to an element of performance is typical of comedy, but very veiled in tragedy; similarly, it is easy to point out the mode termed 'contrafact' by Dobrov in the many cases where a scene in comedy is based on extensive use and comic modification of a certain scene in tragedy, while in tragedy the technique is more elusive. The third mode employed by Dobrov in his analysis of the metafictionality of Greek drama, '*mise en abyme*', defined by him as "a metarepresentational strategy whereby a miniature theatrical situation is embedded within a larger, similarly structured dramatic framework" (15), is well attested in both genres.[8] Dobrov leaves satyr-play out of his discussion on the basis of lack of sufficient evidence due to the scarcity of the material of this genre.[9]

In this article, we use the term 'metatheatricality' both of the self-referential and the self-reflexive expressions found in the satyr-play. We do not imply a 'rupture of illusion' with this term, but try to interpret the expressions in their context. As will be seen, many of the instances, especially in the fragmentary plays, are very difficult to interpret with certainty, and thus a definite answer to the question of the extensiveness of

---

[6] A. Bierl, *Der Chor in der alten Komödie: Ritual und Performativität*, München – Leipzig 2001, 44. The concept of self-referentiality in Greek poetry has been discussed especially by A. Henrichs, *Arion* Third Series 3.1 (1994/1995) 56–111; see also C. Calame in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge 1999, 125–53.

[7] G.W. Dobrov, *Figures of Play: Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics*, Oxford 2001.

[8] On the similarities and differences between the two genres, see Dobrov (above n. 7), 14–20, 158–160.

[9] See Dobrov (above n. 7), 7. In his note 29 to p. 7 (166) he states: "We simply do not have sufficient evidence to fully assess the degree of self-representation and intertextuality in the satyr-play."

metatheatricality in the satyr-play cannot be expected. However, as the satyr-play is often seen as something between tragedy and comedy,[10] we consider it worthwhile to have a closer look at the existence of this feature in it. This scrutiny may also be helpful in understanding the role and function of the chorus of the satyr-play – a theme which in the long-standing and extensive discussion about the chorus in Greek drama has hitherto been neglected to a surprising degree.[11] As a chorus with a fixed identity – the half human, half theriomorphic companions of Dionysus – the chorus of the satyr-play differs fundamentally both from the chorus of tragedy and that of comedy, and deserves therefore serious attention in the discussion of the choruses of Greek literature. Thus, in the first part of this article, we shall discuss different types of possibly metatheatrical expressions in the satyr-play, considering references to choral dancing, music, costumes, masks and the audience, as well as examples of transtextuality. In the second part, we make a few preliminary observations about the function of the chorus of the satyr-play.

I

Choral Dancing and Singing

Passages containing references to the chorus' own dancing appear both in tragedy and comedy. In the extant fragments of satyric drama, such self-referential passages are frequent enough to allow us to think that they belong to the conventional expressions of this genre, too. Fragment F 204b from the satyric *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* of Aeschylus[12] contains a lyric song,

---

[10] Beginning with Demetrius' definition of the satyr-play as τραγῳδία παίζουσα (*De eloc.* 3,169).

[11] Bierl (2001 [above n. 6], 64–65) emphasizes the deficiency of a thorough study of the chorus of comedy (and satyr-play), which would take into account the performative aspects. His own monograph of the comic chorus goes a long way towards filling this gap; he does not, however, go into the satyr-play except in some very limited examples, on the grounds of which he comes to the conclusion that the chorus of the satyr-play is very near the comic chorus (e.g. 65, 103).

[12] E. Fraenkel's suggestion (*PBA* 28 [1942] 245 f.) that F 204a–d (*P. Oxy.* 2245) come from this drama is widely accepted. – The fragments of satyr-plays are quoted according to R. Kannicht, S. Radt, and B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (= *TrGF*) I–IV,

probably performed by the chorus of the satyrs, in which they celebrate the fire just brought to earth by Prometheus and praise him as a benefactor of humankind. The satyrs first state that Charis sets them dancing (1: μ' εὐενὴς χορεύει χάρις), whereupon they affirm that they are sure that also the nymphs will dance in a chorus and sing a ὕμνος in praise of Prometheus (6 ff.). This is a good example of the technique of choral self-referentiality combined with choral projection.[13] While actually dancing themselves in the orchestra, the satyrs, after their first self-referential announcement about their dance, speak only (as far as our text goes) about the imaginary dance of the nymphs which will take place in the future. Thus they are projecting their own dance from the here and now of the actual performance to another time and place in fiction. Choral self-referentiality (with or without choral projection) has firm roots in the ritual character of all choral performance. In the same way as the dithyramb of the cult of Dionysus, choral dance in drama is, of course, also a ritual in honour of Dionysus, not least in satyr-play.[14] Bierl emphasizes that the chorus functions as a mediator between the cultic action and the world of the drama, since it has both a ritual and a dramatic role. Choral self-referentiality is used in order to integrate the ritual dancing into the play.[15] In such cases, we can speak of metatheatricality, but this does not mean breaking the so-called dramatic illusion.

Göttingen 1971–85 (used in *GS* with some omissions of minor fragments).

13 The concepts of choral self-referentiality and choral projection are discussed meritoriously by Henrichs 1994/1995 (above n. 6), 56–111 and *Philologus* 140 (1996) 48–62, who treats the use of these devices in tragedy. Although Henrichs notes that choruses addressing their own performance as dancers can also be found in satyr-play, even mentioning this particular fragment as an example (Henrichs 1994/1995, 58 with n. 14), he does not draw attention to the fact that, in addition to choral self-referentiality, choral projection is also used here. In fact, Henrichs speaks only about Sophoclean and Euripidean choruses using the technique of choral projection (cf. Henrichs 1994/1995, 68; 75; 86; Henrichs 1996, 49).

14 This is emphasized by Bierl 2001 (above n. 6), 21: "Der Chor *ist* im antiken Drama weitgehend Ritual. Komische wie auch satyrhafte Chortanzlieder stehen einem Ritual sehr viel näher als tragische." For the ritual meaning of tragic choral songs, see Henrichs 1994/1995 (above n. 6), 68 ff. and Henrichs 1996 (above n. 13), 53. He proposes that ritual performance, dramatized by the tragedians, underlies all instances of choral self-reference in tragedy (Henrichs 1994/1995, 69).

15 Bierl 2001 (above n. 6), 64. He adds that ritual even seems to need self-referentiality in order to be understood and to be carried out successfully. See also ibid. 365.

In addition to the concrete ritual of dancing, dramatic choruses often simultaneously perform other rituals, too, which can be inserted in the plot of the play. As A. Henrichs has observed, choral self-referentiality often functions as a prelude to other ritual activities.[16] In the case of F 204b, we could think of the song as a paean,[17] which is clearly located within the world of the drama, since it is performed in honour of Prometheus for what he has done earlier in the play (bringing the fire to the earth). Nevertheless, it is at the same time also a part of the actual performance in the orchestra of the real world. Particularly interesting from this point of view is the fact that the imaginary song of the nymphs is quoted by the chorus literally (11–12), in a way which brings into mind the speech-act theory of John Austin. If we were to describe this passage as 'performative' in the sense of this theory, this would mean that it actually represents the accomplishment of an action, i.e. the ritual paean which the satyrs cite in an 'illocutionary' way.[18] Just as the dance is only projected on the nymphs, but in reality performed by the chorus themselves, this applies also to the paean and so the chorus perform this ritual themselves. Thus, if we join the *communis opinio* which ascribes this fragment to *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*, we have to acknowledge that the techniques of choral self-referentiality, choral projection and performative expressions in a ritual context are also used in Aeschylean satyric drama.[19]

References to dancing can also be found in another satyr-play of Aeschylus, namely in *Theoroi* or *Isthmiastae*. In F 78a,32 ff. and F 78c,

---

[16] Henrichs 1994/1995 (above n. 6), 63 (speaking about tragedy).

[17] The word used by the chorus is ὕμνος; this word is generally applied to all kinds of songs to or about gods or heroes (see L. Käppel, *Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung*, Berlin and New York 1992, 83). The song has been defined as a paean, e.g., by D. F. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, Meisenheim am Glan 1980, 25. The expression of gratitude and the use of the word χάρις are common features of a paean (cf. Käppel 150–151).

[18] On the definition of 'performative', see J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words*, Cambridge MA 1962, 4–7 and on the definition of 'illocutionary' ibid. 99. The *ephymnion* of the chorus (6–8, 15–17) can be interpreted as an exhortation leading to the hymn of the nymphs.

[19] Another reference to dancing can be found in the badly mutilated fragment F 204c from the same play, which contains the word χορεύμασ[ιν (line 3). This is also of importance for the discussion about the date of the Pratinas fragment F 3, since it refutes Zimmermann's assertion that the word χορεύματα (which occurs in the Pratinas fragment) cannot be found before the late plays of Euripides (Zimmermann 1986 [above n. 1], 151). Cf. also the *Pyrkaeus* fragments F 204d 4,3 χ]ορεύεις, 5,3]ορχημᾳ[.

37 ff. Dionysus scolds the satyrs because they engage in athletics instead of sticking to their normal activities, such as dancing: F 78a,33 τοὔρχημα μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ἦν σε.[.....]ε̣ιν, F 78c,37 f. κοὐδεὶς παλαιῶν οὐδὲ τῶν νεωτέρω[ν] / ἑκὼν ἄπεστι τῶνδε διστοίχω[ν χορῶν.[20] It has been proposed that the word δίστοιχος in F 78c,38 could be interpreted as an analogy to the arrangement of the tragic chorus in three rows (στοῖχος) described by Pollux (4,108 f.). Thus the expression would represent a direct comment on the way in which the chorus of satyrs entered the orchestra.[21] Others find it more probable that Dionysus speaks about dance as an element of Dionysiac cult only on a rather general level instead of referring to the actual dance in the play.[22] But even in this sense, the use of such a defining adjective is surprising; it must refer to some generally known feature of Dionysiac choruses. One way or another, what interests us most about these passages, is the fact that they thematize dance and the ritual role of the satyrs who form the chorus. Thus we have here a good example of metatheatrical self-reflexion about the *raison d'être* of the satyric chorus and the significance of ritual dance for the cult of Dionysus.

In the satyr-plays of Sophocles, self-referential remarks about choral dance – or at least about some movements of the chorus – can be found in *Ichneutae* and also in the fragment F 269c from *Inachus*. The latter one, though badly preserved and in many respects dubious (e.g., the distribution of the verses to the different characters is not quite certain), contains an interesting scene, in which apparently Hermes, who is invisible thanks to the Cap of Hades he is wearing, frightens the chorus of satyrs who are moving around the orchestra trying to evade him. Vivid movement of the chorus can be inferred from the whole scene, especially from expressions like the lyric verses 36 f. ἐπί με πόδα νεμει. / ἔχε̣ με· πόδα νέμει.[23] It seems that the

---

[20] Text as supplemented by E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XVIII, London 1941, no. 2162, p. 21.

[21] J.C. Kamerbeek, *Mnemosyne* 8 (1955) 10.

[22] A. Wessels and Krumeich, *GS* 139 n. 36; 145 with n. 65.

[23] Compare also 26 π̣όδ’ ἔχειν (lyric) and the trochaic tetrameters, probably spoken by the chorus as well, 23 αὐτὸν ἐῖπ̣ας, αὐτόν, ὅς μ̣οι δεῦρ’ ἀνέστρεψεν πόδα and 43 ποῦ δὲ χ̣ρ̣ὴ πόδα στατίζε̣[ιν. A similar expression might have been also in F 269d from the same papyrus, where we find the word ποδί in line 1. Also F 287 from the same play deals with stamping on the ground: ἐπίκρουμα χθονὸς Ἀργείας.

chorus disintegrates into small groups,[24] but it is hard to draw any further conclusions concerning the satyrs' movements.

In *Ichneutae* F 314,217–220, the satyrs, who are trying to find out who has produced the mysterious sounds they have heard, declare that they will force the producer in his underground hiding-place to hear them by their noisy steps: ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ τάχα / φ[έρ]ῳ̣ν κ̣τ̣ύ[π]ο̣ν πέδορτον ἐξαναγκάσω / π̣[η]δήμ̣ασιν κραιπνοῖσι καὶ λακτίσμασιν.[25] The fact that this announcement is made in a passage in iambic trimeter does not necessarily imply that there is no dancing in this scene.[26] On the contrary, it seems that the satyrs perform a dance right after it, whereupon the local nymph Cyllene appears. Her complaint about the shouting (222) and ποδῶν λακ[(237; probably a form of λάκτισμα[27]) produced by the satyrs proves that they have indeed danced or at least made some agitated, trampling movements. Cyllene wonders why the satyrs have come to disturb her instead of remaining in their normal service of Dionysus (221 ff.), and so there is also in this scene some metatheatrical reflexion about the role of the satyrs, as in Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae*.

