IN SEARCH OF DIONYSOS

GOTHENBURG STUDIES IN HISTORY 1

IN SEARCH OF DIONYSOS
REASSESSING A DIONYSIAN CONTEXT IN EARLY ROME

CARINA HÅKANSSON

UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
ACTA UNIVERSITATIS GOTHOBURGENSIS

ISBN 978-91-7346-681-3

The thesis is also available in full text on
http://hdl.handle.net/2077/22099

Dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical archaeology and Ancient history, Dept. of Historical Studies, University of Gothenburg.

Distribution: ACTA UNIVERSITATIS GOTHOBURGENSIS
Box 222
SE- 405 30 Göteborg, Sweden

Printing: Geson Hylte Tryck, Göteborg, 2010

Abstract

Title: In search of Dionysos.
Reassessing a Dionysian context in early Rome
Language: English
Keywords: Dionysos, Roman religion, Archaic Rome, paradigm shift, satyrs, liminality, iconography, ritual, cult, performance, Fufluns, Liber, Bacchus, oral tradition, antefix, small finds, intercontextual.
ISBN: 978-91-7346-681-3

In the present study the possibility of an early appearance of the god Dionysos and his sphere in archaic Rome, in the decades around 500 BC, will be examined.

In early scholarship, rooted in the 19th century, the phenomenon of Dionysian ecstatic rites, cults, and satyr-plays in Roman society was denied. According to that view and the subsequent tradition in religious studies, such cultic activities were not present in Rome. Furthermore, due to Christian presuppositions, religion could scarcely be connected with sexual activities and bawdy behaviour, and as this is one fundamental quality in Dionysian cultic activities, it was reason enough for neglect and rejection of the thought of Dionysian cult as religion proper, on the whole. These preconceptions have long prevailed and formed the foundation for research in Roman religious studies. Scholars in various disciplines now challenge these ideas.

The theoretical framework in this multidisciplinary study focuses on an intercontextual methodology and will have the approach of a case study. The starting point is thus to make a reassessment of the evidence at hand. The importance of the iconographic material is brought forward, beside the literary and epigraphic sources. Finds from the Greek and Etruscan areas supply a comparative perspective since Rome hardly can be seen as an isolated entity. It is suggested that ideas and values travelled rather freely in the area. Parallel Dionysian phenomena are known in the cultural spheres influencing Rome. Dionysos' visual manifestations are in focus as well as Dionysos' possible revelation in early Rome and plausible relation to the god Liber. Moreover, the diverse aspects of the satyrs as part of the Dionysian sphere are treated and an attempt is made to explain the satyr in a religious context. Liminality is a central feature when satyrs are concerned, and their function as a symbol of inversion of order is considered. Arguments are given for a strong connection between ritual and performance, thus indicating a cultic origin of performances in Rome, and for an early appearance of Dionysos and his *thiasos*.

"..I have tried
in my way
to be free.."

Leonard Cohen
Bird on the wire.

Published with the aid of grants from
Stiftelsen Harald och Tonny Hagendahls minnesfond
and
Wilhelm och Martina Lundgrens Vetenskapsfond.

PREFACE

Thank you –

Prof. Margareta Strandberg Olofsson, my supervisor, friend, and guide. Always there for scholarly discussions, useful criticism, and who, I felt, always stood by my side. My sincere gratitude to both Margareta and her husband Prof. Arne Olofsson who generously invited me to their home in Italy, guided me in the "Etruscan" hinterlands, and shared all their knowledge and experience of Italy, ancient and modern. Unhappy events ended our collaboration, but none of this would have been written were it not for you, Margareta. My sincere appreciation.

Prof. Magnus Wistrand, thanks for once upon a time introducing me to the Latin language, and for my having such a great time while learning – and to Mr. Johnny Strand who taught me the curiosities of the classical Greek language. Without the two of you, this dissertation would not have even been begun.

Dr. Maria Bruun-Lundgren, my supervisor during the last year, who scrutinized my text in detail, thus improving it considerably. Thank you for taking on such a burden at a late stage, and keeping me in good mood.

Assoc. prof. Ingela Wiman, who read the manuscript and gave me the important clue to the right direction.

Members of the former thematic seminars, led by Prof. Strandberg Olofsson, thanks for continuity, shared interests, and many good discussions. To members of the Higher Seminar, later to become the Research Seminar, thanks are due as well.

All the staff at the Swedish Institute in Rome, and especially Dott.ssa. Stefania Renzetti, who helped me with contacts with the Italian museums as well as other practical arrangements, when visiting the Institute.

Annika Pihl, ready to discuss all aspects of the ancient world with an always clever approach, and many thanks for your friendship.

Prof. Göran Malmstedt who reached out a helping hand at a critical moment.

Jenny Högström who read the manuscript and gave valuable advice and good company, and thank you for the title!

Jon van Leuven who corrected my English with much patience, and offered good advice.

Prof. Robin Hägg, thanks for so thoroughly correcting my bibliography, and for bibliographical guidance.

Generous grants have been facilitated by the following foundations: Stiftelsen stipendiefonden Viktor Rydbergs minne, Adlerbertska Stipendiestiftelsen, Stiftelsen Paul och Marie Berghaus donationsfond. Further special thanks to Stiftelsen Harald och Tonny Hagendahls minnesfond, for supporting travels during several years, and not least part of financing costs for publishing this thesis. Funding for publishing has also been provided by Wilhelm och Martina Lundgrens Vetenskapsfond. Thanks for generous support.

My dear friend Dott.ssa Christina Johansson, always keen on discussing Italy, ancient and present, in every possible aspect, and sharing many good lunches.

Special thanks are due to Dr. Gunnel Emgård Olsson & Claes-Olof Olsson, who always stood by.

To all the members of the board committee of S.A.L.T., special thanks for keeping me sane and for all the good laughs.

The staff in administration in the different departments, and staff at the Gothenburg University Library for supplying good service in several ways.

Several museums in Europe have provided photos, fast service and generous conditions for publishing, which have improved the thesis. Due credits are given in the text.

Last, but most important, thank you, my family and true friends who have been a source of strength in all possible ways, and a very special thanks to Andrea.

Gothenburg, April 2010
Carina Håkansson

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION **13**
Aim, method and theory 13
Theoretical and methodological framework 14
Structure 19
On construction and deconstruction 21
Research on Roman religion 22
Some methodological questions 29
The religious experience 31
Terminological remarks on theatre 36
Sources 38

II. TRACES OF DIONYSOS **41**
Dionysos-Bacchus-Pacha-Fufluns-Liber 41
The Greek Dionysos 42
Iconography of Dionysos reflecting myth and cult 43
The Etruscan Dionysos 56
Iconography of Dionysos reflecting myth and cult 57
The Roman Dionysos 69
Discussion 74

III. SATYRS **79**
Satyrs in the Greek area 80
Satyrs in Etruria 84
Satyrs in Rome 89
Discussion 104

IV. PERFORMANCES **107**
Dionysos and performance 107
Performance in the Greek area 107
Performance in Etruria 113
The tradition of Roman performances 117
Discussion 133

V. SYNTHESIS.....**139**

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....**143**

BIBLIOGRAPHY WITH ABBREVIATIONS.....**149**
Modern literature.....149
Ancient sources.....175

APPENDICES.....**177**
Appendix 1, list of iconographical motives,
'Figures carrying ivy leaves'.....177
Appendix 2, list of iconographical motives,
'Satyrs in procession or dance'.....183

I. INTRODUCTION

Aim, method, theory

An early tradition in scholarship, rooted in the 19th century, denied the phenomenon of Dionysian ecstatic rites, cults, and satyr plays in Roman society. If treated at all, the question has been very briefly touched upon, although similar phenomena are known from contemporary societies. This direction in early research has been very influential and persistent until recently. Today, the research on Roman religion seems to be undergoing a paradigm shift. Scholars such as Mary Beard and John North, for example, challenge the validity of the established versions of the history of Roman religion, and argue convincingly that a radical re-assessment of the evidence we have is crucial.[1] In addition, a contextual framework as described by Kristian Kristiansen and Thomas B. Larsson seems favourable.[2] Besides, there seems to be a continuous overlooking of small finds, and a neglect of images, as indications of the god Dionysos' existence, and examples will be brought forward to emphasise what the additional sources can reveal.[3]

This thesis aims to re-assess the evidence at hand concerning one

1 Beard *et al.* 1998:1, 1-18, esp. 10-18. North 1989, 573; see also Isler-Kerényi 2007, 7, 231-254. Further discussed below in Chapter 1.

2 Kristiansen & Larsson 2005, 4-31, discussed below. Although Kristiansen and Larsson apply their framework to Bronze Age societies, the theories will be applicable for this thesis' scope of time as well, as their concepts are used in a general approach.

3 On neglect of small finds, see Hutchinson, 1991, 222-230. Hutchinson discusses evidence from later periods, but the same questions are applicable to earlier times.

aspect of Roman religious life, the Dionysian. The following study will consequently explore the possibility of an early appearance of Dionysos and his *thiasos*, i.e. from ca 500 BC, and compare the god's expressions with the better-known and researched Greek and Etruscan counterparts. Accordingly, it will be explored whether a transition in Dionysian traditions from the Etruscan and Greek areas to Rome can be detected, and an attempt is made to contextualize the god's expressions in time and space.

Furthermore, satyrs are investigated as a vital part of the Dionysian sphere and *thiasos*, and there will be an attempt to explain the satyrs in a religious context. Additionally, performance, in a broad sense, will be discussed, and possible associations between performance and religious expressions considered.

The Dionysian sphere in early Roman religious life will subsequently operate as a case study, in a theoretical framework described below.

Theoretical and methodological framework

The present study is a cross-disciplinary examination supported by methods and theory from several fields. Iconography, philology, religious studies, archaeology and anthropology are among the areas consulted. Each of these fields has of course, its own specific discussions of methods and theories as discussed below. Although it is not possible in a study like this to cover all aspects of these discussions, the advantages will, I hope, outweigh the difficulties in dealing with such disparate fields of expertise. The common structure that will bridge this complexity is the contextual perspective.[4] Further, the firmly grounded experience of the hermeneutic circle, once developed by Gadamer in the 1960s and adapted and advanced by Habermas and Ricoeur, will be essential for our understanding. Very briefly, to be able to interpret the whole one must understand the

4 For an updated assessment and critical view of "context", see Papaconstantinou 2006, esp. 1-21, and Barrett 2006, 194-211.

elements, and to understand the elements, one must comprehend the whole.[5] Intercontextuality, in this particular study, not only emphasises the context of finds, vase paintings, inscriptions, or literary texts, but also considers the social context of several cultural spheres. Gadamer's hermeneutic approach will be employed throughout the work, concerning the textual and iconographical material as well as material finds.

Early Classical scholarship, regarding interpretation of Greek and Etruscan vases, was mostly concerned with style and chronology. Large works were produced to create corpuses, chronologies, and specifications of workshops and painters. Today these achievements facilitate the basis for further studies of, for instance, social context, function and meaning in vase painting. Modern scholarship takes advantage of several fields of expertise to be able to read vase paintings as a communicative system. Herbert Hoffman, a forerunner in this field, inspired François Lissarrague as well as many other scholars at the Collège de France in the late 1970s, resulting in a collaboration that in 1984 presented the book *La Cité des images: religion et société en Grèce antique*, which formed the starting point for a new approach in reading iconography.[6] The French school, and especially Lissarrague, has been very successful in reading iconography in a social context, thereby taking the iconographical research further ahead. In the same spirit, the scholar Szilágyi has, by reinterpretation of iconography and a combination with textual evidence, shown the way for future research in this field.

Philology has historically mostly been concerned with textual in-

5 Gadamer 1989. Gadamer described hermeneutics as an approach rather than a method. Of course, Gadamer's as well as Habermas' and Ricoeur's theories have their own extensive discussions and critics. For further reading, see for example Teigas 1995, Harrington 2001, Davey 2006, or Thomassen 2008. The hermeneutic circle may also be described as the hermeneutic spiral, since increased knowledge will never lead to the same point as in a circle, but improved knowledge rather deepens or broadens understanding and hence resembles a spiral. "The fusion of horizons" is furthermore a central concept in Gadamer's approach. For additional reading, see the recent translation and collection of Gadamer's thoughts in Palmer 2007.

6 Olsson 2006, 37-38.

terpretation, and to a lesser degree with cultural context. Even here, the massive work that has been done in the past forms the basis for further exploration, of context for example. The effort in this thesis is to study the material from an iconographical, archaeological and historical point of view, and literary texts will be set in this context rather than in a philological framework. The literary texts are used and analysed in terms of their value in a historical context. Thus, this thesis benefits greatly from earlier scholarship when interpretation and commentaries are concerned.

To define a "rite", an anthropological view has been favourable, as well as religious studies that can support the issue with further data. Still, defining the term "ritual" has its own problems. There seems to be no consensus and the number of definitions is remarkably rich.[7] Snoek offers help in defining rituals from an anthropological standpoint, by proposing certain characteristics that can be used to construct a framework for a definition of ritual, originating from the Aristotelian classes and further expanded.[8] As Snoek points out, the Aristotelian four characteristics alone, *culturally constructed*, *traditionally sanctioned*, *framed performances*, and *having its performers as its own audience*, will not only define rituals, but differ very little from what we normally regard as "play". Therefore, additional characteristics are necessary, as well as a decision on what purpose the definition will serve.[9] The aim and context are therefore fundamental for any effort to construct a definition of ritual. It is not Snoek's intention to offer an overall useful definition of rituals, but since his proposed definition in this case is adequate for this thesis' aim and context, the following definition will be applied:

---

7 Burkert 1979, 51 defines ritual as "an actor redirected to serve for communication". Backe-Forsberg 2005, 40-41 gives further examples of definitions of rituals. Rüpke proposes to see rituals as a system of signs that, from the actor's point of view, serves to communicate with the gods, but at the same time as a medium for human communication. Rüpke 2007, 97. Due to the large number of explanations for the term, Snoek's claim that aim and context are essential for a definition of rituals seems even more relevant; see below.

8 For the complete list and a thorough discussion, see Snoek 2006, 3-14, esp. 10-11, and further references in n. 25.

9 Snoek 2006, 12.

> A ritual is a prescription (written or otherwise) for a particular ceremony.[10]

This is explicitly contrary to the current habit of using "ritual" as a synonym of "ceremony".[11] Still, ritual needs further definition depending on context. In this case, Bobby Alexander's broad explanation will be helpful:

> Ritual defined in the most general and basic terms is a performance, planned or improvised, that effects a transition from everyday life to an alternative context within which the everyday is transformed.[12]

The definition of rituals in an archaeological context, however, needs further considerations. Renfrew's theory including a number of indicators of ritual may serve as a guideline for a ritual context.[13] However, Bertemes and Biehl have lately increased the understanding of cult and religion by means of a new approach in archaeological theory. According to them, the context is the one most important criterion, and by context, they mean the context both of the artefact and of the place. By considering each object as a contextual structure, supplied with meaningful attributes, the artefact is to be seen as the result of a "system of making". It did not come about at random, but was thought about and considered useful within an established structure. The artefact reflects and represents the physical end-product and the "coming into being", and can be said to be the result of the cultural rules to which the individual maker had to conform. By keeping in mind that every artefact was made by a certain maker, in a certain way, at a certain place, and for a certain purpose, it will help us to understand that each artefact carries a message and its own "living context". We may then be able to "read" the meaning

10 Snoek 2006, 14.
11 Snoek 2006, 14. See also Snoek 2006, 11, for a collection of characteristics that can be useful in defining the term ritual.
12 Alexander 1997, 139; Bowie 2006 138-143.
13 Renfrew 1985, 1994, 51-53.

from an artefact, and see the artefact as a carrier of a wider cultural pattern.[14] The intercontextual approach seems to take the concept of context further ahead. Kristiansen and Larsson suggest that archaeology can reveal more specific religious and cosmological meanings, by applying a new theoretical strategy of interpretation. They think that symbols gain meaning through context but, since archaeological categories such as votive offerings, sanctuaries, or burials are often separated and analysed independently, we are constrained from the beginning in understanding a further meaning in symbolic structures.[15] We also need to rediscover the lost intercontextual meanings that once unified such different material remains. In the past, they would have been understood as a part of common ritual events or myths, while at present they are separated and studied individually as archaeological categories.[16] To be able to rediscover these lost meanings, an integrated holistic approach is necessary. Kristiansen and Larsson describe this as intercontextual archaeology.[17]

When dealing with Dionysos and satyrs, the concept of liminality is central. In 1909, van Gennep described his theory of how to classify rituals in his nowadays well-known *Les rites de passage – étude systématique des rites*. Van Gennep divided the rite of passage into three stages: the separation, the transition, i.e. the liminal stage, and the incorporation stage.[18] The first phase, separation, includes symbolic behaviour, indicating isolation of the subject of the rite from the usual position in the social structure. In the second phase, the liminal (lat. *limen*), the subject of rite becomes "betwixt and between" the ordinary structure in society. In the third, incorporating phase, the passage is completed and the subject is once again incorporated into the society, and is expected to follow its given rules and

14 Biehl and Bertemes 2001, 11-24, esp. 16-18.

15 Kristiansen & Larsson 2005, 29.

16 Kristiansen & Larsson 2005, 11, 29.

17 Kristiansen & Larsson 2005. The theoretical discussion goes much deeper than would be possible to include here, but I refer the reader to the introductory chapter in pages 4-31 for a thorough assessment.

18 van Gennep 1960, 10-11; Turner 1969, 94; Backe Forsberg 2005, 37; Bowie 2006 147-155.

structures.[19] The theory will be of particular interest in this thesis in the chapter dealing with satyrs and their behaviour.

Traditionally, in classical research, when the interpretation of Dionysos and his followers are concerned, scholars have used literary sources, and less significance has been laid upon interpreting the images of the god in figurative art.[20] An attempt in this thesis is therefore made to stress the importance of the iconographical interpretation of the god, as well as using the literary sources available.

Furthermore, the subject of Dionysos may suffer from intellectual reservations due to the difficulties that European culture has had in accepting classical culture as based on values different from its own. Due to European thought, subjected to Christian morality, sexuality and bawdy behaviour could scarcely be connected with religion, and since these are among the more influential elements in the Dionysian sphere, this has been a reason for neglect and rejection of the thought of Dionysian cult as belonging to religion proper.[21] Moreover, Dionysos' representation remains controversial even today, and therefore the subject needs reinterpretation in order to establish a modern view of the ancient practice.

Structure

Apart from the above prologue to this thesis' aim, theory and method, the following introductory chapter will provide the reader with a presentation of the background and underlying structures vital to this study.

In the first chapter, some methodological questions are considered. Then follows a brief outline of previous research in the field of Roman religion, and its implications are reflected on. An overview of sources used will follow.

The second chapter, called "Traces of Dionysos", will give an

19 Turner 1969, 94-95; Bowie 2006, 147-155.
20 Isler-Kerényi 2007, 1-4 and further references.
21 Isler-Kerényi 2007, 1, 231-254; Hutchinson 1991, 230, esp. n. 35.

outline of the god Dionysos' different impressions in iconography as well as in literature, in the Greek, Etruscan and Roman area. As for the Greek examples brought forward, they are all found in the Etruscan or Roman area. The period in focus here starts with the first verified iconographic representation of Dionysos in the Greek area, around 580 B.C, although Dionysos is known in the area long before that.[22] The latest examples which will close the period come from around 480 B.C. Although it is not this thesis' aim to further explore either the Greek Dionysos or the Etruscan counterpart, it is vital to recognize the surrounding cultural spheres in order to be able to get a fuller understanding of the phenomenon of the wine god. It must be kept in mind that sources differ depending on the cultural sphere and time considered. The chapter concludes with a discussion.

In the third chapter, "Satyrs", Dionysos' followers will be explored. Initially the question of the name of the god's *thiasos* is discussed. It is followed by a similar outline, as mentioned above, in the territories near Rome, to get a fuller impression of the satyrs, in iconography and literature, in the different areas. The chapter concludes with a discussion, and an attempt is made to explain the satyr in a religious context.

In the fourth chapter, "Performances", Dionysos' and satyrs' role in a dramatic context is reflected on. The conception of performance is considered. Also here, an outline is given of the surrounding areas in regard to performance.

Subsequently in Chapter 5, "Synthesis", aspects from the previous chapters and discussions are brought together for a general discussion and conclusions.

Finally, in the sixth chapter, "Summary and conclusion", an outline of the different chapters is given, ending with the conclusions drawn. At the end of the thesis is a bibliography, as well as appendices listing the iconographical material referred to.

22 See further under "Traces of Dionysos" in this thesis.

On construction and deconstruction

A contemporary issue in classical research and elsewhere is the discussion of construction and deconstruction. Edward W. Said took up the matter in his book *Orientalism*, in 1978, where he demonstrates how Western scholars have been constructing a view of the Orient that might conclude with a "we-and-them" polarisation. He argues that man makes his own history, and that the Orient as well as the Western world is an idea with its own history and philosophy.[23] These arguments are moreover similar to the observations in *Idea of Europe* discussed in Denys Hay's *Europe: The emergence of an idea* and Gerard Delanty's *Inventing Europe. Idea, identity, reality.*[24] Delanty argues that, from an imperialistic and racistic viewpoint, Europe could maintain the idea of the Outsider, or the perpetual Other, which had to be maintained in order for it to be denied.[25] In the nineteenth century, the Christian identity was rediscovered, and it was in the confrontation with non-Christian civilisations that Europe sought to construct a hegemonic Christian identity. By describing the Orient as morally backward, the Christian West was able to justify the imperialism with moral and religious arguments.[26] This "we-and-them" idea is obviously a very strong influence in our way of perceiving history, and it may be worth bearing in mind when discussing the possible construction of the history of Roman religion. In our own field, the most well-known discussion about construction and deconstruction is perhaps Bernal's *Black Athena*[27].

23 Said 1978. For an interesting discussion on objectivity and reality, see Streiffert Eikeland 2006, 49-61.

24 Hay 1966; Delanty 1995.

25 Delanty 1995, 98-99. Another interesting passage in Delanty discusses our conception of the globe that has been shaped by the sixteenth-century Dutch mapmaker Mercator. His representation of the world reflected Eurocentrism in the undue emphasis given to the northern hemisphere. Even though there are alternative forms of cartography today, the old Renaissance model is still in use and is, according to Delanty, a testimony of the power of European ethno-culturalism. Delanty 1995, 94.

26 Delanty 1995, 96.

27 Bernal 1987.

Whether we agree or not – and many obviously do not, to judge from the massive criticism he has met – the discussion of how history is written is a vital one. It might be worth considering if the history of Roman religion is a parallel construction, and that perhaps a deconstruction would bring new perspective on the issue.

The scholar John North, when discussing in terms of deconstruction, even goes as far as to question whether it is at all possible to say anything about Roman religion before 200 B.C., due to the lack of sources. North is here referring to literary evidence alone, however. It leaves us with two alternatives according to North: we either accept that most evidence comes from later periods, and use it on the grounds that institutional changes are fairly slow, or abandon the attempt to say anything at all.[28] He concludes nevertheless that despite the limitations, something at least in very general terms can be said about religion. He emphasises that in order to challenge the validity of the established versions of the history of Roman religion, any treatment of the subject must begin from a radical re-assessment of the evidence we have.[29] A first move, however, would be to bring up a discussion on the scholarly tradition we all adhere to in some way or another, and on how our conception of Roman religion is formed. The answer lies in the scholarly tradition that dates back to the end of the 19th century, and the tradition before that and, of course, in the history of religion told by the ancient writers.

Research on Roman religion

Numerous works have been written on Roman religion in the past centuries, and this is not the place to mention them all. The present section is based on works with relevance to this study, and will serve as a background for the coming discussion on the Dionysian sphere in early Rome.[30]

---

28 North 1989; 582, Beard *et al.* 1998:1, 1-18.

29 North 1989, 573. In Beard *et al.* 1998:1, 1-18 the arguments are taken further.

30 I refer the reader to the extensive bibliographies mentioned in note 32 below.

The systematic study of Roman religion begins with Theodor Mommsen and his reconstruction of the Roman calendar in *CIL* I, followed by his disciple Georg Wissowa.[31] Wissowa's *Religion und Kultus der Römer* was published in 1902, with a second edition in 1912, and long remained the standard handbook.[32] A well-preserved idea, obviously not only when it comes to religious matters, is that an original Roman form, natural and pure of foreign influence, is to be found. The idea was that Roman religion evolved gradually from a primitive phase of animism to the stage when proper gods and goddesses developed.[33] This was the view of, for example, William Warde Fowler who wrote *The religious experience of the Roman people* in 1911. This implies, though, that the people who first came to settle the slopes of the Palatine were regarded as primitives and had little or no religious thought of their own. If Mommsen's and Wissowa's work was characterised by thorough search for facts, respect for evidence and a closer attention to the community than to the individual, Warde Fowler's was the first attempt to learn from anthropology and his interpretations went deeper into the Roman mind, according to Rose.[34] Warde Fowler had a comparative view, and his work became very influential.[35] It is interesting enough to read Rose's characterisation of Warde Fowler in 1960:

> …he was able to think Roman. Perhaps this was partly because he was so thorough an Englishman of a type commoner then than now, and a rather old-fashioned Englishman has more than little in com-

31 Weinstock 1961, 206. Wissowa took up ideas from, amongst others, the early scholar J.A. Hartung and his *Die Religion der Römer,* published in 1836. Wissowa 1912, 1-2; Bendlin 2000, 115-117. Even if Roman religion was subject to scholarly research prior to Mommsen and Wissowa, it would be too profound a task for this overview to include them all.

32 An account of the long tradition in writing the history of Roman religion must, in this thesis, by necessity, be limited to the more important ideas and outlines. For a thorough summary of major works from 1910 to 1960, see Rose's *Roman religion 1910–1960.* For later works, see the extensive bibliography in Beard *et al., Roman religions,* and bibliography in Bispham & Smith 2000.

33 Beard *et al.* 1998a, 13-14, n. 35 and further references.

34 Rose 1960, 161; Weinstock 1961, 206.

35 Weinstock 1961, 206.

> mon with a Roman of the developed Republic or the early Empire in his mental and religious make-up.[36]

This is interesting because the parallel between Roman and English, ancient and contemporary, reveals the firm ground of the idea of Europe as the origin of civilisations and the bond that tied the ancient world and England together, which was felt at the time. These notions probably go back to the conception of Western society as a proud inheritor of an ancient glorious past that, as claimed by several scholars, eventually led to a legitimisation of imperialism and racism.[37] In 1948, Rose wrote in his *Ancient Roman religion* a comparison between the Greeks and the Romans:

> The Greeks were keen, original thinkers, bold experimenters… They had, moreover, a gift for abstract thought, and remarkably high proportions of them had logical minds and were ready to follow their own ideas to the uttermost consequences. Hence they developed a highly abstract, largely monotheistic theology and read it into the traditional practices of their ancestral religion, and many of their conclusions, passing little changed into Christianity, have coloured the whole of European thought on such matters ever since. But the Romans were a much slower-witted people. Orderly and legalistic, willing to learn but at the same time extraordinarily tenacious of the past, at all events in form, they neither struck out any new lines for themselves nor ever quite abandoned the old, half-savage practices which they had inherited from simple ancestors, peasants and

36 Rose 1960, 161.

37 The theories mentioned are to be found in Delanty's ideas of the "invented Europe", Said's "Orientalism" and Bernal's theory of the "Aryan model". Said 1978; Delanty 1995; Bernal 1987 and 2001. See also Hingley 2000.

> herdsmen of prehistoric days. Their theology and philosophy, when they had such things at all, were simplified adaptations of Greek thought.[38]

This statement of Rose was very typical of the time and the tradition he followed. Unfortunately, these ideas long prevailed and not until recently have serious attempts been made to call them into question. Even so, as early as 1928, Franz Altheim in his first major work, the monograph *Griechische Götter im alten Rom*, challenged the idea of an initial Roman period with a purely native cult, lacking any influences from Etruria, Greece, or even other people of Italic descent.[39] In his *Römische Religionsgeschichte* which appeared in 1933 (revised in 1956), later translated into English as *A history of Roman religion*, he opened a discussion of whether the Greek influence was as powerful as previously thought. He points, amongst other things, to the fact that all deities without exception bear Italian names, and he stresses that to experience the Greek element as specifically distinct in origin or meaning lay far from men's thoughts.[40] Altheim argued as early as 1933 for the existence of Roman myths.[41] He was in this respect in opposition to the traditionally established view.[42] Cyril Bailey for example, in his Sather lectures, published under the title *Phases in the religion of ancient Rome* in 1932, did not even mention Altheim and his early works and theories.[43]

Another approach was that of George Dumézil, a French comparative philologist. In 1966, he wrote *La religion romaine archaïque*

---

38 Rose 1948, 9. Rose's book was well received, even though Weinstock raised objections to Rose's anthropological approach to early Roman religion, and to his explanation of the term *numen.* The disagreement over *numen* cannot be discussed here, but for an overview of opinions see Weinstock 1949, 166-167. See Rose's reply to Weinstock's criticism in Rose 1951, 109-120. Cf. also Dumézil´s theories and the criticism of Rose in Dumézil 1970, 18-31.

39 Rose 1960, 165.

40 Altheim 1938, 156-170, esp. 157.

41 Altheim 1938, 200-206. Further discussion on myths is given below.

42 See Rose 1960, 165-167 for a more profound outline of Altheim's work.

43 Bailey 1932. According to Rose, Bailey's work could have been put forth a dozen years earlier. Rose 1960, 167.

d'un appendice sur la religion des Etrusques, translated into English in 1970, as *Archaic Roman religion,* in two volumes. Dumézil based his theories on comparative anthropological studies. Dumézil´s view was that it was possible to draw parallels between Roman and different Indo-European religions and societies, and that they had, in terms of the internal structure of their mythology, a common inheritance. He believed in a religious mythological structure, which he called "the ideology of the three functions".[44] Dumézil questioned the idea that most scholars before him had maintained, namely that the first Romans were ignorant primitive folk without religious considerations. Instead, he argued that the people who created Rome indeed had a considerable religious heritage.[45] He based this on his idea that the settlers were Indo-Europeans, and by comparing the Latin language to the languages of Vedic Indians, Iranians and Celts he found striking similarities.[46] Of course, Dumézil´s tripartite system and his other theories met a great deal of discussion and disagreement. He was among other things criticised for inventing a theory and then pressing the material into it, especially where Rome was concerned. He was fiercely in opposition to Rose and Latte, for example.[47] At an early stage, before Dumézil's work was translated into English, Rose dismissed his ideas of the three functions completely when applied to Rome, and saw no parallels to Roman conditions at all in Dumézil's theories.[48]

Kurt Latte published his *Römische Religionsgeschichte* in 1960, intended to replace Wissowa's handbook from 1902, to which he

---

44 Dumézil 1970, esp. 148-175, 161. In the tripartite structure, according to Dumézil, the pantheon as well as society was divided into three hierarchical levels: leaders, warriors and producers. Although Dumézil's tripartite ideology won many supporters, there were critics as well. Arnaldo Momigliano and Carlo Ginzburg argued in the 1980s that Dumézil's theory had more to do with the fascism of the 1930s than with prehistoric religions. Arvidsson 2006, 1-3. See also Beard *et al.* 1998, 14-16, for discussion on Dumézil.

45 Dumézil 1970, 15-16, 134.

46 Dumézil 1970, 16-17.

47 For a thorough analysis of Dumézil's theories see Belier 1991, and Beard 1993, 44-64.

48 Rose 1947.

owed much. Latte, as well as Rose, strongly argued against Dumézil's theories of a connection between Indian and Roman religions, and he was not in favour of animism.[49] Latte maintained that Roman religion in the Late Republic was to be considered as dead. This statement, undoubtedly a result of the tradition he followed, was not to be unchallenged.[50]

It has often been claimed that Roman mythology never existed. These ideas are connected with the theories held by early historians, briefly discussed above, that early Rome could only have produced a primitive, godless religion. If there were no gods, it follows that there could exist no myths. Scholars like Wissowa, Latte and Rose and others held the view that the primitive form of religion was only gradually replaced and, as anthropomorphic gods were introduced, the Romans saw some sort of mythology evolve in the last centuries BC. This mythology, however, was in most respects largely influenced by the Greeks.[51] Altheim nevertheless argued for the existence of Roman myths, and he did so convincingly.[52] Even so, he had relatively few followers.

Dumézil, on the other hand, took the position that there had once been a Roman mythology, but it was gradually forgotten or lost due to the invasion of Greek mythology.[53] The discussion then passes over to whether there was an original Roman religion or not.[54] Today these standpoints may be seen as rather irrelevant, but the idea of an original Roman religion has been well maintained, and

---

49 Weinstock 1961, 206 and further references.

50 Latte 1960, in the chapter "Der Verfall der altrömishen Religion" 265-293, thoroughly explains his ideas of the decline in Roman religion; see esp. 287-289. His argument provoked, however; see for example Weinstock 1961, 208-210. Liebeschuetz 1979 devotes a long chapter to the religion in the Late Republic, and its role in the political system, in his *Continuity and change in Roman religion,* 1-54.

51 Above and Beard *et al.* 1998a, 171 and further references. Altheim opened up for other possibilities, mentioned above.

