Editors' Preface

1984 is the annus mirabilis of the modern study of satyr drama: it saw the magisterial Oxford text of Euripides by Diggle, which contains the Cyclops, and the first full-length commentary on the play by Seaford. The years that followed witnessed an explosion of interest in all aspects of satyr drama, leading to numerous articles¹ and books. The study of the fragmentary plays is deeply in debt to the volume edited by Krumeich, Pechstein, and Seidensticker (1999), with reference entries for all of the surviving fragments of satyr drama, combining text with German translation, potential artistic and historical links, as well as Nachleben. In its wake there has been a detailed survey of the themes, the plots and the function of satyr drama by Voelke (2001), a conference volume edited by Harrison (2005) investigating important aspects of the Cyclops and the fragments, as well as critical editions with commentaries of various fragmentary plays: the Euripidean by Pechstein (1998), and those of the minor poets by Cipolla (2003). The past decade started with the publication of another conference volume by Taplin and Wyles (2010), this time focusing on the famous Pronomos krater and other visual remains of the genre. There followed a monoghraph by Lämmle (2013) on the 'poetics' of the genre, and one by Shaw (2014) investigating the relationship of satyr drama with comedy, as well as a collection in a single volume of the Cyclops and the major fragments by O'Sullivan and Collard (2013), containing for each of them, text and English translation, brief notes and up-todate bibliography.

Antonopoulos and Christopoulos decided that the time was right for a volume that would bring together all of the many facets of satyr drama, a genre that spanned more than eight centuries and can be traced in multiple literary and artistic genres. In the end, and unusually, the volume was conceived first by Antonopoulos and Christopoulos and then funding allowed a conference (*Greek Satyr Play: Reconstructing a Dramatic Genre from its Remnants*, Patras, 2016),² in which the themes were further elaborated and researchers could discuss among themselves. This volume brings together twenty-five of the participants of that conference, to which nine other contributions have been sought from among scholars whose expertise in satyr drama made their inclusion desirable.

¹ Among them figure prominently a series of articles by Griffith, now gathered together by him in a single e-publication (2015).

² Of all of the good things to have come out of the conference, pride of place should go to the organization of the *THIASOS – The International Society of Greek Satyr Play*, a global network of satyr drama researchers, under the presidency of George W.M. Harrison, vice-presidency of Ralf Krumeich and direction of Andreas P. Antonopoulos.

Subsequent to the conference, Antonopoulos and Christopoulos asked Harrison to join as co-editor, responsible mainly for contributions on performance and artistic renditions of satyr drama.

This volume is the first collaboration on satyr drama written by experts in multiple fields, aiming at an increased coverage of the genre. Earlier studies, such as the one edited by Harrison (2005), or the recent work by Coo and Uhlig (2019) on the Aeschylean plays, have been entirely (or mostly) philological, or have centered on the artistic remains, such as the volume by Taplin and Wyles (2010). The contributions to this book are grouped by area of specialisation and are linked by chronology and theme, as far as is possible in such a wealthy and cross-supportive endeavour. All the major writers of satyr drama are represented – most significantly Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides – and their plays are referred to throughout the contributions to this volume, accessible easily through the *Index of Satyr Dramas*. The editors have aimed for a volume that is inclusive, illustrative, and thought-provoking. Space limitations make it impossible to be comprehensive of all the many aspects one might wished to have covered. We leave that to those we hope will be inspired by this collection.

The INTRODUCTION has been designed as a general survey of satyr drama, concentrating all basic information on the genre: evidence, origins and function, relationship to tragedy and comedy, history line of satyric performances (from the late sixth century BC down to the mid-second century AD), characters and costumes, scenic setting, typical themes, *et al*. In terms of utility there is a twofold aim in this: (a) to make beginners familiar with the least known dramatic genre and its conventions, (b) to provide a first reference manual for more experienced readers, who up to now had to resort to multiple bibliographical sources.