Let us now turn to Euripides' *Cyclops*. In this play, numerous instances of choral self-referentiality as well as choral projection can be found, which are all set in a distinct, Dionysiac ambience. In fact, the references to dancing in *Cyclops* are the most Dionysiac in all of extant satyric drama. At the end of the prologue, Silenus announces the arrival of the satyrs and wonders if their stamping is the same *sikinnis*[28] as at the time when they went together with Bacchus in a κῶμος to the house of Althaea

---

[24] Cf. R. D. J. Carden, *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles*, Berlin 1974, 54; D. F. Sutton, *Sophocles' Inachus*, Meisenheim am Glan 1979, 30.

[25] According to Bierl, πηδάω is, among others, a typical expression for the dancing movements of the chorus in comedy and satyr-play (Bierl 2001 [above n. 6], 102 n. 214).

[26] Other examples of iambic speech passages with references to the chorus' dancing or at least some kind of agitated movements apparently performed at the same time are found in Eur. *Cycl.* 37–40, 94, 204; similarly Silenus refers to his own dance steps in *Cycl.* 156 βαβαί· χορεῦσαι παρακαλεῖ μ’ ὁ Βάκχιος – note the similarity of this expression with Aesch. *Prom. Pyrk.* F 204b,1 cited above. Cf. Seidensticker, *GS* 21 n. 107.

[27] See *TrGF* IV, 291 ad loc.

[28] A dance typical of the satyr-play (see below pp. 44–45). According to Seaford, this is the only certain reference in satyric drama to this dance (R. Seaford, *Euripides: Cyclops*, Oxford 1984, 104). He adds, though, that the dance is probably meant in Soph. *Ichn.* 218–219.

(37–40). In this clear reference to the satyrs' dance, the actual dance in the orchestra, which the chorus perform as they are coming into the orchestra for their lyric *parodos*, is projected on a past mythological event, namely the love affair between Dionysus and Althaea.[29] It is possible that we have here an intertextual reference to an earlier satyr-play which dramatized this myth.[30] At any rate, the fictional κῶμος of the mythical story goes hand in hand with the ritual dance of the actual performance, and it is at once secular and religious.[31]

After this announcement, the satyrs begin their *parodos*, in the course of which we can find yet another example of choral projection, which functions as a self-referential articulation of their dance, even though it is expressed in a negative way: 63–72 οὐ τάδε Βρόμιος, οὐ τάδε χοροὶ κτλ.[32] In an ironic way, their statement that there is no Dionysus and no dance is, of course, true for the fictive setting on the island of the Cyclops, but at the same time these dances are performed in the orchestra of the real world. The song is full of Dionysiac elements, and as Bierl has pointed out, it is Dionysus who functions here as the crucial link between fiction and reality and makes it possible for these two levels to exist side by side.[33] A comparable pattern of negative reference to choral dance occurs when the Cyclops enters the stage and scolds the satyrs for dancing in a bacchic way, although Dionysus is not present: 204 τί βακχιάζετ'; οὐχὶ Διόνυσος τάδε.

---

[29] This suits well Bierl's view that whereas Sophocles mentions Dionysus mostly in cultic contexts, Euripides emphasizes more the mythical aspects (Bierl 1991 [above n. 5], 126).

[30] See below p. 66.

[31] As Seaford explains, secular κῶμοι would seek entrance to the house of a lover (as in the Althaea myth), and religious κῶμοι are appropriate to the worship of Dionysus (as the actual performance in the orchestra). This combination of secular and religious aspects is also otherwise symptomatic of the satyrs' position between man and god (Seaford 1984 [above n. 28], 105).

[32] This has been well recognized by Bierl 2001 (above n. 6), 78–79. Seaford pays special attention to the fact that the satyrs mention here (and also at verse 205) τύμπανα and argues that their statement of the absence of these instruments must be true, because they were used exclusively in cult and only exceptionally in the theatre; in vase-paintings of theatrical satyrs, no percussion instruments appear (Seaford 1984 [above n. 28], 143–144). But Seaford cannot be right in supposing that at 40, Silenus might have actually heard ἀοιδαὶ βαρβίτων: it is in no way probable that the satyrs would have herded their goats towards the cave with instruments in hand!

[33] Bierl 2001 (above n. 6), 79.

It seems evident that the satyrs are, in fact, dancing in the orchestra. From such passages[34] we can conclude that the members of the satyr choruses apparently were moving around quite a lot in the orchestra, even outside the choral songs proper.

Thus we can say that choral self-referentiality, choral projection, and metatheatrical comments on dancing are used in satyr-play from Aeschylus through Sophocles to Euripides often and in similar ways as in tragedy and comedy, adapted to the situation of the drama, but at the same time evoking in the audience an awareness of the Dionysiac ritual of the performance in the theatre festival of the god. In some cases, the aspect of the actual performance seems to rise rather strongly to the fore. Such are the few passages where technical dance terms are used, or else a certain type of dance is clearly referred to. Aristoxenus (frr. 104, 106 Wehrli) mentions σίκιννις as the characteristic dance of satyric drama, as ἐμμέλεια of tragedy and κόρδαξ of comedy. We have already mentioned Silenus' entrance announcement of the chorus at Eur. *Cycl.* 37 ff., where Silenus refers to the entrance dance of the chorus with κρότος σικινίδων[35] comparing it to a former mythological occasion. Vase-paintings with theatrical scenes show a characteristic step of *sikinnis.* For example, in the Pronomos vase (*ARV*[2] 1336,1) we see a satyr standing on the toes of his right foot, with the knee of his bent left leg raised high. The left arm is extended and the right hand is on his hip. As this painting presents the cast of a satyr-play apparently preparing for the performance and not a scene of a satyr-play, we may expect that the dancing satyr is practising the *sikinnis.* The dance is further described in this passage of *Cyclops* with the words κρότος (37) and σαυλούμενοι (40). The former must refer to the stamping of feet, while the latter connotes lasciviousness which is a typical satyric feature.[36] Probably the *sikinnis* is also described by κτύπος πέδορτος, πηδήματα κραιπνά and λακτίσματα of Soph. *Ichn.* 218 f. Similarly, Pratinas 4 F 3,15 δεξιᾶς καὶ

---

[34] Cf. Soph. *Ichn.* 217 ff. discussed above and the examples cited in n. 26.

[35] The spelling σίκινις occurs only here and may be a haplography. For the dance, see Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 103 f. Of course, other kinds of dance may have been used in satyr-plays, too (cf. L. Lawler, *The Dance of the Ancient Greek Theatre,* Iowa 1964, 91). Therefore it is not necessary to interpret all references to satyric movements, which contain leaps, as a depiction of the *sikinnis.*

[36] According to *LSJ* σαυλόομαι denotes 'to swagger, to dance affectedly' (cf. Luc. *Lexiphanes* 10); the adjective σαῦλος is used 'of the loose, wanton gait of courtesans or Bacchantes' (*LSJ*) by Anacr. 458 and 411b *PMG.*

ποδὸς διαρριφά could be a reference to the specific dance-movement of the *sikinnis*: at least the words fit well together with the depiction of the dancing satyr on the Pronomos vase. Eur. *Cycl.* 220 f. ἐπεὶ μ' ἂν ἐν μέσῃ τῇ γαστέρι / πηδῶντες ἀπολέσαιτ' ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν σχημάτων may also be a reference to the gestures and movements of the *sikinnis*. The Cyclops' words presuppose that he means movements which are very characteristic of the satyrs: he cannot think of eating them, since they would surely cause him a stomach-ache with their antics. σχῆμα appears early as a technical term of dance,[37] and the use of the word can thus direct the audience to link it with the actual performance.

Fr. 79 of Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae* (Athen. 14,629f) καὶ μὴν παλαιῶν τῶνδέ σοι σκωπευμάτων most likely refers to another characteristic movement of the satyr-play, as Photius explains with a reference to Aeschylus (*Lex.* 527,7). Lawler calls this 'peering-schema', a movement where the dancer shaded his eyes with his hand and looked out as if at a distance.[38] It is probable that F 339 ὑπόσκοπον χέρα refers to this movement, whether the fragments are from the same context or not.[39]

Although such references to special dances and dance-movements are not frequent in the extant fragments of satyr-play, they nevertheless exist, perhaps even in a more clear form than in tragedy and comedy, where references to dance movements are frequent but technical terms are generally not used.[40]

---

[37] L. Lawler discusses the meaning and use of the word σχῆμα in *TAPhA* 85 (1954) 148 f. She points out that the attested names of *schemata* are not homogeneous: some of them denote gestures, others a pose or a characteristic movement or action (ibid. 151 ff.).

[38] Cf. Hesychius s.v. σκωπευμάτων. Pollux 4,103 explains that the dance was named after the little horned owl, σκώψ, with its characteristic movements of the head; cf. Ael. *nat.* 15,28. Lawler speculates that from the use of the 'peering-schema' in the dances of satyr-plays there went a corresponding development of plot involving searching or peering, usually on the part of the chorus, but sometimes on the part of Silenus or one of the characters (L. Lawler, *TAPhA* 70 (1939) 485, eadem 1964 [above n. 35], 114–116).

[39] Musurus' emendation for †ὑποσκεπόν†. See H. J. Mette, *Der verlorene Aischylos*, Berlin 1963, 169; E. K. Borthwick, *CQ* 18 (1968) 48–50; S. Radt, *TrGF* III, 411 ad loc.

[40] See M. Kaimio, *The Chorus of Greek Drama in the Light of the Person and Number Used*, Helsinki 1970, 121–150; for comedy, see Bierl 2001 (above n. 6), 107–150.

Instrumental Music

Some references to instrumental music can be discussed from the point of view of metatheatricality. The most clear examples would be references to the official *auletes*, who provided the accompaniment for the singing parts of the drama, while references to instruments belonging to the action of the drama itself are much more ambivalent in this respect. References to *aulos* are naturally very common in Greek drama, regardless of the genre, but they usually reflect the general importance of this instrument in Greek life[41] and hardly emphasize the metatheatrical experience of the audience, although the Dionysiac ambience of the theatre festival is especially characteristic of this instrument. In comedy, there are some direct addresses to the official *aulos*-player, the clearest passage being Ar. *Eccl.* 890–92 where the Old Woman asks the *aulos*-player to accompany her song.[42] Such direct references to the *aulos*-player are not found in the fragmentary evidence of satyric drama, but there are some passages where the *aulos*-player could be involved.[43]

In Sophocles' *Ichneutae*, Silenus, who himself has not yet heard the peculiar new sound of the lyre, blames his sons for cowardice and urges them to keep tracking the cattle-thief: F 314,172 f. ἐγὼ πα[ρ]ὼν αὐτός σε προ̣σβιβῶ λόγῳ, / κυ̣ν̣ο̣ρ̣τικὸ̣ν σύριγμα διακαλούμεν[ος. It has been proposed that this whistling sound was actually made by the *aulos* accompanying the following choral song,[44] in which case this would be a

---

41 On the subject see P. Wilson in Goldhill and Osborne (above n. 6), 58–95.

42 See Taplin 1993 (above n. 3), 67–78. There are also several vases apparently depicting actors who are "playing at playing the *aulos*", which Taplin discusses ibid., 70–75. In Appendix ii (105–110), he lists and briefly discusses possibly corresponding passages in comic texts.

43 On the problems of interpretation inherent in such passages, cf. Taplin's remarks on comedy (Taplin 1993 [above n. 3], 75): "This is not entirely a matter of bad luck or of unfortunate textual transmission – – – These problems are the product of the very phenomenon which I am documenting here: the intermediate metatheatrical position of the official piper."

44 N. Ch. Churmuziadis, Σατυρικά, Athens 1974, 94; S. Scheurer and R. Bielfeldt follow this suggestion (*GS*, 300 n. 38). G. Conrad's suggestion that Silenus himself accompanies the following choral song with his whistling (*Der Silen: Wandlungen einer Gestalt des griechischen Satyrspiels*, Trier 1997, 115–116) is improbable: as the choral song in any case *was* accompanied by the *aulos*-player, it seems most natural that the 'whistling' – which well might accompany the excited cries of the chorus like a *cantus firmus*, as

veiled exhortation to the *aulos*-player. In the fragments of Ion's *Omphale*, there are several lines which refer to a feast apparently given by Omphale in honour of Hephaestus. In 19 F 22 she asks (female) Lydian harpists, singers of ancient hymns, to honour the guest, and in F 23, apparently in the same context, she gives an exhortation to the accompanying instrument: Λυδός τε μάγαδις αὐλὸς ἡγείσθω βοῆς. It is uncertain which instrument is meant: *magadis* is everywhere else in ancient sources used of a stringed instrument, and M. L. West has suggested correcting the text to < > τε μάγαδις Λυδὸς ἡγείσθω βοῆς.[45] It is probable that, after these exhortations, there followed a 'Lydian' choral song, and it is an attractive suggestion that the satyrs performed this song dressed as females.[46] A transvestite satyr-chorus singing an Oriental melody with harps in their hands[47] would surely have made a spectacular effect! We must ask ourselves how the *magadis* fits into this scene. If it refers to a harp, it surely is the instrument in the hands of the ψάλτριαι (F 22,1). In this case, the singers could play themselves, or they could play at playing the harp, and the sound could have come from behind the *skene*.[48] Would the *auletes* have stood silent in such a case, or performed in an 'orchestra' of *aulos* and harps?[49] Again, if the *magadis* is an

---

Conrad suggests (116) – was produced by the *aulos*-player.