52 His *A history of Roman religion* devotes a chapter to discussing Roman myth in detail. Altheim 1938, 200-217.

53 Dumézil 1970, 50, 55-59.

54 Dumézil 1970, 55 ff. Cornell proposed on the contrary in 1978 that there was no such thing as an independent or autonomous Latin culture: Cornell 1978, 110.

has just recently been called into serious question by scholars like John North, Alan Wardman, Denis Feeney, Mary Beard and Simon Price.[55] Like all of Roman culture, Roman mythology was inevitably a complicated amalgam, including adaptations and borrowings from Greek myth as well as "native" Italic tradition.[56]

In the mid-1960s, a re-evaluation of Roman religion commenced.[57] H.D. Jocelyn published in 1966 *The Roman nobility and the religion of the republican state* where he questioned the value of judging Roman religion by the criteria of Christianity or of the Romans' Greek contemporaries.[58] Later on, in the same manner, several scholars called the concept of decline into question. J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, in 1979, in his *Continuity and change in Roman religion* discussed the issue and denied the concept of decline, as far as public divination was concerned.[59] Liebeschuetz argues convincingly that divination played an important role in the Republic, right up to its end.[60] Wardman, in 1982, in *Religion and statecraft among the Romans* argued strongly against decline, on the grounds that it seems most unlikely that belief in a god comes into being, grows, and then declines, with the implication that new belief is mainly accepted when old belief has withered away.[61] Beard published in 1994, in *Cambridge ancient history*, an analysis of religion in the Late Roman Republic and drew the conclusion that rather than decline, an increasing complexity of Roman religious thought emerged in the late republic.[62] Denis Feeney argues in his *Literature and religion at Rome*, published in 1998, that interaction with foreign religious systems was an integral part of Roman religion, as well as other religious systems, and not necessarily a symptom of decline or inadequacy.[63]

---

55 North 1976; Wardman 1982; Feeney 1998; Beard *et al.* 1998a.
56 Beard *et al.* 1998a, 172.
57 Feeney 1998, 3.
58 Feeney 1998, 3-4; Jocelyn 1966, 89-104.
59 Liebeschuetz 1979, 7-29.
60 Liebeschuetz 1979, 29.
61 Wardman 1982, 169.
62 Beard 1994, 729-768.
63 Feeney 1998, 5.

Another well-maintained idea is that of a strict division between a private and a public cult. It has long been argued that the official public religious ceremonies held in Rome were a state affair that did not concern the Romans in their private religious life.[64] The lack of personal commitment – visible to us, that is – would speak for a striking difference between public and private religion. Beard, North and Price, in their *Religions of Rome*, now challenge this traditional view. The argument against this division stands on the grounds that Roman religion is not obeying the same rules and fulfilling the same human needs as our own. Further, if we do accept that the Romans' religious experience might be profoundly different from our own, we do not have to find a context in which to imagine the Romans being religious according to our own preconceptions of religiosity.[65] On the other hand, this approach has received criticism as well. Andreas Bendlin argues that "new orthodoxy" in fact comes round in a circular discussion, and rests on the same assumptions as the "old paradigm", e.g. the ideas of Mommsen and Wissowa. Since this was the very paradigm intended to be replaced, Bendlin claims that no real shift in paradigm is at hand[66] – a statement sure to be challenged in the future.

Some methodological questions

When discussing Roman religion in general, something has to be said about the difficulties regarding the written sources. The major problem is of course that there are no contemporary writers before the Late Republic. The sources we do have, regarding the Early Republic and before that, derive from historians and antiquarians who

64 Feeney sees a forthcoming debate on what counts as private or public in Roman piety. Feeney 1998, 6.

65 Beard *et al.* 1998a, 49-50. The discussion goes much deeper than would be possible to include here. For the full account, see 49-54.

66 For critique of Beard *et al.*, and other researchers falling under the epithet "new orthodoxy", see Bendlin 2000, 115-135, esp. 120-123.

wrote of a distant past. Moreover, when turning to later Christian writers other issues arise, as is well known. The aim of the late Christian writers who wrote about pagan religion makes their statements doubtful information. Obviously, they wanted to demonstrate the absurd and obscene in a religion they wanted to replace.[67] Further, the sources we do have may be biased regarding to what extent some information was selected and some rejected from the material that has eventually reached us.[68]

Still, late writers can support us with rather valid information on religion. Brief records of vows, introduction of new cults, innovations etc. are likely to be not inventions of the later writer, but based on early sources. Writing down and recording was a significant part of the functions of priests, and it is indeed likely that writers such as Livy or Pliny had access to priestly records, stretching centuries back.[69] The difficulty may not be so much a lack of evidence, but how to interpret the often fragmentary evidence, isolated from its original context.[70] Moreover, both our own conception about religion and the reliance on previous research may set hindrances in our way. North wants to demonstrate how a conceptual scheme was constructed in the early scholarly tradition regarding Roman religion. The elements of such a scheme have, according to North, been some characterisation of the original or true nature of Roman religion, and some mechanism for explaining its deterioration or decline. Amongst the mechanisms of decline that have been offered are, first, the contamination of the native tradition by foreign, especially Greek influences; secondly, the sterilisation of true religiosity by the growth of priestly ritualism; and lastly, the alienation of

67 North 1989, 573-574. The works of Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, and Arnobius, *Adversus nationes* give information on religion in Republican Rome. According to North, both authors depend to a high degree on Varro and especially on his *Antiquitates, Rerum Divinarum*. For further references and bibliography see for example Schilling 1972, 317-347; Beard *et al.* 1998:1, ix-xiii, 8.

68 North 1989, 582.

69 Beard *et al.* 1998:1, 9-11. See Wiseman 2008, 1-23 for a discussion on the dif ficulties in using Rome's later historians.

70 Beard *et al.* 1998:1, 7-8.

an increasingly sophisticated urban population from an essentially rural religious tradition.[71] Out of these assumptions, the picture of Roman religion was formed and summarised by saying that the Romans were simple, artless, and unimaginative and that everything involving art, literature, philosophy and spirituality had to be borrowed from Greeks or Etruscans. Once established, this conception becomes self-confirming, and anything falling outside the prescribed pattern may be explained as foreign importation. To put the point in its most extreme form, what we have might be an artificial historiographic construction expressing a kind of official religion that never actually represented the religious life of the Roman people.[72]

The religious experience

When considering religion in a Roman perspective, we may have to free ourselves of prejudices about what religion really is.[73] In the early republican period, many new inventions and changes took place. New temples and cults were introduced, and new or revised ceremonies occurred. Innovation must be seen as a central feature in Roman religion, and gods, goddesses, and their cults were for the most part introduced without complications. Many innovations were encouraged by the Sibylline books.[74] Different gods served dif-

71 North 1989, 577-578; Beard *et al.* 1998:1, 11-12.

72 See North 1989, 573-582 for a more detailed discussion on the topic; Beard *et al.* 1998:1, 10-12, and North 2000, 8-9.

73 Rothstein 1999, 82-108. Rothstein argues, with theories from Martin 1995, that one's conception *about* religion is to a high degree influenced *by* religion. He also suggests that ancient mystery religion today is interpreted through ideological or religious values from the last two centuries. Further, he wants to see an emancipation of the academic from the religious. As for the term "mystery religions" he cites Burkert 1987, 10: "the use of the term 'mystery religions' as a pervasive and exclusive name for a closed system is inappropriate. Mystery initiations were an optional activity within polytheistic religion, comparable to, say, a pilgrimage to Santiago di Compostela within the Christian system." For good examples of what ancient religion was *not* (in this case Greek religion), see Garland 2005, ix.

74 Beard *et al.* 1998:1, 61-63.

ferent needs in life and therefore an abundance of gods was necessary. Some of the early cults show by their very names what function they had, for example Flora, Pomona for fruit, Ceres for growth and Consus, the Storer.[75] As new needs appeared, new forms of worship were introduced. An economic slump in the early fifth century BC, associated with a corn shortage and serious epidemics, called for the institution of the cult of Mercury (495 BC) for the success of business transactions, and in 496 BC the cult of Ceres for growth was established. Before 450 BC, Apollo was needed for the power of healing.[76] The gods were not thought of as watching over man's moral conduct, and Roman literature does not present the gods as originators of the moral code. Further, it seems that Roman morality was sanctioned to only a very limited extent by expectations of divine reward or punishment. Roman gods were called upon to help in difficulties or to ensure well-being, not to make people morally better.[77] It might actually be helpful to recognise what religion was not. There was no dogma or set of beliefs to which everyone had to confess. There was no rule of life, or denial of physical pleasure, and there was no absolute distinction between the sacred and profane.[78] Religion was of course, on the one hand, a private matter but also to a high degree a state affair. Political life can hardly be separated from religion, as religious considerations always had to be counted on. In looking at the way in which religion and society interacted, what we find is, therefore, not special institutions and activities set aside from everyday life, but rather a situation in which all institutions and all activities have some religious aspect or associated rituals. The entirely political and constitutional system was conducted within an

75 Ogilvie 1986, 10.

76 Ogilvie 1986, 11.

77 Liebeschuetz 1979, 39-40.

78 Garland 2005, ix. In these examples of what religion was not, Garland is referring to Greek ancient religion, but it is most certainly applicable to Roman religion as well. For more examples of what religion is not, and a following discussion, see preface in Garland 2005, ix-xi. Scheid offers some helpful definitions on major principles regarding Roman religion: Scheid 2003, 18-21.

elaborate network of religious ceremonial and regulations.[79] Even warfare was set within a religious framework. The gods were consulted and sacrifices were held in order to obtain confirmation of the divine attitude. Conversely, the religious consequences of warfare pervaded the city. Vows taken before a successful battle could lead to the erection of new temples, dedications or festivities.[80] Consequently, we can be assured that the Romans took religious questions seriously. It is of course easier to find the traces of the official Roman religion in texts, as well as in iconography, inscriptions and material remains, but there is evidence to be found even for private piety. To mention one example, when Lucretius, upset over the Romans' religious traditions, describes a praying person in this way:

> *Nec pietas ullast velatum saepe videri vertier ad lapidem atque omnis accedere ad aras, nec procumbere humi prostratum et pandere palmas ante deum delubra, nec aras sanguine multo spargere quadrupedum, nec votis nectere vota…*[81]
>
> It's no piety to be seen at every altar,
> To cover your head and turn to the stone altar,
> Or to flatten yourself on the ground and lift your palms
> To the shrines, or to spray altars with the blood
> Of cattle – so much! – or to string vow on vow.

Lucretius' view was one of concern over the Romans' religious attitude and he was upset by what he saw as the people's ignorance. However, the seriousness of the religious questions is also well attested in an inscription on the bronze tablet that concerns the decree of the senate on the Bacchanalia in 186 BC, discussed below.[82] Polybius writes about Roman religion in a contemporary view, and reflects on how religion pervaded all levels of Roman society. He thinks that religion is what maintains the cohesion of the Roman

79 North 1989, 599.
80 Beard *et al.* 1998:1, 43-44.
81 Lucr. 5. 1198-1202.
82 *CIL*, 1^1, 196. The decree will be discussed in detail later in this thesis.

state, and he marvels at the pomp and extravagance in these matters. Polybius also states that the religion concerns all Romans, on both a public and private level.[83] According to F.W. Walbank, Polybius echoes a religious scepticism normal in his own Greece, and this scepticism was soon to make advances at Rome.[84] The elder Cato includes in his handbook on agriculture several prayers to be used in the daily management of the farm. One example is the following prayer addressed to Mars:

> *Mars pater, te precor quaesoque uti sies volens propitius mihi domo familiaeque nostrae, quoius re ergo agrum terram fundumque meum suovitaurilia circumagi iussi, uti tu morbos visos invisosque, viduertatem vastitudinemque, calamitates intemperiasque prohibessis defendas averruncesque; utique tu fruges, frumenta, vineta virgultaque grandire beneque evenire siris, pastores pequaque salva servassis duisque bonam salutem valetudinemque mihi domo familiaeque nostrae; harumce rerum ergo, fundi terrae agrique mei lustrandi lustrique faciendi ergo, sicuti dixi, macte hisce suovitaurilibus lacentibus inmolandis esto; Mars pater, eiusdem rei ergo macte hisce suovitaurilibus lacentibus esto.*[85]
>
> Father Mars, I pray and beseech thee that thou mayest be propitious and of good will to me, our house and household, for which cause I have ordered the offspring of pigs, sheep and oxen to be led round my field, my land and my farm, that thou mightest prevent, ward off and avert diseases, visible and invisible, barrenness and waste, accidents and bad weather, that thou wouldest suffer the crops and fruits of the earth, the vines and shrubs to wax great and prosper, that thou wouldest preserve the shepherds and their flocks in safety and give prosperity and health to me and our house and household; for all these causes, for the lustration and purification of my farm, land, and fields, as I have said, be enriched by the sacrifice of this offering of sucking pig, lamb, and calf.

---

83 Polyb. 6.56.6-12. Liebeschuetz remarks that Polybius' explanation owes as much to Greek theory as to observation at Rome: Liebeschuetz 1979, 4-5.

84 Although interesting, this discourse will lead too far for the present thesis. See Walbank 1957, 741-742.

85 Cato, *Agr*. 141.

Therefore, there is no reason to doubt the Romans' seriousness when religious matters are concerned; and of course, religion fulfilled a human need on a private level as well as in public events.

Certainly, it is risky to generalise about Roman religion, as it is, first of all, not a unity of beliefs or a religion of common ground, but a mixture of beliefs, and secondly it stretches out for a long period of time. Not even the actual word "belief" is unproblematic. According to Needham, from an anthropological viewpoint, belief does not refer to a natural capacity that is shared by all human beings.[86] Instead, the concept can be seen as an entirely European Christian idea.[87] Although much of the vocabulary used by the Romans in discussing their own religion easily translates into concepts used today, there is an obvious risk of confusion. One of the more significant differences is that there seem to be no religious groups, in the respect of joining into groups principally on the grounds of religion. To be sure, there were all kinds of groups in which religion would be of significant importance, for example in different kinds of associations – but formation into groups was mainly on the basis of birth, occupation, or rank, not religious conviction. Today, we may have the idea of an individual possessing a "religious identity" that can be distinguished from an identity as a citizen or a family member. We can call ourselves "a Moslem", "a Christian", or "an atheist", based on our beliefs. We cannot expect to find such distinctions in Republican Rome. It is only in a religious context where beliefs determine choices that believing as such becomes a focal point in the system.[88] Apart from that, the Romans had no word corresponding to "religion" in our sense of the word.[89] It may well be that the concept of religion as an entity to be found in all cultures is in fact a

86 Needham 1972, 191.
87 Feeney 1998, 12.
88 Beard *et al.* 1998:1, 42-43.
89 Feeney 1998, 1. See Rüpke 2007, 117-134 for a discussion on modern terms contra ancient practice.

result of Christian presuppositions.[90] Despite what is said above, the words religion and belief will be used for lack of better terms.

Terminological remarks on theatre

It seems appropriate to include some brief remarks on the definition of theatre. The concept seems clear enough, but when looking closer it reveals several problems. Jennifer Wise in *Dionysus writes* is strongly against any connection between ritual and drama when Greek theatre tradition is concerned. This is argued on the grounds that theatre is dependent on the written word and that *in the absence of writing, nothing more highly 'theatrical' would have been possible*.[91] Should Wise's statement be true, it would mean that in the Roman area no theatrical activity took place prior to 240 BC, when the first written play is supposed to have been staged. This seems not very likely, and the reasons will be given in the chapter on "Performances".

The word theatre itself contains difficulties. There are immense possibilities of misinterpretation between the uses of the word today and in ancient times. Even more complex seems the concept of theatre when trying to define genres. We have to assume that the idea of tragedy and comedy has meant different things during different times. A further point is that it may be altogether a Western idea that theatre is non-religious, and thereby all theatre is described as totally apart from religion.[92] The tradition is a long one, and church fathers denounced the theatre not only on the grounds that it was a

90 Feeney 1998, 13. For further references on this interesting discussion, see esp. n. 3. The idea that a religion could be false or true is most likely a Jewish/Christian one. See Warmind 1999, 57.

91 Wise 1998, 13.

92 Interestingly enough, scholars devoted to African traditional theatre have a much more extensive definition of theatre. Performances aiming for a religious effect would be described by most Western observers as religious rituals, while in an African context they would be described as theatre. Götrick 1993, 69-70; Götrick 1994, 89-111.

place of immoral behaviour, but also, of course, because theatre was associated with pagan religion.[93]

It might be useful to single out criteria that need to be fulfilled in order to define theatre. The first criterion would concern the visual experience. Something has to be expressed for someone to see. The second criterion would be to express something in front of someone, the audience. Further, an expression, in order to mediate a feeling or a person/character, is necessary. Theatre can be defined as the whole event taking place when a performance is set up, i.e. the relations between actors, space, and audience.[94] If one single part is missing, we can no longer speak of theatre. If all criteria are fulfilled, the concept "theatre" can be used. Nevertheless, all of these criteria could also be applied to spectacles in a wider sense, such as recitation, mime, dance or processions. Drama, on the one hand, can be defined in terms of the written language, and as such is easily appropriated by literary theory.[95] On the other hand, dramatic performances are again a disparate epithet, not requiring a written text. Consequently, in the following, certain distinctions between theatre, performance, drama, and dramatic performances are to be made. According to Wise, only the scripted play can be defined as theatre, depending as it is on the written text. In my view, on the contrary, theatre can be defined as including both written drama and performances in a wider sense, not necessarily accompanied by a text. For example, different types of celebrations, dance, mime, or processions can be included in the concept of theatre. Since there seems to be disagreement over the definition of theatre, perhaps a better terminology of theatre, in this context, would be *performance*. Still, as the word 'theatre' is a commonly used expression, it cannot be altogether avoided.

It may be worth remembering that in the field of performances, as well as in many other spheres, the Roman tradition suffers from a reputation of being uninspired, artless and prone to copying Greek

93 Hanson, 1959, 3.

94 Fortier 2002, 4, 11.

95 Fortier 2002, 4. Fortier poses the question whether theatre is fully understandable when dominated by a linguistic model; thus literary theory often ignores the complex relations between actors, audience, space and props.

practice.[96] Here in fact even more severe judgements are to be found. The Roman drama and dramatists may be accused of misusing or even abusing the Greek technique, when altering the Greek tradition.[97]

Sources

In Rome, the archaeological records, as is well known, are problematic. Once Rome began to be used as a permanent settlement in the first millennium B.C., it remained inhabited without a break. Not only is there a scarcity of finds, but when finds occur they are often out of context. Despite the limitations, the material remains from Rome will provide important information.[98] Additionally, there seems to be a tendency of neglecting Roman archaeological small finds when Dionysian artefacts are concerned.[99] The archaeological material included here comprises antefixes in terracotta, black-figured pottery, and black- and red-figured painted sherds from pottery, found in Rome and its vicinity.

Roman literary sources have their own limitations. First and foremost, the fact that the literary sources that survive until today are of a relatively late date, as discussed above and in coming chapters, makes them uncertain. Secondly, the bias of the ancient writers may affect what was actually written down, and what was not. This, too, will be discussed further in the thesis. The written material used in this thesis is mainly Livy, *Ab urbe condita,* 39, and Dionysius of

96 Above.

97 For just one example, see Bain 1977, 154-155 and further references.

98 For Roman sources in general and the absence of written evidence, see Wiseman 2008, 1-23.

99 Hutchinson discusses mainly research about the four first centuries BC, but this would imply that no prior Dionysian cultic activity ever took place. Hutchinson 1991, 222-230.

Halicarnassus' *Antiquitates Romanae*.[100] Further, texts from several ancient authors are used and referred to. An inscription on a bronze plaque, found in Tirolo, will be referred to as well.[101]

The material brought forward from the Greek area, is used on the grounds of find-places. The examples here are black-figured pottery, made in Greece and found in Etruria, Rome and Lavinium. A sherd from red-figured Attic pottery found in Rome is included as well. The Etruscan area offers further iconographical evidence in the form of domestic black-figured painted pottery. Early tomb-paintings from Tarquinia are considered as well. It has to be pointed out that the sources are disparate and very much dependent on time and place. Still, this is also one of the points made: that brought together and compared, different sources can tell a fuller story.

100 The spelling of the names of classical writers and their works follows the recommendations given in *OCD*, eds. S. Hornblower & A. Spawforth, Oxford 1996[3], xxix-liv.

101 CIL 1.[1].196.

II. TRACES OF DIONYSOS

Dionysos-Bacchus-Pacha-Fufluns-Liber

When Michael Ventris, in 1953, revealed the existence of the god Dionysos as part of the Mycenaean pantheon it was a great surprise to scholars. The name appears for the first time on three fragmentary Linear B tablets from Pylos and Khania. They can be dated to around 1250 BC, but reveal little about the god's identity and function in Mycenaean religion. Dionysos was always seen as a foreign god, even in antiquity, although his descent is much disputed. Dionysos is the deity most often represented in ancient art, from ca 580 BC onwards.[102] In Greek art, he is named for the first time on a dinos painted by Sophilos (London 1971, 1101.1), *Figs. 1 and 1a*, dated to around 580 BC.[103] Throughout antiquity, he was always identified as a wine-god.[104] Fufluns, the Etruscan wine-god and the alleged name for Dionysos, appears on the Piacenza Liver.[105] Although the appearance of the Piacenza liver is rather late, there seems to be a syncretism attested between Fufluns Paxies and Bacchios in four inscribed red-figured vases dated to around 460 BC from Vulci.[106] There have been many suggestions for the etymology of the name Fufluns. One often repeated is the supposed link to

102 *OCD*[3] (1996), s.v. Dionysus (A. Henrichs).
103 Carpenter 1986, xv., 1.
104 *OCD*[3] (1996), s.v. Dionysus (A. Henrichs).
105 See for example Bonfante & Swaddling 2006, 74; Bonfante&Bonfante 2002, 59, 174,198-199.
106 Further discussed, with references, under "The Etruscan Dionysos" in this chapter.

the city of Populonia, in Etruria.[107] Even though the etymology and possible connections between Dionysos, Pacha, Bacchus, and Fufluns are a very tempting topic to explore, the subject has to remain in the hands of the philologists, and will not be further analysed here.[108] Later Roman writers identified Liber with Dionysos, as for example Ennius and Naevius.[109] In *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Liber is described as a metonym for wine.[110] However, it can be concluded that there seems to be a certain confusion, in antiquity as well as in modern times, over the name. Still, not to be forgotten, while modern scholarship seeks Dionysos' descent and describes him as a construct of Greek imagination, to his ancient worshippers he was a god – and in particular an immortal, powerful and self-revelatory god.[111]

The Greek Dionysos

The main issue of this thesis is whether there is evidence of a Roman Dionysos and consequently a cult dedicated to the god in the Roman area, in the early Republic. To be able to read the scant evidence in the Roman region, it will also be necessary to discuss the nearby territories and cultural spheres. The Greek area is well known, and the god Dionysos and his cult and connection to the theatre are thoroughly explored. However, it might be less known to what degree the Italic territory was influenced by the Greeks in regard to Dionysian cultic activities. Since in Rome the evidence is more fragmentary, it will be beneficial to discuss the indications in an intercontextual frame, and therefore this discussion will take the Attic testimony as a starting point. It should be noted that the

107 *RE* (1912), s.v. Fufluns, (Thulin), *Der Neue Pauly* (1997), s.v. Fufluns, (Aigner Foresti). Jannot 2005, 160-161.
108 But see for example Pfiffig 1975, 24-25, 288-293; Bonfante&Bonfante 2002, 85ff; Colonna 1991, 118-119.
109 Rousselle 1986, 194, 195, and further references.
110 *Rhet.Her.* 4.43. Rousselle 1986, 195.
111 *OCD*[3] (1996), s.v. Dionysus (A. Henrichs).

following examples of Attic pottery are all found in Etruria.[112] The examples given will provide a background to the Dionysian imagery later adapted by the Etruscans, who apparently inspired the Romans. Moreover, the intention is to give a short description of the development and inventions in depicting Dionysos. As is well known, the Greek god Dionysos was appreciated as a god of wine, ecstasy, and drama.[113] In classical research, concerning the interpretation of Dionysos and his importance, the literary sources seem to have been favoured, and less significance was laid upon interpreting the images of the god in figurative art.[114] Dionysos' representation remains controversial even today, and suffers from continuing misinterpretation in his Greek context.[115] In the coming chapters, therefore, stress has been laid on the iconographical material of the god.

Iconography of Dionysos reflecting myth and cult

In Greek vase painting, from its introduction and during the whole sixth century BC, the god Dionysos is a frequent theme. The god appears in mythological settings, as a symbolic character, and in cultic sceneries as well. In Greek pottery, Dionysos is often portrayed in contexts not immediately recognised as specific events from mythology, but rather in a generic aura of mythology.[116] The development

112 There may be some uncertainty about the exact provenience of the dinos of Sophilos, Fig. 1, but there seems to be agreement on an Etruscan find-place.

113 Since it is not the aim of this thesis to further survey the Greek Dionysos and Greek religion, I refer the reader to consult for example Burkert 1983; Burkert 1985; Burkert 1987; and Price 1999. For a recent multifaceted study of the Greek Dionysos, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2005 and its bibliography. Further, see Isler-Kerényi's recent study of Dionysos in Archaic Greece, Isler-Kerényi 2007.

114 Isler-Kerényi 2007, 1-4 and further references. The perhaps most influential written source has been Euripides "Bacchae". See Isler-Kerényi 2007, 235-254 for a discussion of modern mythologies of Dionysos.

115 Isler-Kerényi 2007, for a thorough analysis of different scholarly approaches to the study of Dionysos in his Greek context, see McGinty, 1978. See also Henrichs 1984, 205-240.

116 Isler-Kerényi 2007, 2, 8-9.

of Dionysian imagery is the outcome of a relatively small group of artists in Athens during the sixth century.[117] Still, Dionysos is not an exclusively Athenian god but an inheritance of the Greek world, starting at the latest with Homer.[118] It is considered that the earliest certain representations of Dionysos in Greek art are in vase paintings by Sophilos and Kleitias. In both cases, the artists name Dionysos together with other gods in a procession, celebrating the wedding of Peleus and Thetis.[119] Three known paintings depict the wedding, all of them occurring on black-figured vases. Two of them, both dinoi, are attributed to the hand of Sophilos, and one volute krater to Kleitias. Sophilos' appear to be the earliest of them, dated partially on the grounds of the letter forms. Additionally, the dinos is an older shape.[120] The striking similarities in imagery between the two artists suggest that these works depend on a common model. There might be reason to believe that the motifs show influence from liter-

117 Carpenter 1986, 124; Isler-Kerényi 2007, 219.

118 Isler-Kerényi 2007, 219. Privitera 1970. The name Dionysos appears for the first time on three fragmentary Linear B tablets from Pylos and Khania, although nothing more than the god's status as a divinity is hereby confirmed. *OCD*[3] (1996), 479 s.v. Dionysus, A. Henrichs.

119 Carpenter 1986, 1, see n. 1 for an alternative suggestion, not supported by Carpenter however. See Isler-Kerényi 2007, 69-79, figs. 38-41, for an extended discussion on Sophilos' and Kleitias' paintings.

120 Carpenter 1986, 2-3. However, a suggestion recently made propose a Cycladic krater, in fragment, made in the closing decades of the 7th century BC, to be the first representation of the god Dionysos in Greek figurative art. Isler-Kerényi 2007, 6-8. This proposition was first introduced by Papastamos in 1970 (*Melische Amphoren*, Münster 1970, 55-58, 129, pl.10). Concern over the dating and ground of identification makes Carpenter reject the vase as a predecessor to the Attic vase paintings depicting Dionysos. Isler-Kerényi proposes, on the other hand, on good grounds that the Cycladic vase could be an early representation of the Greek Dionysos. Oddly enough, Isler-Kerényi does not mention Papastamos' proposition, or Carpenter's rejection. Carpenter 1986, 1 n.1. However, in this respect, Isler-Kerényi adds to Carpenters exploration of the Greek Dionysos, by emphasising that the Greek Dionysos was not an entirely Attic concern. Isler-Kerényi 2007, Fig. 1-2, 6-8; *LIMC* III, Dionysos 708. The god is not named on the fragment, but depicted is a dignified male character with pointed beard and long hair. He is bare-foot and clad in a chiton and himation. In his right hand, he is holding a kantharos. It seems probable that this is a forerunner of the later common Attic representation of the god Dionysos.

ary works, for example Hesiod.[121] The François Krater, *Fig. 2*, was found in Chiusi, Etruria. The exact find place of Sophilos' dinos, *Fig. 1*, is more uncertain, however an Etruscan provenience is generally agreed.[122]

Fig. 1.
Dinos painted by Sophilos, dated to around 580-570 BC. London 1971, 1101.1, British Museum.

121 Carpenter 1986, 8.
122 Reusser 2002: 1, 22, and n. 47.

Fig. 1.a. Detail.
© Trustees of the British Museum.

The painting by Sophilos *(Fig. 1 and 1a.*) is dated to around 580-570 BC, Kleitias' (*Fig. 2, 2a., and 2b.*) somewhat later.[123] Sophilos shows Dionysos as the sixth figure in the wedding procession approaching Peleus. The god is bearded, has long hair, and wears a chiton and himation. His feet are bare. In his hand, he holds a vine branch, or possibly a vine plant, and clusters of grapes hang down from the branch. The vine branch defines the god's function and the purpose of his presence. Surely, wine was a significant part of the celebration. The grapevine, rather than the god, is the central factor here. Dionysos is simply the bringer of wine.[124] In later black-figured depictions of Dionysos, almost all motifs show the god with an ivy wreath and a drinking-vessel. This seems to indicate that there did not, by the time of Sophilos, exist a common representation of the god.[125] Dionysos emerges as a modest, minor, barefoot figure in early paintings. The vine branch is the common manifestation. He appears alone without the company of his later retinue, the maenads and the satyrs.[126]

123 Carpenter 1986, xv, 1-3; Isler-Kerényi 2007, 5, n. 1, and further references.
124 Carpenter 1986, 8; Hes. *Op*. 614.
125 Carpenter 1986, 9.
126 Carpenter 1986, 124.

Fig. 2.
The François Krater painted by Kleitias around 570 BC. Florence 4209.
© Photo Scala, Florence-courtesy of the Ministero Beni e Att. Culturali, 2010.

Fig. 2. a. Detail,
The François Krater, side A, Dionysos carrying an amphora.
After Furtwängler & Reichhold 1904.

Kleitias' representation of Dionysos, *Fig. 2., 2.a. 2.b.*, shows similarities to Sophilos'. Also here, the god is the sixth figure in the procession approaching Peleus. Dionysos is bearded, probably long-haired, and wears a chiton and a cloak. He is barefoot. The god is in motion and looks out frontally facing the viewer. He carries a vine branch with clusters of grapes hanging down, as well as a large amphora on his shoulder.[127] As in Sophilos' depiction, the ivy wreath and the drinking-vessel are absent. However, in the wedding frieze, Kleitias stresses the importance of Dionysos rather than the wine alone.[128] In the row of profile-drawn participants, Dionysos looks out frontally, thus interrupting the depiction, and seems em-

127 Carpenter 1986, 9-10. Henrichs 1987, 94-99. For a discussion on the amphora, see 10-11 and n.33, 34, 35 in Carpenter.

128 Carpenter 1986, 10.

phasised. It appears that Dionysos is a more distinct and important deity here, compared with Sophilos' rendering.[129]

Consequently, it can be concluded that the figure of Dionysos which first appears in Greek art shows little or no connection with the later so popular motif. Both the ivy wreath and the drinking-vessel are missing. There was supposedly no established tradition for depicting Dionysos by the time of Sophilos, c. 580 BC. Kleitias, about a decade later, presumably depends on the prototype used by Sophilos, but differs in stressing the god's importance rather than the wine alone. Thus, in the time between the works of Sophilos and Kleitias, a change in perception of the god may have occurred. However, the god's canonical appearance was still to come.[130] The Dionysos who first emerges in Attic art, in about 580 BC, is a modest, unpretentious barefoot figure who carries a branch of grapevine. The divergence between this figure and the later traditional representation of Dionysos, based primarily on fifth-century sources, literary as well as iconographic, is immense.[131] There might also be a transition in significance in regard to Dionysos' attributes – from the first paintings where the grapevine is central, to an emphasis of its produce, the wine itself, and further on the actual consumption of wine.

Dionysos' traditional female companions, the maenads, remain unknown in vase painting for nearly half a century after the god's first appearance.[132] Dionysos and satyrs, on the other hand, are for the first time depicted together on the François vase, in the fourth frieze, side B, depicting the Return of Hephaistos (*Fig. 2 b*).[133]

129 Carpenter 1986, 10.
130 Carpenter 1986, 11-12, 124.
131 Carpenter 1986, 124; Isler-Kerényi 2007, 1-3.
132 For maenads see Olsson 2006 and Villanueva Puig, 2009.
133 Carpenter 1986, 125; Henrichs 1987, 94-99.

Fig. 2.b. Detail
The François Krater, side B, Return of Hephaistos, surrounded by Dionysos and satyrs. After Furtwängler & Reichhold 1904.

Nevertheless, the satyrs, discussed in detail in the next chapter, developed independently before they appeared together with the god.[134]

From what remains preserved until today, it can be recognised that it was the Heidelberg Painter, in about 560 BC, who first depicted Dionysos with his canonical attributes, the ivy wreath and a drinking-vessel.[135] Nevertheless, the Heidelberg Painter never named Dionysos in any of his works. Therefore, the god's identity has to be established by the context in which he appears or by corresponding depictions where his identity is certain.[136] Here it is enough, however, to point out the special features included by the Heidelberg Painter that became Dionysos' special attributes.

In a scene on a cup in Munich (7739), around 560 BC, the drinking-vessel and ivy wreath are included as Dionysos' attributes. The Heidelberg Painter, from what we know by what is left today, is the first vase painter after Sophilos and Kleitias to depict Dionysos, and the painter includes him in a number of works. The ivy wreath from now on became a certain element in Dionysos' iden-

134 Carpenter 1986, 124; Isler-Kerényi 2004, 7-18.
135 Carpenter 1986, 30, 124.
136 See Carpenter's discussion on several examples of positive identification, 1986, 36-54.

tification.[137] However, it is not clear why the connection between plant and god became canonical. Later writers describe the plant as intoxicating, deleterious, and causing madness, and because of this, connected with Dionysos. Still, this presumption is not an acceptable explanation without further evidence.[138]

The Amasis Painter is one of the modernizers of the Dionysian motif, and one of his early amphora is from Vulci. It could be that the Amasis Painter is one of the painters involved with the sudden demand in the Etruscan market for Attic pottery, which is dated to around 550 BC.[139] There are over 130 known black-figured vases attributed to the Amasis Painter, produced from c. 560 BC to around 515 BC.[140] The wine god is a vital part in the Amasis Painter's work. Amasis presents Dionysos in a commonplace setting rather than in a mythical form.[141] The image of Dionysos is changing and he successively acquires new attributes, one example being the kantharos. He is also accompanied by maenads.

137 Carpenter 1986, 30-31, 124.

138 Carpenter 1986, 50-51. See Blech 1982, 181-216 for a thorough discussion of the ivy leaf as Dionysos' attribute.

139 Carpenter 1986, 36.

140 Mertens 1987, 168; Moore 1987, 153.

141 Henrichs 1987, 109-110. Henrichs contrasts Amasis' "realistic" depictions to Exekias' imaginary and mythical renderings, and exemplify the contrast in the well-known cup by Exekias in Munich (Staatlishe Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek. 2044.), depicting Dionysos and dolphins.

