

# Brill's New Jacoby

## Satyros

Paola Ceccarelli, University College London

English

Ancient Greek

This entry was prepared by Paola Ceccarelli and published on

### About this Historian

Historian:	Satyros
Jacoby number:	20
Historian's work:	<i>On the Gods</i> : F2
Historian's date:	2nd century BC
Historical focus:	I. Mythological History ( Genealogy and Mythography)   B. Hellenistic Reference Works and Collections
Place of origin:	unknown

### BNJ 20 F 1

Source:	Dionysios of Halikarnassos, <i>Roman Antiquities</i> , 1, 68-69
Historian's work:	Unknown ( <i>On the gods?</i> )
Source date:	1st century BC
Source language:	Greek
Fragment subject:	religion - Library of Congress
Edition:	Schorn 2004; see also Jacoby

ἃ δὲ αὐτός τε ἰδὼν ἐπίσταμαι καὶ δέος οὐδὲν ἀποκωλύει με περὶ αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν Πενάτων) γράφειν τοιάδε ἐστὶ· νεὼς ἐν Ῥώμῃ δαίκενται τῆς ἀγορᾶς οὐ πρόσω κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ Καρίνας φέρουσαν ἐπίτομον ὁδὸν ὑπεροχῆ σκοτεινὸς ἰδρυμένος οὐ μέγας· λέγεται δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιχώριον γλῶτταν ἔπιπ' ἐλαίαις†<sup>1</sup> τὸ χωρίον. ἐν δὲ τούτῳ κείνται τῶν Τρωικῶν θεῶν εἰκόνες, ἃς ἅπασιν ὄραν θέμις, ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχουσαι δηλοῦσαν τοὺς Πενάτας ... (2) εἰσὶ δὲ νεανία δύο καθήμενοι δόρατα διειληφότες, τῆς παλαιᾶς ἔργα τέχνης. πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἐν ἱεροῖς ἀρχαίοις εἶδωλα τῶν

θεῶν τούτων ἐθεασάμεθα, καὶ ἐν ἅπασιν νεανίσκοι δύο στρατιωτικὰ σχήματα ἔχοντες φαίνονται. ὄραν μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἕξεστιν, ἀκούειν δὲ καὶ γράφειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, ἃ Καλλίστρατος τε ὁ περὶ Σαμοθράικης συνταξάμενος (*BNJ* 433 F 10) ἱστορεῖ καὶ Σάτυρος ὁ τοῦ ἀρχαίου μύθου συναγαγὼν καὶ ἄλλοι συγχοί, παλαιότατος δὲ ὢν ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν ποιητῆς Ἄρκτινος. (*Ilii Excid.* F 1 *PEG*) (3) λέγουσι γοῦν ὧδε· Χρῦσην τὴν Πάλλαντος θυγατέρα γημαμένην Δαρδάνωι φερνάς ἐπενέγκασθαι δωρεάς Ἀθηνᾶς τὰ τε Παλλάδια καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τῶν Μεγάλων Θεῶν, διδαχθεῖσαν αὐτῶν τὰς τελετάς. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὴν ἐπομβρίαν φεύγοντες Ἄρκάδες Πελοπόννησον μὲν ἐξέλιπον, ἐν δὲ τῇ Θραικίᾳ νήσωι τοὺς βίους ἰδρύσαντο, κατασκευάσαι τὸν Δάρδανον ἐνταῦθα τῶν θεῶν τούτων ἱερὸν ἀρρήτους τοῖς ἄλλοις ποιοῦντα τὰς ἰδίους αὐτῶν ὀνομασίας καὶ τὰς τελετάς αὐτοῖς τὰς καὶ εἰς τόδε χρόνον γινομένας ὑπὸ Σαμοθράικων ἐπιτελεῖν. (4) ὡς δὲ μετήγε τοῦ λεῶ τὴν πλείω μοῖραν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν τὰ μὲν ἱερὰ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τὰς τελετάς τοῖς ὑπομείνασιν ἐν τῇ νήσωι καταλιπεῖν, τὰ δὲ Παλλάδια καὶ <τὰς><sup>2</sup> τῶν θεῶν εἰκόνας κατασκευασάμενον ἄγεσθαι μετ' αὐτοῦ. διαμαντευόμενον δὲ περὶ τῆς οἰκίσεως τὰ τε ἄλλα μαθεῖν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τῆς φυλακῆς τόνδε τὸν χρησμὸν λαβεῖν· εἰς πόλιν ἣν κτίζησθα θεοῖς σέβας ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ | θεῖναι καὶ φυλακαῖς τε σέβειν θυσίαις τε χοροῖς τε,| ἔστ' ἂν γὰρ τάδε σεμνὰ καθ' ὑμετέραν χθόνα μίμνηι | δῶρα Διὸς κούρης ἀλόχοι σέθεν, ἣ δὲ πόλις σοι | ἔσται ἀπόρθητος τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον ἥματα πάντα'. (69. 1) Δάρδανον μὲν ἐν τῇ κτισθείσῃ τε ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ὀνομασίας ὁμοίας τυχούσῃ πόλει τὰ ἔδη καταλιπεῖν, Ἰλίου δ' ἐν ὑστέρωι χρόνωι συνοικισθέντος ἐκεῖ<σε>μετενεχθῆναι πρὸς τῶν ἐγγόνων αὐτοῦ τὰ ἱερὰ. ποιήσασθαι δὲ τοὺς Ἰλιεῖς νεῶν τε καὶ ἄδυτον αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ἄκρας καὶ φυλάττειν δι' ἐπιμελείας ὅσης ἐδύναντο πλείστης θεόπεμπτά τε ἡγουμένους εἶναι καὶ σωτηρίας κύρια τῇ πόλει. (2) ἀλικομένης δὲ τῆς κάτω πόλεως τὸν Αἰνεῖαν καρτερὸν τῆς ἄκρας γενόμενον, ἄρανα ἐκ τῶν ἀδύτων τὰ τε ἱερὰ τῶν Μεγάλων Θεῶν καὶ ὅπερ ἔτι περιῆν Παλλάδιον (θάτερον γὰρ Ὀδυσσεᾶ καὶ Διομήδην νυκτός φασιν εἰς Ἴλιον ἀφικομένους κλοπῇ λαβεῖν) οἴχεσθαι τε κομίσαντα [τὸν Αἰνεῖαν] ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐλθεῖν ἄγοντα εἰς Ἰταλίαν. (3) Ἄρκτινος δὲ φησιν ὑπὸ Διὸς δοθῆναι Δαρδάνωι Παλλάδιον ἐν, καὶ εἶναι τοῦτο ἐν Ἰλίωι τέως ἡ πόλις ἠλίσκετο κεκρυμμένον ἐν ἀβάτωι· εἰκόνα δ' ἐκείνου κατεσκευασμένην ὡς μηδὲν τῆς ἀρχετύπου διαφέρειν ἀπάτης τῶν ἐπιβουλεύοντων ἕνεκεν ἐν φανερωῖ τεθῆναι, καὶ αὐτὴν Ἀχαιοὺς ἐπιβουλεύσαντας λαβεῖν. (4) τὰ μὲν οὖν εἰς Ἰταλίαν ὑπ' Αἰνεῖου κομισθέντα ἱερὰ τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἀνδράσι πειθόμενος γράφω τῶν τε Μεγάλων Θεῶν εἰκόνας εἶναι, οὓς Σαμοθράικες Ἑλλήνων μάλιστα ὀργιάζουσι, καὶ τὸ μεμυθευμένον Παλλάδιον, ὃ φασὶ τὰς ἱεράς φυλάττειν παρθένους ἐν ναδί κείμενον Ἑστίας.

