

SATYRS IN ROME? THE BACKGROUND TO HORACE'S *ARS*
*POETICA**

By T. P. WISEMAN

Nil intemptatum nostri liquere poetae.

(*AP* 285)

I

At the central point of Horace's epistle to the Pisones (ll. 220–50 out of 476) is a lengthy passage on the history and composition of satyr-plays. At the central point within that passage (ll. 234–5), with emphatic use of the vocative and the first-person pronoun, Horace presents himself and his addressees as actively involved in writing satyr-plays:

non ego inornata et dominantia nomina solum
verbaque, Pisones, satyrorum scriptor amabo.

'Nothing', says Gordon Williams, 'could seem less relevant to the contemporary Roman literary scene.' And C. O. Brink, who differs sharply from Williams in his interpretation of the *Ars poetica*, is at one with him on this passage: 'it presents a major puzzle in Roman literary history ... There is no evidence for Roman Satyric drama'.¹

Earlier, Brink had hinted at a possible solution to the problem: 'I doubt if [Horace] would have spoken as he did if he had not considered satyric drama a viable genre, at any rate for recitation'.² But recitation offers no escape. Horace is explicit throughout the poem that he is talking about writing for the stage, for performance before a real Roman audience; recitation comes only at the end, where the playwright is imagined as trying out a first draft of his work on friends or clients.³

Recent research has done little to resolve the dilemma. Elizabeth Rawson's important article on theatrical life in Rome and Italy allows only a dismissive footnote to the idea of Roman satyric drama; in her view, if satyr-plays were ever seen at Rome, they were performed in Greek by companies visiting from Magna Graecia. Similarly Richard Seaford, in the introduction to his *Cyclops* commentary which is now the standard work on the genre: 'there is no real evidence for satyr-play in Rome ... satyric drama has remained virtually exclusively Greek'.⁴

Certainly it is hard to imagine anything less consistent with Roman *mos maiorum* than the anarchic hedonism of satyrs. It was precisely *libido*, that morally subversive aspect of the Bacchic cult, that led to its brutal suppression by the Roman state in 186 B.C.⁵ And if no satyrs, then no satyr-plays. Yet Horace's poem quite clearly presupposes a Calpurnius Piso, the elder son of a morally exemplary Roman aristocrat,⁶ proposing to write a satyr-play for production before the *equites peditesque*

*This is the revised and annotated text of a lecture given to the Roman Society on 6 June 1987. I am very grateful to the Editorial Committee and to Richard Seaford for suggestions and improvements. The following works are referred to by the authors' names alone:

Brink: C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry II: the 'Ars Poetica'* (1971)

Frassinetti: *Atellanae fabulae*, ed. P. Frassinetti (1967)

Rawson: E. Rawson, 'Theatrical Life in Republican Rome and Italy', *PBSR* 53 (1985), 97–113

Seaford: R. Seaford, *Euripides Cyclops* (1984)

Steffen: *Satyrographorum Graecorum fragmenta*, ed. V. Steffen (1952)

Szilágyi: J. C. Szilágyi, 'Impletæ modis saturæ', *Prospectiva* 24 (1981), 2–23

¹ G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (1968), 354; Brink, 273–4, cf. 286 and 496 on the vocative at l. 235.

² *Horace on Poetry I: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles* (1963), 228. In 1971 Brink criticized his own suggestion as going beyond the evidence, but still wondered whether 'the withdrawal of much tragic production into the reciter's hall' might be relevant to the problem (Brink, 275, 276).

³ Stage: ll. 125, 179 ff. Audience: ll. 113, 153–5, 248–50. Trial *recitatio*: ll. 419–76, esp. 420, 427, 474.

⁴ Rawson, 111 n. 86, cf. 102 f.; Seaford, 21 n. 59, 29 f.

⁵ Livy xxxix, 8–19; *CIL* 1², 581. For the reality behind Livy's hostile travesty, see R. Seaford, 'The Mysteries of Dionysos at Pompeii', in H. W. Stubbs (ed.), *Pegasus: Classical Essays from the University of Exeter* (1981), 52–68.

⁶ Hor., *AP* 36, 366 f. For the identity of the father (Cn. Piso, *suff.* 23 or L. Piso, *cos.* 15), see R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (1986), 379–81 and Table xxv, citing previous bibliography and arguing firmly for Piso the Pontifex (*cos.* 15).

in a Roman theatre. Now, oblique and even devious as his style may be, Horace does not write nonsense. As Brink rightly says, it seems that Horace 'meant to give precisely the emphasis to this subject which many moderns stoutly deny it'.⁷ Could it be that the moderns are simply wrong, and that satyr-play was, after all, a living genre on the Roman stage?

II

There is, in fact, some evidence for it, but it is evidence which needs careful scrutiny. The argument must begin with the grammarian Diomedes, in the fourth century A.D., who identified four *genera* of dramatic poetry:⁸

apud Graecos tragica comica satyrica mimica, apud Romanos praetextata tabernaria Atellana planipes.

When, after a lengthy account of the non-dramatic genres, Diomedes returns to tragedy and comedy and expands on his schematic parallel of Greek and Latin dramatic forms, he makes it clear that *fabulae Atellanae* are similar to Greek satyr-plays in that they employ 'argumenta dictaque iocularia', but differ from them in that their characters are not satyrs but 'Oscae personae'—i.e. Maccus, Pappus, Dossennus and the rest.⁹

So it is clear that Diomedes, at least, knew of no Roman satyr-plays. Their absence from the tradition he was following is, in fact, the main reason for believing that Horace in the *Ars poetica* could not have been referring to a living genre. But Diomedes is not the only witness.

According to Nicolaus of Damascus, a contemporary of Horace, Sulla composed 'satyric comedies' in Latin. Since satyr-play and comedy were different genres, it is universally assumed (remembering Diomedes) that Nicolaus was referring to *Atellanae*.¹⁰ But surely a Greek author knew what he meant by σατυρικός? Nicolaus would hardly mistake the Atellan cast of Oscan rustics for satyrs; and his phrase τῆ πατρίῳ φωνῇ suggests that he thought Sulla was using Latin for what would normally be written in Greek. We must remember Horace's strictures against satyrs behaving like comedy characters, 'velut innati triviis et paene forenses' (*AP* 245 f.). Perhaps Sulla's 'satyric comedies' were examples of the sort of generic contamination Horace was attacking.

The next piece of evidence is more explicit. Porphyryon, commenting on *Ars poetica* 221 ('mox etiam agrestes satyros nudavit'), observes:

Hoc est: satyrica coeperunt scribere, ut Pomponius Atalanten, vel Sisyphon, vel Ariadnen.

L. Pomponius, of course, was best known as a writer of *Atellanae*.¹¹ But he was an innovator, and wrote in more than one genre.¹² If Porphyryon says he wrote satyr-

⁷ Brink, 496.

⁸ Diomedes, *Ars Gramm.* III (*GL* I, 482K).

⁹ *Ibid.* 490K. Similarities: 'Prima species est togatarum quae praetextatae dicuntur, in quibus imperatorum negotia agebantur et publica et reges Romani vel duces inducuntur, personarum dignitate et sublimitate tragoediis similes ... Secunda species [est] togatarum quae tabernariae dicuntur et humilitate personarum et argumentorum similitudine comoediis pares ... Tertia species est fabularum Latinarum quae a civitate Oscorum Atella, in qua primum coepta, appellatae sunt *Atellanae*, argumentis dicitis iocularibus similes satyricis fabulis Graecis. Quarta species est *planipedis*, qui Graece dicitur *mimus*.'

Differences: 'Togata praetextata a tragoedia differt, quod in tragoedia heroes inducuntur, ut Pacuvius tragoedias nominibus heroicis scripsit, Orestem Chrysen et his similia, item Accius; in praetextata

autem quae inscribitur Brutus vel Decius, item Marcellus. Togata tabernaria a comoedia differt, quod in comoedia Graeci ritus inducuntur personaeque Graecae, Laches Sostrata; in illa vero Latinae ... Latina Atellana a Graeca satyrica differt, quod in satyrica fere satyrorum personae inducuntur, aut siquae sunt ridiculae similes satyris, Autolycus Busiris; in Atellana Oscae personae, ut Maccus.' (No differentiation is offered between *planipes* and *mimus*.)