Fig. 3. Amasis Painter neck-amphora, c. 540 BC. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles, 222. Side B.
© Bibliothèque Nationale de France

Fig. 3.a. Detail
© Bibliothèque Nationale de France

In the years after 540 BC, in Amasis' vase painting, the maenad changed in appearance and became a companion of Dionysos in her own right, rather than associated with the satyr. On an amphora (*Fig. 3, 3a*) painted by Amasis, Dionysos is accompanied by two maenads, offering him a hare and a small stag. The maenads bring branches of ivy leaves, a possible forerunner to the later so common thyrsos staff.[142] Dionysos himself is rendered in a coming emblematic style (compare for example an amphora in Würzburg, HA 17.L.793*, Fig. 4*). He wears a long chiton with short sleeves, and a long mantle. The long hair and beard are carefully incised, as well as the ivy leaf crown. Dionysos, the bringer of wine, here holds his characteristic kantharos. Like the above-mentioned examples of

142 Henrichs 1987, 105.

Attic imagery, this one is found in Etruria; the provenience of this particular amphora is Vulci.

Other important changes took place in Dionysian imagery as well. The drinking-horn, for example, is replaced by the kantharos as the god's typical drinking-vessel.[143] By the end of the century, the motifs have changed from a rather jolly character to more severe scenes, where peacefully dancing women have given way to frenzied maenads. Cult scenes begin to appear in which women worship a mask of Dionysos.[144] From 490 BC, the so-called Lenaia Vases present motifs of women performing rituals in front of cult images depicting Dionysos.[145] The later so frequent element in Dionysos' rendering, the thyrsos, is in fact not common until the 5th century. The thyrsos appears on very few black-figured vases, all from the 5th century. The Berlin Painter is one of the first to show the god with a thyrsos, just after 500 BC.[146]

In the following chapter, we will consider the Greek impact and influence on the Etruscan tradition in depicting Dionysos, and make some conjectures about it.

---

143 Carpenter 1986, 125-126. For a more detailed discussion on the kantharos and the drinking-horn, and their background as Dionysos special attribute, see Carpenter 1986, 117-123. See also Isler-Kerényi 2004, 55.

144 Carpenter 1986, 125-126.

145 The Lenaia Vases have been in focus for many studies, the first one already in 1912 by Frickenhaus who also named the group. For a recent bibliography concerning the Lenaia Vases, see Olsson 2006.

146 Carpenter 1986, 63-64. The word thyrsos is first mentioned in Euripides *Bacchae*. For maenadism, see Seaford 1996, 36-37 and further references. Regarding early literary sources, Dionysos occurs, but in the *Iliad*, and the *Odyssey*, Homer mentions Dionysos very briefly. He appears in a few passages only, and not as an especially prominent character. In one passage, he is described as the "joy for mortals", *Il*. 14.325. Hesiod describes Dionysos both in *Theogonia*, and in *Works and days*. Here Dionysos is portrayed as the God of many delights. The wine is his gift to man, but the gift brings both joy and burden. Hes. *Theog*. 941; Hes. *Op*. 614; Hes. *fr*. 239; *OCD*[3] (1996), 480 s.v. Dionysus (A. Henrichs). The most influential literary source to Greek Dionysian interpretation still, is Euripides' *Bacchae*. Here we meet the picture of Dionysos as the revenger. It is the drama of divine punishment, and that of Dionysos arrival and introducing his rites in Greece. Here is also the myth of his followers the frenzied women, the *maenads*, retold, and described as raving dancers performing his cult. The maenads were equipped with fawn-skins, ivy-crowns, and thyrsoi, according to Euripides. *Bacch*. 64-169, 696-704.

The Etruscan Dionysos

From the second quarter of the sixth century BC, an increasing amount of Greek pottery was imported to Etruria.[147] No doubt, Etruscan vase painters were highly influenced by their Greek counterparts. One of the early Etruscan painters was the Paris Painter, active from about 550 BC in Vulci. A common decorative scheme can be seen in the production, and the main figure friezes often show a Greek mythological theme.[148] One of the more productive black-figured vase painters was the Micali Painter; there are some two hundred finds excavated from his hand. Motifs often show ceremonies, dances, and rituals, as well as mythical creatures.[149]

Despite the fact that most of the vases were found in graves, it cannot be considered without further enquiry to indicate that the vases were made for the grave exclusively. Spivey, for example, suggests that the Etruscan vases attributed to the Micali Painter's workshop were primarily intended for graves, and further that Greek imports were also destined only for graves.[150] However, recent research points in another direction. Objections have been raised against the basis for such an assumption. One objection is that due to the quantity of excavated tombs in relation to habitation areas, this is the distribution between necropoleis and habitations that would be expected.[151] Moreover, the reading of the iconography suggests an altogether different outline. The allusions to celebrations are firmly established. These celebrations could be festivities and games of different kinds, but also parts of funerary ceremonies.[152]

Suggestions have been made that the primary reason for the Etruscan import of Greek vases was their use in the banquets. These banquets or symposia could be private as well as public, in private

147 Haynes 2000, 163.
148 Haynes 2000, 163.
149 Haynes 2000, 163-164.
150 Spivey 1988, 15; 1991, 142-150.
151 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 116-117.
152 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 112-117. The iconography will be discussed below.

houses or in sanctuaries, or in other kinds of official buildings, and further in connection with funerals.[153] The imported Greek vases were not primarily intended for funerals, but to be used in the households, and have been found in houses and sanctuaries, not only in graves in Etruria. Finds are attested not only in urban centres, but also at small villages and settlements. This may indicate that Greek imported ceramics were being used by a broad social stratum, not only by the elite.[154] The imported pottery was almost certainly not seen as art[155]; the shapes of the vases were more important, since they had a practical function in the household, or for example in connection with the funeral rites.[156]

Iconography of Dionysos reflecting myth and cult

In Etruscan art, Dionysian figure scenes appear in Etruscan imagery shortly after the middle of the 6th century BC. They first occur on black-figured vases. There are Dionysian motifs by several Etruscan painters, for example the Silen Painter, the Paris Painter, the Bibliothèque Nationale 178 Painter (belonging to the Pontic Group), and the Micali Painter. Etruscan painters were clearly influenced by Greek imported pottery; all the Attic workshops which were active in the third quarter of the 6th century are represented in Etruscan finds.[157] Still, there were probably other sources of inspiration as well.

The Etruscan wine god Fufluns is not named on ceramics until

153 Reusser 2002, 206.
154 Reusser 2002, 204.
155 Sparkes 1996, 140-145, 164-167 for value and prices, and further references.
156 Reusser 2002, 205,206. The manner in which the vessels were placed in the grave also indicates that the vases probably had a further ritual function, Olsson 2006, 26, n. 81. The narrative function of the images of the vases are discussed in chapter "Satyrs".
157 Werner 2005, 64, esp. n. 120 and further references; Paleothodoros 2002, 1.

the 5th century BC.[158] However, several scholars argue for his early appearance in Etruria. Bonfante refers to inscriptions showing the presence of a wine god as early as the 7th century BC.[159] Further, both Szilágyi and Colonna argue convincingly for an early appearance of Fufluns in Etruria.[160] The Greek Dionysian iconography was of course well known in Etruria, due to the large quantities of Greek vases imported.[161] Many of the Greek scenes were consequently taken over, but clearly the Etruscans formed their own interpretations of a local wine god and transformed them into an Etruscan art, reflecting particularly Etruscan beliefs, customs and rituals.[162]

In a recent study, the so-called Ivy Leaf Group, a production of Etruscan black-figured vases fabricated around 540 to 520 BC, is examined. The name is influenced by the unusual figure scenes on 15 of the totally 57 vases. The scenes include men and women dancing and carrying large ivy leaves. Most of the vases have been recovered in the area of Vulci.[163] Dionysos is represented on seven of the Ivy Leaf amphorae along with his attributes, the ivy wreath and the kantharos. On five of these vases, Dionysos appears with his attendants, the satyrs and maenads.[164] An example is the amphora in Würzburg (HA 17.L.793), *Fig. 4,* which presents Dionysos with a kantharos between a satyr playing the flute and a dancing maenad.[165]

158 There are written evidences for Fufluns from the second quarter of the 5th century BC. Christofani & Martelli 1978, 119-133.

159 Bonfante 1993, 222, and further reference, Werner 2005, 64, and n. 121. See also De Grummond 2006, 113, esp. n. 2.

160 Werner 2005, 64, n.119. Colonna 1991, 117-135; Szilágyi 1981, 3, n.12.

161 For a recent report on new finds of Attic ceramics in Campo della Fiera di Orvieto depicting Dionysian motifs, see Stopponi 2009, 439.

162 Bonfante 1993, 222-223; Werner 2005; see also Scheffer 1984, 229-233.

163 Werner 2005, 19, 50.

164 Werner 2005, 63.

165 Werner 2005, 25. (4.3/3.1)

Fig. 4.
The Ivy Leaf Painter, amphora c. 540-520 BC. Würzburg HA 17.L.793.
© Martin von Wagner Museum der Universität Würzburg.
Photo: Karl Oehrlein.

Dionysos is holding a kantharos in his left hand; his right hand is pointing downwards. He wears a long chiton with short sleeves and a mantle decorated with dots. He has long hair and has a beard. The god walks with long steps, and he is barefoot. A dancing maenad and a flute-playing satyr surround him.

Fig. 5.
The Ivy Leaf Painter, amphora c. 540-520 BC. Berlin F 1676.
© Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz.

Another example is the amphora in Berlin (F 1676), *Fig. 5*. Here is Dionysos, to the right, depicted in company with another male, probably Apollo. They are both seated on stools with leonine feet. Dionysos is holding a kantharos in his right hand; the left hand is pointing downwards. He wears a long chiton and a mantle, decorated with dots. He is barefoot, bearded, and seems to be long-haired.

The god is surrounded by his attributes, the ivy leaves and bunches of grapes.[166]

A resemblance between the Greek Dionysos and the Etruscan god is obvious. They have the same attributes: the ivy and the wine. Dionysos himself is rendered in a similar way, and the retinue is the same; both satyrs and maenads are depicted. The kantharos is the god's drinking vessel in both Greek and Etruscan vase painting. Especially the Amasis Painter, active in Athens c. 560 to 520 BC, seems to have been an important influence for the Ivy Leaf Painter. Compositions of scenes and the aspect of Dionysos bear apparent resemblances between the two painters.[167]

What is not found, however, in Greek vase painting is a correspondence to the scenes in the Etruscan vases rendering men and women carrying or dancing with large ivy leaves. One example of these figures carrying ivy leaves is found on an oinochoe in Munich (915), *Fig. 6*. Four young men are running to the right, carrying large ivy leaves in both hands. Two of them wear tight-fitting chitons without sleeves, painted white. The other two are wearing loincloths, painted white as well. Muscles are indicated.[168]

166 Werner 2005, 28-29.
167 Werner 2005, 76.
168 Werner 2005, 23.

Fig.6.
The Ivy Leaf Painter, oinochoe
c. 540-520 BC. Münich 915.
After Sieveking and Hackl 1912.

Another example is the high-handled kyathos where eight women are dancing round the figure field (Bonn 656), *Fig. 7*. They are carrying branches of large ivy leaves in their hands. The women are wearing long chitons and mantles beautifully draped. Incisions are used to accentuate the dresses.

Fig. 7.
The Ivy Leaf Painter, kyathos c. 540-520 BC. Bonn 656.
© Akademisches Kunstmuseum, Bonn.

These motifs have no parallel in Greek iconography, and are suggested to demonstrate a local Dionysian cult in Etruria shortly after the middle of the 6th century BC.[169] The connection between the ivy and Dionysos is definitely established.[170] Dances and processions are here performed by men and women and not by the god's ordinary followers, the satyrs and the maenads. The motifs suggest a depiction of an Etruscan ceremony witnessed by the artist.[171] There are also typical Etruscan features to be found on the Ivy Leaf motifs. One example is the typical Etruscan hairstyle, the tutulus, worn by Etruscan women at the end of the 6th century.[172]

The Ivy Leaf workshop was probably located in Vulci since most of the vases with a known provenience are found in graves at Vulci. The area also had a significant wine production, and was one of the most important districts for wine-making.[173] The fifteen vessels found with ivy leaf motifs were probably produced for wine consumption, an important part of the feast for Dionysos.[174] Even though all these vessels were found in graves, we have to assume that grave-gifts were not the only function of the vases. Recent studies have shown that pottery was also used for wine consumption in Etruscan festivities.[175] It is probably not controversial to imagine that the ceramics produced were intended for everyday use[176] as well as for festivities, and eventually ended up in the grave.

Additional evidence indicates a local Dionysian cult in Etruria. One example is an amphora from Orvieto, *Fig. 8*, now in Museo Claudio Faina. The amphora is attributed to the Group of Munich 883, and fabricated sometime between 500 and 475 BC.

---

169 Werner 2005, 78.

170 Werner 2005, 65, 77-78.

171 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 114; Werner 2005, 78.

172 Werner 2005, 65.

173 Werner 2005, 50-52, 77.

174 Werner 2005, 64-65, for descriptions of the fifteen vessels see Werner's catalogue 21- 25, two jugs, no 1.1.1, and 1.1.2, four kyathoi, no 2.1.1,2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, eight oinochoai, no 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 3.1.8, and one amphora, no 4.1/3.1. See appendix 1, for a complete list and references.

175 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 116-117; Reusser 1, 2002, 205; Werner 2005, 75-76.

176 For an alternative interpretation regarding domestic use, see Sparkes 1996, 158.

Fig. 8.
Group of Munich 883, amphora c. 500-475 BC. Orvieto, Necropoli di Cannicella, Museo Claudio Faina.
After Minto 1940.

On one side, two satyrs are dancing around a large krater, with drinking-horn in their hands. A wreath is placed over the krater, and the satyrs seem to enjoy the pleasures of drinking. The Dionysian connection is ensured by the satyrs. On the other side, two maenads clad in long chitons and mantles dance around a phallus-like idol. It seems an unmistakable cultic scene, connected with the Dionysian sphere.[177] The imagery of a phallic ceremony of this kind is not found on any other black-figured vases although they are known on Attic vases.[178] A note of interest in this connection is the possible connection between the Roman Liber and a phallic cult that is said to have been performed during Liber's festival according to Augustine.[179] Another fine example picturing cultic activities is the famous British Museum B 64, *Fig. 11*, further discussed in the chapter on "Satyrs". [180]

Apart from vase paintings, there is further evidence that shows a continuing tradition of depicting Dionysian cultic motifs. One example is found on the frescoes in graves in Tarquinia. *Tomba dei Baccanti*, *Fig. 9*, is dated to around 510-500 BC, and its decoration includes ivy leaves beside the main theme in the painting, the orgiastic dance, taking place in a grove. Men and women dance and sing, holding cups in their hands, and it is suggested that they have a probable link to Dionysian rites.[181]

177 Paleothodoros 2002, 3; Henriksson 2007, 62, 158, pl. 101.

178 Henriksson 2007, 158.

179 *OCD*[3] (1996), 854 s.v. Liber Pater (L. Aigner-Foresti); Bruhl 1953, 26. In the coming chapters, a possible cult of the Roman Dionysos will be further discussed.

180 Henriksson 2007 establishes a group of 52 vases indicating cultic Dionysian dance, 50-69, 129-132, 153-159. See appendix 2 for a complete list. A further discussion will be found in chapter "Satyrs" in this thesis.

181 Steingräber 1986, no 43, plates 23-26. Colonna refers to *La Tomba di Dioniso e dei Satiri*, for an early depiction of Dionysos in tomb painting. The grave is dated to 520-510 and show Dionysos in a rare mythological setting. Tarquinia, now unfortunately lost. Werner 2005, 64; Colonna 1991, 117-135; Steingräber 1986, no 59.

Fig. 9. Tomba dei Baccanti, Tarquinia.
© Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici per l'Etruria meridionale, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia.

Additionally, *Tomba della Fustigazione*, *Fig. 10*, dated around 490 BC, shows scenes including erotic groups. In one of the groups, a man is whipping a woman. There is no parallel in any other tombs in Tarquinia to these erotic motifs[182], and they are suggested to be interpreted as influenced by Dionysian rites. Beside the erotic motifs, the walls are decorated with komast activities, as in Tomba dei Baccanti.[183]

182 Erotic motives occur in Tomba dei Tori as well, but has not yet been adequately interpreted according to Steingräber, no 120, plates 157-165.
183 Steingräber 1986, no 67, plates 73-75.

Fig. 10. Tomba della Fustigazione, Tarquinia.
© Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici per l'Etruria meridionale, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia.

It has been argued that an emphasis on the symposium in Etruscan iconography, in the Tarquinian tombs of the late sixth century, could be interpreted as an indication of the introduction of Dionysian cults in Etruria.[184] On the other hand, it has been argued that such a reading of the evidence may be an over-interpretation.[185] Even so, evidence points in the direction that a Dionysian cult is present in the Tarquinian tombs of the sixth century BC.

The Greek iconography of Dionysos was of course widespread and well-known throughout Etruria, due to the many vases imported. However, an important point is that the knowledge of a wine-god

184 Torelli 1997, 75-76.

185 Krauskopf 2006, 77. When Torelli sees a religious/dionysiac dimension in the Etruscan symposion, Krauskopf infers that the Greek symposion was above all a social phenomenon, not a religious one.

already existed in Etruria.[186] Fufluns is well attested, and four later inscribed red-figured vases, found at Vulci, validate the syncretism between Bakchios and Fufluns. The inscriptions, all four more or less the same, tell of a "fuflunsul paχies velclδi", translated as "Fufluns Bakchios at Vulci". The inscriptions are dated to around 460 BC, and confirm an Etruscan Fufluns/Bacchus cult at the time.[187]

In the following chapter, the traces of a Roman Dionysos will be discussed.

The Roman Dionysos

In Rome, Dionysos is obscure, and the sources are scarce and different. To be able to record the god in Rome, one point of departure seems to be the events taking place in 186 BC.[188] In a much-discussed section in Livy, in book 39, a dramatic and conspiratory story is told. The story is well known: a young man, Publius Aebutius, is lured into secret Dionysian initiations by his stepfather and mother. His beloved, Hispala, reveals the secrets of the rites to save him from a horrible ordeal.

According to Livy, an insignificant Greek priest and prophet introduced the secret rites at night in Etruria. From Etruria, the wickedness spread to Rome like the infection of a disease. As soon as wine and festivities were included as part of the rites, perversions of every kind began to appear. In addition to the combination of men mingling with women, young and old mixing indiscriminately, the foundation for every kind of vice was laid. Perjury by witnesses, forged wills and declarations, poisoning, and even slaughter were ascribed to the secret rites.

---

186 See Bonfante 1993, 221-235 for a convincing analyse of the early syncretism of Fufluns-Dionysos. See also De Grummond 2006, 113-122.

187 Henriksson 2007, 153; CIE 11073, 11101, 11110; Christofani & Martelli 1978, 121-130; Colonna 1991, 118-119; De Simone 1997, 203; Jannot 2005, 160-161, and n.36. De Grummond 2006, 113-122. See Pfiffig 1975, 24-25, 288-293 regarding the etymology of Dionysos- Pacha- Bacchus- Fufluns.

188 Wiseman 2000, 265, and esp. n. 9.

Initially the rites were kept secret in Rome, until they were revealed to the consul Postumius. When the consul understood the seriousness of the business, he laid the affair before the senate. The counteraction from the senate was severe. A decree was proclaimed where the consuls instructed the *curule aediles* to seek out all the priests of the cult, to detain them and question them. No person initiated into the Bacchic rites should consent to gather or to assemble for the ceremonies, or to perform any such rites. Above all, the investigation should be concerned with those who had assembled or conspired to inflict sexual rape or outrage. Sentries were commanded to ensure that nightly assemblies did not occur. A proclamation was to be made at Rome and decrees dispatched throughout Italy.[189]

A bronze tablet found in southern Italy and published in *CIL* 1^1 196 confirms part of Livy's story.[190] Livy does not refer to the inscription. Nonetheless, the essence of it can be read in book 39.8-18. The inscription tells that in the year of the consuls Quintus Marcius and Spurius Postumius, on October the 7th, in the temple of Bellona, the consuls consulted the senate. Concerning the Bacchanalia, no confederated members were permitted to consent to conduct Bacchic rites. If anyone claimed it was necessary to hold such rites, they had to go to Rome, to the *praetor urbanus*, and ask for permission. The senate was to decide on condition that no fewer than one hundred senators were present when the matter was discussed. Further, it was proclaimed that no man should be a priest. No man or woman should be master of ceremonies. No one was allowed to celebrate secret rituals, or to celebrate them publicly, privately or outside the city, without the consent of the senate. If rites were conducted with the consent of the senate, the number of participants was restricted. No more than two men and three women were allowed to gather, unless otherwise stated by the senate. If the above regulations were neglected, capital charges were to be expected. The decree followed

189 Liv. 39. 8–18.

190 A photograph of the bronze tablet can be found in Pailler 1988, pl. II. The tablet was found in Tirolo, Calabria (*ager Teuranus*), now in Vienna. *CIL* 1^1.196. Further references in Rüpke 2007, 31-34 esp. n. 63. An alternative translation of the text can be found in Rüpke 2007, 32-33, transl. Lewis and Reinhold (adapted).

with instructions on how to distribute it and, moreover, that any Bacchic objects, save for what was sacred, should be dismantled within ten days of receipt of the tablet.

What then can be understood of Livy's story? A possible explanation lies in the threat against the state which obviously was felt. A main issue seems to be whether the young initiated men could become Roman soldiers. Was it possible to assume that these men, abused and abusers, would be able to protect and defend the chastity of Rome's women and children? The answer is most probably that they could not be expected to defend the Roman virtues in any way, and thereby they jeopardised the whole structure of Rome's social order.

From a religious and Dionysian point of view, there is a further conclusion that can be drawn. In Dionysian rituals, in initiation, and in Dionysian symbols, for example in the satyr, there is a common structure, which can explain why such a threat against the state was felt. In the cult, or for that matter in all Dionysian contexts, a "symbolic inversion", or "the upside-down world", is always present. The aim is to dissolve the social order by reversed rites, and thereafter recreate the balance again.[191] The purpose is to strengthen the social hierarchies, not to seriously question the social order. In 186 BC, this order was at stake. It was no longer a question of a momentary symbolic act. It was an undeniable challenge to the social order. Men acted almost indistinguishably from the women, men and women joined together indiscriminately, emasculated men were occupied with shameful deeds and crimes, and therefore posed a serious threat to Roman values. The very fact that it involved thousands of people indicates the seriousness of the challenge. There was already a prohibition against random assemblies and a decree that wherever a crowd gathered, there must be a person appointed by law to govern it.[192] Consequently, the movement suddenly became a real threat to the state. Therefore, the punishment was severe.

Besides the fact that the tablet confirms part of the actual event

191 This is further discussed in chapter "Performances" below.
192 Liv. 39.15.

that Livy describes in book 39, it is important for our understanding of the Roman religious experience.[193] Although the senate banned the Bacchic cult, there were exceptions. If there was anyone who felt it necessary to hold Bacchic rites nevertheless, the decree left an opportunity by saying that permission must be acquired from the senate. Whether this ever happened, or whether it was at all possible to get such permission, we do not know, but this gives a hint that such religious matters, on a private level, were considered so important that they could not be banned altogether. Furthermore, the decree says that all Bacchic objects must be dismantled, but makes an exception for sacred objects. Again, it shows a high respect for religious values.

Apart from anything else, we can be sure that a Dionysian cult was present in Rome in 186 BC. Now is the time to consider the early influences in Rome, to be able to make some conjectures about the Roman Dionysian tradition.

According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus in *Antiquitates Romanae*, the Roman dictator Aulus Postumius, in 496 BC, consulted the Sibylline Books. The reason for this was a severe shortage of crops, since no food was being imported to the town due to a war. The Books recommended that the divinities Demeter, Kore, and Dionysos should be propitiated.[194]

In the original text by Dionysius, he names the god in focus here, *Dionysos*. In English translations of the text, the god is named either Bacchus[195] or Liber.[196] Important here, however, is the fact that the ancient writer names the god *Dionysos.* Whether this fact is there to establish the Greek influence that Dionysius of Halicarnassus is

193 The political and social implications of the decree will not be discussed here but see Pailler 1988; North 1979, and for further references and background see introduction in Walsh 1994, esp. 4–5. For a gender analysis of the Bacchanalia, see Hänninen 1998 and its bibliography. Rüpke 2007, 31-38. See also Wiseman 1998, 43, n. 49 for a bibliography on dramatic contexts.

194 Dion . Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.17.2-4. The trustworthiness of Dionysius of Halicarnassus as a historical source is discussed further in chapter "Satyrs".

195 Translation by Spelman 1758.

196 Translation by Cary 1953, based on Spelman's text.

known to display is not the point here.[197] The chief implication is that the god may very well, at one stage, have been called Liber or Bacchus, but at this stage he was obviously called and known as Dionysos.[198]

To return to the continuing text, Dionysius describes how Postumius made vows to the gods. If there was to be the same wealth in the city during the time of his magistracy as before, he should build temples to the gods and make sure that sacrifices were performed every year. The gods, hearing his prayer (according to Dionysius), made the land produce rich crops, grains, fruits, and even more plentiful imported provisions than before. Seeing this, Postumius had a temple built.[199] Traditionally this occasion is dated to 496 BC.[200] Dionysius further tells that the consul Spurius Cassius dedicated the temple, traditionally dated to 494/3 BC.[201] In the same section in his *Antiquitates Romanae*, Dionysius, places the temple at the end of the Circus Maximus, erected directly ahead of the starting-places. However, the location of the temple is in dispute. Several scholars argue for the remains of a tufa podium beneath the Church of Santa Maria in Cosmedin, in the ancient area of Forum Boarium, as evidence for the temple.[202] Others depend to a higher degree on the literary evidence and place the temple on the lower slopes of the Aventine Hill, facing the Circus Maximus.[203] In either case, at least we can be sure that there was a temple in Rome in the early years of the 5th century BC dedicated to the god Liber/Dionysos, besides

197 Orlin 1997, 100-101; Dion 6.17.2-4; 6.94.2.

198 There seems to be confusion over the names, not only among modern scholars, but even the ancient writers show inconsistencies.

199 Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.17.2-4. Dionysius writes of temples, nevertheless there is only one temple mentioned that was erected.

200 Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.17.2-4; Bruhl 1953, 13; Spaeth 1996, 7.

201 Dion.Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.94.3; Spaeth 1996, 7, 81.

202 See Spaeth 1996, 7, esp. n. 44 and further references.

203 Among them Spaeth. Spaeth 1996, 7, esp. n. 45 and further references. See also Richardson 1992, s.v. Ceres, Liber, Liberaque, Aedes, for a full description of ancient writers who mention the temple.

other gods.[204]

Liber was the god of freedom, by name and nature. His gift of wine freed men from cares. However, many explanations were offered by the ancient sources to account for his name. The ideological one, *Liber a libertate*, may be the most obvious. Political freedom, *libertas*, was the significant feature of the Roman Republic.[205] Naevius, quoted in Festus' dictionary, provides us with a link between Liber and Dionysos, in the following passage:

> *Liberalia Liberi festa, quae apud Grecos dicuntur* Διονύσια. *Naevius: Libera lingua loquimur ludis Liberalibus.*[206]
>
> Liberalia: the festival of Liber, called *Dionysia* by the Greeks. See Naevius: 'At the Liberalia games we enjoy free speech.'

From inscriptions, it seems that Liber was known and worshipped all over Latium.[207] It could be that the first celebrations to Liber were in the form of phallic rites.[208] However, it has been suggested that such rites were confined to the rural population, in contrast to the aristocratic level in society.[209] This seems not very likely, and the reasons will be explored in the chapter below on "Performances".

Discussion

Although the main issue for this thesis is to explore the nature of the Roman Dionysos and his *thiasos*, a look at the nearby territories is necessary. A discussion similar to that mentioned earlier about

204 Even if the exact dating is in dispute, however, most scholars agree to a dating in the first half of the 5th century BC. Spaeth 1996, 7, n. 43 and further references.
205 Wiseman 2000, 265; Wiseman 2008, 84, n. 3 and further references.
206 Wiseman 2000, 266; Festus (Paulus) 103L=Naevius fr. 113R. See also Wiseman 1998, 35-43.
207 *RE* (1926-1927), 68-76 s.v. Liber pater (W. Schur).
208 Bruhl 1953, 19.
209 Bruhl 1953, 18-19.

the Romans' adaptation and so-called corrupting of Greek traditions appears in the Etruscan sphere as well. Here, an opinion long prevailed that the Etruscans copied motifs of Greek myths and cults they did not understand. They simply took over a pattern invented by the Greeks, which meant nothing to them.[210] This is a question under revision at the moment.[211] Scholars reject the theory of distortion, and rather see Greek art as a model for the Etruscans that was used and reinterpreted in Etruscan iconography.[212] It seems plausible that knowledge and awareness of myths and customs in a sophisticated society such as the Etruscan would have been transmitted by oral tradition and was widely known.[213] Recent studies also point towards a common canon of motifs expressed in vase painting as well as in, for example, architectural terracottas, and consequently towards a common set of beliefs, as early as the first decades of the sixth century BC.[214]

In Etruscan iconography, there emerges an outline of the local god Fufluns as identified with the Greek god Dionysos. The resemblance between the Greek Dionysos and the Etruscan god in iconography is obvious. They share the same attributes, the ivy and the wine. They have the same retinue; the satyrs and maenads are the god's servants. The kantharos is the same in both Etruscan and Greek vase painting. Even so, there are motifs exclusively Etruscan, among them the men and women carrying or dancing with large ivy leaves. It seems reasonable to assume that the Greek Dionysos influenced the interpretation of the local Etruscan god Fufluns, and that the two gods'

210 Izzet 2004, 223-226. Camporeale 1991, 14.

211 Not only in the Greek/Etruscan area, but also Greek/Italic influences is under debate, see Carpenter's recent article on reconsidered Greek influences in Apulia, regarding theatre scenes on red- figured pottery, Carpenter 2009, 27-36, esp. 34, 36.

212 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 112-118; Dobesch 1998, 55-56; Reusser, 2002, 1, 189; Werner 2005, 63-76; Henriksson 2007, 99. On Greek cultural influence in general, see Ridgeway 2002, 21-31, and its references.

213 For a proposition on oral tradition and recitation, see Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 116.

214 Reusser 1, 2002, 189.

characteristics merged and became synchronized over time.[215] A local Etruscan Dionysian cult emerged in Etruria, probably as early as 550 BC, confirmed by the motifs as seen in the repertoire by the Ivy Leaf Painter. The Etruscan art reflected particularly Etruscan beliefs, customs and rituals.[216]

Although most finds come from graves, we have to assume that grave-gifts were not the only function of the ceramics. Besides, recent studies point out that finds have been made in houses and sanctuaries, in urban centres but also in small villages. The Attic imports seem not to have been seen as pieces of art, but instead had a practical function in the households. Eventually they ended up in the tombs as grave-gifts. We must assume that this is also the case with the locally produced pottery. Therefore, it seems plausible that the local as well as the Attic imported pottery was widespread in Etruscan society. Dionysian motifs were a frequently recurring theme on pottery, common and therefore familiar to the Etruscan citizen, independently of social stratum or habitat. Consequently, the local Dionysian cult was probably well known and common in a broad social stratum.

When turning to the Roman area, finds are certainly more scant. Still, the cultural impact of the Etruscans in early Rome is indisputable. What we know for certain is that a Dionysian cult was being imported to Rome in 496 BC. From the Etruscan area, the influence came with the local interpretation of the wine-god, Fufluns/Dionysos. In Rome, most certainly, as in the Etruscan area, an early local wine-god merged with the Greek Dionysos. As in Etruria, it most probably turned out to be a local interpretation. In Rome, the ancient wine-god Liber may have merged with the impression from the Greek Dionysos at an early date, and in addition received impressions from the Etruscan Fufluns/Dionysos. It seems valid to conclude that Liber was not a new invention in Rome in the 5th century BC, any more than Fufluns was in Etruria. The fact that no

215 As suggested for example between Minerva/Menvra and Uni, see Pfiffig 1975, 58, 288-289.

216 Werner 2005, 78.

official introduction of Dionysos is attested in Rome, which was the usual procedure to instigate new divinities[217], leads us to presume that Dionysos was in fact no new divinity in Rome, and therefore no official introduction was necessary.

Both Fufluns and Liber certainly had a long tradition respectively, and eventually they became affected by the Greek Dionysos, and turned out to be local interpretations in Etruria as well as in Rome. Syncretism was accomplished.

In the coming chapters, the cultic aspects of the god will be discussed through the presence of the satyrs.

217 Cf. for example official introduction of Magna Mater in 205/204 B.C, described by (among others) Livy, 29.11. Cf. also Hänninen 1998, 111-123.

III. SATYRS

In the following chapter, Dionysos' followers, the satyrs, will be discussed. Apart from a general description, a survey of the Greek and Etruscan area is rewarding for a fuller appreciation of the satyr as Dionysos' servant. Equally, iconography, material remains, and literature add to the understanding of the satyr's role within a religious system.

