

## COMEDY AND SATYR DRAMA<sup>1</sup>

We know that comedy was officially introduced into the dramatic festival of the Great Dionysia in Athens in about 486 B.C. and that satyr drama had already been introduced in about 510 B.C. at the latest. From the first official production of a tragic play in 536 B.C. until 486 B.C., that is for a period of about 50 years, we know very little. The oldest surviving tragedy, Aeschylus' *Πέρσαι*, was produced in 472 B.C., and the only satyr play which survived complete to our time is Euripides' *Κύκλωψ*, which probably was produced in 408 B.C.

The form of this "primitive" tragedy, from 536 to 510 B.C. — that is from the official introduction of tragedy and satyr play respectively —, apart from some indirect evidence is completely unknown to us. Aristotle in his *Poetics*, 1449 a 9-25, informs us that it was "αὐτοσχεδιαστική", it consisted of "μικροὶ μῦθοι" and "λέξεις γελοία", that at the beginning the "<trochaic> tetrametre" was used "διὰ τὸ σατυρικὴν καὶ ὄρχηστικωτέραν εἶναι τὴν ποίησιν", but later that it was replaced by the iambic metre, and that "ὄψὲ ἀπεσεμνύθη", that is after a long period of time became serious disregarding the "γελοία λέξεις", that is the comic diction and style. The phrase "διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν" signifies that tragedy in its serious ("σεμνή") form is a development from its "satyric" form, where the serious and the comic elements coexisted. The latter was connected with the character of the satyrs, who very probably were originally the members of the tragic chorus. When tragedy took its sub-

---

\* A shorter version of this paper was read at a lecture given to the students and staff of the Department of Classics of the University of Heidelberg, Germany in April the 14th, 1999.

1. A limited discussion of this problem is offered by P. Guggisberg, *Das Satyrspiel*, Diss. Zürich 1947, 36 ff; B. Seidensticker, *Das Satyrspiel*, in: *Das griechische Drama* (ed. G.A. Seeck), Darmstadt 1979, 245ff; N. Chourmouziades, *Σατυρικά*, Ἀθήνα 1974, *passim*; and D. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, Meisenheim 1980, *passim*.  
*Δωδώνη: φιλολογία* 28 (1999) 181-207



ject matter not from the Dionysiac myths — as it obviously happened in its first stages — which were limited in number, but from other mythic cycles, it seems that it gradually became more serious (“ἀπεσεμνόνθη”). This departure from its original form and the myths concerning Dionysus created some reaction of which a reminiscence is the proverbial phrase “It has nothing to do with Dionysus” (“οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον”) with a parallel demand to return to its previous form. It is then that some reform of the dramatic festivals took place, with the official introduction of satyr play, alongside with tragedy. And the first “διδάξας” was Pratinas, who because of this was later regarded as the “father” of satyr drama. Consequently for many years, from 536 to 486 B.C., the comic and hilarious element coexisted within the tragic play or, after 510 B.C., was represented in parallel and in connection with it in the form of satyr play. However, after the official introduction of comedy into the dramatic festivals, that is in about 486 B.C., satyr play as well as comedy present, albeit in a different form, diction and style, the comic aspect in the dramatic festivals. But it must always be remembered that satyr play was always written by the tragic poet and always produced in connection with the tragic trilogy. The same actors played both in tragedy and satyr play, whereas different actors specialized in comic roles<sup>1</sup>. In regard to the formal characteristics, the subject-matter, plot, language and metre, satyr-drama differs very little from tragedy<sup>2</sup>; it is a *τραγωδία παλζουσα*<sup>3</sup>. Unfortunately, for the earlier period of satyr drama we know almost nothing, as well as for its relation with tragedy. However, we should consider the doric influence, as the tradition which regarded Pratinas as the “πρῶτος εὐρετής” of this genre implies, as certain, as well as the Sicilian influence and in particular of Epicharmus. The relation of satyr drama with Epicharmus concerns the subject-matter (the common titles imply the dramatic exploitation of the same myth), the mythological character of the plays, as well as the dramatic characters<sup>4</sup>. Thus from Epicharmus we know the following titles of comedies: *Κωμασταὶ ἢ Ἱφαιστος, Βάχχαι, Λιόννσοι, Ὀδυσσεὺς*

1. See L.E. Rossi, *Das attische Satyrspiel. Form, Erfolg und Funktion einer antiken literarischen Gattung*, in: *Satyrspiel*, ed. B. Seidensticker, Darmstadt 1989, 230.

2. See Rossi, *ibid.*, p. 222 ff.

3. This is the term given to satyr drama by Demetrius, *Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας*, 169.

4. See Aly W., *Satyrspiel*, in *R. E.* 2A.1, 1921, 246, Seidensticker, *Das Satyrspiel*, 248, and Chourmouziades, 158f, 162.



ναυαγός, Ὀδυσσεὺς ὁ ἐπὶ τὸν ζωστῆρα, Ὀδυσσεὺς αὐτόμολος, Ἡρακλῆς ὁ παρὰ Φόλω, Βούσιρις, Κύκλωψ, Σειρῆνες, Ἄμυκος, Πύρρα ἢ Προμηθεύς, Σκίρων, Σφίγξ, Ἡβας γάμος, Ἐλπίς ἢ Πλοῦτος, Θεωροί, Γᾶ καὶ Θάλαττα, Λόγος καὶ Λογίνα, Μοῦσαι, Ἑορτά, Νῆσοι, Μήδεια, Ἀγρωστῖνος, Χορευόντες, Ἐπινίκιος, Πέρσαι, Τρωῆες. Several of these titles are also found as titles of satyr plays<sup>1</sup> — which cannot be a coincidence — as *Θεωροί*, *Προμηθεύς* and *Σφίγξ* of Aeschylus, Sophocles' *Ἄμυκος*, Euripides' *Κύκλωψ*, *Βούσιρις* and *Σκίρων* and Aristias' *Κύκλωψ*. In Epicharmus we also meet the well-known "satyric" heroes, such as Heracles (*Ἡρακλῆς ὁ παρὰ Φόλω*, *Βούσιρις*, *Ἡβας γάμος*), Odysseus (*Ὀδυσσεὺς ναυαγός*, *Ὀδυσσεὺς ὁ ἐπὶ τὸν ζωστῆρα*, *Ὀδυσσεὺς αὐτόμολος*, *Κύκλωψ*, *Σειρῆνες*), Theseus (*Σκίρων*), as well as the "satyric" persons such as Sphinx (*Σφίγξ*), Prometheus (*Πύρρα ἢ Προμηθεύς*), Amycus (*Ἄμυκος*), Hephaestus (*Κωμασταὶ ἢ Ἡφαιστος*) and Dionysus (*Βάκχαι*, *Διόνυσοι*, *Κωμασταὶ ἢ Ἡφαιστος*). Along with these satyric characters are present certain satyric motifs and situations, e.g. the conflict between the "good" and the "bad" satyric heroes (*Βούσιρις*, *Κύκλωψ*, *Σειρῆνες*, *Ἄμυκος*, *Σκίρων*, *Σφίγξ*), the defeat or the extermination of the bad by the "good" satyric hero, who employs either the bodily strength (Heracles) or cunning and deceit (Odysseus), scenes with feasts and drunkenness (*Κωμασταὶ ἢ Ἡφαιστος*), strong elements from fairy-tales (e.g. *Κύκλωψ*, *Σειρῆνες*, *Σφίγξ*, etc.), and relentless criminals (*Σκίρων*, *Σφίγξ*, *Ἄμυκος*, *Κύκλωψ*). All these constitute a strong evidence that Epicharmus had exerted his influence not only on comedy but also on satyr drama. Even more, perhaps his influence on satyr drama might have been greater, especially when in its first stages satyr drama drew its subject-matter from Dionysiac myths, from which Epicharmus also drew often his subject (e.g. *Κωμασταὶ ἢ Ἡφαιστος*, *Βάκχαι*, *Διόνυσοι*). Hence the interrelations of satyr drama and comedy seem to be many-sided and multifarious<sup>2</sup>.

After the official introduction of comedy in 486 B.C. and the gradual "solemnizing" of tragedy, it is self-evident that the two genres, comedy and satyr drama, being both vehicles of the comic spirit, would influence one another. One characteristic example of the blending of the comic and the satyric tradition is the person of Heracles, who is both a comic

1. See Chourmouziades, 248 note 120.

2. Seidensticker (p. 247) believes that these relations are deeper than the superficial relations between satyr drama and tragedy.



and a satyric character; in both genres the "good" Heracles is presented with the same attributes: a stout-hearted man and a glutton<sup>1</sup>.