¹⁰ Nic. Dam., *FGrH* 90 F75 (Athen. vi, 261c); Rawson, 110 f.

¹¹ Jer., *Chron.* 150H (89 B.C., 'L. Pomponius Bononiensis Atellanorum scriptor clarus habetur'); Gell., *NA* x, 24. 5; xii, 10. 7; xvi, 6. 7; Macr., *Sat.* I, 4. 22; vi, 4. 13; 9. 4; Nonius 75L.

¹² Vell. Pat. II, 9. 5 ('verbis rudem et novitate inventi a se operis commendabilem'); ps. Acro on *AP* 288 (*praetextae* and *togatae*).

play, and even knows three very plausible titles,¹³ I do not think we can simply assert that he is mistaken. Of Pomponius' seventy known plays, only twenty were certainly *Atellanae* (from the presence of the stock characters in title or fragments); three—*Agamemno suppositus*, *Armorum iudicium* and *Pytho Gorgonius*—were mythological burlesques in which satyrs would certainly be more at home than yokels from Campania; and two others—*Marsyas* and *Satura*—can surely be added to Porphyrio's list as satyr-plays. For one of the surviving fragments of *Satura* featured Liber Pater, which makes it likely that the title meant 'Satyr-woman'.¹⁴ (Lucretius uses *satura* in that sense, and the masculine *satur* is attested in the company of Liber Pater on a tomb-decoration from Ostia.¹⁵)

The direct evidence, then, is not so clear-cut as is sometimes thought. It is not, perhaps, strong enough to prove conclusively that Horace had contemporary satyr-plays in mind; but neither is it strong enough to disprove it. What seems to tilt the balance against the idea is the inherent improbability of satyrs in Rome—especially the ordered, puritanical Rome of Augustus' restored Republic. So what we must look at now is the circumstantial evidence.

III

To begin at the beginning. The man who first 'brought satyrs on stage speaking verse' was Arion of Methymna, whom Herodotus portrays returning from a profitable sojourn in Italy and Sicily late in the seventh century B.C. That was about the time the hut dwellers of Rome started putting up rectangular buildings with tiled roofs in the newly drained valley of the Forum. Their terracotta revetment plaques were decorated with Gorgons' heads and Minotaurs; whether they knew of satyrs yet, we cannot tell.¹⁶

Three generations later they certainly did. When satyric drama was evolving at Athens in the late sixth century, and satyrs' antics were a regular theme in red-figure vase-painting, the Latin communities, like their Etruscan neighbours, were decorating their temples with antefixes in the form of satyrs' faces.¹⁷ The find-spots of two of the examples known from Rome suggest that they came from the temple of Iuppiter on the Capitol and the temple of the Dioscuri in the Forum. (Their habits were as familiar as their faces: another antefix type used on the Capitoline temple showed a satyr seizing a maenad.¹⁸) No remnants happen to survive from the contemporary temple of Liber, Libera and Ceres (Dionysus, Kore and Demeter), but since their cult was—and remained—Greek, it is quite possible that Liber Pater-Dionysus was attended by his satyr-servants.¹⁹

The late fifth and early fourth centuries are a dark age for Rome. Contracting cultural horizons may be suggested by the fact that when Apollo the Healer was vowed a temple in 433 B.C., it was built in the *prata flaminia* outside the *pomerium*, as the shrine of a foreign god.²⁰ But there is no reason to suppose that satyrs had

¹³ Steffen, 117, 139–41, 221 f.; Aristias' *Atalante*, Aeschylus' *Sisyphos*, Euripides' *Sisyphos*. For *Ariadne*, parallels are hardly required (cf. n. 54 below).

¹⁴ Frassinetti, 23–67 for Pomponius' fragments. *Marsyas*: Arnob., *adv. nat.* II, 6. *Satura*: Prisc., *GL* II, 200 K for Liber.

¹⁵ Lucr. IV, 1169; *CIL* XIV, 5303, cf. F. Matz, ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΑΚΗ ΤΕΛΕΤΗ: *archäologische Untersuchungen zum Dionysoskult* (1964), Taf. 25. (At Catullus 32. 10 f. the phrase 'satur supinus' immediately precedes an allusion to a satyr-play: see Seaford, 166 on Eur., *Cyc.* 327 f.)

¹⁶ *Suda* s.v. Arion; Hdt. I, 24. 1 f.; archaeological synthesis in J. C. Meyer, *Pre-Republican Rome* (Analecta Rom. Inst. Dan., Supp. XI, 1983), 157–60.

¹⁷ Athens: Seaford, 12–16. Rome: E. Gjerstad, *Early Rome* III (1960), 139, 144, 189; IV, 2 (1966), 458–62, 597. Elsewhere: A. André, *Architectural Terracottas*

from Etrusco-Italic Temples (1940), clxv–vii, clxxxiii–iv (Signia, Velitrae, Satricum, as well as many Etruscan sites); *Enea nel Lazio: archaeologia e mito* (1981), 15, 197 (Ardea, Lavinium).

¹⁸ Gjerstad, *op. cit.*, III, 202, IV, 2, 463–6; cf. André, *op. cit.*, clxxxiii–v for Caere, Cività Castellana, Velitrae, Lanuvium, and the 'magnificent series' of antefixes from Satricum. For Etruria in particular, see J. Heurgon, 'Le satyre et la ménade étrusques', *MEFR* 46 (1929), 96–114.

¹⁹ Dion. Hal. VI, 17. 2; Vitruv., *Arch.* III, 3. 5; Tac., *Ann.* II, 49. 1; Cic., *Balb.* 55 on the *sacra Graeca*. See A. Bruhl, *Liber Pater: origine et expansion du culte dionysiaque à Rome et dans le monde romain* (BEFAR 175, 1953), 30–45; and now also de Cazanove, *op. cit.* (n. 23 below).

²⁰ Livy IV, 25. 3, 29. 7, cf. III, 63. 7.

suddenly become alien creatures. Vase-painting attests their continued ubiquity in Campania, Lucania and Apulia, and Etruscan art shows an efflorescence of Dionysiac themes in precisely this period.²¹ The Etruscan evidence is particularly interesting for our purposes in that it clearly shows actors and dancers impersonating satyrs, scenes which János Szilágyi convincingly interprets as at least an embryonic form of satyric drama.²² It is hardly surprising that Attic drama in the late fifth century associated Dionysus with Italy²³—and we should not suppose that Rome was somehow immune from such influences.

By the end of the fourth century, Roman power extended as far south as the Greek cities of Campania. For Heraclides of Pontus, Rome was a πόλις Ἑλληνίς; statues of Alcibiades and Pythagoras were erected in the Comitium; a leading member of the new plebeian élite chose Σοφός as his *cognomen*.²⁴ At some time around 320 B.C., a Campanian master-craftsman working in Rome made a bronze chest for a Praenestine lady to give to her daughter (no doubt at her marriage). On it he engraved a scene from the tale of the Argo: Amykos, the tyrannical pugilist of the Bebrykes, is bound to a tree after his defeat by Polydeukes.²⁵ Now, *Amykos* was a Sophoclean satyr-play; and Novius Plautius not only included Silenus in his scene, laughing at the Argonauts' boxing practice, but also made the handle of the chest lid in the form of Dionysus (or Liber Pater) supported by two satyrs.

It was very probably in Novius Plautius' lifetime that the Romans erected a statue of a satyr in the Comitium itself (possibly even on the Rostra). This was Marsyas, from whom the plebeian Marcii claimed descent, and Mario Torelli has very plausibly argued for 294 B.C., the censorship of the plebeian hero C. Marcus Rutilus (*cos.* 310), as the date when his statue was set up.²⁶ Marsyas was the inventor of augury, and Marcus Rutilus was one of the first plebeian augurs, elected in 300.²⁷ Marsyas was also the minister of Liber Pater, and his statue was the *signum liberae civitatis*; in the 290s, *nexum* had recently been abolished, and the plebeian aediles were busy exacting fines from money-lenders and other oppressors of the *plebs*.²⁸

In a strikingly similar political context half a century later, the temple and *ludi scaenici* of Flora were established by plebeian aediles (appropriately called Publicii) who had punished powerful landowners illegally occupying *ager publicus*. The temple was next to that of Liber, Libera and Ceres, and the games provided a stage for Greek drama in Latin, as recently introduced by Livius Andronicus.²⁹ Rome was now firmly

²¹ See A. D. Trendall, *The Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily* (1967), index p. 707; A. D. Trendall and A. Cambitoglou, *The Red-Figured Vases of Apulia* (1978–82), partial index p. 1293 (cf. 1279: 'genre scenes of no special significance not included'); Y. Bomati, 'Les légendes dionysiaques en Étrurie', *REL* 61 (1983), 87–107. It may not be irrelevant that Aristophanes was evidently being performed in Apulia in the first half of the fourth century (O. Taplin, *PCPS* n.s. 33 (1987), 96–101).

