


EULIMENE

Vol 1 (2000)

EULIMENE 1 (2000)



Praxitelian Dionysi

Antonio Corso

doi: [10.12681/eul.32682](https://doi.org/10.12681/eul.32682)

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

ΜΕΛΕΤΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΚΛΑΣΙΚΗ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ,
ΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΙΚΗ, ΤΗ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΠΥΡΟΛΟΓΙΑ

Τόμος 1
Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία
Ρέθυμνο 2000

ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ

ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΑΚΗ

ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ

Π. Μανουσάκη 5 - Β. Χάλη 8

GR 741 00 - Ρέθυμνο

PUBLISHER

MEDITERRANEAN

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

P. Manousaki 5 - V. Chali 8

GR 741 00 - Rethymno

ΕΚΔΟΤΕΣ - ΕΠΙΜΕΛΗΤΕΣ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας (Ρέθυμνο)

Δρ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Χανιά)

EDITORS

Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymno)

Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Chania)

Η Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία και οι Εκδότες του περιοδικού
ευχαριστούν θερμά τους Δήμους Ρεθύμνου και Αρκαδίου για τις
χορηγίες τους στη δαπάνη της έκδοσης.

Mediterranean Archaeological Society and the Editors wish to thank the
Municipalities of Rethymnon and Arkadi for their sponsorship.

© ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 2000

EULIMENE

ISSN: 1108-5800

Επιστημονική Επιτροπή

Καθ. Πέτρος Θέμελης (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Νίκος Σταμπολίδης (Ρέθυμνο)
Δρ. Charles V. Crowther (Οξφόρδη)
Δρ. Alan W. Johnston (Λονδίνο)
Καθ. Άγγελος Χανιώτης (Χαϊδελβέργη)
Δρ. Ιωάννης Τουράτσου (Αθήνα)
Καθ. Σοφία Καμπίτση (Ρέθυμνο)

Advisory Editorial Board

Prof. Nikos Stampolidis (Rethymno)
Prof. Petros Themelis (Rethymno)
Prof. Angelos Chaniotis (Heidelberg)
Dr. Charles V. Crowther (Oxford)
Dr. Alan W. Johnston (London)
Dr. Ioannis Touratsoglou (Athens)
Prof. Sofie Kambitsis (Rethymno)

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ είναι μία επιστημονική περιοδική έκδοση που περιλαμβάνει μελέτες στην Κλασική Αρχαιολογία, την Επιγραφική, τη Νομισματική και την Παπυρολογία εστιάζοντας στον Ελληνικό και Ρωμαϊκό κόσμο της Μεσογείου από την Υστερομινωική / Υπομινωική / Μυκηναϊκή εποχή (12^{ος} / 11^{ος} αι. π.Χ.) έως και την ύστερη αρχαιότητα (5^{ος} / 6^{ος} αι. μ.Χ.).

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ περιλαμβάνει επίσης μελέτες στην Ανθρωπολογία, Παλαιοδημογραφία, Παλαιοπεριβάλλον, Παλαιοβοτανολογία, Ζωοαρχαολογία, Αρχαία Οικονομία και Ιστορία των Επιστημών, εφόσον αυτές εμπίπτουν στα προαναφερθέντα γεωγραφικά και χρονικά όρια. Ευρύτερες μελέτες στην Κλασική Φιλολογία και Αρχαία Ιστορία θα γίνονται δεκτές, εφόσον συνδέονται άμεσα με μία από τις παραπάνω επιστήμες.

Παρακαλούνται οι συγγραφείς να λαμβάνουν υπόψη τους τις παρακάτω οδηγίες:

1. Οι εργασίες υποβάλλονται στην Ελληνική, Αγγλική, Γερμανική, Γαλλική ή Ιταλική γλώσσα. Κάθε εργασία συνοδεύεται από μια περίληψη περίπου 250 λέξεων σε γλώσσα άλλη από εκείνη της εργασίας.
2. Συντομογραφίες δεκτές σύμφωνα με το *American Journal of Archaeology*, *Numismatic Literature*, J.F. Oates *et al.*, *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, ASP.
3. Τα γραμμικά σχέδια γίνονται με μαύρο μελάνι σε καλής ποιότητας χαρτί με ξεκάθαρους χαρακτήρες, ώστε να επιδέχονται σμίκρυνση. Οι φωτογραφίες είναι ασπρόμαυρες, τυπωμένες σε γυαλιστερό χαρτί. Όλα τα εικονογραφικά στοιχεία είναι αριθμημένα σε απλή σειρά.
4. Οι εργασίες στέλνονται σε δύο εκτυπωμένα αντίτυπα συνοδευόμενα από το κείμενο σε δισκέτα ηλεκτρονικού υπολογιστή.