A few words about the name silenoi/satyrs seem appropriate to include. Silenoi is the plural form of Silenos, the name of a specific mythological figure, mentioned for example by Herodotus.[218] In Greek satyric drama, Silenos appears as the father of the satyrs. From the fifth century on, there is, particularly in red-figured vase painting, evidence that the figure was called a satyr. By the mid-fourth century, the two words silen/satyr are used interchangeably.[219] Most scholars accept the terms as equivalent, and here the name satyr is preferred.[220]

Satyrs can be defined as imaginary male creatures with human characteristics as well as animal features, in iconography often represented naked. The large pointed ears, the horse/goat hoofs, and the snub nose are some of the frequent attributes of the satyrs. They are

218 Hdt. 7.26; 8.138. Carpenter 1986, 76-77, n. 2 and further references; Isler- Kerényi 2004, 2.

219 Carpenter 1986, 77-78.

220 Isler-Kerényi 2004, 2; References to discussion about the names, silenoi/satyr, can be found in Carpenter 1986, 19, n.31; Hedreen 1994, 47, n.1.

often depicted as half man, half animal, with a tail and a beard, and sometimes with fully hairy bodies. The hoofs and the hairy body cannot be expected to change in a stylistic evolution; variations of these depictions can be seen in the same picture.[221] The satyr appears in many different shapes, like that of the slave or servant to the god, sometimes as sculptors, sometimes as cooks. They are for example depicted as thieves, gluttons, and unrepentant drunkards.[222] In the course of time, the satyr became more human in appearance and could decorate a Roman pastoral landscape in wall paintings, or take the form of a charming statue as in the Hellenistic Barberini Faun.[223]

Satyrs in the Greek area

The Greek Dionysos has been the focus of much scholarly attention as well as his followers, the satyrs.[224] Along with the maenads, the satyrs formed the sacred band, *thiasos*, of Dionysos.[225] During the 6th century B.C, the *thiasos* occurs as the chorus in Greek satyric drama, with Silenos as the father of the satyrs. Unlike the chorus of tragedies, the satyrs did not limit themselves to remarks about what was taking place on the stage, but also actively participated in the action. During the same time, there are an increased number of representations of satyrs in Greek vase painting. In the beginning, they are only present in a limited number of myths, but eventually

221 Lissarague 1993, 207-209.

222 Lissarrague 1993, 214 and further references.

223 This follows the general tendency in Greek art and mythological motives. See for example Woodford 1986, or Woodford 2003.

224 For a thorough discussion on the Greek satyr, see Lissarrague´s extensive work on the subject, for example Lissarrague 1988, 335–348; 1990a, 228–237; 1990b, 53–81; 1993, 207–220, and Isler-Kerényi 2004.

225 The female worshippers of Dionysos, the maenads, will not be discussed here, but see for example Olsson 2006 and Villanueva Puig, 2009.

the representations multiply.[226] The artistic genre is not realistic. The intention of the images was to evoke figures and ideas that existed in the shared mental world of the original audience. The difficulty that meets us today is the fact that their original meaning is no longer obvious. The associations that originally were apparent and familiar no longer exist, and therefore they have to be rediscovered and reinterpreted in order to be understood.[227]

The satyrs show an ambiguous set of characteristics; on the one hand, they are grotesque beings with an unrestrained desire for wine, festivities and sexual adventures, and on the other hand, they are the followers of a god. References to satyrs in archaic literature are rare and brief. In a Homeric hymn the silenoi are regarded as the dancing partners of the nymphs.[228] Hesiod also mentions satyrs briefly, and in a negative way: "the race of lazy good-for-nothing Satyrs".[229] In the Athenian festival *Anthesteria,* people dressed up as satyrs in the procession of Dionysos. The ambiguity of the nature of the satyr is once again obvious. In contrast to these public events, satyrs may also be connected with mysteries, where some form of initiation took place.[230]

In Greek iconography, satyrs accompany Dionysos who is present among humans together with wine, dance and music, and surrounded by maenads. The satyr is one of the oldest and most common figures in the repertoire of archaic Greek pottery.[231] Satyrs appear

226 *OCD*[3] (1996), 1361 s.v. satyrs; satyric drama (R.A.S. Seaford); *Der Neue Pauly* 11 (2001), 119 – 121 s.v. satyr (T. Heinze); *RE* II.3 (1929), 35-53 s.v. Silenos und Satyros (A. Hartmann). For discussion on satyrs in Greek iconography, see for example Lissarrague 1988, 335–348; Isler-Kerényi 2004. An interesting gender analyse is to be found in Hall 1998, 13–37. For a profound background of Greek satyrs and satyrplay, see introduction in Seaford 1984. There are a vast number of contributions to the discussion on the Greek satyr in its different aspects. These references are but a few.

227 Isler-Kerényi 2004, 4.

228 *Hom. Hymn Aph*. 5. 262; Isler-Kerényi 2004, 2.

229 Hes. *Fr*. 123; Isler-Kerényi 2004, 2; Lissarague 1993, 208.

230 *OCD*[3] (1996), 1361 s.v. satyrs; satyric drama (R.A.S. Seaford); *Der Neue Pauly* 11 (2001), 119 – 121 s.v. satyr (T. Heinze); *RE* II.3 (1929), 35-53 s.v. Silenos und Satyros (A. Hartmann).

231 Isler-Kerényi 2004, 2.

on several Attic vases that pre-date the appearance of Dionysos.[232] In several examples, the pre-Dionysian satyr is depicted as a hairy, ithyphallic figure, chasing women. Whether the women should be called nymphs or maenads is disputed; here it is enough to point out that the women's connection with Dionysos may in fact have come through the satyrs.[233] In the first portraits of Dionysos in Greek vase painting, the god is depicted as one of many deities. He has no companions; he walks alone, and has no distinguished position among the other gods (*Fig. 1*). On the François Vase, however (*Fig. 2b*), as mentioned in Chapter II, in a scene depicting the Return of Hephaistos, the satyrs, here called collectively *silenoi*, appear together with Dionysos for the first time. From then on, the satyr became the regular follower of Dionysos.[234] The big volute-krater was found in Chiusi, Etruria, but produced in Greece. In the scene depicting the myth of Hephaistos' return to Olympos, Dionysos is accompanied by his attendants. Dionysos leads the way for Hephaistos on his donkey, and is followed by three ithyphallic satyrs. They are engaged with some of the characteristic themes for satyrs. The first satyr carries a wineskin, the second plays the double flute, and the third is courting a woman. This image on the François Vase is considered to represent a kind of prototype for the Etruscan iconography when painting the myth of the Return of Hephaistos. The satyr is here depicted in his coming emblematic manner, and he will occur frequently on Etruscan black-figured vases hereafter.[235]

When, after the François Vase, the women join in together with Dionysos, the satyr becomes a more servile figure. The satyrs are usually ithyphallic, at least until the middle of the sixth century BC

232 See Carpenters comment on other figures on non-Attic vases that bear resemblance to the satyr. None of them however convincingly explained as a "proto-satyr", Carpenter 80, n.19. See also Isler-Kerényi 2004, 7-18, esp. 9-11, " A Protocorinthian precursor".

233 Carpenter prefers the term nymphs, Carpenter 1986, 82, further references 80, n. 17. Hedreen refer to them as nymphs as well. Hedreen 1992, 9. For an overview of the discussion, see Olsson 2006, 10-13, and its references.

234 Isler-Kerényi 2004, 19-21

235 Henriksson 2007, 115-121.

and often later; however, they indulge only occasionally in sexual activities in the presence of Dionysos.[236] Satyrs and women sometimes dance together in the presence of the god, but the relations between them are passive.[237]

Two basic forms confirm the association between satyrs and wine on Attic black-figured vases. Satyrs either carry the wine, or are involved with the production of it. This is pictured either by picking grapes or by treading them. Satyrs are only rarely shown drinking or holding a drinking vessel.[238] In the early stages of the development in the Dionysian imagery there seems to be little consensus and perhaps confusion in the identity of the god's companions.[239] Later, however, depictions show a more formalised structure for the companions of the god. The *thiasos* is the most common type of image involving satyrs, and probably one of the most popular motifs on amphorae and kraters dated to the 6th century BC.[240]

Questions have been raised as to what context the various scenes depicting satyrs should be read in. Hedreen emphasises that the narrative content of the black-figured vases has been underestimated. He argues that, unlike the poet or storyteller, the visual artist cannot effectively communicate a story that is completely new or unknown to the viewer. [241] As discussed above, when interpreting the image of Dionysos, the interpretation of the satyr might also suffer to a high degree from the mental hindrances of early classical scholarship. European thought, based on Christian values, had has great difficulties in connecting religion with sexuality. The images of Dionysos' retinue, the satyr and the maenad, then became a dilemma, best alienated.[242]

Rituals, by definition, take place in a transitional or interme-

236 Carpenter 1986, 82-83.
237 Carpenter 1986, 85.
238 Carpenter 1986, 91.
239 Carpenter 1986, 86.
240 Isler-Kerényi 2007, 35 and esp. n. 97.
241 Hedreen 1994, 4. For a thorough discussion on interpreting myths see Woodford 2003, 15-27.
242 Isler-Kerényi 2007, 1-4.

diate level between the human and divine spheres. Most probably the images did not represent "photographic" scenes, but had an emblematic and allusive nature. If the images were to be read in a cultic context, it seems quite natural that figures from the tangible world would be presented together with imaginary figures, such as Dionysos and satyrs. At the same time, depicted scenes were to be understood in the Greek world as well as outside it in order to be attractive products possible to export.[243] Consequently, there was nothing new or unfamiliar in the depicted motifs; on the contrary, the scenes presented a widespread, commonly shared perception of the "nature of the world".

Satyrs in Etruria

The Etruscan satyr appears in various shapes, both in iconography as on mirrors, reliefs and vases, and in plastic art such as statuettes, antefixes and terracotta masks.[244] In the present study, however, only the material concerning the decades around 500 BC is considered. Like the Greek satyr, the Etruscan satyr is an ambiguous character. There is the familiar mixture of both human and animal appearance. In Etruscan black-figured vase painting, the satyrs are often depicted naked, mostly slender, sometimes hoofed. For the most part the satyrs are painted full-length, and have a long horse's tail. The pointed ears, snub nose, and ithyphallic state are recognised from the Attic iconography.[245] The vases with mythological motives show that the Etruscans were acquainted with Greek mythology, but the Etruscan vase painters made their own free interpretations of the myths and

243 Isler-Kerényi 2004, 49, 80,

244 Henriksson 2005, 5. For antefixes see for example Brendel 1995, 232-234; Bonfante 1993, 228. For mirrors see for example van der Meer 1995, for an over view of studies of mirrors, 1-2; for mirrors in a Dionysian context, see for example 51-54, 122-124, and 149. For satyrs as motifs on mirrors see Wiman 1990 for example 106, figs. 11:5; 11:6; 11:7; 11:8; 11:9.

245 Henriksson 2007, 116-117.

presented the mythological narratives in an Etruscan way.[246]

In Etruria, the satyr first appears on the aforementioned *François Vase,* (*Fig. 2*), and it probably served as a kind of prototype for Etruscan painters.[247] However, some Etruscan scenes differ markedly from those depicted by the contemporary Greeks.[248] As for the representation of satyrs as companions of the god, there are several examples.[249]

The following satyr images will provide typical examples of the rendering of the satyr in Etruscan iconography by this time. Satyrs are well represented for example in the corpus of the Micali Painter; there are some 25 vases depicting satyrs in various settings.[250] The reading of these Etruscan motifs has varied. Spivey suggests that the ithyphallic satyrs in a funerary context, in vase painting, are to be seen as signs of ideas of rebirth.[251] Strandberg Olofsson, on the contrary, sees them in terms of inversion of order[252], and sets them in a context of celebrations as a common theme rather than connected with the underworld.[253]

The six satyrs in the belly frieze on an amphora in British museum (B 64), *Fig. 11*, by the Micali Painter, Provenience Vulci, have been much discussed. Various suggestions for the reading have been offered, but there seems to be a general acceptance among scholars of the idea that the satyrs are engaged in some form of performance, even though the interpretation of the character of the celebration differs.[254]

246 Henriksson 2007, 151-153.
247 Henriksson 2007, 115-121.
248 Bonfante 1993, 223.
249 Werner 1999, 120; Henriksson 2007, 15-24, 123- 125.
250 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 114, and n. 49.
251 Spivey 1988, 19 –21.
252 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 114 esp. n. 51 with further references.
253 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 115–116.
254 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 114–115 and further references. For an overview of different interpretations, see Henriksson 2007, 154-158.

Fig. 11.
Micali Painter, amphora c. 510-500 BC. British Museum B 64. 1865, 0103.25.
© Trustees of the British Museum .

Twenty-nine figures are engaged in the motif on the amphora, divided in nine different parts. Moving to the left are six satyrs, two by two, and they set out in a procession. Following them are among others flute-players, boxers, dancers and athletes, presumably performing in front of an audience.[255] A strong argument for a reading in favour of a performance is the context in which the satyrs appear, inserted as they are among human beings, participating in a procession. The conclusion that the satyrs are masked performers, engaged together in a celebration, is not a new one. Already in 1947, Beazley posed the question whether the six satyrs were "real" satyrs or performers dressed up like satyrs. However, the allusion to celebration may be the key issue here.[256] If, as discussed above, we are to read

255 Henriksson 2007, 129-132.
256 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 114-116.

the satyrs' appearance in a cultic context, the allusion to celebration, procession and performance will form the expected surrounding for such Dionysian cultic activities.[257]

In yet another example, a hydria found in Pitigliano, *Fig. 12*, and painted by the Micali Painter, satyrs are seemingly participating in a processional dance.

Fig. 12.
Micali Painter, hydria, ca 520-510 BC. Florence. Museo Archeologico Nazionale. 4139.
© Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici della Toscana.

On the shoulder of the hydria, eight ithyphallic satyrs dance two and two. Dot fronds are inserted in between the satyrs.[258] The satyrs are hoofed, have long horse's tails and ears, and are bearded, and their hair reaches the neck. Another example will be the somewhat later amphora with lid, attributed to the Group of Munich 883, and dated to around 500-475 BC, *Fig. 13*.

257 The amphora British Museum B 64, will be further discussed in the chapter "Performances" below.

258 Henriksson 2007, 54, 130, pl. 84.

Fig. 13
Group of Munich 883, amphora with lid c. 500-475 BC. Museo Civico 337/212, Viterbo. After Emiliozzi 1974.

The satyrs are here depicted with human legs and feet, snub noses, and long pointed beards. On side B, the satyrs engage in a seemingly cultic scene, dancing around an amphora on a tripod.[259] All these examples are included in a group of fifty-two vases, proposed to indicate cultic Dionysian dance.[260]

Satyrs in Rome

In Rome, the image of the satyr is more obscure. The question of satyrs being present in Rome is of a relatively late date. Early scholars have treated this question very briefly, and the general idea, even among several contemporary scholars, is that satyrs and satyr-plays were a genuine Greek tradition, which the Romans never adopted.[261]

The aim of this section, and the next, is to examine the possible evidence, and to find out to what extent satyrs were present in cult and drama in early Rome, i.e. during the early Republic, from c. 509 BC onwards. Along with this question another issue arises, namely whether satyr-plays occurred in Rome and, if practised there, what role that form of drama had in society.[262] Literary material will be used, mainly works by Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Horace, but also the works of other classical writers. The following assessment is not to be considered as a philological analysis of the historical texts. The texts used are well known and much discussed, for example Livy in Oakley's *A Commentary on Livy*,[263] and this is not an attempt to draw new conclusions from the material on a philological basis. The texts are used and analysed on the basis of what value they may have in a historical context. Of course, commentaries on

259 Henriksson 2007, 66, 131-132; 153- 159.

260 Henriksson 2007, 50-69; 129-132; 153- 159. See appendix 2 for a complete list.

261 The following references represent the idea that no satyr-play was present in Rome, or, if they did, they were performed in Greek by Greeks. Rawson 1985, 111, n. 86; Seaford 1984, 21; Brink 1971, 274–277; 1995, 271–275; Williams 1968, 341-345.

262 The religious aspect of the satyr will be discussed in the following, and further what possible role the satyr could have had.

263 Oakley 1998.

the texts have been consulted, whenever available. Walsh's work on Livy has been of great value – both his reinterpretation of Livy as an historian in *Livy: his historical aims and methods,* and his translations and commentaries of Livy's texts.[264] An interesting passage in Horace is discussed;[265] the question whether this passage confirms satyr-plays in Rome is much disputed.[266]

Among the literary sources mentioning satyrs we find Dionysius of Halicarnassus and his work *Antiquitates Romanae*, and his source, the testimony of Rome's first historian Q. Fabius Pictor.[267] Dionysius commented on this account, which according to Fabius Pictor was not just from what he had heard from others but from what he knew at first hand.[268] In this commentary, Dionysius is referring to the rituals of *Ludi Magni* known to have been performed in 490 BC for the first time.[269] According to Dionysius, the Senate ordered the festival and a fixed sum was to be expended every year. The Romans maintained this tradition until the time of the first Punic war.[270] Dionysius carefully points out that what is described is a long tradition that never changed due to the fact that new inventions could arouse divine anger.[271] In the account, Dionysius tells of a procession from the Capitol to the Circus Maximus that preceded the games and was held to honour the gods. He says further that after the armed dancers in the procession, others came impersonating satyrs and portraying the Greek dance *sicinnis*.[272] Those who represented satyrs wore girdles, goatskins, and similar things. They mocked and mimicked others and made them a laughing-stock and were provocative in different ways. Dionysius goes on to say that the satyrs'

264 Walsh 1961, 1994.
265 Hor. *Ars. P.* 2. 220–250.
266 See esp. Brink 1963, 1971, 1995, vs. Wiseman 1988. See further discussion below.
267 For an interesting discussion about history before Fabius Pictor, see Purcell 2003, 12-40, esp. 33-34.
268 Dion. Hal. 7. 71. 1.
269 Gabba 1991, 89, 134.
270 Dion. Hal. 7. 71. 2, Dionysius refers to the first Punic war, i.e. 265 BC.
271 Dion. Hal. 7. 70. 3.
272 *Sicinnis* referred to as a Greek dance particularly associated with ludi, see Dion. Hal. 7. 71. 1. See also Flower 1996, 104-105.

manner of jesting and fun-making was an ancient practice native to the Romans and that soldiers who took part in the triumphs were allowed to satirise and ridicule the most distinguished men, even the generals.[273] Dionysius then comments that even at funerals of famous persons, which he himself has witnessed, bands of dancers impersonating satyrs joined in the procession along with other participants. They preceded the carriage and imitated the dance *sicinnis*, especially at the funerals of the rich. He then proceeds to explain that this jesting and dancing in the manner of satyrs was an invention of the Greeks.[274] Whether this was a Greek invention as Dionysius wants to demonstrate can be disregarded for the moment; we will return to that question later on. What is of more interest is that he actually is a contemporary witness to a funeral tradition that included bands of dancers impersonating satyrs. This leaves us with further information: the satyrs were present in festivities, such as *ludi*, and in connection with funerals as well. The tradition was well-maintained in Dionysius' own time and there is no reason to mistrust him when he says that this custom had a long history.

The qualities of Dionysius' authorship have in recent years been discussed and re-evaluated in literary criticism.[275] The *History* has traditionally been judged negatively and there are several causes for this. One is that in 1905, E Schwartz's contribution to *Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* was published and his opinion of Dionysius was altogether negative. Dionysius is described as an example of the worst kind of rhetorical historiographer, with no ability to comprehend the major problem of writing Rome's history.[276] This negative opinion of Dionysius has formed a tradition during a great deal of the 20th century. In 1949, J.W.H. Atkins

273 C.f. the ribald songs sung by soldiers at Caesar's Gallic triumph in Suetonius, *Iul.* 49, 51. See also Östenberg 2009, 6-12 for triumphs and processions described as performances.

274 Dion. Hal. 7. 72. 10-12.

275 See for example Gabba 1991 and Feeney 1998, both with extensive bibliographies.

276 *RE* V (1905), 934-971 s.v. Dionysios von Halikarnassos (Schwartz). For discussion of the cultural and ideological background of Schwartz's assessment, see Gabba, 1991, 6-9 and Gabba 1979.

contributed to *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* and wrote about Dionysius in a somewhat more moderate way but he is still considered untrustworthy.[277] In recent times, however, a more balanced view of Dionysius has been formed, and his knowledge and understanding of his sources are reconsidered in favour of the author. Of interest is of course the underlying aim and method in the *History*, but also the expected audience of the work. Dionysius' declared intention with the work was to combine references to military and political activities with remarks on the lifestyle of the people[278], and this would show "the whole life of the ancient Romans".[279] Therefore, the ideal for Dionysius was not just a bare mention of events, but also a full description of the development of causes, and the intentions of the actors involved.[280] His overall effort was to demonstrate the Greek influence on Roman society, but despite this fact he undeniably provides us with a lot of useful information about Roman practice, both ancient and contemporary with Dionysius. His method is much debated, however, and there is an obvious uncertainty in his choice of sources. He often makes a choice between conflicting accounts and what is left to us is, of course, the choice that served Dionysius' purpose best. No doubt he was unable to verify all the material he used, but still he was often critical of his sources, and especially so when dealing with chronology.[281] Dionysius counted on Roman as well as Greek readers of his work, and he aimed to attract a wide audience. In the foreword he declares that his aim is to satisfy three categories of readers: "to those who occupy themselves with political debates, and to those who are devoted to philosophical speculations, as well as to any who may desire mere undisturbed entertainment in their reading of history"[282] Furthermore he wanted to serve his reader with such fullness of historical description that the reader

277 *OCD*[2] ed. (1949), s.v. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (J.W.H. Atkins).
278 Dion. Hal. 5. 48.1.
279 Dion. Hal. 1. 8.2.
280 Gabba 1991, 80-81.
281 Gabba 1991, 82-85.
282 Schultze 1986, 136; Dion. Hal. 1. 8. 3.

himself could partake in every detail of the event.[283]

The Greek bias of Dionysius has traditionally earned him a reputation of being untrustworthy, which, by and large, is somewhat exaggerated. If we see beyond this Greek framework, especially when compared with other evidence, both literary and archaeological, Dionysius becomes a useful source.[284]

Another late writer that mentions satyrs is Horace in his *Ars Poetica*. In a lengthy passage, Horace gives advice on how to compose a satyr-play.[285] Wiseman, in his *Satyrs in Rome? The background to Horace's Ars Poetica* argues in opposition to, amongst others, Brink[286] and Williams[287] that satyr-plays were a living genre in Rome at that time, even if in a contaminated form. Wiseman says:

> Certainly it seems there was a demand for the genre. Satyric drama was thriving at the festivals of the Hellenistic world, particularly in Delos, with its important population of Roman and Italian negotiatores, and in Boeotia, where Sulla set up the new Amphiaria at Oropos in or about 84 BC. At that time of unprecedented cultural

283 Gabba 1991, 80-81; Schultze 1986, 133–141; Hill 1961, 88–94. See also Wiseman 1994, 18–22, and Wiseman 1998, 1–16 for discussion on the origin of the Roman historiography and the suggestion of a derivation from a dramatic context. See also Webb 2009.

284 For comparative studies and analysis of Dionysius, see for example Schultze 1986, 128–141; Gabba 1984, 855–870; Gozzoli 1976, 149–76; and Wiseman 1994, 54–58. See also Andrén 1960, 88–104. Here Andrén states the standard negative opinion of Dionysius as an historian, but when discussing archaeological evidence compared with the *History* he reluctantly must give some credit to the author, and state that "He has no doubt acquainted himself thoroughly with the topography and monuments of Rome and its vicinity, and in describing them he often shows himself to possess an observing mind, a good judgement, and a clear perception of the main features". For a more discerning assessment se Cornell 1986, 67–86.

285 Hor. *Ars. P.* 2. 220-250.

286 Brink 1963, 227–228. Brink declares, "All that can safely be said today is that the genre was Attic and Alexandrian, not Roman…." He leaves an opening however to the problem by saying: "But I doubt if he [Horace] would have spoken as he did if he had not considered satyric drama a viable genre, at any rate for recitation". This possible solution Brink withdraws in 1971 (Brink 1971, 274-277 esp. 275) and maintains the former opinion that satyric drama did not exist in Rome. In 1995, 271–275 Brink maintain this opinion.

287 Williams 1968, 341–345.

> Hellenization at Rome, it is, I think, inconceivable that this genre alone should have failed to tempt Latin poets to rival the Greeks. [288]

Wiseman's remark on contamination deserves some attention, however. This view of a pure and original form of a certain phenomenon, be it myth, rite or religion as a whole, and then the transformation into a contaminated form, is well maintained and preserved in the scholarly tradition of Rome's history.[289] The overall foundation when it comes to Rome and Roman tradition is that no originality was developed, but that a rather simple take-over from other cultures, and of course mainly from the Greeks, took place. These simplified preconceptions of Roman culture have had an unfortunate bearing on the interpretation of, among other things, the Roman religious experience. If we can establish the satyrs' existence in Rome as early as 490 BC, as Dionysius tells us, and the tradition is maintained in Horace's time, then it would seem highly improbable that the customs did not transform, develop and take new forms in a rather natural course, in a time-span of almost five hundred years. This does not mean, however, that the tradition became contaminated or inferior to the practice introduced in 490 BC. It is most certainly because of the transformation that the genre was still a living one, five hundred years later.

Another interesting notice about satyr-play is found in Vitruvius. In his book *De Architectura,* one chapter is concerned with the construction of theatres. Vitruvius says that the Roman theatre has three types of scenery: tragic, comic, and satyric. Their decorations differ. The tragic scene is decorated with columns, statues, frontispieces and other ornaments, which fit the palaces of kings. The comic scene shows private houses with balconies and rows of windows. Finally, the satyric scene is decorated with trees, caves and other rural features. In other words, a kind of painted pictures of landscapes is at

288 Wiseman 1988, 8.

289 See Introduction, and on the use of the word contamination see Conte 1994, 99, "Contaminatio".

hand.[290] From this text it seems inevitable to draw the conclusion that satyr-play was an established and acknowledged form of drama in Rome by that time.[291]

If we turn back to the satyrs as Dionysos' companions, is it also possible that the phenomenon of satyrs could be part of a religious system? In terms of inversion of order, it does seem possible. If the nature of the satyr can be seen as an inverted code of behaviour, moral and social as well as religious, it would make sense. The satyr then represents the opposite of the normal order. Can satyrs even be seen as divine? Cicero states in a discussion in *De natura Deorum* that satyrs are not to be seen as deities.[292] Moreover, there is no other evidence that points in that direction. There are no indications of a cult being performed to satyrs in any area.

How then are we to understand the ambiguous satyr? If we place the satyr within the religious framework and have in mind the Romans' need of different symbols for different needs in life, and see the satyr as a representation of the unaccepted, liminal, but also comical side of the male nature, it seems rather plausible that the Romans would have had that representation within their religious sphere as well as all other aspects of life represented by their different gods. If so, the satyr is a representation of how a man should not act, the opposite to the prescribed paradigm, and the concept of the satyr becomes clearer.[293]

However, there are tangible indications of satyrs in early Rome and its vicinity as well. The earliest known evidence, to my knowledge, for satyrs in iconography in the Latin area, is to be found on a dinos dated between 575 and 550 BC, *Fig. 14*. It is an Attic

290 Vitr. *De arch*. 5. 6. 9. c.f. 7. 5. 2. See also discussion in Rudd 1989, 31–32.

291 Brink 1995, 272–274, discusses the passage in Vitruvius and suggests that the chapters in the book are mixed up, and that what is described is actually the Greek theatre, not the Roman, and therefore rules out Vitruvius as evidence for Roman satyr-play. Brink´s solution to the problem seems, to me, a bit constructed.

292 Cic. *Nat. D*. 3. 43.

293 Cf. discussion in "Satyrs in Etruria" above. Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 114. See also discussion below in chapter "Performances".

black-figured dinos, which was found in the area of Lavinium, in the vicinity of Rome.

Fig. 14.
Dinos with satyrs and maenads, c. 575-550 BC. Museo Archeologico Lavinium, Città di Pomezia. E 1985, E 1878.
© Museo Archeologico Lavinium - Città di Pomezia.

Depicted is a dance scene including satyrs and maenads. Satyrs are rendered with horse's tails and wide beards; the maenads are clad in long dresses. In the field below, several different animals are depicted; examples are felines, a ram and a lioness. Further decorations are rosettes and lotus flowers. The dinos form is not very frequent in the area; only two examples have been recovered in Lavinium.[294] From this early find we turn to somewhat later examples, all found in the area of Rome. Fragments of Greek pottery depicting satyrs occur in various parts of Rome. The first example given here is a sherd from

294 Christofani 1990, 190.

a red-figured kylix found in the area of Forum Romanum *Fig. 15*.

Fig. 15.
Fragment, red-figured kylix, interior decoration showing a satyr looking left, 4.2 cm., c. 510 BC.
After Gjerstad 1960, Fig. 161:9. Courtesy of the Swedish Institute at Rome.

The interior decoration shows the head of a satyr looking left. The characteristic features of the satyr are apparent, such as the snub nose, wide beard and long hair.[295] The satyr is looking left. The second example, a fragment from a black-figured kylix, shows the upper part of a satyr looking left.

Fig. 16.
Fragment from a black-figured kylix, chest and head of a satyr looking left. 3.4 cm. c. 500 BC. After Gjerstad 1966, 178:26. Courtesy of the Swedish Institute at Rome.

295 Gjerstad 1960, 263-264.

Even here, the characteristic features of the satyr are clearly visible. The fragment is dated to around 500 BC, and was found within the area of the Temple of Vesta, presumably from a votive deposit.[296] Another fragment presenting a satyr is a black-figured sherd, *Fig. 17*, showing a scene including a maenad and an additional figure holding a drinking horn in his right arm. Leaves of ivy surround the figures. Gjerstad does not specify the date closer than 530-500 BC.[297]

Fig. 17.
Fragment, black-figured sherd depicting a satyr, a maenad, and a drinking horn c. 530-500 BC. After Gjerstad 1966, Fig. 185:9. Courtesy of the Swedish Institute at Rome.

Yet another black-figured sherd depicts a satyr and a large krater, *Fig. 18*. It is probably a scene picturing satyrs dancing around a mixing-bowl, known from several Greek and Etruscan motives. Cf. for example *Fig. 8,* from Orvieto.[298]

296 Gjerstad 1960, 314, 318-320, Fig. 205.15; 1966, 540, 22, Fig. 178:26. For votive deposits found in Rome, se Holloway 1994, 81-90.
297 Gjerstad 1966, 544, 22.
298 For further similar Etruscan motifs, see Henriksson 2007, pl. 79, 88, 92, 109, 170.

Fig.18.
Fragment black-figured sherd, satyr and krater c. 530-500 BC.
After Gjerstad 1966, Fig. 178:19. Courtesy of the Swedish Institute at Rome.

Apart from these fragments showing satyrs, there are several sherds found all over Rome, picturing maenads, grapes, krotala, and ivy leaves, all alluding to the sphere of Dionysos.[299] To my knowledge, none of these fragments has been discussed in the literature since Gjerstad published them in the 1960s.

Furthermore, several terracotta antefixes representing satyrs have been found in and around Rome. According to Gjerstad, three phases can be distinguished in Roman architectural terracottas: the first phase from c. 575 BC until 530 BC, the second phase c. 530-500 BC, and the third phase c. 500-450 BC.[300] Examples are here given from the different phases, although the demarcation lines may be subtle. The one below is an antefix in the shape of a satyr's head.

299 For maenads, grapes, krotala and ivy-leafs se for example Gjerstad 1960 Fig. 161, and Gjerstad 1966, Fig. 178. For further satyrs, see for example Cristofani 1990, 189, 8.3.24.

300 Gjerstad 1966, 568-579.

Fig. 19.
Antefix. c. 530-525 BC.
After Gjerstad 1960, Fig. 92:1, 2. Courtesy of the Swedish Institute at Rome.

This is the earliest example in the series of satyr's heads discovered in Rome. Gjerstad gives it a date around 530–525 BC, thus belonging to phase 1. The nose is characteristically broad and snub. The eyebrows are marked and the eyes elliptic and slightly winding. The beard is long, wide, and wavy, and the moustache prominent and long. The forehead is wrinkled and the head is crowned by a wreath of ivy leaves. The clay is red and gritty, with red and black paint clearly visible. It was found in the area of the Esquilino. Height: 33.5 cm.[301]

The following example, *Fig. 20*, was found in the vicinity of the Archaic temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus.

Fig. 20. Antefix. c. 500 BC.
After Gjerstad 1960, Fig. 130: 3-4.
Courtesy of the Swedish Institute at Rome.

301 Gjerstad 1966, Fig. 130: 1, 2, 401, 460-461, 572, 575; Gjerstad 1960, Fig. 92:1, 2, 139; Christofani 1990, tav. XXVIII, Fig.10.1.4, 254.

The antefix shows a satyr with a snub broad nose, globular bulging eyes, and a forehead lined with heavy wrinkles. His high brows underline the wrinkles. Lips are thick, although the mouth is rather small. The cheeks are significant. A moustache ending in spirals crowns the long smooth beard. The hair, though much of it is missing, seems flat. The clay is red-brownish and traces of paint still remain. Height: 17.0 cm. Dated approximately around 500 BC, in the second phase.[302] A further example, *Fig. 21*, was found in the same area of the Capitoline. Although much of the antefix is missing, it clearly shows the face and head of a satyr.

Fig. 21. Antefix. c. 500 BC.
After Gjerstad 1960, Fig. 119: 3-4. Courtesy of the Swedish Institute at Rome.

302 Gjerstad 1966, Fig. 119, 1-2, 188-189; Gjerstad 1960, 130:3, 4, 575.

The satyr, now in Copenhagen, shows the emblematic bulging eyes and snub, broad nose. The eyebrows are raised, and the forehead lined with wrinkles. The head is bold. Much of the lower part of the face is missing, although traces of a moustache are plausible. Gjerstad suggests a rather late date, around 500 BC.[303] This is also the demarcation between the second and third phases of Archaic sculpture in Rome, as described by Gjerstad.[304] An example of a later satyr's head is shown beneath, *Fig. 22.*

Fig. 22. Antefix. c. 480 BC.
After Gjerstad 1966, Fig. 131:1-2. Courtesy of the Swedish Institute at Rome.

A late Archaic antefix dated to around 480 BC and an example from the third phase. The snub, broad nose is recognizable, as well as the circular eyes and wrinkled forehead. The beard, long and wide, is here painted as curved lines in white. The moustache is long and

303 Gjerstad 1960, fig 119: 3-4, 188-189; Gjerstad 1966, 575, n. 7, and further references.
304 Gjerstad 1966, 568-579.

painted red, and the hair is plain in black. Black, white, and red paint is clearly visible. The head stands on a base, painted with meander pattern in red and black. The antefix was found in 1960 in the excavation under the Basilica Julia.[305]

However, altogether there are several diverse indications of the satyrs' early appearance in Rome and its vicinity. Both the archaeological record and literary evidence lead to the same conclusion explicitly – the widespread knowledge of the Dionysian sphere and its connotations in early Rome.