²² Szilágyi, 2–4, 8–11 (late sixth to mid fourth centuries B.C.).

²³ Soph., *Ant.* 1118. See now O. de Cazanove in *L'association dionysiaque dans les sociétés anciennes* (Coll. de l'éc. fr. de Rome 89, 1986), 177–97—though he sees it as a 'dionysisme sans Dionysos'.

²⁴ Her. Pont., *ap.* Plut., *Cam.* 22. 3; Pliny, *NH* xxxiv, 26; Plut., *Numa* 8. 20; *Fasti Cap. and triumph.* sub anno 304 B.C. (P. Sempronius Sophus). Cf. A. La Regina, *DdA* 2 (1968), 176 on *ILLRP* 309, the *elogium* of L. Scipio Barbatus, *cos.* 298; 'quoius forma virtutei parisuma fuit' translates καλός κάγαθός.

²⁵ *ILLRP* 1197: 'Dindia Macolnia fileai dedit, Novios Plautios med Romai fecid'; T. Dohrn, *Die ficoronische Cista* (1972). For the iconography, see A. Weis, *AJA* 86 (1982), 22–38, who suggests it was 'ultimately based on a monumental painting ... created in central Italy in the fifth or early fourth century B.C.' (p. 29).

²⁶ Hor., *Sat.* 1, 6. 115–17 and scholiasts ('in rostris', ps. Acro); Serv., *Aen.* iv, 58 ('in foro'); M. Torelli,

Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs (1982), 98–106, for Marsyas on the Anaglypha Traiani; F. Coarelli, *Il foro romano: periodo repubblicano e augusteo* (1985), 91–119. P. B. Rawson, *The Myth of Marsyas in the Roman Visual Arts* (BAR Int. Ser. 347, 1987), 11 f., 224 f., adds nothing new.

²⁷ Serv., *Aen.* 111, 359 ('a Marsya rege missos e Phrygia regnante Fauno, qui disciplinam auguriorum Italis ostenderunt'), cf. Gellius fr. 7P on Marsyas' ambassador Megales; Livy x, 9. 2.

²⁸ Serv., *Aen.* 111, 20 ('in liberis civitatibus simulacrum Marsyae erat, qui in tutela Liberi patris est'), iv, 58; see Coarelli, *op. cit.* (n. 26 above), 95–100 on Marsyas' shackles (presumably with a broken chain). Aediles: Livy x, 23. 11–13, 31. 9, 33. 9. For the popular tradition of the Marcii (e.g. Sall., *Cat.* 33. 2; Virg., *Aen.* vi, 815 f.), see D. C. Feeney, *PCPS* n.s. 32 (1986), 9 f.

²⁹ Ovid, *Fasti* v, 277–94 ('vindicibus laudi publica cura fuit', 290); Tac., *Ann.* 11, 49. 1 (temple); cf. Varro, *LL* v, 158; Festus 276L. The Publicii may have been prophets as well (Cic., *div.* 1, 115; 11, 113); cf. the Marcii, n. 33 below. For the dates of the Floralia (241? 238?) and of Livius Andronicus' first production (240?), see Vell. Pat. 1, 14. 8; Pliny, *NH* xviii, 286; Atticus fr. 5P (Cic., *Brut.* 72, cf. *sen.* 50, *Tusc.* 1, 3). For aediles' fines, cf. also Schol. Bob. 90St (249); Gell., *NA* x, 6. 3; Livy xxiv, 16. 19 (246; temple of *Libertas*); see T. P. Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* (1979), 92–4.

in the Greek world, her origins and history of interest as much to Callimachus and the poets as to Theophrastus, Eratosthenes and the historians.³⁰ Whether satyr-plays were ever shown at the new *ludi scaenici* we do not know, but drama was certainly performed in the Forum (that is, *coram Marsya*); and the plebeian Iunii now start using 'Silanus' as a *cognomen*.³¹

It is important to remember that Silenus is not just the father of the satyrs; he is the source of arcane wisdom, if he can be caught and made to divulge it. Similarly Marsyas, though the symbol of liberty, is not a licentious hedonist; on the contrary, his Phrygian myth (in which he is associated with the Magna Mater) attributes to him sagacity and self-control.³² His gift of augury was handed on to his descendants, the Marcii, whose prophetic verses led to the institution of the *ludi Apollinares* in 212 B.C.³³ His chaste-loved Cybele was brought from Phrygia to the Palatine in 204, and the *ludi Megalenses* instituted in her honour in 191.

Marsyas was important for Italian legends too. He was the eponymous founder of the Marsi,³⁴ and he sent his ambassador Megales (whose name recalls the Magna Mater) to Tarchon the Etruscan.³⁵ The Etruscans had their own historical legends, intersecting with those of Rome in the persons of Aulu and Caile Vipinas (Vibenna).³⁶ A late fourth-century mirror from Bolsena shows the brothers about to attack Cacus the seer; a *satyriskos* watches from behind a rock, and a grapevine surrounds the whole scene (see Fig. 1).³⁷ Could the allusions be to Dionysus as a god of drama?

Certainly the Etruscans had a dramatic tradition of their own. The clearest evidence for it is in the first century B.C., when Varro knew a certain Volnius who wrote *tragoediae Tuscae*,³⁸ but there is no reason to suppose it was a late innovation. The Livian excursus on the origin of *ludi scaenici* (supposedly in 364 B.C.) clearly presupposes a long-standing Etruscan tradition of mimetic dance and embryonic drama; Szilágyi has made a very powerful case for accepting at least the essentials of Livy's account, and for interpreting the mysterious 'impletae modis *saturae*' as linking the satyric dances attested in Etruscan vase-painting with the later tradition of Roman satire.³⁹

Whether or not the Etruscan word for an actor (*ister*, whence *histrion*) was derived from ἴστωρ,⁴⁰ we may reasonably guess from the Cacus-Vibennae scene that the subject matter of the performances might well be quasi-historical. And not only in Etruria. Most of the 'historical' legends of the towns and peoples of Italy were Greek in origin—foundation stories attached to wandering heroes like Odysseus and Diomedes. That is a familiar phenomenon in historiography and learned poetry,⁴¹ but it is less often remembered in the context of drama. In a brilliant recent article,

³⁰ Callim. fr. 106–7Pf; Dion. Hal. 1, 34, 4, 49, 2, Plut., *Rom.* 17, 6 etc. (poets); Pliny, *NH* III, 57 (Theophrastus), Strabo 1, 66 (Eratosthenes), *FGrH* 840 F7–23.

³¹ Drama in Forum: M. Gaggiotti, *Analecta Romana Inst. Dan.* 14 (1985), 60 f.; E. J. Jory, *CQ* 36 (1986), 537 f. Iunii: first known Silanus *pr.* 212 B.C. (Livy xxv, 20, 1); n. 57 below.

³² Silenus: Cic., *Tusc.* 1, 114; Hdt. VIII, 138, Xen., *Anab.* 1, 2, 13 etc. (Midas); Virg., *ecl.* 6, 13 ff. Marsyas and Cybele: Diod. Sic. III, 58–9 (σύνεσις, σωφροσύνη); Paus. x, 30, 9, Steph. Byz. s.v. Pessinus, etc. Cf. Plato, *Symp.* 215a–c for Socrates as Silenus or Marsyas. The satyrs themselves represent the eternal felicity of the initiate: see Seaford, *op. cit.* (n. 5 above) 64 f.

