SATYR DRAMA
Tragedy at Play

edited by

George W.M. Harrison

SATYR DRAMA

SATYR DRAMA

Tragedy at Play

Editor

George W.M. Harrison

Contributors

Z. Philip Ambrose, T.H. Carpenter, Judith Fletcher,
Mark Griffith, George W.M. Harrison, C.W. Marshall,
Patrick O'Sullivan, A.J. Podlecki, Hanna M. Roisman,
Niall W. Slater, Willeon Slenders, Ian C. Storey

The Classical Press of Wales

First published in 2005
The Classical Press of Wales
15 Rosehill Terrace, Swansea SA1 6JN
Tel: +44 (0)1792 458397
Fax: +44 (0)1792 464067
www.classicalpressofwales.co.uk

Distributor in the United States of America:
The David Brown Book Co.
PO Box 511, Oakville, CT 06779
Tel: +1 (860) 945–9329
Fax: +1 (860) 945–9468

ISBN 1-905125-03-8

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Typeset by Ernest Buckley, Clunton, Shropshire
Printed and bound in the UK by Gomer Press, Llandysul, Ceredigion, Wales

---

The Classical Press of Wales, an independent venture, was founded in 1993, initially to support the work of classicists and ancient historians in Wales and their collaborators from further afield. More recently it has published work initiated by scholars internationally. While retaining a special loyalty to Wales and the Celtic countries, the Press welcomes scholarly contributions from all parts of the world.

The symbol of the Press is the Red Kite. This bird, once widespread in Britain, was reduced by 1905 to some five individuals confined to a small area known as 'The Desert of Wales' – the upper Tywi valley. Geneticists report that the stock was saved from terminal inbreeding by the arrival of one stray female bird from Germany. After much careful protection, the Red Kite now thrives – in Wales and beyond.

CONTENTS

Other Genres

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS

ARV	Beazley, J.D., 1963, *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters*, 2nd edn, Oxford.
Biehl	Biehl, W., 1983, *Euripides* Cyclops, Teubner.
Diggle	Diggle, J., 1984, *Euripidis Opera Omnia*, Oxford Classical Text.
FGrH	Jacoby, F., 1923, *Die Fragmenta der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin.
KPS	Krumeich, P., Pechstein, N. and Seidensticker, B., 1999, *Das griechische Satyrspiel*, Darmstadt.
LCS	Trendall, A.D., 1967, *Red-figured Vases of Lucania, Campania, and Sicily*, Oxford.
LIMC	*Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, 1999, Zurich.
PCG	Kassel, R. and Austin, C., 1983–, *Poetae Comici Graeci*, Berlin.
PMG	Page, D.L., 1962, *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford.
P.Oxy.	*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 1898–, London.
PSI	*Papiri greci e latini*, Papiri della Società Italiana, 1912–83, Florence.
RVAp	Trendall, A.D., 1978–82, *Red-figured Vases of Apulia,* Oxford.
TrGF I	Snell, B., 1971, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vol. 1, *Didascaliae tragicae, catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum, testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum*, Göttingen.
TrGF II	Kannicht, R. and Snell, B., 1981, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vol. 2, *Fragmenta adespota testimonia volumini 1 addenda, indices ad volumina I et II*, Göttingen.
TrGF III	Radt, S., 1985, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vol. 3, Aeschylus, Göttingen.
TrGF IIII	Radt, S. and Kannicht, R., 1977, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vol. 4, Sophocles, Göttingen.
TrGF V	Kannicht, R., 2004, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vol. 5, Euripides, Göttingen.

INTRODUCTION

The esteem in which satyr drama was held in antiquity is a matter of continuing examination and controversy. Dismissed too often as a flip *coda* to weightier and more important tragedies, it has not been accorded the attention it deserves and the respect it requires. Little notice has been taken of the fact that by simple mathematics one-quarter of the output of Attic tragedians would have been satyr plays, and that in the balloting at the Lenaia and Dionysia, the drama which would have been freshest in the minds of voters would have been the satyr play. It is only the accident of survival that has given more contemporary emphasis to tragedy and comedy, not any implicit greater value or artistry. The record of modern production of satyr plays mirrors scholarly inattention. Tony Harrison's *Trackers* and Richard Seaford's *Cyclops* stand out, not just for their excellence but also for their singularity. The last two decades of the twentieth century saw annual productions of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata,* and of several others of his plays. Such a climate should have been conducive to staging satyr drama, but audiences conditioned by the more or less standard two hours' length of movies showed little taste for a play which is staged normally in less than half that time, regardless of how ironic and irreverent the subject; the last fifteen years have seen worldwide only seven productions of the *Cyclops.*

The editor of this volume thus leapt at the chance to participate in the production of the *Cyclops* when he was approached by the head of the Theater Program at Xavier University, Cincinnati, to suggest a play, a Greek play, since Seneca's *Trojan Women* had recently been performed. The *Cyclops* has numerous unresolved questions on which it was thought a fresh production might shed light. Cathy Springfield, head of the Theater Program, produced the play, which was directed by Bulgarian exile Peter K. Karapetkov. A fresh translation for the modern stage was commissioned from George W.M. Harrison. Peter K. Karapetkov brought in his own crew of costume and set designer (Boryana Kostadinova Semerdjieva), and music composer (Petar Radevski) from New York. An unexpected wrinkle in the casting was the unavailability of males because of the recent production of two plays with all-male casts. The play thus featured female satyrs, well attested in ancient vases, disguised as males to protect themselves from

unwanted attention. That is, until Odysseus and his crew in one of the last scenes in the play 'took advantage' of the casting of the chorus.

In conjunction with the play, the Department of Classics sponsored a two-day conference, 21–22 February 2003, co-organized by George W.M. Harrison and Jane E. Francis, to explore current trends in scholarship and future directions for research on satyr drama. The conference was possible because of the active support of many groups at Xavier: Office of the President, Office of the Academic Vice President, Office of the Dean, Arts and Sciences, Archaeological Society, Gallagher Student Center, Office of Special Events, Office of Student Development, Office of Student Life, Office of Student Retention, Student Activities Council, Weekenders, Wheeler Fund, and Xavier Honors Program. Support was also given by the Greater Cincinnati Convention and Visitors Bureau, John Grissmer Fund for the Performing Arts, and the Department of Classics, Modern Languages and Linguistics, Concordia University. Thanks are also owed to Oliver Taplin and Amanda Wrigley of the Archive of Performance of Greek and Roman Drama (Oxford) for fulfilling numerous requests for information, and advice.