45 M. L.West, *BICS* 30 (1983) 79. In *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992, 91, however, he suggests that this 'Lydian *magadis-aulos*' possibly consisted of an unequal pairing of 'male' and 'female' pipes designed to sound an octave apart.

46 Pechstein and Krumeich in *GS* 490. They point out that the address παρθένοι in F 20 would add to the comic effect.

47 Cf. the chorus of old silens/satyrs accompanying their song with the *kithara* on the bell-krater painted by Polion (see below p. 50).

48 It seems improbable that the music so expressly described as coming from harps would have been in reality performed by the *auletes*. This is, of course, the speculation of 21st century readers. It is possible that the convention of accompaniment by the *aulos* was so strong in the theatre that the audience would not have thought imaginary sounds of the harp performed by the *aulos* unrealistic. Also, the *aulos* was considered to have very versatile mimetic qualities, and Plato (*Rep*. 397a2–7) criticizes the modern virtuoso *aulos*-music for imitating, e.g., the sounds of all kinds of animals. Cf. Wilson in Goldhill and Osborne (above n. 6), 92 f.; Zimmermann 1986 (above n. 1), 150.

49 Such combinations occur in Greek literature, especially in descriptions of wedding scenes (e.g. Hom. *Il*. 18,491 ff.; [Hes.] *Sc*. 273 ff.; Sappho 44,24 ff. *PMG*; Pindar is especially fond of such ensembles, e.g. *O*. 3,8 ff.; *P*. 10,38 f.), but we have no evidence of the practice of the theatre in this respect. On the occasional use of the lyre in the theatre and *synaulia* as an agonistic performance, see Wilson in Goldhill and Osborne

aulos, the line must be an exhortation to the official *aulos*-player, such as we have seen in comedy.

A satyr-play which could well have contained metatheatrical references to the *aulos*-player is Iophon's *Aulodoi*. Unfortunately, we know next to nothing of this play. Clement of Alexandria, who quotes the only fragment we have (*Strom.* 1,3,24,3), mentions that Iophon says "of rhapsodes and other such people": 22 F 1 καὶ γὰρ εἰσελήλυθεν / πολλῶν σοφιστῶν ὄχλος ἐξηρτυμένος. 'Sophist' is probably used here in the sense 'expert in art', and it may be that the meeting, perhaps in the context of a competition, of these experts and the satyrs, aspiring to the same status, was part of the action in this drama.[50] The title gives us some more clues. It probably refers to the chorus, as the titles giving a noun in the plural generally do,[51] and the activity it denotes must be central to the play. The activity, however, is not playing the *aulos*,[52] as αὐλῳδός regularly means 'singer to the accompaniment of the *aulos*'.[53] It is common to sing and play the *kithara* at the same time, as κιθαρῳδός does, but it is not possible to sing and play the *aulos* at the same time. Thus it is probable that the satyrs try to attain success as virtuoso singers, and their accompanist is the official *aulos*-player. If this is the case, metatheatrical expressions are almost bound to appear in this play.

In Sophocles' satyr-plays, we have a few references to musical instruments which are part of the dramatic action. Strictly speaking, they are not metatheatrical; on the other hand, the presence of these instruments in the theatre is so important that references to them may direct the audience's attention to the actual musical performance at the same time. In *Ichneutae*, the invention of the lyre by Hermes is one of the main themes of the play. The satyrs (and the audience) apparently hear the sound of the lyre between lines 123–124, as the satyrs' frightened reaction and odd crouching move-

---

(above n. 6), 76, 78.

50 So Schloemann and Krumeich in *GS* 549 n. 3, 551. Their alternative explanation, that the satyrs took part in a competition and that σοφιστῶν ὄχλος ironically refers to them, seems less plausible considering that the sophists are "many and well-prepared".

51 A known exception is Aristophanes' *Frogs*, where the title refers to an additional chorus; cf. E. W. Handley, *BICS* 29 (1982) 115.

52 As Schloemann and Krumeich surmise, translating the title *Die Flötenspieler* (*GS* 549–550); similarly Sutton 1980 (above n. 17), 75 n. 250 translates the title *The Flautists*.

53 Cf. A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings* I: *The Musician and His Art*, Cambridge 1984, 50; West 1992 (above n. 45), 18 n. 23.

ments are commented on by Silenus in 124 ff. In this context, the sound heard must be the sound of a real lyre, played probably behind the *skene*. We can only speculate as to how much lyre music was heard during this drama. At least between lines 327 and 328, one would suppose some sweet music was heard, as Cyllene has just revealed how Hermes has constructed the instrument and delights in making music, and then the chorus describes the sounds which spread all over the place like flowers.

In *Inachus*, the satyrs hear a shepherd's pipe: F 269c,7 σ̣ύρι̣γγο̣[ς] δ̣ἑ κ̣λ̣ύω. Hermes, invisible under his cap of Hades, is coming to lull Argos into sleep with his syrinx, to kill him and liberate Io. The satyrs do not see him – much of the humour of the scene comes from the fact that the audience does – but recognize their tormentor by the noise he makes: F 269c,22 ε̣ἰ̣κ̣ά̣σαι πάρεστιν Ἑρμῆν π̣[ρὸ]ς τὰ σὰ ψοφήματα. The last word has been explained in various ways, either as referring to the words of the preceding line, to the noise Hermes makes when moving or to the sound of his syrinx.[54] We believe that the last one is the probable explanation, as ψόφος is not uncommonly used of musical sounds (as in Eur. *Ba.* 687, *Cycl.* 443), and suggest that all references to something heard in this context reflect the maddening sound made by the invisible Hermes. No wonder the satyrs are harassed (F 269c,27 μανία τάδε κλύειν), as they are at the same time tripping all over his feet! L. 32 ψ̣ιθυ̣ραν μάλ' αἰολα[ν] (either acc.sg. or gen.pl.) can well be a description of the sound of the syrinx.[55] The interesting question is whether the official accompanist played the music or whether the actor himself played the shepherd's pipe. In connection with comedy, it is usually thought that when a character played the *aulos*, he/she mimed the playing and the sound was produced by the *aulos*-player.[56] In this case, there would be a difference between the sounds of the instruments, the syrinx of the drama and the *aulos* of the performance, but it probably would not have been too disturbing.

---

[54] In the first case, the speaker of l. 21 is supposed to be either the chorus (A. S. Hunt in *The Tebtunis Papyri* III, London 1933, 10 at 692 col. II 1–15) or Hermes (Carden 1974 [above n. 24], 85). Ψοφήματα (l. 22) could mean 'your words' or 'what you say' referring to the previous verse (Carden ibid.). Hunt presumes that Ψοφήματα could also describe the noise made by the invisible Hermes (11 at col. II 7). C. Heynen and Krumeich, *GS* 327 nn. 57, 62 consider both movement and syrinx as possible suggestions.

[55] So R. Pfeiffer, *SBAW* 1938, 44, and Heynen and Krumeich in *GS* 327 n. 63.

[56] Taplin 1993 (above n. 3), 74.

The presence of the official *aulos*-player along with satyrs in vase-paintings (either in theatrical costume or in their 'natural' guise) is a clear indication that the painting is depicting a theatrical performance.[57] The *aulos*-player is always male, wears an ornate long-sleeved robe, is never masked, is often garlanded, and wears often the *phorbeia*. Usually he is standing aside, detached from the actors. Oddly enough, sometimes he is not even playing his instrument: the red-figure dinos by the Painter of Athens Dinos shows four dancing satyrs and four 'civilians' around the *aulos*-player, who has apparently just taken the pipes from his mouth, and the fragments of a red-figure bell-krater in Bonn by the same painter present the *aulos*-player and three satyrs in very similar positions to the dinos.[58] Such scenes are usually interpreted as presenting the moments before or after a performance, perhaps a rehearsal situation.[59] However, the explanation for the passivity of the *aulos*-player may not necessarily be similar in every case. In the Attic red-figure bell-krater by Polion,[60] three old satyrs covered with white tufts are seen with *kitharai* in their hands, singing, while a young *aulos*-player stands passive, his hands with the pipes hanging down by his sides. The text ΟΙΔΟΙ ΠΑΝΑΘΕΝΑΙΑ has led to the supposition that this illustrates a satyr-clad chorus performing dithyrambs, but this is unlikely.[61] The scene could be connected with a satyr-play where the chorus took part in the competition in the Panathenaia singing a song and accompanying themselves on their instruments, either playing or playing at playing, in which case the sound of the *kithara* could be supplied from behind the *skene*. It might be considered natural that the official *aulos*-player did not take part in this performance, and is therefore standing idle.

---

[57] Krumeich, *GS* 47–48.

[58] Athens, N. M. 13027 and Bonn 1216.183 = *ARV*^{2} 1180,2–3 = *GS* pl. 6 b and a (420 B.C.). Cf. also the volute-krater in Taranto (Taranto 4358 = *GS* pl. 14b, late fifth century), where in the lower range an *aulos*-player with his pipes and *phorbeia* in his hands stands between *kalathiskos*-dancers, some of whom are dancing and some not. In the upper range, Perseus is shown terrifying satyrs with Medusa's head; both scenes may commemorate the same Karneia-festival (J. D. Beazley, *Hesperia* 24 [1955] 315–316).

[59] So e.g. A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, Oxford 1968, 185; J. R. Green, *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society*, London and New York 1994, 44.

[60] New York, Metropolitan Museum 25.78.66 = *ARV*^{2} 1172,8 = *GS* pl. 15b (ca. 425 B.C.).

[61] See the discussion by H. Froning, *Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei in Athen*, Würzburg 1971, 25; cf. also Beazley (above n. 58), 314–315.

At this point, we return to the famous Pratinas fragment 4 F 3. We cannot, in the scope of this article, discuss the numerous problems connected with this 'hyporchema', nor do we wish to take any definite stand as to the date or to the genre of the fragment. Our intention is to look at the metatheatrical aspects of this lyric passage against the background provided by our observations so far. The metatheatrical tone is very pointed in almost every line of the fragment. It is obvious that the object of the attack of the chorus is the too dominant position taken by the *aulos* accompaniment, which overshadows the singing of the chorus. It is obvious, too, that something must have preceded this reaction – either something related about the supremacy of the *aulos* (if this is from a dithyramb or other non-dramatic poem) or something performed in the theatre (if this is from a satyric drama): F 3,1 τίς ὁ θόρυβος ὅδε; τί τάδε τὰ χορεύματα; τίς ὕβρις ἔμολεν ἐπὶ Διονυσιάδα πολυπάταγα θυμέλαν; If from a drama, this need not be the entrance song of the chorus, nor is it necessary to think that there is another chorus who is causing the 'racket' – χορεύματα may refer to the music of the *aulos* as does the corresponding verb in l. 5. The mention of the *thymele* is a clear link to the place of the performance. In the following lines, the chorus proclaim their righteous position as singers in the Dionysiac thiasos – "it is for me to shout and stamp".[62] These expressions contain nothing very dissimilar from the self-references to choral singing and dancing discussed above. More disturbing are the following abuses hurled against the *aulos* (4–14), with the imperatives of attack (10–12 παῖε – – – φλέγε) familiar from the antagonistic choruses of comedy[63] and the long adjectives made up for the occasion (12–13 ὀλεσιαλοκάλαμον λαλοβαρύοπα ⟨πα⟩ραμελορυθμοβάταν) which are very suggestive of Aristophanic diction. They may be connected with the dithyrambic style,[64] but taking into account the hostile tone and the metrical peculiarities of the very passages describing the *aulos*, Seaford's suggestion that the style is a

---

[62] Translations are by D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric* III, Cambridge, Mass. – London 1991.

[63] Cf. Kaimio 1970 (above n. 40), 130–131.

[64] As both Seaford and Zimmermann believe, although the former connects the style with the extravaganza of Lasus of Hermione (Seaford 1977/78 [above n. 1], 88–93) and the latter with the late fifth century dithyramb (Zimmermann 1986 [above n. 1], 149–153).

parody of dithyrambic style is attractive.[65] But it must be said that we have no parallels for such stylistic parody in the extant remains of satyr-play. The last three lines again (15–17), with their reference to dance movements ("Here is how to fling out hand and foot!") and invocations to Dionysus, have nothing which, on the evidence presented above, could not be said by the chorus of a satyr-play.