³³ Livy xxv, 12 (*carmina Marciana*); Cic., *div.* 1, 89 for the Marcii as seers 'nobilis loco nati'.

³⁴ Sil. It. VIII, 502–4; Pliny, *NH* III, 108 (from 'Gellianus'); Solinus 2, 6.

³⁵ Gellius fr. 7P (Solinus 1, 7). On this text see F. Coarelli, in *Gli Etruschi e Roma: incontro di studi in onore di Massimo Pallottino* (1981), 200 f.; J. P. Small, *Cacus and Marsyas in Etrusco-Roman Legend* (1982); T. P. Wiseman, in *Les 'bourgeoisies' municipales italiennes aux IIe et Ier siècles av. J.-C.* (1983), 302–4 (= *Roman*

Studies Literary and Historical (1987), 300–2); and Coarelli, *op. cit.* (n. 26 above), 113–17. I am not convinced by Small's attempt to find a sixth-century context for the passage (*op. cit.* 15 f., 45–7, 105–8).

³⁶ *ILS* 212, 17–24 (Claudius); Arnobius VI, 7; Serv., *Aen.* VIII, 345; Varro, *LL* v, 47; Festus 38L, 468L; Tac., *Ann.* IV, 65, etc. For a full presentation and discussion of the evidence on the Vibennae saga, see F. Buranelli (ed.), *La tomba françois di Vulci* (1987), 225–33 (M. Pallottino), 234–43; *ibid.* 79–110 (F. Roncalli) on the paintings of the François tomb. For Etruscan historians (Varro *ap.* Censor. 17, 6; *ILS* 212, 18), see T. J. Cornell, *ASNP* 6, 2 (1976), 411–39.

³⁷ Small, *op. cit.* (n. 35 above), 4, 113.

³⁸ Varro, *LL* v, 55.

³⁹ Livy VII, 2, 4–8, Val. Max. II, 4, 4, with Szilágyi, 4 f., 12–18; cf. n. 22 above. Earlier accounts—e.g. M. Coffey, *Roman Satire* (1976), 18–22, and A. S. Gratwick in *CHCL* II (1982), 160–2—will have to be modified in the light of Szilágyi's arguments.

⁴⁰ See O. Szemerényi, *Hermes* 103 (1975), 312–16.

⁴¹ The classic account is still E. J. Bickerman, 'Origines gentium', *CP* 47 (1952), 65–81; for poetic *ktiseis*, see F. Cairns, *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (1979), 68–70.



FIG. 1. BRONZE MIRROR FROM BOLSENA (BM 633): *ETRUSKISCHE SPIEGEL V* (1897), PL. 127. CAILE VIPINAS, ARTILE, CACU, AULU VIPINAS: SATYRISKOS BEHIND, GRAPEVINE AROUND.

Stephanie West has very convincingly interpreted as interpolations for dramatic recitation the 200 or so lines in Lycophron's *Alexandra* that refer to Roman and Italian legendary origins; 'deutero-Lycophron ... is to be sought among the artists of Dionysos in southern Italy', probably in the second century B.C.⁴²

Wandering heroes are also a regular feature of satyr-play, and it is striking how far satyric plots overlap with Italian foundation stories. Aeschylus' satyr-play *Circe*, for instance, belonged to a tetralogy which featured Telegonus, Circe's son by Odysseus;⁴³ Telegonus was said to have founded Tusculum and Praeneste. Other versions of Circe's offspring by Odysseus included the eponymous founders of Antium, Ardea, and Rome itself.⁴⁴ Sophocles wrote a satyr-play on Amphiaraus the seer, whose sons were the founders of Tibur. Danae, mother of Perseus, was said to have founded Ardea; she and her infant son were rescued from the sea by the satyrs in Aeschylus' *Diktyoulkoi*.⁴⁵

⁴² S. R. West, 'Lycophron Italicised?', *JHS* 104 (1984), 127–51, esp. 145 f.

⁴³ Seaford, 22, 24; Plut., *Mor.* 316A (Praeneste); Hor., *Odes* III, 29. 8 (Tusculum).

⁴⁴ Xenagoras, *FGrH* 240 F29 (Rhomos, Anteias, Ardeias); anon. *ap. Plut.*, *Rom.* 2. 1 (Romanus); anon. *ap. Serv.*, *Aen.* 1, 273 (Latinus, cf. Hes., *Theog.* 1011–16).

⁴⁵ Steffen, 151–3, 123–7. Tibur: Pliny, *NH* xvi, 237 (Tiburinus); Sextius *ap. Solin.* 2. 7 (Catillus), cf. Serv., *Aen.* vii, 670; see F. Coarelli, *DdA* n. s. 1. 2 (1983), 60–5 for Amphiaraus and Tibur in the François Tomb. Ardea: Pliny, *NH* III, 56. For lists of Italian foundation legends, see Ovid, *Fasti* iv, 65–81; Justin, *epit.* 20. 1; Solinus 2. 5–13.

Also Aeschylean, and probably from a satyr-play, is the aetiology of Rhegion from ῥήγνυμι, comparable with the later derivations of Tusculum from δύσκολον ('difficult of access'), Bauli from βοαύλοι (where Herakles kept the cattle of Geryon), and Pompeii from πομπή (Herakles' triumph).⁴⁶ No etymology happens to survive for the Latin town of Satricum at the edge of the Pomptine marsh, but it can hardly have been anything other than σατυρικόν. Already in the sixth century B.C., as recent excavations have shown, the temple of Matuta at Satricum was decorated with a conspicuous variety of satyr-motif antefixes.⁴⁷ Virgil refers to the neighbouring marsh as *Saturae palus*; and a context for the aetiology is provided by the story of Dionysus' war against the Etruscans, after which he left the oldest and youngest of his satyrs in Italy to teach the natives viticulture.⁴⁸

The first literary evidence for satyrs in Rome comes from Fabius Pictor at the end of the third century B.C. Describing the original *ludi Romani*, 'not just from what he had heard but from what he knew at first hand',⁴⁹ Fabius begins with the *pompa circensis* from the Capitol to the Circus Maximus. It included dancing choruses of *satyristai*, imitating and making fun of the other participants in a dance like the Greek *sikinnis*.⁵⁰ Szilágyi is surely right to see this as the old Etruscan custom still surviving, and to adduce in support Appian's description of Scipio's triumphal procession in 201, where the Etruscan origin is explicitly attested.⁵¹ (In Appian the satyr-dancers appear as *tityristai*: we know from Aelian and Strabo that *tityroi* were 'creatures like *sileno*i and *baccho*i'.⁵²)

It seems, then, that from the end of the sixth century to the end of the third the Romans were quite familiar with satyrs and their ways. In the second century, the increasing Hellenization of Roman culture added a new dimension—with tragic results for the worshippers of Dionysus in 186 B.C. Against the persecution of the Bacchanals, however, we may set the second-century temple decoration from Civitalba in Umbria, the ancient Sentinum. The frieze of fleeing Gauls shows that the temple was a monument to the great Roman victory over the Gauls and Samnites 150 years earlier; on the pediment, however, is Dionysus with his satyrs, uncovering the sleeping Ariadne.⁵³ Since Ariadne was an important figure in the mystic cult of Dionysus (her awakening was evidently interpreted as the initiate's entry into everlasting life),⁵⁴ this scene reminds us that the suppression of the Dionysiac mysteries in 186 represents only one side of the polarized culture of second-century Rome. The conflict it reveals is attested also by the building and subsequent demolition (in 154) of a permanent theatre below the temple of the Magna Mater, and by the censors' expulsion of Greek stage performers from Rome in 115.⁵⁵

Even in Rome the god of drama and his satyrs were in only temporary retreat. It is certain that Greek plays were being performed again in Rome very soon after the censors' ban: they are attested at Marius' triumphal games in 101, and referred to casually several times in the first century B.C.⁵⁶ Moreover, Silenus and Marsyas

⁴⁶ Steffen, 147 (Strabo VI, 258—from *Glaukos Pontios?*); Festus 486L; Serv., *Aen.* VII, 662.

⁴⁷ See n. 18 above. For the Satricum excavations, see J. A. De Waele, *Med. Nederl. Inst. Rome* 43 (1981), 7–68, and *Arch. Laziale* 4 (1981), 305–16.

