Daniela Toševa-Nikolovska
Faculty of Philosophy
Ss. Cyril and Methodius
University in Skopje

SATYR-PLAY: TRAGEDY AT PLAY
OR MOCKERY DRAMA?

1. THE PURPOSE OF THE SATYR-PLAY

The most discussed matter concerning satyr-play is its purpose. Aristotle explicitly says that the purpose of tragedy, or the tragic effect, is achieving an emotion of *pity and terror* (*ἔλεος καὶ φόβος*)[1]. Satyr-play, albeit structurally connected to tragedy as part of the tragic tetralogy, has the same purpose as the opposite genre to tragedy – comedy, namely its purpose is *the laughable* (*τὸ γελοῖον*). The subject of comedy is therefore *τὰ γελοῖα* which is antithesis to *τὰ φοβερὰ καὶ τὰ ἐλεεινά* – the subject of tragedy. For the purpose of satyr-play loc. cit. classicus is Demetrius (*De eloc.* 169):

> Καὶ ἐκ τόπου, ἔνθα μὲν γὰρ γέλωτος τέχναι καὶ χαρίτων, ἐν σατύρω καὶ ἐν κωμωδίαις. τραγωδία δὲ χάριτος μὲν παραλαμβάνει ἐν πολλοῖς, ὁ δὲ γέλως ἐχθρὸς τραγωδίας· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπινοήσειν ἄν τις τραγωδίαν παίζουσαν, ἐπεὶ σάτυρον γράψει ἀντὶ τραγωδίας.[2]

From this definition derives the second name of satyr-play – *τραγωδία παίζουσα,* or *tragedy at play*. This name points out that satyr-play is some hybrid between tragedy and comedy, because it has the same purpose as comedy, but its plot and structure are connected to tragedy. It means that satyr-play's generic markers are derived from the combination of tragic and comic generic

---

[1] Aristoteles, *Poet.* 1453b1–13.

[2] "Again, the provinces of the kinds do not coincide. There is, indeed, one place in which the arts of mirth and of charm are found together, in the satyric drama and in comedy. It is different, however, with tragedy, which everywhere welcomes elegances, but finds in mirth a sworn foe. A man could hardly conceive the idea of composing a sportive tragedy; if he did so, he would be writing a satyric play rather than a tragedy." (trans. W. R. Roberts, Demetrius, *On Style*: *The Greek Text of Demetrius "De Elocutione"*, edited after the Paris Manuscript, Cambridge University Press 2011 [First published 1902]).

markers. At any rate, these are only assumptions, based on external characteristics. The purpose of satyr-play can be understood the best if we investigate its qualitative components, comparing them to the qualitative components of tragedy, comedy, and dithyramb where necessary. In this way satyr-play's generic markers could be easily distinguished.

1.1. PLOT AND CHARACTERS

The structural connection of satyr-play and tragedy contributes to the similar choice of themes, which are taken from the myth. Aeschylus, who was considered as a master of the satyr-play according to the ancient writers[3], is the only one who structured his tetralogies around the same theme; the other tragic playwrights did not use this method. The myth as a subject-matter in Greek literature is not a novelty, but has a long tradition before it became the subject-matter of the dramatic genres. In dithyramb, tragedy and satyr-play it is the only theme for elaboration,[4] whereas in comedy the myth as a subject-matter represents a choice of the comic playwright. However, there is a substantial difference between all three dramatic genres, concerning the choice of the myth and its adaptation into dramatic form. In tragedy, the mythical plots have tragic contents, and that is why the episodes from *Iliad* are more often exploited; the episodes from *Odyssey,* on the other hand, are more often exploited in satyr-plays and comedies, because *Odyssey* ends with a double scheme, i.e. happy ending, which means that the story ends well for the good and badly for the bad.[5] Nonetheless, the comic effect, or the laughable, cannot be achieved only by performing such stories with double scheme; this could be confirmed from Euripides' pro-satyric plays, which have happy endings, but do not arouse laughter.[6] The laughable in satyr-play is partly achieved by the presence and the actions of the satyrs and their father Silenus, who are embodiment of basic instincts. They might be defined as people with equine characte-

---

[3] Pausanias, *Graec. desc.* 2.13.6–7; Diogenes Laert. *Vit. phil.* 2.133.

[4] There are some exceptions from the rule: Phrinychus' tragedies *The Destruction of Miletus* and *Phoinissiae,* and Aeschylus' tragedy *Persians* are based on stories taken from historical events; Agathon, on the other hand, is the only playwright who wrote tragedy, named *Antheus*, based on a fictional story and characters (Aristoteles, *Poet.* 1451b21).

[5] Aristoteles, *Poet.* 1453a30–39.

[6] *Alcestis* is the only pro-satyric play (=performed instead of a satyr-play) according to ancient testimony. However, there are some indications that *Helen* and *Iphigeneia in Tauris* are pro-satyric plays as well.

ristics, whose main aims are sex, drinking wine, and revelry.[7] These qualities are in opposition with those of the heroes or the gods, who are dramatic personae in the same satyr-play and are represented in the same dignified manner as in the preceding tragedies. This dichotomy is indeed arousing laughter.

The most common mythological characters in satyr-play are those who are at the same time convenient for comic elaboration: Dionysus, Heracles, Hermes, Odysseus, Sisyphus, Autolycus (the last four are famous conmen in Greek mythology). They are well known as comic characters from mythological travesties. The difference between satyr-play and comedy, concerning the elaboration of mythological themes and characters, consists in the following: 1) There is no twisting of the traditional story in satyr-play; rather it is taken as it is (usually a cheerful story, located on some exotic place, away from the civilization, which is in accordance with the uncivilized satyrs). The satyrs and their father, Silenus, are integrated in the chosen story, in which they don't have legitimate place. 2) The dramatic personae in satyr-play are not objects of mockery because of their excessive qualities, but their dignity is causing laughter when it is put in relation with the lustful satyrs, and in a location which is far away from the civilization. In some satyr-plays, however, there are moments when the excessive qualities of the hero are hinted, such as the famous gluttony of Heracles, the cleverness of Odysseus, which dissents with the ideal of heroism, Hermes' association with theft (cf. Sophocles' *Ichneutae*), Dionysus' feminine apparition (cf. Aeschylus *Theoroi* fr. 78a.65–71) and cowardice. In comedy these qualities of the characters are object of mockery, devices for achieving comic effect. In satyr-play the same qualities of the heroes are not exploited for achieving laughter by themselves, but in relation with the satyrs. "Political attack, social satire, critical caricature are not the business of classical satyr-play. Its tone is not biting and hurtful but light-hearted and cheerful; mocking, but not derisive. The corollary is that the term "parody" should not be used in reference to satyr-play. As far as we can see, satyr-play does not aim at a distorting parody of familiar myth; rather, it selects cheerful or at least unproblematic subjects or dramatizes a happy episode from the life of one of the tragic heroes."[8]

(1) The best example for adapting a famous episode from epic poetry into satyr-play is Euripides' *Cyclops*. The contents of

---

[7] The revel nature of the Satyrs is in common with the comastic nature of the comedy.