Casaubon's remark that "inter duo haec dramaticae poëseos genera, tragoediam et comoediam, satyrica fuit, neque illi per omnia similis, sed utriusque naturam proprio modo quodam participans" (16) is confirmed from all the evidence we have until now. However, it needs further investigation. The differences between satyr drama and comedy, especially of the 5th century B.C., are located in the form and structure<sup>2</sup>, the development of the action<sup>3</sup>, the masks and costume<sup>4</sup>, the chorus<sup>5</sup>, the mythological content<sup>6</sup>, the combination of the tragic and the humorous element<sup>7</sup>, the absence of any direct or indirect reference or criti-

1. Cf. Chourmouziades, 158 f. Heracles as a dramatic person is met in Epicharmus (*Ἡρακλῆς ὁ παρὰ Φόλω, Βούσιρις, Ἦβας γάμος*), Aristophanes (*Ὀρνίθες, Σφήκες, Εἰρήνη, Αἰολοσίκων, Βάτραχοι*), Cratinus and Ephippus (*Βούσιρις*), Antiphanes and Cratinus the younger (*Ὀμφάλη*), Euripides (*Ἀλκυστις, Βούσιρις, Εὐρισθείς, Θιρισταί, Σκίρων, Συλεύς*), Aeschylus (*Κήρυκες, Λέων*), Sophocles (*Ἐπιταυνᾶριοι σάτυροι, Ἡρακλείσκος, Ἡρακλῆς*), Achaëus (*Αἴνος*), Dionysius (*Λιμός*) and Astydamas (*Ἡρακλῆς σατυρικός*).

2. In satyr play we have neither the epirrhematic contest (agon) nor the parabasis, but on the contrary its structure and form is similar to that of tragedy.

3. In Old Comedy usually the comic hero's victory is followed by scenes, where in a way his victory is confirmed over several parasitic and social character-types. On the contrary the development of the action and the plot in satyr drama are closer, if not similar, to tragedy.

4. The "tragic" characters, that is those persons that come directly from the previous trilogy, have on tragic masks and costumes. The other satyric persons have on their idiosyncratic masks and costume, and the chorus carries the well-known satyric mask and costume.

5. In satyr drama the chorus is always consisted of satyrs.

6. No doubt we find comedies with a mythological plot, but in satyr drama this is absolutely essential. Furthermore, the dramatic exploitation of myth by the two genres is quite different. In a way this practice has to do with the fact that satyr plays are always connected with tragedy, are produced with tragedy within the pattern of tetralogies. They are never produced independently.

7. Tzetzes rightly points out that "ἡ μὲν τραγωδία θρήνους μόνον ἔχει καὶ οἰμωγὰς, ἡ δὲ σατυρική ταις ἄλοφύρασι βλαβρότητα, καὶ ἀπὸ θαυρῶν εἰς χαρὰν καταστᾶν εἴωθε". There exist however certain scenes in the surviving tragedies of the three great tragedians, especially of Euripides, of which the tone is lighter and sometimes hilarious in comparison to other scenes full of tragic pathos and emotional tension, as for instance the herald in the *Suppliants* and the guard and the herald in the *Agamemnon*, the nurse in the *Choephoroi* of Aeschylus, the guard in Sophocles' *Antigone*, the Phrygian slave and the pedagogue in Euripides' *Orestes* and *Electra* respectively, etc.





cism of contemporary persons or events, the extent and the kind of the comic element, etc.<sup>1</sup>.

Despite all these important differences, many are the common points and similarities between satyr drama and comedy. Common is the world view about life and about the good and bad times of it, a world view which faces life with an optimistic perspective, with joy and laughter. Suggestive to this end is the happy end of both comedy and satyr play<sup>2</sup>, with the victory of the comic and satyr hero and the prevalence of justice and morality. Both comedy and satyric drama, each in its own way, are an escape from the cruel reality, and for this reason the fairy-tale element is important. Here all the wishes of the spectators, although in the sphere of fancy and utopia, are being fulfilled and materialized and they are redeemed from their fears and anxieties<sup>3</sup>. Here is the realm of brave men (e.g. Heracles and Perseus), of cunning men (e.g. Odysseus) and of villains (e.g. Sisyphus, Autolycus etc.), of supernatural monsters and criminals who are exterminated by gallant and witty men (e.g. Sphinx, Cyclops, Bousiris, Amycus), of miraculous "inventions" (e.g. lyre, flute, fire, wine, etc.) and of elixirs which give eternal youth or even immortality; here also the spectator sees, as if in a mirror, his own failings and shortcomings, deceit, lie, perjury, arrogance, slyness, untrustworthiness, cruelty and inhumanity, inconsistency between words and deeds, selfishness, and every other physical or moral deficiency. Everyday situations and activities, wants and wishes, are described and presented on stage more directly in comedy, from a distance in satyr drama because of its mythological content. The chorus of satyrs, being cheerful, blusterer, erotic, good for nothing and having many more shortcomings, does not really differ from the character of the comic slave in Aristophanes or Menander. Actually, the shaping of the character

---

1. For the differences between the two genres see also Arrowsmith W., Introduction to Cyclops, in: *The Complete Greek Tragedies* vol. III: Euripides, Chicago and London 1956, 182, and Seidensticker B., *Das Satyrspiel*, 249 ff.

2. We should however observe that several Euripidean plays (e.g. *Ἴων*, *Ἑλένη*, *Ἰφιγένεια ἐν Ταύροις*, *Ἀνδρομέδα*) have also a happy end. But there the dramatic perspective is different. We should not forget, moreover, that Euripides was a great innovator.

3. See on this my article "Winged hours of bliss": Comparative notes on satyr drama, in: *Tria Lustra*, Essays and Notes presented to J. Pinsent, ed. by H.D. Jocelyn, Liverpool 1993, 139-140.



of the comic slave, at least in the first stages, must have been influenced by the character of the satyrs<sup>1</sup>.

The comic element in satyr drama depends and is related to the myth, the characters, Silenus and the chorus of satyrs, the diction and style, the combination of the σπουδαῖον and the γελοῖον, the masks and costume, but also the correlation of satyr play with tragedy and the reflection of thematic motifs and scenes of the preceding trilogy into the satyr play that follows. This latter element is of course absent from comedy. Paratragedy, frequent in comedy, is something different and functions differently. The anti-tragic and anti-heroic spirit, combined with the mythological content of satyr play and contrasted with the tragic pathos and the high and heroic spirit of tragedy, creates comic results. The means, on the other hand, which are employed by the comic poet are different. Here plot is the comic poet's own creation. And comedy is produced separately from tragedy, on another day. Moreover, its masks and costume are different. Its relation and reference to contemporary persons — politicians as well as other social types and individuals —, and political events is direct. The political and social criticism is sharp. The contact with the audience is direct. The diction and style is varied and the jokes and pleasantries have no moral limit; every kind of joke, sexual or scatological, vulgar or witty, is permissible. Personal satire is often quite caustic and is directed both against eminent personalities of the political and social environment and individuals or types of the contemporary with the comic poet political and social reality. In contrast to satyr drama, here parody and paratragedy is frequent. However, common topics and common motifs do exist in satyric drama and comedy; this is self-evident. And in time the limits between the two genres become more and more vague and indefinite.

Here we must also add that we are in complete disagreement with the view that in satyr drama only lower quality humour is met, while a high quality humour which springs from the comic exploitation of several ideas is absent<sup>2</sup>. Both forms of humour are present in Old Comedy as well as in satyr drama.

---

1. For the opposite view see Chourmouziades (p. 83). The fact however that chronologically satyr drama came first strengthens our view. Later, it is very probable that we had a mutual influence.

2. See Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Drama*, 173.



A further point of controversy, linked with the comic spirit of satyr drama, is the problem of the function and the aim served by this genre. The first to give an answer to this was the Roman poet Horace:<sup>1</sup>

“carmine qui tragico vilem certavit ob hircum,  
 mox etiam agrestis Satyros nudavit, et asper  
 incolumi gravitate iocum temptavit, eo quod  
illecebris erat et grata novitate morandus  
 spectator, functusque sacris et potus et exlex.  
 verum ita risores, ita commendare dicaces 225  
 conveniet satyros, ita vertere seria ludo,  
 ne quicumque deus, quicumque adhibebitur heros,  
 regali conspectus in auro nuper et ostro,  
 migret in obscuras humili sermone tabernas,  
 aut, dum vitat humum, nubes et inania captet. 230  
 effutire levis indigna Tragoedia versus,  
 ut festis matrona moveri iussa diebus,  
 intererit satyris paulum pudibunda protervis.  
 non ego inornata et dominantia nomina solum  
 verbaque, Pisones, satyrorum scriptor amabo; 235  
 nec sic enitar tragico differre colori,  
 ut nihil intersit Davusne loquatur et audax  
 Pythias emuncto lucrata Simone talentum,  
 an custos famulusque dei Silenus alumni.  
 ex noto fictum carmen sequar, ut sibi quivis 240  
 speret idem, sudet multum frustraue laboret.  
 ausus idem: tantum series iuncturaque pollet,  
 tantum de medio sumptis accedit honoris.  
 silvis deducti caveant, me iudice, Fauni  
 nec velut innati triviis ac paene forenses 245  
 aut nimium teneris iuvenentur versibus umquam,  
 aut immunda crepent ignominiosaque dicta:  
 offenduntur enim quibus est equus et pater et res,  
 nec, si quid fricti ciceris probat et nucis emptor,  
 aequis accipiunt animis donantve corona”. 250

1. *Ars poetica*, 220 ff. See also the commentary by C.O. Brink (*Horace on Poetry*, Cambridge 1971).