## Apparatus criticus

1. ὑπ' ἐλαίως A ὑπελαίαις B Ὑπ' Ἐλαίας Jacoby ὑπὸ Οὐελίας Jordan, Fromentin ὑπ' Οὐελίας Nibby Οὐελία Cary Οὐελία Casaubon; see discussion in Schorn (1994) 64, 140, and 477.

2. <τὰς> add. Reiske.

## Translation

But what I know from having seen it (the Penates), and which no scruple prevents me from writing about, is this: they show you a temple in Rome, not far from the Forum in the short street leading to the Carinae, a small shrine built in the shadow of the adjacent buildings. In the native language the place is called †Velia†. In this shrine are images of the Trojan gods, which it is lawful for all to see, with an inscription indicating the Penates. ... (2) They are two youths, seated

and holding spears, works of ancient craftsmanship. We have seen many other images of these gods in ancient sanctuaries, and in all they appear as two youths with military appearance. And it is allowed to see them, and to hear and write about them what Kallistratos, who wrote about Samothrake, relates, and also Satyros, who collected the ancient myths, and many others, among whom the most ancient we know of is the poet Arktinos. (3) They say then the following: Chryse the daughter of Pallas having married Dardanos brought as a dowry Athena's gifts, the *Palladia* and the sacred rites and images of the Great Gods, in whose mysteries she had been instructed. When the Arcadians, fleeing the deluge, left the Peloponnesos and established themselves in the Thracian island, Dardanos built there a temple to these gods, keeping their specific appellations secret to all others, and performed the mysteries in their honour which are accomplished to this day by the Samothrakians. (4) But when he brought the greater part of the people to Asia, he left the sacred rites and mysteries of the gods to those who remained in the island, but the *Palladia* and the images of the gods he got ready and carried with him. And upon consulting the oracle concerning the place where he should settle, among other things that he learned he received this answer relating to the custody of the holy objects: 'Institute in the city you are founding an eternal worship for the gods, and worship them with night watches, sacrifices and dances; for so long as these sacred things, gifts of Zeus' daughter to your wife, remain in your land, your city shall exist unsacked forever in all times and days'. (69.1) Dardanos left the statues in the city which he had founded and which had received his name, but when later Ilion was founded the sacred statues were moved there by his descendants. And the Ilieis built a temple and a shrine for them on the citadel and preserved them with as much care as they could, considering them as sent from Heaven and as pledges of safety for the city. (2) But when the lower part of the city was taken, Aeneias having taken control of the citadel and having taken from the shrines the cult images of the Great Gods and the Palladium which still remained (for they say that Odysseus and Diomedes stole the other one when they came by night into Ilion), left carrying them out of the city and arrived still carrying them to Italy. (3) Arktinos however says that one Palladium only was given to Dardanos by Zeus, and that this remained in Ilion, hidden in the sanctuary, until the city was taken; but that a copy of it made so as to differ in nothing from the original was exposed in the open, in order to deceive those who might be planning to steal it, and that this one the Achaians, having formed such a plan, took away. (4) I write, then, following the above mentioned authorities, that the sacred objects brought to Italy by Aeneias were the images of the Great Gods, whom the Samothrakians worship more than any other of the Greeks, and the celebrated Palladium, which they say the holy virgins keep in the temple of Hestia.

### **Commentary on the text**

Dionysios opens with a polemic against those who discuss objects that it is not lawful to see, and in particular against Timaios, who had described the sacred objects (according to him, coming from Troy) kept in the sanctuary of Lavinium (Dionysios, *Roman Antiquities* 1.67.3-4 = Timaios *BNJ* 566 F 59). Dionysios then presents what he himself has seen in Rome, and proceeds to weave together two stories, one concerning the arrival from Troy to Rome of the Palladion, and one concerning the Penates, stressing the remote Samothrakian origins of both. (It is actually because of the connection he makes with Samothrake and its mysteries that Dionysios highlights the necessity of mentioning only those aspects of the cult that are public). In his version, both the Palladion and the Penates were brought directly to Rome by Aeneas. Dionysios closes this

account with a strong statement of reliance on the authors he has mentioned, evidently because he knows that his version of the events is controversial.

The Palladion, a small wooden statue of Athena, is since the earliest times part of the Greek tradition concerning Troy. In the initial version of the story, as attested in the *Little Iliad* of Lesches, there was only one Palladion, which was stolen from Troy by Odysseus and Diomedes, causing the fall of the city (A. Bernabé, *Poetae epici graeci* I (Leipzig 1996), *Ilias Parva*, *argumentum* 1-2 = Proklos, *Chrestomathy* 228 Severyns; Anonymous, *Encheiridion* (P. Rylands I, 22), *BNJ* 18 F 1). That there were two original *Palladia*, rather than a real one and a copy, is probably a relatively late variant, meant to support the Roman claim to have an original, carried by Aeneas directly from Troy (see the detailed discussion, with further references, in S. Schorn, *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel 2004), 481-2).

