Συναγωνίζεσθαι
Studies in Honour of Guido Avezzù

Edited by Silvia Bigliazzi, Francesco Lupi,
Gherardo Ugolini

Skenè Studies I • 1

S K E N È Theatre and Drama Studies

Executive Editor Guido Avezzù.
General Editors Guido Avezzù, Silvia Bigliazzi.
Editorial Board Simona Brunetti, Francesco Lupi, Nicola Pasqualicchio, Susan Payne, Gherardo Ugolini.
Managing Editors Serena Marchesi, Savina Stevanato.
Editorial Staff Francesco Dall'Olio, Marco Duranti, Carina Fernandes, Antonietta Provenza, Emanuel Stelzer.
Layout Editor Alex Zanutto.
Advisory Board Anna Maria Belardinelli, Anton Bierl, Enoch Brater, Jean-Christophe Cavallin, Rosy Colombo, Claudia Corti, Marco De Marinis, Tobias Döring, Pavel Drabek, Paul Edmondson, Keir Douglas Elam, Ewan Fernie, Patrick Finglass, Enrico Giaccherini, Mark Griffith, Daniela Guardamagna, Stephen Halliwell, Robert Henke, Pierre Judet de la Combe, Eric Nicholson, Guido Paduano, Franco Perrelli, Didier Plassard, Donna Shalev, Susanne Wofford.

Copyright © 2018 S K E N È
All rights reserved.
ISSN 2464-9295
ISBN 978-88-6464-503-2
Published in December 2018

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form
or by any means without permission from the publisher
Dir. Resp. (aut. Trib. di Verona): Guido Avezzù

P.O. Box 149 c/o Mail Boxes Etc. (MBE 150) – Viale Col. Galliano, 51, 37138, Verona (I)

S K E N È Theatre and Drama Studies
http://www.skenejournal.it
info@skenejournal.it

Contents

Silvia Bigliazzi - Francesco Lupi - Gherardo Ugolini
Πρόλογος / Prologue 9

Part 1 – Τραγῳδία / Tragedy

1. Stephen Halliwell
"We were there too": Philosophers in the Theatre 15

2. Maria Grazia Bonanno
Tutto il mondo (greco) è teatro. Appunti sulla messa-in-scena greca non solo drammatica 41

3. Vittorio Citti
Una nota inutile ad Aesch. *Suppl.* 950 69

4. Angela M. Andrisano
Le *performances* della Pizia (Aesch. *Eum.* 29-33) 81

5. Pierre Judet de La Combe
Una dialettica regale. Gli argomenti della regina sulla ricchezza in Aesch. *Pers.* 159-69. 91

6. Liana Lomiento
Osservazioni critico-testuali e metriche su Aesch. *Eum.* 352-3 = 365-6 107

7. Enrico Medda
Alcune congetture inedite di A.E. Housman all'*Agamennone* di Eschilo 133

8. Franco Montanari
Mito e poesia: la figura di Clitennestra dall'*Odissea* a Eschilo 147

9. Antonietta Provenza
Un destino paradigmatico.
L'ibrido e la necessità del γάμος nel mito di Io 167

10. Alessandro Grilli
Forme e funzioni della parola magico-sacrale
nei *Sette contro Tebe* 195

11. Giovanni Cerri
Antigone, Ismene e sepoltura di Polinice:
protostoria di un mito 219

12. Renzo Tosi
Creonte e il potere che rivela l'uomo (Soph. *Ant.* 175-7) 237

13. Roberto Nicolai
Perché Edipo è chiamato τύραννος?
Riflessioni sull'*Edipo re* come tragedia del potere 251

14. Seth L. Schein
The Second *Kommos* in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (1081-1217) 277

15. Camillo Neri
Marginalia Colonea 299

16. Francesco Lupi
Minima Sophoclea. Frr. 150, 722, 338 R.^{2} 323

17. Paola Angeli Bernardini
Ecuba, le prigioniere troiane e la presenza del mare
nelle *Troiane* di Euripide 341

18. Adele Teresa Cozzoli
Azione drammatica e metateatro nell'*Oreste* di Euripide 359

19. Jordi Redondo
Alcestis: Pro-Satyric or Simply Romantic Tragedy? 385

20. Marco Zanolla
Tracce di polemica contro il *ploutos*
nell'*Alcmena* di Euripide: frr. 95, 96 e 92 Kn. 403

21. Edward M. Harris
Pollution and Purification in Athenian Law
and in Attic Tragedy: Parallels or Divergences? 419

Part 2 – Κωμῳδία / Comedy

22. Andreas Bagordo
κομψευριπικῶς. Tracce di Euripide socratico-sofistico
nella commedia attica 457

23. Marco Duranti
Due questioni interpretative nelle *Ecclesiazuse*
di Aristofane (vv. 1089-91, 1105-11) 491

24. Giuseppe Mastromarco
Aristofane, *Le donne che occupano le tende*, fr. 488 K.-A. 503

25. Olimpia Imperio
I demagoghi nelle commedie di Aristofane e dei suoi rivali 515

26. Andreas Markantonatos
The Heracles Myth in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*:
The Boeotian and Dicaeopolis Scene (ll. 860-958) 545

27. Piero Totaro
Antiche e nuove esegesi di Aristofane, *Pluto* 168 563

28. Fausto Montana
Lamia nella *Collana* di Menandro (fr. 297 K.-A.) 585

29. Guido Paduano
Un tema della Nea: la verità come perfetto inganno 599

30. Massimo Di Marco
Una probabile eco della parodia comica del *Ciclope*
di Filosseno in Ermesianatte (fr. 7.73-4 Powell) 615