[he who competed with a tragedy to win a mere he-goat as a prize, soon afterwards introduced into the stage nudes the rustic satyrs and being rough tried to write jokes with dignity untouched, with the intention to keep at their seats with the charm of a pleasant innovation the spectators, who having acted the holy rites were drunk and irresponsible. However, it should be appropriate to present the mocker and witty satyrs in such a way, to turn seriousness to jest in such a way, that any god and any hero who comes on stage, who a little earlier appeared grand dressed in royal gold and purple, not to be changed moving with his vulgar speech into the dark taverns or, avoiding the ground, to seek to the clouds and the empty space. To babble trifling verses is unworthy of Tragedy, like a married woman who is obliged to dance at a festival and finds herself in the company of shameless satyrs and is shy. I, as a writer of satyr plays, would not favour only ordinary words, Pisones; nor would I try that the satyric style differs so much from the tragic stylistic colour, in such a way that there would be no difference whether Daos speaks or arrogant Pythias who cheated Simon and got a talent, or the comrade and follower of the divine child, Silenus. I should aim at writing a poem with familiar diction, in such a way that everyone hopes for himself the same, to sweat very much and in vain to toil to achieve it, although he tries hard. Such strength has the word order and the structure of speech, such the charm which will be added to the familiar words. Since the satyrs come from the forests, I think that they should not speak as if they were born and bred in the market-place and speak almost in a forensic manner or with exaggeratedly tender speech, to behave like small children or to pour out vulgar and shameless words. For in this way the equestrians and the aristocrats and the rich are offended, nor if the buyer assents to the rubbed down chick-peas and nuts, will they accept it benevolently and give them the crown of victory].

The aim therefore of satyr drama, according to Horace, was to attract the spectators who were drunk and beyond control and were willing to leave the theatre and make them stay in their seats. However, there is not any evidence at all to seriously support this view. The Roman grammarian Diomedes, many centuries after Horace, expressed the view that the tragic poets introduced satyr drama "ludendi causa iocandique, ut simul spectator inter res tragicas seriasque satyrorum quoque iocis et lusibus delectaretur". Hence for him "delectatio", the pleasure of the spectator, a kind of pleasant relaxation from the tragic tension, was what the poets aimed at with satyr plays. Similarly Marius Victorinus writes: "satyros inducat ludendi iocandique causa, quo spectatoris animus inter tristes res tragicas satyrorum iocis relaxetur". The tragic poet, that is, produced satyr play as a kind of "παίγδιον" for the sake of laughter, in order to play and joke with the purpose of creating pleasure or relaxation with the satyrs' jokes for the spectators who with tension had attended the previous tragedies. In modern times A. W.



Schlegel<sup>1</sup> supported the view that satyr drama was created from the need of the spectator for spiritual relaxation after the seriousness of tragedy. We know, however, that another was the reason for its creation and production. A similar view about the function of satyr drama is shared by Sutton, who over and over again remarks that the role of satyr drama is to offer "comic relief" to the spectators<sup>2</sup>. But, as R. Seaford<sup>3</sup>, rightly observes, "comic relief" could be offered by comedy. The humour which is inherent in satyr drama is also sprung from the relation of satyr plays to the previously produced trilogy. In regard to this relation there are different, even contrasting, views. Seidensticker, for instance, points out that satyr drama is not a parody of tragedy or of tragic myth<sup>4</sup>. On the contrary, Sutton accepts that satyr drama is a parody of tragedy and of tragic mythology, and even more that the mythological parody corresponds to the similar technique of Old comedy<sup>5</sup>. However, a simple comparison of paratragedy and mythological parody in Old comedy with the alleged parody in satyr drama leads us to the undisputed conclusion that it is about dissimilar things. The reminiscence and reflection in satyr drama of motifs and themes of the previous trilogy, with which it constitutes an integral whole, and the presence in the satyric environment of "tragic" characters, who retain not only the external "tragic" insignia (mask, costume), but also their "tragic" ethos, creates an irony which we could call satyric irony, in analogy with the tragic or comic irony. Progressively of course with the interaction between the two genres, comedy and satyr drama, the "comic" elements in satyr drama grow both in numbers and in quality.

The earliest satyric fragment is transmitted to us through Aethnaeus, who characterises in as "ὑπόρχημα", hyporchem. It comes from

1. *Kritische Schriften und Briefe* V., edited by E. Lohner, Stuttgart 1966, 128-129 [the third edition by E. Böcking, 1846-7]. See now in *Satyrspiel*, edited by B. Seidensticker, Darmstadt 1989, 18-19.

2. "the purpose of classical satyr play was to supply comic relief after tragedy" (*The Greek Satyr Play*, 85. See also 120 note 377, p. 129, 158, 165, 172).

3. Euripides *Cyclops*, Oxford 1984, 27. The character of satyrs ("a vulgar hedonism", "outside the confines of the civilized community", "they represent a community which is antithetical to the πόλις, because representative of more ancient social relations" — see p. 32, 30) justifies the existence and the function of satyr drama.

4. *Das Satyrspiel*, in: *Das griechische Drama*, edited by G. A. Seeck, Darmstadt 1979, 250. See also W. Aly, *R.E.* 2A.1, 1921, p. 247.

5. *The Greek Satyr Play*, 162.





Pratinas' *Παλαισταί* and consists of 17 lyric verses. Because of his Doric origin (from the Peloponnesian Phleious), its author very probably combined elements from the doric comedy with the needs of the satyr drama<sup>1</sup>. It is noteworthy that this fragment resembles, in its form as well as its content, more to an old comedy than to a satyr play<sup>2</sup>. The anapaestic system and the appeal to attack<sup>3</sup> which follows; the satyrs' mood to attack their adversary (παῖε ...φλέγε), an element which is related to the chorus' entrance into the orchestra, the chase of the comic hero by the chorus and the contest (ἀγών); the reference to theatre, the self-presentation of the chorus and its juxtaposition with another chorus<sup>4</sup> and the criticism of their adversaries, where the self-praise is obvious<sup>5</sup>, as well as the element of timeliness (since the poet's contemporary artistic tendencies are critically compared with the traditional ones) recall the parabasis of Old comedy; the polycompound words (e.g. in line 13)<sup>6</sup> and probably the personal attack in line 10, παῖε τὸν φρυνεοῦ, where with the word φρυνεοῦ there is an allusion to Phrynichus; all are elements characteristic of Aristophanic comedy<sup>7</sup>.

Speaking about the 5th century we note that several titles of Old comedy allude to the existence of a satyr chorus, as for instance the *Σάτυροι* by Ecphantides, Cratinus, Callias and Phrynichus<sup>8</sup>. Quite often satyr drama and comedy exploit dramatically the same theme: the Homeric episode with Polyphemus the Cyclops (*Κύκλωπες* by Epicharmus, Aristias, Euripides, *Ὀδυσσεῖς* by Cratinus), the character and the labours of Heracles (*Ἡρακλῆς ὁ παρὰ Φόλω, Βούσιρις, Ἦβας γάμος* by Epicharmus, *Κήρυκες* and *Λέων* by Aeschylus, *Ἄλκηστις, Βούσιρις, Εὐρυσθεύς,*

1. Cf. also W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* B.I, München 1959, 82.

2. Cf. also R. Seaford, *Euripides Cyclops*, Oxford 1984, 15ff, and *Maia* 29, 1977-78, 81-94; and Chourmouziades, 19-20.

3. See also Chourmouziades, 19-20.

4. *Ibid.*, 19-20. Suggestive of the existence of two choruses is also his comedy *Δύσμαινες ἢ Καρνάτιδες*.

5. These elements are usually found in the anapaests of the Aristophanic parabasis.

6. Such polycompound words are very frequent in Old comedy, but rare in satyric drama.

7. For these similarities see also M. Pohlenz, *Das Satyrspiel und Pratinas von Phleius*, *NGG* 1926, 298-321 (= *Kleine Schriften* II, 473-496), and Chourmouziades, 19 ff.