The main section of the volume is arranged thematically in six parts. PART I brings together four essays on the genre. PALMISCIANO surveys the origins and early development of satyr drama and its common roots with tragedy. The relationship with tragedy is further investigated by TOUYZ, who adduces new data on this topic from the evolution in the iconography of the satyrs. VOELKE explores the connections of satyr drama with dithyramb through the *anodos* theme, placing the two genres in their common cultic (Dionysiac) framework. Indicative of the various approaches for the theoretical interpretation of the genre is the final paper by SEAFORD; he studies the institution and the function of satyr drama in the Athens' City Dionysia through the old antithesis of the centre of the polis and the mountainous periphery.

Two key features of satyr drama as a dramatic/poetic genre, which set it apart from tragedy (written by the same poets) and comedy, are its production (covered in the Introduction) and its composition. PART II is devoted to the most visible

aspects of the composition, namely to language/style and to metre.³ SLENDERS' chapter is a survey on the use of colloquialisms, perhaps the most noted characteristic of the language of satyr drama, as distinct from that of tragedy. The next two papers combine language and style, approaching satyr drama from a sociolinguistic angle: CATRAMBONE examines communication strategies in the dialogues of satyr drama, focusing on forms of politeness/impoliteness, while REDONDO draws attention to occasions where an elevated language is used by the Satyrs. Moving to metre, JACKSON surveys the composition of the songs of satyr drama and the accompanying dancing movements of the satyric chorus.

Satyr drama is the least known of the three dramatic genres mainly because of its poor attestation. So, PART III focuses on the transmission of the text and its criticism. Many satyric fragments have come down to us through quotations by ancient authors, the topic of CIPOLLA's chapter. One of the main challenges with fragments is to distinguish whether they actually belong to satyr dramas or to tragedies, since they were both written by the same poets and in the sources they are often quoted by poet name only. Thus, CARARRA has developed a methodology, a set of criteria for determining the genre of unidentified fragments. In the same line, MECCARIELLO examines the transmission of the Euripidean satyr dramas, focusing on their titles and total number. The other main challenge with the satyric corpus is the restoration of the text and of the accompanying stage action. And this is true even for Euripides' Cyclops, the only complete satyr drama. With a set of notes on the Cyclops, ahead of his new edition and commentary, SEIDENSTICKER offers a demonstration of textual criticism and analysis. DIGGLE shows how deeply such analysis could go, by scrutinising and restoring a single puzzling passage from the same play.4

PART IV contains ten studies on individual plays. In addition to providing some general information on the plays, these studies focus and contribute new ideas on specific aspects of them. BIERL compares a famous satyric song by Pratinas, the pioneer of satyr drama, to Euripides' *Cyclops*, a play belonging to the mature phase of the genre, focusing on choral self-references by the Satyrs. SFYROERAS analyses the sacrificial theme in Euripides' *Cyclops*, arguing that its treatment in this play – and possibly in other satyr dramas too – was distinct from that of tragedy and of comedy, and perhaps constituted a satyric *topos*. O'SUL-LIVAN focuses on the concept of *philia* in the same play, demonstrating that it

³ Another important aspect of the composition, satyr drama's typical themes, is likewise covered in the Introduction; individual themes are also analysed in several chapters (for instance, the *anodos* in VOELKE and the *new techne* in ANTONOPOULOS).

⁴ Similar textual discussions on the fragmentary plays are also included in the contributions by SONNINNO and ANTONOPOULOS in Part IV.

played a central role in it. Moving to the fragmentary plays, CHARALABOPOU-LOS investigates satyric paidotrophia in Aeschylus' Diktyoulkoi, studying one of the most charming scenes with Silenos, the satyrs and baby Perseus. SONNINO'S chapter elucidates certain puzzling aspects of the stage action in Aeschylus' *Isthmiastai or Theoroi*. The next two contributions refer to Sophocles' *Ichneutai*. ANTONOPOULOS focuses on a crucial scene of the play, where the (silent) Satyrs' actions on stage can be restored with the aid of Silenos' comments on the strange behaviour of his sons; in addition, he demonstrates that these comments constitute a topos in the genre. CHRISTOPOULOS studies the invention of the lyre in this play; since the satyric theme of the heurema is already analysed in the Introduction, this paper is rather concerned with the details of the lyre's construction, comparing in this respect the *Ichneutai* with its Epic prototype, the *Homeric Hymn* to Hermes. The minor poets are represented by three chapters. UHLIG investigates satyric transvestism in Ion's Omphale. SLATER surveys the innovations of satyr drama in the fourth century BC through the fragments of Chaeremon and Astydamas. Finally, KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA studies fragmentary plays from Hellenistic playwrights, demonstrating how satyr drama engaged with new aesthetic trends, in order to increase its appeal as theatrical practices continued to develop and change.