Είναι υποχρέωση του κάθε συγγραφέα να εξασφαλίζει γραπτή άδεια για την αναπαραγωγή υλικού που έχει δημοσιευτεί αλλού ή είναι αδημοσίευτο.

Οι συγγραφείς θα λαμβάνουν δέκα αντίτυπα και έναν τόμο του περιοδικού. Επιπλέον αντίτυπα θα μπορούν να αγοραστούν.

Συνδρομές - Συνεργασίες - Πληροφορίες:

Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία, Π. Μανουσάκη 5 - Β. Χάλη 8, GR 741 00 Ρέθυμνο

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας, Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, Τμήμα Φιλολογίας, Ρέθυμνο - GR 74 100

Δρ. Μανώλης Ι. Στεφανάκης, Καλόβες- Αποκορώνου, Χανιά - GR 73003

EULIMENE is an academic periodical which contains studies in Classical Archaeology, Epigraphy, Numismatics, and Papyrology, with particular interest in the Greek and Roman Mediterranean world. The time span covered by EULIMENE runs from the Late Minoan / Sub Minoan / Mycenaean period (12th / 11th cent. BC) through to the late Antiquity (5th / 6th cent. AD).

EULIMENE will also welcome studies on anthropology, palaeodemography, palaeo-environmental, botanical and faunal archaeology, the ancient economy and the history of science, so long as they conform to the geographical and chronological boundaries noted. Broader studies on Classics or Ancient History will be welcome, though they should be strictly linked with one or more of the areas mentioned above.

It will be very much appreciated if contributors consider the following guidelines:

1. Contributions should be in either of the following languages: Greek, English, German, French or Italian. Each paper should be accompanied by a summary of about 250 words in one of the above languages, other than that of the paper.
2. Accepted abbreviations are those of *American Journal of Archaeology*, *Numismatic Literature*, J.F. Oates *et al.*, *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, ASP.
3. Line drawings should be in black ink on good quality paper with clear lettering, suitable for reduction. Photographs should be glossy black-and-white prints. All illustrations should be numbered in a single sequence.
4. Please send two hard copies of your text and one version on computer disc.

It is the author's responsibility to obtain written permission to quote or reproduce material which has appeared in another publication or is still unpublished.

Ten offprints of each paper, and a volume of the journal will be provided to the contributors free of charge. Additional offprints may be purchased.

Subscriptions - Contributions - Information:

Mediterranean Archaeological Society, P. Manousaki 5 - V. Chali 8, GR 741 00 Rethymno

Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis, Kalives - Apokoronou, Chania, GR - 73003

Dr. Nikos Litinas, University of Crete, Dep. of Philology, Rethymno, GR - 74 100

web : <http://www.phl.uoc.gr/eulimene/>

mail : eulimene@mail.com

Περιεχόμενα
EYAIMENH 1 (2000)

List of contents
EULIMENE 1 (2000)

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti	6
Anagnostis Angelarakis , Aspects of demography and palaeopathology among the hellenistic Abderetes in Thrace, Greece	13
Antonio Corso , Praxitelian Dionysi	25
Angelos Chaniotis , Hellenistic Lasaia (Crete): a dependent polis of Gortyn. New epigraphic evidence from the Asklepieion near Lasaia	55
Εύα Γραμματικάκη - Νίκος Λίτινας , Μαγικός κατάδεσμος	61
Nikos Metenidis , Zu den Denarbildern des CN. PLANCIUS	71
Manolis I. Stefanakis , Kydon the oikist or Zeus Cretagenes Kynotraphes? The problem of interpreting Cretan coin types	79
Ioannis Touratsoglou , The price of power: Drachms in the name of Alexander in Greece (On the occasion of the Thessaly/1993 confiscation)	91
Σελήγη Ψωμά , Σκάψα και Κίθας. Η νομισματική μαρτυρία	119
David Jordan , Ψήγματα κριτικής	127
Nikos Litinas , A private letter of the VI A.D.	133

Περιλήψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti

Anagnostis Angelarakis, Aspects of demography and palaeopathology among the hellenistic Abderetes in Thrace, Greece, EYΛIMENH 1 (2000), 13-24

Η εργασία αυτή παρουσιάζει αποτελέσματα φυσικής ανθρωπολογικής έρευνας οστεολογικού υλικού των αρχαίων Αβδήρων, χρονολογούμενο στην Ελληνιστική εποχή.