It is very clear that the chorus who is speaking consists of satyrs – along with the Naiads, they are part of the Dionysiac *thiasos*, they dance and stamp, they throw their limbs in movements resembling *sikinnis*, and there may be an obscene reference to the *aulos* as phallus (14 δέμας).[66] However, it is not certain that the lines are from a satyr-play.[67] We find it probable that fragment F 3 is by the known Pratinas of Phleius, as Athenaeus says,[68] and this would speak for a dramatic origin, as Pratinas was known especially for his satyr-plays. The possibility that Pratinas wrote other kinds of poetry cannot, however, be ruled out. His other, very scanty fragments do not offer any clues as to their genre (except F 1 quoted from his *Dymaenae* or *Caryatids*, which very likely is either tragedy or satyr-play). Many of them deal with music (F 4, F 6–9), which shows that whatever the genre, the theme of F 3 is not unique in the context of Pratinas.

There is one odd feature in F 3 which has not attracted the notice of scholars: how does it fit into the Dionysiac performance context of the poem – be it a dithyramb or a satyr-play – that the *aulos*, which is the most Dionysiac of all instruments, is so heavily abused? Even if Pratinas were deprecating the dominance of the music of the *aulos*, the violent language used by the satyrs fits badly with a performance in the Dionysiac festival and its traditional accompaniment by an *auletes*. But we must remember that we know nothing of the literary context of the fragment. It can hardly have

---

[65] Seaford 1977/78 (above n. 1), 93. Zimmermann, too, emphasizes the difference of rhythm between the regular choral metres of the lines describing the chorus and the irregular metres of the lines abusing the *aulos*, but he finds this a feature typical of the New Dithyramb and the late lyric of Euripides, without considering the parodic effect (Zimmermann 1986 [above n. 1], 148–149).

[66] See Seaford 1977/78 (above n. 1), 84–85; cf. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, New York – Oxford 1991^2, 115.

[67] Zimmermann 1992 (above n. 1), 126 n. 27 suggests a direct speech by satyrs forming a part of a dithyramb.

[68] Seaford rightly emphasizes the reliability of the Peripatetic tradition behind Athenaeus (Seaford 1977/78 [above n. 1], 82 n. 3).

been an independent little poem, but is a part of a larger whole. One possible explanation is that after the situation described in the fragment, the satyrs came somehow to be reconciled with the *aulos*, and a common harmony was found. This would certainly suit a plot of a satyr-play, perhaps also a narrative dithyramb.

Costume and Mask

The costume and mask of stage-satyrs is in keeping with the image of 'real' satyrs as half human, half bestial creatures. Their appearance is made clear from vase-paintings with theatrical subjects, which began in Athens between 520 and 510 B.C. and show satyrs with equipment atypical of their 'natural' environment or with the *aulos*-player of the theatre. The typical costume of the choristers included bearded, long-eared masks with a snub nose and bald forehead, and short pants (περίζωμα) with a phallus in front and a horse-tail in the back. It seems that in the early days of satyr-play, the pants were made of cloth with spots or cross-like decoration, while later the furry tights seen, e.g., on the Pronomos vase became popular. The Papposilenus had the white hair and beard of an old man, and from the middle of the 5th century onwards, a white-tufted tightly-fitting costume which covered the whole body.[69]

Most references to the appearance of the satyrs found in the texts apply to their baldness, beard or phallus (but none, we may note in passing, to their tail, which, however, is so characteristic of both their 'real' and stage habitus). Such references are naturally quite in harmony with their dramatic role, denoting both their outer and inner nature.[70] At the same time, however, by pointing out a detail of the costume which is very clearly seen by the audience in the theatre, such passages emphasize their awareness of the performance.[71] So, in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*, Prometheus warns

---

[69] On the history of the satyr costume, see Pickard-Cambridge (above n. 59), 183–187; Krumeich, *GS* 53–55 with further literature. E. Simon in D. Kurtz and B. Sparkes (eds.), *The Eye of Greece: Studies in the Art of Athens*, Cambridge 1982, 142–143 argues that the origin of the white-tufted costume of Silenus lies in the comedy, whereas dotted long tights were in use for the satyr choruses in the early fifth century, as the stamnos by the Eucharides Painter in Louvre (Louvre c 10754 = *ARV*^{2} 228,32) shows.

[70] This comes through well in Silenus' tirade to his good-for-nothing sons in Soph. *Ichn.* F 314,150–151 σῴματ᾽ εἰ[σ]ιδ[ε]ῖν μόνον / κα[ὶ γ]ᾳῷσσα κα[ὶ] φάλητες.

[71] In this respect, the satyr-play is nearer to comedy than tragedy. Cf. the remarks on

the satyrs who try to kiss the fire to mind their beards (F 207). In *Dictyulci*, Papposilenus points out how Danae's baby laughs in delight when seeing his bald head, or, as others have it,[72] his erect phallus: F 47a,787–788 λιπαρὸν / [μ]ι̣λ̣τ̣[ό]πρεπ̣τ̣ον φαλακ̣ρὸν. In any case, the baby does look at the phallus at 794–795, when Silenus notes] π̣οσθοφιλὴς ὁ νεοσσὸς. In between, there is an interesting fragmentary word in 790: if we can read in ποικιλονω[a form of ποικιλόνωτος, we could perhaps have a reference to Silenus' costume, whatever it was at this time.[73] In Soph. *Ichn.* 368 there has been similar controversy in the interpretation of φαλακρόν: 366–368 ἀ[λλ᾽] αἰὲν εἶ σὺ παῖς· νέος γὰρ ὢν ἀνὴρ / π[ώγ]ωνι θάλλων ὡς τράγος κνηκῷ χλιδᾷς· / παύ̣ου τὸ̣ λεῖον φαλακρὸν ἡδονῇ πιτνάς. As the comparison with a he-goat creates the impression of lasciviousness, one might think that this train of thought would be continued.[74]

In several plays, satyrs take roles that differ from their usual ones. Sometimes these individual plays require them to wear special costumes. Surely the appearance of satyrs with some clothing additional to their usual short pants would attract the attention of the audience. There are, however, not many references to such clothing in our extant material, but this may be due to the few fragments of such plays. In Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae*, Dionysus reproaches the satyrs for having phalluses that are short, like mouse-tails (F 78a,29), as well as for wearing pine wreaths (F 78c,39) – both deviations from their usual attire as servants of Dionysus and marks of their new athletic interests. In the parodos of Euripides' *Cyclops*, the satyrs complain

---

comedy by Green (above n. 59), 27–28: "What we can be certain of, however, is that this style of comedy with its very outspoken self-referentiality must reflect a style of theatre in which both poet and audience share and enjoy this mutual exchange about what is going on in the performance itself. – – – This is a suggestion which has strong support from scenes on vases."

72 So R. Cantarella, *I nuovi frammenti eschilei di Ossirinco*, Napoli 1948, 46 f.; H. Lloyd-Jones, *SIFC* 12 (1994) 142; cf. Henderson (above n. 66), 245, whose remarks are, however, a bit confused: Aesch. *Dict.* 787–788 cannot refer to the penis of young Perseus, but Silenus speaks of himself, and the double-entendre in Soph. F 171 is doubtful.

73 A tight-fitting dotted or tufted costume would be a good candidate for such a description. Wessels and Krumeich translate "(mit buntem Rücken?)". Lobel suggests that the satyrs are represented as wearing the skin of the roe-deer (*P. Oxy.* XVIII, London 1941, 12 at col. I 26), but there seems to be no reason for that kind of dress here.

74 So Lloyd-Jones (above n. 72), 142; he translates "Cease to expand your smooth phallus with delight!" (*Sophocles Fragments*, Cambridge, Mass. – London 1996, 173).

of the shabby goatskins they are wearing: 80 σὺν τᾷδε τράγου χλαίνᾳ μελέᾳ. They cannot be complaining about their own regular appearance, i.e., the furry pants which represent nudity, but probably have special shepherd's costumes as the Cyclops' slaves.[75] It may be, however, that Euripides is making a little metatheatrical joke here, as the usually goat-like satyrs complain that they must wear goatskins.

Aeschylus' *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* F 204b,2 presents a problem, as the singers seem to refer to a chiton they are wearing: σ̣ί̣ᾳ[76] δέ μ᾽ εὐμενὴς χορεύει χάρις / φ[α]ε̣ν̣[ὸ]ν ⟨ ∪ – ⟩ / χιτῶ̣να πὰρ̣ πυρὸς ἀκάματον αὐγάν. Terzaghi has claimed that satyrs do not wear chitons, and that for this reason we are not dealing here with the satyr-play *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*, but with a tragedy with a chorus of divine females, either *Prometheus Lyomenos* or *Pyrphoros*.[77] But we must also consider that satyrs are sometimes shown on vase-paintings dressed in chiton or himation. In these cases the chorus-leader may have a special dress or the whole chorus be dressed in non-satyric clothes.[78]

A good example of satyrs taking unlikely roles and dressed accordingly is presented by the so-called Fujita hydria, an Attic red-figure hydria which is dated around 470/460 B.C. and which, as Erika Simon has shown, represents Aeschylus' satyr-play *Sphinx* from the Theban tetralogy presented in 467 B.C.[79] The vase shows a satyr-chorus, reduced to five, of old silens trying to find an answer to the riddle presented by the sphinx

---

[75] See Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 118.

[76] Νυ]/σία Fraenkel, ἐκου]/σία Terzaghi, see *TrGF* III, 322 ad loc.

[77] M. Terzaghi, *RFIC* 82 (1954) 348–349.

[78] The Pronomos vase shows the chorus-leader in an ornate short chiton and himation, while the other choristers appear in satyr pants. On an oenochoe in London (private collection, Pickard-Cambridge [above n. 59], fig. 37, last decade of the 6th cent.) there is, besides a naked satyr, a dancing satyr clothed in chiton and himation (and yet his tail showing!). On an Attic red-figure cup in Cambridge (Fitzwilliam Museum GR 2.1977 = Green [above n. 59], 41, fig. 2.16a–b) there is a group of seven satyrs clothed in cloaks, one in a long one, the others in short ones; they have no chitons underneath. At least the latter one may well be connected with a satyr-play (Green [above n. 59], 42). The word χιτών is sometimes used of garments which are not chitons in the strict sense: Pollux explains (4,119) that Silenus' costume, χορταῖος, is "a shaggy chiton" (χιτὼν δασύς), and Dionysius of Halicarnassus mentions its alternative name μαλλωτὸς χιτών (*ant. Rom.* 7,72,10); cf. Ael. *var. hist.* 3,40.

[79] Tokyo, Coll. Fujita, in E. Simon, *SHAW* (1981) 28 pl. 7 = *GS* pl. 22b. See also Simon in Kurtz and Sparkes (above n. 69), 141–142.

crouching on a rock before them. They are seated on well-upholstered *klismoi*, wearing diadems, sceptres and ornate cloaks. How they have come to have such attire in the play we cannot know,[80] but it seems very plausible that their dressing-up was somehow commented on the text itself.

There are a few instances of possible references to masks in the satyr-plays. The most extensive fragment that can be thus interpreted is F 78a of Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae*, but despite the fact that ca. 70 lines are extant, the exact meaning of the fragment remains enigmatic. The satyrs are at the Isthmian games, outside the temple of Poseidon, to whom they bring votive gifts. Of the many suggestions as to what these gifts actually were, the most likely are that they are either masks or votive tablets (*pinakes*).[81] Since the votive gifts are referred to many times and with different words, we should be able to deduce something about their nature, but the words used are inconclusive. The satyrs start off by saying (l. 1) that somebody (probably visitors or competitors in the Isthmian games) shall see εἰκοὺ[ς] οὐ κατ᾽ ἀνθρώπους['the likeness not of human [making]' [82], and a little later (l. 6–7) the lifelikeness is emphasized: εἴδωλον εἶναι τοῦτ᾽ ἐμῇ μορφῇ πλέον / τὸ Δαιδάλου μ[ί]μημα· φωνῆς δεῖ μόνον 'this image is more [like] my own form, this Daedalic representation, it lacks only a voice'. The votive function is brought out in ll. 11–12: εὐκταῖα κόσμον ταῦτ[α] τῷ θεῷ φέρω / καλλί-γραπτον εὐχάν 'I'm bringing these votives, an ornament, to the god as a beautifully-painted dedication'. The chorus goes on to say that the likenesses are true enough to scare their own mother, who would think the image is her son.[83] Then the satyrs turn to the temple of Poseidon and exhort themselves (ll.19–20): κἀπιπασσάλευ᾽ ἕκαστος τῆς κ[α]λῆς μορφῆς .[ ] / ἄγγελον, κήρυκ᾽ [ἄ]νουδον, ἐμπόρων κωλύτορ[α 'Let each of you nail up [the image] of your own beautiful form as a messenger, a voiceless herald, a

---

80 See Germar and Krumeich, *GS* 193 n. 13, 195.

81 Wessels and Krumeich argue (*GS* 132; R. Krumeich, *Philologus* 144 [2000] 176–192) that the objects are wooden or ceramic tablets with a painted full-length figure of a satyr. Most scholars have accepted Fraenkel's suggestion of masks (Fraenkel [above n. 12], 245) without much explanation; recent bibliographies on the subject in P. O'Sullivan, *CQ* 50 (2000) 357, n. 21; Krumeich 2000, 178 n. 12.