Each speaker was allotted an entire hour to develop and demonstrate his or her point in detail, which touched upon not just the *Cyclops* itself, but prosatyric drama, fragments of other satyr dramas, the intellectual currents in which satyr drama was written, produced, and performed, the relationship of language both within the play and as that language refracted concerns of contemporary society, and the potential allure of satyr drama to other artistic genres, most often (but not always) at some remove in time and distance from the production of the Attic dramas themselves. This volume comprises the publication versions of those eleven papers, which take into account, as far as each individual has chosen, the comments made and general discussion at the conclusion of their papers and relaxed imbibing of conversation which continued well into the mornings. It is a mark of the success of the conference and the deep respect of the participants for one another that each and every paper in this collection cites several other papers, and several of the authors passed drafts of their final versions among themselves at their own initiative. The reader is directed to acknowledgements and footnotes to the text which show how much this volume is a truly collaborative effort. To the eleven papers delivered at the conference, one has been appended, the final paper, since it reflects on the history of what must have been the final performances in antiquity and on the understanding of later writers about satyr drama.

The conference and this volume would not have been thinkable without the labours of Seaford, Seidensticker, and particularly Sutton, all of whom

are cited with the praise they merit throughout these proceedings. An Oxford Classical Text (Diggle) and a Teubner (Biehl) appeared a year apart in the early 1980s. These texts and their generous recording of variants and critical appendices have made possible some of the new approaches to the text and interpretations advanced by the authors. The translation of Shelley would no longer be possible for textual as well as cultural reasons. As the conference was in its first stages of organization, the magisterial collection of fragments gathered by Krumeich, Peckstein, and Seidensticker appeared which was instantly recognized by the scholarly world as a great research tool. So much in the conference is indebted to their efforts, and citation of fragments is now possible through one unified, agreed-upon system.

The twelve papers in this volume examine the possibilities and limitations of scholarship on the satyr drama and challenge implicitly or explicitly current views of the role of the satyr drama, prestige of authors writing in this genre, complexity of plots with concomitant challenge to perceived views of relationship to the tragic trilogy, and relevance of potential depictions of satyr drama on vases. Experts on drama were invited who had also distinguished themselves in other areas, such as production, art, feminist reception, social history, religious history, and epigraphy/papyrology. Their talks are organized around four general topics, although there is so much cross-reference among all of the papers that any classification seems superfluous. Any number of different orderings were available given the scope of the papers and breadth of scholarship they all demonstrate individually and as a group. The bibliography, therefore, should be taken as the collection of what is the most valuable among current research and what is best of time-tested scholarship. It was not meant to be comprehensive but rather to make it possible for readers to retrace the paths of inquiry and to direct investigators to books and articles which will be most productive in further study.

The first three papers principally depend upon the fragments. That of Podlecki is the most thorough analysis to date of the fragments of satyr drama attributed to Aeschylus. These fragments are essential to an understanding of the genre since the ancients themselves considered Aeschylus the best writer of satyr drama and thus the standard Euripides sought to supercede. A knowledge of the range of topics and characters in Aeschylus' satyr dramas emphasizes the arguments made by Marshall and O'Sullivan by demonstrating how trends in Euripides were already in motion half a century earlier. Ambrose's catalogue of motifs in the fragments looks forward to contributions by Fletcher, Roisman and Slater in particular, also Griffith, but illuminates others as well. The various types of family origin, nurture, and interaction stand sometimes in contradistinction to Euripides'

tragedies, but as often seem to move on parallel tracks with (especially) the later tragedies. Slenders carefully traces words for erotic actions or intentions in the *Cyclops* and in selected fragments, and constructs a convincing hierarchy of coarseness of epithet with level of emotion, but also demonstrates that in several passages there is an ascending level of sexual hostility, or energy. What is most revealing is that epithet need not be directly related to audience perception of sophistication or crudity of character. Significantly some of the erotic puns crafted by Euripides are meant to be taken by the audience as unintended by the character. His use of language can thus under-cut the surface stratum in ways that are instinctive yet telling.

The paper of Slenders leads naturally into the second group of three which are concerned in large part with the use and abuse of language in the *Cyclops* and *Alcestis*. Fletcher's paper especially anticipates some of the points raised by Marshall, O'Sullivan, and Griffith. Scholarly opinion is widely divergent on the dramatic and literary success, and purpose, of the prayers/oaths in the play. Fletcher examines some of these and other passages in light of the kind or oath, or evasion from making an oath, organizing them by precision of the language in the oath and intent of the character in making the declaration to deities. Her research shows that prevarication is dependent upon character: Silenus, consistent with his dramatic *persona*, makes incomplete prayers/oaths or addresses them incorrectly. He also uses oaths that try to hide (unsuccessfully) his culpability, and Fletcher thus considers his rape to be justified divine retribution. The prayers of Odysseus belong to several different classes of prayer, such as calling down retribution or challenging a deity to prove his/her power, but are genuine calls for assistance, and thus are granted. Polyphemos, as someone who scorns any divine influence, berates deities for which his blindness and too late understanding of the prophecy are retribution. The eating of Odysseus' crewmen is relegated to being a proximate cause and Odysseus becomes the human agent of divine wrath. Hanna Roisman applies to *Cyclops* and *Alcestis* verbal analysis within the context of episodes similar to her well-known work on other plays of Euripides, both on her own and in collaboration with Luschnig. Perhaps the most provocative paper in the collection, she deconstructs scene and character from the viewpoint of logic and common sense but more importantly from the viewpoint of how scenes in these two plays do not mirror in any meaningful way daily life of the Athenians in the audience. Significantly, for the *Cyclops* she diminishes the stature of Odysseus, and she argues that the ending of the *Alcestis* is not happy, both points on which Slater and Griffith register their disagreement. Slater poses an extremely important question that in his reading has great repercussions for both the composition of the text and

performance: 'What did the audience in the theatre [on] that day [of first performance] know about the play before it began?' He sees the absence of satyrs in the *Alcestis,* replaced by curmudgeonly old geezers, to be Euripides' slap at a recent, short-sighted law known as τὸ περὶ τοῦ μὴ κωμῳδεῖν γραφὲν ('a law of his [Morychides] to not revel'), and bolsters his case by arguing that a comedy with satyrs in the following year was in reaction to the satyrless *Alcestis* of 438. His findings are confirmed by Storey, who would assert that 437 had not one, but two comedies with satyr choruses, not just in reaction to Euripides but further registering artistic disapproval of the decree passed during the archonship of Morychides (440/39).