Part 3 – Παράδοσις / Reception

31. Maria Pia Pattoni
Tragic and Paratragic Elements in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* 633

32. Paola Volpe
Il Ciclope: un mostro tra antico e moderno 653

33. Eric Nicholson
Finding Room for Satyrs at the Theatrical Table,
from Ancient to Modern Times 675

34. Francesco Dall'Olio
Oedipus Tyrant? Tyranny and Good Kingship
in Alexander Neville's Translation of Seneca's *Oedipus* 693

35. Silvia Bigliazzi
Euripidean Ambiguities in *Titus Andronicus*:
the Case of Hecuba 719

36. Vayos Liapis
On the Sources of Petros Katsaïtis' *Iphigenia* (1720): Between
Lodovico Dolce, Molière, and the Commedia dell'Arte 747

37. Gherardo Ugolini
Il Genio della tragedia. Antigone nel *Vorspiel* di Hofmannsthal 783

38. Douglas Cairns
Fascism on Stage? Jean Anouilh's *Antigone* (1944) 805

39. Avra Sidiropoulou
Negotiating Oblivion: Twenty-First Century Greek
Performances of Ancient Greek Plays 833

40. Martina Treu
'Guidaci a passo di danza'. Cori comici sulla scena 857

41. Adele Scafuro and Hiroshi Notsu
Miyagi's *Antigones* 881

Part 4 – Ἔξω τοῦ θεάτρου / Theatre and Beyond

42. Anton Bierl
Symmachos esso: Theatrical Role-Playing and
Mimesis in Sappho fr. 1 V. 925

43. Walter Lapini
La casa dei belli (Asclepiade *AP* 5.153) 953

44. Mauro Tulli
Plato's κάλλιστον δρᾶμα in Greek Biography 963

45. Simona Brunetti
Il coraggio di tradire per poter tramandare: un allestimento
contemporaneo del *Gysbreght van Aemstel*
di Joost van den Vondel 975

46. Nicola Pasqualicchio
Piano d'evasione: carcere e utopia negli Shakespeare
della Compagnia della Fortezza 1003

47. Sotera Fornaro
Il giovane rapsodo nella Stanza della Segnatura di Raffaello 1025

The Authors 1043

Appendix

Guido Avezzù's Publications (1973-2018) 1079

33

Finding Room for Satyrs at the Theatrical Table, from Ancient to Modern Times

Eric Nicholson

Abstract

Although the ancient Athenian satyr-play, in its one fully surviving exemplar of Euripides's *Kyklops*, was the originating model for late Italian Renaissance pastoral tragicomedy, its obligatory chorus of singing and dancing satyrs was suppressed, and these same defining characters most often reduced to a single outsider figure representing a violent threat rather than a vital force for human communities. My essay asks how and why this reduction and exclusion came to be the norm. Connecting an appraisal of *Kyklops* to its cultural as well as performance contexts, I follow the lead of classical scholars – Seaford, Lissarrague, Konstan, *et al.* – who accentuate the playful, ambiguous, and 'anthropological' qualities of the Dionysiac theatrical satyr.

I then chart several important several important figurations of the satyr in Italian pastoral drama, from Giraldi Cinthio's *Egle* through Tasso's *Aminta* to Valeria Miani's *Amorosa speranza*, not only to reconsider the outcast and scapegoat status of the character, but also to argue that his ludic energies and primordial vigour get channelled into his laughable, less threatening, and indeed feminizing humiliations at the hands of wittily resourceful and self-defending nymphs. While the satyr's absence from the concluding nuptial celebrations of pastoral drama may attest to his embodiment of "dirt" (to apply Mary Douglas's reading of cultural conceptions of disorder), his susceptibility to quick domination and transformation may also suggest that his playful, fluid, and almost childlike spirit persists through late Renaissance pastoral plays, especially ones written by women. This final point gains support and demonstration through live theatrical interpretation.

To open with a somewhat satirical question: why are satyrs not invited to the nuptial celebrations that so often conclude early modern pastoral tragicomedies? It is somewhat surprising that they do not appear on the guest list, since their hybrid form and classical roots make them figures that are essential, indeed foundational, to late Renaissance pastoral drama. With their mixture of the an-

imal and human, satyrs are benders and transformers of *genus*, and thus they serve as embodiments of the bending and transforming of *genre* pursued by late sixteenth- to early seventeenth-century Italian and European playwrights. 'Stars of the show' as the speaking, singing, and dancing chorus-members in the ancient Greek satyr-plays which provided a model for the 'third genre' of pastoral tragicomedy, they tend to become marginalised, denigrated, and/or outcast in the very plays that they had helped to inspire. While the dramaturgical agenda of resolving tensions through the eventual achievement of heterosexual matrimony, performed for Christian patrons and audiences, can provide one explanation for the suppression and even 'editing out' of the 'primitive' 'wild-man' satyr,[1] other aesthetic as well as ideological motives come into play. This short essay aims to clarify some of these motives, while arguing that Renaissance pastoral's banishment and exclusion of the satyr is not as definitive or intractable as it would appear.

As befits their ontological status, satyrs cannot be entirely repressed and put down, all the more so when almost 2,000 years later they leap off the pages of the one fully surviving satyr-play, Euripides's *Cyclops*, and in to the scripts and stagings of sixteenth-century Ferrarese and later Italian and European pastoral dramas. In the ancient Athenian, pre-Christian world of Euripides, they are shown to be free-wheeling, fun-loving fertility spirits, dedicated devotees of Dionysus, who unabashedly and even expertly release the energies of dance, acrobatics, and theatrical performance.[2] As humans they speak and sing, but especially as animals they run, spring, somersault, spin, and twist: this non-verbal, kinetic impulse needs to be emphasised, if satyrs and their usage are to be understood. This emphasis is also appropriate for a volume in honour of Guido Avezzù, whose multi-faceted work has illuminated not only rhetorical and historical aspects of Greek dramatic texts, but also their physical and performative

1 For a useful explanation of how the "wild-man" figure of the Christian Middle Ages inherited and supplanted the pagan satyr figure, modifying the latter's reappearance in Renaissance pastoral drama, see Pieri 1983: 133-40.