8. See D. Sutton, *Greek Satyr Play*, 136 with note 403.



*Θερισταί*, *Σπίρων* and *Συλὲς* by Euripides, *Ἐπὶ Ταυάρῳ ἢ Ἐπιταυάρῳι σάτυροι*, *Ἡρακλίσκος*, *Ἡρακλῆς* by Sophocles, *Ἄμφαλη* by Mesatus, *Ion* of Chios, *Achaeus*, *Ἡσιόνη* by Demetrius, *Βάτραχοι* and *Ἔοριθες* by Aristophanes), the myth about Prometheus (*Κωμασταὶ ἢ Ἡφαιστος* by Epicharmus, *Προμηθεὺς πτοχραεὺς* by Aeschylus), the Sphinx (*Σφίγξ* by Epicharmus and Aeschylus), Amycus (*Ἄμυκος* by Epicharmus and Sophocles), Amphiaraus (*Ἀμφιάρεως* by Sophocles, Aristophanes and Plato), Daedalus (*Δαίδαλος* by Sophocles, Aristophanes and Plato), Danae (*Δανάη* by Sannyrion, *Δικτυοῦργοι* by Aeschylus)<sup>1</sup>. Unfortunately it is impossible to know what the differences or the similarities were in the case of dramatic exploitation of the same myth. However, it is very probable that each genre kept its own traditional characteristics. But it should be pointed out that common characters and types, as well as common literary motifs are found both in satyr drama and comedy. Sisiphus, Odysseus, the arrogant and glutton Heracles, Daedalus, Hephaestus, Prometheus, witches, monsters and criminals such as Circe, Sphinx, Amycus, Bousiris, Polyphemus, Syleus, Skiron, are often presented on stage in both literary genres<sup>2</sup>. The character-type of the arrogant soldier is represented by Silenus in satyr drama<sup>3</sup> and Heracles in comedy; the crafty slave who is often found in comedy is represented in satyr drama by Silenus and the satyrs;<sup>4</sup> the character-type of the pimp is represented by the robber Skiron in Euripides' play with the same title; the cook<sup>5</sup> and the detailed descriptions of preparations of food as well as the feasts is a common ground in both literary genres<sup>6</sup>. Moreover many motifs are also common. Craftiness, lies, theft, deceit, perjury, sloth, gluttony, eroticism, love of women and wine, in general the everyday life with its character-types and its materialistic concepts, are all realistically present and at the same time humorously exploited both in comedy and satyr drama. Common to both is also the presentation of everyday-life situations and character-types. More in particular, Autolykus

1. See Guggisberg, p. 36 f and W. Schmid, *GGL B.L.*, p. 82 note 5.

2. See Seidensticker, p. 248, and Guggisberg, p. 38ff.

3. E.g. in the prologue of Euripides' *Κύκλωψ* and in Sophocles' *Ἰγρευτιές*.

4. Cf. Chourmouziades, p. 83 ff.

5. Polyphemus in Euripides' *Κύκλωψ* may be compared to the comic "mageiros" (e.g. in Cratinus, fr. 68, and Epicharmus, fr. 82 and fr. 83). Cf. also Ussher R.G., *Euripides' Cyclops*, Rome 1978, commentary on lines 241-243.

6. Cf. Chourmouziades, p. 134. In Aristophanes such descriptions are frequent. In satyr drama we find them in Euripides' *Κύκλωψ*, where we see Polyphemus in the role of the "mageiros" too.



who takes the old Silenus as a young bride is compared to the Megareus in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* who tries to sell his daughters pretending that they are piglets<sup>1</sup>. The athletes' gluttony, a well-known comic motif, is found not only in Achaeus' *Ἄθλα*<sup>2</sup>, but is a permanent trait of the character of Heracles. The drunken Polyphemus, Silenus stealing the wine, the detailed description of the preparation of food, the feast-scene with Silenus as "teacher" of good behaviour and Polyphemus as the "pupil", the indirect reference to and the criticism of contemporary with the tragic poet political and philosophical situations and theories, such as e.g. the atheistic and hedonistic theories of Polyphemus and his concepts about law and morality<sup>3</sup>, in Euripides' *Κύκλωψ* can be compared to corresponding comic elements in Old comedy. One further common element is parody of the literary genres, which is both rich and various in Aristophanes, whereas in satyr drama is limited, as far as we can conclude from the existing evidence, especially to Euripides and to a lesser extent to Critias. In Euripides' *Κύκλωψ*, for instance, we have exploitation and parody of Euripides' attacks on women in tragedy (as e.g. in the *Μήδεια* and *Ἰππόλυτος*) and of the accusation, already known to Aristophanes, of Euripides for misogynism, of the negative portraiture of Helen and Menelaus in his tragedies, of the beatitude ("makarismos"), the "komos" the "paraklausithyron", the "hymenaeus", the "partheneion", and of the Anacreontic poetry. Euripides' *Κύκλωψ* is regarded by Sutton<sup>4</sup>, although with some exaggeration in my view, as a parody of the plot, the characteristics and the theme of *Ἐκάβη*<sup>5</sup>. According to this view, Euripides here parodies the tragic notion of ὕβρις and downfall, as well as other tragic motifs. As a kind of subtle parody could be regarded the use of tragic motifs and structural patterns, as e.g. the form of the agon and especially Odysseus' rhesis towards the end of the episode in the *Κύκλωψ* (vv. 354-355) or the full of agony and despair rhesis by Danae and her threat of suicide in Aeschylus' *Δικτυουλοί*<sup>6</sup>.

1. See Chourmouziades p. 162.

2. See Guggisberg, 38.

3. See also the attack against the athletes in the *Αὐτόλυκος*, the criticism of human sacrifice and of slave-trade in the *Βούσιρις* and *Συλεύς* respectively. Cf. Guggisberg, 39-40.

4. *Greek Satyr Play*, Meisenheim 1980, 129.

5. Ussher too relates it with Euripides' *Ἐκάβη*, especially the scene where Polyphemus is blinded with the corresponding blinding of Polymestor. See *Euripides Cyclops*, 196ff.

6. Cf. Sutton, *Greek Satyr Play*, 162.



The *σπουδαῖα* and the *γελοῖα* (the *seria* and the *ludi*, according to Horace)<sup>1</sup> coexist in this dramatic genre, as in comedy. The subject matter, the *πρᾶξις*, according to Casaubon, is “*σπουδογελοία*”<sup>2</sup>. We should add however that not only the plot but also the satyric persons are usually *σπουδογελοῖα*. The same is true of diction and style. Horace<sup>3</sup> would rather prefer a diction and style which is intermediate between that of tragedy and comedy. It is not proper that the “satyric” hero who “comes” directly from the previous tragedy of the trilogy, where he appeared dressed in grand purple clothes interwoven with gold, use vulgar language which someone hears in a cheap joint or on the contrary to use a highly poetic diction<sup>4</sup>. Both diction and style should not be excessively simple, limited that is in simple and proper nouns, and “vulgar”, intentionally remote from the tragic diction and style, in such a way that it coincides with the diction and style of the slaves in Latin comedy. A conscious effort should be made in order that the familiar diction acquires strength and charm with the word-order and the structure in general. Finally, Horace says about the diction and style of the satyrs in particular that they shouldn’t speak as if they were born and bred in the market place (to use, that is, a “vulgar” speech) nor as small children do with excessively tender speech. Their speech should be appropriate to their character and nature<sup>5</sup>.

A careful examination of the satyric fragments and of Euripides’ *Κύκλωψ* confirm that the diction and style of satyr drama is indeed more simple than that of tragedy and sometimes is nearer to that of comedy. “*Propria quoque satyricae fuit sua quaedam dictio*”, notes Casaubon<sup>6</sup>. We should add however that in regard to style satyr drama is closer to tragedy than comedy<sup>7</sup>. Nevertheless, very seldom we find the highly poetic diction and style of tragedy.

Thus in the satyric fragments of Aeschylus the style is quite different than the style of his tragedies;<sup>8</sup> very often one has the impression

1. *Ars poetica*, 226.

2. See in: *Das Satyrspiel*, ed. B. Seidensticker, “*De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira*”, p. 16.

3. *Ars poetica*, 229 f.

4. *Ibid.*, 229-230.

5. *Ibid.*, 244ff.

6. See *Satyrspiel* (ed. Seidensticker), 15ff.

7. Cf. W. Schmid, *GGL B.I.*, p. 83, and R. Seaford, *Euripides Cyclops*, Oxford 1984, 47.

8. See also Ussher, *Euripides Cyclops*, p. 176ff.



that it approaches that of the colloquial speech, not to say that sometimes it is colloquial<sup>1</sup>. The same observations is also valid for the satyric style of Sophocles and Euripides. In the *Κύκλωψ*, for instance, the colloquialisms are more frequent than in any other of his tragedies, twice as many in proportion to their length<sup>2</sup>. Many words are found only in the *Κύκλωψ*, other words have a different meaning than the usual one, some are met only or usually in comedy, and some are proper to satyr drama<sup>3</sup>. In this dramatic genre diminutives are also frequent<sup>4</sup>. The jokes about sex are few and the Aristophanic "vulgarity" are, with few exceptions, absent. In Aeschylus such jokes we meet in the *Ἀμυμώνη*, fr. 13 σοί μὲν γαμῆσθαι μόρσιμον, γαμῆν δ' ἐμοί, if of course the verb γαμῆν and γαμῆσθαι has by that time developed, beside the usual, other semasiological undertones, as it seems probable. In his *Δικτυουλοί* too the young Perseus is characterised by Silenus in line 795 as ποσθοφιλήs and a few lines later (824 ff) he insinuates to Danae's alleged sexual hunger and her impatience to enjoy Silenus' "company":

καὶ τήνδ' ἔσορῶ νύμφην ἤδη  
 πάνν βουλομένην τῆς ἡμετέρας  
 φιλότητος ἄδην κορέσασθαι.  
 καὶ θαῦμ' οὐδέν. πολὺς ἦν αὐτῇ  
 χρόνος δν χήρα κατὰ ναῦν ὕφαλος  
 τείρετο. νῦν δ' οὐδν  
 ἔσορῶσ' ἦβην τὴν ἡμετέραν  
 γηθεῖ, γάνυται, νυμφίον τοῖον  
 δαισὶν λαμπραῖς τῆς Ἀφροδίτης.