If Slater brings the audience of the premiere performance to the foreground, then the third group of three papers present convincing and cross-supporting visions of what exactly that audience was meant to see. Marshall and O'Sullivan in the two most intertwined papers of the conference demolish current received scholarly opinion that Euripides is engaged in an intellectual game in the *Cyclops*, simultaneously conducting conversation with Socrates and the rhetors but also dismissing them similarly to the way Aristophanes did in the *Clouds*. Such a view moves satyr drama closer to comedy, the instinct of all modern production, and one about which Griffith has much to say. One, correctly, distances *Cyclops* from contemporary innovations in philosophy and firmly places it among presocratic cosmology, emphasizing by insinuation that the meeting of Odysseus and Polyphemus belongs to the world of Homer. The other, as correctly, declines to view the two protagonists, and most particularly their *agon*, as a critique of new educational methods; rather, Euripides' point of reference is to *tyrannis*, a peculiar Greek institution, overturned in Athens by democracy, but kept too little at bay for comfort. These two papers, plus that of Griffith, should change forever our perception of the world in which the *Cyclops* and *Alcestis* were written, and which they attempt to expose so as to ameliorate. Griffith builds on his own substantial body of scholarship on power politics, audience, and satyr drama, but pays particular attention to Edith Hall's brilliant 1998 article on 'Ithyphallic males behaving badly', which as much as any other article, began dissolving accretions of scholarly patina. Griffith analyses diction in order to reassert the connection between tragedy and satyr drama and then looks at ways in which the satyr choruses could engage, or were meant to engage, adult male fantasy life, particularly their ambivalence about slavery. His choice of Aeschylus' *Diktyoulkoi* as his main example looks directly back to, and references, the papers of Ambrose, Podlecki, and Slenders.

The last three papers examine satyrs in other genres, and particularly the possible extent of collusion, or perhaps confusion. Storey, although

mainly in agreement with Podlecki, argues against the easy and natural inclination to class as a satyr drama any and every dramatic fragment which mentions or seems to mention satyrs, or the kind of scene in which they could reasonably appear. Evidence for satyrs in comedy and for the long durée, much longer than the span of old comedy, is given by Storey, who also disentangles convincingly several Greek writers with the same name who wrote comedies and satyr drama but who over time were agglomerated into one. Storey also demonstrates, as has not been done before, that writers of comedy could and did also write satyr drama; that is, satyr drama was not left to tragedians alone to write. Carpenter visits the issue of vase painting with the same justified skepticism as Storey. Most of the vases come from Magna Graecia, but significantly from areas which are not Greek settlements. He several times points out that the cultural reference of the vases in their place of deposition would have been very different from the way these vases are generally considered in scholarship. He would, rightly, limit the use of these vases as evidence only for the time and place of their production, and minimize any value they might have for Euripidean drama. It has been noted that the end of datable production of vases with satyr drama, *c.* 380 BC, is close to the point in time when the production of satyr drama was limited to one per festival. Carpenter stresses strongly that these two phenomena are probably not linked, or at least not in the way some have believed. The end of production of these vases, correctly in his opinion, is tied to changes in taste of potters and changes in taste of the non-Greek market. The final paper considers an issue raised implicitly or explicitly by most of the papers in this collection: where satyr drama should be placed on a continuum with tragedy at one end and comedy at the other. The author weighs ancient *testimonia* carefully and attempts to place the writers within the performative conventions and preferences of their own times. He concludes that satyr drama was partially conflated with but largely displaced by Italian comic genres, such as Atellan farce, mime, and phlyakes. Satyr drama over time must increasingly have moved in the direction of farce, something which mirrors modern proclivities.

One of the early editorial decisions was about style and orthography. Several of the authors stated decided preferences for Hellenic forms, such as 'Aiskhylos', over the Latinate. It was deemed appropriate to honour their wishes, at the small cost of homogeneity. One trusts it will cause the reader no harm. So, too, the first person pronoun was generally discouraged, but even in this the expressed preferences of each author were respected. Similarly, an editorial suggestion was made that puns and jocular references to pop culture, so devastating in oral delivery, be moved to the notes. In the event some of the puns were so delicious – Marshall, Roisman, and Slater

leap to mind – and the feigned hurt from contributors so universal that the decision was made to leave them in the text or move them to the notes at the author's selection. Each of the contributions is thus highly singular and very individual, preserving the flavour of the style of the writer. In this, I trust that I would have Euripides' approval.

The conference did not, and could not, resolve all of the debates about satyr drama, and prosatyric drama. The endings of the *Alcestis* and *Cyclops* are largely matters of interpretation, and room must be left for the possibility that the *Alcestis* was played with a happy ending in one production and not in another, as likewise the satyrs leave the island or are abandoned depending upon the reading of each new director in light of cultural, social and political conditions at the time of each new production. Opinion is almost evenly split, also, on whether the audience was to understand that Silenus was raped off-stage or had a narrow escape from *stuprum*. Fletcher's understanding of the divine matrix would require the rape; similarly for Harrison; for others, like Ambrose and Slenders, it would not have been justified by the levels of language, and so is unlikely. Similarly, language and diction, a concern of nearly every paper, expose facets of the principal characters which cannot always be reconciled easily with one another. The different readings of obscenity (Slenders), vows (Fletcher), tragic diction (Griffith), attraction to comic norms (Storey), political nuance (O'Sullivan), cultural nuance (Marshall), familial connection (Ambrose) and character consistency (Harrison) are by no means automatically mutually exclusive. In the end we are all, each in our own way, willing servants to Dionysos, as the chorus sings in its exodus: τὸ λοιπὸν Βακχίῳ δουλεύσομεν ('for the rest of time we will be servants to Dionysos').

The title of this collection of essays is taken from Demetrios *On Style* 169: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπινοήσειεν ἄν τις τραγῳδίαν παίζουσαν, ἐπεὶ σάτυρον γράψει ἀντὶ τραγῳδίας ('no one would think to 'play at' tragedy, since [to do so] he writes a satyr drama instead of a tragedy'). This project has always made me mindful of William Arrowsmith, who first caused me to read the *Cyclops* and from whom I learned to write while serving as his research assistant. It will always conjure up his memory.