2 On ancient Greek satyrs and their representation in the visual and performing arts, see especially the work of Lissarrague 1990a, 1990b and 1993. A fundamental study of satyr-drama remains Rossi 1972.

qualities. Professor Avezzù teaches us to maintain awareness and discover specific inflections of *context,* for example when he suggestively calls the satyr of satyr-plays "the hero of the *polis*" (2003: 45-52). In this contextual regard, valuable insights regarding theatrical 'citizen'-satyrs can be gained from observation of their gestures, poses, grimaces, and interactions in ancient Greek statuary and vase-decorations. The *Cyclops,* the *Ichneutae* (Trackers) of Sophocles, and other fragmentary satyr-plays feature important moments of discovery, even prodigious discovery, when almost like children the satyrs express astonishment (*thambos*) at the divinely imbued entities that they find.[3] Likewise the satyrs of contemporary statuettes and vase-paintings, despite their most often having mature male bodies and bearded faces, communicate infantile surprise and excitement through their outstretched arms, open hands, and wide-staring eyes: they are captured in a state of bedazzlement, or *aposkopein*, often conveyed by their frontal presentation.[4] Their gestures and facial expressions suggest how they also can serve as models for the potential wonder and amazement that audience members could and perhaps should feel when watching plays in the theatre.

Indeed, one can postulate that souvenir-representations of theatrical performance appear in some ancient Greek domestic artworks. Surviving bronze statuette-ornaments of the sixth-fifth century BCE show satyrs and their balding, potbellied leader

3 On these and other related points see Seaford: 1984. Seaford stresses the paradoxical and ambiguous qualities of satyrs, who are at once "worthless hedonists", but also bearers of "more than human wisdom" (6-7). Also see Seaford 1976: 216, for his explanation of how the satyrs experience *heuremata* ('discoveries') as *terata* ('prodigies').

4 Here it is worth quoting at length the eloquent comments of François Lissarrague: "It is important to emphasize the essential role of the specific gesture of *aposkopein*, which signifies bedazzlement, as well as the frequent frontal presentation of satyrs. Everything takes place as if the satyrs were discovering the human world, as if they were being used to explore culture in two ways: throught their behavior, which is more or less close to the human model to which they are trying to conform, and through their relationships with the world outside – especially in satyric drama – where they are like naifs who discover what the spectator knows all too well. As a result, their response suggests a renewal of the world and of culture" (1993: 219).

Silenus in a variety of tumbling and acrobatic positions, including balanced on one hand.[5] The tour de force red-figure *psykter* (vase for cooling wine) painted by Douris ca. 485 BCE features a 'leader satyr', dressed à la Hermes the Messenger, presiding over four groups of fully naked satyrs, drinking, revelling and cavorting in spectacular ways. One pair, for example, seem to treat a curving-handled *kantharos* (wine-cup) as a swimming pool, one of them poising his foot above it while the other – revealingly shown *en face*- – readies himself for a dive into it. The adjacent trio of satyrs executes a particularly impressive routine: two standing satyrs, one holding a *kantharos* and the other a *oinochoe* (small carafe), flank a crouching satyr who supports himself on his fingertips, all the while balancing his *kantharos* on his erect penis as his companion pours wine into the precariously perched vessel.[6] This sense of acrobatic poise and movement would have been accentuated by the effect of the satyrs performing 'their antics on the very surface of the wine' as the ice-filled *psykter* bobbed up, down, and round and round inside the wide-mouthed *krater* mixing bowl.[7] Appropriately, then, virtuosic theatricality abounds in Douris' painting of Dionysiac satyrs. Recent scholarship has recognised overtly theatrical elements in red-figure vase production, with satyrs and their plays often taking centre stage in these scenes. As early as the 1880s, Carl Robert identified the Hermes-style satyr of the Douris *psykter* as a kind of Coryphaeos, linking him with a similar figure on the famous "Pronomos Vase"

5 A remarkable showcase display at the Musée du Louvre, Paris, Departement des Antiquités Grecs, preserves and vividly presents more than a dozen such figurines.

6 Excavated in Cerveteri, Italy, the vase was sold in 1868 to the British Museum, London. See http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?assetId=34652001&objectId=461894&partId=1 (Accessed 20 October 2018).

7 For this highly salient point, see Osborne 1998: 164. Osborne also pertinently notes that almost all the satyrs on this vase have tied-up penises, arguing that this ligaturing "seems to be adopted as a visual symbol of urbanity and sexual continence" (165). This portrayal confirms the fact that satyrs were not inevitably understood as incarnations of sexual license and phallic violence.

in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples.[8] Meanwhile, the "Pronomos Vase" itself, which depicts satyric performers in close proximity to the enthroned Dionysus and Ariadne, and also shows a dancer-actor 'warming up' in an ithyphallic kilt, has become the focus of numerous studies and even an entire book dedicated to links between ancient Greek theatre and vase-painting.[9]