[8] B. Seidensticker, "Dithyramb, Comedy, and Satyr-Play," *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Justina Gregory (ed.), Blackwell Publishing, pp. 38–54, 2005, p. 47.

this play are taken from *Odyssey* 9th: "Odysseus and the Cyclops Polyphemus". The hero in this drama is Odysseus, who arrives in Sicily with his comrades. The story is changed slightly, according to the conventions. This implies that the narrated parts in the epic must be acted in the drama, and according to the standards of the classical theatre, the action must take place outdoors. Therefore the happenings in the cave are narrated, and the action is placed in front of the cave, which is different from the epic. The presence of the satyrs is another reason for slight changes of the original story, but not for travesty of the story. This accommodation is announced at the beginning of the play, in the prologue, which is spoken by Silenus. Silenus informs the audience that Dionysus was abducted by Tyrrhenian pirates (cf. Homeric hymn to Dionysus), and for that reason he and his sons, the satyrs, took voyage overseas to look for their master Dionysus. Because of a storm they were driven on the island of Sicily, where they are at the present time in captivity of the Cyclops Polyphemus. This is a very common motif in satyr-plays: the satyrs are captivated by some kind of ogre and are deprived from their usual activities (revelry and dancing), but at the end of the play they are liberated by a hero (*Cyclops, Bousiris*), or are forced to accomplish a mission in order to regain their freedom (*Ichneutae*). In the satyr-plays *Theoroi* or *Isthmiastae* of Aeschylus and *Ichneutae* of Sophocles, the satyrs are in captivity of Dionysus himself. Anyhow, at the end they return to their usual activities, staying in service (δουλεία) of Dionysus. In *Cyclops* the laughter is caused by the cowardice of the satyrs and their lustful nature, which are opposed to the unorthodox heroic actions of Odysseus, because Odysseus is using deceit in order to accomplish his purpose. The same episode is a subject-matter in the comedy *Cyclops* of Epicharmus, from which only three fragments are preserved, consisting of one verse. These fragments show culinary elements, but reconstruction of the story cannot be made. The preserved fragments of Cratinus' comedy *Odysseis,* which was performed before Euripides *Cyclops,* give us some clarification how this episode from the epic was elaborated in comedy and what is the difference with satyr-play. Cratinus uses one usual element for comedy: changing of the scenery (cf. Aristophanes *Frogs, Birds, Peace,* Eupolis *Demoi*). The play opens on sea; Odysseus with his comrades, the Odysseis, who represent the chorus, are onboard (encyclema) but there is a storm which enforces them to anchor (in Sicily?). The action is afterwards dislocated in front of the cave of the Cyclops. In Cratinus' play there is travesty of the myth on many levels. First, the Cyclops in *Odyssey* is presented as a monster, who eats people uncooked, after he kills them in a very cruel manner (*Odyssey* 9. 287–97). Some fragments from *Odysseis*, on the other hand, show that the Cyclops is not an uncivilized monster, but a real gurman,

who prepares different kinds of sauces, which are characteristic for fish. He tries to cook the Odysseis using various methods: frying them (φρύξας), boiling them in pot (ἑψήσας), and co-oking them on sticks (ὀπτήσας ἐπ᾽ ἀνθρακιᾶς) (fr. 150 K-A). Euripides' Cyclops is presented in a very similar way. By showing affinities towards culinary, the famous monster is degraded on a human level, and is presented as a contemporary of Cratinus or Euripides. Another twisting of the story in *Odysseis* is when the Cyclops at the beginning of the play mentions that he will be blinded by Odysseus, and he discusses this with Odysseus himself, not knowing that it is him. Odysseus lies to the Cyclops that he saw Odysseus on Paros, where he bought huge melon full of seeds (fr. 147 K-A). The answer of Odysseus is typical for him even in epic: he pretends to be someone else, and tells that he saw Odysseus somewhere and that he talked to him.

The comic Odysseus is best attested in Epicharmus' comedy *Odysseus automolos,* which is an adaptation of *Iliad* 10th for comic purpose. First, Epicharmus travesties the story from the epic poem, in which Diomedes is sent in a spy mission at the Trojan camp, together with Odysseus. But the two of them never finish their mission, because of Odysseus' cowardice. Odysseus is presented as a real comic anti-hero, who turns out to be a coward; instead of going on a spy mission he goes in the Trojan camp as a deserter, and is treated as character with flaws, who gets beaten as well. This kind of travesty is not attested in the classical satyr-play.

(2) The famous association with thieves and theft of Hermes is shown in *Ichneutae* of Sophocles, where two important events happen: the birth of Hermes and the invention of the lyre. The satyrs do not have a legitimate place in the traditional story, which is attested in the Homeric hymn to Hermes. They are integrated in the story in order to find the stolen cattle of Apollo, hence the name *hounds* (ἰχνευταί) in the title of the play. In the middle of the play the satyrs discover that the theft was performed by the newly born god Hermes, in whose defend is acting the nymph Cyllene. However, Hermes is not an object of mockery in this play, as he is in the comedies (cf. Aristophanes *Peace*), but the laughter is based rather on the satyrs and their actions.

(3) Aeschylus's *Dictyoulci,* the satyrs are incorporated in the story about Danaë and Dyctis. The satyrs are trying to sexually harass Danaë, who they found in a chest with her baby Perseus. They pull the chest on the shores of Seriphus with a fishing net, hence the name *net-haulers* (δικτυουλκοί). The hero of this story is Dyctis, who saves Danaë and the baby Perseus, although it is unknown how the story ended for the satyrs.

(4) Heracles in satyr-play is always a hero who travels and happens to end up in places where a monster is dwelling, or he just solves the situation which the hosts are not able to solve by themselves, as it is shown in Euripides' *Alcestis*. The enormous courage of Heracles is accompanied by his enormous appetite. This appetite, at any rate, is not an object of mockery, but simply a manifestation of the hero's enormous powers. The same character in comedy becomes comic anti-hero because of the above mentioned qualities, and this is well attested in Epicharmus' comedy *Bousiris*[9] (fr. 18 K-A)*, as well as in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (passim), where Heracles' enormous appetite is presented as gluttony. It is known that Euripides also wrote a satyr-play *Bousiris,* but very little text is preserved in order to be assumed how Euripides adapted the traditional story. Anyhow, the story about Bousiris is amenable for satyric adaptation, because the king Bousiris, as it is well-known from the traditional story, is a typical monster, who sacrifices strangers. The satyrs were most probably in captivity of Bousiris, but Heracles comes and saves them by killing Bousiris. The saving of the satyrs is not the main purpose of the heroes, but it is rather a side effect, because they save the satyrs when they are trying to save themselves or someone else (Danaë). This is the model which is applicable in most satyr-plays.

The three classical tragic playwrights show different approach towards the mythical material, which they adapted in satyr-plays. In Aeschylus' and Sophocles' plays the satyrs have great part in the dramatic action and the plays are actually written for them; but in the satyr-plays of Euripides the satyrs have diminished role compared to those of the heroes. This could be explained as Euripides' mark, because he treats the same way the chorus in his tragedies. This conveys that he diminishes the role of the chorus so much that their songs have loose connection to the dramatic part. In this way Euripides deprives the satyr-play from its constitutive element – the chorus of satyrs – and this is especially apparent in his pro-satyric plays in which the chorus of satyrs is totally absent.

1.2. LANGUAGE AND IDEAS

It is generally accepted that the language of satyr-play is a hybrid between the language of tragedy and the language of comedy, which are two polarized languages. Eire[10], however, shows

---

[9] The story about Bousiris is a subject-matter in many comic playwrights: Cratinus, Antiphanes, Cratinus Junior, Ephippus, Mnesimachus.