Discussion

There is enough evidence to establish the existence of satyrs in Rome over a long period of time. Taken together, the textual evidence from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Horace, and the instructions on how to build stages for satyr-plays in Vitruvius, together with iconographic material and antefixes depicting satyrs in Rome and its vicinity, makes it very hard to deny the Romans' awareness of satyrs and satyr-plays.

Satyrs appeared, according to the sources, in different settings such as celebrations, funerals, satyr-plays, and iconography. Regardless of where the satyrs appeared, the religious context is obvious. Inevitably the satyr in Rome has to be considered as a character within the religious sphere, as the follower of a god, but also acting on his own. Liminality is a central feature when satyrs are concerned, and the satyr may function as a symbol of inversion of order. The nature of the satyr can be seen as an inverted code of behaviour, social as well as religious. There is no evidence however, which supports the notion that satyrs were seen as divine. Given the Romans' religious preferences, with all kinds of different representations within their religious sphere, the satyr would be a representation of the unaccepted, liminal, but also comical side of male nature. In an anthropological

305 Gjerstad 1966, Fig. 131:1-2, 458, 575-577; Christofani 1990, tav. VI, Fig. 3.4.1, 63.

perspective the satyr and his behaviour may be described as the opposite of the prescribed paradigm, that is, how a man should not act. In ritual, the satyr was a personification of the upside-down world, in which, for instance, it was fully legitimate to ridicule even the most distinguished of men.[306]

There is a line of development of the satyr and satyr-play from the processions in the early 5th century BC, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes, where the jesting and mocking manner of the satyr is the most outstanding feature, to Horace's advice on how to compose a satyr-play. Considering the amalgam of political games, religious rituals, cult, *lectisternia*, recitations, oral traditions, dance and celebrations, it may well be possible that satyr-plays evolved as a first step to future dramatic performances in Rome, discussed further in the next chapter.

In iconography, satyrs occur in Rome as early as the third quarter of the 6th century BC, and in Lavinium well before that. Satyrs continue to appear in the area. At about the same time, satyrs begin to appear as decorations on antefixes. Both Greek and Etruscan influences are evident. The fact that Rome was an Etruscan city in the 6th century BC., and inevitably must have gained a considerable Etruscan inheritance, seems to be an important issue of denial for later Roman historiographers. Still, the material remains add to a fuller history.

As discussed earlier, regarding Etruscan import of Greek vases, the iconography was evidently understood. The Etruscans were not ignorant of the depicted motives and their connotations. Likewise, the Romans imported Greek and Etruscan artefacts and influences, and were fully aware of the significance of the motifs. In all three areas, people dressed up as satyrs are either depicted or described, and participating in processions. The contexts of these processions are religious and presumably specifically Dionysian cultic activities.

In the next chapter, a discussion on how satyrs and Dionysian rituals may have influenced a coming Roman dramatic tradition is to be found.

---

306 The phenomenon of liminality will be further discussed in the chapter "Performances", below.

IV. PERFORMANCES

Dionysos and performance

The following chapter will investigate a possible association between the Dionysian sphere in Rome and performances. The Greek and Etruscan areas will be reflected on for purposes of comparison. As reflected on in the chapter 'Introduction', under 'Terminological remarks on theatre' certain distinctions between theatre, performance, and drama are to be made. Theatre, in this case, can be defined as the whole event taking place when a performance is set up, i.e. the relations between actors, space, and audience. Theatre can also be defined as including both written drama and performances in a wider sense, not necessarily accompanied by a text. For example, different types of celebrations, dance, mime, or processions can be included in the idea of theatre. However, since there seems to be disagreement over the definition of theatre, perhaps a better terminology of theatre, in this context, would be *performance*. Nevertheless, as the word 'theatre' is a commonly used expression, it cannot be avoided altogether.

Performance in the Greek area

The discussion of the origin of theatre and its connection with ritual goes a long way back, with roots that can be seen in the Cambridge

School and particularly in the works of Jane Ellen Harrison.[307] Ever since Harrison's statement, published already in 1903, that Dionysian ritual was the origin of the Athenian theatre, the question has been on the agenda.[308] This is certainly a discussion of interest for this thesis; however, the main focus of that discussion is naturally located within the Greek sphere.[309] Eli Rozik in *The roots of theatre* argues against a ritual connection of drama. He holds that the roots of theatre are to be found in the human psyche rather than in a religious experience.[310] He discusses the issue in general terms and claims to apply an alternative interdisciplinary method, within the boundaries of a structuralistic and semiotic approach. He further claims to apply additional disciplines such as:

> ...psychoanalysis, neurology, sociology, play and game theory, science of religion, mythology (….), poetics, philosophy of language, and linguistics, particularly pragmatics.[311]

On the other hand, he dismisses the material remains as being too ambiguous, and thereby excludes all the possibilities that archaeology offers.[312] This shows the fundamental obstacle when an interdisciplinary study is attempted, i.e. how to grasp all the different disciplines involved. In the above-mentioned work, it clearly shows how

307 The issue was discussed before Harrison by for example Frazer and Müller; see Wise 1998, 220. For a background to the Cambridge school and the ritualists, see Ackerman 1991; however, it cannot be recommended for its analysis of Jane Ellen Harrison herself. Ackerman stresses Harrison's personal life rather than her achievements as a scholar. A fuller assessment is given in McGinty 1978, 71-103, and a limited but sufficient bibliography of Harrison's work is found in note 1 in the same chapter. See also Kowalzig 2007, 13-23.

308 Wise 1998, 1-2 and further references. Kowalzig 2007.

309 For a more profound background, it is worth reading Wise 1998, 213-237, i.e. the concluding chapter for its discussion of theatre theory from "ritualism" to more modern ideas.

310 Rozik, 2002, 345-347.

311 Rozik 2002, xiv.

312 Rozik 2002, xii. "Although pottery contemporaneous with the recorded events is more plentiful, this kind of evidence also remains ambiguous due to the lack of complementary verbal descriptions and insufficient knowledge of the background culture." sic.

incomplete such study turns out when an important link is missing. The conclusion drawn by Rozik that ritual and theatre are mutually independent, and that

> …claiming that theatre originated in ritual is as absurd as claiming that natural language, music, or design originated in ritual.

seems not very plausible.[313] Anyhow, the issue of the roots of theatre may not be the most important question from which to begin. Perhaps a more rewarding attitude towards theatre and performances would be to set the evidence in a contextual frame.

Numerous works have been written on the Greek theatre. Dionysos' connection with theatre is not a controversial question in this area.[314] Most obviously, it is manifested through the Athenian festivals of Dionysos. Still, most studies on Greek theatre have concentrated on specific festivals, plays, tragic or comic scripts, and very often one particular script or author. Social studies[315] have not very often influenced the outcome. In the last two decades or so, however, several studies have appeared concentrating on the context of Greek theatre in its contemporary society. For example, questions have been raised about the social context the author operates in, the communication between actors and audience, or the political frame that plays were inevitably staged within.[316] Likewise, J.R. Green, in *Theatre in ancient Greek society*, shifts the focus of the theatre from the literary achievement to the experience of theatre, by concentrating on the audience's reactions to the staged plays – in other words,

313 Rozik 2002, 337; see also Rozik 2003.

314 There are, of course, extensive discussions concerning the significance of Dionysos' influence in Greek theatre. Just one example is the discussion in Riu 1999, esp. 49-58. For a good overview of Dionysos' influence in the Athenian festivals and rituals, see chapters 7 and 8 in Seaford 1994, 235-327.

315 For Social studies in an archaeological framework, see Streiffert Eikeland 2006, 49-69.

316 A collection of essays in this spirit is found in the highly interesting volume *Nothing to do with Dionysos?* by Winkler & Zeitlin 1990. The influence of the French school is immense. For theatre rituals, see Chaniotis 2007, 48-66. See also Goldhill 1992 for a profound social analyse of Aeschylus' drama *Oresteia* and the society it was staged within.

what role the theatre played in contemporary society and the influence it had, and what place it had in people's lives. In order to do so, Green has studied the archaeological evidence for the theatres. This means, besides the actual remains of the buildings themselves, evidence for example in the form of votives, such as iconographic renderings of the theatre, terracotta or bronze figurines of performers, but also different kinds of representations of masks.[317] These questions set the theatre in a much more interesting and contextual framework.

Another aspect, pointed out by Oddone Longo, is the place of ritual and performance that eventually became the theatre. In the earliest performances there was no division or distinction between the stage area and the auditorium, or thus between public and actors. In time, as dramatic performances developed, collective participation was replaced by the chorus. Therefore, the choruses are to be seen as the representatives of the collective citizen body. Consequently, the community no longer took direct part in the action, but became the audience – still profoundly engaged and involved in the action, but in a mediated form.[318] It should be noted as well that the audience was a political community, the assembled citizenry of Athens.[319]

In Archaic times, until the end of the 6th century BC, tragic performances took place in Athens on an *orkhestra* in the Agora. It was only at the beginning of the 5th century that a theatrical space, made of provisional wooden structures, was arranged on the south slope of the Acropolis.[320] The public, i.e. the community as described above, was also the collective actor in the drama. There seems to have been a regular pattern of outward procession, sacrifice, and then returning to town in Dionysian festivals in Athens.[321] As for a transition

317 Green 1994, xii-xv. For terracotta figurines see Pedley 1990, 72-73, Fig. 42; Baumbach 2004, 138, Fig. 5.63 and further references. For an interesting contextual discussion on votives as a reflection of the giver in regard to her/his age, gender, economic resources and social status, see Högström Berntson, forthcoming.

318 Longo 1990, 16-18.

319 Longo 1990, 16-18. Seaford 1994, 270-271.

320 Longo 1990, 16-17.

321 Seaford 1994, 239 and n. 15, 270-272.

of Dionysian ritual to the theatre, Richard Seaford argues that a reversal took place in the time of the third Great Dionysia in Athens, in the 6th century BC. The reorganisation of the festival allowed a reversal of the formerly mentioned pattern of the *polis* festivals. The reversal had three aspects: firstly the shift of the celebrations from the external destination of the procession to the internal one, to the heart of the city. Along with this spatial aspect came the growth of a mass audience, and this required a slope in the centre of the city. This turned the focus from being a performance on behalf of the *polis* to a performance in front of the *polis*. The second aspect is that, when presenting a performance before a mass audience, a precondition is the abandonment of any secrecy. This in turn requires the third aspect, a male rather than a female *thiasos*. On the other hand, the female Dionysian rituals had to remain secret.[322]

The theatre could be described as being a place of consensus, a place for the maintenance and reinforcement of community cohesion.[323] Longo argues that in order to frame a consensus that can involve diverse social classes, it must lie not so much in the specific content of dramatic representations, or in the system of opinions expressed in the text, as in a social process that occurs at a deeper level. The spectatorship sets in motion a mechanism of identification with the dramatic characters, and especially with the chorus. Thereby a powerful mechanism, complex yet simple – a collective identification – is in motion.[324] Placed in a political frame, this would be a tremendously powerful tool for creating consensus and reinforcement of the social unity in the *polis*.

Due to their complete strangeness, the various manifestations of Dionysos' cult have been a difficult task for interpretation. As has been pointed out previously, Dionysos has been provocative to early

322 Seaford 1994, 248-249, 269-270. The female participation probably became controversial as soon as performances were acted in front of an audience, since women's participation in public life was very restricted.

323 Longo 1990, 18. See also Wistrand 1992 for attitudes among Roman writers of the first century AD, in regard to different forms of performances. See esp. p. 72 on social control.

324 Longo 1990, 18-19.

scholars, and suggestions have for example been made of his importation from the east or north, and his representing a cult that was totally foreign to the Hellenes. Another aspect has been that the cult would never have been introduced in Greece but for the irrational women who forced it through.[325] This could serve as a fitting rationalization for the questionable qualities in Dionysian cultic activities. Des Bouvrie, on the other hand, argues as an alternative that, since the Mycenaean origin and the aristocratic element of Dionysos are well attested, it would be preferable to make efforts to understand his cult as part of the Greek religious system.[326] Des Bouvrie continues to suggest that the starting point for an approach to Dionysos should be from the collective rather than what usually is the case, the individual.[327] Besides, groups tend to establish some regular recurrence of an event, whence the notion of "seasonal rituals", and the most important aspect is their collective nature. Consequently, it is not the individual transition that is the focus here, but the community departing from everyday life to celebration and back, in order to renew its existence.[328] It could be argued that the theatre festivals of Dionysos are to be classified as "seasonal rituals".[329] The essence of the festival was the liminal experience gained by means of alcohol, rhythmic instruments, dance and theatrical devices. In this way, euphoria was created, aiming at a shared collective experience. Dionysos can be said to be a liminal power and, through reversed rites, the social order was dissolved and thereafter recreated. The main reason was to strengthen the social hierarchies, and it was never a

325 Des Bouvrie 1993, 83-84 and further references.
326 Des Bouvrie 1993, 85.
327 Des Bouvrie 1993, 85-87.
328 Des Bouvrie 1993, 89.
329 Des Bouvrie 1993, 92 and 108-109.

question of true revolt against the social order.[330] The "symbolic inversion" as described by Barbara A. Babcock is then in progress.[331] Although it is uncertain, there might be reason to believe that the history of Athenian theatre is a gradual urbanisation of rural dramatic rites.[332] To participate in ritual as a companion of Dionysos could be regarded as participating in the enactment of myth. Such enactment can be seen as preceding the emergence of drama.[333]

Performance in Etruria

Thorough research concerning scenic entertainment in Etruria was done by J.G. Szilágyi in the 1980s and presented in his article *Impletae modis saturae*.[334] Szilágyi concludes that scenic art appears in Etruria at the beginning of the 5th century BC, perhaps already in the third quarter of the 6th century BC, and included professional actors. These shows could be part of *ludi,* according to Szilágyi, and these *ludi* could for example be funeral games of a private character, festivities, or religious actions of a more public nature. Szilágyi

330 Des Bouvrie 1993, 110-112. Des Bouvrie's conclusions, based on the theories of Turner and van Gennep's tripartite system, seem very likely. On the other hand, the conclusion that the Dionysian mystery cults seem to have promised their participants an exclusive membership after death, and that consciousness of belonging to the elect in the nether world created a particular bond between the living, is not very convincing. Des Bouvrie 1993, 111. The conclusion appears to be very influenced by later Christian thought, and in my view it does not seem to follow from the earlier discussion in the article. Any comparison between Christianity and early religions tends to fail for diverse reasons. One that possibly can be made, however, is that of the "paradigm of truth" within the respective religion.

331 Babcock 1978, 14. "Symbolic inversion" may be broadly defined as any act of expressive behaviour which inverts, contradicts, abrogates, or in some fashion presents an alternative to commonly held cultural codes, values, and norms, be they linguistic, literary or artistic, religious, or social and political". For several examples of the "world upside down" concept, both ancient and modern, see Kunzle 1978, 39-94. See also Wistrand 1992, 60-80, esp 72-73 for 'culture of laugh'.

332 Longo 1990, 16.

333 Seaford 1994, 269 and further references.

334 Szilágyi 1981.

argues, from both archaeological and literary evidence, for the existence of mimic and parodic dances, such as the parody of armed dances, and for a chorus dressed up like satyrs in Etruria.[335] When Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes the *ludi* and the dancing processions of satyrs in Rome, Szilágyi sees this as an old Etruscan custom still surviving.[336] Furthermore, he draws parallels based, among other evidence, on Livy's account of *Ludi,* between the origins of *Ludi* in Etruria and in Rome.[337] Moreover, it can be argued that Livy's description of the introduction of *Ludi scaenici* to Rome describes one sort of scenic entertainment, not necessarily all scenic entertainment, as the name is a collective one.[338] It should also be noted that inclusion of every new presentation in the program of the *ludi publici* was founded on rigorous religious considerations.[339] Szilágyi argues in fact that it is undoubtable that Rome's actors came from Etruria, and that Etruria was the model and principal source of Rome's artistic production.[340]

The much-discussed London amphora (British Museum B 64), *Fig. 11*, can give some hint of the Etruscan tradition of performance. There are several interpretations regarding the motif; opinions have varied between, for example, funeral celebrations, a Dionysian festival, or celebrations in general.[341]

The vase was found at Vulci and is dated to c. 510 BC and attributed to the Micali Painter. The frieze encircling the belly shows a procession. Sporting scenes including boxing, discus throwing, and pole climbing forego the three pair of satyrs, which are matters of special attention here and will be discussed in more detail below.[342] The scene continues, showing three pairs of veiled women followed

335 Szilágyi 1981, 11.
336 Szilágyi 1981, 10. Dion 7.72.10-12.
337 Szilágyi 1981, 12, Se further discussion of Livy's text below.
338 Szilágyi 1981, 12.
339 Szilágyi 1981, 13.
340 Szilágyi 1981, 4.
341 For a recent summary regarding different interpretations, see Henriksson 2007, 154-158.
342 Also discussed in the chapter "Satyrs".

by two pairs of nude young men, playing the *krotala*[343]. Chariots, spectators and animals are represented as well. All in all, there are 29 figures depicted, and the actions seem to take place in public.[344] It cannot be established where the frieze begins and ends.[345] It has been pointed out that the scenes could be read as depicting two out of three parts in a celebration, namely the *pompa* and *ludi*, but omitting the sacrifice.[346]

The six satyrs dancing on the belly frieze of the London amphora B 64, *Fig. 11*, deserve special attention in this context, since the satyrs are vital elements in the cult of Dionysos.

The three pairs of satyrs are engaged in a procession or dance side by side, with their arms swinging. They have their usual characteristics of hoofs, pointed ears, long tails, snub noses and pointed beards, and they are ithyphallic. Since long ago, the question whether the satyrs are "real" ones or costumed performers has been discussed, and moreover in what context they should be understood. As mentioned before, suggestions have been made in favour of a coding of ceremonies connected with rites performed in a funerary context as well as for festivals and celebration or other types of theatrical performances. However, there seems to be a general acceptance of a coding pointing to some kind of performance, although opinions vary regarding what type of celebrations is depicted.[347] In addition, it is appropriate to point out the relation between the London amphora scenery and other motifs by the Micali Painter and motifs by other contemporary artisans as well. The allusions to celebration are rather common in the production of the Micali Painter, as well as in other workshops that were probably active in Vulci at about the same time. The motifs on B 64 are not unique in representing celebrations. It is rather the concentration of various parts of a celebra-

343 For *krotala*, see Landels 1999, 82-83; Bundrick 2005, 46-47; *Der Kleine Pauly*, s.v. Krotalon. Krotala were often associated with Dionysos and his cult, but not always.

344 van der Meer 1986, 439-445; Henriksson 2007, 57, 129-130. For an extensive bibliography on the London amphora, see Henriksson 2007, 57.

345 Szilágyi 1981, 8.

346 Henriksson 2005, 108, and further references.

347 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 114-115, and further references.

tion in one and the same belly frieze that is unparalleled. [348]

Strandberg-Olofsson argues in favour of a reading, based on the theories of van Gennep, in terms of inversion of order. Bearing that in mind, it is of interest to place the celebration, of whatever kind, within the Etruscan context. As discussed above regarding Greek theatre and dramatic representation, performances can be interpreted as a way to create consensus and reinforcement in the society. Seen in this light, the satyrs on the London amphora can be read in the context of the "symbolic inversion" also discussed above, and consequently the concept of the "upside-down world" and the inversion of order.[349]

I am inclined to agree with van der Meer who in 1986 concluded:

> …albeit tentatively, that the frieze presents a sacral, possibly Dionysian festival with satyrical, triumphant elements, that was influenced by a comparable Panathenaic festival held in about 500 BC.[350]

What further encourages a reading in favour of a Dionysian festival is the interpretation of the motives of the aforementioned Etruscan black-figured vases, collected under the name *The Ivy Leaf Group*. The vases were probably fabricated between 540 and 520 BC, perhaps continuing into the following decade. The place of origin is Vulci, and the group is named after the figure scenes on 15 of the vases (out of totally 57 vases) with dancing men and women carrying large ivy leaves.[351] It is possible that some communication took place between the workshops of the Ivy Leaf Group and the Micali Painter.[352] In any case, the strong connection with the Dionysian sphere leads Werner to argue that knowledge of the god and Dionysian rituals existed in Etruria as early as the last third of the 6th century BC.[353] According to Werner, it can be stated that it is not a

348 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 115.
349 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 114.
350 van der Meer 1986, 444.
351 Werner 2005, 19, 50.
352 Werner 2005, 60. See also previous discussion in the chapter "Satyrs".
353 Werner 2005, 75-76, and bibliography.

question of copies painted from Greek prototypes. She also suggests that the paintings of dances, where the participants are carrying the Dionysian symbolic ivy leaves, show that real performances took place in the Etruscan cities.[354]

The tradition of Roman performances

If we are to believe Livy, the Romans first encountered the theatre in 364 BC.[355] This should not be taken to mean that the Romans did not have any dramatic performances prior to that date. They presumably had, but in other forms.[356] Unfortunately, Livy is not concerned with the theatre and its development in the years to come, and only offers a remark that takes us a century forward.

> *Livius post aliquot annis, qui ab saturis ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere…*[357]
>
> Livius [Andronicus] was the first, some years later, to abandon saturae and compose a play with a plot…

The "some years later" is traditionally dated to 240 BC.[358] Therefore, it leaves us with little information on the years in between. Livius Andronicus was of Greek origin and is said to have translated the first play for a Latin audience from a Greek play. It seems that the Romans by this time demanded more frequent and more varied entertainment. Livius Andronicus' first production was intended for the *Ludi Romani*, but even the *Ludi Florales* gave opportunities of

354 Werner 2005, 75.
355 Liv. 7.2. 2-8. Wiseman 2008, 24-38, esp. 25-26.
356 Beacham refers to Aristotle as the first to point out that the impulse towards imitative activity is fundamental – shared, indeed, with animals – and is evident in even the most primitive societies long before its expressions are formalised and defined as "theatrical art". Beacham 1991, 2, and Aristotle *Poetica*, 4. 1448 b.
357 Liv. 7. 2. 8.
358 Rawson 1989, 428.

performing plays and many more were to come.[359] Games in Rome can be divided into "regular games", i.e. *ludi solemnes*, and "honorary spectacles", i.e. *munera*. *Ludi solemnes* can be subdivided into genres like scenic games, *ludi scaenici,* and circus games, *ludi circenses*. The *ludi solemnes* were held regularly by the authorities as part of religious festivals or public celebration. *Munera*, on the other hand, were irregular and paid for by wealthy citizens, often in connection with funerals or triumphs, for example.[360]

Some of the *ludi* included scenic performances from the start and some included the entertainment gradually. *Ludi Romani*, also called *Ludi Magni*, were held annually in September. Three days of *ludi scaenici* may have been attached to the games as early as in 366 BC.[361] *Ludi Florales* were instituted to secure the protection of the goddess Flora, after consultation of the Sibylline books.[362] *Ludi Florales* were celebrated annually in April/May from at least 241 BC, and regular scenic games were included from at least 173 BC.[363] *Ludi Megalenses* were instituted in honour of the introduction of the Phrygian goddess Cybele (Magna Mater) in 204 BC, and dramatic performances were introduced to the games in 194 BC according to Livy.[364] What all these and other *ludi* had in common was that the origin and the celebration were acts of religion. All citizens had the right to attend the games, the entertainment was free of charge, and it was all part of the political life. It was the obligation of the public magistrates to present and pay for the games and therefore they served a political role as well. The games included a variety of activities besides the dramatic performances, such as races, boxing,

359 Beacham 1991, 18-20.

360 Csapo & Slater 1995, 207-208. For an exhaustive study on the Roman triumphs, see Östenberg 2009.

361 Csapo & Slater 1995, 208.

362 Beacham 1991, 20.

363 Csapo & Slater 1995, 208, and further references.

364 Liv. 34. 54. 3-4. According to Briscoe, the passage describes that this was the first occasion on which plays were performed at the *Megalensia*, not that it was the first time plays were performed at any *ludi*, as has been suggested. The *Ludi Megalenses* were first performed in 204 BC in celebration and dedication of a temple to Magna Mater. Briscoe 1981, 134; Csapo & Slater 1995, 208.

animal fights and similar events, and the citizens came with expectations of being entertained. Nevertheless, the religious foundation of the games was always present.[365]

What kind of performances are we to expect on the Roman stages, in connection with the *Ludi*? There is a long scholarly tradition which has maintained the idea that there existed no dramatic performances in Rome prior to Livius Andronicus, i.e. 240 BC. This assumption was made because of the lack of written evidence for such dramas.[366] Today, with an expanded research in the field, this assumption seems not very plausible. As Wiseman puts it:

> …to assume that the Romans had no significant drama before Livius Andronicus (and no drama on historical subjects before Naevius), or that any drama the Romans had must always have obeyed the same generic rules as the surviving texts of Attic tragedy and comedy, is simply to beg the question in advance. I prefer to make a different assumption: that since the ludi scaenici were important festivals, the performances watched by the Roman people will have touched on the matters that concerned them most – their gods, their freedom, their victories – and presented them in whatever way they would most enjoy.[367]

Further, Wiseman actually suggests that Livy's account of the Bacchanalia derived from a dramatic context that was taken over by Livy and transformed into his history.[368] Whether this was the case is of course difficult to say, but it certainly cannot be ruled out.[369] However, there is more substantial evidence of Roman drama in remaining texts and fragments. Livius Andronicus, who worked as a *grammaticus*, a teacher of Greek and Latin, in Rome, also wrote texts for the stage. All that remains of his works are some sixty fragments,

365 Beacham 1991, 20–26; Szilágyi 1981, 13.

366 Wiseman 1998, 1–16, esp. note 103.

367 Wiseman 1998, 16.

368 Wiseman 1998, 48. Cf. also chapter 1. See now also Wiseman 2008, 24-38, esp. 36-38.

369 Cf. Wiseman 1994, and critique of Wiseman in Flower 1995, 173-175. See also Cornell 2003, 73-97, esp. 91-93. For *Ekphrasis*, see Webb 2009, 1-11, esp. 4-5, and 195.

and the titles of eight tragedies.[370] Livius Andronicus is known to have been the first to have a dramatic text performed on stage in 240 BC.[371] Writers of the first century BC like Varro, Cicero and Horace all agree in presenting Livius Andronicus as the originator of Latin literature.[372] The above-mentioned Naevius wrote many tragedies and comedies. Most of his texts, however, remain only in fragments and are very incomplete.[373] Plautus is known to have produced a vast number of comedies, now unfortunately lost.[374] The work of Plautus has come down to us through Varro, who selected twenty-one comedies by Plautus for a corpus, *De Comoediis Plautinis*. From Terence there are six comedies preserved in entirety, the first being set up in 166 BC.[375] There are also a number of early authors whose works have survived in varying condition, for example Caecilius' forty titles and fragments, Ennius' fragments of tragedies and comedies, and the remains of Pacuvius' tragic works.[376] However, taken all together, they provide little or no information on the tradition that gave rise to the Roman theatre.

The lack of material evidence for the early period is of course an obstacle in our discussion, but if the dramatic tradition in early Rome was entirely oral, then this lack is what to be expected. It is worth noting that the absence of material remains cannot be seen as conclusive evidence that no theatrical activity took place. Anyhow, all that can be done in such circumstances is to carefully establish what the theatrical tradition may have looked like. In Roman soci-

370 The tragedies are *Achilles, Aegisthus, Aiax Mastigophorus, Equos Troianus, Hermiona, Andromeda, Danaë,* and *Tereus*. He also wrote *palliata* where some fragments remain. Conte 1994, 39.

371 Conte 1994, 39. For references to fragments and work on Livius Andronicus, see 42.

372 Conte 1994, 40; So do Livy, Liv. 7.2.8 and Valerius Maximus, drawing on Livys account Val. Max. 2.4.4.

373 Conte 1994, 43. For a full bibliography on Naevius' texts, see 47-48.

374 Conte 1994, 50. For a description of the plot of the twenty complete comedies that remain, see 51-54.

375 The comedies are *Andria, Hecyra, Adelphoe, Heautontimoroumenos*, *Eunuchus* and *Phormio*, Conte 1994, 92-93.

376 Conte 1994, On Caecilius 65–67; Ennius 75–84; Pacuvius 104–109.

ety, the art of oratory was highly appreciated and nurtured throughout history, and later commentators frequently compared oratory to theatrical art.[377] It might be provoking to a modern viewer to think of theatre without a script, as we are so dependent on texts today. Even so, looking back just a few generations (or for that matter, to our contemporary "traditional" societies), the tradition of storytelling, oral transmitting of history and so forth was appreciated. The ability of learning by heart is a capacity rapidly decreasing in use in the modern world. Nevertheless, in a society lacking literacy its importance cannot be overestimated. In a culture like the Roman, which so greatly venerated its past, the tradition of oral storytelling would have been very important, and even this tradition could be seen in a dramatic context. The form for prayers and rituals, or other formulas to be learned by heart, is naturally an aid to the memory. Certain rhythms and rhymes help to memorize and repeat the phrases exactly.[378] Another parallel that can be drawn is the connection with formal public speaking, which was at the centre of Roman political life.[379] As for political communication, as well as for religious formulas, it seems necessary to have a certain form or structure, regardless of whether in public speeches or inscriptions.[380]

Furthermore, religious rituals can be seen in a dramatic context, as there is a similarity between the replication of rituals and the performance of a play. The symbolic framework of rituals often contains words and gestures bordering on the theatrical.[381] The anthropologist Victor Turner discusses, amongst other things, in his book *From ritual to theatre*, the origin of theatre. He states:

> I have also argued that ritual in its performative plenitude in tribal and many post-tribal cultures is a matrix from which several other genres of cultural performance, including most of those we tend to

377 Beacham 1991, 1-2.
378 Conte 1994, 19-20. See also Cicero's statement about *Carmen necessarium*, below. Cic. *Leg*. 2.59.
379 Beacham 1991, 2.
380 Conte 1994, 20.
381 Beacham 1991, 2–3.