At the same time, the possible allusions to actual satyr plays in some of these surviving pictorial images are not the primary concern here; what matters is the prominence of satyrs in the consciousness of ancient Greek theatregoers. Euripides could rely on his audiences' enthusiasm for and thorough familiarity with satyrs and their antics when he wrote his play inspired by the Polyphemos episode from Homer's *Odyssey.* As befits Euripides's as well as Dionysus's affinity for irony and surprises, the Chorus of Satyrs and their leader Silenus do not first appear as their true selves – that is, as celebrants of Bacchus, juggling Nature and Culture as surely as they do their *kylix* wine-bowls – but as captives of a one-eyed, godless barbarian pastoralist, a monster who is unfamiliar with grapes and wine but brutally includes human flesh in his diet.[10] With negative-stressing anaphora, the enslaved satyrs communicate the extremity of their suffering in their opening epode/lament:

> No Bacchus here! Not here the dance,
> or the women whirling the *thyrsos,*
> or the timbrels shaken,
> where the springs rill up!
> Not here the gleam of wine,
> and no more at Nysa with nymphs
> crying *Iacchos! Iacchos!*
> *Where is Aphrodite?...*
> she that I used to fly after
> along with the bare-footed Bacchae!

8 See British Museum site, cit.

9 See Taplin and Wyles 2010.

10 It is important to note here how Euripides departs from the Homeric original (where Polyphemos does know about viticulture): on this and other key points of the Euripidean adaptation, see Konstan 1990.

> Dear lord Bacchus, where do you run,
> tossing your auburn hair?
> For I, your servant, am a wretched slave,
> tricked out in dirty goatskin
> to serve a one-eyed Cyclops.
> (63-81)[11]

Thus the satyrs enter, 'tricked out' in slaves' costumes. They metatheatrically call attention to how they are playing a role they do not want to play: a troupe of sub-shepherds, of the flocks belonging to the gruesome Uber-shepherd Polyphemos. If these energetic dancers and tumblers need not fear being eaten alive by their cruel overlord, who comically opines to the Coryphaeus that "I'd soon be dead if I had you / jumping through your capers in my belly" (220-1), they are tragically deprived of their true master Dionysus, lord of the dance and leader of their ecstatic *thiasos* rites. Instead of joyously releasing their natural, playful energies in attendance on their divine patron, they are enslaved by a profane *tyrannos*, who declares that "There's no Bacchus here, / no bronze clackers or rattling castanets!" (204-5), and whose only god is his own belly. In a satirical spin on the sophistic positions of Kallikles and Thrasymakhos, Euripides has Polyphemos proclaim that the only things that matter to him are wealth, power, and self-satisfaction: when Odysseus pleads to him to honor the code of 'xenos', the giant retorts, "Money's the wise man's religion, little man. The rest is mere bluff and purple patches" (316-7). As Guido Avezzù astutely observes, the Kyklops is not an authentic 'primitive', but a greedy, self-centred individual who, "fully aware of the laws that men have given themselves, deliberately rejects every social norm, and makes wealth his supreme value".[12]

The play dramatises the satyrs' eventual liberation from their enslavement, after the scheming, duplicitous Odysseus – his persuasive rhetoric marking him as more of a fifth-centu-

11 All quotations are from Euripides 1956.

12 The Italian original reads: "pienamente consapevole delle leggi che gli uomini si sono dati, [il Ciclope] respinge intenzionalmente ogni norma e si dà come valore supremo le richezze" (Avezzù 2003: 242). Also see Konstan 1990: 215, and Paganelli 1979.

ry Athenian orator than a Bronze Age hero – manages to get Polyphemos deliriously drunk, allowing him to gouge out the giant's single eye and escape. As elsewhere in this play, Euripides also somewhat surprisingly adheres closely to the Homeric version of the tale, deploying the famous "Nobody" joke-name trick, and having Odysseus represent civilized customs *vs* Polyphemos's barbaric savagery. Yet the fidelity to basic plot structure and characterisation is in itself something of a ruse, as the script makes a series of anachronistic manoeuvres, not only associating Polyphemos with opportunistic fifth-century sophists and Odysseus – here the son of cheating Sisyphus, and not the noble Laertes – with ethically dubious defenders of Athenian imperialism, but also confronting the Athenian audience with ambivalent reflections of their own ethnographic curiosities, and the potential contiguity between their local Selves and distant Others.[13]

The crucial change, however, is the introduction of Silenus and the Chorus of Satyrs, who disrupt the Civilised Odysseus-Barbarian Polyphemos binary, and through their hybrid, disorderly, adolescent and parodic characteristics as well as their non-heroic attitudes entail a repositioning and reevaluation of epic and tragic tropes from a liminal, ambiguous perspective. In convincing ways, Pierre Voelke and Carol Dougherty have argued that the world of ancient Greek satyrs and their drama is a border-world, neither completely foreign nor completely familiar, often set at the edges of civilisation, and often in flux and in transit.[14] And as François Lissarrague has appositely put it, the "presence of satyrs within the myth [of the rediscovery of wine, and the culture of drinking it] subverts tragedy by shattering its cohesiveness", and therefore, appropriately, "they appear as blatant meddlers, creators of disorder, fashioning before the audience's eyes a negative anthropology, an anthropology of laughter" (Lissarrague 1990b: 236). A fine example of this significant bathos occurs when Odysseus, partially echoing lines from Book 9 of *The Odyssey*, recounts to the satyrs his tearful witnessing of the Kyklops's devouring of his shipmates, and then his offer of Maron's 'heavenly' wine to the

13 On these points, see Euripides 1956, 5-8; and Dougherty 1999.
14 See Voelke 1992, and Dougherty 1999: 326-9.

belching ogre, which allowed him to slip out of the cave. He thus is able to propose to the oppressed sub-shepherds a valorous deed of liberation and revenge:

ODYSSEUS . . . Now, if you agree,
I'd like to save myself and you as well.
So tell me, yes or no, whether you want
to escape this monster and live with the nymphs
in the halls of Bacchus. Your father [Silenus] in there
agrees, but he's weak and loves his liquor.
He's stuck to the cup as though it were glue,
And can't fly. But you are young, so follow me
and save yourselves; find again your old friend,
Dionysus, so different from this Cyclops!
COR. OF SATYRS My good friend, if only we might see that day
when we escape at last this godless Cyclops!
(*Showing his phallus.*)
his poor hose has been a bachelor
A long time now. . . .
(427-40)

For a moment Odysseus's exhortation to the downtrodden satyrs to free themselves from their oppressor and reunite with their beloved Dionysus seems to lift the Coryphaeus into the tone and spirit of epic, only to yield abruptly to the phallic, carnivalesque gag about sexual need and privation. This moment foreshadows the even more bathetic excuses the satyrs will make, such as spraining their ankles while standing still, to refrain from helping Odysseus and his men to thrust the sharpened tree-trunk into Polyphemos's eye: their cowardly, self-protective retreat is all the more ludicrous for its contradiction of their previously made offer to "help hold the pole", and their boast that "I could shoulder a hundred wagon-loads / so long as Cyclops died a wretched death!" (473-4). The satyrs, on-stage and thus potentially voicing the audience's wishes, do act as cheerleaders for Odysseus and his men, who enact the blinding off-stage. Perhaps this is the way that most ordinary mortals would behave in such a situation, and in fact the satyrs' prudent keeping of distance from the wounded, raging Kyklops enables them to survive. They thus make good their

promise to escape with Odysseus, and attain their happy ending through setting sail towards an expected reunion with Bacchus.

In keeping with a play named for the round-eyed Kyklops, the ultimately freed satyrs come full circle, since they themselves, led by their Falstaffian father Silenus, had set sail towards Sicily to free their beloved master Dionysus, after they had found out that he had been kidnapped by Tyrrhenian pirates. It is as if their reverent devotion has finally been rewarded by the elusive god of wine, theatre, and ambiguities himself, who though absent as an embodied character is nonetheless present throughout the play, in his manifestation as wine, especially the strong delicious irresistible vintage that will intoxicate Polyphemos, and consequently enable the freeing of the gods' long-suffering followers. Again Richard S. Seaford offers a persuasive reading, of how this "playful tragedy" recapitulates the ritual pattern of initiation into the mysteries of Dionysus through confinement, suffering, release, and ultimate affirmation of the celebratory *thiasos*.[15] This Dionysian triumph thus reaffirms the satyric qualities of the dithryrambic origins of Greek drama, and refutes the notion that the post-trilogy satyr-play mainly served as a kind of comic relief. Extending Seaford's analysis, one could perceive how Aristotle's assertion that tragedy derived from satyric drama is reaffirmed as well, along with Nietzsche's view that the "satyr chorus of the dithyramb is the saving deed of Greek art" (Nietzsche 1967: 60). In fact it is Nietzsche's interpretation of the satyr figure that informs my own reading of the ambivalent permutations of this character in Italian and European pastoral drama. I concur (at least partially) with Nietzsche in arguing that the Greek "satyr was something sublime and divine", and that he "was the archetype of man, the embodiment of his highest and most intense emotions", "the offspring of a longing for the primitive and natural" (1967: 61). Yet instead of decrying a 'mawkish', sentimentalising displacement of the satyr into the 'idyllic shepherd', I propose an alternative appraisal of the marginal, outcast satyr characters of early modern pastoral as a lingering and not quite completely suppressed vari-

15 See Seaford 1984: 7-9, where he aptly compares and contrasts this Dionysiac schema to its use in Euripides's *Bacchae*.

ant of their ancient theatrical predecessors. I also propose that several pastoral plays by Italian women pursue this variation with special vigour, acumen, and self-referential implications.

As students of Italian pastoral tragicomedy know, it was Euripides's *Cyclops* that enabled the new genre to emerge out of the first thorough dramatic experiment in devising a modern version of the 'third' type of classical Greek play. The experiment was Giovan Battista Giraldi Cinthio's *Egle,* the "satira" first performed at Ferrara in 1545, and published with a prefatory "lettera" in 1554. True to its Euripidean model, *Egle* does bring a group of lusty satyrs out of a cave and on to the stage, where the title character – who is Silenus's lover – helps the satyrs with a scheme to seize their beloved nymphs before their rivals, the heavenly gods themselves, can do so. The nymphs, however, flee the satyrs' advances, and are transformed (off-stage) into trees, flowers, rivers, and in one case, a reed: this is Syrinx, the nymph beloved by the minor deity Pan, who then turns her into his pan-pipe.[16]

Giraldi starts the gradual suppression of the satyrs' Dionysiac energies, for example editing out their bawdy complaint about their under-used phalloi, and submitting their comical-tragical-satirical and indeed pastoral hybridity to a process of decorum-making. Still, he does retain more of the sexual frankness of Euripides than his Ferraran successors would: if the aged Silenus no longer plays a ridiculous 'Ganymede'-lover to the lascivious Cyclops, Giraldi's script does have the character Silvano remark that the fleeing nymphs look like Venus from the front, and Ganymede from behind (Giraldi 1985: 115). In this regard Giraldi applies his insight, explained in his "Lettera sovra il comporre le Satire atte alla scena", that frolicking and agitated mobility befits the chorus of a satyr-play, "satyrs being naturally none other than goats, with whom they have many similarities in their leaps and their vigorous movements" ("essendo naturalmente I satiri non al-