The dynamic of a literary genre is perhaps best manifested by its influences on other genres. Thus, PART V deals with satyr drama's indirect tradition and its reception in antiquity. Given the scattered nature of the evidence across various genres and in different periods and, hence, the difficulty for an overall survey, this field is hereby investigated by three detailed case-studies. CHARAL-ABOPOULOS brings together and elucidates metatheatrical references to satyr drama (whether explicit or allusive) in the works of Plato. MICHELS traces the afterlife of satyric plots in the mythographic tradition, demonstrating the value of Pseudo-Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca*, in particular, for the reconstruction of fragmentary or lost satyr dramas. Finally, THOMAS draws attention to the use of satyr drama references by Aelius Aristides, Athenaeus and Lucian for the purpose of satirising Cynic philosophers.

The volume closes with an extensive PART VI covering the archaeological evidence. In addition to the textual remains of satyr drama, there is a huge corpus of relevant vase-paintings and other artifacts, as well as inscriptional records, which not only can help us with lost or poorly attested plays, but most importantly, they are absolutely necessary for us to get an overall picture of the genre and its history. This Part starts with an introductory survey of satyric iconography by KRUMEICH, who focuses on several Athenian and South Italian vase-paintings that can plausibly be connected to particular satyr dramas. With a focus on dancing and the prehistory of the genre, SMITH studies black-figure

vases produced across Archaic Greece; in these vases we recognise dancing figures of various types (Satyrs, komasts, et al.), who might have been involved in pre-dramatic performances. SHAW collects visual evidence from the Archaic down to the early Hellenistic period for a most surprising association of Satyrs with dolphins, which he traces back to the Dionysiac cultic choral dances, particularly the dithyramb; he argues that the dolphin-satyr-dithyramb correlation played a significant role in the development and the eventual decline of satyr drama. HEDREEN uses certain vases so as to investigate the concepts of love and marriage in satyr drama, within the wider framework of Dionysiac mythology and cult. PRITCHETT deals with the offshoots of satyric love, drawing attention to the portrayal of Satyr children in Athenian vase-painting, allowing us to follow their childhoods and see how their upbringing might contribute to their adult satyr behaviour. CARPENTER'S study of Apulian vases with Silenos opens up a new dimension, that of the influence of satyrs and satyr dramas in the imagination of the non-Greeks. The next two papers utilise archaeological evidence so as to map out the history of satyr drama during the late Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods. SKOTHEIM'S survey of the inscriptional records (an aspect virtually neglected in previous satyr drama volumes) elucidates these two periods, from which we have no textual remains; she demonstrates that satyr drama not only continued to be performed, but became so popular that it expanded to various festivals across the Greek world, lasting at least until the second century AD. The continuing popularity and performance of satyr drama well into the Roman Empire is also demonstrated by HARRISON, who surveys architectural and artistic evidence of satyrs in theatres and in theatre contexts.

This collaborative volume comes at a particularly welcome time since 2020 seems to be another *annus mirabilis* for the studies in satyr drama. A new (German) commentary on Euripides' *Cyclops* has been published by Seidensticker from De Gruyter; Hunter's and Lämmle's commentary is also out now from Cambridge; in addition, Aguirre and Buxton have published a more general investigation of cyclopes in literature and art. The editors regret that these appeared too late to be considered in this volume.