The Penates are divine entities of uncertain number and sex, not having any specific personal name, venerated in the house, and object of cult at Lavinium and in what became known as the Latium during the archaic period (see e.g. G. Radke, 'Penati' in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, 4, (Rome 1988), 12-16). The tradition that Aeneas carried with himself the Penates of Troy is attested as early as Hellanikos (*BNJ* 4 F 31 = Dionysios, *Roman Antiquities* 1.46.4); on this tradition, the Penates and the Great Gods see N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A commentary* (Leiden 2006), 48-50. The great gods of Samothrake, Dardanos, and the Palladion may have been associated in the West sanctuary at Ilion, together with Cybele, at any rate from the third century BC: see M.L. Lawall, 'Myth, Politics, and Mystery Cult at Ilion', in M.B. Cosmopoulos (ed.), *Greek Mysteries. The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults* (London 2003), 79-111. On Dardanos, Samothrake and Troy see also N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary* (Leiden 2000), 167-68, with further references. But the first certain reference to the presence of the Trojan gods in Lavinium is Timaios (*BNJ* 566 F 59 – Dionysios, *Roman antiquities* 1. 67, 4): see Schorn, *Satyros*, 479.

By the time of Dionysios the Romans had long been acquainted with these traditions; and for Dionysios, the Penates, the great gods of Samothrake, and the Dioskouroi are clearly one and the same thing (E. Gabba, *Dionysius and the history of archaic Rome* (Berkeley 1991), 134). The identification of the Penates with the Great Gods of Samothrake had already been proposed, around the mid-second century BC, by Cassius Hemina (*HRR* F 5-6 = F 6-7 Santini = F 6-7 Chassignet), who must have followed Greek sources; it is unclear however whether for Cassius Hemina Aeneas had taken the Penates from Samothrake in the course of his journey to Rome (so e.g. A. Dubourdieu, *Les origines et le développement du culte des Pénates à Rome* (Rome 1989), 126-27), or whether they had come from Troy (discussion in C. Santini, *I frammenti di L. Cassio Emina* (Pisa 1995), 128-38 and in M. Chassignet, *L'Annalistique Romaine II: l'annalistique moyenne* (Paris 1999), 95-6).

Varro's position is difficult to ascertain: according to Servius, *Commentary to Vergil's Aeneid* 3.12, Varro assimilated the Penates to the Great Gods of Samothrake, and further the Great Gods to the Dioskouroi (Varro in Servius Auctus, *Commentary in Vergil's Aeneid* 3.12; see R.B. Lloyd, 'Penatibus et Magnis Dis', *AJPh* 77 (1956), 38-46); but see on this issue Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 3*, 49, who points out inherent contradictions and suggests that this might be an error, or also an instance of Varro's reporting conflicting traditions. At any rate, Varro had narrated the

arrival of the Penates, described as ‘sigilla lignea vel marmorea’ (i.e. aniconic images, unlike those mentioned by Dionysios), from Samothrake to Troy, and thence to Rome (Varro in Servius Auctus, *Comm.* 1.378, and 3.148; Varro in Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 3.4.7; and Varro in Servius Auctus, *Comm.* 3.12, with A.J. Kleywegt, *Varro über die Penaten und die “Größen Götter”* (Amsterdam 1972); Chassignet, *L’annalistique*, 93-6; N. Horsfall, ‘The Aeneas-Legend from Homer to Virgil’, in J.N. Bremmer and N.M. Horsfall (eds.), *Roman Myth and Mythography*, *BICS Suppl.*52 (London 1987), 23-4; and the detailed discussion, with extracts of relevant texts, in Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 3*, 49-50). As for the Palladion, in both Cassius Hemina and Varro the statue was taken from Troy by Diomedes, and by him later handed over to Aeneas (Cassius Hemina: HRR F7 = 8 Santini = 8 Chassignet, with the remarks of Santini, *I frammenti*, 138-44 and of Chassignet, *L’Annalistique*, 96-7).

However, Dionysios does not mention Latin authors, and refers by name to three Greek sources, Kallistratos, Satyros, and the epic poet Arktinos, besides adding that the story was told by ‘many others’; it is very difficult to ascertain with precision to what sources the various parts of his narrative go back (G. Vanotti, *L’altro Enea. La testimonianza di Dionigi di Alicarnasso* (Rome 1995), 76-81, 234-5 briefly touches on the issue; see also the overview in A. Erskine, *Troy between Greece and Rome* (Oxford 2001), 23-6).

Arktinos is explicitly mentioned towards the end of the passage as the source for the existence of only one real Palladion, and for the preparation of a copy of it (Dionysios, *Roman Antiquities* 1.69.3). That the story of a fabricated copy goes back to Arktinos is however unlikely, as it does not square with Proklos’ summary of his poem (*Chrestomathy* 239 Severyns = *Fall of Ilion, argumentum*, in A. Bernabé, *Poetae epici graeci I* (Leipzig 1996), 88). This should in any case mean that what is narrated in 1.68.3 on the *Palladia* (already in the plural) being the dowry of Chryse cannot go back to Arktinos (most likely he followed the version according to which the Palladion was a statue fallen from the sky), and that for the Samothrakian side of things Dionysios relies on Kallistratos and Satyros (so Schorn, *Satyros*, 478; so also G. Wissowa, ‘Die Überlieferung über die Römischen Penaten’, *Hermes* 22 (1887), 40-1 = G. Wissowa, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur römischen Religions- und Stadtgeschichte* (Munich 1904), 108-109, although for him, as for most scholars, the underlying source in Dionysios is Varro, who in turn will have relied on Kallistratos and/or Satyros; see e.g. W. Ameling, ‘Domitius Kallistratos, *FGrHist* 433’, *Hermes* 123 (1995), 373-4). It seems at any rate fairly clear that Dionysios, in his endeavour to avoid any mention of Diomedes and of the story according to which the Palladium had been handed over to Aeneas by Diomedes, is here contaminating various stories, and it is extremely unlikely that what we have closely reflect Arktinos’ version (so N. Horsfall, ‘Some Problems in the Aeneas Legend’, *CQ* 29 (1979), 374-75 and 388-9; N. Horsfall, ‘The Aeneas-legend from Homer to Virgil’, 12-13).