[10] A.L. Eire, "La lengua del drama satírico", *Minerva* 15, 2001, p. 47.

that the language of satyr-play has its own characteristics, which he demonstrates by comparing the language of satyr-play to the language of tragedy and comedy. He demonstrates that there are "4 linguistic criteria, which serve to differentiate the one language from the other: 1. The language of the satyr-play is more tolerant towards archaisms, homerisms, hapax legomena, rare words and words from other times, or generally towards other poetics forms, than the language of tragedy. 2. The language of satyr-play has many vulgarisms – a characteristic which is totally absent from the language of tragedy. 3. The percent of colloquialisms is much higher in the language of satyr-play than in the language of trage-dy. 4. There are some comic strategies in satyr-play, which are common in Aristophanic comedy, or political comedy, or ρχα α generally, such as 'verbal accumulation', and all this is completely distant and unusual for the language of tragedy". This dichotomy which causes incongruity and comic effect is demonstrable on two levels: first by the language of the satyrs, which is at the same time archaic and colloquial, full of exotic words, as well as with sexual insinuations, and some excretory jokes, which make the language of satyr-play closer to the 5th century comic language; on the second level this dichotomy appears when the language of the satyrs is opposed to the dignified and almost tragic language of the heroes, and causes comic effect as well. Sometimes the hero in satyr-play uses colloquial language because he finds himself in an unheroic ambient and situations, or he uses scatological or sexual language, which brings him closer to comedy. A reason for this kind of rationalizing are the two fragments of Aeschylus and Sophocles (which are very similar, so the assumption is that Sophocles imitated Aeschylus), in which Odysseus is complaining because someone threw a night-pot full of urine towards his head; the pot broke when it hit his head, and he was covered with an awful odor: Aeschylus fr. 180 *TGrF* (*Ostologoi*) ὅδ' ἔστιν, ὅς ποτ' ἀμφ' ἐμοὶ βέλος/ γελωτοποιόν, τὴν κάκοσμον οὐράνην,/ ἔρριψεν οὐδ' ἥμαρτε· περὶ δ' ἐμῷ κάρᾳ/ πληγεῖσ' ἐναυά-γησεν ὀστρακουμένη/ χωρὶς μυρηρῶν τευχέων πνέουσ' ἐμοί.[11]; Sophocles fr. 565 *TGrF* (*Syndeipnoi*) ἀλλ' ἀμφὶ θυμῷ τὴν κάκοσμον οὐράνην/ ἔρριψεν οὐδ' ἥμαρτε· περὶ δ' ἐμῷ κάρᾳ/ κατάγνυται τὸ τεῦχος οὐ μύρου πνέον·/ ἐδειματού-μην δ' οὐ φίλης ὀσμῆς ὕπο.[12] These are the only examples of

---

[11] "There is the man who once hurled at me (nor did he miss his aim) a mis-sile that caused them all to laugh, even the ill-smelling chamber-pot; crashed about my head, it was shivered into shards, breathing upon me an odour unlike that of unguent-jars." (trans. Smyth, 1922)

[12] "But in his anger he hurled at me the stinking chamber pot, nor did he miss; and the vessel, which did not smell of myrrh, broke about my head, and I was shocked by the unpleasing smell." (trans. Lloyd-Jones, 2003)

scatological language used by the heroes in satyr-play, but it doesn't mean that there weren't many. The language of the satyrs, on the other hand, is full of sexual insinuations, which are not as direct nor as vulgar as those in comedy, but they are in any case unattested in tragedy. Instead of the direct βινεῖν, which is often used in Old Comedy, the satyrs use metaphorical phrases when they talk about the adulteress Helen in *Cyclops* (διεκροτήσατ' (180), πολλοῖς ἥδεται γαμουμένη (181)) in order to show their sexual nature. Not only the satyrs, but Silenus as well, even though old, shows his sexual nature frequently (*Cyclops* 169-72), which is visualized with his erect phallus: ἵν' ἔστι **τουτί τ' ὀρθὸν ἐξανιστάναι / μαστοῦ** τε δραγμὸς καὶ παρεσκευασμένου / ψαῦσαι χεροῖν **λειμῶνος**, ὀρχηστύς θ' ἅμα / κακῶν τε λῆστις.[13]

There is one element that lacks in classical satyr-play, but is immanent in comedy and very important in achieving comic effect, namely mockery. Satyr-play in the 5th century is not a mockery genre, but genre with cheerful contents, in which metaphorical sexual language is used occasionally, as well as moderate excretory language, as the previous examples have shown. The language that is full of sexual contents and excretory functions is part of the shameful speech (αἰσχρολογία) in comedy, which is a device for achieving comic effect. Comedy, on the other hand, represents a mockery genre, which ridicules at least one of the four basic targets: 1) specific individuals; 2) religion; 3) social life and 4) cultural forms.[14] The first type of ridicule, known as ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν (making fun by name) or deridere ad personam, is generally ascribed to Old Comedy, which is based mostly on Aristophanes' comedies. If we examine the fragments of Aristophanes' rivals, as well as of the comic playwrights who are representatives of Middle and New Comedy, we come to a different conclusion: whether the author uses mocking individuals or not, depends on his style, not so much on the period in which he composes. For example, the comic playwright Crates (fl. 450-430) never used this device for achieving comic effect. This manner of writing was followed by many comic writers of that period, such as Pherecrates and Phrinychus, in whose fragments sometimes can be detected mocking individuals, but they are never politicians. Indeed, mocking individuals, especially politicians, doesn't end with Aristophanes, who, together with

---

[13] "in drink one can raise **this** to a stand, catch a handful of breast and look forward to stroking her boscage, there's dancing and forgetfulness of cares." (trans. Kovacs, 1994)

[14] The division is made by H. Denard ("Lost theatre and performance traditions in Greece and Italy" in M. McDonald, M. Walton. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*, Cambridge University Press, 2007, p. 140).

Eupolis and Cratinus, is typical representative of this kind of comedy. This comic routine continues in the 4th century, although not with such frequency and intensity; in the Menandrean comedy it is totally absent. It must be emphasized that mocking individuals in Old Comedy is mostly political, which means it is connected to the third target of ridiculing, whereas in the next century the mockery does not refer to politics and politicians, as much as it refers to the other targets. Making fun by name is replaced with presenting typical comic characters that possess some excessive qualities, which are in fact very similar with the characters from the mythological burlesques in the 5th century. The absence of ridiculing individuals and allusion to everyday events in satyr-play, on the other hand, doesn't show the choice of the author, but its generic marker: its distance from the civilization, which is shown as well by the location where the action of the satyr-play is happening.

1.3. THE MUSIC AND THE VISUAL ELEMENT IN SATYR-PLAY

All four poetic forms, which were performed at the Dionysia festival in Athens, had choruses that danced and sang songs accompanied by aulos, i.e. they were highly depending on the visual and the musical element. This similarity is the basis for the differences between these poetic forms, and it refers to: the number of the choreuts, the type of the dances, the type of the songs, and the appearance of the choreuts. The dithyrambic chorus consisted of 50 choreuts, because it represented a hymn in honor of Dionysus, and it was based mostly on the song element. The chorus in tragedy and satyr-play had logically the same number of chorus members, because the same actors and the same chorus members performed in the tragic trilogy and in the satyr-play that followed. This means that the chorus in tragedy and satyr-play consisted of 15 members after Sophocles raised that number, which previously numbered 12 members. The comedy, on the other hand, had chorus of 24 members. The chorus members in dithyramb were dressed in luxurious outfit, which was in accordance to their luxurious even baroque language, but the chorus members in tragedy and comedy were dressed according to the needs of the story. Indeed, they always represent a different group. Satyr-play in this manner shows greater stability, because the chorus is always consisted of satyrs, who are always dressed in short chiton over the theatrical body, which represents nudity, with equine tail and erect phallus. The mask of the scenic satyr shows ugly face with bald head, snub nose, long black beard, and pointing ears, which are very similar to horse ears. Silenus is dressed in white fur, instead of the-

atrical body, and his mask presents him as older, namely with white hair and beard, and face features of an older man.[15]

Besides the difference which refers to the masking and to the number of choreuts, every dramatic genre had its own dances, which were appropriate to the genre, albeit tragic and satyric dances were performed in comedy in order to parody them. The ancient writer Ammonius gives an explanation about the dances and the music in ancient drama: καλεῖται δὲ ἡ μὲν τραγικὴ ὄρχεσις ἐμμέλεια, σίκινις δὲ ἡ σατυρική, κόρδαξ δὲ ἡ κωμική.[16] But, except for the name of the dances, nothing further is known about them: how they were performed, or to what kind of music they were performed. This ignorance about the dances and the music deprives all the poetic genres from their essentiality. It is probable that every dance had its own music and choreography, which gave the performance its wholeness.