> think of as "aesthetic" have been derived. Further: Ritual is, in its most typical cross-cultural expressions, a synchronization of many performative genres, and is often ordered by dramatic structure, a plot, frequently involving an act of sacrifice or self-sacrifice…[382]

It can be argued that few rituals are so completely stereotyped that every word, every gesture, and every scene is prescribed. Instead, most often improvisation is not merely permitted but required.[383] However, a critical attitude toward our contemporary view of ritual is likewise necessary. It may be a late modern Western myth, encouraged perhaps by psychologists and ethnologists, that ritual has the static exactness of the ritualised behaviour of an obsessive neurotic, and that ritual is mere empty form without true religious content. Instead, living ritual may be better likened to artwork than neurosis.[384] In his *Anthropology of performance,* Turner argues, in general, that the formal characteristics of a collective ceremony, or ritual, are clearly transferable to other genres and are shared with, for example, theatre and games. Celebration, at times, is not too far from its ritual origins, and can give its participants something like a religious experience.[385] Interestingly enough, Turner draws parallels between law and religious ritual:

> Since law is concerned with orderly control, legal and religious ritual have much in common. One difference is that in law cognitive processes assume priority, in religion orectic processes prevail, though both have similar procedures involving repetition, conscious "acting", stylization, order, and evocative presentation style of "staging".[386]

Another significant factor in Rome's dramatic tradition would have been dance and music. However, even here we are left without much evidence, as music, dance, mime, and rhythmic movement

382 Turner 1982, 81.
383 Turner 1982, 81–82.
384 Turner 1982, 81, Kreinath et al., xv 2006.
385 Turner 1987, 93.
386 Turner 1987, 93.

leave very little behind.[387]

To be able to understand the development of Roman performance it may be worth looking into some different concepts used by various ancient writers. The pre-literary forms of the *carmina* can perhaps give some clues to an enhanced understanding. The word *carmen*, however, includes a vast range of possible meanings. The most common meaning, derived from *cano*, i.e. "sing" or "sound", is poem.[388] It may also be defined as "something chanted", a ritual or a structured utterance, but not necessarily in verse. In early Latin, the word was used especially for religious expressions such as spells and charms.[389] The word is disputed, though, and in archaic Rome *carmen* is a remarkably ill-defined term. The word is used by several ancient writers to describe various different forms of poems. They are for example referred to as magic formulas, prayers, oaths, prophecies, judicial judgements, and even lullabies for babies.[390] Later, *carmen* became the standard Latin term for a song, and hence a poem.[391] Cicero gives a clue to an earlier meaning when he recalls his schooldays when he and his friends had to study the Twelve Tables as a *carmen neccessarium,* to be learnt by heart.[392] A *carmen* therefore is not a *carmen* by virtue of its content or its use, but has to be explained through its form. Another important point about the relations between poetry and prose in archaic Rome can be made: the boundary between the two is much less sharp than in our culture, or for that matter in later Roman classical culture. Early Roman prose is characterised by strong stylisation, and has an intensely marked apparent rhythmic nature, and verbal correspondence. Roman archaic poetry, on the other hand, is remarkably weak in metrical structure, and works in a loose framework and is subject to

387 Beacham 1991, 3.
388 Conte 1994, 20.
389 *OCD*[3]. (1996), 292 s.v. carmen (P. G. Fowler; D. P. Fowler). The laws of Twelve Tables contained provisions against anyone who uttered a *malum carmen*, i.e. evil spell.
390 Conte 1994, 20.
391 *OCD*[3]. (1996), 292 s.v. carmen (P. G. Fowler; D. P. Fowler).
392 Williams 1982, 53; Cic. *Leg*. 2.59

rules with large loopholes. The result is that prose and poetry seem to draw close to another, and practically touch and meet.[393] The stylistic tradition of *carmen* may be the most important element of continuity linking the period of its origins to the rest of Roman literary tradition. While the Greek influence accumulated and became stronger, the tradition of the *carmen* never completely disappeared. It left a lasting mark on Latin literary style, and it can be argued that when later Catullus and Vergil echo the manner of *carmen*, they are in fact closer to rustic proverbs and religious litanies than to Homer and Callimachus.[394] The most ancient forms of *carmina*, except for funeral inscriptions, are of a religious and ritual nature. The most important, although ambiguous and controversial, evidence refers to two ritual *carmina*: the *Salian* and the *Arval.*

The former was a chant of a famous priestly college, the Salii, which is traditionally said to have been founded by Numa Pompilius. The college consisted of twelve priests of the god Mars, who every year in March carried twelve sacred shields in a procession. They pronounced the *carmen* while progressing in a kind of ritual dance, moving to a triple beat, called *tripudium*. Accompanied by percussion, they beat the ground three times rhythmically with the foot as they struck the shields with lances. The language of the Salii was incomprehensible to the Romans of historical times, and the remains of the hymn are very obscure. A fundamental concern may have been to invoke the divine powers. Jupiter and Mars can possibly be identified. However, only a few fragments exist presenting incoherent evidence.[395]

The second *carmen* described here is the *Carmen Arvale.* Annually in May the *fratres Arvales*, a college of twelve priests, sang a hymn for the purification of the fields, *arva* in Latin. The hymn was sung during the sacrifice to Dea Dia, and the priests induced the protection

393 For examples, see Conte 1994, 20-27.

394 Conte 1994, 20-22.

395 Conte 1994, 22. *OCD*³. (1996), 292 s.v. Carmen Saliare or Carmina Saliaria (L. A. Holford-Stevens). *Der Neue Pauly* 2 (1997), s.v. Carmen Saliare (Schiemann). Regarding *tripudium,* in magic and religious folklore, triple words and acts are widely considered to accomplish effects. Conte 1994, 23.

of Mars and of the Lares. The interpretation of the text is problematic, but still of great interest, as it is believed to be older than the 4th century BC at the least. Like the *carmen Saliare* it is based on a triple rhythm, and began with a triply repeated request for aid from the *Lares*. It continued with the invocation of Mars, three times thrice, and culminated in a fivefold cry of triumph.[396] Later, Vergil mentions *carmina* in one passage. He describes a wine-festival dedicated to Bacchus, in which the participants wore crude masks, called on the god, and sang joyous songs, *carmina*.[397] As for *Carmen saeculare*, in Horace, the interpretation has been a difficult task; nevertheless it is the only surviving poem in Latin of which we know time and place of a choral performance.[398] However, I will not dip into the complicated question of possible interpretations of the text itself. Here it is enough to mention the very fact that it was a living tradition in the time of Horace.[399]

In connection with *Carmina,* another concept is of interest, namely the *Fescennini verses*. There are several different etymological explanations of the word *Fescennini*, but all of them are related to ribaldry in several different settings.[400] There may also be a sexual connotation to the word.[401] Livy states that the *Fescennini verses* were hastily improvised rude lines.[402] Catullus mentions them as well and they are usually explained as songs of ribald abuse at weddings, and also "popular justice", a form of public defamation.[403] The name may come from the south Etruscan town of Fescennia, presumably because such entertainment excelled there.[404] The etymology can

396 Conte 1994, 22-23. *OCD*³. (1996), 292 s.v. Carmen Arvale (J. Scheid).
397 Vergil. G*eorg.* 2.380-390; Beacham 1991, 4. n. 6.
398 Hor. *Epist*. 2.1 Barchiesi 2002, 107-108, n 1. Pighi 1965, 201-221.
399 For a full account of Horace's *Carmen saeculare* see Barchiesi 2002, 107-123 and further references. See also Zanker 1988, 169-172. For Horace's role in Augustus' cultural renewal, see for example Zanker 1988, 156-159.
400 *OCD*³. (1996), 593 s.v. Fescennini (L. A. Holford-Stevens).
401 *Der Neue Pauly* 4 (1998), s.v. Fescennini versus (Courtney).
402 Liv. 7.2. 7.
403 Catull. 61. 119-148. Conte 1994, 23-24, 27-28 and further references.
404 *OCD*³. (1996), 593 s.v. Fescennini (L. A. Holford-Stevens). *RE* VI. (1909), 2222-2223 s.v. Fescennini versus (Wissowa), and 2223 s.v Fescennium (Hülsen).

also be derived from *fascinum*, i.e. "the evil eye, or "penis", an indecency that had power to cast a spell.[405] Horace mentions the *Fescennini verses* as licentious. He continues to describe the transformation from a jolly and innocent amusement at harvest festivals to cruel, savage jokes and slander. Eventually a law was passed to forbid abusive slander in poems, and a more decorous form of speech evolved according to Horace.[406] Several other writers mention the concept, among them Pliny who says that the *Fescennini* songs were sung at weddings.[407]

Another parallel that can be drawn is between the *Fescennini* verses and the Greek *Phallica*, a sort of ribald rural entertainment of great antiquity.[408] Aristotle describes the phenomenon of *Phallica* as improvised licentious entertainment, and he continues to describe how comedy developed out of such mockery.[409] Richard Beacham's hypothesis is that there already existed in early Rome some sort of proto-farce, prior to the development of more advanced forms of theatre.[410] Further, Beacham argues from some two hundred fourth-century vases, the so-called *phlyakes* vases, that the Romans were bound to have been influenced by the neighbouring stage traditions.[411] The scenes depicted on these vases give, according to Beacham, a first glimpse of stage practice in the Italic area. The masked characters are generally grotesque, wearing padded costumes, and the males were outfitted with a phallus.[412] This is a controversial standpoint, however; the discussion of the *phlyakes* vases has been a vivid one.[413]

Yet another parallel can be drawn to *Atellanae*, or *Oscan farces,*

405 Conte 1994, 23, and bibliography 27-28.
406 Beacham 1991, 3-4. Hor. *Epist*. 2. 1. 145-146; 150-154.
407 Plin. *HN*. XV 86.
408 Beacham 1991, 4.
409 Beacham 1991, 4, 8-9, Arist. *Poet.* 4. 1449 a.
410 Beacham 1991, 4-5.
411 Beacham 1991, 8-10.
412 Beacham 1991, 8-9.
413 For an overview and references, see Taplin 1993, 52-54. For a background to the discussion, see 48-52. For illustrations, see Bieber 1961, 129-146. Most recent is Carpenter 2009, 27-38.

a native Italian farce, named after Atella in Campania. Performed in Latin, it was a masked drama, improvised with stock characters. In the early form, it was doubtless an unscripted, improvised, oral tradition that eventually became a literary form. Both Livy and Valerius Maximus mention *Atellana*.[414] They seem to have been lowly comedies, often in harsh language, set in small Italian towns. They gave a humorous image of rustic and provincial life with familiar characters. Later literary fragments are in verse, using the same metres as *Palliata* and *Togata,* described below. The dramatic motifs were often disguise and masquerade, and the pieces were short and sometimes used as *exodia* to tragedies. There are examples of titles that suggest parodies of tragedies.[415]

Regarding *Palliata,* it may well have been influenced by the *Atellanae*, and was almost certainly a masked drama from the start, although the evidence shows some inconsistency. In *Palliata,* it was possible to portray slaves as wiser than their masters. Written texts of Plautus and Terence are at hand.[416] As for *Togata,* the surviving texts are in fragments only, by three principal authors. This type of comedy was written in Rome in the 2nd century BC, and was also known as *Tabernaria*, or "private-house drama". The plays were possibly in verse, the actors were presumably masked, and the play had Italic or Roman settings. Later *Togata* were written by Juvenal, who speaks of *Togatae* written for recitation in his day.[417]

Another text of substantial length concerned with theatre and performances is that of Livy in *Ab urbe condita,* book VII. Here Livy is referring to the events of 364 BC and the organising of a *lectister-*

414 *OCD*³. (1996), 200 s.v. Atellana (P.G. Mc Carthy Brown). Liv. 7.2.12. Val. Max. 2.4.4. Also discussed by Beacham 1991, 5-6. Several fragments of later scripted plays are at hand. See *OCD* above.

415 *OCD*³. (1996), 200 s.v. Atellana (P.G. Mc Carthy Brown). *RE* II. (1896), s.v. Atellanae fabulae (Marx). *Der neue Pauly* 2 (1997), s.v. Atellana fabula (Blänsdorf).

416 Later European comedy is highly influenced by *Palliata*, and can be seen in for example Shakespeare and Molière. *OCD*³. (1996), 1101 s.v. Palliata, 1533 s.v. Togata (P.G. Mc Carthy Brown).

417 *OCD*³. (1996), 1533 s.v. Togata (P.G. Mc Carthy Brown).

nium, a banquet to the gods.[418] This was the third one in the history of the city according to Livy. In order to induce the gods, scenic entertainment was instituted amongst other things. The scenic entertainment was a new experience for a warlike people whose only previous games had been those of the circus, according to Livy. He continues to tell that the Romans summoned professional *ludiones* from Etruria, and they danced to the accompaniment of the flute. They neither sang nor did they act *carmina,* which might be imitated, and their movements were decorous and in the Etruscan style. The young Romans then started to imitate the *ludiones*, and at the same time uttered jests in uncouth verses, their movements inconsistent with their words. The entertainment became more popular at Rome and repetition improved its quality. Native professional artists who performed it were called *histriones*, because *ister* was the Etruscan for *ludio* (i.e actor or player). They gave up uttering verses akin to crude *Fescennines*, but rather performed to the flute *impletae modis saturae*, which had been written down in advance, with song and movement now properly suited to each other.[419] In this way, the amusement was adopted and frequent use kept it a living genre, all according to Livy.[420]

A similar fate of distrust, as with Dionysius of Halicarnassus, has

418 The background to the decision to arrange the *lectisternium* was according to Livy an attempt to appease the gods and rescue the Romans from the plague. Even though scenic entertainment was introduced for the first time, the gods' wrath was not reduced; on the contrary, it seemed to bring down the gods' anger even more. Livy states that whatever it was that caused the gods' anger, the Romans' superstitious practices were not sufficient. Livy describes the introduction of the Roman drama and its later development in one of the most discussed sections of his work, 7.2. For further background and philological discussion, see Levene 1993, 211–213. For discussion on historicity, see esp. references in Levene 1993, 212 n. 24. For a full bibliography, see Oakley 1998, 40. Wiseman 2008, 24-38. Cf. also Hor. *Ars p.* 2. 206–219.

419 Liv. 7. 2. 2-7. According to Oakley 1998, 41, n. 3, Livy demonstrates that the term *satura* should only be applied to the new development and not to the earlier stages described, and Livy did not envisage *satura* as containing reciprocal chanting. Oakley suggests that Livy in this particular part of the book used Varro as his source. Oakley 1998, 43-51.

420 Liv. 7. 2. 5.

fallen also upon Livy. In the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century, Livy was the subject of much scholarly attention. There developed two main schools with different approaches to the subject, which both have influenced modern scholars. The focus of early German scholars was set on source criticism, to identify Livy's sources and to describe how he used them. The main effort was laid on identification and reconstructing the sources, and in particular on penetrating and describing the inconsistencies in Livy's accounts. The other main line of Livian studies was focused on literary criticism. The orientation of this school was to demonstrate Livy's literary originality in style and rhetorical organisation. However, even here Livy was described in terms of "lack of originality" when it came to the matter of content.[421] The formation of the idea of Livy as an inferior historian, indifferent, and a mechanical writer was then about to be established. This opinion of Livy and his work was long prevalent and not much questioned. In 1961, Walsh published *Livy: his historical aims and methods*. Here Walsh argues for looking at Livy and his achievements in his contemporary context and by what the author was influenced. This is also a line taken up by later scholars.[422] Moreover, Walsh effectively demonstrates that Livy was not as much a tool for Augustus in his restoration of the state as was previously taken for granted. Walsh makes his case by rather simple chronology, for example: Augustus' social legislation to encourage marriage and discourage adultery was enacted in 9 BC. Livy wrote about the cases of Verginia and Lucretia and the importance of chastity as early as 25 BC.[423] Walsh even claims that Livy might have been forming public policy, rather than praising it.[424] Still, there are of course several problems with Livy's history. Walsh's main conclusion comprises one of them: *Livy's value for Roman history varies*

421 The introduction in Miles 1995 and Luce 1977 give a good overview of previous research, the different schools and references to them.

422 See discussion in Oakley 1998, 51–55, and further references. For a recent summarizing volume in Livian research see Chaplin & Kraus 2009.

423 For this and more examples, see Walsh 1961, 10–19, esp. 13–14.

424 Walsh 1961, 13–14.

according to the source followed.[425] Livy has been accused of various things over the years and considered capable of almost anything. In many cases, this criticism is formed out of a later conception of how to write history. It has been suggested that there ought to be a different and better way for Livy to write his history. This is not very plausible, as Livy wrote his history on the basis and standards of his own time.[426] Moreover, he did so with great success. What he wrote was highly appreciated in Rome and even beyond the Italic peninsula. According to Luce, Livy might have been "something of a living legend in the empire at large, perhaps almost an institution".[427] In our own time, in the last few decades, the picture of Livy has altered from unreliable and inferior to a more moderate view. Still, Livy's writing has to be handled with care.[428]

As for the much discussed and interesting term *Satura,* it is disputed even in antiquity.[429] Quintilian claims that satura is an all-Roman form of literature. The name *Satura* is the feminine form of *satur*, meaning full, often explained as mixed or varied entertainment. [430] Livy's statement on *ludi scaenici* in 364 BC that variety shows called *saturae* were an early form of Roman drama is disputed. It has been seen as an attempt of Livy to falsely link Roman satire with Greek satyr-play. This has to be revised nonetheless in the light of Szilágyi's and Wiseman's research that shows the link between Etruscan satyric dances and the later Roman tradition. On the contrary, Livy's explanation on the origin of *Ludi scaenici* assumes a long-standing Etruscan tradition of mimetic dance and drama that influenced Rome. In fact, Szilágyi accepts the essentials of Livy's account, and interprets the concept of "*Impletae modis saturae*" as linking the satyric dances attested in Etruscan vase painting with the later tradition of Roman

425 Walsh 1961, 273. See now also Wiseman 2008, 24-38.
426 Luce 1977, see introduction, esp. xxiv – xxvi.
427 Luce 1977, 296–297. Luce is referring to an anecdote in Pliny's letters, 2. 3. 8.
428 For an interesting and convincing interpretation of Livy's text 7.2.5, see Wiseman 2008, 24-38.
429 Beacham 1991, 11-12.
430 *OCD*[3]. (1996), 1358-1359 s.v. satire (satura) (E.J. Gowers).

satire.[431] What exactly was performed according to Livy is unfortunately problematic and greatly disputed.[432] However, Livy contrasts *saturae* to *Fescennini verses*, by stating that apart from the *Fescennini verses*, which were hastily improvised rude lines, the *saturae* were medleys full of music, melodies to go with the flute, and gesticulation, presumably without a plot.[433] Without reading too much into the term, it was undoubtedly a mixed and varied entertainment as the word implies.

Further, in the Italic area, some interesting material remains are at hand. Wiseman, in his *Liber: myth, drama and ideology in Republican Rome*, discusses the corpus of engraved bronze cistae and mirrors dated from the late fourth and early third centuries BC. Wiseman argues that these "Praenestine" artefacts should be understood as illustrating the story-world of Latium in general, and that at least one of the cistae was certainly made in Rome, the "Ficoroni cista".[434]

Wiseman points out that it is clear that all over Italy, Latium included, the iconography of the *thiasos* was perfectly familiar in the fourth and third centuries BC, as it had been in the sixth and fifth.[435] By comparing the political events in Greece and Rome, Wiseman draws the plausible conclusion that the ideological significance of Liber and his *ludi* goes back to the very beginning of the Roman Republic.[436] Of further interest is that, due to study of south Italian vase painting, there might be reason to believe that the Italic dramatic genres were not watertight compositions, but were rather mixed in style. Thus, the motifs shown in Apulian and Paestan vases may depict naked girl acrobats performing together with comic actors.[437] Moreover, there is a possible connection with mime

---

431 Liv. 7.2. 2-8. *OCD*[3]. (1996), 1358-1359 s.v. satire (E.J. Gowers); Szilágyi 1981, 2-23; Wiseman 1988, 5. Cf. also chapter "Satyrs" in this thesis and discussion below.

432 Beacham 1991, 11.

433 Liv. 7.2. 7-8.

434 Wiseman 2000, 266 and n. 13 with further references, 2008, 85. Bonfante 1993, 228 and n. 18. Wiseman 2007, 85.

435 Wiseman 2000, 266 n. 14 and further references, 2008, 86.

436 Wiseman 2000, 297-299.

437 Wiseman 2000, 278. For illustrations see for example Bieber 1961, 144, Fig. 535.

suggested by young women depicted on certain mirrors and *cistae* who actually are performers, best described as *mimae.* These scenes, including women dancing in the Bacchic *thiasos*, are suggested to play on the viewer's understanding that Liber is among other things a god of drama, and indicates that his followers are not only singing and dancing but also imitating.[438] According to Wiseman, it can be assumed that the *cista* scenes may imply a kind of Dionysian dramatic performance – perhaps not separable from Dionysian ritual, in which one feature was the participation of *mimae*.[439] The iconographic evidence presented, indicates a common fourth-century culture of mimetic representation extending far beyond the Greek cities of southern Italy into Latium and Etruria. Moreover, there is no reason to think that Rome was in any way immune to this culture of Dionysian *mimesis*.[440]

From the above discussion, even though the evidence is scarce, one conclusion can undoubtedly be drawn: the tradition of pre-literary performances in Rome was a lively, varied and nurtured practice. An intricate web of a dramatic context reveals itself. The venerated past, the *Ludi*, formal public speaking, religious rituals, dance and music, all point in the direction of a growing foundation for Roman dramatic development. As has been said before, the absence of material remains cannot be seen as conclusive evidence for a non-existent dramatic tradition. Furthermore, in this particular case there is circumstantial evidence, since there are several examples of later texts and fragments. The later literary tradition obviously did not spring up fully developed from nowhere, but most certainly arose from a long oral dramatic context. It can also be assumed that influences travelled from both Campania, and especially from neighbouring Etruria. When form is concerned, we have to assume that both improvised as well as more structured performances were familiar to the contemporary Romans. Humour seems to have been an important element, but it has to be pointed out that matters more mo-

438 Wiseman 2000, 282-283.
439 Wiseman 2000, 283. Wiseman 2007, 119.
440 Wiseman 2000, 286.

mentous were presumably touched upon as well. In several forms of early performances discussed above, there is a common theme to be recognised. It is often improvised, masked and licentious, and there are examples of the "upside-down concept" discussed above and in the chapter "Satyrs". This is also an important link to the Dionysian sphere when Roman performances are concerned.

To conclude: the circumstantial evidence points in the direction of a lively, varied and growing practice of Roman pre-literary performances. It can be assumed that neighbouring Etruscans had a mediating function when style and form of performances is concerned. A common framework can be distinguished in pre-literary Roman performances, namely the improvised, masked and the often ribald expression. The upside-down world reveals itself in early Roman performances and is a link to the Dionysian sphere, to the god himself, as well as to the satyrs. The religious foundation seems well established.

Discussion

Despite the good use I have had of Beacham's *The Roman theatre and its audience* for this chapter, I do not agree with his conclusion that it is;

> …most unlikely that Rome of the mid-fourth century was in any position either geographically or culturally to benefit directly from such a sophisticated theatrical culture [the Greek]. Roman visitors may possibly have been bemused observers from time to time of performances in Greek theatres, but they would have brought back only travellers' tales of practices, entertaining perhaps to recount to their families and friends, but aesthetically too advanced to be understood or to influence the growth of whatever crude drama was germinating at Rome.[441]

441 Beacham 1991, 7-8.

This is, in my opinion, not the conclusion that can be drawn from the evidence at hand. Wiseman argues against Beacham on the ground that we cannot rely solely on Horace's account in *Graecia capta,* or for that matter on Livy's or Valerius Maximus' reconstructed Varronian history of origin of Roman drama.[442] Wiseman argues instead, and very convincingly, that the iconography of the *cistae* represents such artistic sophistication that it contradicts Beacham's statement completely.[443]

All in all, there are similarities in the pattern of Dionysos' connection with performances in all three areas, in Greece, in Etruria, as well as in the Roman area. It can be established that Dionysos and his *thiasos* were well known in all spheres and most probably during parallel times. In Etruria, Dionysos was presumably venerated as early as the last third of the 6th century BC, according to Werner.[444] The connection between Dionysos and performance in Etruria seems to be confirmed by Szilágyi's study which shows that mimic and parodic dances, and more importantly, satyrs occurred in Etruria, and further that scenic art appeared in the area at the beginning of the 5th century, perhaps already in the third quarter of the 6th.[445] Strandberg Olofsson has suggested that recitations, as part of celebrations, may be read into the Etruscan iconography by for example the Micali Painter, and that this would reflect a living oral tradition, consistent with the aristocratic ideology, in Etruscan society of the 6th century BC.[446] It is reasonable to assume that the same kind of oral tradition existed in Rome. What further encourages the thought of a strong cultural influence coming from Etruria to Rome is the fact that classical authors mention the ancient Roman habit of

442 Wiseman 2000, 287-289, 2008, 125-127. Hor. *Epist.* 2. 1. 139-76, Liv. 7.2, Val. Max. 2.4.4. See also Brink 1982, 183.

443 Wiseman 2000, 265-299, esp. 288-289. Wiseman has discussed influences in Roman theatre previously in *Roman drama and Roman history* and is quoted earlier in this chapter.

444 Werner 2005, 78.

445 Szilágyi 1981, 11. Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 114.

446 Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 116, and esp. n. 66.

sending their youths to Etruria for education.[447]
In the Italic area, Wiseman argues that the iconography of the *thiasos* was perfectly familiar in the area as early as the 6th century BC. The iconography is suggested to play on the viewer's understanding that Liber is among other things a god of drama.[448] In all three areas there seems to be an understanding of Dionysos and his *thiasos* as connected with performance. Wiseman sums up by maintaining that the iconography may imply a kind of Dionysian dramatic performance that perhaps was not separable from Dionysian ritual.[449] This seems true for all the areas discussed.

It may be rewarding to think of ritual, which of course varies in expression depending on time and place, as a confirmation of myth. But as such, not necessarily as a direct retelling of myth, but as an acceptance of underlying structures. When a god is venerated by ritual, there will at the same time be a confirmation of the myth of man's coming into being, about the place of gods and humans, man's place in nature and so forth. In this way, the ritual is used as a means to confirm the order of the world. If we now see the connection between ritual and dramatic performances, the theatrical presentation becomes a refined medium to confirm the order of the world. The ritual need not be specifically addressed to a god or goddess, but then has a further function. It is thereby possible to send a message to the audience, and in that sense the performance becomes a political act. Recalling the circumstances in which the Roman *ludi* were held, in a political framework but nevertheless as a religious manifestation, the connection between ritual-performance-religion and political life suggests itself. In a society without the possibility of mass communication, the performances would be a very powerful tool for transmitting an explicit message.

Even if all these activities cannot form hard evidence for Roman performances, they can give us a hint of the oral tradition, the religious life and the neighbouring traditions that might have influ-

447 Liv. 9.36.3; Cic. *Fam*. 6.6; Cic. *Div*. 1.41.92
448 Wiseman 2000, 266 n. 14 and further references, and 282-283.
449 Wiseman 2000, 283, Wiseman 2008, 119.

enced the Romans in forming a dramatic tradition. If the dramatic tradition, as postulated for example by Wise, is totally dependent on the written word, then the assumption made by early scholars that no dramatic tradition could have developed in Rome before 240 BC was right. However, as the evidence shows, this is certainly not the case. We must also question Livy's statement that the Romans first were exposed to theatre in 364 BC. It might have been a new form of theatrical performances that was introduced, but the Romans were hardly unfamiliar with the concept of dramatic performances. It might have been, more or less, an integrated part of society. Later, Vitruvius expects a city to have a proper theatre, and tells that once a forum has been laid out (in city planning), a site should be selected for a theatre for watching the entertainment on the feast days of the immortal gods.[450]

To sum up, it seems reasonable to see a connection between performances and religious rituals and the development of the Roman dramatic tradition. Considering the neighbouring traditions in Etruria and in the Greek area, it seems possible that influences travelled freely in the region. Contrary to Beacham, it seems that the Romans were not at all unable to benefit from the Greek theatrical tradition in the mid-fourth century. Instead, it is likely that influences travelled freely long before the fourth century, and that the Romans adopted whatever they found interesting. Influences may have come from the Greek area; still, Etruria may in fact have had a more mediating role than previously recognised in regard to performances. The Roman dramatic tradition presumably grew out of these influences, the Romans' own experiences and interests, and their religious and political framework. I agree with Wiseman that they most certainly felt free to assimilate the influences into their own oral dramatic tradition. Eventually, this resulted in a written dramatic tradition. Regarding the ritual connection, it might not even be possible to single out the religious expression from a profane narration. In the intermingling milieu of religion, ritual, dance, celebration, oral tradition, and the political agenda in Rome, it appears

450 Vitr. 5.3.1.

that the tradition of performances thrived and developed in its own Roman direction.

Altogether, it certainly seems that Roman dramatic performances had a long and varied tradition. It is most probable that Roman theatrical tradition arose from a ritual structure. There is certainly nothing that argues for a tradition beginning with scripted plays as late as 240 BC. Nor is there any question of a sudden encounter with theatre in 364 BC. On the contrary, the scanty but still existing evidence points in another direction: to an early oral tradition sprung from storytelling, religious rituals, festivals, processions, spells and charms, ritual, dances, festivities, and ribaldry. With time, this highly appreciated tradition took on a literary shape, expressed in a written tradition. The upside-down-concept seems to be a common structure in Roman pre-literary performances, and suggests a further function and link to the Dionysian sphere.

V. SYNTHESIS

The Dionysian follower, the satyr, is known from all the areas covered here – the Greek, the Etruscan and the Roman – during parallel times. According to the sources, either in iconography or the written records, people dressed up like satyrs and participated in processions in all three areas. The religious context is always present, independent of area. The liminal capacity of the satyr seems central. Satyrs can be seen as a symbol of inversion of order, and their behaviour as the opposite of the prescribed paradigm: how a man should not act. It seems very difficult to deny the Romans' awareness of satyrs and satyr plays, although the significance of their presence can of course be discussed. However, in all three areas, there seems to be an understanding of Dionysos and his *thiasos* as related to performance.

In iconography, in Rome, in the form of Greek imports, satyrs occur as early as the 3rd quarter of the 6th century BC, and in Lavinium well before that. Later, iconography on cistae may imply a form of Dionysian dramatic performances, perhaps identifiable as Dionysian ritual. Given the political framework in which these performances took place, we have to assume a further function for such rituals. The traditional scholarly view, and firm resistance against a ritual connection of drama, may originate in a denial and doubt that Dionysian ritual was to be considered religion proper at all. If we can overcome these kinds of mental barriers, the evidence may reveal a completely different narrative. Religious manifestations have always served as a means to control people. In the early Roman society, such

control was of utmost importance. Religious manifestations were tolerated and encouraged, but when the situation got out of hand, as was the case in 186 BC, an immediate and brutal intervention of the senate was called for, and carried out.

In Etruria, recent studies point in the direction of a common canon of motifs, in vase painting as well as, for example, in architectural terracottas, and consequently towards a common set of beliefs as early as the first decades of the sixth century BC. Especially the Dionysian influences are strong. In Etruscan vase painting the iconography of the wine god Fufluns/Dionysos bears a strong resemblance to the Greek Dionysos, although Etruscan vase painting also show some distinctive character. The god's retinue is the same in both Etruscan and Greek iconography. The satyrs and maenads attend the god in a similar way, independent of sources. A local Etruscan Dionysian cult probably emerged as early as around 550 BC. Both the local and imported ceramics were widespread throughout Etruscan society. The Dionysian theme in iconography, one of the most frequent and recurrent themes, was familiar and probably well known, regardless of social stratum or habitat.

In Rome, a Dionysian cult was imported in 496 BC, and most probably turned into a local interpretation influenced also by the Etruscan Fufluns/Dionysos. The strong cultural impact of the Greeks, as well as the Etruscans, is well known. In Rome, it is probably not ruled out that Dionysos merged with the ancient wine god Liber, with impressions from both the Greek Dionysos and the Etruscan Fufluns/Dionysos, thus accomplishing a syncretism. Exactly how such cult was conducted in Rome is unfortunately not possible to read in the evidence at hand.

As a whole, the evidence supports the plausibility that an early Roman dramatic tradition resulted from an oral tradition of storytelling, spells and charms, dances, festivals, religious rituals and processions, all within the elaborate Roman political framework. In time, a literary tradition formed and left tangible indications for us to interpret. The lack of such evidence in the early period should nevertheless not lead us to conclude that a dramatic tradition was

absent. On the contrary, the circumstantial testimony favours an early ritual origin of Roman drama. The Dionysian sphere may well be the very foundation for this development.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In the introductory **Chapter I**, a presentation is given of the thesis' aim, method, and theoretical and methodological framework, as well as discussions concerning previous research on Roman religion. The contemporary discussion of construction and deconstruction is considered a vital part of the theoretical framework, as is an intercontextual methodology. Early classical scholarship traditionally neglected or refuted the existence of Dionysian ecstatic rites, cults and satyr plays in Roman society. However, recently scholars have raised questions about the established versions in Roman religious studies on the whole, arguing for a radical re-assessment of evidence at hand. Furthermore, issues have been raised about the inevitable degree to which religious studies are influenced by one's own religion. Regarding Dionysian religious studies, they may suffer from intellectual reservations due to difficulties that European thought, subjected to Christian morality, had and still has in accepting sexual and bawdy behaviour as connected with religion. Since these are among the significant elements in the Dionysian sphere, they have been a reason for neglect and even rejection of the thought of Dionysian cult as religion proper. A paradigm shift may be at hand in Roman religious studies.

The aim of this thesis has been to reassess the evidence at hand concerning a possible Dionysian appearance in early Rome, during the decades around 500 BC. A cross-disciplinary and intercontex-

tual approach has been favourable in order to set Roman Dionysian activities in an integrated perspective. The satyrs as a vital element in Dionysian cultic activities are examined. To be able to contextualise the Roman Dionysian sphere, the more known and researched Dionysian phenomena in the Greek and Etruscan areas have been used as comparative material. The existing evidence in the Roman area has been compared with examples, assessed as typical, from the Greek and Etruscan areas. The sources are disparate and very much dependent on the time and place considered. In the Roman area, literary sources as well as iconographical materials such as vase paintings and architectural terracottas, are examined. Additionally, an inscription on a bronze plaque is referred to. Greek iconographical materials are used on the grounds of find-places. Examples of Greek black-figured pottery found in Etruria, Rome and Lavinium are brought forward. In the Etruscan area, domestic black-figured pottery is considered, as are early tomb paintings from Tarquinia. Since less significance traditionally has been laid on interpreting Dionysos in the iconographical material, in favour of literary material (even though in recent years there has been an increased interest in the iconographical material and its context), an attempt is made to stress the information gained from the iconographical remains. One of the points made in the thesis is that although the sources are disparate, once brought together and compared they can give a contextualised outline otherwise difficult to achieve.

In the following **Chapter II**, the Dionysian exposure is considered and compared throughout the Greek, Etruscan, and Roman areas. In Attic vase painting Dionysos first appears around 580 BC. In time, Dionysos' canonical depiction is formalised. Around 560 BC the ivy wreath becomes a certain element in Dionysos' identification, as well as the drinking horn. The ivy leaf and the grapevine are also associated with the god. Later on, around 540 BC, the emblematic kantharos is first introduced, and replaces the drinking horn as one of Dionysos' key elements in black-figured vase painting. Etruscan vase painters were highly influenced by their Greek counterparts. Motifs appear on Etruscan black-figured vases depicting

Greek mythological themes. Dionysos is one of the most common motifs. Still, Etruscan vase painters transformed Greek motifs into Etruscan art, reflecting particularly Etruscan beliefs, customs and rituals. In Etruscan iconography emerges an outline of the local god Fufluns as identified with the Greek god Dionysos. The resemblance between the Greek Dionysos and the Etruscan Fufluns/Dionysos in vase painting is apparent. They have the same attributes and are rendered in a similar way. A syncretism between the Greek Dionysos and Etruscan Fufluns is suggested by several scholars. Furthermore, there are motifs in Etruscan vase painting with no parallels in Greek painting. The so-called Ivy Leaf Group has motifs showing men and women carrying, or dancing with, large ivy leaves. The motifs are suggested to demonstrate a local Dionysian cult in Etruria shortly after the middle of the 6th century BC.

In Rome, Dionysos is ambiguous and the sources are scarce and different. A late event in 186 BC confirms Dionysian activities in the so-called Bacchanalia affair. For the early period there is scarce evidence, but nevertheless it exists. Dionysius of Halicarnassus writes about a Dionysian cult being introduced in Rome in 496 BC. A temple was dedicated to the god in 494/3 BC. The writer names the god "Dionysos". A confusion about the name of the god may be due to later translations into English where the god is named either Bacchus or Liber. There was no official introduction, to our knowledge, of a Dionysian cult in Rome at that time or later. The usual procedure when foreign cults were brought to Rome was not observed in this case. It could be interpreted to show that the cult was not seen as a foreign import, and hence no introduction was needed. In the Roman area, the ancient wine god Liber was long known and worshipped, and a syncretism like that described between Dionysos and Fufluns may have occurred between Dionysos and Liber. Presumably, the Etruscan influence was considerable as well, and the Etruscan Dionysos/Fufluns was most probably a mediator in the process of syncretism.

In **Chapter III,** satyrs as part of the Dionysian sphere are considered. The manifestations of satyrs in the different areas concerned

are discussed and compared. Tangible evidences for satyrs' appearance in Rome is presented, and compared with material known from Greece and Etruria. Literary sources from Rome, including for example Dionysius of Halicarnassus, tell of satyrs in several different situations. Satyrs appeared, according to the sources, both literary as well as material remains, in various settings such as celebrations, funerals, and satyr plays. The liminal capacity of satyrs seems central and the upside-down world an always present feature. In all three areas, people either depicted or described in the material dressed up as satyrs and participated in processions. The context of these processions is religious and most probably part of Dionysian cultic activities.

In **Chapter IV,** the association between Dionysos and satyrs in Rome, in connection with performances, is considered. Here too, the Greek and Etruscan areas are reflected upon for a comparative view. In all three areas there seems to be an understanding of Dionysos and his *thiasos* as related to dramatic performances, which may be indistinguishable from Dionysian ritual. This seems true for all the areas discussed.