82 The translations of the fragment are by H. Lloyd-Jones from vol. II of the Loeb edition of Aeschylus (Cambridge, MA, 1956) with the alterations of O'Sullivan (above n. 81), 356 f.

83 These realistic images have often been thought to represent a new tendency in Greek art, see M. Stieber, *TAPhA* 124 (1994) 85–119; C. H. Hallett, *JHS* 106 (1986) 75–76.

warder-off of travellers'.

To support his view that the objects are masks, E. Fraenkel points out that it was customary to model antefixes of temples in the shape of apotropaic heads of Gorgons or satyrs. J. R. Green, instead, refers to the common custom of dedicating one's mask to the god after a victorious performance by placing it in the temple of Dionysus, and adds evidence of vase-painting showing the use of satyr-masks for apotropaic purposes.[84] R. Krumeich, who favours the interpretation of *pinakes*, thinks that καλλίγραπτος εὐχά is more likely to describe a wooden or ceramic *pinax* than a plastic work of art; a mask, though painted, is more likely to be perceived and described as a three-dimensional object than as a painting.[85] This may be true, although Krumeich's argument is problematic: he argues that since the objects of the plastic arts were always painted, it was not likely that this fact would be specially emphasized with such an adjective. But why would it be more natural to emphasize the fact that a painting is painted? However, since καλλίγραπτος is, surprisingly, a *hapax*, it is impossible to say what kind of objects could be thus termed. The reference to a Daedalic representation speaks rather for a plastic object: Daedalus was known as a many-faceted artisan, but especially as a sculptor, not a painter.[86] Krumeich also employs the repeated use of μορφή as an argument for the images representing the whole satyr, not just the head, and points out that *pinakes* regularly represent the whole body.[87] However, μορφή is a remarkably vague word;[88] for instance, Aeschylus employs it in *Su.* 496 μορφῆς – – – φύσις with reference to the dark skin of the Danaids. Attractive as the evidence for *pinakes* presented by Krumeich is, he fails to answer the question why such wooden tablets should be so strongly apotropaic as they are here presented. This function would be better explained if the votive gifts were masks.

---

[84] Fraenkel (above n. 12), 245; Green (above n. 59), 45–46 with n. 60 and 78–79 with fig. 3.16. Cf. Krumeich 2000 (above n. 81), 177.

[85] Krumeich 2000 (above n. 81), 178; cf. Hallett (above n. 83), 76.

[86] See O'Sullivan (above n. 81), 358 with n. 30; S. Morris, *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*, Princeton 1992, 221–237. In visual arts, Daedalus is often represented with the tools of the sculptor's or carpenter's trade (see J. E. Nyenhuis in *LIMC* [= J. Boardman and others (eds.), *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, Zürich – München 1981–] 3:1, 313–21).

[87] Krumeich 2000 (above n. 81), 185.

[88] E.g. in Eur. *Alc.* 1063 and *Pho.* 162 it is used of a human form not clearly seen because of a veil or of the distance.

Another consideration in favour of masks is that Aeschylus repeatedly emphasizes that the likenesses only lack voice – and even then fulfill the function of a messenger (ll. 7, 20). This could point to the possibility that the μορφή in question is represented by the head only, i.e. the mask. Another point worth making is the presumable effect of the scene in the performance: the full-length figures of satyrs on smallish wooden tablets would hardly be visible and identifiable to the audience, while the joke of masked satyrs carrying identical masks could be easily appreciated. However, since this passage is so crucial for the theme of metatheatricality, it is best to leave the question open.

Other possible references to masks are not without problems either. In Sophocles' *Inachus*, Io may have appeared on stage in a mask of a cow's head after her transformation, but we have no evidence on whether she actually was one of the cast of persons in this play. The transformation of Io is referred to at least in F 269a, 36 ff. and F 295a, and possibly also in F 279.[89] In the first passage, Io's metamorphosis is described with references to her head and neck on her shoulders changing into a cow's head and her feet changing into hooves. It is probable that if she later appeared on stage, she wore the head of a cow, but retained her human body.[90] H. Maehler has plausibly suggested that a change of iconography in vase-paintings of Io ca. 460–450 B.C. is due to an appearance onstage of the heroine wearing a cow-mask. Before this period, Io is represented as a cow in all respects, whereas afterwards she retains her human body, and only her head is that of a cow.[91] If Io did appear on stage after her transformation in *Inachus*, the earlier description of her head would have prepared the audience for what to expect.

In Euripides' *Cyclops*, Silenus has probably changed his mask between his going to the cave after l. 197 and his reappearance around l. 222 in order to look as if he were beaten when bravely defending the Cyclops'

---

[89] On this fragment, see Heynen and Krumeich, *GS* 333 n. 80; M. L. West, *CQ* 34 (1984) 300–301; W. Luppe, *Philologus* 120 (1976) 296–299; 128 (1984) 303-304.

[90] Heynen and Krumeich point to the comparison of Io with a sphinx, another mixed being, in l. 42 (*GS* 322 f. nn. 39 and 40).

[91] H. Maehler, *AAntHung* 40 (2000) 321–329. Maehler argues that the only fifth-century play where we know that Io appeared on stage is *Prometheus Vinctus*. He does not take a stand on the question of the authorship of this play, but argues that on the basis of vase-paintings, it can be dated between 460–450 or even 460–455.

property against Odysseus and his men:[92] the Cyclops sees (l. 226 f.) γέροντά τε / πληγαῖς πρόσωπον φαλακρὸν ἐξῳδήκοτα, 'the old man with his bald head swollen with blows'. It may well be that the poet deliberately employs the expression πρόσωπον meaning both 'face' and 'mask' in order to insert a metatheatrical reference calling the audience's attention to the change of mask.[93]

Audience Address

It is characteristic of Old Comedy to pay regard to the audience, but it seems that in tragedy such a thing as straightforward audience address does not exist at all.[94] Satyr-play is usually seen as following the convention of tragedy in this respect.[95] However, we have already mentioned one clear example of metatheatrical reference to the audience, namely the fragment ascribed by Athenaeus to the satyr-play *Heracles* by the fourth-century tragedian Astydamas II (60 F 4). The ascription has been doubted, mainly because of the Eupolidean metre of the fragment and its metatheatrical content, which do resemble the *parabasis* of Old Comedy; emendations to the text of Athenaeus surrounding the quotation have also been suggested.[96] It may be that satyr-play and comedy come closer to each other in the fourth century, but this does not mean that Astydamas must have included in his satyr-play a real *parabasis* or a section much resembling the *parabasis* of comedy, although it has some features reminiscent of one.[97] One can also not state outright that because the passage is metatheatrical, it must be so due to the influence of comedy. The fragment is interesting not only because it contains unambiguous references to the poet, the spectators and

---

92 So R. G. Ussher, *Euripides: Cyclops*, Roma 1978, 82; Seaford, too, mentions this as a possibility (1984 [above n. 28], 149).

93 So V. de Falco, *Euripides: Il Ciclope*, Napoli 1936, 69. J. Diggle accepts Tyrwhitt's emendation μέτωπον in his edition (Oxford 1984), and Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), follows him, although in his note ad loc. he seems to prefer to keep the MSS. text. On possible metatheatrical uses of πρόσωπον in comedy, see Taplin 1993 (above n. 3), 68 n. 2.

94 See the discussion by Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 17–23; Bain 1988 (above n. 3), 1–14; Taplin 1986 (above n. 3), 166–167.

95 So explicitly Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 23–25.

96 See Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 25 with n. 2; Taplin 1986 (above n. 3), 166 n. 16.

97 In fact, it would be rather strange if the *parabasis* of comedy were imitated by an author of satyr-play in a period when *parabasis* was fallen out of favour in comedy itself.

music/poetry, but also because of the way it sketches the relationship between the poet and his audience:

> ἀλλ' ὥσπερ δείπνου γλαφυροῦ ποικίλην εὐωχίαν
> τὸν ποιητὴν δεῖ παρέχειν τοῖς θεαταῖς τὸν σοφόν,
> ἵν' ἀπίῃ τις τοῦτο φαγὼν καὶ πιών, ὅπερ λαβὼν
> χαίρει ⟨τις⟩, καὶ σκευασία μὴ μί' ᾖ τῆς μουσικῆς…

T. Günther remarks that here one can see tendencies which become characteristic of the Hellenistic period: a well-educated and competent public, who is able to choose and is not prepared to accept whatever is offered, and a poet who is willing to present a well-polished literary work to his public.[98] We do not see the verses in this way; rather they seem to imply that the good poet must offer to the audience such a play that – as at a generous banquet consisting of many different dishes – everybody finds something to enjoy. Instead of emphasizing the refinement of the public, the verses demand versatility on the side of the poet. And this is something that the fifth-century poets mastered very well – one need only think of the humour of Aristophanes, ranging from buffoonery and slapstick to refined literary jokes. As a matter of fact, Astydamas' verses do not postulate any refinement on the side of the audience.

The appearance of the word θεωρός in Achaeus' *Athla* or *Athloi* (20 F 3) has roused the suggestion that here might be a reference to the spectators sitting in the theatre. The word means both 'spectator', a person who is viewing something, e.g. a festival – in this sense, also θεατής is used – and, in a more institutional sense, an ambassador sent by the state to consult an oracle, to present an offering or to be an official representative at a festival. S. Goldhill points out that the latter function was funded by liturgy, and so the word θεωρός has a more formal sense than the related θεατής.[99] In Achaeus F 3,1 a person asks: πότερα θεωροῖς εἶτ' ἀγωνισταῖς λέγεις; It is very likely that ἀγωνισταῖς refers to the satyrs, who appear in this drama, as often in satyr-plays, as athletes, taking part in the competitions of a certain festival. The following lines make clear that these athletes are both gluttons – as athletes were generally thought to be – and Boeotians, who were notorious for their appetites, too, but in this context the ethnicity of the satyrs is

98 *GS* 573.

99 S. Goldhill in Goldhill and Osborne (above n. 6), 6.

meant – as servants of Dionysus they can be termed Boeotians.[100] But in which sense is the word θεωροί used here? Schloemann and Krumeich state that the word means official delegates sent to the games,[101] but as we do not know the context, the word can equally well refer here to the spectators of the games in general. As regards the metatheatrical sense sometimes suggested,[102] it is clear that the words are used primarily referring to the situation of the drama. Whether the actual public in the theatre sensed in them an underlying reference to themselves and the competitors on stage, is very difficult to say.[103] The spectators in the theatre are usually called θεαταί, but they are also θεωροί in the more institutional sense of the word. The official term for the competing actors in the fifth century is ὑποκριτής, but it is not out of the question that ἀγωνιστής – as also πρωταγωνιστής, etc. – could have been employed of actors in current speech.[104]

A very similar pair of words is found in the double title of Aeschylus' Θεωροὶ ἢ Ἰσθμιασταί. The second term may be an alternative title coined by later grammarians on the basis of the contents of the drama, as I. Gallo has suggested.[105] Θεωροί must refer to a function the satyrs have in the

---

[100] B. Snell, *TrGF* I, 116, note to 3.1: "ἀγωνισταί sunt satyri servi Bacchi Thebani." Another interesting point in this line is the dative form. According to Schloemann and Krumeich (*GS* 513 n. 3), there are two possible explanations for that. The first one is to assume that a dative has been already used in the preceding verse and the datives in this verse would be related to that. The other interpretation is that these datives are connected to word λέγεις. Schloemann and Krumeich assert that the former is more likely.

[101] *GS* 515. Similarly Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 23 with n. 3, who, however, adds that they are possibly a group of satyrs. But as stated before, in this play the satyrs must be the competitors. Therefore 'the delegates' can refer to the satyrs only if the speaker is asking whether the satyrs appear in the role of spectators or of competitors.

[102] See Schloemann and Krumeich, *GS* 513 n. 4.

[103] In a performance, such an ambivalent meaning could well be emphasized by a gesture. Let us suppose – to indulge in wild speculation – that the previous line of speaker B has been something like the suggestion of Schloemann and Krumeich (*GS* 513 n. 3) 'Ich muss meinen Schützlingen zu essen geben' – perhaps more vaguely 'I must give them something to eat', at which point A asks 'do you mean to the spectators or to the competitors?' with a gesture to the audience, thus implying that B may mean that he is going to throw some titbits to the public, in a comedy-like fashion. It is, of course, unsound to suggest such a thing in earnest, as we have no evidence of such a practice outside comedy – but what if we do not see the evidence because of our prejudices?