The ancient writer Vitruvius (*De arch.* 5.6.9.) gives a description of the scenic surroundings in the different dramatic genres, which corresponds to the contents and the location of the three dramatic genres:

> genera autem sunt scaenarum tria: unum quod dicitur tragicum, alterum comicum, tertium satyricum. horum autem ornatus sunt inter se dissimili disparique ratione, quod tragicae deformantur columnis et fastigiis et signis reliquisque regalibus rebus; comicae autem aedificiorum privatorum et maenianorum habent speciem prospectusque fenestris dispositos imitatione, communium aedificiorum rationibus; satyricae vero ornantur arboribus, speluncis, montibus reliquisque agrestibus rebus in topeodis speciem deformati.[17]

What Vitruvius gives as a description of the comic scene is based on New Comedy, which was performed in Hellenistic theatres, i.e. theatres with different architecture from the classical theatres. However, the description of the scene in tragedy and satyr-play corresponds to the stories that were performed in the classical period, when these two dramatic genres were at their peak.

---

[15] The look of the scenic satyrs can be observed carefully on the famous Pronomos vase (ARV2, 1336, 1; FR, pls. 143–144, Naples, Museo Archaelogico Nazionale).

[16] Ammonius Gramm. *De adfinium vocabulorum differentia*, 275, 3–4: "the tragic dance is called emmeleia, the satyric sikinis, and the comic cordax. " (trans. D. Toševa-Nikolovska)

[17] "There are three styles of scenery: one which is called tragic; a second, comic; the third, satyric. Now the subjects of these differ severally one from another. The tragic are designed with columns, pediments and statues and other royal surroundings; the comic have the appearance of private buildings and balconies and projections with windows made to imitate reality, after the fashion of ordinary buildings; the satyric settings are painted with trees, caves, mountains and other country features, designed to imitate landscape." (trans. Granger, 1995)

***

The examination of the qualitative elements in satyr-play shows that satyr-play is not a hybrid, invented dramatic genre, which possesses the characteristics of tragedy and the comedy, but it is an original dramatic genre. Its purpose is not a simple comic relief after the tragic trilogy, but intensification and key point in the tetralogy performed in honor of Dionysus. Because of the later institutionalization of comedy, the Dionysia festival had need of importing comastic contents with rural characteristics, as is the Dionysian cult. That is why the simple satyric dances and songs were transformed into an elaborate literature genre, which found its place in the tragic tetralogy.

2. FROM TRAGEDY AT PLAY TO MOCKERY DRAMA

Around the 340s B.C. satyr-play ceased to be a part from the tragic tetralogy and started to be performed as an independent dramatic piece, as the epigraphic evidence suggests. Authors of satyr-plays continued to be the tragic poets, except for the poet Timocles, who will be analyzed below. This independency of the satyr-play triggered many changes, which are related to the qualitative and the quantitative parts of satyr-play, as well as to the way in which the laughable was achieved. Satyr-play lost its generic markers and overtook the comic generic markers, not to ridicule them, only to achieve its purpose. This indicates that the laughable was no longer achieved by contrasting the incongruent elements, but by the novelties taken from comedy.

The traditional opinion is that satyr-play in the period of its independency took ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳιδεῖν and αἰσχρολογία from comedy. This means that from tragedy at play, satyr-play became mockery drama (δρᾶμα σκῶπτον), i.e. it became a mockery genre. In comedy this type of mockery was abandoned at the end of the fourth century. Besides these two main changes, satyr-play changed the way it communicated with the audience, namely it doesn't strive towards maintaining scenic illusion, but towards breaking it. This is something alien to classical tragedy and satyr-play. The structure of the satyr-play seems to have been following the trend set by Euripides in the 5th century. This trend is related to: the diminished role of the chorus in the dramatic action, bringing in elements from everyday life, interest towards less familiar myths or versions of the myth. Furthermore, satyr-play changed its location – it was no longer located in some exotic place, far from the civilization, moreover it became an urban drama, like comedy and mime.

Nevertheless, with careful investigation of the fragments from the 4th and the 3rd century B.C., it can be concluded that this general impression is based on certain plays such as: *Agen* by Python, *Menedemus* by Lycophron, *Icarioi Satyroi* by Timocles, *Daphnis* or *Lityerses* by Sositheus, and *Heracles* by Astydamas Junior.

2.1. MOCKERY

The first impression, that satyr-play satirizes political figures, is mostly generated from Python's satyr-play *Agen,* of which 18 verses are preserved in a single fragment (fr. 1 *TGrF*). Information about the play gives Athenaeus[18], who names the play σατυρικὸν δράματιον (little satyr-play), which indicates that it was short in length. Athenaeus also says that *Agen* was written by Python from Catania or Byzantium[19] or that it was written by the king Alexander. It was performed on the banks of the river Hydaspes, where the Dionysia were celebrated. Except in Athenaeus this play is not mentioned in other ancient writers:

> **1.** ἔστιν δ' ὅπου μὲν ὁ κάλαμος πέφυχ' ὅδε
> †φέτωμ' ἄορνον,[20] οὐξ ἀριστερᾶς δ' ὅδε
> πόρνης ὁ κλεινὸς ναός, ὃν δὴ Παλλίδης
> τεύξας κατέγνω διὰ τὸ πρᾶγμ' αὑτοῦ φυγήν.
> ἐνταῦθα δὴ τῶν βαρβάρων τινὲς μάγοι
> ὁρῶντες αὐτὸν παγκάκως διακείμενον
> ἔπεισαν ὡς ἄξουσι τὴν ψυχὴν ἄνω
> τὴν Πυθιονίκης ...
> ... ἐκμαθεῖν δέ σου ποθῶ
> μακρὰν ἀποικῶν κεῖθεν, Ἀτθίδα χθόνα
> τίνες τύχαι †καλοῦσιν ἢ πράττουσι τί.
> {Β} ὅτε μὲν ἔφασκον δοῦλον ἐκτῆσθαι βίον,
> ἱκανὸν ἐδείπνουν· νῦν δὲ τὸν χέδροπα μόνον
> καὶ τὸν μάραθον ἔσθουσι, πυροὺς δ' οὐ μάλα.
> {Α} καὶ μὴν ἀκούω μυριάδας τὸν Ἅρπαλον
> αὐτοῖσι τῶν Ἀγῆνος οὐκ ἐλάττονας
> σίτου διαπέμψαι καὶ πολίτην γεγονέναι.
> {Β} Γλυκέρας ὁ σῖτος οὗτος ἦν, ἔσται δ' ἴσως
> αὐτοῖσιν ὀλέθρου κοὐχ ἑταίρας ἀρραβών[21]

---

[18] Athenaeus *Deipn*. 13.50.27.