George W.M. Harrison
Chania (Crete)
6 June 2005

1

AISKHYLOS SATYRIKOS

A.J. Podlecki

Satyr drama was a surprisingly robust and long-lived genre. Krumeich, Pechstein and Seidensticker 1999 (hereafter KPS) record author, title and/or fragments of about 75 satyr plays, and there is evidence for performances of satyr plays, both new and revivals, at various dramatic festivals as late as the third century CE.[1] The origins of the genre are shrouded in obscurity: the ancient data are sparse and often conflicting and some of the later theorizing seems to be little more than conjecture. The Suda-lexicon s.v. 'Arion' says of that probably historical poet who worked at the court of Periandros in Corinth that he 'introduced satyrs speaking verses' (or 'speaking in verse', ἔμμετρα λέγοντας). It is not certain (although it may appear likely) that this was in a context of dramatic productions and perhaps even at state-sponsored festivals.[2] Aristotle (*Poetics* 1449a19–23) presents a brief sketch of how he thought early tragedy developed:

> ἐκ μικρῶν μύθων καὶ λέξεως γελοίας διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν ὀψὲ ἀπεσεμνύνθη, τό τε μέτρον ἐκ τετραμέτρου ἰαμβεῖον ἐγένετο. τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον τετραμέτρῳ ἐχρῶντο διὰ τὸ σατυρικὴν καὶ ὀρχηστικωτέραν εἶναι τὴν ποίησιν.
>
> Because [tragedy] changed from satyric its small plots and laughable diction were solemnized late, and the metre changed from [trochaic] tetrameter to iambic. For first they used the tetrameter because the poetry was satyric and full of dancing.

Among various explanations of the saying 'Nothing to do with Dionysos', the Suda offers the following:

> τὸ πρόσθεν εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον γράφοντες τούτοις ἠγωνίζοντο, ἅπερ καὶ σατυρικὰ ἐλέγετο. ὕστερον δὲ μεταβάντες εἰς τὸ τραγῳδίας γράφειν, κατὰ μικρὸν εἰς μύθους καὶ ἱστορίας ἐτράπησαν, μηκέτι τοῦ Διονύσου μνημονεύοντες. ὅθεν τοῦτο καὶ ἐπεφώνησαν. καὶ Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ περὶ Θέσπιδος τὰ παραπλήσια ἱστορεῖ.
>
> Formerly, when writing in honour of Dionysos they competed with these pieces which were called 'satyric'. But later, having changed over to the writing of tragedies, they gradually turned to mythical and historical subjects and no

> longer made any mention of Dionysos. Hence they also exclaimed this. And Khamaileon reports very much the same thing in his work 'On Thespis' (fr. 38 Wehrli).[3]

But a reverse process seems to be implied by Zenobios *Proverbs* 5.40:

> Ἐπειδὴ τῶν χορῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰθισμένων διθύραμβον ᾄδειν εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον, οἱ ποιηταὶ ὕστερον ἐκβάντες τὴν συνήθειαν ταύτην 'Αἴαντας' καὶ 'Κενταύρους' γράφειν ἐπεχείρησαν. ὅθεν οἱ θεώμενοι σκώπτοντες ἔλεγον, 'Οὐδὲν πρὸς Διόνυσον'. διὰ γοῦν τοῦτο τοὺς Σατύρους ὕστερον ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς προεισάγειν, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶσιν ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ.
>
> When the poets, having abandoned the writing of dithyrambs, turned to plays with titles like 'Ajax' and 'Centaurs', the spectators would jeeringly say 'Nothing to do with Dionysos', and for this reason they decided later to introduce satyr plays as a prelude in order that they might not seem to be forgetting the god.

Even if it were possible to ascertain when this alleged change occurred, the testimonium is unlikely to shed much light on the *early* history of the genre. The term 'introduce as a prelude', προεισάγειν, suggests that the Suda's source had in mind a later (possibly late classical or early Hellenistic) alteration to the festival. At an unspecified date before 341/40 BCE the arrangements were changed and a single satyr drama was presented at the opening of the festival as a 'Vorspiel' before the tragedies, rather than one-per-playwright as the concluding play of a tetralogy, as had been done formerly.[4]

Claims have been made, chiefly on the basis of iconographic evidence, for satyrs engaging in organized choral activity of some sort as early as the first part of the sixth century (Hedreen 1992, 125–8), but choral *celebration* is not necessarily the same as dramatic *performance*, and so it is dangerous to use one as evidence for the other. That the pictures on vases of satyrs in unusual mythic situations reflect plots of actual satyr dramas is a very problematic assumption and one addressed by Carpenter in this volume. Some scholars believe that scenes on vases can be used as evidence for the existence of satyr plays even if there are no actual satyrs depicted.[5] Experts in vase painting and iconography disagree on the significance of the περίζωμα, the 'satyric breeches' or furry shorts with phallus and horsetail attached that seem to have been the standard costume of stage satyrs, and so the issue of how much light art can throw on actual dramatic peformance becomes even more confused. Hedreen (1992, 107–12) and others see in them almost infallible markers that *theatrical* satyrs are being depicted.[6] Bérard and Bron (1989, 143) on the other hand insist that, since satyrs in furry shorts and with other elements of costume sometimes appear in 'non-

theatrical contexts', it is only proper to conclude that in some vase scenes 'this costume has nothing to do with the theater' (1989, 143). Hence, the salutary warning of Lissarrague (1990a, 233): for an Athenian who has seen a play and is now perhaps considering buying a pot, 'the vases are souvenirs, rather than reproductions, of the dramas', and even this contention of vases as 'souvenirs' is not beyond dispute.