16 For this description, and other invaluable material on *Egle* and early Ferrarese pastoral drama, I am gratefully indebted to the outstanding study by Sampson 2006. On Satyr characters and their uses in the theatre of sixteenth-century Ferrara, see Garraffo 1985: 185-201. I have also benefitted from Chiabò and Doglio 1991, especially the essays by Umberto Albini (1991) and Riccardo Bruscagli (1991).

trimente che le capre, colle quali essi hanno molto simiglianza sui salti e sui movimenti gagliardi"; Giraldi 1985: 160; translations are mine). All in all, Giraldi retains the animalesque qualities of the Greek Satyr Chorus, and avoids anachronistically identifying their lust as sin, because – as he recognises in his "Lettera" – instinctive libido is an integral part of their Bacchic nature. Moreover, he sustains the view of tragedy's emergence from satyr-plays, for "these fables [satyr-plays] were born from Bacchic sports and games" ("sono nate queste favole da' giuochi di Bacco"), and therefore he avers "that the satyrs, who were Bacchus's familiars and companions, first inspired that sort of play suited to their nature, which was entirely libidinous and lascivious" ("I satiri, ch'erano a Bacco famigliari e compagni, prima a quella sorte di favola si dessero che alla loro natura si confacesse, la quale era tutta libidine e lascivia"; Giraldi 1985: 148). Their amoral disorderliness thus persists, even as they are frustrated in their erotic designs. Giraldi's refinement does not involve the creation of a shepherd's idyll, but rather pursues, albeit somewhat clumsily, a sincere and thoughtful project of altering the all-male scenario of *The Cyclops*: as Giraldi explains, "from that *Cyclops* I have so far distanced myself that instead of Ulysses and his companions I have introduced a band of nymphs, with their purity" ("Dal qual *Ciclope* mi sono nondimeno in tanto allungato che, in vece di Ulisse e de' suoi compagni io vi ho introdutte le ninfe colla purità loro"; Giraldi 1985: 162-3). The revisionist playwright thus allows the Satyrs – supported by their leaders Silenus and an amoral god Pan – to express their unbridled sexual energies, but he makes sure that they do not achieve their desire, because of the superior, transformative power of Nature that changes the nymphs into trees. Moreover, Giraldi modulates their aggressive threat by including "Little Satyrs", who ingenuously believe that their desired nymphs have shown them "immense courtesy" and "so much love" (Giraldi 1985: 103). In this attempted modern satyr-play, then, the would-be trickster satyrs are given strongly serio-comic voices, and though thwarted in their design, they make a lasting centre-stage theatrical impression.

Almost ten years later, it was the Ferraran Agostino Beccari who would diminish the satyrs' role significantly, and at this point it is worth asking: is this a main reason why later Italian theo-

rist-historians of Pastoral would identify Beccari's *Il Sacrificio* (first performed 1554, and published in 1555), rather than Giraldi's *Egle*, as the first exemplar of the genre? No longer is there an entire Chorus of Satyrs, but instead a single solitary one, now relegated to the status of the truly marginalised figure, and often designed to incarnate the vice of lust. Beccari's Satyr is tricked and frustrated, as he unsuccessfully attempts to take the nymph Stellinia by force, and ends up exposed to mockery, as she manages to tie him to a tree (Beccari 1555: 4.7). While he does free himself from his bonds after Stellinia slips away, and tries a second time to rape her, he is prevented by the arrival of her lover Turico. The scene of his harshly comical punishment, iconographically deriving from the classical topos of Apollo's tying up and flaying of Marsyas, evidently impressed later readers and authors. It recurs with significant alterations in Isabella Andreini's pastoral drama *Mirtilla* (1588), where the nymph Filli – played by Andreini herself – pulls off a thorough sequence of deception, titillation, and humiliation of her desperately amorous satyr-assailant. This scene has attracted a good deal of recent critical attention, since Andreini adds the triumphantly self-liberating as well as self-celebrating metatheatrical demonstration of her own desirability but also inviolability as the Nymph-Innamorata figure, who though lovesick for the disdainful Uranio is able to outwit, mock, and escape from the ineptly aggressive and foolishly narcissistic Satyr.

Even more tellingly, the actress-playwright feminizes and symbolically castrates her tied-up assailant, grasping and twisting his useless horns, pulling hairs out of his heavy beard, and pinching his "mammelle morbide" ("soft breasts"), before she pretends to give him a fragrant thyme breath freshener, which he then learns too late is a ball of repulsive aloes. She thus forces the Satyr to reenact the bitter-tasting practical joke of demeaning humiliation played on Boccaccio's Calandrino and Machiavelli's Nicia, making him a fully comical public laughingstock. As Françoise Decroisette incisively notes, Andreini conveys an optimistic vision of ingenious female agency here, in a way that sixteen years later (1604) Valeria Miani would extend in more ferocious terms.[17]

17 See Decroisette 2002, especially 161-7 and 177-82. Also see Ray 1998,

In this Paduan author's pastoral play *Amorosa speranza* ('Amorous Hope'), the Satyr – suggestively named Eliodoro, profaner of the Temple – is shown no mercy by the nymph Tirenia: after she first succeeds in sending him to the top of a tree to retrieve her shot arrow, leaving him there to be rescued by the female satyr Artemia, she finds herself assaulted by him a second time, and then manages to tie him to a tree. She goes even farther than Andreini's Filli in figuratively castrating and feminizing the Satyr, as she removes not only his entire beard but both of his horns. Where the Satyr of *Mirtilla* would be found, untied, and re-educated into culinary preferences by the gluttonous shepherd Gorgo, Eliodoro loses his very identity, so much so that the ox-driver Bassano doesn't even recognise him. Even more than the other Satyrs of contemporary Italian pastoral, these characters yield to female power.