In Sophocles, as far as the surviving fragments allow us to conclude, although the erotic element is frequent (*Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταί*, *Ἐλένης γάμος*, etc.), there are no "vulgar" sexual jokes. The only words which can be characterised thus is οὐράνη in his *Σύνδειπνοι* and ἐνουρήθρα in the *Πανδώρα ἢ Σφυροκόποι*.

1. See Th. Ph. Howe, *The Style of Aeschylus as a satyr-playwright, Greece and Rome VI*, 1959, 153, and A. G. Katsouris, *Linguistic and Stylistic Characterization*, Athens 1975, 33.

2. See P. T. Stevens, *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides, Hermes Einzelschrift 38* (1979), 64-65, and R. Seaford, *Euripides Cyclops*, p. 47.

3. See Ussher, *Euripides Cyclops*, p. 204-207.

4. E.g. in Euripides' *Κύκλωψ*, 185 ἀνθρώπιον, 266 Κυκλώπιον, 267 δεσποτίσκει, 316 ἀνθρωπίσκει.





In Euripides' *Σκίρων*, Silenus plays the role of the pimp. In the surviving fragments however the diction is not vulgar. There is a reference to the erect phallos of the satyrs, and the word used is also found in Aristophanes, fr. 317, the *ἔμβολον* (=φαλλός)<sup>1</sup>. A double-edged meaning has probably the word *ξύλον* in fr. 693 of the *Συλεύς*<sup>2</sup>. In the *Κύκλωψ* we can see better the restrained and allusive manner with which such references, usually connected with the satyrs and Silenus, are made. In lines 169-171 Silenus, heated by the wine, remembers other comparable pleasures:

ἴν' ἔστι τουτί τ' ὀρθὸν ἐξανιστάναι  
 μαστοῦ τε δραγμὸς καὶ παρεσκευασμένου  
 ψαῦσαι χεροῖν λειμῶνος ὀρχηστὺς θ' ἄμα.

The word *φαλλός* is however avoided with the use of the demonstrative pronoun and the related gesture by Silenus, whereas for the *αἰδοῖον* the word *λειμών* is employed. No doubt however the general style recalls Aristophanic comedy.

Similarly the chorus of satyrs speaks with sexual insinuations about Helen (177 *ἐλάβετε Τροίαν τὴν Ἑλένην τε χειρίαν*; 179-81 *οὔκουν, ἐπειδὴ τὴν νεᾶνιν εἴλετε, ἅπαντες αὐτὴν διεκροτήσατ' ἐν μέρει, ἐπεὶ γε πολλοῖς ἤδεται γαμουμένη*);. And in line 439f the satyrs' expression recalls the orphaned phallos in Aristophanes' *Λυσιστράτη* 956, *πῶς ταυτηνὶ παιδοτροφῆσω*; With a double entendre and sexual insinuation is also used by Polyphemus the verb *ἀναπαύσομαι* (v. 582), in the scene of the abduction of Silenus, and *συμμεμιγμένος* (578) in relation to the sexual intercourse of Ouranos with Gaia.

With regard to the metre Cesaubon had pointed out the following: "satyricorum autem metrorum hic fuit character, ut tragicis remissiora, comicis astrictiora inter horum solutam lecentiam et illorum observationem exactam medium servarent"<sup>3</sup>. The satyric metre in general is closer to tragedy than comedy<sup>4</sup>. And, at least as far as we could conclude from Euripides' *Κύκλωψ*, those verses which are spoken by "tragic" character are stricter in their metrical structure than those spoken by

1. See A. G. Katsouris, *Τὸ Σατυρικό Δράμα, Αισχύλος Σοφοκλῆς Εὐριπίδης*, Ἰωάννινα 1990, 163.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 166.

3. See in: *Satyrspiel* (ed. Seidensticker), p. 15ff.

4. See R. Seaford, *Euripides Cyclops*, p. 45.



the other satyric persons<sup>1</sup>. The frequent resolutions of long elements<sup>2</sup>, the violation of Porson's law<sup>3</sup>, two or three continuous iambic feet with three short syllables (τριβραχεις)<sup>4</sup>, anapaestic feet in place of iambic<sup>5</sup>, split anapaests<sup>6</sup>, the absence of caesura<sup>7</sup>, are characteristics of the satyric as well as of the comic metre. The comic anapaests, the anapaests that is which are found in other than the first foot positions and not with a proper noun<sup>8</sup>, the infringement of Porson's law, and the three consecutive three-short-syllable feet, are frequently found in comedy, never found in tragedy, and several times in satyr drama. Furthermore, the violation of the technique of the "ἀντιλαβαί", the division that is of the line into two or three speakers — something which is frequent in comedy — is also found in satyr drama<sup>9</sup>.

The lyrics are shorter and simpler as regards their metrical structure and variety than the corresponding lyrics of tragedy and comedy<sup>10</sup>. The choral songs are framed by the entrance or exit of actors on or off stage. Quite often the lyric songs in satyr drama accompany some work, they are in other words work - songs, as for instance very probably, the entrance-song of the chorus of satyrs in Aeschylus' *Δικτυουλοί*,<sup>11</sup> the entrance-song in Sophocles' *Ἰχνευταί*, 64ff, 100ff, and the choral song in 176-202, and the entrance-song in Euripides' *Κύκλωψ*, which is, in its larger part, a boucolic song<sup>12</sup>, but also the choral songs in 608ff and 656ff; or they express the reaction of the chorus of satyrs to the action and its development. It is clear that their relation with the on

1. In regard to style as well they are closer to tragedy. Cf. Schmid, *GGL* I. 2, p. 83, note 7.

2. They are however fewer than in comedy. See Schmid *GGL* I. 2, p. 83 note 8, who observes that in Sophocles' *Ἰχνευταί* out of 320 trimetres resolutions are found only in 18. For Euripides' *Κύκλωψ*, see Ussher, p. 208.

3. E.g. *Κύκλωψ* 210, 304, 681, 682, Aeschylus' *Δικτυουλοί* 783, Sophocles' *Ἰχνευταί* 333, 344. See Seaford, p. 45, and Ussher, p. 210.

4. E.g. *Κύκλωψ*, 203, 210.

5. See also Schmid, *GGL* I. 2, p. 83 note 8.

6. E.g. *Κύκλωψ*, 154, 235, 334, 343, 410.

7. E.g. *Κύκλωψ*, 7, 9, 182, 213, 203, 586.

8. See, for instance, in the *Κύκλωψ*, 154, 232, 234, 242, 272, 274, 546, 558, 560, 562, 566, 582, 588, 637, 646, 647, 684. Cf. also Seaford, p. 45, and Ussher, p. 208ff.

9. This is frequent in Euripides' *Κύκλωψ*. See also Ussher, p. 210.

10. Cf. Seaford, p. 17 f and 46, and Ussher, p. 177, 210.

11. Cf. Aristophanes' *Ειρήνη*.

12. A boucolic song we very probably have also in Sophocles' *Ἰναχος*, in the mouth of Argos (see scholia in Aeschylus' *Προμηθεὺς δεσμώτης*, 574ff.).



stage action is close enough. There is a greater freedom in the chorus' movement, which is in a way expressed in the structure of the lyric songs as well. Often they are "astrophe", as e.g. *Δικτυολκοὶ* 786-801, *Ἰχνευτέες* 64ff, 100ff, 176ff, *Κύκλωψ* 608ff, 656ff, or are arranged in strophic stanzas, as e.g. *Δικτυολκοὶ* 802-811 // 812-820, 821-826 // 827-832, *Ἰναχος*, 16-20, 25-30, 34-39, *Ἰχνευταὶ* 243-250 // 290-297, 329-337 // 371-379, *Κύκλωψ* 495-502 // 503-510 // 511-518.

In Aeschylus' *Δικτυολκοὶ* Silenus' astrophic lyric song, lines 786-801, is in choriambic dimeter and is followed by a strophic system (strophe 802-811, antistrophe 812-820) in aeolochoriambic metres (choriambic dimeter, glyconics, pherecratic, phalaecean). Then a strophic system in marching anapaests by the chorus follows (strophe 821-826 antistrophe 827-832). In fr. 204, probably from Aeschylus' *Προμηθεὺς πυρκαεὺς*, a choral song is preserved which is organised in strophe and antistrophe, and each one is followed by a refrain (ἐφύμνιον). The metre of the strophe and antistrophe is in dochmiacs with iambics and cretics whereas the metre of the refrain is in iambic with cretics and bacchic. We also see that the chorus is not divided in more than two semichoruses. It is also interesting to see that the chorus, at least in Aeschylus' *Θεωροὶ ἢ Ἰσθμιασταί*, engages in conversation with the actors: in lines 33ff, with Silenus, and it seems that in between the conversational tone is replaced by a song (e.g. 14-17; the metre is there iambic dimeters which end with a bacchic), and in lines 53ff.