As for the other two explicitly mentioned sources, Satyros and Kallistratos, it is impossible to know with any certainty in what relationship (if any) their narratives stood. Dionysios seems to mention his sources here in reverse chronological order, with the earliest, Arktinos, at the end. Jacoby (*FGrH* 1a 498) thus assumed that Kallistratos was the most recent source available to Dionysios, and very cautiously proposed to date him to the mid-first century BC, suggesting that Dionysios found the reference to Satyros ‘and many others’ in him: Kallistratos would have cited Satyros for the relationship between Samothrake and Troy, discussed already in Hellanikos

(*BNJ* 4 F 23). He further (*FGrH* 1 a 498 and *FGrH* 3b (Text) 265) suggested that the Kallistratos author of a work on Samothrake might have been identical with the historian Domitius Kallistratos, author of a history of Herakleia Pontike. In favour of such an identification is the fact, stressed by D. Palombi, ‘Aedes Deum Penatum in Velia’, *MDAI(R)* 104 (1997), 441, that the Domitii were established on the Velia, close to the temple housing the Samothrakian cult images; and that the traditions on the origin of the *cognomen* Ahenobarbus of part of the *gens* Domitia have been interpreted in connection with the Dioskouroi, and have further been linked to the accusation of having neglected the cult of the Penates of Lavinium, moved by Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus against M. Aemilius Scaurus in 104 BC (see resp. Suetonius, *Life of Nero* 1.1 and Asconius, *Against Scaurus* 18-19 p. 21C, with Palombi, ‘Aedes’, 461-2). Accepting the identification of Kallistratos with Domitius Kallistratos, Palombi, ‘Aedes’, 453-62 has proposed that the activity of the historian should be seen in connection with the self-promotion of the plebeian family of the Domitii, through the celebration of a cult, that of the Penates, established on the Velia, in the area where the family was also established, and that it should be dated to the beginning of the second century BC. Kallistratos might have come to Rome in the aftermath of the victory of Magnesia in 190 BC, a victory in which Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus played a central role (Appian. *Syr.* 32, 152–156, 158–159, 178, 184).

This date is probably too high: if the Kallistratos author of the work on Samothrake was consulted by Dionysios as the most recent source available (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3b (Text) 265), this implies a date in the first half of the first century BC; a second century BC date for Kallistratos, if accepted, would render the relationship between the works of Satyros and Kallistratos less easy to define. One may note however here the resolutely –although ultimately unconvincing – separatist stance of Ameling, “Domitius Kallistratos”, 373-6, who dates the Kallistratos author of a history of Samothrake between Cassius Hemina and Varro, at the end of the second - beginning of the first century BC, but suggests for the Domitius Kallistratos author of a history of Heraclea a date as low as the second sophistic. U. Heinemann, *Stadtgeschichte im Hellenismus: die lokalhistoriographischen Vorgänger und Vorlage Memnons von Herakleia* (München 2010), 239–42 has recently returned on the question: following Jacoby, he makes a strong case for the identification of the two Kallistrati: he proposes that Kallistratos came to Rome at some point after the Roman conquest of Herakleia, in 71 BC, and there established himself with one of the members of the *gens* Domitia, writing a work *On Samothrace* which had a strong philoroman tendency, as well as a history of his own city, Herakleia.

Dubourdieu, *Les origines*, 137 assumes Satyros to have been a poet, as Arktinos; but the way in which Dionysios refers to him renders this unlikely. In this context, it is interesting to note that Dionysios refers to Kallistratos and Satyros in exactly the same way, with two parallel participial expression: ὁ συνταξάμενος and ὁ συναγωγών, both of them moreover equally vague, so that in both cases it is difficult to tell whether the works referred to bore the appellation of περὶ Σαμοθράκης and Μύθων συναγωγή (as Jacoby suggests, respectively in *FGrH* 3B 335, and in *FGrH* 1A 184, the latter with a question mark), or whether Dionysios here refers to parts of larger works. At any rate, the way Dionysios mentions them does not give any clues as to whether he consulted both or only one of them, and if the latter, which one (if he is moving backwards in time, as suggested above, then Kallistratos). It is however also clear that in such a context the author of a work on Samothrake is the best evidence possible; if Satyros is also mentioned, either Dionysios found a reference to him in Kallistratos, or the reference must have

been to a relatively well-known work (see below on possible identifications). S. Schorn, *Satyros*, 478 concludes that it is best to speak of Kallistratos-Satyros, and prints the entire passage as F\* 31 (cf. already C.F. Kumaniecki, *De Satyro peripatetico*, (Cracow 1929), F\* 29), offering a detailed commentary of the passage at 478-82.

In what context Satyros narrated the story of the Penates / Great Gods, if he told the story of the Palladion as well, and what his line of approach to the question was, is impossible to say.

## Commentary on F 1

It is rather unlikely that we have here the very words of Satyros: Dionysios of Halikarnassos, who has preserved the passage, mentions Satyros together with other authorities, and gives an account which pulls together the various versions. A discussion of the sources cited by Dionysios is offered by C. Schulze, 'Authority, Originality and Competence in the Roman Archaeology of Dionysios of Halikarnassos', *Histos* 4 (2000), 6-49, and on Satyros in particular 22 and 25.

## BNJ 20 F 2

Source: Philodemos, *On Piety*, *PHerc* 1088 col. VIII - IX 14 + 433 VIA  
 Historian's work: On the Gods  
 Source date: 1st century BC  
 Source language: Greek  
 Fragment subject: religion - Library of Congress  
 mythology, greek - Library of Congress  
 Edition: Schorn, modified.