[19] *Idem,* 13, 68, 15.

[20] The first word in this phrase is corrupted; the second word: ἄορνον (without birds), however, is attested in Sophocles as ἄορνος λίμνη ("birdless lake"), on which coasts, as Pausanias says (*Graec. descr.* 9.30.6.), there was a νεκρομαντεῖον ("oracle of the dead"), from where the soul of Eurydice was taken out. According to this, the phrase can be translated as 'the entrance of the underworld'.

Albeit it is said that satyr-play generally had undergone a lot of changes in this period, one thing is certain: there was a chorus of satyrs. It is probable that the chorus in this play was composed of barbarian priests (μάγοι), who were mentioned in line 5; they were supposed to bring back the soul of Pythionice from Hades. The humor in this attempt of the *satyroi/magoi* to bring back the soul of Pythionice would be based on sexual insinuations; first because of their lustful nature, second because Pythionice is defined as a whore (πόρνη). The language in this fragment indicates greater colloquialism than the language of the 5th century satyr-play; for example the colloquial πόρνη is used, instead of the phrase used by Euripides in the above cited verses from *Cyclops,* where the promiscuous Helen is described as πολλοῖς ἥδεται γαμουμένη. In addition to the colloquial language, there is a tragic language, parodied in the first few lines. These lines belong to the prologues of Sophocles' plays *Electra* and *Orestes.* The only metaphor being used here is the word-play: Παλλίδης instead of Φαλλίδης (son of phallus)[22] which refers to Harpalus, according to his nature: he is obsessed by whores. But, this metaphorical expression doesn't seem to be very important, because couple of lines further Pythionice, the dead lover of Harpalus, is named by her name, as well as Harpalus and Glycera, the actual lover of Harpalus. Only the name of the king remains Ἀγήν, for which Snell[23] thinks it is *nomen agentis* from ἄγω (=lead). Sutton[24] argues that Παλλίδης is not a pun for Φαλλίδης, but it is a derivative from Παλλὰς (Ἀθήνη). It is logical because his whereabouts are closely connected to the Athenians, whose goddess patron is Pallas Athene.

[21] "Here where the reeds are growing in an entrance to the underworld, and here to the left the famous harlot's temple which Pallides had built and has chosen as place of exile in atonement for his past affair [with her]. When some of the Persian μάγοι [magi] saw him lying there in distress, they persuaded him that they could conjure up the soul of Pythionike.

A: I should gladly hear from you, as I live far away from there, what conditions are like in the Attic country and how the people fare.

B: When they maintained they had won a life as slaves, they had enough to eat. Now they have only their pea mash and fennel to eat, but no wheat bread at all.

A: And yet I hear that Harpalos sent them over thousand of bushels of corn, no less than Agen once did, and that he has been made an honorary citizen.

B: This corn is a payment on account for Glykera. Perhaps it will be the earnest for their own destruction and not for the hetaera." (trans. Snell, 1967, p. 101)

[22] Snell, 1967, p. 104.

[23] *Ibidem*.

[24] D.F. Sutton, , "The satyr play", *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature,* Vol. I, Part 2. Greek Drama, P.E. Easterling, B.M.W. Knox (ed.), Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 94–102.

This involvement of the play with everyday events and people, necessarily leads to mocking persons by name, as well as to changing the subject of the satyr-play from exotic and unusual surroundings towards urban people and places. Although there are elements of urbanization in this play, such as the interest towards happenings at Athens, the ambient of the play is exotic – the action takes place in barbaric country, in Babylon. The mockery is directed to Harpalus and his lovers Pythionice and Glycera, as well as to the Athenian people, who got more wheat only because of one prostitute – Glycera. Because of her, Harpalus got Athenian citizenship. However, there is no aischrology in direct form in this fragment, as there is in Old Comedy. The giving of directions in the first couple of lines is very similar to the prologue speeches of New Comedy, which are usually spoken by some deity that doesn't have involvement in the dramatic action. This deity speaks directly to the audience, in order to explain what has happened and what is going to happen. There is no direct address to the audience in *Agen*, because the prologue is not preserved from the very beginning, and it couldn't be assumed whether there is breaking of the scenic illusion or the prologue is nicely incorporated in the body of the play as it is in *Cyclops*.

One cannot generalize according to this play that political figures were object of mockery in this period, because the conditions in which this play was performed were different from the mainstream. It is probable that the conditions didn't allow political satires to be written in Athens or in royal Alexandria. *Agen* by Python is only misleading that mocking political figures was trend in satyr-play, because the conditions in which this play was performed are the following: Alexander the Great on his expedition to the East, in order to bust the moral of his soldiers, organized different kinds of spectacles and feasts. He had various profiles of people in his companionship. This is an excellent example of privatization of the drama, which became especially popular in the following centuries. According to Snell[25] this play was performed in 326 B.C. in India, by the banks of the river Hydaspes, not in 324 in Persia, after Alexander's coming back from the East, as it is usually considered. Snell bases his allegations on the fact that Harpalus, who was mocked in the play, was already gone in 324, so the mockery wouldn't be that effective, whereas in 326, when Alexander was in India, this kind of mockery would have been more effective, because Harpalus was then assigned as a treasurer in Babylon. In this period happened the crowning of Glycera, for which Athenaeus gives some information.

There is another example that mockery became satyric generic marker, and that is Timocles. Timocles lived in the 4th cen-

---

[25] Snell, 1967, p. 117.

tury B.C. in Athens, and was active during the period of Middle
and New Comedy. Despite the explicit claim of Athenaeus that
Timocles the tragic playwright and Timocles the comic play-
wright is the same person[26], the fragments from the play *Icarioi*
(frr. 14-16 K-A) do not give grounds for this play to be identified
as satyric. Dana Sutton[27] is very firm in her attitude that Timo-
cles' *Icarioi* is a satyr-play, because it is common for the satyr-
plays on the inscriptions to have written after the title *ΣΑΤΥΡΟΙ*.
The comedies that are titled *Σάτυροι* do not have an alternative
title, i.e. do not have it as added to the title, but as their only title.
In Timocles' case *Σάτυροι* is added to *Ἰκάριοι,* and this is the
main argument of Sutton that this play is satyric. The only pro-
blem here is that *Icarioi* wasn't discovered as a title on inscripti-
on, but in Athenaeus. It is more likely that *Ἰκάριοι* is an adjective
of *Σάτυροι*, so the title could be read as a single syntagma: *Icari-
an Satyrs*. If, however, Sutton's claim is taken for granted, then
this satyr-play is preceding Python's *Agen;* so *Agen* wouldn't be
the first satyr-play in which famous politicians and people are be-
ing mocked, because in *Icarioi* Timocles speaks of the same Py-
thionice, only alive. This means that the play was written before
326. But the excretory humor, presented in such direct manner
(fr.16) as well as the sexual insinuations (fr. 14), remind us more
of Old and Middle Comedy, than of satyr-play, which in this peri-
od was occupied with satirizing, not with aischrology.

Icarians were people from the island of Icaria, whose main
occupation was fishing. The title is not given by accident, but, as
Athenaeus suggests, Pythionice had love affairs with Haerephilus'
sons, who were selling salt fish (ταρίχους). That's why in frag-
ment 14[28] her female associates are described as some kind of
fish, and Pythionice herself as enjoying eating fish. In fr. 15[29] is

---

[26] Athenaeus, *Deipn*. IX 407d.