The structure and order of Sophocles' lyrics is very interesting. The differences from Aeschylus are noteworthy. In his surviving satyric fragments we do not find lyric songs in aeolochoriambic metres<sup>1</sup>. Three short songs in the *Ἰναχος*<sup>2</sup> are written in dochmiacs or anapaests<sup>3</sup>. A short lyric fragment from the *Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταὶ* is in various metres (cretics, iambics, spondees, bacchic). The choral songs in the *Ἰχνευταὶ* show Sophocles' preference of the cretics. The chorus of the satyrs enters the orchestra after Apollo's monologue-prologue and the short dialogue scene with Silenus, in line 64. The chorus' first entrance is quite peculiar, since, first, in between the choral songs comments and exhortations (79-87 and 91-99) by Silenus in conversational metres (iambic trimeters)

1. We find glyconics in combination with other metres in Sophocles' *Ἰχνευτέες*, 176-202.

2. Lines 16-20, 25-30, 34-39.

3. Because of the many resolutions it is difficult to decide with certainty.



are inserted. Second, the chorus is at first divided into four groups<sup>1</sup>, and then the twelve<sup>2</sup> chorus members move independently, something which is an indication of their great freedom of movements and of the vivacity of the satyrs, who like hunting dogs bend down probably on all fours and with smelling<sup>3</sup> try to trace the tracks of Apollo's stolen oxen; third, their first song (64-78), which is astrophic, is composed in cretics, anapaests and dochmiacs, the second (100-123), also astrophic, is in iambic trimeters and three iambic monometers (107, 109, 117), and finally, approximately in the middle of the second song, after line 113, from within the cave some sound (ροῦβδος), is heard, very clearly the sound of the lyre, which terrifies the satyrs. The satyrs' third song is also astrophic (176-202); the satyrs move, dance and sing individually<sup>4</sup>. Here the metres are various: iambic, anapaestic, cretic, glyconics, trochaic<sup>5</sup>. One further interesting peculiarity is that the satyrs call each other with their names: Δράκις, Γράπις, Ούριας, Μέθυσος, Στράτιος, Κροκίας, Τρέχις. The interjections are also frequent: 176 ὦ ὦ ὦ, ψ ψ ἄ ἄ, 197 ὀπποῖ. ἄ, as in other places, in the first song (66 ἀπαπαπαῖ, 67 ὦ ὦ), and in lines 88 ἰὼ ἰὼ, 89 ὤή, 131 ὦ ὦ ὦ ὦ). Besides we find here a Euripidean figure, the epanadiplosis: 180 ἐλήλυθεν ἐλήλυθεν, 184 Ούριας Ούριας, ἀδικεῖς ἀδικεῖς, 189 Στράτιος Στράτιος, 196 ἐφέπου ἐφέπου.

The satyrs' songs afterwards are structured in strophe and antistrophe, but in between them each time a dialogue scene between the chorus of satyrs and Cyllene the nymph (in iambic trimeters) is inserted:<sup>6</sup>

strophe	243-250	
dialogue scene	251-289	[39 lines]
antistrophe	290-297	
strophe	329-337	
dialogue scene	338-370	[33 lines]
antistrophe	371-379	

1. See A.G. Katsouris, *Τὸ Σατυρικό Δράμα, Αἰσχύλος Σοφοκλῆς Εὐριπίδης*, p. 133.

2. In lines 100-123 eleven "paragraphoi" (changes of speaker) are noted.

3. See lines 124-130.

4. The eleven "paragraphoi" are noted in lines 176, 177, 180, 181, 184, 189, 191, 196, 197, 201.

5. See A.G. Katsouris, *Τὸ Σατυρικό Δράμα, Αἰσχύλος Σοφοκλῆς Εὐριπίδης*, p. 135.

6. In regard to this structural element it resembles the Old comedy structure (cf. Seaford, p. 46).



In between the two structural patterns a dialogue scene (298-328: 30 lines) between the chorus and Cyllene is inserted, of which the larger part is in the form of stichomythia and is composed in iambic tetrameters.

A similar pattern we find in the *Ἰναχος*, 16-39, where each one of the three short stanzas (26-20/25-30/34-39) is followed by a dialogue in four trochaic catalectic tetrameters.

The prevailing metre in the above strophic systems of the *Ἰχθυεῖται* is the cretic:

243-250

```

-- υ - - υ - - υ -
-- υ - - υ - - υ -
-- υ - - - υ -
-- υ - - - υ -
- υ - - υ - - - υ
-- υ - - υ - - υ -
- υ - - υ - υ - υ -
- υ - - υ - υ - -

```

329-337

```

-- υ - - υ - - υ - - υ -
      - υ - - υ - - υ -
                - υ - υ - -
          υ - υ - - υ - - υ -
            - υ - - υ - - υ -
- υ - - υ - - υ - - υ -
      - υ - - υ - υ - -
υ - υ - υ - υ -
      - υ - - υ - υ - -

```

In Euripides' *Κύκλωψ* there are five lyrics, as in tragedy. The structure of the first two approaches that of tragedy: the parodos consists of strophe, mesodos, antistrophe and epodos; and the lyric song in lines 356-374 of strophe, mesodos and antistrophe. The third is peculiar, since, after a system of marching anapaests there follow three monostrophic songs in ionic metre (anacreontics), the first and the third by the satyrs, the second by Polyphemus. Finally, the last two choral lyrics are very short and astrophic (608-623 and 656-662). The metres are generally simpler than the ones used in tragedy. The strophe and antistrophe of the parodos are in choriambic dimeter, a metre which was also used by Aeschylus in the astrophic song of his *Δικτυουλοί* (786-801). The mesodos





is in anapaestic, enoplian, hemiepes and choriambic, and the epodos in aeolochoriambic metres<sup>1</sup> with iambics and anapaests. In the strophe and antistrophe of the second lyric choral song the metre is iambic, dactylic and anapaestic, whereas the metre of the mesodos is iambic, trochaic, anapaestic and choriambic<sup>2</sup>. The marching anapaests (483-494) as an introduction to a choral lyric song are frequent in Aeschylus<sup>3</sup>. The ionic (anacreontic) metre is found only here (495-502, 503-510, 511-518) in satyr drama. The astrophic choral lyric in lines 608-623 is in iambotrochaic metre with dactyls, and the short astrophic lyric in 656-662 is in aeolochoriambic metre with dochmiacs (choriambic, dochmiacs<sup>4</sup>, pherecratean, cretics, reizianum). Here the metric variety is impropotional with the shortness of the song.

Judging the Euripidean lyrics in the *Κύκλωψ* as a whole, we observe that as regards the metres used they are not simpler than those used by Sophocles and Aeschylus<sup>5</sup>. On the contrary, it seems that the variety both in the metres used and their structure is greater.

Quite interesting is also the influence of satyr drama on Old comedy or its exploitation by Old comedy poets. Unfortunately the detection of satyric influences is difficult, if not impossible, unless we get some direct information about it. We are forced therefore to limit ourselves to the information given to us by the scholiasts, which however is not numerous<sup>6</sup>.

The motif of rejuvenation of an old man with magic firtres, and in particular with his boiling in hot water, which the sausage-seller alludes to in Aristophanes' *Ἰππείς*, 1321, was known from Aeschylus' satyr play *Λιονύσου τροφοί*<sup>7</sup>.

1. Similarly in the *Δικτυουλλοί*, 802-820 (strophe and antistrophe).

2. Cf. the metres in Sophocles' *Ἰναχος*, 176-202.

3. See also *Δικτυουλλοί*, 821-826 and 827-832, where however they are included in a strophic system.

4. We find dochmiacs in Aeschylus' *Προμηθεὺς περκαεὺς* and probably in Sophocles' *Ἰναχος*.

5. On the contrary, Seaford (*Euripides Cyclops*, p. 46) supports the view that "the regularity and simplicity of rhythm", which as he says, is "characteristic of *Cyclops*", is found only in lines 806-820 of Aeschylus' *Δικτυουλλοί*.

6. I am indebted for my information mainly to P. Rau, *Paratragodia*, München 1967.

7. See fr. 246a R. In the Hypothesis to Euripides' *Μήδεια* we get the information that Aeschylus "ἐν ταῖς Λιονύσου τροφοῖς ἱστορεῖ ὅτι καὶ τὰς Διονύσου τροφοὺς μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν ἀναψήσασα (=ἡ Μήδεια), ἐνεοποίησε".



In the lyric medley in Aristophanes' *Βάτραχοι*, 1285-95, with which Euripides burlesques and parodies the Aeschylean choral lyrics, Aristophanes includes a verse from Aeschylus' *Σφίγγς* in dactylic metre:

*Σφίγγα δυσαμεριᾶν πρύτανιν κῶνα πέμπει.*

The comic poet criticizes the uniformity, the rhythmic monotony and the archaic style of Aeschylus' choral lyrics<sup>1</sup>, since this song is accompanied not by the flute but by the lyre. The effect is comic, and this is further increased by the refrain which follows after each verse, which is an imitation of the music of guitar (*τοφλαττοθράτ τοφλαττοθράτ*) as well as by the incoherence of content which is created by the lyric verses taken from several tragedies of Aeschylus<sup>2</sup>.

A third case where we probably have an exploitation of satyr drama is in the *Βάτραχοι*, lines 462-463, where Xanthias induces Dionysus who is disguised as Heracles with the following words:

*οὐ μὴ διατρίψεις, ἀλλὰ γεύσει τῆς θύρας,  
καθ' Ἡρακλέα τὸ σχῆμα καὶ τὸ λῆμ' ἔχων.*

This may probably refer to Euripides' *Συλεύς*, where we get the information from Tzezes that Heracles "τὰς θύρας ὡς τράπεζαν θεὸς ἤσθιε".