⁴⁸ Virg., *Aen.* VII, 801 f.; Sil. It. VIII, 379 f.; Charax, *FGrH* 103 F31; cf. Sil. It. VII, 162–211 (Dionysus in the Ager Falernus).

⁴⁹ Dion. Hal. VII, 71. 1.

⁵⁰ Fabius, *FGrH* 809 F13(b) = Dion. Hal. VII, 70–3: to be read in Jacoby's text (*FGrH* III C (1969), 865–9), where Dionysius' own comments are distinguished typographically.

⁵¹ App., *Pun.* 66; Szilágyi, 8–11, 21 n. 90; de Cazanove, op. cit. (n. 23 above), 190–5.

⁵² Aelian, *VH* III, 40; Strabo X, 466.

⁵³ M. Verzar, in P. Zanker (ed.), *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* (1976), 122–6, 133 f. Cf. Bomati, op. cit. (n. 21 above), 90–5 for the popularity of the theme in Etruscan art.

⁵⁴ In a near-contemporary painting on Delos, Ari-

adne is shown being awakened by a winged Psyche: *Ricerche di pittura ellenistica* (Quaderni dei DdA 1, 1985), 219, fig. 3. See in general E. Richardson in *Styles in Classical Art and Archaeology: a Tribute to Peter Heinrich von Blanckenhagen* (ed. G. Kopcke and M. B. Moore, 1979), 193–5; F. Matz (ed.), *Die Dionysischen Sarkophage* (1969) III, 374 f. Cf. Ovid, *Fasti* III, 512; Hyg., *Fab.* 224. 2: Ariadne as *Libera* (cf. n. 19 above).

⁵⁵ Theatre: Val. Max. II, 4. 2; Vell. I, 15. 3; Livy, *per.* 48; App., *BC* I, 28; Aug., *Civ. Dei* II, 5. *Ars ludicra*: Cassiod., *Chron. sub anno* 115 B.C. Note also the expulsion of 'Chaldaean' soothsayers in 139 (Val. Max. I, 3. 3; Livy, *per. Oxy.* 54); see nn. 29 and 33 for the *vates Publicius* and the *Marcii*; Enn., *Ann.* VII, 206Sk on 'Fauni vatesque'.

⁵⁶ Plut., *Mar.* 2. 2; Cic., *fam.* VII, 1. 3 (55 B.C.); *ILLRP* 803 (late Republic); Nic. Dam., *Caes.* 19 (46 B.C.); Cic., *Att.* XVI, 5. 1 (44 B.C.); *ILS* 5050. 157–61 (17 B.C.); see Rawson, 102 f.

suddenly become popular as coin types at the time of the *Bellum Italicum*, along with Pan, who now joins them as the ancestor of a senatorial family, the *Vibii Pansae*.⁵⁷ Satyrs were present when the war itself broke out (at the fateful *ludi scaenici* at Asculum in 91, the Latin actor Saunio was a σατυρικὸν πρόσωπον), and Sulla even had a wild one brought before him at Apollonia in 83.⁵⁸

That familiarity with satyrs was not restricted to the Hellenized élite is suggested by the passage in Lucretius on *loca sola*—remote places believed by the country people to be the haunts of satyrs, nymphs and *fauni*. In Horace's lifetime, therefore, as in practically every generation of Rome's history, the conditions necessary to satyric drama were part of the experience of Roman citizens from top to bottom of the social scale—from the *celsi Ramnes* to the *fricci ciceris emptor*.⁵⁹

IV

Before proceeding to the next stage of the argument, it may be worth pausing for a moment to consider, firstly the genre itself as it had developed by the first century B.C., and secondly the nature of Roman drama as it was performed at the *ludi scaenici* of the late Republic.

As Richard Seaford points out with reference to *Cyclops*, already by the last decade of the fifth century B.C. satyr-play had evolved some way from its original form and content. Influence from another dramatic genre is tantalizingly suggested by a fragmentary calyx *crater* of the Talos painter, about 400 B.C.: in a scene interpreted by Erika Simon as illustrating Achaëus' satyr-play *Hephaestus*, Dionysus reclines at a banquet to the piping of a satyriskos called 'Mimos'. Our best evidence for contemporary mime is the final scene of Xenophon's *Symposion*, where the dancers impersonate Dionysus and Ariadne.⁶⁰ Old Comedy was also an influence, as may be inferred from personal and contemporary references in satyr-play fragments. Indeed, by the late fourth century, when Old Comedy was obsolete, we find satyric drama which is explicitly satirical: Python's *Agen*, staged at Alexander's camp on the Hydaspes in 324, attacked Harpalus and his mistress, while Lycophron's *Menedemos* mocked the banquets of contemporary philosophers.⁶¹ That provoked a reaction, with Sositheos of Alexandria taking the satyrs out of the city and back into their ancestral wilds;⁶² whether Horace's distaste for urban satyrs with their sophisticated wisecracks is merely a reflection of this Alexandrian controversy (as the critics think), or actually refers to his own time (which is what he says),⁶³ either way it is clear that by the first century B.C. the composer of satyr-play, long since freed from the Athenian tragic tetralogy format, had a wide variety of styles open to him to choose from.

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 *Amphiaraia* at Oropos in or about 84 B.C.⁶⁴ At that time of unprecedented cultural Hellenization at Rome, it is, I think, inconceivable that this genre alone should have failed to tempt Latin poets to rival the Greeks.⁶⁵

⁵⁷ M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (1974), nos 337 (D. Silanus, 91 B.C., Silenus), 341 (Q. Titius, 90 B.C., Liber and Silenus), 342 (C. Vibius Pansa, 90 B.C., Silenus and Pan), 363 (L. Censorinus, 82 B.C., Marsyas). For Pansa's 'double-headed' issues, cf. A. Wallace-Hadrill, *JRS* 76 (1986), 74 f. and 82: 'double-headed coins ... invite the user to discover some special significance'. Pan and Liber are featured on the issues of Pansa's son in 48 B.C. (Crawford, nos 449, 451).

⁵⁸ Diod. Sic. xxxvii, 12. 1 f.; Plut., *Sulla* 27. 2.

⁵⁹ Lucr. iv, 580–9; Hor., *AP* 342, 249.

⁶⁰ Seaford, 16–18; E. Simon, *The Ancient Theatre* (1982), 19 f. and pl. 8; Xen., *Symp.* 9. 2–7.

⁶¹ Seaford, 18–20; B. Snell, *Scenes from Greek Drama* (1967), 99–138 on Python; Athen. ii, 55d, x, 419d on Lycophron.

⁶² Dioscorides 23G-P (*Anth. Pal.* vii, 707); Seaford, 20 f. Cf. Meleager 126G-P (*Anth. Pal.* vii, 535): Pan comes to town now that Daphnis is dead.

⁶³ Hor., *AP* 244–50, cf. Brink, 291 f. Roman context in l. 248 (*equites*)—and *forenses* in 245 might make Horace's readers think of Marsyas.

⁶⁴ See G. M. Sifakis, *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama* (1967), 26 f., 30, 53, 124–6; C. Garton, *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre* (1972), 154 f. The records of the *Amphiaraia*: *IG* vii, 416, 419–20, etc.

⁶⁵ See G. Williams, *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (1978), 102–52 on 'the dominance of Greek culture'. Cf. also Wiseman, op. cit. (n. 29 above), 154–67, op. cit. (n. 35 above), 299–307.

What actually went on at the *ludi scaenici* of the Roman festivals?⁶⁶ About fifty days every year—not counting *ad hoc* shows for triumphs, funerals and so on—were devoted to stage performances of one sort or another. They were organized by ambitious aediles who had to provide the best possible entertainment in order to impress the citizen body with their munificence. What sort of works did they commission, or revive? Comedies and tragedies, of course—and since the standard work denies it, it is worth insisting on the perennial popularity of themes from Roman history: the house of Tarquin was as rich in tragic plots as the house of Atreus.⁶⁷ But it took more than just comedy and tragedy to keep the chestnut-munching audience of a Roman theatre attentive for day after day at the Megalesia or the Floralia.