What exactly is being 'edited out', however, in this process of the suppression of the Satyr? Simply the moral, sexual threat of an emblem of lust? Or is an almost gratuitous scapegoating being practiced, for the sake of the final comic resolution? In Battista Guarini's *Pastor fido* (1590), the Satyr appears as a would-be lover, but eventual dupe of the trickster/'bad girl' Corisca. In this regard, his in- or non-humanity is underlined, since Corisca eventually repents, and converts to virtue, pleading forgiveness from her lover Amarilli; in contrast, the rude and ungainly Satyr, humiliated and painfully falling to the ground as he pulls off Corisca's blonde wig, remains unredeemed, and excluded from the social re-groupings of the play (Guarini 1999: 2.6.965-1007).

To employ Mary Douglas's insight into cultural concepts and constructs of hygiene *vs* pollution, do early modern pastoral satyrs represent too much "dirt", that is, disorder and exceptionality (Douglas 1966: 35-40)? In the primarily elite genre of Italian pastoral, they also can represent the threat of poverty. The most famous Ferrarese poet and playwright of the late Renaissance, Torquato Tasso, reveals through the voice of the Satyr the inconvenient truth made available by the pastoral 'mode', but often suppressed by the Italian pastoral tragicomic 'genre': "Non sono io brutto, no, né tu mi sprezzi / perché sì fatto io sia, ma solamente /

---

and the illuminating article by Tylus 1992.

perché povero sono; ahi, ché le ville / seguon l'esempio de le gran cittadi; / e veramente il secol d'oro è questo, / poiché sol vince l'oro e regna l'oro" ("I am not ugly, no, nor do you disdain me / because I'm made the way I am, but only / because I'm poor. Alas, that rustic villages/ should follow the example of great cities! / And truly this is the golden age, / since gold alone conquers, and gold alone reigns"; Tasso 2015: 119.776-81). At this point, the Satyr overtly serves as the Satirist, all the more so because he is recycling a witty critique from Ovid's *Ars amatoria* (Ovid 1957: 93.277-8). A startling intertextual citation, perhaps, but once again Tasso has managed to revive the element of surprise so crucial to the ancient Greek portrayal of satyrs. His subaltern, aggressive Satyr in fact takes Silvia by surprise off-stage, strips her naked and ties her to a tree with her own flowing hair, only to be prevented from accomplishing his planned assault by the arrival of Aminta, the sexually timid shepherd in love with Silvia. The rescued nymph flees from Aminta, though she will return to help revive him after he attempts suicide; the Satyr, on the other hand, is never seen or heard from again in this exceptionally structured but also exceptionally influential pastoral play.

Further questions arise, then: what are the most urgent threats incarnated in the satyr-figure? Is it primitive violence alone, or is it rather violence's potential interdependence with economic deprivation, and social marginalisation? To what extent is the Satyr the convenient but also necessary scapegoat, banished not only for his violation of the poetic, idealising courtship values of the refined nymphs and shepherds, but also for his structurally over-determined embodiment of 'mongrel tragicomedy', and its impure, dirty origins? How might we today confront the complexities of the pastoral genre's moves of appropriation (in all senses, from the aesthetic to the economic), and of its agenda of exclusion vs. inclusion, precisely by acknowledging and seeking to re-integrate its actual originators, the Satyrs? Could the Satyr-figure's pre-civilized, instinctually playful, and naturally sublime but simultaneously bathetic energies be recuperated and re-evaluated through an experimental, outdoor theatrical interpretation?

Inspired by the scenes of nymphs emasculating and comically humiliating satyrs in Andreini's *Mirtilla* and Miani's

Amorosa speranza, as well as by the imaginative kind of modernising adaptation seen in Tony Harrison's smartly raucous version of Sophocles' fragmentary *Ichneutae,* entitled *The Trackers of Oxyrhynchus* (performed at Delphi, 1988), this experimental approach was put into practice at New York University, Florence, for the premiere English-language production of the pastoral drama *Clorilli* by Leonora Bernardi of Lucca, dated to ca. 1591. Given its title by the editors of the forthcoming edition of the play, Virginia Cox and Lisa Sampson (the latter of whom rediscovered the untitled script in the Biblioteca Marciana, Venice), and translated by Anna Wainwright, *Clorilli* was performed before a live audience in the gardens of Villa La Pietra, Florence, in May of 2018. Early on in the rehearsal process, the productions set designer, Cameron Anderson, proposed that the play's Satyr character be played by the same actress who played the character of the playwright herself. This proposal met with unanimous approval by the director, cast, and production team, and thus the professional actress Elia Nichols opened the performance as Bernardi, welcoming the audience in a formal, brocaded Renaissance dress while she delivered the prologue. A half hour later, she reappeared in the shaggy woollen outfit – complete with high-contrast make-up, long fake beard, large curving ram's horns, and a half litre-sized cheap beer tin in hand – of Ruscone the Satyr, making ridiculously goat-like movements but also posturing like a strutting, swaggering, young 'macho' would-be seducer. Support for this interpretation came from the original script itself, with its post-Tassian lines including Ruscone's lovesick naming of Clorilli as his "goddess", and boasting of his "venerable and strong features, so fitting for a semigod". Taking a cue from this Satyr's final complaint against "deceitful Clorilli", Ms Nichols as the potentially violent Ruscone was teased, tricked, and easily defeated by Clorilli, even before the arrival of Clorilli's long-lost brother Fillinio, who delivered the coup de grace to the limping Satyr's backside. All the while, she made it clear that she in some ways was still Bernardi in this cross-gendered performance. The transformative and tragicomic sequence was made complete, then, by the return of Leonora Bernardi in her original costume at the end of the performance, inviting the audience to witness the final harmonious group dance in celebration

of the play's double weddings. The Satyr character thus was able to express his/her sublimely natural energies, and to recuperate his/her place at the festive table of a celebratory theatrical group, not exactly the Chorus of an ancient Attic drama, but nonetheless an updating of a Dionysiac *thiasos*. Significantly, women were the ones who enabled this recuperation to happen.