The architecture of the book was designed to probe for themes and connections within satyr drama and between satyr drama and other genres (especially dithyramb, tragedy and comedy), as also to identify and resolve, if possible, problems and controversies. In essence we have tried to answer the questions 'what is satyr drama' and 'what do we know of it'. The papers in this collection answer these questions in ways that are common to other genres too, as well as particular to satyr drama. In the process of addressing these questions, the editors had the pleasure to engage in fruitful discussions and exchange of views with the contributors (who have also done the same with one another in areas of mutual

interest), but at the same time they have respected each contributor's intellectual and academic freedom. Thus, the ideas expressed in the individual papers are ultimately the responsibility of their respective authors.

With regard to presentation, the editors have not presumed to impose a straight-jacket in terms of style on contributors, since this publication brings together scholars working in multiple fields and from different scholarly traditions. Nevertheless, they insisted on matters that will make consultation of the indices easier and, hopefully, more productive. Thus, Latin or Latinised spellings have generally been preferred for figures from myth, names of ancient authors and titles of works, because these forms are commoner and universally recognised. In contrast, Hellenised spellings have been preferred for Dionysos and Silenos, as well as for the titles of satyr dramas (with the exception of Euripides' Cyclops, commonly spelled this way), in an effort to maintain as much as possible their Greek savour.5 Especially the transliteration of satyric titles has had two additional advantages: (a) easily distinguishing satyric from tragic fragments, and (b) play titles from homonymous mythological figures/ play characters. Moreover, as these titles belong to fragmentary plays, and what is more, from a genre that has received proper attention only in the recent decades, many of them are not widely known⁶ and there is no unanimous way of referring to them.⁷ So, the Hellenised spelling has also been mandated to facilitate the reference to the original title of these plays and for avoiding confusion. The same applies to terms from Greek art (such as krater), which have been transliterated and sometimes (in cases of less known words, or when a word appears for the first time in a paper) also italicised.

A project as long and complicated as this one relies on the help and good will of so many people, and it is a very great pleasure to acknowledge them all for their patience and good humour, first and foremost among which are our wives, Thaleia, Anastasia and Jane. Many thanks are also due to Ralf Krumeich, who has compiled with great care the Index Vasorum, to Panagiota Taktikou for assisting with the General Index and the Index Locorum, and to Anne Bowtell, who has made possible research in Oxford.

The project has had tremendous support from our institutions: Judy Donaldson and Andrea McIntyre in Greek and Roman Studies, Michelle Santoianni in

⁵ It is observable that performances of satyr drama even during the Roman Empire were mainly a phenomenon of Greek speaking provinces.

⁶ For instance, many are not included in the lists of the OCD or the LSJ, which focus on the complete plays.

⁷ In scholarly and other publications they tend to be translated into various modern languages depending on the author, and even when Latinised, they appear with variant spellings depending on scholarly tradition.

Technology, Society and Environmental Studies at Carleton, and Froso Polyzogopoulou in Patras. Gratitude is also expressed to chairs at Carleton, John Buschek and Shane Hawkins, and to the Vice-Rector for research in Patras, Demosthenes Polyzos.

Expenses were partially met through a travel grant from Carleton and through the generosity of the University of Patras on numerous occasions: the University's Research Committee provided funding for the Patras conference on satyr drama (1–3 July 2016), assisted with the publication of the volume, and also supported Andreas Antonopoulos with a fellowship (2014–2016) through its *C. Caratheodory Programme for Postdoctoral Research*. In the later stages of the project, Andreas Antonopoulos has been supported by a fellowship (2017–2019) from the *State Scholarships Foundation* of Greece (I.K.Y.). Final stages of the editing were expedited by Carleton's appointment of George W.M. Harrison to a university Research/Teaching Fellowship.

Finally, special thanks are due to Anton Bierl for welcoming this volume's inclusion in the *MythosEikonPoiesis* Series and for kindly accepting our invitation to contribute a paper himself, as well as to Torben Behm from De Gruyter for his most helpful support in the publication process.

August 2020

A.P.A. M.M.C. G.W.M.H.