Η καλή διατήρηση ενός σκελετικού δείγματος 48 ατόμων, αποτελούμενο από τα δύο γένη και από διαφορετικές ηλικίες, έδωσε τη δυνατότητα να πραγματοποιηθούν λεπτομερείς εργαστηριακές αναλύσεις σκελετικής βιολογίας, παλαιοπαθολογίας, και αρχαιομετρίας.

Τα επιστημονικά δεδομένα αυτής της έρευνας διαφωτίζουν πολλές πλευρές του δημογραφικού τομέα, του παλαιοπαθολογικού συνόλου, και των ιδιομορφιών των σκελετο-μυικών αναγλύφων μεταξύ ανδρών και γυναικών αυτής της εποχής στα Αβδηρα, δίνοντας έτσι την δυνατότητα να πραγματοποιηθούν ακριβέστερες διαχρονικές συγκρίσεις μεταξύ των πληθυσμών αυτού του χώρου από την Αρχαϊκή έως και τη Μεταβυζαντινή περίοδο.

Antonio Corso, Praxitelian Dionysi, EYΛIMENH 1 (2000), 25-53

Si percorre l'evoluzione dell'interpretazione statuaria di Dioniso nel Santuario di Dioniso Eleutereo ad Atene, dallo xoanon arcaico del dio alla statua criselefantina di Alcamene, ai tipi Hope, alcamenico, e Sardanapalo, cefisodoteo. Questa tradizione figurativa, e l'Ermite con Dioniso di Cefisodoto il Vecchio, stanno alla base della ridefinizione del dio operata da Prassitele. L'immagine di Dioniso accreditata nelle 'Baccanti' di Euripide ebbe pure un rilevante impatto nella cultura figurativa tardoclassica. Alla bottega di Prassitele è riconducibile la base di monumento coregico, con Dioniso e due Vittorie, che si trova ad Atene, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, n. 1463. Il Dioniso di Prassitele ricordato da Plinio e descritto da Callistrato può esser riconosciuto, grazie alla descrizione di questi, nel tipo Sambon/Grimani. Il Dioniso d'Elide, pure di Prassitele, è raffigurato su monete di questa città e riconoscibile nel tipo Tauromorfo Vaticano/Albani. L'Ermite con Dioniso di Olimpia è forse un donario degli Elei del 343 A. C. ed è quasi certamente un'opera originale di Prassitele. Ai figli di Prassitele è ascrivibile il Dioniso Woburn Abbey/Castle Howard, rimeditazione del tipo Sambon/Grimani. Il tipo Richelieu/Prado pare dipendere da una variante protoellenistica del tipo Woburn Abbey/Castle Howard, il tipo Jacobsen sembra essere un adattamento dello stesso alla temperie barocca, il tipo Terme pare costituire una rimeditazione del medesimo in chiave Rococò. Il tipo Cirene offre una soluzione tardorepubblicana dello stesso schema compositivo, rispondente all'esigenza eclettica di valorizzare le soluzioni ritenute migliori di Prassitele, Policleteo e Lisippo. Il tipo Borghese/Colonna sembra un adattamento del ritmo Woburn Abbey alla predilezione neoattica per ritmi frontali. Il

tipo Horti Lamiani/Holkham Hall pare un adattamento del tipo Woburn Abbey alla posizione di quinta architettonica destra di un ambiente. Il tipo Copenhagen/Valentini risponde al bisogno, tipico del classicismo romano, di dare movimento e vita alla creazione statuaria. Altri due Dionisi, che si trovano a Digione e a Cirene, sono variazioni del tipo Jacobsen. La documentazione raccolta dimostra che l'immagine del dio elaborata nella corrente prassitelica divenne quella consueta nella cultura iconografica di età ellenistica e imperiale.

Angelos Chaniotis, Hellenistic Lasaia (Crete): a dependent polis of Gortyn. New epigraphic evidence from the Asklepieion near Lasaia, EYAIMENH 1 (2000), 55-60

Ziegelstempel, die 1987 im Tal von Agia Kyriake bei Lasaia (Kalo Limenes) gefunden wurden, nennen Zenas, Sohn des Apellonios. Dieser Mann war verantwortlich oder trug die Kosten für den Bau oder die Restaurierung eines dem Asklepios geweihten Bauwerkes (SEG XLII 804, spätes 2. Jh. v. Chr.). Er kann mit dem gortynischen Magistraten Zenas, Sohn des Apellonios, identifiziert werden, der in einer Inschrift aus dem Pythion von Gortyn genannt wird (I.Cret. IV 251, late 2nd cent. B.C.). Unabhängig davon, ob Zenas als gortynischer Beamter oder als Privatperson im Asklepieion bei Lasaia tätig war, deutet seine Tätigkeit darauf hin, daß dieses Heiligtum, genau wie das Asklepieion von Lebene, im Besitz der Gortynier war. Der neuer Fund unterstützt die Annahme, daß spätestens im späten 2. Jh. v. Chr. Lasaia eine abhängige Gemeinde von Gortyn war.