One rare and precious fragment of evidence comes from a lost speech of Cicero delivered in 66 B.C.:⁶⁸

His autem ludis—loquor enim quae sum ipse nuper expertus—unus quidam poeta dominatur, homo perlitteratus, cuius sunt illa convivia poetarum ac philosophorum, cum facit Euripiden et Menandrum inter se, et alio loco Socraten atque Epicurum disserentes, quorum aetates non annis sed saeculis scimus fuisse disiunctas. Atque his quantos plausus et clamores movet! Multos enim condiscipulos habet in theatro qui simul litteras non didicerunt.

At this year's games (for I speak from recent experience) there is one particular dominant poet—a very cultured man, the author of those *Poets' and Philosophers' Dinner-Table Discussions* in which he has Euripides arguing with Menander and another time Socrates with Epicurus, though we know that their lifetimes were not years but centuries apart. And what thunderous applause he gets for them! There are plenty of his fellow-pupils in the theatre audience, who like him never learned their lessons at school.

What sort of performances were these? The *convivia philosophorum* are reminiscent of Lycophron's satyric *Menedemos*, and also of Varro's Menippean satire *Eumenides*.⁶⁹ (Varro seems to have described his satires as 'hic modus scaenatilis'. Were they written for theatrical performance?⁷⁰) What is clear is that our ignorance should discourage dogmatism about what could or could not be shown on a Roman stage.

We know from Cicero about the recent introduction of Alexandrian mime in the fifties B.C., perhaps to be associated with the *pantomimi* and the tragic ballet which became so popular with Bathyllus and Pylades in the twenties.⁷¹ We know from Ovid of stage plays that celebrated, in the manner of *aretalogoï*, the miraculous deeds of the gods at whose festivals they were shown.⁷² The first century B.C. was evidently a period of vitality and innovation in Roman drama. Why deny the satyrs a place in it? It seems to me that Horace's purist plea for 'genuine' satyr-play presupposes exactly the kind of creative mixture of genres the other evidence leads us to expect.

To test the hypothesis, let us apply it to three items which are otherwise hard to explain.

First, an elliptical comment by Cicero in a letter to his brother in August 54:⁷³

Συνδείπνους Σοφοκλέους, quamquam a te actam fabellam video esse festive, nullo modo probavi.

⁶⁶ See now E. J. Jory, in J. H. Betts, J. T. Hooker, J. R. Green (eds), *Studies in Honour of T. B. L. Webster* I (1986), 143–52.

⁶⁷ Livy I, 46, 3 ('tulit enim et Romana regia sceleris tragici exemplum'); cf. v, 21, 9; Dion. Hal. III, 18, 1, ix, 22, 3; Plut., *Rom.* 8, 7 ('theatrical' inventions). W. Beare, *The Roman Stage* (1950), 42–4 on the supposed obsolescence of the *fabula praetexta* after Accius; contra T. P. Wiseman, *Caecilius and his World* (1985), 33 f.

⁶⁸ Cic., *pro Q. Gallio* fr. 4 Puccioni (Jer., *ad Nepotianum ep.* 52, 8). Cf. also fr. 6P (Nonius 88L) on 'logi qui ludis dicti sunt'.

⁶⁹ Lycophron, n. 61 above; Varro, *Men.* 143–4B (117, 131 Cèbe).

⁷⁰ Varro, *Men.* 304B (Nonius 259L): 'sed, o Petrule,

ne meum taxis librum, si te ꝑpegigat haec modoꝑ scenatilis'. Oehler (1844) emended to *hic modus*.

⁷¹ Cic., *Rab. Post.* 35; Wiseman, op. cit. (n. 67 above), 34 f.; cf. also Ovid, *Tristia* I, 2, 79 f.; Stat., *Silv.* v, 5, 66–9. *Pantomimi*: see E. J. Jory, op. cit. (n. 66 above), 147–9, and *BICS* 28 (1981), 147–61, esp. 154 f. on Livy VII, 2, 157 on mid-first-century innovation.

⁷² Ovid, *Fasti* IV, 326 ('mira sed et scaena testificata loquar'), on Q. Claudia and the Magna Mater. *Aretalogi*: H. Engelmann, *The Delian Aretalogy of Sarapis* (1975), esp. 37, 55 f.; Philodemus (*de poem.* 13 Dübner) associates *aretalogoi* and *mimographoi*; also Suet., *Aug.* 74; Juv. xv, 16; Dio Chrys., *Or.* 20, 493R, etc.

⁷³ Cic., *QF* II, 16, 3; Shackleton Bailey, following Buecheler, reads *factam*.

Quintus, writing from Caesar's camp in Gaul just before the crossing to Britain, had evidently reported his own production of, or performance in, Sophocles' satyric play *Syndeipnoi*.⁷⁴ (Remember Python's *Agen*, staged before Alexander at the Hydaspes: perhaps satyr-play was particularly appropriate for highbrow horseplay in the officers' mess.) In Sophocles' drama, the Greeks at Tenedos snub Achilles by not inviting him to dine. If Quintus had adapted that to mock the *boni* and their treatment of Caesar, the great conqueror, we can understand Cicero's disapproval in a letter which emphasizes the need not to offend anyone.⁷⁵ So perhaps this passage counts as evidence for the use of satyr-play as a vehicle for topical comment.

Second, Virgil's Tityrus. The enigmatic herdsman who seems to personify Virgil's early work, and certainly represents the poet himself at one point in the *Eclogues*, is named after a species of satyr.⁷⁶ The *Eclogues* imitate Theocritean mime-sketches, and were certainly performed in the theatre.⁷⁷ One of Virgil's herdsmen is explicitly a rustic mime—'saltantes satyros imitabitur Alpheisiboeus'—and performs the Theocritean dramatic monologue in *Eclogue* 8. Though the details escape us, we seem to be in the world of the satyr called Mimos.⁷⁸

The third passage also joins satyrs with mime. It is in the long digression at the end of book VII of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Antiquitates Romanae*, where he uses Fabius Pictor's account of the *Ludi Romani* procession to prove his constant theme that the Romans were really Greek in origin.⁷⁹ He quotes Fabius on the satyr-dances, and then adds that he himself had seen such *satyristsai* dancing the *sikinnis* in aristocratic funeral processions, where the jesting and mockery is elsewhere attributed to *mimi*.⁸⁰ Moreover, Aristonicus of Alexandria, a contemporary of Dionysius, claimed that 'the satyr-rout called *sikinnis*' was one of the elements out of which Bathyllus and Pylades fashioned their new form of mime. A connection with the Megalesia may be implied by the theory that the dance was Phrygian in origin, named after one of Cybele's attendant nymphs.⁸¹

V

So I think we may conclude that Roman satyr-play did exist after all—largely, no doubt, in generically contaminated forms like 'satyric comedy' (as written by Sulla) and 'satyric mime'. What Pomponius' satyr-plays were like, whether they would have satisfied a purist like Horace, we cannot tell; but there is certainly no reason to suppose that they were *fabulae Atellanae* like most of his *oeuvre*. He and his audience knew perfectly well what satyrs were, and that they were not Campanian rustics like Maccus and his friends.

Now that we know what we are looking for, we can even find some plausible plots to add to those three titles of plays by Pomponius. Ovid gives us the hint in that precious line already referred to from his story of Q. Claudia and the Magna Mater: 'mira sed et scaena testificata loquar'. That tells us, first, that Ovid used drama as a source (a fact recently exploited in excellent articles by J. C. McKeown and Elaine Fantham); second, that the plays he knew used historical material; and third, that they

⁷⁴ Steffen, 273–6, among the doubtful satyr-plays; but since somebody throws a stinking chamber-pot across the room (Athen. I 17d), it is not likely to be a tragedy.

⁷⁵ Cic., *QF* II, 16. 1 ('ut tibi placet, damus operam ne cuius animum offendamus'): similar sentiments at II, 11. 3, 13. 2, 14. 4.

⁷⁶ Virg., *ecl.* I. 1, 6. 4, etc, *Georg.* IV, 566; see n. 52 above.

⁷⁷ Serv., *ecl.* 6. 11; Donat., *vita Verg.* 26; cf. Tac., *Dial.* 13. 2.

⁷⁸ Virg., *ecl.* 5. 73, 8. 62 ff.; n. 60 above. (Cf. n. 32 above for Silenus in *ecl.* 6.)