Those who try to navigate through the visual evidence soon find themselves in treacherous waters. If the text of *Kyklops* had not survived, one might have been tempted to believe on the basis of the elder Pliny's description (*Nat. Hist*. 35.74) of a painting by Timanthes that Euripides' satyr play contained a scene in which the satyrs measured the thumb of a sleeping Polyphemos.[7] It is sobering that the heroically nude writer of the satyr production (if it was such) depicted on the Pronomos Vase (see p. 224) is designated 'Demetrios', a name which recurs only as that of a satyrographer from Tarsus (*TrGF* I 206).[8]

Numerous innovations in dramatic performance are ascribed to the legendary Thespis, but there appears to be nothing to connect him with satyr plays. Pratinas of Phleious (Suda s.v.), who is reported to have competed against Aiskhylos and Khoirilos in the 70th Ol. (499/6 BCE), is said to have been 'the first to write *Satyroi*'. A view widely held is that he was the poet whose satyr plays were first presented as a required component of the dramatic festivals, and the date generally given is *c.* 520/10 BCE.[9] The only certainly satyric title preserved under Pratinas' name is *Palaistai*, which probably dealt with the fight between Theseus and Kerkyon, king of Eleusis, or Herakles and the giant Antaios (KPS 77); if it was Kerkyon there is an interesting possible overlap with Aiskhylos' satyr drama of that name (no. 1 below). On the evidence of vase representations Simon (1982, 125–9, and cf. Simon 1997, cat. 159) conjecturally assigns to Pratinas a satyr play involving Iris, Hera, Dionysos, Herakles and Hermes, which, she believes, ended with the establishment of a festival of reconciliation in (appropriately enough) the sanctuary of Dionysos Eleuthereus. Sutton (1974b, 114) lists Phrynikhos' *Antaios or Libyes* as 'conjecturally satyric' on the basis of ancient testimony (*TrGF* I s.v. Phrynichus fr. 3a) that it dealt with the wrestling match between Herakles and Antaios, a popular theme in satyr dramas (for example, Pratinas' *Palaistai* and Aiskhylos' *Kerkyon*). Pratinas' son Aristias wrote an *Antaios*, which is also classed as doubtfully satyric (KPS 223).

It may be of interest to compare statistically the satyrographic output of the three main tragedians. Of the 123 Sophoklean titles in Lloyd-Jones' Loeb edition (1996, vol. 3, 7–8) he lists 13 as 'satyr plays attested', 7 as 'plausibly conjectured to be satyric' and 2 'for which a case can be made'.

That gives a total of 20 (or, generously, 22), that is, 16 to 18 per cent of Sophokles' entire output. Titles of only 8 Euripidean satyr plays were preserved at Alexandria. Set against the figures variously transmitted for Euripides' total production, 75, 88 or 92 dramas,[10] these would represent 10.6, 9, or 8.7 per cent respectively.

Aiskhylos stood in very high repute in antiquity, and possibly even in his own lifetime, as a writer of *Satyrika*. The philosopher Menedemos of Eretria (*c.* 300 BCE) considered him the best, giving second place to Akhaios.[11] Some figures for Aiskhylos' total output are given in the ancient sources. The Medicean *Life* appears to ascribe to him 70 tragedies, 15 satyr dramas, and 5 *amphibola* (doubtful) for a total of 90 (the figure in the Suda). Smyth's catalogue (1957, 375–7) credits him with 83 titles and *TrGF* III 58–9 gives 72. From these two catalogues the following are designated 'satyric': (1) *Kerkyōn* (2) *Kērykes* (3) *Kirkē* (4) *Leōn* (5) *Lykourgos* (6) *Promētheus* (probably *Pyrkaeus*) (7) *Prōteus* and (8) *Sphinx*. To these can confidently be added (9) *Amymōnē* (10) *Diktyoulkoi* (11) *Glaukos Pontios*[12] (12) *Kallistō* (13) *Kabeiroi* (14) a *Sisyphos* play and (15) *Theōroi or Isthmiastai*. The case for (16) *Trophoi* seems to me to be compelling and a (less convincing) case has also been made for (17) *Xantriai* (18) the *Dikē*-drama and (19) *Ostologoi*. If we take the total as 16, the proportion of Aiskhylos' known satyr plays to his total output is just under 20 per cent (Smyth's figures) or about 22 per cent (*TrGF* III).

The scheme of presentation of the data in this survey is as follows. The certain and putative titles are numbered as in the above catalogue with, under each,

(a) total number of citations in *TrGF* III
(b) number of preserved complete verses
(c) general outline of the plot so far as it can be reconstructed
(d) the tetralogy to which it can plausibly be assigned
(e) additional observations.

1. *Kerkyōn*

(a) 6

(b) 1. Fr. 102 ἀμφωτίδες τοι τοῖς ἐνωτίοις [or ἐνῳδίοις Radt comparing fr. 424b] πέλας, 'ear-coverings close to his ear-rings', referring to wrestlers. Sutton comments, 'the meager fragments of this play mention technicalities of wrestling but are otherwise uninformative' (1980, 17).

(c) The action probably involved Theseus' 'closure' of the wrestling-school of this son of Poseidon who was King of Eleusis; compare Kratinos, *Drapetides* fr. 53, *PCG* IV, where someone, probably Theseus, says, 'I found Kerkyon at dawn crapping among the cabbages and throttled him.'

(d) *Kerkyōn* has been conjecturally placed as the fourth play in the *Epigonoi* tetralogy (*Argeiai/oi*, *Eleusinioi*, *Epigonoi*, in various combinations)
(e) Cf. Pratinas' *Palaistai*, discussed above.

2. *Kērykes*
(a) 6
(b) 0
(c) The play possibly concerned Herakles on the basis of Frs. 109 and 110, refs. to a lion-hide and a red-maned lion.
(d) This play (or *Leōn*) was possibly the fourth in a tetralogy with *Alkmēnē* and *Herakleidai*.
(e) Simon (1982, 138–9) follows B.A.Van Groningen (*Mnemosyne* n.s. 58 [1930] 134) in positing a connection with a story reported by Apollodoros (2.4.11): King Erginos of Orchomenos sent his heralds to Thebes to fetch a tribute of 100 cattle, paid annually in retribution for a murder in the past history of the two cities. Herakles, who happened to be in Thebes at the time, put the heralds in chains and cut off their ears and noses, which he sent back to Erginos. A battle ensued in which the Orchomenians were defeated and compelled thereafter to reciprocate with a double tribute, 200 cattle, which they had to send annually to Thebes. For all the farcical elements that a satyrical rendering of these proceedings would have required, Sutton (1980, 23, with n. 83) rightly calls them 'extraordinarily grim'. Simon suggested that Erginos' heralds were 'played by satyrs or accompanied by satyrs', an assumption that enables her to see influences of the play in two late Attic red-figure lekythoi in which satyrs are shown in fetters and being led along, on the first vase by Herakles and on the second by a figure identified by Simon as a herald, but by others as Hermes.[13]