[104] For the use of these terms, see Pickard-Cambridge (above n. 59), 132–135.

[105] I. Gallo, *Ricerche sul teatro greco*, Naples 1992, 68 (originally published in *Studi*

play, but what way? G. Conrad thinks that the double title reflects the conflict between Dionysus and Poseidon apparent in the play.[106] This may be so, but we agree with Gallo that the satyrs can hardly have arrived at Isthmus as an official delegation, neither alone nor with Dionysus.[107] Rather they have come on their own initiative after abandoning the service of Dionysus and, posing at first as spectators, they soon acquire the desire to pose as competitors.

A passage from the same play deserves attention. In F 78c,37–38 Dionysus (?) declares: κοὐδεὶς παλαιῶν οὐδὲ τῶν νεωτέρω[ν] / ἑκὼν ἄπεστι τῶνδε διστοίχω[ν χορῶν. We have already discussed the last adjective in the connection of possible references to special forms of dancing (above p. 41), but now we draw attention to the first part of the expression 'nobody, neither old or young, is willingly absent from these two-line (?) [choruses]'. Probably the older and younger people (or former and present generations) referred to must be understood quite generally as worshippers of Dionysus, but when the expression is heard in the context of a Dionysiac festival, the audience must feel they are included in this group. In this sense the expression has a metatheatrical flavour. This kind of vague identification between the situation of the drama and the situation of the performance is not alien to tragedy either, as we have seen. Tragic parallels can also be found for Sophocles' *Ichneutae* 83–85, where Silenus asks anyone who has seen the stolen cattle to kindly report to him. As the satyrs are already aware of Apollo's similar proclamation, this passage has been taken as an audience address. Bain, however, compares Sophocles' *Ajax* 879 ff. and claims that Silenus makes his proclamation to whoever might be listening.[108] We agree that such expressions can hardly be considered metatheatrical.

Thus, the examples where one can possibly see metatheatrical references to the audience are very few, and on the basis of our evidence, we cannot conclude that audience address was a conventional element of satyr-play, as it was of comedy. However, one should not explain away the few instances we do have.

Salernitani in memoria di R. Cantarella, Salerno 1981).

[106] Conrad (above n. 44), 58 f.

[107] Gallo (above n. 105), 69.

[108] Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 24.

Transtextuality

Transtextuality – to use G. Genette's term[109] – is characteristic of most genres of Greek literature and certainly of Greek drama. The great majority of tragedies and, to judge from the titles and existing fragments, a fair share of satyr-plays were based on mythological stories usually well-known for the public from Homer or other previous literature. In Old Comedy, transtextuality usually appears in a more strictly metatheatrical form, either as quotations from and allusions (e.g. verbal, stylistic or metrical) to tragedy or in the form of more extensive comic passages inspired by a certain scene of a tragedy.[110] In tragedy, this kind of transtextuality is more veiled, but by no means non-existent.[111] As regards satyr-play, most of our examples come from Euripides' *Cyclops* – this may be due simply to the scarceness of material from other plays.

The main hypotext of the play is, of course, the ninth book of Homer's *Odyssey*. As this text was so wellknown to the public, the similarities and differences in Euripides' treatment of the story must have been noticed by them.[112] There is also the possibility of more strictly metatheatrical interference between this drama and the previous dramatizations of the story of the Cyclops: Epicharmus wrote a *Cyclops*, and, in Attic comedy, the theme is represented by Aristias' *Cyclops* and Cratinus' *Odysseis*.[113]

The thematic and verbal resemblances between *Cyclops* and *Hecuba*, especially after the blinding, have often been noted.[114] D. F. Sutton even concludes that these plays were parts of the same tetralogy, the satyr-play

---

109 G. Genette, *Palimpsests. Literature in the Second Degree*, Lincoln and London 1997 (orig. in French 1982), 1.

110 The former type would correspond to Genette's use of the term 'intertextuality' and the latter of 'hypertextuality', by which he means any relationship uniting text B (hypertext) to an earlier text A (hypotext), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary (Genette 1–2, 5). Of the latter type, Dobrov uses the term 'contrafact' (Dobrov [above n. 7], 16–17, 33–53).

111 See the remarks of Dobrov (above n. 7), 18–19.

112 These are analyzed by W. Wetzel, *De Euripidis fabula satyrica quae Cyclops inscribitur cum Homerico comparata exemplo*, Wiesbaden 1965; Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 51–59.

113 See Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 52 with n. 157.

114 See G. Arnott in *Antidosis: Festschrift für Walter Kraus*, Wien 1972, 22–27; Ussher (above n. 92), 196–197.

taking up the themes presented earlier in tragic form.[115] However, the dating of *Cyclops* to the year of *Hecuba* (424) is improbable,[116] and one can ask whether such ridiculing of a previous tragedy of the same tetralogy would have had the desired effect on the public. Would it not have undermined the effect of the tragedy in question, instead of presenting a hilarious conclusion to the tetralogy? As we do not have a single whole tetralogy left, it is impossible to make any certain conclusions as to the internal echoes between the different parts.[117] Seaford argues that such resemblances are likely to result, consciously or unconsciously, from the treatment of similar scenes.[118] However, in the case of such a powerful scene and such obvious parallelity as the entrance of a blinded person in *Hecuba* and *Cyclops*, it is possible that the author has counted upon the audience's memory. In this case, the similarity would not have the same effect as in the performance of a tetralogy, but could be a positive reminder of a previous impressive play.

Similarly, although Euripides certainly often used stock phrases, some verbal echoes are so clear and at the same time such uncommon phrases that they seem to be conscious references to either his own or other tragedians' works. Seaford agrees with Milman Parry's suggestion that in *Cycl.* 222 ἔα· τίν' ὄχλον τόνδ' ὁρῶ πρὸς αὐλίοις; Euripides is answering Aristophanes' mockery *Thesm.* 1105 (413 B.C.) ἔα· τιν' ὄχθον τόνδ' ὁρῶ καὶ παρθένον of his own *Andromeda* fr. 125 (412 B.C.) ἔα, τίν' ὄχθον τόνδ' ὁρῶ περίρρυτον / ἀφρῷ θαλάσσης; παρθένου τ' εἰκώ τινα κτλ. by mocking himself.[119] But what lies behind such self-parody? The extensive

---

[115] D. F. Sutton, *Arethusa* 4 (1971) 58–67. He argues similarly on the basis of resemblances in theme, structure, and the verbal similarity of some passages that Sophocles' *Ichneutae* and *Ajax* were also written and produced together.

[116] See Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 48–51; idem, *JHS* 102 (1982) 163–172.

[117] However, in his survey of thematically connected and inconnected tetralogies, Seaford notes (1984 [above n. 28], 26–29) that there is no clear case of a satyr-play cohering with part of an incoherent tetralogy, and that after Aeschylus, the satyr-play tends to be separate from the tragedies. The evidence we have of the thematically linked tragedies and satyr-plays does not speak for such a close parallellism as, for instance, the blinding-scenes of *Hecuba* and *Cyclops*.

[118] Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 48–49.

[119] M. Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse*, Oxford 1971, 319 = *HSCP* 41 (1930) 140–141; Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 49. Seaford sees another possible case of self-parody in *Cycl.* 203 = *Tro.* 308 ἄνεχε πάρεχε. The exact meaning of the phrase and thus the sense of the parody is, however, problematic (see Seaford 1984, 142–143).

Andromeda-scene in *Thesm.* 1009 ff. is, as well as a humorous literary parody and a witty example of the metatheatrical mode of contrafact according to Dobrov, a tribute to Euripides, as it recalls in the minds of the audience his play of the previous year. Euripides, for his part, pays tribute to Aristophanes by reminding the audience of this parody – and at the same time he reminds them of his own play. The quotation may thus act as a reminder of his previous career.

Another clear verbal allusion is *Cycl.* 707 δι' ἀμφιτρῆτος τῆσδε προσβαίνων ποδί – this time to Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, possibly presented in the previous year (409 B.C), l. 19 δι' ἀμφιτρῆτος αὐλίου πέμπει πνοή.[120] Seaford sees the mention of the cave's second entrance as a neat solution of the problem that Polyphemus cannot throw stones at the departing Greeks on the stage – thus, he says he is going through his cave to the hilltop to perform this task.[121] In our eyes, the problem solved is not so much what can be done on the stage, but how the poet wishes to end his drama: not with Polyphemus throwing stones or pursuing the Greeks and the satyrs out of the theatre, but by showing how the satyrs return to the service of Dionysus, as they say in the last two lines of the play (708–709). As we have seen above (p. 42), in satyr-plays there apparently is often dancing on the stage even in connection with iambic trimeters, and it would certainly be in harmony with the Dionysiac festival if this play would end with the satyrs skipping out in lively steps of *sikinnis*.[122] The fact that the Sophoclean allusion comes as the last line of Polyphemus, at the end of the play, gives special emphasis to the quotation. We can only guess why Euripides wanted to do this. Perhaps there had been lively discussion about Sophocles' staging, and Euripides thought that a reminder of that would rouse a final laugh from the audience to close his play.[123]

---

[120] The allusion is suggested by A. M. Dale, *Collected Papers*, Cambridge 1969, 129 = *WS* 69 (1956) 106. Seaford suggests that *Cycl.* 60 †ἀμφιβαίνεις† may be restored to ἀμφίθυρον, comparing Soph. *Phil.* 159 (Seaford 1984 [above n. 28], 112). This would, however, spoil the surprise effect at the end of the play (see below n. 123). For the dating of the plays, see Seaford 1984, 48–51.

[121] Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 225.

[122] "A spirited display of happy dancing" is suggested by Ussher (above n. 92), 193.

[123] Cf. O. Zwierlain's remarks (*Gnomon* 39 [1967] 453–4 with n. 2) about the comic effect of suddenly bringing forth the detail that the cave has two entrances and, thus, all the fears of Odysseus and his mates have been vain.

Another example of allusions to another author's tragedies may be found in Sophocles' *Inachus*, where several Aeschylean words can be found. Sutton suggests that the use of such words appears calculated to impart an Aeschylean coloration to the style of the play; especially κάρβανος, λάτρις and τρόχις invite comparison with Aeschylus' two plays in which Io figures prominently. Sutton suggests that such features might be intended to draw attention to the thematic similarity of the plays.[124]

An example of metatheatrical reference to another satyr-play may be found in Eur. *Cycl.* 37–40, where Silenus refers to a former time when the satyrs accompanied Dionysus to Althaea's house, singing to the accompaniment of their *barbita*.[125] In the context of *Cyclops*, the reference emphasizes the difference of the current situation of the satyrs from their normal, joyous existence – a theme that is picked up by the satyrs themselves at the end of their *parodos* (64 ff.). We have no evidence for a satyr-play with a theme connected with Oeneus and Althaea except maybe Soph. F 1130, though the story would be well suited to the genre.[126] The special mention of the *barbiton* as the accompanying instrument of the satyrs may point to a spectacular musical scene in a recent satyr-play which Euripides here wishes to call into the minds of the audience. The metatheatrical allusion appears veiled to the readers of today, but it may have been quite clear to the contemporary audience. The technique of reference used here strongly recalls the way in which Aristophanes helps his audience to identify a tragedy referred to by him: besides the straightforward mentioning of the title of the play, he often mentions the name of the hero (which may have been used as the title, too) or another character prominent in the play in question.[127]

The Athenian dramatists apparently wove a web of literary references and allusions into their plays. In comedy, the metatheatricality of such allusions is obvious, as their origin is often plainly shown. However, many such allusions escape us even in comedy, since we do not know the text of

---

[124] Sutton 1979 (above n. 24), 38–39; 46–48. κάρβανος Soph. *Inach.* F 269a,54 is used in Aesch. *Su.* 118 = 129 and 914 and in Aesch. *Ag.* 1061, τρόχις in *Inach.* F 269c,21 and in Aesch. (?) *PV* 941, λάτρις in *Inach.* F 269c,35, F 269d,22, F269e,2, and λατρεία in Aesch. (?) *PV* 966.

[125] Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 105 finds the reference to a satyr-play probable, while Ussher (above n. 92), 44 does not.

[126] Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 105.