⁷⁹ Dion. Hal. VII, 70–3 (see n. 50 above), with I, 4–5, 89–90.

⁸⁰ VII, 72. 10 and 12; cf. Suet., *Vesp.* 19. 2 for funerals. Note that Dionysius also cites the soldiers' songs at triumphal processions as analogous to σατυρική παιδία (VII, 72. 11); the word he uses for their mockery is λαμβίζειν, and *Iambe* was a satyr-play by Sophocles (on *Iambe*, see N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (1974), 213–17). For satyrs and processions in the Hellenistic world, see Callixenos of Rhodes, *FGrH* 627 F2 on the 'grand procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus'.

⁸¹ Athen. I, 20c (Aristonicus); Arrian, *FGrH* 156 F106; the *sikinnis* was discussed by Accius in his *Pragmatika* (Gell., *NA* xx, 5).

celebrated the *hieroi logoi* of the divinities honoured at Roman dramatic festivals.⁸² Let us look more closely at Ovid's *Fasti*.

In book VI, Cybele throws an *al fresco* party on Mount Ida. Among the guests are satyrs, nymphs, Silenus and Priapus. Priapus' attempt on the sleeping Vesta is frustrated by the braying of Silenus' ass. Elsewhere in Ovid we have allusions to Priapus' lecherous designs on Pomona, and in Martial to his pursuit of Flora, in the goddess's own grove. Any one of these would be good for a one-act satyric mime at the Floralia or the Megalesia.⁸³

On a more ample scale is the story, also in book VI, of Ino and Melicertes and their reception at the site of Rome. No satyrs here, but the Dionysiac background is proved by the 'Ausonian Maenads' in the grove of Stimula, and all the topographical references are to the Forum Bovarium and the Circus Maximus, close to the temple of Liber Pater.⁸⁴

Ino and Melicertes were rescued by Hercules—the god of the Forum Bovarium, but also a favourite character in satyr-play. He appears most clearly in that guise in the aetiology of the naked Luperci in book II of the *Fasti*. Here, instead of a Theban story in a Roman setting, we have a Roman god at large in Lydia: Faunus falls in love with Omphale, but in the dark puts his hand up the skirt of the transvestite Hercules instead. Which is why his worshippers come naked to the Lupercalia. Faunus was the Roman Pan, 'Nympharum fugientum amator', a quasi-satyric figure like Priapus; and Hercules and Omphale had long been material for satyr-play plots.⁸⁵

In book III, Faunus is joined by Picus for the aetiology of Iuppiter Elicius (a story told also by Valerius Antias, that most stage-struck of historians).⁸⁶ Ovid calls them *silvestria numina*; in Plutarch's version of the story they are '*daimones* who may be likened to satyrs or Pans', and Numa's capture of them (at Egeria's suggestion) is an exact doublet of the capture of Silenus by Midas of Phrygia.⁸⁷ Revealed wisdom, magic, and secret spells like the charm against thunder that Iuppiter is tricked into revealing—all these are familiar satyr-play motifs.⁸⁸ And *Picus* was the title of a play by Novius, who like Pomponius wrote both *Atellanae* and mythological burlesque.⁸⁹

Like Janus and Saturn, Picus and Faunus could be regarded either as timeless gods or as kings in the history of an aboriginal, pre-Arcadian Latium.⁹⁰ Like Marsyas, they were augurs and prophets.⁹¹ Picus, as a young king, was loved by Circe, that familiar satyr-play character, who turned him into a woodpecker when he remained faithful to his wife. (In another version, Circe *was* his wife.⁹²) The wife of king Faunus was Fatua the prophetess, whose story was used as an *aition* for the Bona Dea cult: she was a secret drinker, beaten to death by her husband, who then made her a goddess. Alternatively, she was Faunus' daughter, whom he lusted after and

⁸² Ovid, *Fasti* IV, 326; J. C. McKeown, 'Augustan Elegy and Mime', *PCPS* n.s. 25 (1979), 71–84; E. Fantham, 'Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*', *HSCP* 87 (1983), 185–216, esp. 187, 197 f. on satyr-play (but only as a literary source?).

⁸³ Ovid, *Fasti* VI, 319–48 (the same story at I, 390–440, with Lotis for Vesta, is set at a Greek Dionysiac festival); *Met.* XIV, 634–41 (also satyrs, Pan, Silenus); *Mart.* X, 92. 11 f. See Fantham, op. cit., 201–9 on the two versions in the *Fasti*.

⁸⁴ Ovid, *Fasti* VI, 480–550, exploiting a myth often featured in satyric drama (Steffen, 150, 245, 258 on *Athamas* satyr-plays). Maenads: 503 f., 507, 514 (cf. *Livy* XXXIX, 12. 4, 13. 12 for the *Lucus Stimulae* and the *Bacchanalia*). Topography: 477 f., 518 (cf. *Tac., Ann.* II, 49. 1 for the temple of *Liber ad circum maximum*).

⁸⁵ Ovid, *Fasti* II, 303–58, cf. *Hor., Odes* III, 18. 1 for Faunus (and *Dion. Hal.* I, 32. 3–5 on the *Lupercal* as the cave of Pan). Steffen, 230–4, 241 f. for *Omphale* satyr-plays by Ion and Achaëus; cf. E. Simon, *Arch. Anz.* (1971), 199 f., and Fantham, op. cit. (n. 82 above), 192–201.

⁸⁶ Ovid, *Fasti* III, 285–348, leading into the *aition* of the *Salii* and their *ancilia* (349–92, cf. *Plut., Numa* 13); the *Salii* were presumably the armed dancers imitated by the *satyristai* in the *pompa circensis* (*Dion. Hal.* VII, 72. 6). *Antias* fr. 6P, cf. *frr.* 18, 22, 37, 40, 46, 55P on *ludi*; *Wiseman*, op. cit. (n. 29 above), 116 f.

⁸⁷ Ovid, *Fasti* III, 303, cf. 309, 315 ('*di memorum ... di agrestes*'). *Plut., Numa* 15. 3. *Midas*: n. 32 above.

⁸⁸ See *Seaford*, I, 7, 37; for satyrs as magicians, see *Snell*, op. cit. (n. 61 above), 106 f., on *Python's Agen.*

⁸⁹ *Frassinetti*, 88; *Festus* 369L. For *Novius* as 'Atellanarum scriptor', see *Gell., NA* XVII, 2. 8; *Macr., Sat.* I, 10. 3; his titles include not only *Duo Dossenni*, *Maccus copo*, *Pappus praeteritus*, etc. but also *Andromacha*, *Hercules coactor* and *Phoenissae*.

⁹⁰ See *Virg., Aen.* VII, 45–9, 177–91, VIII, 319–23.

⁹¹ *Picus*: *Pliny, NH* X, 40 f.; *Serv., Aen.* VII, 190. *Faunus* (and *Fauna*) *a fando*: *Varro, LL* VII, 36; cf. *Calp. Sic.* I, 33–5. For *Marsyas* and *Faunus* as royal contemporaries, see n. 27 above.

⁹² Ovid, *Met.* XIV, 320–434; *Virg., Aen.* VII, 189–91. *Circe*: see above, nn. 43, 44.

ravished in the form of a snake, having first got her drunk.⁹³ Sex, wine, and an ogre are certainly plausible satyr-play material.