Early pre-literary performances in Rome arguably constituted a varied and lively tradition, long before the alleged introduction of scripted plays in 240 BC. An oral tradition may leave very few remains for us to interpret. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to neglect the existing circumstantial evidence, which points to the possibility that an early Roman dramatic tradition arose from an oral tradition of storytelling, spells and charms, dances, festivals, religious rituals, processions, all set in a Roman political framework. A common framework can be distinguished in Roman pre-literary performances, especially the improvised, masked, and often ribald expression. The upside-down world is exposed as well, and forms a link to the Dionysian sphere, to the satyrs and to the god himself. Thus, the evidence supports an early ritual origin of Roman drama, and the Dionysian sphere may well be the foundation for this development.

C**hapter V** forms a short synthesis of the conclusions drawn in

the thesis.

Finally, in **Chapter VI** it remains to conclude this case study. There may be reason to agree with contemporary scholars about the necessity of reassessment concerning Roman religious studies. A cross- disciplinary and intercontextual framework seems to be one constructive path for new conclusions to be drawn from existing material. Therefore, it can be inferred that the denial in early classical scholarship and the following tradition concerning possible Roman Dionysian cultic activities, satyrs, and satyr plays in Rome may have to be revised. A reinterpretation of available evidence points towards different assumptions to be made. It seems when studying the iconography in the areas concerned that there might in fact have been a shared idea and perception of the Dionysian *thiasos* spreading throughout the Greek, Etruscan, and Roman areas. To doubt the Romans' awareness of the Dionysian sphere and its connotations seems difficult in the light of the accessible material. Through literary sources as well as material remains stemming from Rome, the view is entirely defensible that satyrs were present in early Rome and that the god Dionysos' presence is strongly indicated by indirect evidence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY WITH ABBREVIATIONS

Periodicals and series have been abbreviated according to the *American Journal of Archaeology* 111, 2007, 14-34 (except *ActaAth* and *ActaRom* instead of *SkrAth* and *SkrRom,* respectively).

Modern literature

Ackerman 1991 — R. Ackerman, *The myth and ritual school: J. G. Frazer and the Cambridge ritualists,* New York & London 1991.

Alexander 1997 — B. C. Alexander, 'Ritual and current studies of ritual: overview', in *Anthropology of religion: a handbook,* ed. S. D. Glazier, Westport, CT 1997.

Altheim 1938 — F. Altheim, *A history of Roman religion,* transl. H. Mattingly, London 1938.

Andrén 1960 — A. Andrén, 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Roman monuments', in *Hommages à Léon Herrmann* (Collection Latomus, 44), Brussels 1960, 88-104.

Arvidsson 2006 — S. Arvidsson, *Aryan idols. Indo-European mythology as ideology and science*, transl. S. Wichmann, Chicago, IL 2006.

Babcock 1978 — B. A. Babcock, 'Introduction', in *The reversible world. Symbolic inversion in art and society,* ed. B. A. Babcock, Ithaca, NY 1978.

Backe-Forsberg 2005 — Y. Backe-Forsberg, *Crossing the bridge. An interpretation of the archaeological remains in the Etruscan bridge complex at San Giovenale, Etruria*, Ph.D. Diss., Uppsala University, 2005.

Bailey 1932 — C. Bailey, *Phases in the religion of ancient Rome* (Sather classical lectures, 10), Berkeley, CA 1932.

Bain 1977 — D. Bain, *Actors and audience. A study of asides and related conventions in Greek drama,* Oxford 1977.

Barchiesi 2002 — A. Barchiesi, 'The uniqueness of the *Carmen Saeculare* and its tradition', in *Traditions and contexts in the poetry of Horace,* eds. D. Feeney and T. Woodman, Cambridge 2002, 107-123.

Barrett 2006 — J.C. Barrett, 'Archaeology as the investigation of the con texts of humanity', in *Deconstructing context. A critical approach to archaeological practice,* ed. D. Papaconstantinou, Oxford 2006, 194-211.

Baumbach 2004 — J. D. Baumbach, *The significance of votive offerings in selected Hera sanctuaries in the Peloponnese, Ionia and Western Greece* (BAR-IS, 1249), Oxford 2004.

Beacham 1991 — R. C. Beacham, *The Roman theatre and its audience*, London 1991.

Beard 1993 — M. Beard, 'Looking (harder) for Roman myth: Dumézil, declamation and the problems of definition', in *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft: Das Paradigma Roms* (Colloquium Rauricum, 3), ed. F. Graf, Stuttgart & Leipzig 1993, 44-64.

Beard 1994 — M. Beard, 'Religion', in C*AH*², IX: *The last age of the Roman Republic, 146-43 B.C.,* eds. J. A. Crook *et al.,* Cambridge 1994, 729-768.

Beard *et al.* 1998 — M. Beard, J. North & S. Price, *Religions of Rome* 1-2, Cambridge 1998.

Belier 1991 — W. W. Belier, *Decayed gods: origin and development of Georges Dumézil's "idéologie tripartite"* (Studies in Greek and Roman religion, 7), Leiden 1991.

Bendlin 2000 — A. Bendlin, 'Looking beyond the civic compromise: religious pluralism in late republican Rome', in *Religion in archaic and republican Rome and Italy*. *Evidence and experience* (New perspectives on the ancient world, 2), eds. E.Bispham and C. Smith, Edinburgh 2000, 115-135.

Bernal 1987 — M. Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic roots of classical civilization. The fabrication of ancient Greece 1785-1985*, London 1987.

Bernal 2001 — M. Bernal, *Black Athena writes back.: Martin Bernal responds to his critics,* Durham 2001.

Bieber 1961 — M. Bieber, *The history of the Greek and Roman theater,* Princeton, NJ 1961[2].

Bispham & Smith 2000 — *Religion in archaic and republican Rome and Italy*. *Evidence and experience* (New perspectives on the ancient world, 2), eds. E. Bispham and C. Smith, Edinburgh 2000.

Blech 1982 — M. Blech, *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, 38), Berlin & New York 1982.

Boardman 1991 — J. Boardman, *Athenian black figure vases: a handbook,* corrected ed., London 1991.

Bonfante 1993 — L. Bonfante, 'Fufluns Pacha: The Etruscan Dionysus', in *Masks of Dionysus*, eds. T. H. Carpenter and C. A. Faraone, Ithaca, NY & London 1993, 221-235.

Bonfante & Bonfante 2002 — G. Bonfante & L. Bonfante, *Etruscan language: an introduction*, Manchester, 2002[2].

von Bothmer 1985 — D. von Bothmer, *The Amasis Painter and his world. Vase-painting in sixth-century B.C. Athens,* Malibu, CA, New York & London 1985.

Bowie 2006 — F. Bowie, *The anthropology of religion: an introduction*, Malden, MA & Oxford 2006[2].

Brendel 1995 — O. J. Brendel, *Etruscan art*, 2nd ed. with an additional bibliography by Francesca R. Serra Ridgway, New Haven & London 1995.

Brink 1963 — C. O. Brink, *Horace on poetry* I*: Prolegomena to the literary epistles*, Cambridge 1963.

Brink 1971 — C. O. Brink, *Horace on poetry* II*: the Ars poetica*, Cambridge 1971.

Brink 1982 — C. O. Brink, *Horace on poetry, Epistles book II: the letters to Augustus and Florus,* Cambridge 1982.

Brink 1995 — C. O. Brink, 'Second thoughts on three Horatian puzzles', in *Homage to Horace, a bimillenary celebration*, ed. S. J. Harrison, Oxford 1995, 267-278.

Briscoe 1981 — J. A. Briscoe, *A commentary on Livy, books XXXIV-XXXVII*, Oxford 1981.

Bruhl 1953 — A. Bruhl, *Liber pater. Origine et expansion du culte dionysiaque à Rome et dans le monde romain* (BÉFAR, 175), Paris 1953.

Bundrick 2005 — S. D. Bundrick, *Music and image in classical Athens*, Cambridge 2005.

Burkert 1979 — W. Burkert, *Structure and history in Greek mythology and ritual* (Sather classical lectures, 47), Berkeley, CA 1979.

Burkert 1983 — W. Burkert, *Homo necans. The anthropology of ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth*, Berkeley, CA 1983.

Burkert 1985 — W. Burkert, *Greek religion. Archaic and classical*, Oxford 1987.

Burkert 1987 — W. Burkert, *Ancient mystery cults*, Cambridge, MA 1987.

Carpenter 1986 — T. H. Carpenter, *Dionysian imagery in archaic Greek art: its development in black-figure vase painting*, Oxford 1986.

Carpenter 2009 — T. H. Carpenter, 'Prolegomenon to the study of Apulian red-figure pottery', *AJA* 113, 2009, 27-38.

Chaniotis 2007 — A. Chaniotis, 'Theatre rituals', in *The Greek theatre and festivals: documentary studies*, ed. P. Wilson, Oxford 2007, 48-66.

Colonna 1991 — G. Colonna, 'Riflessione sul dionisismo in Etruria', in *Dionysos: mito e mistero. Atti del convegno internazionale, Comacchio 3-5 novembre 1989*, ed. F. Berti, Comacchio 1991, 117-135.

Conte 1994 — B. G. Conte, *Latin literature: a history*, transl. J. B. Solodow, rev. D. Fowler and G. W. Most, Baltimore, MD 1994.

Cornell 1978 — T. J. Cornell, [Review of] A. Wardman, *Rome's debt to Greece*, London 1976, *CR* 28, 1978, 110-112.

Cornell 1986 — T. J. Cornell, 'The formation of the historical tradition of early Rome', in *Past perspectives: studies in Greek and Roman historical writing. Papers presented at a conference in Leeds, 6–8 April 1983*, eds. I. S. Moxon, J. D. Smart and A. J. Woodman, Cambridge 1986, 67-86.

Cornell 2003 — T. Cornell, 'Coriolanus: Myth, history and performance', in *Myth, history and culture in republican Rome. Studies in honour of T. P. Wiseman*, eds. David Braund and Christopher Gill, Exeter 2003.

Cristofani 1990 — M. Cristofani, *La grande Roma dei Tarquini: catalogo della mostra, Roma, Palazzo delle Esposizioni 12 giugno-30 settembre 1990*, Roma 1990.

Cristofani & Martelli 1978 — M. Cristofani & M. Martelli, 'Fufluns paxies. Sugli aspetti del culto di Bacco in Etruria', *StEtr* 46, 1978, 119-133.

Csapo & Slater 1995 — E. Csapo & W. J. Slater, *The context of ancient drama*, Ann Arbor, MI 1995.

Davey 2006 — N. Davey, *Unquiet understanding: Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics*, New York 2006.

De Grummond 2006 — N. Thomson De Grummond, *Etruscan myth, sacred history, and legend,* Philadelphia, PA 2006.

Delanty 1995 — G. Delanty, *Inventing Europe: idea, identity, reality*, London 1995.

Des Bouvrie 1993 — S. Des Bouvrie, 'Creative euphoria. Dionysos and the theatre', *Kernos* 6, 1993, 79-112.

De Simone 1997 C. De Simone, 'Dénominations divines étrusques binaires: considérations préliminaires', in *Les étrusques, les plus religieux des hommes: actes du colloque internationale* (Rencontres de l'école du Louvre, 12), eds. . Gaultier and D. Briquel), Paris 1997, 185-208.

Dobesch 1998 G. Dobesch, 'Ende und Metamorphose des Etruskertums. Grundsätzliche Gedanken zu einer konkreten Fallstudie', in *Die Integration der Etrusker und das Weiterwirken etruskischen Kulturgutes im republikanischen und kaiserzeitlichen Rom*, ed. Luciana Aigner-Foresti, Wien 1998, 29-147.

Dumézil 1970 G. Dumézil, *Archaic Roman religion, with an appendix on the religion of the Etruscans* 1-2, transl. P. Krapp, Baltimore, MD 1970.

Elliott 1986 J. A. Elliott, *The mask in the Etruscan religion, ritual and theatre*, Ph.D. Diss., Florida State University, 1986.

Emiliozzi 1974 A. Emiliozzi, *La collezione Rossi Danielli nel Museo civico di Viterbo* (Musei e collezione d'Etruria), Roma 1974.

Feeney 1998 D. Feeney, *Literature and religion at Rome: cultures, con text, and beliefs*, Cambridge 1998.

Flower 1995 H. I. Flower, 'Fabulae praetextae in context: When were plays on contemporary subjects performed in republican Rome?', *CQ* 45, 1995, 170-190.

Flower 1996 — H. I. Flower, *Ancestor masks and aristocratic power in Roman culture*, Oxford 1996.

Fortier 2002 — M. Fortier, *Theory/theatre: an introduction*, London & New York 2002².

Furtwängler & Reichhold 1904 — A. Furtwängler & K. Reichhold, *Griechische Vasenmalerei*, München 1904.

Gabba 1979 — E. Gabba, 'Eduard Schwartz e la storiografia greca', *AnnPisa*, 3rd ser. 9, 1979, 1033-1049.

Gabba 1984 — E. Gabba, 'Dionigi, Varrone e la religione senza miti', *RivStorIt* 96, 1984, 855-870.

Gabba 1991 — E. Gabba, *Dionysius and The history of archaic Rome* (Sather classical lectures, 56), Berkeley, CA 1991.

Gadamer 1989 — H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and method*, London 1989².

Gadamer 2007 — H-G. Gadamer, *The Gadamer reader. A bouquet of the later writings*, ed. R. E. Palmer, Evanston, IL 2007.

Garland 2005 — R. Garland, *Religion and the Greeks*, London 2005.

van Gennep 1960 — A. van Gennep, *The rites of passage*, transl. M. B. Vizedom and G. L. Caffee, London 1960.

Gjerstad 1960 — E. Gjerstad, *Early Rome*, III: *Fortifications, domestic architecture, sanctuaries. Stratigraphic excavations* (ActaRom-4°, 17:3), Lund 1960.

Gjerstad 1966 — E. Gjerstad, *Early Rome*, IV: *Synthesis of archaeological evidence* (ActaRom-4°, 17:4), Lund 1966.

Goldhill 1992 — S. Goldhill, *Aeschylus, The Oresteia*, Cambridge 1992.

Götrick 1993 — K. Götrick, 'Egungun apidan - rituell teater', in *Ritual & performance* (Kulturstudier, 20), ed. Jörgen Östergård Andersen, Aarhus 1993.

Götrick 1994 — K. Götrick, 'Ritual theatre or theatrical ritual?', in *Images and enactments. Possible worlds in dramatic performance*, eds. Göran Aijmer and Åsa Boholm, Gothenburg 1994, 89-111.

Gozzoli 1976 — S. Gozzoli, 'Polibio e Dionigi d'Alicarnasso', *Studi classici e orientali* 25, 1976, 149-176.

Green 1994 — J. R. Green, *Theatre in ancient Greek society*, London & New York 1994.

Hall 1998 — E. Hall, 'Ithyphallic males behaving badly; or, Satyr drama as gendered tragic ending', in *Parchments of gender. Deciphering the bodies of antiquity*, ed. M. Wyke, Oxford 1998, 13-37.

Hanson 1959 — J. A. Hanson, *Roman theater-temples* (Princeton monographs in art and archaeology, 33), Princeton, NJ 1959.

Harrington 2001 A. Harrington, *Hermeneutic dialogue and social science: a critique of Gadamer and Habermas*, London & New York 2001.

Hay 1966 D. Hay, *Europe: The emergence of an idea*, New York 1966.

Haynes 2000 S. Haynes, *Etruscan civilization: a cultural history*, London 2000.

Hedreen 1992 G. M. Hedreen, *Silens in Attic black-figure vase-painting: myth and performance,* Ann Arbor, MI 1992.

Hedreen 1994 G. M. Hedreen, 'Silens, nymphs, and maenads', *JHS* 114, 1994, 47-69.

Henrichs 1984 A. Henrichs, 'Loss of self, suffering, violence: the modern view of Dionysos from Nietzsche to Girard', *HSCP* 88, 1984, 205-240.

Henrichs 1987 A. Henrichs, 'Myth visualized: Dionysos and his circle in sixth-century Attic vase-painting', in *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his world*, Malibu, CA 1987, 92-124.

Henriksson 2005 B. Henriksson, *Satyrs on Etruscan black-figured vases*, Thesis for the licentiate degree, Göteborg University, 2005.

Henriksson 2007 B. Henriksson, *Satyrs in Etruria. A study of a theme on Etruscan black-figure vases*, Ph.D. Diss., Göteborg University, 2007, rev. ed. 2008.

Hill 1961 — H. Hill, 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the origins of Rome', *JRS* 51, 1961, 88-94.

Hingley 2000 — R. Hingley, *Roman officers and English gentlemen: the imperial origins of Roman archaeology*, London 2000.

Holloway 1994 — R. R. Holloway, *The archaeology of early Rome and Latium*, London 1994.

Hutchinson 1991 — V. J. Hutchinson, 'The cult of Dionysos/Bacchus in the Graeco-Roman world: new light from archaeological studies', *JRA* 4, 1991, 222-230.

Hänninen 1998 — M.-J. Hänninen, 'Conflicting descriptions of women's religious activity in mid-republican Rome: Augustan narratives about the arrival of Cybele and the Bacchanalia scandal', in *Aspects of women in antiquity, proceedings of the first Nordic symposium on women's lives in antiquity, Göteborg 12-15 June 1997* (SIMA-PB, 153), eds. L. Larsson Lovén and A. Strömberg, Jonsered 1998, 111-126.

Högström Berntson, forthcoming — J. Högström Berntson, Ph.D.Diss., forthcoming.

Isler-Kerényi 2004 — C. Isler-Kerényi, *Civilizing violence. Satyrs on 6th-century Greek vases* (Orbis biblicus et orientalis, 208), Fribourg 2004.

Isler-Kerényi 2007 — C. Isler-Kerényi, *Dionysos in archaic Greece. An understanding through images* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman world, 160), Leiden 2007.

Izzet 2004 — V. Izzet, 'Greeks make it; Etruscans fecit: the stigma of plagiarism in the reception of Etruscan art', *EtrStud* 10, 2004-07, 223-237.

Jannot 2005 — J.-R. Jannot, *Religion in ancient Etruria*, transl. J. White head, Madison, WI 2005. (French original: *Devins, dieux et démons : regards sur la religion de l'Étrurie antique,* Paris 1998.)

Jocelyn 1966 — H. D. Jocelyn, 'The Roman nobility and the religion of the republican state', *Journal of Roman history* 4, 1966, 89-104.

Kowalzig 2007 — B. Kowalzig, *Singing for the gods. Performances of myth and ritual in archaic and classical Greece*, Oxford 2007.

Krauskopf 2006 — I. Krauskopf, 'The grave and beyond in Etruscan religion', in *The religion of the Etruscans*. eds. N. T. de Grummond and E. Simon, Austin, TX 2006, 66-89.

Kreinath 2006 — J. Kreinath *et al.*, 'Ritual studies, ritual theory, theorizing rituals – an introductory essay', in *Theorizing rituals: issues, topics, approaches, concepts* (Studies in the history of religions, 114:1), eds. J. Kreinath, J. Snoek and M Stausberg. Leiden 2006, xiii-xxv.

Kristiansen & Larsson 2005 — K. Kristiansen and T. B. Larsson, *The rise of the Bronze Age society: travels, transmission and transformation,* Cambridge 2005.

Kunzle 1978 — D. Kunzle, 'World upside down: The iconography of a European broadsheet type', in *The reversible world. Symbolic inversion in art and society*, ed. B. A. Babcock, Ithaca, NY 1978.

Landels 1999 — J. G. Landels, *Music in ancient Greece and Rome*, London 1999.

Latte 1960 — K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abt. 5, T. 4), München 1960.

Levene 1993 — D. S. Levene, *Religion in Livy* (Mnemosyne, Suppl., 127), Leiden 1993.

Liebeschuetz 1979 — J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Continuity and change in Roman religion*, Oxford 1979.

Lissarrague 1988 — F. Lissarrague, 'Les satyres et le monde animal', in *Proceedings of the 3rd symposium on ancient Greek and related pottery*, eds. J. Christiansen and T. Melander, Copenhagen 1988, 335-351.

Lissarrague 1990a — F. Lissarrague, 'Why satyrs are good to represent', in *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian drama in its social context*, eds. J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, Princeton, NJ 1990, 228-237.

Lissarrague 1990b F. Lissarrague, 'The sexual life of satyrs', in *Before sexuality. The construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*, eds. D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, Princeton 1990, 53-81.

Lissarrague 1993 F. Lissarrague, 'On the wildness of satyrs', in *Masks of Dionysus*, eds. T. H. Carpenter and C. A. Faraone, Ithaca & London 1993, 207-220.

Longo 1990 O. Longo, 'The theatre of the *polis*', in *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian drama in its social context*, eds. J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, Princeton, NJ 1990, 12-19.

Luce 1977 T. J. Luce, *Livy: the composition of his history*, Princeton, NJ 1977.

Martin 1995 L. H. Martin, 'Secrecy in Hellenistic religious communities', in *Secrecy and concealment. Studies in the history of Mediterranean and Near Eastern religions* (Studies in the history of religions, 65), eds. H. G. Kippenberg and G. G. Stroumsa, Leiden 1995, 101-121.

McGinty 1978 P. McGinty, *Interpretation and Dionysos. Method in the study of a god* (Religion and reason, 16), The Hague 1978.

van der Meer 1986 L. B. van der Meer, 'Greek and local elements in a sporting scene by the Micali painter', in *Italian Iron Age artefacts in the British Museum, Papers of the 6th British Museum classical colloquium*, ed. J. Swaddling, London 1986, 439-446.

van der Meer 1995 — L. B. van der Meer, *Interpretatio etrusca. Greek myths on Etruscan mirrors*, Amsterdam 1995.

Mertens 1987 — J. R. Mertens, 'The Amasis Painter: artist and tradition', in *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his world*, Malibu, CA 1987, 168-183.

Miles 1995 — G. B. Miles, *Livy: reconstructing early Rome*, Ithaca, NY 1995.

Minto 1940 — A. Minto, 'Vasi dipinti della necropoli di Cannicella (Orvieto) (Materiali per un "corpus" della ceramica etrusca)', *St Etr* 14, 1940, 367-375, tav. XXXI-XXXIII.

Moore 1987 — M. B. Moore, 'The Amasis Painter and Exekias: approaches to narrative', in *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his world*, Malibu, CA 1987, 153-167.

Needham 1972 — R. Needham, *Belief, language and experience*, Oxford 1972.

North 1976 — J. A. North, 'Conservatism and change in Roman religion', *PBSR* 44, 1976, 1-12.

North 1979 — J. A. North, 'Religious toleration in republican Rome', *PCPS* 25, 1979, 85-103.

North 1989 — J. A. North, 'Religion in republican Rome', in *CAH*^{2}, VII:2: *The rise of Rome to 220 B.C.*, eds. F. W. Walbank *et al.*, Cambridge 1989, 573-624.

North 1995 — J. A. North, 'Religion and rusticity', in *Urban society in Roman Italy*, eds. T. J. Cornell and K. Lomas, London 1995, 135-150.

North 2000 — J. A. North, *Roman religion* (Greece & Rome. New surveys in the classics, 30), Oxford 2000.

Oakley 1998 — S. P. Oakley, *A commentary on Livy books VI-X* 2: *Books VII-VIII,* Oxford 1998.

Ogilvie 1986 — R. M. Ogilvie, *The Romans and their gods*, London 1986.

Olsson 2006 — V. Olsson, *The Lenaia vases revisited. Image, ritual and Dionysian women,* Ph.D. Diss., Göteborg University, 2006.

Orlin 1997 — E. M. Orlin, *Temples, religion and politics in the Roman Republic* (Mnemosyne, Suppl., 164), Leiden & NewYork 1997.

Östenberg 2009 — I. Östenberg, *Staging the world. Spoils, captives, and representation in the Roman triumphal procession*, Oxford 2009.

Pailler 1988 — J.-M. Pailler, *Bacchanalia. La répression de 186 av. J.-C. à Rome et en Italie; vestiges, images, tradition* (BÉFAR, 270), Rome 1988.

Paleothodoros 2002 — D. Paleothodoros, *Dionysiac imagery in archaic Etruria*. (Etruscans now.) Conference paper presented at the British Museum 9-11 December 2002.
http://www.open.ac.uk/Arts/classtu...scans-now/papers/paleothodoros.htm

Papaconstantinou 2006 — D. Papaconstantinou, 'Archaeological context as a unifying process', in *Deconstructing context. A critical approach to archaeological practice*, ed. D. Papaconstantinou, Oxford 2006, 1-21.

Pedley 1990 — J. G. Pedley, *Paestum. Greeks and Romans in southern Italy*, London 1990.

Pfiffig 1975 — A. J. Pfiffig, *Religio Etrusca*, Graz 1975.

Pighi 1965 — I. B. Pighi, *De ludis saecularibus populi Romani quiritium libri sex*, Amsterdam 1965².

Price 1999 — S. Price, *Religions of the ancient Greeks,* Cambridge 1999.

Privitera 1970 — G. A. Privitera, *Dioniso in Omero e nella poesia greca archaica,* Roma 1970.

Purcell 2003 — N. Purcell, 'Becoming historical. The Roman case', in *Myth, history and culture in republican Rome. Studies in honour of T. P. Wiseman*, eds. David Braund and Christopher Gill, Exeter 2003, 12-40.

Rawson 1985 — E. Rawson, 'Theatrical life in republican Rome and Italy', *PBSR* 53, 1985, 97-113.

Rawson 1989 — E. Rawson, 'Roman tradition and the Greek world', in *CAH*², VIII: *Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 B.C.*, eds. A. E. Astin *et al.*, Cambridge 1989, 422-516.

Renfrew 1985 C. Renfrew, *The archaeology of cult: the sanctuary at Phylakopi* (BSA, Suppl., 18), London 1985.

Renfrew 1994 C. Renfrew, 'The archaeology of religion', in *The ancient mind: elements of cognitive archaeology,* eds. Colin Renfrew and Ezra B. W. Zubrow, Cambridge 1994, 47-55.

Reusser 2002 C. Reusser, *Vasen für Etrurien. Verbreitung und Funktionen attischer Keramik in Etrurien des 6. und 5. Jahrhunderts vor Christus* 1-2 (Akanthus crescens, 5), Zürich 2002.

Richardson 1992 L. Richardson, *A new topographical dictionary of ancient Rome,* Baltimore, MD 1992.

Ridgway 2002 D. Ridgway, *The world of the early Etruscans* (SIMA-PB, 162), Jonsered 2002.

Riu 1999 X. Riu, *Dionysism and comedy*, Lanham, MD 1999.

Rose 1947 H. J. Rose, 'G. Dumézil, Mitra-Varuna: Essai sur deux représentations Indo-Européennes de la souveraineté', *JRS* 37, 1947, 183-186.

Rose 1948 H. J. Rose, *Ancient Roman religion*, London 1948.

Rose 1951 H. J. Rose, 'Numen and mana', *HTR* 44:3, 1951, 109-120.

Rose 1960 H. J. Rose, 'Roman religion, 1910-1960', *JRS* 50, 1960, 161-172.

Rothstein 1999 — M. Rothstein, 'Religiøse hemmeligheder i hellenistiskromersk tid og i dag', in *Nye religioner i hellenistisk tid og i dag*, eds. P. Bilde and M. Rothstein, Aarhus 1999, 82-108.

Rozik 2002 — E. Rozik, *The roots of theatre. Rethinking ritual and other theories of origin,* Iowa City, IA 2002.

Rozik 2003 — E. Rozik, 'The ritual origin of theatre: a scientific theory or theatrical ideology?', *Journal of religion and theatre* 2:1, 2003, http://www.rtjournal.org.

Rudd 1989 — N. Rudd, *Horace: Epistles II and Epistle to the Pisones (Ars Poetica*), ed. N. Rudd, Cambridge 1989.

Rüpke 2007 — J. Rüpke, *Religion of the Romans*, transl. and ed. R. Gordon (first published in German as *Die Religion der Römer*, München 2001), Cambridge 2007.

Said 1978 — E. W. Said, *Orientalism*, New York 1978.

Scheffer 1984 — C. Scheffer, 'The selective use of Greek motifs in Etruscan black-figured vase painting', in *Ancient Greek and related pottery. Proceedings of the international vase symposium in Amsterdam 12-15 april 1984,* ed. H. A. G. Brijder, Amsterdam 1984, 229-233.

Scheid 2003 — J. Scheid, *An introduction to Roman religion*, transl. J. Lloyd, Edinburgh 2003.

Schilling 1972 — R. Schilling, 'Les études relatives à la religion romaine', *ANRW* 1:2, 1972, 317-347.

Schultze 1986 — C. Schultze, 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus and his audience', in *Past perspectives: studies in Greek and Roman historical writing. Papers presented at a conference in Leeds, 6-8 April 1983*, Cambridge 1986, 121-142.

Schöne 1987 — A. Schöne, *Der Thiasos. Eine ikonographische Untersuchung über das Gefolge des Dionysos in der attischen Vasenmalerei des 6. und 5. Jhs. v. Chr.* (SIMA-PB, 55), Göteborg 1987.

Seaford 1984 — R. Seaford, *Euripides Cyclops*, Oxford 1984.

Seaford 1994 — R. Seaford, *Reciprocity and ritual. Homer and tragedy in the developing city-state,* Oxford 1994.

Snoek 2006 — J. A. M. Snoek, 'Defining rituals', in *Theorizing rituals: issues, topics, approaches, concepts,* eds. J. Kreinath, J. Snoek *et.al.*, Leiden 2006, 3-14.

Sourvinou-Inwood 2005 — C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Hylas, the Nymphs, Dionysos and others. Myth, ritual, ethnicity* (ActaAth-8°, 19), Stockholm 2005.

Spaeth 1996 — S. B. Spaeth, *The Roman goddess Ceres*, Austin, TX 1996.

Sparkes 1996 — B. A. Sparkes, *The red and the black. Studies in Greek pottery*, London & New York 1996.

Spivey 1988 — N. J. Spivey, 'Il pittore di Micali', *Un artista etrusco* 1988, 11-21.

Spivey 1991 — N. J. Spivey, 'Greek vases in Etruria', in *Looking at Greek vases,* eds. T. Rasmussen and N. Spivey, Cambridge 1991, 131-150.

Steingräber 1986 — S. Steingräber, *Etruscan painting: catalogue raisonné of Etruscan wall paintings,* ed. S. Steingräber, English-language edition eds. D. Ridgway and F.R. Ridgway, New York 1986.

Strandberg Olofsson 1996 — M. Strandberg Olofsson, 'Celebration or death? Aspects of a new amphora from the Micali painter's workshop and the iconography of Etruscan black-figured vases', *OpRom* 21, 1996, 107-118.

Streiffert Eikeland 2006 — K. Streiffert Eikeland, *Indigenous households. Transculturation of Sicily and southern Italy in the archaic period* (Gotarc, Series B:44), Göteborg 2006.

Szilágyi 1981 — J. G. Szilágyi, 'Impletae modis saturae', *Prospettiva* 24, 1981, 2-23.

Taplin 1993 — O. Taplin, *Comic angels and other approaches to Greek drama through vase-painting*, Oxford 1993.

Teigas 1995 — D. Teigas, *Knowledge and hermeneutic under standing: a study of the Habermas-Gadamer debate*, Lewisburg 1995.

Thomassen 2008 — L. Thomassen, *Deconstructing Habermas*, New York 2008.

Torelli 1997 — M. Torelli, 'Limina Averni: Realtà e rappresentazione nella pittura tarquiniese arcaica', *Ostraka* 6, 1996, 63-93.

Turner 1969 — V. W. Turner, *The ritual process. Structure and anti-structure*, London 1969.

Turner 1982 — V. W. Turner, *From ritual to theatre. The human seriousness of play*, New York 1982.

Turner 1987 — V. W. Turner, *The anthropology of performance,* New York 1987.

Un artista etrusco 1988 — *Un artista etrusco e il suo mondo. Il pittore Micali* (Studi di archeologia pubblicati dalla Soprintendenza per l'Etruria meridionale, 5), Roma 1988.

Villanueva Puig 2009 — M.-C. Villanueva Puig, *Ménades: recherches sur la genèse iconographique du thiase féminin de Dionysos des origines a la fin de la période archaïque*, Paris 2009.

Walbank 1957 — F. W. Walbank, *A historical commentary on Polybius*, I, *commentary on books I-VI*, Oxford 1957.

Walsh 1961 — P. G. Walsh, *Livy: his historical aims and methods*, Cambridge 1961.

Walsh 1994 — P. G. Walsh, *Livy book XXXIX, edited with an introduction, translation & commentary by P.G. Walsh*, Warminster 1994.

Warde Fowler 1911 — *The religious experience of the Roman people from the earliest times to the age of Augustus,* London 1911.

Wardman 1982 — A. E. Wardman*, Religion and statecraft among the Romans,* London 1982.

Warmind 1999 — M. Warmind, 'Om pseudoreligiositet. Kriterier for at skelne falske religioner fra sande i antikken og i dag', in *Nye religioner i hellenistisk tid og i dag*, eds. P. Bilde and M. Rothstein, Aarhus 1999, 53-65.

Webb 2009 — R. Webb, *Ekphrasis, imagination and persuasion in ancient rhetorical theory and practice*, Farnham 2009.

Webster 1978 — T. B. L. Webster*, Monuments illustrating Old and Middle Comedy* (BICS, Suppl., 39), 3rd ed. rev. and enl. by J. R Green, London 1978**.**

Webster 1995 — T. B. L. Webster*, Monuments illustrating New Comedy* (BICS, Suppl., 50), 3rd ed. rev. and enl. by J. R Green and A. Seeberg, London 1995**.**

Weinstock 1949 — S. Weinstock, [Review of:] H. J. Rose, *Ancient Roman religion* , *JRS* 39, 1949, 166-167.

Weinstock 1961 — S. Weinstock, [Review of:] Kurt Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*', *JRS* 51, 1961, 206-215.

Werner 2005 — I. Werner, *Dionysos in Etruria. The Ivy Leaf Group,* with an introduction by F. R. Serra Ridgway (ActaRom-4°, 58), Stockholm 2005.

Williams 1968 — G. Williams, *Tradition and originality in Roman poetry*, Oxford 1968.

Wiman 1990 — I. M. B. Wiman, *Malstria-Malena. Metals and motifs in Etruscan mirror craft* (SIMA, 91), Göteborg 1990.

Winkler & Zeitlin 1990 — *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian drama in its social context*, eds. J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, Princeton, NJ 1990.

Wise 1998 — J. Wise, *Dionysus writes. The invention of theatre in ancient Greece*, New York 1998.