[. . . . .] ζοντας<sup>1</sup> | [. . . .Κρ]όνον αλ- | [λ. . . . .] ΕΟΙΣΕΡ | [. . . . .] τὸν Οὐ-<sup>5</sup> [ρανὸν. . . .] λησα |  
 [± 9] ΟΤΟΙ | [- - - ] | [± 10] ΚΑΙ | [± 10] ΕΩΝ |<sup>10</sup> [± 10] ΑΝ | [με]μυθεύκασι. | [ἐν τῷ] γὰρ  
 π<ε>ρ<ι><sup>2</sup> θε- | ὦν [ \_ \_ ] ωι<sup>3</sup> Σάτυρος Ἔ- | [ρεβός<sup>4</sup>] φησι βασιλεῦ-<sup>15</sup> [σαι πρ]ῶτον, εἴτ'  
 ο | [ . . ] ΤΑΣ<sup>5</sup> μυριάδας ἐ- | [τῶν<sup>6</sup> . .] ΚΑΟΣΑΣ[.]ρε<sup>7</sup> | [ . . πάντων] τῶν θε- | ὦν [ἀνακτ]α κατα-<sup>20</sup>  
 [στῆναι<sup>8</sup>, τ]ρίτο[ν] δὲ | [τὸν Οὐρ] <α>ν<ο> [ν ἄ]ν- | [τὶ τοῦ] τῶν<sup>9</sup> καὶ ἄ<μ>α | τῆι Γα]ία<sup>10</sup> κύριον  
 [αὐ- | τοῦ γ]ε<ν>όμενον ἄ-<sup>25</sup> [πὸ τῆς] ἐκτομῆς | [τὴν] ἀρ]χὴν Κρόνον | [λαβεῖν.] τοῦ χρόνου | δ'  
 ἐπιόν]τος<sup>11</sup> κατὰ | [τὴν διαδοχ]ῆν<sup>12</sup> τοῦ-<sup>30</sup> [ . . . .] η[ς συ]ν- |<sup>1</sup> νόμου λ[αχόντα<sup>13</sup> ἄ]- | φελέσθ[αι τὴν  
 δυ- | ναστεῖ[αν<sup>14</sup> - - -] δε<sup>15</sup> οὐδ[7-9] |<sup>5</sup> θέξειν α[7-8] | πολ]λῶν<sup>16</sup>, [ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἄ-] | ρείονος [7-8] | θαι<sup>17</sup>  
 κ[ ]κα[7-8] | δων· ον[7-8]<sup>18</sup> |<sup>10</sup> τῆς Κρό[νου] κατα- | λύσεως [καὶ] τῆς Διὸς | ἀπάντ<ω>[ν  
 β]ασιλεί- | ας πολλ[άκις] μνη- | μονεύε[ι].<sup>19</sup>

## Apparatus criticus

1. Schorn; φησὶν ἐρί]ζοντας Philippson, στασιά]ζοντας? Luppe, τοὺς ἀεὶ] ζ<ῶ>ντας? Obbink (in Schorn).
2. Gomperz (and Schober, Luppe, Obbink, Schorn, Salati); ΠΑΡΑ Ν.

3. Schorn; [λό]γωι? Gomperz (and Schober, Jacoby, Luppe); [τρίτ]ωι or [ἔκτ]ωι Obbink.
4. Luppe, Obbink, Schorn, Salati; Ἐ[ρωτά] Gomperz, Schober, Jacoby.
5. ειτο .. τας Ν; ει το-|[σαῦ]τας Bücheler; εἶτ<α>| [με]τὰ(ς)? Gomperz; εἶτ' ὀ-|[λί]γας Schober, Luppe 1986, ὀ-|[λίγας] Luppe 2004-5; εἶτ' <Ἐ>-|ρω]τα Schorn; εἶτ<ε>| [τρ]εῖς Obbink (in Schorn) and Salati following Obbink
6. ἐ-/|τῶν Bücheler
7. τὸ Χάος ἄσ[τ]ρε[πτα πάντων] or ἄσ[τ]ρε[πτον Luppe (ἄσ[τ]ρε[πτί Luppe 2004-2005). According to Obbink/Schorn, traces befitting a κ or a χ are discernible at the beginning of the preserved text: τὸ Χάος Obbink; δέ]κα ὄσας [Ἐ]ρε-|[βος Schorn.
8. Schorn.
9. Schorn; [τὸν Οὐρ]ανὸ[ν ἄ]ν-| [τὶ τοῦ]των Salati; [Οὐρανὸν] ἀντ[ὶ τω]ν | [τοιού]των Luppe, with similar meaning; [τρίτο]ν δὲ [τὸν Οὐρ]ανὸ[ν τὸ]ν [τοῦ]των Obbink.
10. Luppe (followed by Schorn); ἅμα | τῆι Ἐ]ία Obbink. αλλα Ν
11. Luppe (followed by Schorn and Obbink); ἀδάμα]τος Quaranta, ἀδάμαν]τος? Obbink in app.
12. Janko in Obbink (followed by Schorn); ? τὴν ἀνάγκ]ην Luppe, κατα[λῦσαι καὶ πάλ]ιν Gomperz
13. τοῦ]των Ἦρας οὔσ]η[ς Obbink, τοῦ]των δὲ τ]ῆ[ν Ἦρα]ν Gomperz (does not fit the space), τοῦ]του Δία... η[ς συ]ν-| νόμου λ[αχόντα Luppe, [Δία τῆς Ἦρ]η[ς συ]ν Fowler in Obbink's apparatus; κατὰ | [διαδοχ]ῆν<sup>14</sup> τού-|<sup>30</sup> [ του (or τούτων) Δία Ἦρ]η[ς συ]ν-||<sup>1</sup> νόμου λ[αχόντα ?
- 14 Bücheler, Gomperz, followed by all editors.
15. ll. 3-9: ἔπειτα (or name of new authority?, or ἔνιοι) δὲ οὐδ[ὲ τὸν Δία ἀν-] | θέξιν δ[ιὰ χρόνων] | πολλῶν [ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀ-] | ρείονος [ἐκπεσεῖσ-] | θαι Fowler per litteras; μετὰ τῆσδε· οὐδ[ὲ τὸν Δία κα]θέξιν α[ὐτὴν (the *dynasteia*), ἀλλ' ὑπ' Ἀ]πόλλων[ος καὶ Ὑπε]ρείονος [ἐκβεβλησ]θαι κ[α]κὰ [ἐκδικούν]των Luppe; [λέγει] δὲ οὐδ' [ὔστερον με]θέξιν, Ἀ[πόλλω δὲ] ἢ ὁμώ[νυμόν τιν' Ὑπε]ρείονος [διαδέξασ-] | θαι Philippson, ---]δὲ [τ]ὸ<ν> Δ[ία ... με]θέξιν ἀ[ρχῆς ὑ]πὸ μ<ό>νου τοῦ Ὑπε]ρείονος [ἐκβεβλησ]θαι Schober.
16. The disegni have M, which could be a misreading for ΛΛ.
17. either ἐκπεσεῖσθ]αι (West in Obbink, Fowler) or ἐκβεβλησ]θαι(Schober) will do.
18. Ὅ<μ>[ηρος δὲ καὶ Luppe.
19. ll. 10-14: Gomperz, followed by editors.