3. *Kirkē*
(a) 3
(b) 0
(c) Probably, from the title, some episode from *Odyssey* 10, quite possibly Kirke turning Odysseus' men into satyrs, which Gantz (1980, 153) calls '…a light-hearted moment from Odysseus' earlier adventures'.
(d) Conjecturally *Kirkē* was the satyr play with *Psykhagōgoi*, *Ostologoi* and *Pēnelopē.*
(e) The *Odyssey* seems to have been a rich quarry for satyric plots (Sutton 1974c). Sutton connects with this play 'a rather marvellous vase-painting (Syracuse bell krater 23508) showing a witch making passes with her hands at some satyrs who have been transformed into apes'.[14]

4. *Leōn* (it has been suggested that this was an alternative title for *Kērykes*, or *Kallistō*)
(a) 1
(b) 1 Fr. 123 ὁδοιπόρων δήλημα, χωρίτης δράκων, 'the bane of wayfarers, the serpent that haunts the place'
(c) It may have dealt with Herakles' assault on the Nemean lion.
(d) unknown
(e) Simon (1982, 136) suggests that the plot involved the satyrs attempting to steal Herakles' club and bow when he laid these weapons aside to wrestle with the lion, and she conjectures that a scene from the play may be depicted on a red-figure kalpis of about 460 BCE by the Villa Giulia painter, now in the Vatican.[15] Sutton (1980, 23–4) raises the possibility that the lion in question was not the Nemean beast but 'an individual named Leon, one of the sons of Lycaon punished for their hubris: when Zeus, disguised as a mortal, visited them, they fed him an impious banquet and were destroyed by the resentful god (cf. Ps.-Apollodorus, *Library* III 8.1)'.

5. *Lykourgos*
(a) 3
(b) 2 Fr. 124 κἀκ τῶνδ' ἔπινε βρῦτον ἰσχναίνων χρόνῳ | κἀσεμνοκόμπει τοῦτ' ἐν ἀνδρείᾳ τιθείς, 'And after this he drank beer, thinning it with time (?) | and made a loud boast and made it (?) a test of his manhood.'
(c) It is thought to have been connected with Lykourgos' brutal treatment of his guests.
(d) The satyr play in the *Lykourgeia* tetralogy: (1) *Edōnoi* (Lykourgos probably taken to Mt. Pangaios on orders of Dionysos and there tied up, to be devoured by horses), (2) *Bassarides* or *Bassarai* (also on Mt. Pangaios; Dionysos sends the Bassarai against Orpheus, perhaps at the request of Apollo, who had been offended by the fact that Orpheus identified Apollo with Helios, whom he addressed as 'greatest of the gods') and (3) *Neaniskoi* (Edonian converts to Dionysos-worship).

6. *Promētheus* (*Pyrkaeus*)
(a) 6
(b) about 14. Fr. 204b is a fairly extensive choral passage preserved in *P.Oxy.* 20 (1952) 2245 fr. 1 (assigned plausibly to this play by Eduard Fraenkel, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 1942, 246); about 12 lines are more or less complete. Other citations add 2 more lines.
(c) Beazley (1939), in a thorough review of the ceramic evidence, suggested that the play showed Prometheus bestowing fire not upon humans, but satyrs, whom he instructed how to make torches. Excited by the wonderful

discovery a satyr, ever an amorous creature, tried to kiss the flame but was warned, perhaps by Prometheus himself, to be careful lest the fire scorch his beard. At *Mor*. 86 F ('How to profit from one's enemies') Plutarch quotes fr. 207 τράγος γένειον ἆρα πενθήσεις σύ γε, 'Like the goat, you'll indeed mourn for your beard,' and Plutarch comments that it was spoken by Prometheus to a satyr who was seeing fire for the first time and wanted to embrace and kiss it. In fr. 204 b, a song by the chorus of satyrs, they say (vv. 6–8) Νύμφας δέ τοι πέποιθ' ἐγώ | στήσειν χοροὺς | Προμηθέως δῶρον ὡς σεβούσας, 'I persuaded the Nymphs[16] to set up choruses in honour of Prometheus' who will be called βροτοῖς φερέσβιός τε…σπευσίδωρος, 'the bringer of sustenance and the eager giver of gifts to mortals'. Fr. 187a (206), if it belongs to this play, may be Prometheus warning the satyrs not to come too close to a boiling cauldron.

(d) The play has been almost universally ascribed to the *Persai* tetralogy of 472.

(e) Fr. 207a, which is only conjecturally ascribed to Aiskhylos, may point in the direction of a comic elaboration involving Prometheus' reception of the jar of evils, and his ineffectual warnings to his brother Epimetheus concerning Pandora, in an ambience of frolicking satyrs. Greifenhagen 1963 argued (on the basis of a depiction on a red-figure oinochoe by the Altamura Painter *c.* 460 BCE, now in Berlin, 1962.33) that there may have been another satyric *Prometheus*, surnamed 'Pyrphoros', which featured a torch-relay race.

7. *Prōteus*

(a) 6

(b) 2

(c) The action probably progressed much as in *Odyssey* 4, Menelaos' encounter with Proteus, and the latter's prophecy.

(d) attested as the fourth play in the *Oresteia*

(e) Griffith (2002, 238–50) posits the rounding out of certain themes introduced earlier in the trilogy: Iphigeneia's sacrifice averted, and substitution of a phantom for the real Helen.

8. *Sphinx*

(a) 3

(b) 3. Fr. 235 refers cryptically to a στέφανον, ἀρχαῖον στέφος, a 'garland, an ancient crown' for an unnamed ξένος (who may, in fact, be Oidipous, if he appeared in the play; see below), δεσμῶν ἄριστον ἐκ Προμηθέως λόγου, 'the best of bonds, as Prometheus said'. It is not clear what is being alluded to; perhaps it was the cult practice, mentioned by Athenaios, the source

of the citation, of votaries wearing crowns of osier as a memento of the binding, and subsequent release, of Prometheus.
(c) Simon reconstructs the play on the basis of several vase scenes (1981b, 19–34; cf. Simon 1982, 141–2 and Simon 1997, cat. 160). The Theban elders have again failed to solve the Sphinx's riddle and so another victim must be offered to her depredations; this time it is Haimon, King Kreon's son. The dejected elders have left their insignia of office on their official chairs and the somewhat elderly, white-haired satyrs, overconfident of their abilities at riddle-solving, try their hand at outwitting the Sphinx, with ludicrous results.