[127] See M. Kaimio, *Classica Cracoviensia* 5 (2000) 62–64.

the tragedies referred to. It is only natural that the existence and interpretation of such allusions in tragedy is more controversial, since they are used in a less evident way. Euripides' *Cyclops* shows that they are quite frequent in satyr-play, too. The titles of the satyr-plays show that, as in tragedy, the same mythological stories were used by different poets.[128] The high degree of hyper- and intertextuality raises the question about the literary competence of the audience – were they able to pick up and appreciate the allusions and the changes in the plot compared with earlier plays about the same myth? The evidence of comedy seems to show that although the audience in the Dionysiac festivals naturally was not homogeneous, it was in the interest of the author that a maximum of the audience should derive enjoyment from it, be it on different levels.[129]

In summing up the evidence for metatheatricality in satyr-play, we must emphasize the meagreness of the extant material and the difficulty of interpretation brought about by its fragmentary state. Many of the passages discussed above are such that no definite interpretation is possible. It seems rather clear, however, that self-referential and even self-reflexive choral expressions prompted by the dancing and singing common to the dramatic situation and the performance are frequent in satyr-play, as they are in tragedy and comedy. The lively dancing characteristic of satyr-play may even have favoured such expressions in the texts of the plays. Similarly, the popular theme of the invention of different musical instruments, as well as the themes of such plays where the satyrs themselves try their hands as musicians, seem to have brought with them expressions which point both to the dramatic action and to the performance. The same can be said about the references to the satyrs' costumes, both in their normal guise and in strange dresses required by the plot. The metatheatricality is usually not of the blatant kind typical of comedy, but consists of the audience's appreciation of both the drama and the performance at the same time. Audience address

---

[128] In the fifth century, we find, e.g., the following titles of satyr-plays which are used by different playwrights: Ἀμυμώνη (by Aeschylus and Nicomachus I; a comedy by Nicochares), Κύκλωψ (by Aristias and Euripides), Μῶμος (by Achaeus and Sophocles), Ὀμφάλη (by Achaeus and Ion), Σίσυφος (by Aeschylus, perhaps twice, Critias? and Euripides; by Sophocles either tragedy or satyr-play) and Τήλεφος (by Agathon and an anonymous writer).

[129] See Kaimio 2000 (above n. 127), 56–57 with references to discussion in n. 12.

does not seem to be characteristic of satyr-play, although some possible cases can be found. Transtextuality in its different forms is present in satyr-play, though in a more veiled form than in comedy.

In this summary, we have left out the most apparent cases of possible metatheatricality, such as Pratinas 4 F 3, the votive gifts in Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae* or the audience address of Astydamas 60 F 4, since their relevance to the metatheatricality of satyr-play has been heavily doubted. But even without these examples, one can see that metatheatricality is not completely foreign to satyr-play. There is no good reason to systematically explain away all possible metatheatrical flavour and, on the basis of this, to deny out of hand the possibility of the more obvious examples. When discussing the metatheatricality of satyr-play, we have noted many similarities with tragedy, and some with comedy. However, it is more helpful to the understanding of satyr-play to examine the relevant passages in the frame of the genre of satyr-play than to try to calculate whether satyr-play more resembles tragedy or comedy in this respect.

II

Satyr-play is often characterized as being a form of drama situated somehow between tragedy and comedy. This is in many respects true. It was closely linked with tragedy by the fact that for ca. 150 years, satyr-plays were produced by tragic poets and performed by the same actors and the same chorus as in the preceding tragic trilogy.[130] Mythological themes were characteristic of both genres. The structure of Euripides' *Cyclops* shows remarkable similarity to tragedy, but in earlier satyr-plays the structure may have been looser as, for instance, the fragments of Sophocles' *Ichneutae* and Aeschylus' *Theoroi* suggest.[131] Language and the metre of iambic parts were near to those of tragedy, although the vocabulary included non-tragic elements for humorous purposes, and there may be have been greater liberties with the metre in the speech of the satyrs and Silenus compared with the other roles. The metre of the choral songs of *Cyclops* is relatively simple, as

[130] In the fourth century, a new system was adopted, with a single satyr-play presented at the beginning of the programme. The first evidence of the new system preserved to us is from the years 341–339 (*IG* II/III^2 2319–2333).

[131] See Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 16–18.

in Old Comedy, but the astrophic songs accompanied by lively action in, for instance, *Ichneutae* show that satyric choral songs were far from uniform.[132] A significant resemblance between satyr-play and comedy is that one of the functions of both was to amuse. The laughter of the comedy was, however, more critical and biting, and the allusions to contemporary phenomena, political attacks and critical personal jokes which were typical of comedy were not familiar to the classical satyric drama.[133] The audience of comedy was expected to react to what happened on the stage by laughing, shouting and applauding, but the audience of the severe tragic drama, even if emotionally moved, was probably not expected to express its reactions as freely.[134] One might surmise that the audience's outward reactions to the satyric performance were similar to those to comedy.

We must also bear in mind that choruses of satyrs existed in comedy, too. This is not surprising, considering the widely different creatures which can appear as a comic chorus, ranging from human beings to cities or elements of nature, from animals to all kinds of partly theriomorphic mythical beings, such as centaurs or sirens.[135] We know comedies with the title *Satyroi* by Ecphantides, Cratinus, Callias and Phrynichus.[136] The material

---

[132] On metre and language, see Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 44–48.

[133] Such features are found in some later satyr-plays, as in Python's *Agen* (326 or 324 B.C.) and Lycophron's *Menedemus* (third cent. B.C.); this is generally seen as a tendency towards the mixture of the dramatic genres (see Seaford 1984 [above n. 28], 19–20).

[134] Although there are numerous anecdotes, e.g., of the audience's reactions to some provocative lines of Euripides (see Pickard-Cambridge [above n. 59], 272–275).

[135] G. M. Sifakis remarks that their origin might not be the pre-dramatic animal choruses, but their appearance must have been influenced by them (*Parabasis and Animal Choruses: A Contribution to the History of Attic Comedy*, London 1971, 77).

[136] In addition, *P. Oxy.* 1801,7 (= C. Austin, *Comici Graeci in papyris reperti*, Berlin – New York 1973, nr. 343) mentions after the lemma βδύλλειν [a comedian] ἐν Σατύροις. A. Meineke, *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*, Berlin 1839–1857, I 36–37 points to the possibility that the title could refer to licentious people, comparing Hermippus F 47, 1, where Pericles is addressed as "king of the satyrs" (cf. *PCG* [= R. Kassel and C. Austin (eds.), *Poetae comici Graeci*, Berlin – New York 1983–] 5, 127). Similarly Meineke (II:1 396) explains Timocles' *Demosatyroi* as referring to demagogues, comparing Ar. *Ran.* 1085 where they are called δημοπίθηκοι. But it seems improbable that at least four comedies would have the title *Satyrs* without having a chorus of satyrs. The play *Satyrs* assigned by *Suda* to Ophelio probably refers to Phrynichus (*PCG* 7, 97 Ophelio test. 1). It is uncertain whether Timocles' *Ikarioi Satyroi* was a comedy or a satyr-play; since we know only a comic poet named Timocles, the former view is safer (cf. *PCG* 7, 766).

consisting of titles and meagre fragments does not give us much information about these plays. We know more about Cratinus' *Dionysalexander*, the hypothesis of which is mainly preserved in *P. Oxy.* 663. The comedy apparently combined mythological travesty with contemporary satire, making fun of Pericles by indirect means (δι᾽ ἐμφάσεως col. II 46 f.). The text of the papyrus has been interpreted so that the chorus of satyrs (cf. col. II 42) addressed the audience in the *parabasis* in the metatheatrical convention typical of Old Comedy "on behalf of the poet" (col. I 6 ff. π(ερὶ) τῶν ποιη(τῶν) Koerte, pap. πυωποιη), but as E. W. Handley has shown, a very different interpretation is possible.[137]

Among vase-paintings with satyric scenes, probably connected with performances on stage, there is one which E. Simon tentatively connects with comedy, not satyr-play: According to her interpretation, a bell-krater in Syracuse shows two satyrs as *propompoi* of Dionysus and his (mortal) bride, possibly the wife of the *archon basileus*. As the satyrs, although clearly dressed up, do not wear the typical costume of satyr-play satyrs or Papposilenus, but close-fitting, full-length, mud-coloured garments with tufts, and because of their ungraceful movements very different from the dancing satyrs of satyr-play scenes, Simon has suggested that the scene is inspired by a comedy with a chorus of satyrs.[138]

However, the occasional satyric chorus of comedy and the chorus of satyrs in satyr-play are two different things. One difference, pointed out, for instance, by Simon in connection with the vase just discussed, was the nature and extent of their movements during the performance. Although satyrs are presented in a humorous light and although their faces are not beautiful (except in their own eyes), neither in vase-paintings connected with theatre nor in the dramatic texts themselves are they presented as comically clumsy. Their movements are lascivious, but at the same time swift, varied, skilful – and in the vase-paintings, whatever they are doing, they are very graceful. In the texts, one gets the impression in many choral passages that the chorus is divided into groups with different movements and lively action. Such passages may be found in comedy and even in some cases in tragedy, but apparently this is a feature characteristic of satyr-play. There are also several passages where the satyrs seem to be moving or

---

[137] π(ερὶ) ὑῶν ποιή(σεως), see Handley (above n. 51), 110–111. Handley, however, shares the common assumption that satyrs formed the main chorus (111 with n. 6).

[138] Simon in Kurtz and Sparkes (above n. 69), 133–134.

dancing even when not singing, as e.g. when Silenus *Cycl.* 94 orders his sons ἀλλ᾽ ἥσυχοι γίγνεσθ᾽[139] or when the Cyclops when entering asks τί βακχιάζετ᾽; pointing out that there is no Dionysiac music either (203–205). The element of vigorous dancing seems to be much more prominent in satyr-play than in tragedy or in comedy where the choruses probably stood still (or at most made suitable gestures) during the long *rheseis* of the actors. The satyrs seem to be constantly moving.[140] It is probable that part of the effect of satyr-play on the audience consisted in the enjoyment created by the continuous flow of rapid movement of the satyrs. This may have been a characteristic feature preserved intact in the satyr-plays of fourth and third centuries, too – at least we can see it in *Cyclops* at the end of the fifth century as clearly as in the fragments of Aeschylus and Sophocles. It is thus no wonder that the strong element of dancing also produced such references to the satyrs' own dancing and singing as we have seen above, which we can call metatheatrical in the sense that they draw the audience's attention to the dance being performed on stage as well as to the function of the dance in the drama itself.

An even greater difference from the chorus of both tragedy and comedy is inherent in the fact that the identity of the chorus of satyr-plays remained unchanged from play to play. This brought the satyr-chorus much nearer to the performing chorus. In a certain sense, they had no 'dramatic' identity: from play to play, they retained their 'real' identity as companions of Dionysus, the patron god of the festival. The Athenian satyr-play probably had its origins in rituals where the participants of a Dionysiac *komos* or *thiasos* were dressed up as satyrs,[141] but a stronger link to ritual than obsolete customs connected with religious events prior to the dramatic festivals of Athens was probably formed by contemporary living traditions of dressing up as satyrs in certain rituals and, most of all, by the Dionysiac context of the dramatic festival itself. Because of these, a stronger feeling of witnessing a real ritual may have been present in the minds of the spectators

---

[139] As Seaford remarks (1984 [above n. 28], 121), ἥσυχοι here obviously means 'still' rather than 'quiet'.

[140] See Seidensticker's discerning comments on the dance of satyr-play in *GS* 21–23. F. Lissarrague remarks on the satyrs in vase-paintings that "satyrs are represented in perpetual movement, as if they were incapable of controlling their movements" (in T. H. Carpenter, C. A. Faraone [eds.], *Masks of Dionysos*, Ithaca 1993, 212).

[141] See Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 7–14.

when following satyr-play with its chorus of companions of Dionysus than when following tragedy or comedy with their choruses of various dramatic roles. But the same feature entails the spectator being aware of the subordination of mimetic fiction inside the play to something else – the presence of the satyr chorus always refers to something outside the dramatic plot, as the real motive for satyrs being on the stage lies in the demands of the literary genre. The spectators cannot fail to recognize this; they are necessarily aware of the play being a play.

The plot of most satyr-plays seems to have had a mythological basis,[142] which has certain consequences for the specimens of the genre, as satyrs play a definitely minor role in Greek mythology. In many cases, the satyrs had to be introduced into stories they originally did not belong to at all. Euripides' *Cyclops* shows that even a very famous story could serve as a plot for a satyr-play – clearly the fact that everyone in the audience already knew the myth in a form containing no satyrs did not cause the poets to avoid such themes. Two questions naturally arise: Was the presence of satyrs somehow explained in the play? Did the satyrs have an active part in the mythological events, or were they more like spectators of actions performed by someone else?

Mostly on the evidence of the only complete surviving satyr-play, Euripides' *Cyclops*, it has been argued that an explanation for the presence of satyrs was usually offered in the prologue of the play. In the prologue of *Cyclops* Silenus informs the audience of the events that had caused him and his sons to become slaves of Polyphemus, and the theme of satyrs being held in captivity has been regarded as a typical one, serving as an explanation for their presence. It is possible that finding some kind of explanation – perhaps most preferably a witty one – was a characteristic of the genre, but it is also possible that no explanation was normally offered. The prologue of *Cyclops* follows a typically Euripidean model of opening a tragedy, while the openings of tragedies by the other tragedians show remarkable variation.