## Translation

... Kronos ... Ouranos ... [parts of five more lines very badly preserved] ... have narrated.

For in the [discourse? third book? sixth book?] On the Gods, Satyros says that Erebos ruled first, then [Eros?/Chaos?] for ... myriad of years ... was established as lord of all the gods, and third Ouranos instead of these; and together with Gaia, having acquired power over him after the mutilation, Kronos took over the empire. But as the time went by, following the succession of these?, Zeus? having received? Hera? as his consort ... took away from him the power... nor will Zeus keep it (for a very long time?), but he will be cast out by someone better. [Name of other author: Homer?] often mentions the fall of Kronos and the reign over all of Zeus.

## Commentary on the text

Satyros seems to have sketched a succession of five divine reigns (general discussion of the various divine myths of succession in H. Schwabl, 'Weltschöpfung' in RE, suppl. IX, (1962), 1433-1582). Erebos would have been the first king. Its position seems assured: it is true that Eros, proposed by T. Gomperz, *Philodem Über Frömmigkeit* (Leipzig 1866), 44 and accepted in Jacoby, would also fit (although slightly shorter than the space available); Eros furthermore figures as one of the earliest divinities in numerous theogonies (cf. Hesiodos, *Theogony* 116–119; Akousilaos of Argos, *BNJ* 2 F 6a; and Parmenides, 28 B 13 D.-K., all mentioned in Plato, *Symposium* 178ab). It is also true that having Erebos at the very beginning is unique (so S. Schorn, *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel 2004), 476). But Chaos, Nyx and Erebos are simultaneously present at the beginning in the birds' cosmogony of Aristophanes, *Birds* 693; more importantly, Cicero, *On the nature of gods* 3.44, mentions a genealogy (Stoic? he is polemicizing against them) beginning with Erebos and Night (cf. M.L. West, *Theogony* (Oxford 1966), 193).

The identity of the second god to assume the kingship poses the central challenge for the understanding of the fragment (lines 15-17 of PHerc 1088 col. VIII). Most editors restore here some indication of time (εἰ το-[[σαῦ]τας 'as many years', Bücheler, 'a few myriads of years', ὀ[λί]γας, W. Luppe, 'Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos bei Satyros-Philodem, *De pietate* 1088 VIII/IX + 433 VIa', *CErc* 16 (1986), or three myriads of years, εἴτ<ε>| [τρ]εῖς, Obbink *apud* Schorn), and then Chaos as the second god. The overall sequence would then be Erebos – Chaos – Ouranos – Kronos – Zeus. But besides the difficulty with the following lacuna (ll. 17-18), Chaos is problematic: in the entire ancient tradition Chaos precedes Erebos. For this reason, Schorn restores here the name of Eros, thus obtaining a succession Erebos - Eros - Ouranos - Kronos - Zeus, and in the following sentence an indication of the duration of the reign (Eros would have reigned for ten myriads of years, as many as Erebos). As pointed out by Schorn, *Satyros*, 476, Chaos may have occupied a place before the series of divine reigns; more significantly, a scheme in which Eros succeeds Erebos corresponds to the cosmogonies of Akousilaos ( *BNJ* 2 F 6b) and Antagoras (F 1 Powell = Diogenes Laertios, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* 4.26), who both make of Eros the son of Erebos and Nyx; this correspondence is appropriate to an author who 'collected the ancient myths' (F 1). However, Schorn's own restoration is not without problems:

in particular, he nowhere says what he proposes to make of the ζ that according to all editors (including himself) follows the τα at l. 16: it must be considered an error in order to read εἴτ' Ἔ[ρω]τα{Σ} μυριάδας ἐ-| [τῶν δέ]κα ὄσας [Ἔ]ρε-|[βος (note however the possibility, suggested by Obbink and W. Luppe, 'Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos bei Satyros (Zu Philodem *Peri eusebeias* 1088 Kol. VIII 12 ff.)', *Analecta Papyrologica* XVI-XVII (2004-5), that the letters τας at l. 16 may be a later addition by another hand). In his most recent contribution Luppe, 'Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos' (2004-5), 35-6, restates his preference for Chaos as second of the series; he is followed by O. Salati, 'Mitografi e storici in Filodemo (*De Pietate, pars altera*)', *Cronache Ercolanesi* 42 (2012), 251-2.

The second god is followed by Ouranos (ll. 20-22); the whole must imply a sentence to the effect that Ouranos took the power 'instead of them' (as Luppe, 'Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos' (1986), 74 and Schorn, *Satyros*, 476 suggest), rather than that Ouranos was the son of the gods previously named (Erebos and Chaos or Eros): for Ouranos is not otherwise attested as son of Erebos or Eros and Chaos. Kronos succeeded to the throne as fourth, after castrating Ouranos with the help of Gaia (as in Hesiodos, *Theogony* 159-82); the alternative restoration "together with Rhea" is also possible, as long as this is linked to τὴν ἀρχὴν Κρόνον λαβεῖν (he took the power with Rhea); on the whole, Luppe, 'Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos' (1986), and Schorn, *Satyros*, 477 seem right to think that it makes more sense to link the specification introduced with ἄμα to what immediately follows, i.e. the castration.