Another occasion where there is no doubt that Aristophanes uses Aeschylean satyric techniques is in his *Εἰρήνη*. Here he adapts in order to accommodate it to the new situation and comic demands the scene from Aeschylus' *Δικτυουλοί*, where the chorus of satyrs helps Dictys and Silenus to pull out of the sea the nets in which an urn was caught with Danae and Perseus in it<sup>3</sup>.

The invitation for help<sup>4</sup> which is addressed to the farmers, vine-growers, shepherds and coal-dealers<sup>5</sup> in the *Δικτυουλοί* is followed soon after by the entrance into the orchestra of the satyric chorus and the scene of pulling out the nets<sup>6</sup>.

In the *Peace* there is a similar invitation for help from Trygaios, in lines 296-300:

1. See line 1262, and Rau, 125ff.

2. See Rau, 126, and E. Fraenkel, *RhM* 72 (1917-18), 321.

3. Cf. Newiger H.-J., *Metapher und Allegorie*, *Zetemata* 16. München 1957, 114f.

4. A usual technique for the preannouncement of the arrival and the entrance of the chorus into the orchestra.

5. *Δικτυουλοί*, 19 f.

6. This does not survive, but is easily deduced.



ἀλλ' ὦ γεωργοὶ κᾶμποροι καὶ τέκτονες  
καὶ δημιουργοὶ καὶ μέτοιχοι καὶ ξένοι  
καὶ νησιῶται, δεῦρ' ἴτ' ὦ πάντες λεῶ,  
ὡς τάχιστ' ἄμας λαβόντες καὶ μοχλοὺς καὶ σχοινία.  
νῦν γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀρπάσαι πάρεστιν ἀγαθοῦ δαίμονος.

And soon after the chorus of farmers appears with joyful and loud voices dancing lively<sup>1</sup>. Although we do not have any direct evidence, we believe that the chorus' vividness here would correspond to the liveliness of the satyric chorus in the *Δικτυουλκοί*. The evolutions of the dancers, the so-called "σχήματα", some of which here are described<sup>2</sup>, look similar with the corresponding satyric dancing evolutions on vase-paintings. It is noteworthy that a few lines later the chorus, speaking about his misfortunes caused by the war, uses in a comic way a phrase (ξὺν δορὶ ξὺν ἀσπίδι) from Achaeus' satyr play *Μῶμος*.

In the following scene Trygaeus tries to find a way to pull Peace out of the deep cave, where gods had thrown her burying her under stones, and faces Hermes' reaction and threats. It is interesting to note that the chorus stands out of the way silent and afraid<sup>3</sup>. This kind of reaction is characteristic of the satyrs, who quite often appear first enthusiastic but then cowards and silent, when they find themselves in front of something new or menacing.

Finally Hermes is persuaded and thus the job of pulling Peace out of the cave begins; Trygaeus and the chorus holding the robes pull in order to haul Peace up<sup>4</sup>. Unfortunately we cannot know up to what point this scene corresponded in its details with the similar scene in the *Δικτυουλκοί*. It is clear however that in both cases we have working songs and exclamations which accompany the hauling up.

To Sophocles' *Ἰναχος*, probably a prosatyric play, Aristophanes alludes at least twice. In his *Ἐκκλησιάζουσαι*, 76-81, he refers to some Lamius, a poor man with clothes in holes, who had the ability to cheat the common folk, as follows: ἐπιτήδειός γ' ἂν ἦν τὴν τοῦ πανόπτου διφθέραν ἐνημμένος, εἶπερ τις ἄλλος, βοηκολεῖν τὸ δῆμιον. Lamius dressed with the much worn out leather is compared to Panoptes Argus with the many

1. See in particular lines 322-326.

2. τὸ σκέλος ὄψιντες ἤδη τὸ δεξιὸν 332, ἀλλὰ καὶ τᾶριστερόν... 334

3. See lines 383-384 εἰπέ μοι, τί πάσχετ' ὠνδρες; ἔστατ' ἐκπεπληγμένοι,  
ὦ πόνηροι μὴ σιωπᾶτ'. εἰ δὲ μή, λακῆσεται.

4. See lines 460-472, 486-489 and 512-519.



eyes on his body, who had appeared in the *Ἰναχος*<sup>1</sup>. For a second time Aristophanes uses a motif from the same play. In his *Πλοῦτος*<sup>2</sup>, lines 806-818, Ploutos' entrance into Chremylos' house is accompanied by rich and miraculous goods and, according to the ancient scholiast, these lines are borrowed or are adapted from the *Ἰναχος*, where Inachus' house after Zeus' entrance, was filled with rich goods. In both cases, the dramatic exploitation of lines and motifs from Sophocles' satyric play has nothing to do with parody.

As regards Euripides, it is well-known that Aristophanes parodies his work very often and sometimes extensively. However, few of these parodies refer to satyric plays. The following cases are the most obvious ones. In the *Σφήκες*, 312-314, he exploits dramatically words and lines from Euripides' *Θησεύς*<sup>3</sup> and probably from his *Ἰππόλυτος*.

From the *Alcestis*, a prosatyric play, he employs or parodies six passages in seven of this comedies:

1) in the *Ἰππείς*, 1250-52, Cleon, after his defeat by the sausage-seller, says goodbye to the crown, the symbol of his power over the Demion (=the people), with the following lines:

ὦ στέφανε, χαιρών ἄπιθι, κεῖ σ' ἄκων ἐγὼ  
λείπω. σὲ δ' ἄλλος τις λαβὼν κεκτήσεται  
κλέπτῃς μὲν οὐκ ἂν μᾶλλον, εὐτυχῆς δ' ἴσως.

The model for this farewell is a similar scene in the *Ἀλκίησις*, where the heroine with the same name in her last final moments before her death, as the maiden informs the audience, bids farewell to the hearth, the altars, the bridal bed, the slaves and her children. In lines 179ff, in a passionate state, she says:

ὦ λέκτρον...

...

χαῖρ'. οὐ γὰρ ἐχθαίρω σ'. ἀπώλεσας δ' ἐμέ  
μόνην. προδοῦναι γάρ σ' ὀκνοῦσα καὶ πόσιν  
θνήσκω. σὲ δ' ἄλλη τις γυνὴ κεκτήσεται,  
σώφρων μὲν οὐκ ἂν μᾶλλον, εὐτυχῆς δ' ἴσως.

As we see, in the comic parallel, both the highly tragic style and pathos and the substitution of the adjective *σώφρων*, an attribute which

1. See Rau, 206, and Chourmouziades, *Σατυρικά*, 224 note 92.

2. See Katsouris A.G., *Τὸ σατυρικό δράμα*, p. 123f and Rau, 208.

3. Fragments 385 and 386.



characterises Alcestis in this play, with the word κλέπτῃς, which is a basic characteristic of Cleon, create a comic effect<sup>1</sup>.

2) in the *Ἀχαρνεῖς*, 893-4, in a comic apostrophe and greeting to the eel, which both parodies various scenes of recognition in Tragedy<sup>2</sup>, Dicaeopolis ends using and parodying the words with which Admetos close his passionate speech to her wife Alcestis, that is with

μηδὲ γὰρ θανάων ποτε

σοῦ χωρὶς εἶην τῆς μόνης πιστῆς ἐμοί,

substituting for comic reasons the last phrase τῆς μόνης πιστῆς ἐμοί with the participle ἐντετευλανωμένης, cooked that is in beets.

3) in the *Ὀρνιθεῖς*, 1244, Peisthetaeros uses a line from the *Ἀλκῆστις* (675), which is a reprimand of Admetos by his indignant father Pheres:

*Ἀλκ.* ΦΕ. ὦ παῖ, τί ν' ἀρχεῖς, πότερα Λυδὸν ἢ Φρύγα  
κακοῖς ἐλαύνειν ἀργυρώνητον σέθεν;

*Ὀρν.* ΠΙ. φέρ' ἴδω, πότερα Λυδὸν ἢ Φρύγα  
ταυτὶ λέγουσα μορμολύττεσθαι δοκεῖς;

4) *Νεφέλαι*, 1415, and *Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι*, 194. Line 691 of the *Ἀλκῆστις* (χαίρεις ὄρων φῶς, πατέρα δ' οὐ χαίρειν δοκεῖς;) is a selfish trick with which Pheres, Admetus' father, dismisses the reproach that he did not offer himself to die in the place of his son. His logic argumentation, instead of dissipate his selfishness, stresses it even more. In the *Νεφέλαι*; Pheidippides, the son, parodying this verse, reinforces comically his argument that children have the right to beat their parents:

κλάουσι παῖδες, πατέρα δ' οὐ κλάειν δοκεῖς:

And in the *Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι* Agathon the poet rejects Euripides' suggestion to present himself as a woman at the Thesmophoria in order to defend him answering to the women's accusations, employing arguments from Euripides' own work<sup>3</sup>. Here the line from the *Ἀλκῆστις* suggests that each should take care of his own business, which is clear enough from the lines that follow, 195-199:

ΑΓ. *Εὐριπίδῃ* - ΕΥ. τί ἐστίν; ΑΓ. ἐποίησάς ποτε  
'χαίρεις ὄρων φῶς, πατέρα δ' οὐ χαίρειν δοκεῖς;'

ΕΥ *ἔγωγε*. ΑΓ. μή νυν ἐλπίσης τὸ σὸν κακὸν  
ἡμᾶς ὑφέξειν. καὶ γὰρ ἂν μαινοίμεθ' ἄν.