The second question is closely connected with the first one: the satyrs' active participation in the plot would at least reduce the need for a specific explanation. Again, the evidence is extremely meagre. In *Cyclops*, the satyrs are definitely present in the action taking place at the cave of Polyphemus

---

142 In others, the mythological connection seems to be rather slight, as, e.g., in Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae*, although the extant fragments are scanty and we cannot have any idea of the whole of the drama.

and communicate with actors who duly react to their comments and suggestions; yet they have no real effect on what happens. In fact, the satyr chorus of *Cyclops* does not seem to differ in this respect from the chorus of tragedy, as in both cases the members of the chorus are mostly spectators of action taking place independently of them. Yet *Cyclops* need not be a typical example, for, for instance, in Sophocles' *Ichneutae* the satyrs seem to carry out most of the action themselves. On the other hand, the satyrs are often concretely affected by the action of the drama in a different way from either tragedy or comedy. In neither of these is the status and wellbeing of the chorus generally affected by the fate of the principals (although their emotions are), while in satyr-play, the status of the chorus is apparently often materially changed: they become free of alien slavery, or they return to Dionysus from alien activities entered into by them voluntarily. Although the ending of satyr-play is happy, one should note that the satyrs do not get what they want if they want something other than to dance and sing in the service of Dionysus. They do not succeed in their courtship of Danae in Aeschylus' *Dictyulci*,[143] they do not guess the riddle of the Sphinx in his *Sphinx*, they do not become winners in the Isthmian games in his *Isthmiastae*, and they do not attain the heights of artistic ability after which they probably aspire in such plays as Iophon's *Aulodoi*.

In view of the necessity of always having a chorus of satyrs in a play and of the scarcity of mythological stories originally including satyrs, it is natural that satyrs in satyr-plays often appear in situations and functions which are alien to their natural pursuits. A merit grows out of this necessity: a great deal of the genre's humour is due to the incompatibility of the satyrs and the situation where they find themselves, as well as to the incompatibility of the mythological heroes to the satyrs as their helpers or rivals.[144] This is also relevant to the discussion of the metatheatrical aspects of Greek drama: often in satyr-play, a traditional myth is metamorphosed into a burlesque, and the audience must have been aware of this kind of transformation. Because of the scarcity of our material, we do not know how far we can speak of hypertextuality in the sense that a satyr-play toyed with a story presented previously by a tragedian. By this transformation we do not mean that the satyr-play of a tetralogy would have ironically turned the themes of

---

[143] Seidensticker emphasizes their failure in sexual matters in *GS* 31.

[144] F. Lissarrague's 'recipe' is often quoted: "take one myth, add satyrs, observe the result" (Lissarrague 1990 [above note 3], 236).

the preceding tragedies into parody[145] – we have no evidence for that, even in the case of a thematically connected tetralogy, as noted above. But the audience, not to speak of the poets themselves, can hardly have been unaware that similar themes had been treated by different poets in earlier years in the same festival, and this fact must have created an atmosphere favourable to the observing of transtextuality in one form or another.[146]

We conclude with a few words about the function of the satyr-play in the program of the Great Dionysia in the fifth century B.C. – or rather the functions, since no single interpretation can offer an exhaustive explanation. Aristotle, when speaking of tragedy in the *Poetics*, concentrated upon the οἰκεία ἡδονή of tragedy, while recent scholarship has centered its attention on the political aspects of the Dionysiac festival.[147] The political function and the experience of the audience are naturally connected: no political aim can be reached if the audience experience does not form a basis for it, and no audience experience in Athens is without political significance. We look at the satyr-play mainly from the Aristotelian viewpoint, emphasizing the experience of the audience. The pleasure brought by the different artistic aspects of the play – the words, the music, the dance – is one part of the effect, and in connection with satyr-play, we have emphasized the preponderance of lively dancing. The fruitful tension between convention and novelty is another, which, although characteristic of all Greek drama, is perhaps especially prominent in satyr-play with its consistent chorus always set in different situations. The sheer amusement brought by the hilarious

---

[145] Pfeiffer warns against such an interpretation of satyr-play (*SBAW* 1938, H. 2, 61 = *Wege der Forschung* 579 [1989] 115); similarly Seidensticker, *GS* 36–37 and Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 32 against D. F. Sutton, *The Date of Euripides' Cyclops*, Ann Arbor 1974, 192.

[146] Pfeiffer's criticism of seeing satyr-play as travesty of a heroic tale does not, in fact, mean a removal of the idea of transtextuality, since he himself sees satyr-play as moulding something new on a traditional basis: "Das Satyrdrama selbst aber gestaltet die überlieferten Geschichten von Danae oder von Io zum einfachen, unbeschwerten, problemlosen Spiel." (Pfeiffer 1938, 61 = 1989, 115–116.)

[147] This aspect is in the forefront e.g. in many recent collections of essays: Winkler and Zeitlin (above n. 3); S. Halliwell, J. Henderson, A. Sommerstein, and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis*, Bari 1993; R. Scodel (ed.), *Theater and Society in the Classical World*, Ann Arbor 1993; R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Festschrift D. M. Lewis*, Oxford 1994; C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, Oxford 1997; P. E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge 1997.

plot and the antics of the libidinous, boastful but cowardly satyrs is also one of the functions. All these work together to form a relieving contrast to the preceding three tragedies of the tetralogy,[148] but a more important function of this fourth and last play was its obvious link with the cult of Dionysus celebrated in the festival. It is probable that the emphasis laid on this was the incitement behind the development of satyric drama by Pratinas and its institutionalization in the Dionysiac festivals where tragedies had, for the most part, lost their connection with Dionysiac myths.[149] Seaford rightly emphasizes the importance of the komastic ending of satyr-play as reinstituting the joyful reunification of the *thiasos* with their god.[150] The satyrs are freed from alien oppression or return from temporary novel activities to their own sphere, the service of Dionysus.

Seaford also emphasizes the daemonic nature of the satyrs: they are immortal, not human, and they represent a wild, primordial existence with no ties to the political culture of human beings.[151] He does not, however, articulate how these facts form the key to the problem of the function of satyr-play, unless he means simply the return to the Dionysiac world.[152] But surely it is not the detachment of Dionysus and the satyrs from the human world which formed the concluding effect, but on the contrary, the audience felt that at the end of the tetralogy they experienced something with a special concern for themselves as spectators and human beings. The prevalent view, presented, for instance, by Seidensticker on the basis of articles by F. Lasserre and F. Lissarrague, is that this is achieved by the satyr-play through confirming *ex negativo* the prevalent values of the *polis* and of its citizens by presenting satyrs as their antitypes.[153] This view of

---

[148] Seidensticker remarks (*GS* 37 n. 180), in our opinion rightly, against Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 26–27, that the common view of seeing 'comic relief' as at least *a* function of satyr-play is justified by the fact that satyr-play was introduced into the Dionysiac festival before comedy.

[149] So Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 13–15, 30–32, Seidensticker, *GS* 8–9, 38.

[150] Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 31.

[151] Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 32–33.

[152] P. Burian in his recent review of *GS* in *BMCRev* 00.11.05 elaborates the thoughts presented by Seaford: "…they [sc. satyrs] precede (and thus transcend) the division of tragic and comic, and they bridge the gap between gods and mortals. Their perspective restores a sense of that wholeness and offers a comforting closeness to Dionysus in his most benevolent and joyful aspects."

[153] Seidensticker, *GS* 38–39; F. Lasserre, *Wege der Forschung* 579 (1989) 252–286

comprehending satyr-play as a tool in the hands of the city-state to educate its citizens to accept the prevailing values has, in our opinion, misguided emphasis. The question of how much the poet, whether a tragic or a comic one, wished to educate his audience by his dramatic performance has been extensively discussed; it certainly has no simple answer, since the drama and its performance at the festival have so many different facets. Lasserre presents, starting from vase-paintings and proceeding to literature, a picture of satyrs as being in every way the antitypes of fifth-century virtues and good conduct crystallized in the concepts ἀνδρεία, εὐσέβεια, εὐταξία, εὐσχημοσύνη, εὐκοσμία.[154]

We do not at all wish to deny the importance of those virtues in the Athens of Aeschylus' and Sophocles' time, but we consider it inconsistent to explain the function of satyr-play using them. True, satyrs are traditionally drunk, indecent and fond of music, and the two first characteristics do not belong to the strict code of good conduct in Athens. Lasserre even makes music a bad habit, pointing to the ethical contrast created in the first half of the fifth century between *aulos* and lyre, exemplified by the story of Athene rejecting the *aulos* and Marsyas picking it up and by its representations in the fine arts of the period.[155] But this story has 'nothing to do with Dionysus'. Although Marsyas is a satyr, the story does not relate to the worship of Dionysus, where music, and the music of the *aulos* in particular, plays a central part.[156] In following the performance of a satyr-play, however, the spectators are in the middle of a Dionysiac celebration where Athene plays a marginal role. Even a satyr-play which apparently had as its theme the story of Athene and Marsyas, as the anonymous play from which we have the fragment F 381 (where a satyr advises Athene to reject the instrument as not suitable to her), can hardly have ended otherwise than with

---

(original in *RFIC* 101 [1973] 273–301); Lissarrague 1990 (above n. 3), 228–236.

154 Lasserre (above n. 153), 256 ff., especially 261; cf. Seidensticker, *GS* 38–39.

155 Lasserre (above n. 153), 257–258; 263–266. The ambivalent position of the *aulos* in Athenian culture is further discussed by Wilson in Goldhill and Osborne (above n. 6), 58–95.

156 Wilson, when discussing the group of Athene and Marsyas by Myron, situated on the Acropolis, tries in passing to reconcile the role of the *aulos* in the Dionysiac context with its rejection by Athene (Wilson in Goldhill and Osborne [above n. 6], 62): "Yet this process also, and in the same gesture, incorporates it, with all its disruptive and useful powers, into the heart of civic life, in a realm (that of the Dionysiac) where it can indeed find its 'proper' place."

satyrs dancing and rejoicing to the music of the *aulos*. It is clear that the *aulos* was perfectly acceptable in the Dionysiac context in fifth-century Athens. Similarly, the drunkenness and the uninhibited sexuality of the satyrs were essential parts of their Dionysiac nature. Thus, it is odd how Lasserre interprets the development of the plot of satyr-play: in *Isthmiastae*, Silenus and the satyrs "werden schliesslich, man ahnt es schon, jämmerlich auf den ihnen zukommenden Rang als Diener des Gottes zurückgestuft", "er [sc. Silenus] wird schmählich kapitulieren, und mit ihm werden die Satyrn zu ihrem wahren Stand zurückkehren."[157] We have argued above that the return of the satyrs and, with them, of the whole tetralogy and its spectators, to the service of Dionysus is the expression of a central function of satyr-play. However little satyrs fit the ideals of καλοκἀγαθία, in the Dionysiac context of the festival their return to the service of their god cannot be a wretched and shameful degradation. It is good and honourable to be a slave of Dionysus. It is a relief from false pretences, a return to the satyrs' own nature, however humble.

In this sense, we would like to look at the effect of satyr-play in the tetralogy. In following the tragedies, the audience has been forced to look at and to reflect upon the most horrible possibilities of human life, which can fall upon everybody, regardless of status, education and character. Such admission may do good, even be a liberating experience, but it is also oppressing. In following the satyr-play, the audience, in addition to the fun created by the hilarious story and the lively performance, follows a humorous presentation of the vices of the satyrs and mankind – boastfulness, cowardice, licentiousness, impiety, unruliness of every kind. These vices, when taken to excess, are by no means harmless, but fortunately, the satyrs are not allowed to succeed in their infamous plans. The glory of attaining one's goal goes to the hero or to the god, but in the end, the satyrs can enjoy their normal existence as servants of Dionysus. The satyrs may be antitypes of ideals, but they are not antitypes of man, rather an only too true image of the weakness of mankind.[158] Luckily, the satyrs' return to the control of Dionysus liberates them from every responsibility save obedience to him. After the weighty problems of tragedy, the acceptance by Dionysus, who

---

[157] Lasserre (above n. 153), 267, 269.

[158] The growing similarity of the satyrs with the ordinary Athenians during the fifth century – both in the plays and in vase-paintings – is a feature often noticed; see e.g. Lissarrague 1993 (above note 140), 216–217; Krumeich, *GS* 68–69.

does not demand καλοκἀγαθία, is sheer joy. From the point of view of the *polis*, this may be explained as the phase of Dionysiac liminality, after which the worshippers return to the sobriety of everyday life.[159] But the effect of satyr-play as the end of the tetralogy, as it is experienced by the audience, lies in this relief from ordinary morality. At this moment, they hardly think of being good citizens. The end of the tetralogy is the moment of Dionysus, and it is good to be his servant.

University of Helsinki

[159] For the model of dissolution and re-establishment of the normal order in connection with Greek drama, see A. Brelich, *Dioniso* 39 (1965) 82–94, J. Aronen, *Arctos* 36 (1992) 19–37.