Faunus was not always an ogre: his name could be derived from *favere*, and it was his friendly welcome which enabled Evander and his Arcadians to settle at Pallanteion, the site of the future Rome.⁹⁴ He was still king of Latium when Hercules came with the cattle of Geryon, and among the stories attached to that episode were several that celebrated the hero's sexual prowess with various aetiologically significant partners—Palanto, the eponym of Pallanteion; a daughter of Faunus; Lavinia the daughter of Evander, and so on.⁹⁵ The most interesting is that which derived the name of the patrician Fabii from *fovea*, a pit for trapping animals, in which Hercules ravished the ancestress of the *gens*.⁹⁶ (A different version alleged that the first Fabius invented such pits, and was named after them: 'first inventions' are also a theme of satyr-play.⁹⁷) Did the Marcii, the Iunii Silani and the Vibii Pansae have similar stories about their origins?⁹⁸

One family whose legendary genealogy seems made for satyr-play was that of the Aelii Lamiae. Their home was Formiae, which some identified as the land of the Laestrygonians,⁹⁹ and their ancestor was Poseidon's son Lamos, the Laestrygonian king.¹⁰⁰ The wanderings of Odysseus were full of satyr-play plots—*Cyclops*, *Circe*, *Nausicaa* and so on—and Lamos and his people fit perfectly into the generic theme exemplified by Aeschylus' *Kerkyon*, Sophocles' *Amykos*, and Euripides' *Skiron* and *Busiris*, all 'persecutors of mankind'.¹⁰¹ Queen of the Laestrygonians was the ogre Lamia, who ate children; she is attested in Euripidean satyr-play and actually mentioned as a stage character in the *Ars Poetica* itself.¹⁰²

Like the primordial kings of Latium, so too the dynasty of Alba Longa provided suitable satyr-play material. (They were Silvii, 'men of the forest', and true satyrs, according to Horace, had to be *silvis deducti*.¹⁰³) The childhood of Proca is Ovid's context for the sex comedy of Janus and Crane, and his reign as king of Alba for the story of Pomona and Vertumnus, in which the satyrs, Silenus and Priapus play a minor (possibly choral?) role.¹⁰⁴ Proca, of course, was the father of Numitor and Amulius. Here we approach the most famous satyr-play plot of all, for which it is necessary to set the scene.

Vitruvius, writing in the twenties B.C., described the three different types of theatrical scene appropriate for wall painting: columns and pediments for tragedy, balconies and windows for comedy, and for satyr-play 'trees, caves, mountains and other rustic features'. We may add a spring, from Ovid and other authors: what counts as satyr country is a wooded glen with running water and a cave.¹⁰⁵ Like this one:

⁹³ Plut., *Mor.* 268d–e; Arnob., *adv. nat.* v, 18; Macr., *Sat.* 1, 12, 24 f.; T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet and other Roman Essays* (1974), 135 f. Note that the celebrants of the Bona Dea mysteries are called 'Priapi maenades' in Juv. vi, 316 f.; and Propertius' grove of the Bona Dea (invaded by Hercules, IV, 9, 22–70) seems to be the *lucus Stimulae* of Ovid's maenads (n. 84 above).

⁹⁴ Dion. Hal. 1, 31, 2; Justin, *epit.* XLIII, 1, 6; *Origo gentis R.* 5, 3. Cf. Seaford, 6 f. on the ambiguity of satyrs and *silenoi*.

⁹⁵ Solinus 1, 15 (Silenus of Caleacte); Justin, *epit.* XLIII, 1, 8 f.; Serv., *Aen.* VII, 51; Dion. Hal. 1, 43, 1.

⁹⁶ Festus (Paulus) 77L; Plut., *Fab.* 1, 1; Sil. It. VI, 627–36 (Evander's daughter).

⁹⁷ Festus (Paulus) 77L; Plut., *Fab.* 1, 2; cf. Seaford, 36 f.

⁹⁸ Cf. nn. 26, 31, 57 above. One wonders too (remembering Marsyas and the *popularis* tradition) about the Satureii (*tr.pl.* 133) and the Sicinii (*trr.pl.* 493–2, 449, 387', 76); see n. 81 above on the *sikinnis*.

⁹⁹ Cic., *Att.* II, 13, 2; Hor., *Odes* III, 16, 34; Pliny, *NH* III, 59; Sil. It. VII, 276, 410, VIII, 529; otherwise, Formiae could be called a Laconian foundation (Strabo v, 233), and the Laestrygonians sited in Sicily (Thuc. VI, 2, 1, etc).

¹⁰⁰ Hom., *Od.* x, 81 and schol.; Hor., *Odes* III, 17, 1–9, 'Aeli vetusto nobilis ab Lamo', for whose identification see Syme, *op. cit.* (n. 6 above), 394 f.

¹⁰¹ Seaford, 33 f. For the geographical exploitation of *Od.* IX–X, see above, nn. 43, 44. *Cyclops* was a familiar mime plot in Horace's time (*Sat.* 1, 5, 63).

¹⁰² Schol. Theocr. 15, 40; Diod. Sic. XX, 41, 6 (Euripides); Hor., *AP* 340; before the association with the Laestrygonians, she was assigned to Libya (Duris, *FGrH* 76 F17, Paus. x, 12, 1, etc).

¹⁰³ Livy 1, 3, 7 ('mansit Silvii postea omnibus cognomen'); Hor., *AP* 244.

¹⁰⁴ Ovid, *Fasti* VI, 143, *Met.* XIV, 622 f.

¹⁰⁵ Vitruv., *Arch.* v, 6, 9, VII, 5, 2; Ovid, *Fasti* I, 401–4, II, 315 f., III, 295–8; Plut., *Sulla* 27, 2, *Numa* 15, 3; Calp. Sic. 1, 8–12, etc.

There is not far off a holy place, arched over by a dense wood, and a hollow rock from which springs issued: the wood was said to be consecrated to Pan.

Pan Lykaios, that is, for 'this place the Romans call Lupercal'. Here they celebrated the Lupercalia, with young men running around laughing, naked but for goatskin loincloths; hilarity and drunkenness were a necessary part of the ritual.¹⁰⁶

That in itself is appropriate to satyr-play, and as we have seen already, the Ovidian aetiology of the Lupercalia involves the quasi-satyr Faunus. But even the story itself falls into a familiar satyr-play category, 'the care of divine or heroic infants'.¹⁰⁷ Plutarch was right to call the story of Romulus and Remus δραματικὸν καὶ πλάσματῶδες. The particular 'theatrical' aspect he had in mind may have been the capture of Remus and his 'recognition by signs' (in Aristotle's terminology), which was a technique more used in tragedy and comedy than in satyr-play.¹⁰⁸ But the influence of one dramatic genre on another is both explicitly attested, in Sulla's 'satyric comedies', and to be inferred in any case from Horace's argument in the *Ars poetica*.

VI

If there is after all no reason to deny the existence of Roman satyr-play, whether 'pure' or contaminated, mimic or comic, erotic or patriotic, we need not resist the natural assumption that Horace's advice to young Piso was practical, and concerned with the writing of plays for real stage performance.¹⁰⁹

As an Augustan purist, Horace called for a return to real classical satyric drama. The intellectual ferment of the first century B.C. had evidently affected drama like everything else, and in that experimental and innovative atmosphere the satyrs were simply too versatile to be kept corralled inside their traditional genre. The young, urban, lovesick, shameless satyrs Horace objected to sound rather like Encolpius and Giton in the picaresque novel Petronius entitled *Satyrika*. The mixture of genres went on.

I have touched only lightly on one possible aspect of it—the relevance of satyrs to satire. The first of Diomedes' three definitions of *Satura* is generally waved away by modern theorists, but it was evidently taken seriously in the ancient world:¹¹⁰

Satira dicta est a satyris, quod similiter in hoc carmine ridiculae res pudendaeque dicuntur.

Some satyric drama was certainly satirical; so can we be quite certain that Diomedes was altogether wrong?

University of Exeter

¹⁰⁶ Val. Max. II, 2. 9 ('laetitia exultantes ... epularum hilaritate et vino largiore ...'); Plut., *Rom.* 21. 3-7 (*aition*).

¹⁰⁷ See Seaford, 38 on Aeschylus' *Trochoi*, Sophocles' *Dionysiskos*, *Harakleiskos*, etc. Note that one of Pomponius' mythological burlesques was *Agamemno suppositus* (Nonius 758L).

¹⁰⁸ Plut., *Rom.* 8. 7 (cf. n. 67 above); Ar., *Poet.* 16. 1 (1454b21).

¹⁰⁹ See Kiessling-Heinze on *AP* 220 (III, 329), where the essentials were set out three generations ago—Pomponius' three titles, Q. Cicero's *Syndeipnoi*, the fact that satyr-play still flourished in the Greek East. Cf. also D. F. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play* (1980), 93, where the credibility of Horace (and Porphyrius on Pomponius) is rightly defended.

¹¹⁰ Diomedes, *GL* I, 485K. See n. 39 above for Szilágyi's heterodox (and convincing) view.