Finally, Zeus took the power, probably with the help of Hera. While the general import is here certain, the lines at the end of column VIII and at the beginning of column IX are badly preserved and difficult to understand. Lines IX 4-8 were taken by Philippson to contain the prophecy of a future reign by Apollo and/or Hyperion, not attested by any other sources; this is the interpretation still accepted by Schorn, *Satyros*, 477. Luppe, 'Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos' (1986), 77 has pointed out that in the last line of col. IX, i.e. after the references to Stesimbrotos' account (in which Rhea took the power from Zeus and handed it to Athena and Artemis?), and to Aristodikos (who wrote about Demeter, mentioning Zeus' succession in the rule), there is a reference to Hesiod, followed by a ὑπερ (IX l. 29-30: γρά[φ]ει δὲ | καὶ Ἡσίοδ[ο]ς ὑπερ) that can be interpreted as the preposition ὑπέρ, in which case it refers generally back to the myths recounted, or also as a specific reference to the story of Hyperion (who would be here the subject in the accusative of an infinitive sentence, Ὑπερ-|είονα), recounted in some lost work attributed to Hesiod. However, Luppe himself, in stressing how very hypothetical this was, pointed out that in this case the noun Ὑπερείονα would have been divided differently at l. 6-7 and at l. 30-31. But it seems likely that Hyperion was never mentioned in this context: Fowler's suggestion οὐδ' ἐ τὸν Δία ἀν-| | θέξειν ἄ[λλ]α χρόνων | πολλῶν [ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἄ-| | ρείονος [ἐκπεσεῖσ-| | θαι, '(some say that) not even Zeus will hold out forever but will be deposed by someone better', makes away with earlier proposals: as he points out (*per litteras*), a sentence to that effect fits the sense well; we would have here an echo of the traditional stories about a possible fall of Zeus (see *e.g.* Hesiodos, *Theogony* 886-900, and the Aeschylean *Prometheus bound*). This has however consequences on the extent of Satyros' citation: as Fowler adds, the choice of the term ἀρείων might imply that a poetic authority is being paraphrased, in which case the suggested restoration ἐνιοι at l.3 would mark the change to another source. This is possible, but not certain, as other restorations are possible. What is certain is that the citation from Satyros' work ended at the latest at IX l. 9 (Luppe, 'Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos', 76; Schorn, *Satyros*, 477); it may have

ended slightly earlier, at IX l. 3 (Salati, ‘Mitografi e storici in Filodemo’, 252, ends the citation at VIII l. 27, with Kronos’ reign; this is rather unlikely; see indeed her own discussion at 254).

How important was, in terms of size, Satyros’ work, and what was its angle? Obbink (followed by Schorn) has pointed out that the restoration ἐν τῷ Περὶ θεῶν [λόγ]ωι (‘in the discourse *On the Gods*’) is linguistically unsatisfying; the alternative suggested (ἐν τῷ Περὶ θεῶν [τρίτ]ωι or [ἔκτ]ωι, ‘in the third or sixth book *On the Gods*’) is slightly better (although one would expect ἐν τῷ [τρίτ]ωι or [ἔκτ]ωι Περὶ θεῶν), but it has the disadvantage of implying a huge, multivolume work, in which the succession myth was narrated only in the third (or sixth) book, i.e. definitely later than one would expect. As for the positioning of Satyros in respect to the cosmogonic tradition, we would need a more secure text to be able to evaluate it; there are clearly some innovative aspects (they might explain why Philodemos chose to open his discussion with Satyros’ account).

## Commentary on F 2

All editions are based on the Neapolitan ‘disegni’ (N in the apparatus) executed when opening the rolls; the original rolls, opened with the ‘scorzatura’ method, were destroyed in the process. Jacoby’s text, based on those of T. Gomperz, *Philodem Über Frömmigkeit* (Leipzig 1866) and of R. Philippson, ‘Zu Philodems Schrift über die Frömmigkeit’, *Hermes* 55 (1920), 255-6, is now superseded, as is the text of C.F. Kumaniecki, *De Satyro peripatetico* (Cracow 1929), F. \*28; the new disposition of the text proposed by W. Luppe, ‘Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos bei Satyros-Philodem, *De pietate* 1088 VIII/IX + 433 VIa’, *CErc* 16 (1986), 71-7, has made possible a better understanding of the passage.

The fragment has subsequently been edited by S. Schorn, *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel 2004), 138-9 (F\*30), who could use the preliminary (unpublished) draft of Obbink’s text of *PHerc* 1088 VIII-IX + 433 VIa (to appear in D. Obbink’s edition of *Philodemus. On Piety*, 2); W. Luppe, ‘Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos bei Satyros (Zu Philodem *Peri eusebeias* 1088 Kol. VIII 12 ff.)’, *Analecta Papyrologica XVI-XVII* (2004-5), 35-6, has returned briefly on a disputed passage; O. Salati, ‘Mitografi e storici in Filodemo (*De Pietate, pars altera*)’, *CErc* 42 (2012), 251-2, presents an edition of VIII 12-27, following in the main Schorn, *Satyros*. The apparatus above presents a selection of the most important conjectures.

The reference to Satyros is introduced by a με]μυθεύκασι (‘have narrated in their mythological stories’) that betrays the critical approach of Philodemos, and at the same time prepares the reader to a succession of authorities: the summary from Satyros is followed by a reference to an author whose name is lost (possibly Homer, as suggested by Luppe, ‘Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos’ (1986), 75), after which Stesimbrotos ( *BNJ* 107 F 17), Aristodikos ( *BNJ* 36 F 1), and Hesiodos are mentioned.

## Biographical Essay

Nothing is known of a Satyros author of a collection of mythical stories, or of a book *On gods*: the only chronological indications for his activity are the *termini ante* provided by the references

in Dionysios and in Philodemos: he was active before the first century BC. It is not even absolutely certain that the two works belong to the same writer: Jacoby classified F 2 as 'uncertain' (*FGrH* 1A, 185).