1. The two passages are also compared by Rau, 172-3.

2. Cf. Rau, 146.

3. Similarly Dionysus in the *Βάτραχοι*, 1471, 1475, 1477. Cf. Rau, 113.





ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ γε σὸν ἔστιν οἰκείως φέρε.  
 τὰς συμφορὰς γὰρ οὐχὶ τοῖς τεχνάσμασιν<sup>1</sup>  
 φέρειν δίκαιον ἀλλὰ τοῖς παθήμασιν.

5) In the *Σφήκες*, 749ff<sup>2</sup>, Aristophanes, embellishing Philocleon's speech with tragic utterances, succeeds to give with a comic exaggeration the comic hero's pathos. Philocleon begins with an expression of agony from the *Ἀλκηστις*, 863, *ὦ μοί μοι*. The extent of his pathos to judge is thus compared to the depth of Admetus' sorrow, when after the funeral returns to his empty palace, or to Phaedra's ardent love and her wish to be in the same places where Hippolytus frequently goes. The tragic tone is reinforced with the self-apostrophe to his soul (line 756), a well-known tragic motif, and other expressions which are identical or adapted from Euripides' *Βελλεροφόντης* (*Σφήκες*, 757, *πάρες ὦ σκιερά*) and *Κοῆσσαι* (*Σφήκες*, 763):

749 ΦΙ. ὦ μοί μοι.  
 751 κείνων ἔραμαι, κεῖθι γενοίμαν  
 756 σπεῦδ' ὦ ψυχή· ποῦ μοι ψυχή;  
 πάρες ὦ σκιερά....  
 762 τοῦτο δὲ Ἄιδης διακρινεῖ πρότερον ἢ ἄγὼ πείσομαι.

6) In the *Λυσιστράτη*, 865-9, Aristophanes, having as his model Admetus' speech in the *Ἀλκηστις*, 935-960 — who only after the funeral of his wife becomes conscious of the magnitude of the loss, as well as the loneliness and solitude he feels inside and outside his house — shapes Kinesias' speech in the *Λυσιστράτη*, 865-869. Kinesias, like Admetus, feels also the solitude and loneliness since his wife Myrrhine had left, but for a different reason, the fact that is that he cannot satisfy his sexual desires:

ὥς οὐδεμίαν ἔχω γε τῷ βίῳ χάριν,  
 ἐξ οὐπερ αὐτὴ ἔξηλθεν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας.  
 ἀλλ' ἄχθομαι μὲν εἰσιῶν, ἔρημα δὲ  
 εἶναι δοκεῖ μοι πάντα, τοῖς δὲ σιτίοις  
 χάριν οὐδεμίαν οἶδ' ἔσθλιων. ἔστυκα γάρ.

There is no need to say that this passage both linguistically and stylistically has not any tragic colour whatsoever.

1. Rau (p. 113) refers *τεχνάζειν* to Euripides, whereas *πάσχειν* with Agathon.  
 2. Cf. Rau, 153ff.



Finally, in the *Βάτραχοι* 184, Dionysus salutes Charon with a verse from Achaëus' satyr play *Αἴθων σατυρικός*, (fr. 11):

χαῖρ' ὦ Χάρων, χαῖρ' ὦ Χάρων, χαῖρ' ὦ Χάρων.

The mutual influence between the two dramatic genres, of comedy and satyr drama, is even more striking, in the case when comedies have a satyric chorus. Known comedies titled *Σάτυροι* were written by the comic poets Ephantides, Cratinus, Callias and Phrynichus<sup>1</sup>. It is probable that other comedies, the title of which does not suggest the presence of a satyric chorus, had also a satyric chorus. This view can be supported e.g. by Cratinus' *Διονυσαλέξανδρος*, where, according to the hypothesis preserved by the papyrus fragment<sup>2</sup>, the chorus of satyrs escorts Dionysus. As far as we can deduce from the hypothesis, in this play comic and satyric elements coexist. The mythological background, the presence of Dionysus and of the satyrs, the satyrs' devotion to Dionysus, the "hunting" of a woman, are all satyric elements. It is probable that Cratinus in this play has exploited dramatically Sophocles' satyric plays *Κρίσις* and *Ἑλένης γάμος*<sup>3</sup>. The mythological parody, the political satire of Pericles, the parabasis where the chorus leader speaks to the audience about the adoption, and the disguise are all comic motifs.

Noteworthy is the original reversal of well-known traditional roles and motifs by Cratinus. Here it is not Paris the judge of the goddesses, but Dionysus; the presents promised by the goddesses are a firm tyranny (Hera), courage in war (Athena) and erotic charm (Aphrodite); the seducer of Helen is not Paris, but Dionysus; on the contrary, Paris is the one to arrest Dionysus and Helen and is prepared to give them over to the Achaeans, but the last moment he takes pity on Helen and decides to keep her for himself as his wife.

In the fourth century B.C., satyr drama is represented by the younger Astydamas' *Ἡρακλῆς* and *Ἑρμῆς*, by Dionysius' *Λιμός*, by Timocles' *Λυκοῦργος* (340 B.C.), *Φορκίδες* (339 B.C.) and the *Ἰκάριοι σάτυροι* and Python's *Ἀγὴν*, and from the third century B.C. we have Sositheus' satyr plays *Κρότος* and *Δάφνις ἢ Λιτυέρσης* and Lycophron's *Μενέδημος*. We should also note that along with the new productions old satyr plays

1. Cf. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, 136.

2. POxy 663, v. 41f *συνακολουθοῖσι* (sc. Διονύσῳ) *δ' οἱ σάτυροι παρακαλοῦντές τε καὶ οἶκ' ἄν προδώσειν αὐτὸν φάσκοντες*.

3. See also Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, 137.



are produced on stage. Furthermore, some comic poets of the Middle Comedy write comedies which suggest the existence of a satyr chorus, continuing the tradition, as for instance Ophelion who wrote a comedy titled *Σάτυροι* and Timocles who wrote *Σάτυροι* and *Δημοσάτυροι*. The careful examination of the satyr plays of this period<sup>1</sup> leads to the conclusion that now we have a new kind of satyr play. For the first time, a comic and not a tragic poet (Timocles) writes and produces satyr plays. The satyr play comes nearer and sometimes is identical in its content perhaps also in its form<sup>2</sup>, with Aristophanic comedy<sup>3</sup>. Personal attack and political satire, as we find it e.g. in Aristophanes' *Ἰππείς*, is now the thematic focal point of Python's *Ἀγήν*, this "σατυρικὸν δραμάτιον" which was produced in 324 B.C. at Ecbatana and ridiculed Arpalos, Alexander the Great's treasurer and his erotic adventures with the courtesan Pythonice<sup>4</sup>. A similar attack we find in an earlier satyr play, Timocles, *Ἰκάριοι σάτυροι*, as we can see from the surviving fragments<sup>5</sup>. Timocles is in all probability the creator of this new kind of satyr play<sup>6</sup>. In the same category with the *Ἰκάριοι σάτυροι* and the *Ἀγήν* belongs also Lycophron's satyr play *Μηνέδημος*<sup>7</sup>, where the cynic philosopher Menedemos is ridiculed<sup>8</sup> — similar to Aristophanes' attack on Socrates in the *Νεφέλαι*.

1. This I have done but it has not yet been published.

2. A fragment from Astydamos' *Ἡρακλῆς σατυρικός* is similar both in metre and content with corresponding parts of Old comedy. Cf. the parabasis in Cratinus' *Διονυσάλεξανδρος*.

3. Cf. Seidensticker, in *Das griechische Drama*, 229.

4. See Guggisberg, p. 140; Seidensticker, *Das Satyrspiel*, p. 229; Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, pp. 75-81; Schiassi G., Sul dramma satiresco Agen, *Dioniso* 21, 1958, 83-94. For a discussion see B. Snell, *Scenes from Greek Drama*, Berkley and Los Angeles 1964, 99-138 "A unique satyr drama; Python's *Agen*: structure and dating" and "Python's *Agen*: sources, political slant".

5. See Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, 83-85; Seidensticker, p. 228; Constantinides E., Timokles' *Ikarioi Satyroi*. A reconsideration, *TAPA* 100, 1969, 49-61.

6. Cf. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, 85.

7. See Stephen V., De Lycophronis Menedemo, in: *Charismata T. Sinko*, Warsaw 1951, 331-337; Guggisberg, p. 141; Seidensticker, p. 130; and Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, 81 f.

8. In fr. 4 from an unknown satyr play by Sositheos we see that the philosopher Cleanthes is satirised. However, we do not know whether this was the thematic centre of the play. Sutton includes in the same category Astydamos' *Ἡρακλῆς σατυρικός*, but this is quite uncertain.