[27] Sutton, 1974, p. 121, 1999, p. 102.

[28] 14. ἡ Πυθιονίκη δ' ἀσμένως σε δέξεται,
καί σου κατέδεται τυχὸν ἴσως ἃ νῦν ἔχεις
λαβὼν παρ' ἡμῶν δῶρ'· ἄπληστός ἐστι γάρ.
ὅμως δὲ δοῦναί σοι κέλευσον σαργάνας
αὐτήν· ταρίχους εὐπόρως γὰρ τυγχάνει
ἔχουσα καὶ σύνεστι σαπέρδαις δυσίν,
καὶ ταῦτ' ἀνάλτοις καὶ πλατυρρύγχοις τισίν.

"Pythionica will be glad to welcome you, and probably she will consume
all the gifts which you have taken from us. For she is insatiable. Nevertheless,
tell her to give you some baskets of food; for she happens to be rich in Smoked
Fish, and she's keeping company with two sea-crows, although they are unsal-
ted and have broad snouts." (trans. Gulick, 1961)

[29] 15. τόν τ' ἰχθυόρρουν ποταμὸν Ὑπερείδην περᾷς,
ὃς ἠπίαις φωναῖσιν ἔμφρονος λόγου

mentioned Hypereides (ca. 390–322 B.C.), who was a logographer from Athens. Hypereides was connected with the affair of the disappearing of Harpalus' money. Fragment 16[30], however, presents us with more names, which are unknown today, but they were probably Timocles' contemporaries, familiar to the audience.

The preserved fragments from the other comedies of Timocles suggest that he used political attack in most of his comedies, which was not so common for his contemporaries. He talks about Harpalus in the comedy *Delos* (fr. 4 К-А), where the name Harpalus is not preserved, but there are references to the affair of bribing, in which Demosthenes and later Hypereides suffered consequences. References towards other politicians of the day are present in frr. 7; 12; 19 (К-А). If *Icarioi* is a satyr-play, then it sounds illogical that Timocles wrote in the same manner his satyr-plays and his comedies.

2.2. BREAKING OF SCENIC ILLUSION

Breaking of scenic illusion is noticed in one fragment of the tragic playwright Astydamas Junior (4th century), who lived and worked in Athens before Timocles. Fr. 4 from the satyr-play *Heracles*[31] shows self-reference towards its own theatricity, because the poet gives direction how (satyr)drama should be composed:

κόμποις παφλάζων ἠπίοις πυκνώμασιν
πρὸς πανδυσας ἔχει,
μισθωτὸς ἄρδει πεδία τοῦ δεδωκότος.

"And so you will cross the Hypereides river, which teems with fish, and in tender tones, or spluttering noisy bombast of reasoned logic, with retraced arguments frequently repeated, is prepared to meet anything when he has loosed the bolts; and ready for hire, he waters the fields of the briber." (trans. Gulick, 1961)

[30] 16. ὥστ' ἔχειν οὐδὲν παρ' ἡμῖν· νυκτερεύσας δ' ἀθλίως
πρῶτα μὲν σκληρῶς καθεῦδον, εἶτα Θούδιππος βδέων
παντελῶς ἔπηξεν ἡμᾶς, εἶθ' ὁ λιμὸς ἥπτετο.
ἐφέρετο πρὸς Δίωνα τὸν διάπυρον· ἀλλὰ γὰρ
οὐδ' ἐκεῖνος οὐδὲν εἶχε. πρὸς δὲ τὸν χρηστὸν δραμὼν
Τηλέμαχον Ἀχαρνέα σωρόν τε κυάμων καταλαβὼν
ἁρπάσας τούτων ἐνέτραγον. ὁ δ' ὄνος ἡμᾶς ὡς ὁρᾷ,
(ὡσπερεὶ) Κηφισόδωρος περὶ τὸ βῆμ', ἐπέρδετο.

"Hence we had nothing in the house. Then I spent a miserable night trying to sleep first on a hard bed, and Thudippus completely suffocated us with his smells, and hunger gripped us as well. Then I rushed to the ardent Dion, but even he had nothing. I went then to the good Telemachus of Acharnae, and finding a heap of beans, I grabbed some and ate them up. But when the donkey saw us, like Cephisodorus on the platform, he left forth wind." (trans. Gulick, 1961)

[31] This play is named satyric in Athenaeus (*Deipn.* X 411a.)

ἀλλ' ὥσπερ δείπνου γλαφυροῦ ποικίλην εὐωχίαν / τὸν ποιητὴν δεῖ παρέχειν τοῖς θεαταῖς τὸν σοφόν, / ἵν' ἀπίῃ τις τοῦτο φαγὼν καὶ πιών, ὅπερ λαβών / χαίρει <τις>, καὶ σκευασία μὴ μί᾽ ᾖ τῆς μουσικῆς ...[32] This is the only evidence that breaking of scenic illusion was practiced in satyr-plays, but not that it was a common practice. This attitude towards illusion in satyr-play and tragedy in the 5th century is undocumented and unbelievable. In this passage the poet suggests how (satyr)drama should be made: the stories should be diverse, as well as the music composition, which implies that satyr-play was in a period of decadence.

2.3. URBANIZATION

The opinion that satyr-play became an urban genre is derived mostly from the satyr-play *Menedemus* by Lycophron. As the name indicates, in this play was mocked the philosopher Menedemus, whom Lycophron knew personally. A proof that the drama was satyric gives Athenaeus[33], as well as Diogenes Laertius[34] and the preserved fragments of the play in which the Silenus speaks. Lycophron was born around 330-325 B.C. in Chalcis, in Euboea, which dates his play much later than Python's *Agen*. He spent his early years in Chalcis, Athens, and Rhegium, writing and performing tragedies. In his early years he came in contact with Menedemus (who died soon after 278 B.C.) from Eretria, founder of the Eretrian or Neo-Megarian philosophical school. Menedemus was famous for his symposiums organized for poets and musicians. Lycophron went in Alexandria around 285-283, where he continued to write and produce tragedies, and worked as a scholar as well. The satyr-play *Menedemus* was probably written in this period.

Only three fragments are preserved from *Menedemus* (frr. 2-4 *TGrF*), written in colloquial language κοινή, which is characteristic for the Hellenistic period. In fr. 2[35] the Silenus addresses

---

[32] "Like the varied bounty of a reach dinner, such must be the fare provided by the clever poet for the spectators, so that each departs after getting his fill, having eaten and drunk again what he likes, and the entertainment is not one monotonous dish" (trans. Gulick, 1961)

[33] Athenaeus, *Deipn.* X 420b.

[34] Diog. Laert. *Vit. Phil.* II.140.

[35] 2. {ΣΙΛ.} παῖδες κρατίστου πατρὸς ἐξωλέστατοι,
ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμῖν, ὡς ὁρᾶτε, στρηνιῶ·
δεῖπνον γὰρ οὔτ' ἐν Καρίᾳ, μὰ τοὺς θεούς,
οὔτ' ἐν Ῥόδῳ τοιοῦτον οὔτ' ἐν Λυδίᾳ
κατέχω δεδειπνηκώς· Ἄπολλον, ὡς καλόν

his children (the satyrs), narrating them about a dinner party (hosted by Menedemus?) he attended to. The description of the dinner party is comic, because Menedemus has proved to be a cheap host, who offers conversation for desert (fr.3)[36], but it seems like people were very eager to be on his parties (fr.4)[37].