A serious uncertainty remains: did Oidipous himself actually appear in the play, as Simon and many others think (some vases show Oidipous in the costume of a traveler, apparently ready to take up the Sphinx's challenge)? Robert denied that Oidipous figured in the action. Basing his argument on a Paestan bell krater by Python now in Naples, 2846, and a Roman lamp,[17] Robert postulated that the action involved Silenos defeating the Sphinx by putting to her the question whether a bird he was hiding under his cloak was alive or dead. The more widely held view is that the play's action climaxed with the Sphinx killing herself in frustration when Oidipous famously solved her riddle.
(d) the fourth play in the *Oidipodeia* of 467 BCE

9. *Amymōnē*
(a) 3
(b) 2 Fr. 13 σοὶ μὲν γαμεῖσθαι μόρσιμον, γαμεῖν δ' ἐμοί, 'It is fated for you to be married, and for me to marry' (spoken to Amymone by Poseidon, or possibly Silenos).
(c) After arriving in the dry land of Argos, Danaos sent his daughters to find water. One of them, Amymone, got bored and went off to chase a deer, at whom she threw a javelin which hit a sleeping satyr instead. Poseidon appeared and frightened the lustful satyr away with his trident, and then exacted his due from Amymone, who found him less repulsive than the satyr. When Amymone remembered what she was supposed to be seeking, Poseidon aided her quest by pulling his trident from the rock in which it had stuck. From this a triple stream poured out, which was named first 'Amymone' and then 'Lerna'. The child of the union was Nauplios, who became a famous seaman (Apollodoros 2.1.4; Hyginus *Fab.* 149A).

Sutton reconstructs as follows: '…the heroine, one of Danaus' daughters, is pursued by randy satyrs, appeals for aid, and is rescued by Poseidon, who then marries her himself. Co-ordinated with their marriage is the discovery of the 'spring of Amymone' at Lerna, and this ends a drought plaguing

Argos [he cites Hyginus, *Fab.* 169–169A Rose]. This presents a parallel to the pursuit of the Danaids by the Egyptians, their cries for aid and their rescue by Pelasgus [in *Supplices*], and an equally obvious thematic parallel: flight from sexual oppression' (1974c, 174).
(d) This was almost certainly the closing work of the *Danaid* tetralogy (probably 463 BCE), of which *Suppliants* survives.
(e) See in general Sutton 1974a. The story was extremely popular with vase painters; see Simon 1981a. Among an array of possible visual references to the play may be mentioned three Attic red-figure bell kraters: (1) Vienna, Kunst. Mus. IV 1011, (ill. Simon 1981a, cat. 12, KPS Tafel 18 a), (2) Vatican U 13 Inv. 9096, (ill. Simon 1981a, cat. 45), both of these *c.* 410 BCE, and (3) Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Univ. Mus. L 634 (ill. KPS Tafel 18 b; Simon 1981a, cat. 69 and 1997, cat. 163; Griffith 2002 fig. 8b), 390/80 BCE.

10. *Diktyoulkoi* ('Net-haulers')
(a) 7
(b) about 35 complete or almost complete, and about a dozen more or less intelligibly preserved in fairly extensive papyrus fragments: PSI 1209 and 1209b; *P.Oxy.* 18 (1941) 2161; *P.Oxy.* 20 (1952) 2255 frs. 20 and 21, and 2256 fr. 72.
(c) The plot involves the rescue of Danaë and Perseus from the sea; 'the general action was apparently an attempt by Silenos to carry off Danaë after Diktys had gone for help' (Gantz 1980, 151). In fr. 46a 'two people catch sight of the chest containing Danaë and the infant Perseus as it appears near the shore of…Seriphos'; according to Lloyd-Jones (1957, 532) the two are Diktys and Silenos, father of the satyrs.[18] If Diktys' companion is Silenos, he may have accompanied Diktys on a fishing expedition. They have difficulty dragging the 'whale-monster or hammer-headed shark' from the water, so they call on the satyr-chorus to help them. But these latter do not find it easy either, so they summon the local country-folk and urge one another not to let go the line. Another, and by far the longest, papyrus fragment preserves an extended exchange between a female character, most probably Danaë, and (probably) Silenos, who says to her μάλ' εὐμενῆ δέχ]ου με καὶ προπράκτορα, 'accept me as a most kindly protector and supporter'. The infant Perseus, he insists, μαῖαν ὡς γερασμίαν | [σαίνει προσαυδῶν] ἠπίος προσφθέγμασιν, 'is greeting me with friendly words, as he would his respected grandmother'. Danaë then utters a plaintive lament (cf. Simonides fr. 543 *PMG*), calling on the ancestral gods and (probably) Zeus, to deliver her from her sufferings and not hand her over to the 'beasts' (presumably, the satyrs). She prays not to undergo defilement as a hostage.

Shall she string up a noose and hang herself? She does not want to be put to sea again, by her father or anyone else. In closing she addresses Zeus:

> ...πέμπ᾽ ἀρωγόν, εἰ δοκεῖ, τινά·
> σὺ μὲν γὰρ] εἶχες αἰτίας τῆς μείζονος
> βλάβης, δίκη]ν δὲ πᾶσαν ἐξέτεισ᾽ ἐγώ.
>
> Send me some help in this plight,
> for you were guilty of the greater fault,
> but it is I who have paid the full penalty.

Silenos (or perhaps the Chorus, according to Lloyd-Jones) interjects in lyrics: ἡδὺ] γελᾷ μου προσορῶν, | ἦν, τόδ᾽] ὁ μικκὸς λιπαρὸν | τὸ μιλτόπρεπτον φαλακρόν, 'Look, the little tyke smiles as he looks on | this shiny bright-red bald head…the little kid's a real ποσθοφιλής' ('prick-lover'; cf. Slenders 1992, 157–8 and in this volume). What follows, the longest continuous passage in the papyrus, is a ludicrous song by Silenos to the baby Perseus:

> ἴξῃ παιδοτρόφους ἐμάς,
> ὦ φίλος, χέρας εὐμενοῦς,
> τέρψῃ δ᾽ ἵκτισι κα[ὶ] νεβρο[ῖς
> ὑστρίχων τ᾽ ὀβρίχοισ[ι],
> κοιμήσῃ τε τρίτος ξὺν
> μητρὶ [καὶ π]ατρὶ τῷδε.
> ὁ πάπα[ς δ]ὲ παρέξει
> τῷ μικκῷ τὰ γελ[οῖ]α
> καὶ τροφὰς ἀνόσους, ὅπως π[οτ᾽ ἰσχὺν
> ἀλδὼν αὐτὸς, ἐ[πεὶ πατὴρ
> χαλᾷ νεβροφόν[ου] ποδ[ός],
> μάρπτων θῆρας ἄνευ δορός
> θῶσθαι μητρὶ παρέξεις
> κ]ηδεστῶν τρόπον οἷσιν
> ἔ]ντροφος πελατεύσεις.
> -- ἀλλ᾽] εἶα, φίλοι, στείχωμεν, ὅπως
> γ]άμον ὁρμαίνωμεν, ἐπεὶ τέλεος
> καιρὸς ἄναυδος τάδ᾽ ἐπαινεῖ.
> καὶ τήνδ᾽ [ἐ]σορῶ νύμφην ἥ[δ]η
> πάνυ βουλομένην τῆς ἡμετέρας
> φιλότητος ἄδην κορέσασθαι.
> καὶ θαῦμ᾽ οὐδέν· πολὺς ἦν αὐτῇ
> χρόνος ὃν χήρα κατὰ ναῦν ὕφαλος
> τείρετο· νῦν δ᾽ οὖν
> ἐ]σορῶσ᾽ ἥβην τὴν ἡμετέραν
> γαθ]εῖ, γάνυται, νυμφ[ί]ον [ο]ἷον
> δαι]σὶν λαμπραῖς τῆς Ἀ[φ]ροδίτης…

> Damnation take Diktys, who is trying to cheat me of this prize behind my back! [To Perseus] Come here, my dearie! [He makes clucking noises.] Don't be frightened. Are you whimpering? Over here to my sons, so that you can come to my protecting arms, dear boy – I'm so kind – and you can find pleasure in the martens and fawns and young porcupines, and can make a third in bed with your mother and with me your father. And daddy shall give the little one his fun. And you shall lead a healthy life, so that one day, when you've grown strong, you yourself – for your father's losing his grip on his fawn-killing footwork – you yourself shall catch beasts without a spear [like Dionysos' other followers, the Mainads], and shall give them to your mother for dinner, after the fashion of her husband's family, amongst whom you'll be earning your keep [a change to anapaests at v. 821]. Come now, dear fellows, let us go and hurry the marriage [that is, between Silenos and Danaë], for the time is ripe for it and without words speaks for it. Why, I see that already the bride is eager to enjoy our love to the full. No wonder: she spent a long time wasting away all lonely in the ship beneath the foam. Well, now that she has before her eyes our youthful vigour, she rejoices and exults; such is the bridegroom that by the bright gleam of Aphrodite's torches…

Lloyd-Jones suggests that the play ended with the return of Diktys with a party of friends, to force Silenos to give up his booty for, as he comments, 'The rescue of a distressed beauty from the satyrs was a not uncommon theme of satyric drama (1957, 535).'

(d) *Diktyoulkoi* is generally agreed to have been the satyr play in the Perseus tetralogy, which comprised also *Phorkides* and *Polydektēs*. About *Phorkides* we know little more than that someone – probably Perseus – 'rushed into the cave (probably of the Gorgons, who were under the guardianship of their sisters, the Phorkides or Graiai, and whose single, shared eye Perseus had snatched and flung into lake Tritonis) like a wild boar' (fr. 261). *Polydektēs* may have involved Perseus' petrifaction, using the Gorgon's severed head, of people of Polydektes' court at Seriphos and the king himself, who was in some versions Diktys' brother. The place of *Diktyoulkoi* is assured, but it is not clear what position the other two held, nor what the third tragedy was.

(e) Howe (1959, 151) gives a good basic analysis of the content of the preserved passages, particularly from the aspect of the 'aura of light romanticism' that hangs over Aiskhylos' satyr dramas. Werre-De Haas 1961 offers a comprehensive treatment of the papyrus fragments and the main issues connected with the play. Reflections of the play (and its tetralogy) have been seen on several vases, principally a red-figure pyxis in the Ch. Clairmont collection and a red-figure bell krater in Syracuse, Museo Nazionale 23910, both from the period 460–450 BCE.[19] Goins (1997, 210) dates the tetralogy on the basis of the literary and iconographic evidence to 461 or 460.

11. *Glaukos Pontios*
(a) 9
(b) 5 separate + a papyrus-fragment (*P.Oxy.* 18 [1941] 2159) in which two more verses are restored. Lloyd-Jones (1957, 529) cites with approval a suggestion by E. Siegmann 'that an old herdsman is here describing to an incredulous listener [? Silenos or the satyrs] an appearance of the transformed Glaucus'.
(c) The action took place at Anthedon, on the Boiotian side of the Euripos. Glaukos was a fisherman who, because he had eaten the 'ever-living', 'imperishable grass' (fr. 28 and fr. 29), was changed into a prophetic sea-daimon, whose prophecies were especially valued by sailors. Possibly the incurably inquisitive satyrs, on coming upon this creature, were startled by his 'shaggy moustache and beard's base' (fr. 27).
(d) unknown
(e) Sutton (1974b, 123) once followed Guggisberg (1947, 87–8) in questioning the satyric nature of *Glaukos Pontios*, but he later resolved these doubts: 'in all probability satyric' (1980, 22). Plutarch (*Life of Cicero* 2.3) refers to 'a little poem in [trochaic] tetrameters' about Glaukos written by the youthful Cicero and still extant in Plutarch's own day.

12. *Kallistō*
(a) 1
(b) none
(c) See Hesiod fr.163 Merkelbach and West. Kallisto was an Arkadian nymph, a companion of Artemis; Zeus loved her, and she was turned into a bear, perhaps (as in the similar case of Io) through the jealousy of Hera. Eventually she became the constellation, the Great Bear.
(d) unknown
(e) Sutton holds that there is 'no reason to regard this play as satyric' (1974b, 125), nor does it appear in KPS. The metamorphosis-motif would seem to make it a suitable story for light-hearted treatment, but there were versions in which the transformed nymph became the target of the archery of her patroness Artemis, either through Hera's jealous prompting or as a penalty for Kallisto's having surrendered (albeit unwillingly) her virginity to Zeus (Apollodoros 3.8.2).

13. *Kabeiroi*
(a) 5
(b) 4
(c) The Argonauts (enumerated in fr. 97a) were given a hospitable reception by the Kabeiroi (vegetation divinities, identical with the Great Gods on