Works Cited

Albini, Umberto (1991), "Il dramma satiresco greco", in M. Chiabò and F. Doglio (eds), *Sviluppi nella drammaturgia pastorale nell'Europa del Cinque-Seicento,* Roma: Nuova Coletti, 15-27.

Andreini, Isabella (2017), *Mirtilla, A Pastoral: a bilingual edition,* trans. by Julia Kisacky and ed. by Valeria Finucci, Toronto: Iter Press.

Avezzù, Guido (2003), *Il mito sulla scena: la tragedia ad Atene,* Venezia: Marsilio.

Beccari, Agostino (1555) *Il sacrificio,* Ferrara: Francesco di Rossi da Valenza.

Bruscagli, Riccardo (1991), "Ancora sulle pastorali ferraresi del cinquecento: la parte del Lollio", in M. Chiabò and F. Doglio (eds) (1991), *Sviluppi nella drammaturgia pastorale nell'Europa del Cinque-Seicento,* Roma: Nuova Coletti, 29-43.

Chiabò, M. and F. Doglio (eds) (1991), *Sviluppi nella drammaturgia pastorale nell'Europa del Cinque-Seicento,* Roma: Nuova Coletti, 1991.

Decroisette, Françoise (2002), "Satyres au féminin dans la pastorale italienne de la fin du XVIe siècle", in Giuditta Isotti Rosowsky (ed.), *La campagna in città: letteratura e ideologia nel rinascimento*, Firenze: Franco Cesati, 149-82.

Dougherty, Carol (1999), "The Double Vision of Euripides' 'Cyclops': An Ethnographic 'Odyssey' on the Satyr Stage", *Comparative Drama* 33 (3): 313-38.

Douglas, Mary (1966), *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo,* London: Routledge.

Euripides (1956), *The Cyclops*, trans. and ed. by William Arrowsmith, in *The Complete Greek Tragedies: Euripides II,* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Euripides (1984), *Cyclops of Euripides,* ed. by Richard S. Seaford, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garraffo, Ornella (1985), "Il satiro nella pastorale ferrarese del Cinquecento", *Italianistica* 14 (2): 185-201.

Guarini, Battista (1999), *Il pastor fido*, ed. by Elisabetta Selmi, Venezia: Marsilio.

Giraldi Cinzio, Giambattista (1985), *Egle; Lettera sovra il comporre le satire atte alla scena; Favola pastorale,* ed. by Carla Molinari, Bologna: Commissione Per i Testi di Lingua.

Harrison, Tony (1990), *The Trackers of Oxyrhynchus: the Delphi Text 1988,* London: Faber and Faber.

Konstan, David (1990), "An Anthropology of Euripides' *Kyklops*", in Johm J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin (eds), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 207-27.

Lissarrague, François (1990a), "The Sexual Life of Satyrs", in David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin (eds), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 53-81

— (1990b), "Why Satyrs Are Good to Represent", in John J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin (eds), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context,* Princeton: Princeton University, 228-36.

— (1993), "On the Wildness of Satyrs", in Thomas H. Carpenter and Christopher A. Faraone (eds), *Masks of Dionysus,* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 207-20.

Miani (Negri), Valeria (1604), *Amorosa speranza, favola pastorale*, Venezia: Francesco Bolzetta.

Nietzsche, Friedrich (1967), *The Birth of Tragedy,* trans. by Walter Kaufmann, New York: Random House.

Osborne, Robin (1998), *Archaic and Classical Greek Art*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ovid (1957), *The Art of Love*, trans. by Rolfe Humfries, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Paganelli, Leonardo (1979), *Echi storico-politici nel* Ciclope *euripideo*, Padova: Antenore.

Pieri, Marzia (1983), *La scena boschereccia nel Rinascimento italiano*, Padova: Liviana.

Ray, Meredith (1998), "La castità conquistata: The Function of the Satyr in Pastoral Drama", *Romance Languages Annual* 9: 312-21.

Rossi, Luigi Enrico (1972), "Il dramma satiresco attico: forma, fortuna, e funzione di un genere letterario antico", *Dialoghi d'Archeologia* 6: 248-302.

Sampson, Lisa (2006), *Pastoral Drama in Early Modern Italy: the Making of a New Genre*, Oxford: Legenda.

Seaford, Richard S. (1976), "The Origins of Satyric Drama", *Maia* 28: 209-21.

– (1984), “Introduction”, in *Cyclops of Euripides,* ed. by Richard S. Seaford, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-72.

Taplin, Oliver and Rosie Wyles (eds) (2010), *The Pronomos Vase and Its Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tasso, Torquato (2015), *Aminta,* ed. by Marco Corradini, Milano: Rizzoli.

Tylus, Jane (1992), “Colonizing Peasants: the Rape of the Sabines and the Renaissance Pastoral”, *Renaissance Drama* 23: 113-38.

Voelke, Pierre (1992), “L’espace dans le drama satyrique”, in Claude Calame (ed.), *Figures Grecques de l’intermédiaire*, Lausanne: Université de Lausanne, 33-58.

Winkler, John J. and Froma I. Zeitlin (eds) (1990), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.