An exception from this trend of urbanization of the satyr-play and adopting the comic generic markers shows the tragic playwright Sositheus (280 B.C.), who was author of satyr-plays and tragedies, and probably originated from Alexandria. He was one of the tragic Pleiad as Lycophron. According to the epigram Dioscorides, Sositheus was a traditionalist, who returned the old themes in satyr-play, as they were first presented in Phlius. He was innovator as well, namely he experimented with the traditional genres (like Callimachus) rejecting the satyr-play which was adopted in the town according to the taste of Lycophron. Sositheus is actually the one that brings back the satyrs to their original surroundings and abandons the writing of 'urban' satyr-plays. This claim in the epigram is affirmed in the remaining fragments from the play *Daphnis* or *Lityerses* (frr. 2-3 *TGrF*):

2. τούτῳ Κελαιναὶ[38] πατρίς, ἀρχαία πόλις
Μίδου γέροντος, ὅστις ὦτ' ἔχων ὄνου
ἤνασσε καὶ νοῦν φωτὸς εὐήθους ἄγαν.
οὗτος δ' ἐκείνου παῖς παράπλαστος νόθος,

ἀλλὰ κυλίκιον
ὑδαρὲς ὁ παῖς περιῆγε τοῦ πεντωβόλου,
ἀτρέμα παρεξεστηκός· ὅ τ' ἀλιτήριος
καὶ δημόκοινος ἐπεχόρευε δαψιλής
θέρμος, πενήτων καὶ τρικλίνου συμπότης
"Cursed children of most excellent father, 1, as you see, wax riotous. For not in Caria, by the gods, nor in Rhodes, nor in Lydia, do I remember to have dined so well ! Apollo ! what a feast ! But the boy carried round a watery cup of five-obol wine, slightly turned; and the accursed hangrnan lupine danced on abundantly — the boon-companion of poor men and the dining-room" (trans. A.W. Mair, 1921)

[36] 3. ὡς ἐκ βραχείας δαιτὸς ἡ βαιὰ κύλιξ
αὐτοῖς κυκλεῖται πρὸς μέτρον, τράγημα δέ
ὁ σωφρονιστὴς πᾶσιν τοῖς φιληκόοις λόγος
"When after a scanty meal the little cup circles among them moderately and for desert the studious guests have improving conversation" (trans. A.W. Mair, 1921)

[37] 4. πολλάκις
συνόντας αὐτοὺς
ἐπὶ πλεῖον ὁ ὄρνις κατελάμβανε
τὴν ἔω καλῶν
<×– –×> τοῖσι δ' οὐδέπω κόρος
"[Many times, when they were dining together] Chanticleer, calling the dawn, surprised them still unsatisfied." (trans. A.W. Mair, 1921)

[38] Capital of Phrygia.

μητρὸς δ' ὁποίας ἡ τεκοῦσ' ἐπίσταται,
ἔσθει μὲν ἄρτους, τρεῖς ὅλους κανθηλίους,
τρὶς τῆς βραχείας ἡμέρας· πίνει δ', ἕνα
καλῶν μετρητήν, τὸν δεκάμφορον πίθον.
ἐργάζεται δ' ἐλαφρὰ πρὸς τὰ σιτία
ὄγμον θερίζων· τῇ μιᾷ δ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ
†δαίνυσί τ' ἔμπης συντίθησιν εἰς τέλος.
χὤταν τις ἔλθῃ ξεῖνος ἢ παρεξίῃ,
φαγεῖν τ' ἔδωκεν εὖ† κἀπεχόρτασεν
καὶ τοῦ ποτοῦ προὔτεινεν ὡς ἂν ἐν θέρει
πλέον· φθονεῖν γὰρ τοῖς θανουμένοις ὀκνεῖ.
ἐπιστατῶν †οἴδῃα Μαιάνδρου ῥοαῖς
καρπευμάτων ἀρδευτὰ δαψιλεῖ ποτῷ
τὸν ἀνδρομήκη πυρὸν ἠκονημένῃ
ἅρπῃ θερίζει· τὸν ξένον δὲ δράγματι
αὐτῷ κολούσας κρατὸς ὀρφανὸν φέρει
γελῶν θεριστὴν ὡς ἄνουν ἠρίστισεν
3. θανὼν μὲν οὖν Μαίανδρον ἐρρίφη ποδός
σόλος τις ὥσπερ {δίσκος}· ἦν δ' ὁ δισκεύσας ἀνήρ
†πυθιο· τίς γὰρ ἀνθ' Ἡρακλέους;[39]

The play is based on the following mythological story: Lityerses was a son of Midas, the king of Phrygia. He challenged people to compete with him in harvesting. To those who lost in the contest he chopped off their heads. Theocritus in the 10th Idyll dedicates a harvesting song to Demeter, which he calls it "A song to the divine Lityerses". Daphnis is incorporated in this story in such way that his loved one Pimpleia (or Thalia) was kidnapped by pirates and was brought to Lityerses in Phrygia. Daphnis looked for her in the whole world and at the end he found her at Lityerses'. He was confronted with a harvesting contest, and he would have died if it wasn't for Heracles, who participated in the harvesting contest instead of Daphnis. He won over Lityerses, and killed him eventually. Daphnis and Pimpleia were saved and reunited at the end of the play.

---

[39] **2.** His (Lityerses') fatherland is Celaenae, an ancient town of the old man Midas, who had donkey ears, and ruled with brilliance and a mind of a simpleton. He (Lityerses) is a bastard son of Midas, but who is the mother, knows only the one that gave birth to him. He eats so much bread as three donkeys' freight, three times in one brief day. His measure for wine is a ten-amphora cask, which he drinks in a single draught. He works with easiness around the corn, reaping swathe; in one day he gives a feast and also finishes his work. When a stranger comes around or passes through, he gives him to eat well and supplies him with provender and offers him to drink as in summer or even more. It's because he hesitates to envy the ones that are going to die. Being in charge with the fields swollen from the waters of the river Maeander, and full of corn because of the water, he reaps his corn tall as a man, with a sharp sickle. He cuts of the stranger's head, who is covered with stalks of corn, and then he feasts and laughs as a mindless beast. **3.** When he died, he was thrown in the river Maeander, like a disc with foot. You might wonder who the man that threw him was. None else than Heracles. (trans. D. Toševa-Nikolovska)

Lityerses is presented as a gluttonous beast, very much like Polyphemus in Euridipes' *Cyclops*. There is no mocking of individuals or breaking of scenic illusion. The location of the play is exotic: in the fields of Phrygia, and the civilization is far away. A hero shows up, who saves Daphnis and his loved one; the satyrs were probably in captivity of Lityerses, but were rescued by the hero (cf. Odysseus the hero in *Cyclops*). Nevertheless, Sositheus is a real Hellenistic poet because he shows interest in opscure myths, in which love is the main agent, and bucolic motifs are present as well. *Lityerses* could be named love drama without mistake, which, on the other hand, makes it closer to New Comedy; but this is generally a tendency in the Hellenistic period. Fr. 1 most likely belongs to the prologue, as it is very similar to the prologue of *Cyclops,* where the Silenus describes the horrifying Cyclops Polyphemus. In this satyr-play there are no elements which are not inherent to the satyr-play, and this is due to the puritan aspirations of Sositheus to renew the classical satyr-play.

3. CONCLUSION

Satyr-play as well as the other Dionysiac literature genres, had acquired significant changes in its plot and structure, which had started in the 5th century B.C. The changes that happened before the satyr-play had achieved its independent performance (340 B.C.) indicate that under the influence of comedy, which became the dominant dramatic genre in the 4th century and afterwards, satyr-play became a mockery genre. The shameful speech became also part of the satyric language, and that is a commonly accepted opinion, which is based on the previously cited fragments. This opinion is based mostly on the fragments of *Agen,* which was written in different conditions – on the expedition of Alexander the Great, as well as on *Icarioi,* which most likely is not a satyr-play.