Wiseman 1988 — T. P. Wiseman, 'Satyrs in Rome? The back ground to Horace's *Ars Poetica*', *JRS* 78, 1988, 1-13.

Wiseman 1994 — T. P. Wiseman, *Historiography and imagination. Eight essays on Roman culture*, Exeter 1994.

Wiseman 1998 — T. P. Wiseman, *Roman drama and Roman history*, Exeter 1998.

Wiseman 2000 — T. P. Wiseman, 'Liber: myth, drama and ideology in republican Rome', in *The Roman middle republic. Politics, religions, and historiography c. 400-133 BC. Papers from a conference at the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, September 11-12, 1998*, ed. C. Bruun (ActaInstRomFin, 23), Rome 2000, 265-299.

Wiseman 2008 — T. P. Wiseman, *Unwritten Rome,* Exeter 2008.

Wissowa 1912 — G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abt. 4, T. 5), München 1912[2].

Wistrand 1992 — M. Wistrand, *Entertainment and violence in ancient Rome. The attitudes of Roman writers of the first century A.D.*, (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, 56), Göteborg 1992.

Woodford 1986 — S. Woodford, *An introduction to Greek art*, London 1986.

Woodford 2003 — S. Woodford, *Images of myths in classical antiquity*, Cambridge 2003.

Zanker 1988 — P. Zanker, *The power of images in the time of Augustus* (Jerome lectures, 16), transl. A. Shapiro, Ann Arbor, MI 1988.

Ancient sources (editions and translations used)

The abbreviations of ancient writers and their works follow the recommendations of *The Oxford classical dictionary*, eds. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth, Oxford 1996[3], xxix-liv.

Cato, *Agr.*	Cato, *De agricultura* 141, transl. C. Bailey, in *Phases in the religion of ancient Rome* (Sather classical lectures, 10), Oxford 1932.
Cic. *Nat.D*	Cicero, *De natura deorum*, transl. P. G. Walsh in *The nature of the gods. Translated with introduction and ex planatory notes*, Oxford 1997.
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, 1[1], 196. P. G. Walsh in *Livy-book XXXIX, edited with an introduction, translation and commentary*, Warminster 1994.
Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*.	Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae*, transl. E. Cary, (Loeb classical library), London 1950.
Hes. *Fr*.	*Fragmenta Hesiodea*, eds. R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, Oxford 1967.
Hom. Hymn Aph.	*Homeric hymn to Aphrodite*, in *The Homeric hymns,* transl. M. Crudden, Oxford 2001.
Hor. *Ars. P*	Horace, *Ars poetica*, ed. Niall Rudd, Cambridge 1989.

Hor. *Ars. P*	*Horace for students of literature. The "Ars poetica" and its tradition*, O. B. Hardison, Jr. and Leon Golden, Gainesville, FL 1995.
Liv. 7	Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, VII, transl. B. O. Foster (Loeb classical library), London 1924.
Liv. 34	Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, XXXIV, transl. E. T. Sage (Loeb classical library), Cambridge, MA 1935.
Liv. 39	Livy, *Ab urbe condita,* XXXIX, transl. P. G. Walsh in *Livy-book XXXIX, edited with an introduction, translation and commentary*, Warminster 1994.
Lucr.	Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, *On the nature of things,* ed. and transl. by Anthony M. Esolen, Baltimore, MD 1995.
Polyb.	Polybius, *Historiai*, transl. W. R. Paton in Polybius, *The histories* (Loeb classical library), London 1923.
Vitr. *De arch*.	Vitruvius, *De architectura*, *Ten books on architecture*, eds. I. D. Rowland and T. Noble Howe, Cambridge 1999.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1.

List of iconographical motives, 'Figures carrying ivy leaves'

The following entries comprise a group of vases established by I. Werner under the heading *Figures carrying ivy leaves*. The list below follows Werner's numerical system. Plates referred to are also according to Werner's system. In case pictures occur in the present thesis, references are given after plate number as Fig. Below are abbreviated entries for the 15 vases, however bibliographical references are given in full. For complete descriptions of the items readers are referred to Werner 2005, 21-25. For a full bibliography, see;

http://gu-se.academia.edu/carinahakansson/Papers/164505/Bibliography--appendix-1---2-/

1.1.1 (Pl. 1) Munich, Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen 981.
High-handled jug. H. 15 cm.
Condition: partly destroyed in 1944.
Provenience: Vulci.
Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Boehlau 1900, 99; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, 148f., no 981, fig. 190, pl. 42; Dohrn 1937, no 2; Drukker 1986, no.2; Werner 2005, 22, pl. 1.

1.1.2 (Pl. 1) Munich, Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen 982.
High-handled jug. H. 14 cm.
Condition: partly destroyed in 1944.
Provenience: Vulci.
Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Boehlau 1900, 99; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, 149, no 982, fig. 191, pl. 42; Dohrn 1937, no. 3; Drukker 1986, no. 3; Werner 2005, 22-23, pl. 1.

2.1.1. (Pl. 2) Munich, Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen 954.
High-handled kyathos. H. 30 cm.
Condition: destroyed in 1944 and not recovered.
Provenience: Vulci.
Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Boehlau 1900, 99; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, 141, no 954, figs. 177-178, pl. 42; Dohrn 1937, no. 4; Drukker 1986, no. 4; Werner 2005, 23, pl. 2.

2.1.2. (Pl. 2) Fig. 7, Bonn Akademisches Kunstmuseum 656.
High-handled kyathos. H. 34,5 cm.
Condition: broken into several fragments, but pasted together.
Provenience: no information.
Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Dohrn 1937, no. 5; Drukker 1986, no. 5; Werner 2005, 23, pl. 2; Bentz 2008/09, no. 247.

2.1.3. (Pl. 3) London Market, 1967.
High-handled kyathos on stemmed foot. H. 39,6 cm
Condition: no information.
Provenience: no information.
Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Sotheby's *Sale catalogue*, 27 Nov. 1967, no. 150; Drukker 1986, no. 6; Werner 2005, 23, pl. 3.

2.1.4. Naples, Museo Nazionale 908 (905).
Kyathos on stemmed foot.
Condition: destroyed 1944.
Provenience: no information.
Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Boehlau 1900, 99; Dohrn 1937, no. 6; Drukker 1986, no. 7; Werner 2005, 23.

3.1.1. (Pl. 4) Fig. 6. Munich, Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen 915.
Oinochoe. H 27 cm.
Condition: damaged in 1944.
Provenience: no information.
The Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Endt 1899,62-64; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, 128f., no.915, figs. 149-150, pl. 32; Dohrn 1937, no. 7; Drukker 1986, no. 8; Werner 2005, 23, pl. 4.

3.1.2 (Pl. 5) Munich, Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen 916.
Oinochoe. H 29 cm.
Condition: damaged in 1944.
Provenience: no information.
The Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Endt 1899,62-64; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, 129, no.916, pl. 32; Dohrn 1937, no. 8; Drukker 1986, no. 9; Werner 2005, 23-24, pl. 5.

3.1.3 (Pl. 5) Munich, Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen 917.
Oinochoe. H 31,5 cm.
Condition: damaged in 1944.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Endt 1899,62-64; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, 129, no.917, pl. 32; Dohrn 1937, no. 9; Drukker 1986, no. 10; Werner 2005, 24, pl. 5.

3.1.4 (Pl. 6) Munich, Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen 918.
Oinochoe. H 32 cm.
Condition: damaged in 1944.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Endt 1899,62-64; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, 129, no.918, pl. 32; Dohrn 1937, no. 9; Drukker 1986, no. 10; Werner 2005, 24, pl. 6.

3.1.5 (Pl. 6) Brussels, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Historie R 425.
Oinochoe. H 35 cm.
Condition: broken and pasted together.
Provenience: no information.
The Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Dohrn 1937, no. 11; *CVA Bruxelles, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Historie* 3, pl. IV B, 1:5 (Belgique 3, pl. 150); Drukker 1986, no. 12; Werner 2005, 24, pl. 6.

3.1.6 (Pl. 7) Leipzig, Antikenmuseum der Universität (formerly Karl-Marx-Universität) T 329
Oinochoe. H 33 cm.
Condition: broken and mended.
Provenience: no information.
The Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Dohrn 1937, no. 12; *CVA Leipzig* 2, pl. 48:1-3 (Deutsche Demokratische Republik 2, pl. 109); Drukker 1986, no. 13; *Welt der Etrusker* 1988, 143, no. B 5.12; Werner 2005, 24, pl. 7.

3.1.7 (Pl.7) Milan, Soprintendenza archeologica della Lombardia A 10517
Oinochoe. H 26 cm (est.).
Condition: broken and pasted together.
Provenience: no information.
The Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Drukker 1986, no. 14; Werner 2005, 24, pl. 7.

3.1.8 (Pl.8) Princeton, The Art Museum, Princeton University, y 1989-53
Oinochoe. H 36,2 cm.
Condition: unbroken.
Provenience: no information.
The Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; *Record of the Art Museum Princeton University* 49, 1990, 45; Werner 2005, 24, pl. 8.

4.1/3.1 (Pl. 8) Munich, Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen 832
Amphora H 40,5 cm.
Condition: destroyed in 1944.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Ivy Leaf Painter. 540-520 BC.

Bibl.; Endt 1899,63; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, 92f., no.832 fig.89, pl. 32; Dohrn 1937, no. 1; Drukker 1986, no. 1; Werner 2005, 25, pl. 8.

Appendix 2.

List of iconographical motives, 'Satyrs in procession or dance'

The following entries comprise a group of vases established by B. Henriksson under the heading *Satyrs in procession or dance*, and are proposed to indicate cultic Dionysian dance. The list below follows Henriksson's numerical system. Plates referred to are also according to Henriksson's system. In case pictures occur in the present thesis, references are given after plate number as Fig. Below are abbreviated entries for the 52 vases, however the bibliographical references are given in full. For complete descriptions of the items readers are referred to Henriksson 2007, 50-69. For a full bibliography, see;

http://gu-se.academia.edu/carinahakansson/Papers/164505/Bibliography--appendix-1---2-/

4.1. (Pl. 75) Baltimore. Walters Art Gallery. 48.7. Frieze.
Amphora. H. 42.6 cm.
Condition: intact.
Provenience: Castel Campanile.
The Micali Painter. About 510 BC.

Bibl.: Esbroeck 2, 1897, 51, 230; Hill 1940, 110, 137, fig.1; EVP, 14 no.1, pl. 3:2; Uggeri 1975, 40, no. 36; Spivey 1987, 10, no. 27.pl. 5; Brendel 1995, 197-198, fig. 131. Henriksson 2007, 50-51, pl. 75.

4.2. (Pl. 76) Berlin. Staatliche Museen. Antikensammlung. F 2125. Side B**.**
Amphora. H. 24.5 cm.
Condition: good preservation.
Provenience: Calvi.
The Milano Painter Group. 490-480 BC.

Bibl.: Furtwängler 1885, 467, no. 2125; Mingazzini 1958, 8-9, no. 21; Parise Badoni 1968, 47, no. 15; Henriksson 2007, 51, pl. 76.

4.3. (Pl. 25) Berlin. Staatliche Museen. Antikensammlung. F 4024. Side B.
Column-krater. H. 40 cm.
Condition: restored from fragments.
Provenience: Vulci?
The Micali Painter. About 510 BC.

Bibl.: Furtwängler 1885, 1019-1020, no. 4024; Weicker 1902, 196, no. 11; Dohrn 1937, no. 185, Taf. 7:4; *RG* 1939, 79, no. 62; Uggeri 1975, 42, no. 82; Spivey 1987, 28, no. 184, pl. 31 a-b; Rizzo 1987, 309, no. 126, A-B; Henriksson 2007, 24-25, pl. 25.

4.4. (Pl. 77) Berlin. Staatliche Museen. Antikensammlung. V.I. 5017. Frieze.
Amphora. 25.5 cm.
Condition: some damage.
Provenience unknown.
Painter unknown. About 470 BC.

Bibl.: Mingazzini 1958, 10, no. 47; Parise Badoni 1968, 73, no. 25; *Welt der Etrusker* 1988, 226, C 1.16, fig. S. 225; Henriksson 2007, 51, pl. 77.

4.5. (Pl. 78) Bourges. Musée du Berry. 883.71.1. Frieze.
Kyathos. H. 16.55 cm.
Condition: restored, small pieces missing.
Provenience unknown.
Painter unknown. 500-480 BC.

Bibl.: CVA Bourges et Tours. Bourges IV B d, pls. 19:1-3 (France 30, 1980, pl. 1379); Henriksson 2007, 51-52, pl. 78.

4.6. (Pl. 79) Cambridge. Formerly in Dr. A. H. Lloyd's Collection. Belly.
Amphora. No dimensions available.
Condition: no information.
Provenience unknown.
The Group of the Vatican 265? 510-490 BC.

Bibl.: CAH. Plates 1 (1927), 342, pl. 343a; *EVP*, 296; Schwarz 1984, 69, no. 11; Henriksson 2007, 52, pl. 79.

4.7. (Pl. 80) Cerveteri. Museo Archeologico. Side A.
Amphora.
Condition: paint missing at the shoulders of the satyrs.
Provenience: Cerveteri.
Painter unknown.

Bibl.: Lerici 1960, 37, fig. 1; Henriksson 2007, 52-53, pl. 80.

4.8. (Pl. 81) Chianciano Terme. Museo Civico Archeologico. Belly.
Olpe. H. 18.2 cm.
Condition: Restored from large fragments.
Provenience: Chianciano.
The Group of Vatican 265? 5000-480 BC.

Bibl.: Henriksson 2007, 53, pl. 81.

4.9. (Pl. 82) Chianciano Terme. Museo Civico Archelogico. Belly.
Olpe. H. 18, D. Mouth 10.2 cm.
Condition: intact.
Provenience: Chianciano.
The Group of Vatican 265? 500-480 BC.

Bibl.: Henriksson 2007, 53, pl. 82.

4.10. (Pl. 83) Chianciano Terme. Museo Civico Archeologico. Belly.
Olpe. H. 17.9, cm.
Condition: intact.
Provenience: Chianciano.
The Group of Vatican 265? 500-480 BC.

Bibl.: Henriksson 2007, 53-54, pl. 83.

4.11. (Pl. 84) Florence. Museo Archeologico Nazionale. 4139. Shoulder.
Hydria. H. 46 cm.
Condition: restored from fragments.
Provenience: Pitigliano.
The Micali Painter. 520-510 BC.

Bibl.: Inghirami 2, 1833, tav. 109-110; Dümmler 1888, 176, no. 4; Dohrn 1937, no. 286, Taf. 9:3; *RG* 1939, 78, no. 38; Uggeri 1975, 41, no. 53; Sprenger & Bartolini 1977, 71, fig. 73; Scheffer 1979, 42-43, fig. 12; Mangani 1980, 156-158, no. 92; Cristofani 1985, 169, 171 (tav.) 6.42-5; Small 1987, 130; Spivey 1987, 17-19, 21, no. 126, pls. 22 a-b, 23 a; Rizzo 1988, 63, figs. 76-78; Henriksson

2007, 54, pl. 84.

4.12. (Pl. 85) Florence. Museo Archeologico Nazionale. 4168. Side A.
Amphora. Dimensions not available.
Condition: good.
Provenience unknown.
The Lotus Bud Group. 500-475 BC.

Bibl.: Dohrn 1938, 290, pl. LVI: 2; *EVP*, 18 no. 3; Schwarz 1989, 180, no. 3; Henriksson 2007, 54-55, pl. 85.

4.13. (Pl. 86) Florence. Museo Archeologico Nazionale. N. 75787. Side A.
Stamnoid amphora with lid. H. 30 cm.
Condition: intact.
Provenience: Orvieto.
The Group of Munich 883. 500-475 BC.

Bibl.: Magi 1941, 320, fig.7, tav. XXXIX: 1-2; Schwarz 1984, 65, no.24; Henriksson 2007, 55, pl. 86.

4.14. (Pl. 87) Göttingen. Archäologisches Institut der Universität. Hu 552 a. Belly.
Oinochoe. H. without handle 23.3 cm.
Condition. Restored from large fragments, the mouth heavily damaged.
Provenience unknown.
The Group of Munich 883. 500-475 BC.

Bibl.: CVA Göttingen Archäologisches Institut der Universität 2. Taf. 45: 1-2 (Deutschland 73, 2001, Taf. 3688); Henriksson 2007,

55-56, pl. 87.

4.15. (Pl. 88) Hamburg. Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe. 1917. 509. Side A.
Amphora. H. 40.9 cm.
Condition. Almost intact.
Provenience: Vulci?
The Micali Painter. 530-520 BC.

Bibl.: Dohrn 1937, no. 289; Mercklin 1937, 361-362, Taf. XXXV: 3-4; *EVP*, 13; Mingazzini 1958, 8, no. 16; Simon 1975, no. 436: Uggeri 1975, 40 no. 35; Spivey 1987, 7, no. 2; Henriksson 2007, 56, pl. 88.

4.16. (Pl. 88) Hamburg. Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe. 1917. 509. Side B. See 4.15.

4.17. (Pl. 89) Hamburg. Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe. 1960.54. Side A.
Stamnos. H. 40 cm.
Condition: restored from fragments, som paint lost.
Provenience unknown.
The Painter of the Dancing Satyrs. About 480 BC.

Bibl.: Hoffman 1961, 257-258; Rizzo 1987, 312, no. 137, pl. 137; Henriksson 2007, 55-56, pl.89.

4.18. (Pl. 89) Hamburg. Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe. 1960.54. Side B. See 4.17.

4.19. (Pl. 38) Kiel. Private collection. Shoulder A.
Amphora. H 36,1 cm.
Condition: restored from large fragments.
Provenience unknown.
The Tityos Painter. About 550-540 BC.

Bibl.: Sotheby & Co., London. Catalogue 18.6 1962, no. 149; Schauenburg 1970, 29, note 10; Hannestad 1976, 77, no. 143; Hornbostel 1977, 443, no. 383, Abb. S. 443; Spivey 1988b, 30, fig. 44; Henriksson 2007, 31-32, pl. 38.

4.20. (Pl. 90) Fig. 11. London. British Museum. B 64. 1865, 0103.25. Frieze.
Amphora. H. 47.5 cm.
Condition: intact.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Micali Painter. 510-500 BC.

Bibl.: Walters 1893, 71, no. B 64; Webster 1928, 197, no. 18, figs. XI-XII; Brommer 37b, 58, no.3; Dohrn 1937, no. 285, Taf. 8; *RG* 1939, 77, no. 11; *EVP* 2-3, pls. 2-2 A; Bronson 1965, 93, no. 24, 94-106; Banti 1969, 110, tav. 32a; Uggeri 1975, 39, no.1; Szilágyi 1981, 8-11, figs. 24-27; Thuillier 1985, 148-149, fig. 25 a-b; Elliot 1986, 97, figs. 51-54; Meer 1986, 439-445; Spivey 1987, 19, no. 102, pl. 18 a-b; Jolivet 1993, 353-364, figs. 1-6; Säflund 1993, 54-55, figs. 39-40; Thuiller 1993, 22-34, figs. 1-2, 4, 10; Brendel 1995, 197, figs. 129-130; Strandberg Olofsson 1996, 113-114, fig. 14; Paleothodoros 2002, 3-4; Henriksson 2007, 57, pl. 90.

4.21. (Pl. 41) London. Harrow School. 1864.25. Shoulder B.
Amphora with lid. H. 48,9 cm.
Condition: good, but some paint is missing
Provenience: unknown.
The Orvieto Group. 525-500 BC.

Bibl.; CVA Great Britain. Harrow School, pls. 38:1-4, 39:1 (Great Britain 21, 2005, pls. 1058-1059); Henriksson 2007, 33-34, pl. 41.

4.22. (Pl. 91) Milano. Collezione "H.A." 2, IV B. Frieze.
Amphora.H. 38 cm.
Condition: intact except for a small missing piece at the mouth.
Provenience: Vulci?
The Micali Painter. 520-510 BC.

Bibl.: CVA Milano Coll "H.A." 2, IV B, tav. 1:1-4 (Italia 51, 1972, tav. 2282); Spivey 1987, 1987, 19, no. 105; Henriksson 2007, 58, pl. 91.

4.23. (Pl. 92) Munich. Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen. V.1.263. (Kat. 841). Lost. Shoulder B.
Amphora. H. 34.5 cm.
Condition: once in 8 large fragmengts.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Silen Painter. 530-510 BC.

Bibl.: Jahn 1854, 303, no. 999; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, 105-106, no. 841, Abb. 112-115; Greifenhagen 1929, 91, no. 361; Dohrn 1937, no. 76; Hannestad 1976, 61-62, no. 51; Henriksson 2007, 58, pl. 92.

4.24. (Pl. 93) Munich. Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen. V.I. 528. (Kat. 844). Samml. Candelori Frieze.
Amphora. H. 42 cm.
Condition: many fragments, one large body fragment.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Micali Painter. 525-500 BC.

Bibl.: Jahn 1854, 311, no. 1045; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, no. 844, Taf. 36; Dohrn 1937, no. 184; *RG* 1939, 78, no. 21; Uggeri 1975, 40, no. 53; Spivey 1987, 12-13, no. 50; Henriksson 2007, 58-59, pl. 93.

4.25. (Pl. 94) Munich. Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen. V.I. 540 (Kat. 868). Samml. Candelori. Body-frieze. Lost.
Amphora. H. 27.5 cm.
Condition: once intact.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Micali Painter? About 515-510 BC.

Bibl.: Jahn 1854, 314, no. 1069; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, no. 868; Dohrn 1937, no. 190; *RG* 1939, 81, no. 23; Spivey 1987, 32-33; Henriksson 2007, 59, pl. 94.

4.26. (Pl. 95) Munich. Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen. V.I. 381 (Kat. 894). Samml. Candelori. Shoulder.
Hydria. H. 47.5 cm.
Condition: restored from fragments, the foot is missing.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Micali Painter. 530-520 BC.

Bibl.: Jahn 1854, 310, no. 1038; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, no. 894, Abb. 134-138; Greifenhagen 1929, 92 no. 363; Dohrn 1937, no. 182; *RG* 1939, 78, no. 42; Uggeri 1975, 41, no. 58; Spivey 1987, 8,

no. 9, fig. 7; Henriksson 2007, 59-60, pl. 95.

4.27. (Pl. 96) Munich. Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen. Kat. 952. Lost. Side B.
Calyx. Fragment 5.5 cm.
Condition: once partly restored from fragments.
Provenience unknown.
The Silen Painter. 530-510 BC.

Bibl.: Sieveking & Hackl 1912, no. 952, Abb. 176; Dohrn 1937, no. 148; Hannestad 1976, 62, no. 54; Henriksson 2007, 60, pl. 96.

4.28. (Pl. 97) Munich. Die Staatlichen Antikensammlungen. Kat. 956. Lost. Cup.
Kyathos. H. 36.5 cm.
Condition: once restored from fragments.
Provenience unknown.
The Micali Painter. 530-520 BC.

Bibl.: Sieveking & Hackl 1912, no. 956, Taf. 42; Dohrn 1937, no. 192; *RG* 1939, 80, no. 72; Uggeri, 1975, 43, no. 97; Spivey 1987, 16, no. 95; Henriksson 2007, 60-61, pl. 97.

4.29. (Pl. 97) Munich. Die Staalichen Antikensammlungen. Kat. 956. Stem. See. 4.28.

4.30. (Pl. 98) Munich. Die Staalichen Antikensammlungen. Kat. 979. Cup.
Kyathos. H. 16 cm.
Condition: no information.
Provenience unknown.

The Group of Munich 980. 500-475 BC.

Bibl.: Jahn 1854, 34, no. 117; Sieveking & Hackl 1912, no. 979, Taf. 43, *EVP*, 23; Henriksson 2007, 61, pl. 98.

4.31. (Pl. 99) Naples. Museo Archeologico Nazionale. 81056. Belly. Oinochoe. H. 24 cm.
Condition: no information.
Provenience: Vulci. Marked ”Canino” on the base.
The Kyknos Painter. 490-480 BC.

Bibl.: Heydemann 1872, 323, no. 2508; Dümmler 1888, 159, vignette, 176, figs. 7-8; *RG* 1939, 79, no. 65; *EVP*, 17; Rizzo 1987, no. 123; Spivey 1987, 42, no. 4; Henriksson 2007, 61-62, pl. 99.

4.32. (Pl. 100) New York. Norbert Schimmel Collection. Belly. Skyphos. H. 7.7 cm.
Condtiton: small damage.
Provenience: Vulci?
The Micali Painter. 520-500 BC.

Bibl.: Hoffman 1964, no. 49; Teitz 1967, 47, no. 32, fig. 129; Muscarella 1974, no. 66; Uggeri 1975, 43, no. 103; Spivey 1987, 31-32; Henriksson 2007, 62, pl. 100.

4.33. (Pl. 101) Fig. 8. Orvieto. Museo Claudio Faina. Side A. Amphora. H. 44 cm.
Condition: restored from fragments, pieces missing on the belly and shoulder.
Provenience: Orvieto.
The Group of Munich 883. 500-475 BC.

Bibl.: Minto 1939, 17; Minto 1940, 367-368, tav. XXXI; Schwarz 1983, 129, no. 23; Schwarz 1984, 65, no. 23; Paleothodoros 2002, (3), note 42; Henriksson 2007, 62, pl. 101.

4.34. (Pl. 102) Paris. Musée du Louvre. CA 3185. Frieze.
Amphora. H. 41 cm.
Condition: intact.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Micali Painter. 530-520 BC.

Bibl.: CVA *Paris Musée du Louvre* 26, pls. 6:1-4, 7:1-2, 8:1-2, 9:1-2 (France 39, 2003, pls. 1678-1681); *Le monde étrusque* 1977, 74-75, no. 118; Schwarz 1984, 73, no. 3; Spivey 1987, 7-8, no. 3, pl. 1:a-b; Henriksson 2007, 62-63, pl. 102.

4.35. (Pl. 166) Paris. Musée du Louvre. CA 6046. Campana Coll. Fragment B.
Amphora in two fragments.
Condition: fragments.
Provenience: Cerveteri?
The Painter of the Dancing Satyrs. About 490-470 BC.

Bibl.; CVA Paris Musée du Louvre 26, pls 38: 1-4, 39: 1-2 (France 39, 2003, pls. 1710-1711); Schauenburg 1980, 439, Taf. 81: 3-4; Szilágyi 1981, 2-5, fig. 1-2, 4; Jolivet 1991, 361; Thuillier 1992, 201-208, fig. 5; Jannot 1993, 295, fig. 12; Henriksson 2007, 95, pl. 166.

4.36. (Pl. 103) Rome. Museo di Villa Giulia. 15539. Side A.
Hydria. H. 38.5 cm.
Condition: good.
Provenience: Cerveteri.

The Painter of Vatican 238. 510-500 BC.

Bibl.: CVA Roma, Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia 1, IV B n, tav. 1:4-5, 2:5 (Italia 1, 1926, tav. 36-37); Cultrera 1916, 390-391, tav. XX-IV-XXV; Giglioli 1935, 25, pl. CXXXI:1, Dohrn 1938, 286, no.3, tav. LII:4, LIII:1-2; *EVP*, 16, no. 4; Spivey & Rasmussen 1986, 3, no. 6, fig. 7-8; Spivey 1987, 44, no. 6; Rizzo 1988, 81, no. 34, figs. 134-136, tav. VIII:1; Pelagatti *et al*, 1989, 42, no. 18, figs. 25-26; Henriksson 2007, 63, pl. 103.

4.37. (Pl. 103) Rome. Museo di Villa Giulia. 15539. Side B. See 4.36.

4.38. (Pl. 104) Tarquinia. Museo Nazionale Archeologico. RC 3869. Side A.
Stamnos. H. 24.6 cm.
Condition: intact, but much of the painting is damaged.
Provenience: Tarquinia.
Painter unknown.

Bibl.: Ginge 1987, 83-84, no. 45, tav. LXXVIa-LXXVII, IC; Henriksson 2007, 64, pl. 104.

4.39. (Pl. 104) Tarquinia. Museo Nazionale Archeologico. RC 3869. Side B. See 4.38.

4.40. (Pl. 105) Tarquinia. Museo Nazionale Archeologico. RC 6884. Side A.
Amphora. H. 40.95cm.
Condition: restored from fragments.
Provenience: Tarquinia.
The Micali workshop. 515-490 BC.

Bibl.: Helbig 1896, 21; *RG* 1939, 80 no. 5; Ginge 1987, 47-48, no. 20, tav. XXVII-XXIX, XCVII; Henriksson 2007, 64, pl. 105.

4.41. (Pl. 105) Tarquinia. Museo Nazionale Archeologico. RC 6884. Side B. See 4.40.

4.42. (Pl. 106) Tarquinia. Museo Nazionale Archeologico. RC 7289. Fragments.
Amphora. H. orginally 34 cm.
Condition: restored from many fragments.
Provenience unknown.
The Micali Painter. 525-500 BC.

Bibl.: Ginge 1987, 47, no. 19, tav. XXVI; Ginge 1990, fig 233. fig. 1; Henriksson 2007, 65, pl. 106.

4.43. (Pl. 107) Tolfa. Museo Civico 62814. Belly fragments.
Amphora fragments. H. max 14 cm.
Condition: small belly fragments.
Provenience: Tolfa.
The Micali Painter. 530-510 BC.

Bibl.: Rizzo 1988, 66, no. 11, fig. 91; Pelagatti *et al.* 1989, 38, no. 5, fig. 15; Henriksson 2007, 65, pl. 107.

4.44. (Pl. 108) Vienna. Kunsthistorisches Museum. IV 3578 a. Samml. Castellani 4604.
Frieze.
Dinos on a high stand. H. 20, stand 30 cm.
Condition: intact.
Provenience: Cerveteri.

The Northampton Group. About 540 BC.

Bibl.: Masner 1892, 20, no. 215, Taf. V; Endt 1899, 21, no. XII; Karo 1899, 144, no. 4; Brommer 1937b, 58, no. 9: Greifenhagen 1929, 91, no. 350; Boardman 1998, fig. 490; Henriksson 2007, 65-66, pl. 108.

4.45. (Pl. 109) Fig. 13 Viterbo. Museo Civico. 337 / 212. Side A.
Amphora with lid. H. 35.5 cm.
Condition: small fragments on the neck missing.
Provenience: Viterbo.
The Group of Munich 883. 500-475 BC.

Bibl.: Scriattoli 1920, 380-381, figs. 574-575; Giglioni 1935, 26, pl. CXXXI:5; Dohrn 1938, 290; Rossi Danielli 1959, 38, 45, figs. 9, 19; Emiliozzi 1974, no. 200, tav. CI-CII; Schwarz 1983, 129, no. 26; Schwarz 1984, 66, no. 26; Henriksson 2007, 66, pl. 109.

4.46. (Pl. 109) Viterbo. Museo Civco. 337/ 212. Side B. See 4.45.

4.47. (Pl. 110) Viterbo. Museo Civico. 337 / 220. Side A.
Amphora with lid. H. 35.4 cm.
Condition: restored from large fragments, a piece of the satyr's neck is missing.
Provenience: Viterbo.
The Group of Munich 883. 500-475 BC.

Bibl.: Scriattoli 1920, 380-381, figs. 574-575; Rossi Danielli 1959, 45, figs. 9, 19; Emiliozzi 1974, no. 199, tav. XCIX-C; Schwarz 1983, 129, no. 25; Schwarz 1984, 65, no. 25; Henriksson 2007, 66-67, pl. 110.

4.48. (Pl. 111) Vulci. Museo Archeologico. Shoulder.
Hydria. H. about 40 cm.
Condition: Belly is badly damaged, fragments missing.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Miacali Painter. About 510 BC.

Bibl.: Henriksson 2007, 67, pl. 111.

4.49. (Pl. 112) Würzburg. Martin von Wagner Museum. HA 18 (L 798). Samml. Feoli.
Shoulder A.
Amphora. H. 43.7 cm.
Condition: the foot restored, the rest intact.
Provenience: Vulci.
The Miacali Painter. About 510 BC.

Bibl.: CVA *Würzburg. Martin von Wagner Museum* 3, Taf. 42:4-6, 43:1-2, 45:1-3, Abb. 22 (Deutschland 51, 1983, Taf. 2507-2508, 2510); Dümmler 1888, 177, no. 6; Langlotz 1932, no. 798, Taf. 234; Dohrn 1937, no. 196; *RG* 1939, 78, no.20; Simon 1975, 269; Uggeri 1975, 40, no. 32; Spivey 1987, 14, no. 63; Henriksson 2007, 68, pl. 112.

4.50. (Pl. 112) Würzburg. Martin von Wagner Museum. HA 18 (L 778) Shoulder B. See
4.49.

4.51. (Pl. 113) Würzburg. Martin von Wagner Museum. HA 24 (L 779) Samml. Feoli.
Shoulder A.
Amphora. H. 38.6 cm.
Condition: restored from large fragments.
Provenience: Vulci?

The Silen Painter. About 530 BC.

Bibl.: CVA Würzburg Martin von Wagner Museum 3, Taf. 28, 29:1-2, 31:1-2, 36:2, 7, Abb. 17 (Deutshland 51, 1983, Taf. 2423, 2494, 2496, 2501); Endt 1899, 39, no. XVI, Abb. 18-19; Mingazzini 1930, 71, no. 12; Langlotz 1932, 138, no. 779, Taf. 227; Ducati 1932, 10, Taf. 4; Dohrn 1937, no. 82; Hannestad 1974, 13, pls. 17. 30; Hannestad 1976, 61, no. 48; Simon 1975, 260; Rizzo 1981, 41; *LIMC* VIII (1997), 1113 s.v Silenoi, no. 28 a (E. Simon); Henriksson 2007, 68-69, pl. 113.

4.52. (Pl. 113) Würzburg. Martin von Wagner Museum. HA 24 (L 779). Samml. Feoli.
Shoulder. B. See 4.51.

GOTHENBURG STUDIES IN HISTORY

Editors: THOMAS LINDKVIST, INGELA WIMAN

Subscriptions to the series and orders for single volumes should be addressed to:
ACTA UNIVERSITATIS GOTHOBURGENSIS, Box 222,
SE- 405 30 Göteborg, Sweden

Volumes published:

1. CARINA HÅKANSSON, In search of Dionysos.
   Reassessing a Dionysian context in early Rome. 2010. 198 pp.