The name Satyros is attested for other authors: a Peripatetic biographer, author of *Lives* in at least six books (Satyros of Kallatis, on whom see the monograph of S. Schorn, *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel 2004), as well as the overview by M. Regali, 'Satyrus', in: *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*, <https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/lexicon-of-greek-grammarians-of-antiquity>, published online 2018); the author of a work in many books *On Characters*, cited once in Athenaios, *Deipnosophists* 4.168bd (= Schorn, *Satyros*, F 27), who is certainly the same as the biographer; the author of a book *On the Demes of Alexandria*, written in Alexandria around the mid-second century BC or possibly slightly later (to the citation in Theophilos of Antioch, *Apologia to Autolykos* 2.7.3-6 = *BNJ* 631 F 1, should be added the fragment published in *POxy* XXVII 2465 = Schorn, *Satyros*, F \*28). Yet another Satyros is mentioned in a list of persons known by the letters of the alphabet by Ptolemaios Chennos (*New History* 5 F 30 Chatzis = Photios, *Library*, cod. 190, 151b21-22 Bekker): a 'gnorimos' of Aristarchos (the term may mean 'a relative', but also, as is more likely here, a close friend or a student), he would have been nicknamed *Zeta* because of his passion for *zetemata* (riddles). To this Satyros should be attributed the Homeric question concerning love being stitched in Aphrodite's belt, preserved in the scholia to Homer, *Iliad* 14.216 and Homer, *Odyssey* 8.288 (Porphyrios, *Homeric questions*, *Iliad* 14.216 and *Odyssey* 8.288). Four further authors named Satyros, discussed in Schorn, *Satyros*, 14-15 (a collaborator of Theophrastos; the author of five epigrams preserved in the *Anthologia Palatina*; the author of a poem on precious stones, mentioned in Pliny, *Natural History* 37.31, Pliny, *Natural History* 91 and Pliny, *Natural History* 94; and the author of a work on the Mausoleum, mentioned by Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 7 praef. 12 = Pytheos-Satyros, *BNJ* 429 T 1) need not concern us, since an identification with the mythographer is clearly out of question (note however that intriguingly in Pliny, *Natural History* 37.94 a Satyros and a Kallistratos are mentioned side by side in a discussion of Indian gems).

Can our Satyros be identified with one of the above? As pointed out by Jacoby, ὁ συναγαγὼν might be a distinctive title, but it need not necessarily be so. The mythographer could be identified without difficulties with the friend of Aristarchos, learned in Homeric matters (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3b (Noten) 171). But it is unclear, and on the whole rather unlikely, that the Satyros writer on myths may be the same as the Peripatetic biographer. Similarly, the author of the *On the demes of Alexandria* might be the same as the writer on myths (after all, the *On the Demes of Alexandria* gives an important place to genealogical discussion of the mythical ancestry of the Ptolemies, as well as to the religious life of the various demes and tribes of the city), or also as the composer of the *Lives*, but again, nothing is certain (against the identification of the 'historian' author of a work *On the demes of Alexandria* and of the biographer is S. West, 'Satyrus: Peripatetic or Alexandrian', *GRBS* 15 (1974), 279-87; for it, M.R. Lefkowitz, 'Satyrus the Historian', *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* (Naples 1984), 339-43; neither mentions the mythographer).

General panorama on the various authors named Satyros in P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972), 656-7 n. 57; detailed discussion and collection of the *testimonia* in Schorn,

*Satyros*, 10-15 and 128. Schorn sensibly concludes that the identification of the mythographer and the author of *On the demes of Alexandria* is plausible (12); this had already been forcefully suggested by A. Momigliano, 'Note su fonti ellenistiche II: Satiro biografo e Satiro ἱστορῶν τοῦς δήμους Ἀλεξανδρέων', *BFC* 35 (1929), 259-61 = A. Momigliano, *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Roma 1980), 789-91, who moreover interpreted the rather vague formulation of Theophilos in introducing the passage (Σάτυρος ἱστορῶν τοῦς δήμους) in the sense that the discussion of the demes of Alexandria was an excursus in the context of a larger work on myth; such an interpretation also makes more sense of the general considerations with which Theophilos closes his citation: "but there have been many other appellations, and there still are until now; the Herakleidai taking their name from Herakles, and the Apollonidai and Apollonioi from Apollo" ( ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτεροι πολλὰ ὀνομασίαι γεγόνασι καὶ εἰσὶν ἕως τοῦ δεῦρο· ἀπὸ Ἡρακλέους Ἡρακλεΐδαι καλούμενοι, καὶ ἀπὸ Ἀπόλλωνος Ἀπολλωνίδαι καὶ Ἀπολλώνιοι). As for the further identification in one person of the biographer, the grammarian, the mythographer and the historian, neither the chronology nor the subject of the works is an obstacle; but there are no strong arguments for it either (Schorn, *Satyros*, 13-14). The fact that the biographer is mentioned in a papyrus from Herculaneum (*PHerc* 558, F 18 Schorn), probably a work by Philodemus, in the context of a discussion of the process or the death of Socrates, is of course not an argument for identifying him with the *Satyros* mentioned by Philodemus in *De Pietate*. On the whole, our *Satyros*' activity is best dated in the first half of the second century BC.

One reference to *Satyros* should be eliminated from scholarship. In 2002, S. Trojahn, *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare zur Alten Komödie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Philologie* (München 2002), 197 and 205, suggested that *Satyros* was mentioned, together with Aristophanes of Byzantion, Aristarchos, Seleukos and possibly Kallistratos, in a (then) unpublished hypomnema to a comedy of Kratinos, *POxy ined.* inv. 101/175(a); she was followed by Schorn, *Satyros*, 485 F\* 38. The papyrus has now been published as *POxy* 5160 (W.B. Henry, S. Trojahn, '5160. Commentary on Eupolis' *Goats?*', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* vol. 78 (2012) 111-18); but the text does not refer to *Satyros*, rather, at ll. 34-6, it cites a verse from Aristomenes' *Dionysus in training* addressing satyrs.

## Bibliography

W. Luppe, 'Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos bei *Satyros*-Philodem, *De pietate* 1088 VIII/IX + 433 VIa' in *CErc*, 16, (1986), 71-77

W. Luppe, 'Götter-Sukzessions-Mythos bei *Satyros* (Zu Philodem Peri eusebeias 1088 Kol. VIII 12 ff.)' in *Analecta Papyrologica*, XVI-XVII, (2004-2005), 35-36

O. Salati, 'Mitografi e storici in Filodemo (*De Pietate, pars altera*)', *Cronache Ercolanesi* 42 (2012), 209-58

S. Schorn, *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel 2004)

S. West, 'Satyrus (2)' in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford 1996) 3, 1362

A. Gudeman, 'Satyros (19)' *RE*, 19, (Stuttgart 1921), col. 235