If the fragments are examined in their context, then a different conclusion occurs about the changes that happened in satyr-play. There are elements in later satyr-plays that are characteristic for the mockery genres. However, satyr-play doesn't adopt them and make them its own generic markers, but occasionally uses them. Even the attitude that satyr-play was urbanized, is based on the fragments of the play *Menedemeus,* while the titles of the satyr-plays written in this period and later suggest that the stories were taken from the myth.[40] Actually, that the urbanization of the

---

[40] Timesitheus' *Heracles*; Timocles' (4th c. B.C.) *Lycourgus*; Chaeremon' (4th c. B.C.) *Dionysus, Io, Centaurus*; Dionysius' (4th c. B.C.) *Adonis*; Theodo-

satyr-play was just a trend set by Lycophron (and it is unknown whether he had followers in this style of writing), shows the above mentioned citation from Vitruvius, who declares the characteristics of the satyr-play such as they were in the most documented period, namely the 5th century.

The most important thing about the satyr-play is that it started and ended as a Greek product; there are no testimonies for Roman satyr-play, although there was some kind of mixing of genres – a dramatic forms in which satyrs were presented. The presence of the satyrs doesn't make the play satyric, and this refers as well to the comedies which are titled *Satyroi,* because they do not possess satyric generic markers. The satyrs are involved in the comic story only to act and speak in a comic manner. Satyr-play, as well as comedy and tragedy, had undergone many changes, which were conditioned by the different location where it was performed. In the period of Hellenism Athens was no longer the leading place for performing plays; the center of the drama was dislocated gradually. There were drama festivals at Delos, in royal Alexandria, in Magna Graecia, where they were liberated from the model set in Athens in the 5th century. In Alexandria the plays of the Pleiad poets were performed at the festival Ptolemaica, established by Ptolemaeus Philadelphus in honor of his father. This freedom had triggered experimenting with many genres, meters and linguistic forms.

ABBREVIATIONS

De arch.	Vitruvius, *On Architecture*, ed. from the Harleian Manuscript 2767 and translated into English by Frank Granger,vol. I, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1955.
De eloc.	Demetrije, *Περὶ ἑρμηνείας: O stilu*, prijevod s grčkoga, predgovor i bijeleške uz prijevod Marina Bricko,ArTresor Naklada, Zagreb, 1999.
Deip.	Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists*, with an English translation by Charles Burton Gulick in seven volumes,vol. IV, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961 (first published 1930).
Graec. descr.	*Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*, F. Spiro (ed.), 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1903 (repr. Stuttgart: 1:1967).
K-A	R. Kassel, and C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci,* vols. i – viii, Berlin, 1983- .

rus' (2nd c. B.C.) *Sacrificer;* Polemaeus' (1st c. B.C.) *Ajax;* Harmodius' (1st c. B.C.) *Protesilaeus;* Theudotus' (1st c. B.C.) *Palamedes*.

Poet.	*Aristotelis de arte poetica liber,* R. Kassel (ed.), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965 (repr. 1968 [of 1966 corr. edn.]).
TGrF	*Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta,* vol. 1, B. Snell (ed.), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
Vit. phil.	*Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum,* H.S. Long (ed.), 2 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964 (repr. 1966).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aeschylus, H. W. Smyth (ed. et trans.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1922.

Ammonius Gramm., *Ammonii qui dicitur liber de adfinium vocabulorum differentia,* K. Nickau (ed.), Leipzig: Teubner 1966.

Aristotel, *O pjesničkom umjeću,* prijevod i objašnjenja Zdeslav Dukat, August Cesarec, Zagreb 1983.

Аристотел, *За поетиката,* (превод од старогрчки, белешки и коментари Михаил Д. Петрушевски) Македонска книга, Скопје 1979.

Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists*, with an English translation by Charles Burton Gulick in seven volumes, vol. IV, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961 (first published 1930).

Bakola, E., "Cratinus and the Satyr Play", *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy,* Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 81–117.

Callimachus, Lycophron and Aratus, Callimachus and Lycophron with an English translation by A. W. Mair, Aratus with an English translation by G. R. Mair. London: New York 1921.

Cipolla, P., "De Euripideo Cyclope cum Iovis tontribus certante," *Eikasmos* XV, 2004, pp. 59–68.

Demetrius, *On Style*: *The Greek Text of Demetrius "De Elocutione"*, edited After the Paris Manuscript, trans. W. R. Roberts, Cambridge University Press 2011 (First published 1902).

Denard, H., "Lost theatre and performance traditions in Greece and Italy" in McDonald, M., Walton, M. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*, Cambridge University Press 2007, pp. 139–160.

Eire, A.L., "La lengua del drama satírico", *Minerva* 15, 2001, pp. 137–160.

Euripides: Cyclops, Alcestis, Medea, D. Kovacs, (ed. et trans.), Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1994.

Euripides, *Cyclops,* translated by H. McHugh, with Introduction and Notes by David Konstan, Oxford University Press 2001.

Gontijo Aun, A.L., "*Diktyoulkoí* – um drama satírico de Ésquilo", *Nuntius Antiquus, Belo Horizonte,* n°4, 2009, pp. 82–91.

Gutzwiller, K., *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature,* Blackwell Publishing 2007.

Henderson, J., *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy,* Oxford University Press 1991, (first published by Yale University Press 1975).

Lesky, A., *Ιστορία της αρχαίας ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας,* Μετάφραση Αγαπητοού Γ. Τσοπανάκη, Εκδοτικός οίκος Αδελφών Κυριακίδη, Θεσσαλονίκη 1983.

Page, D. L. (ed.), *Greek Literary Papyri in Two Volumes*, vol. I, texts, translations and notes by D. L. Page, Cambridge, Harvard University Press 1942.

Seidensticker, B., "Dithyramb, Comedy, and Satyr-Play," in J. Gregory (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Tragedy,*Blackwell Publishing 2005, pp. 38–54.

Snell, B., *Scenes from Greek Drama,* University of California Press, Berkley and Los Angeles 1967.

Sophocles: Fragments, H. Lloyd-Jones (ed. et trans.), Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press 2003 [repr.].

Sommerstein, A.H., *Greek Drama and Dramatists*, London: rev. English version of *Theatron: Teatro Greco*, 2002 (Bari, 2000).

Storey, I. C., Allan, A., "The Satyr Play", *A Guide to Ancient Greek Drama.* Blackwell Publishing 2005, pp. 156–167.

Suidae lexicon, 4 vols., ed. A. Adler, [Lexicographi Graeci 1.1-1.4. Leipzig: Teubner, 1.1:1928; 1.2:1931; 1.3:1933; 1.4:1935. (repr. Stuttgart: 1.1:1971; 1.2:1967; 1.3:1967; 1.4:1971)]: 1.1:1-549; 1.2:1-740; 1.3:1-632; 1.4:1-854.

Sutton, D. F., "The satyr play", in P.E. Easterling, B.M.W. Knox (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature,* vol. I, part 2. "Greek Drama", Cambridge University Press 1999, pp. 94–102.

——— "A Handlist of Satyr Plays", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* Vol. 78, 1974.

———"Harpalus as Pallides", *RhM* 123, 1980.

Vitruvius, *On Architecture,* ed. from the Harleian Manuscript 2767 and translated into English by Frank Granger, vol. I. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, London.