Εύα Γραμματικάκη - Νίκος Λίτινας, Μαγικός κατάδεσμος, EYAIMENH 1 (2000), 61-69

Edition of a separation curse, inscribed in a soft stone (steatite). It was found in a robbed cist grave at the site of the Venizelion Hospital (Knossos, North Cemetery). By the remaining evidence the grave can be dated from the last quarter of the first century B.C. to the third quarter of the first century A.D. Over this tomb and another cist grave, a large monument was erected. Evidence for cult of the dead in the monument, unique in this cemetery, may be connected with the curse.

This is the first inscribed separation curse in a steatite and the first separation curse found in Crete. The *defixiones* were thrown in graves of untimely persons or in chthonic sanctuaries. Precious or semi-precious gemstones were not used as *defixiones*, because of their cost and scarcity. However, steatite can be considered as a cheap and easy to find stone and in our case probably its colour effected its certain use. Someone is asking from one or more deities to separate a man and a woman, Preimogenes and Daphne. The inscription can be dated in the end of the first century A.D.-beginning of the second century A.D. because of the characteristic forms of the letters of that period, the names mentioned (esp. Preimogenes) and the dating of the grave in the Roman period. Translation of the text: «(Magic letters). Separate Preimogenes, whom Artemeis bore, from Daphne, whom Daphne bore».

Nikos Metenidis, Zu den Denarbildern des CN. PLANCIUS, EYAIMENH 1 (2000), 71-77

Plancius' coin portrays on the obverse a female head wearing *causia* (the Macedonian hat). This attribute has been quickly recognized and its Macedonian connection would have been registered by any average Roman. The goat on the reverse is a species familiar to Crete. It is often represented on Cretan coins like the bow and arrow, which are also similar to Cretan forms.

Cn. Plancius selected types for his coins which illustrate events connected with his military and political career. He first served in Crete under the proconsul Q. Metellus 68-66 B.C., then in 62 B.C. as military tribune in the army of C. Antonius, in which province he was quaestor under the proprætor L. Appuleius.

Before entering his curule aedile office was accused of electoral corruption, but being defended by Cicero was acquitted. The summation of his own military service on his coin types anticipates the answer to the question that was raised by the prosecution at his trial. «You ask» said Cicero, «what military service has he seen? He was a soldier in Crete...and he was a military tribune in Macedonia».

This complementary summation of the two different types can also be moved into the mythological sphere of the Onomastic: Karanos for the Deductio-Heros of the Macedonians which is also the name for the wild goat called Karano by the Cretans.

Manolis I. Stefanakis, Kydon the oikist or Zeus Cretagenes Kynotraphes? The problem of interpreting Cretan coin types, EYAIMENH 1 (2000), 79-90

Η ερμηνεία των νομισματικών παραστάσεων είναι πολλές φορές δύσκολη και το φαινόμενο είναι ιδιαίτερα αισθητό στα κρητικά νομίσματα. Ανάμεσα στις άφθονες αφηγηματικές και μη παραστάσεις της κρητικής νομισματικής εικονογραφίας, για παράδειγμα, ιδιαίτερο ενδιαφέρον παρουσιάζει το βρέφος που θηλάζεται από μια σκύλα στους ασημένιους στατήρες, δραχμές, τετρώβολα και τετράδραχμα της Κυδωνίας. Η παράσταση έχει πιθανότατα επηρεαστεί από ρωμαϊκά πρότυπα και ως εκ τούτου δεν θεωρείται πρωιμότερη των αρχών του δευτέρου αι. π.Χ. Οι δύο σημαντικές ερμηνείες που έχουν προταθεί για το θηλαζόμενο βρέφος, ως Κύδων ο οικιστής ή ως Δίας κυνοτραφής, υποστηρίζονται από σωρεία επιχειρημάτων. Ανάλογη είναι η περίπτωση των ασημένιων στατήρων της Γόρτυνας του δευτέρου μισού του τετάρτου και του πρώτου μισού του τρίτου αι. π.Χ. όπου μια γυναικεία μορφή εικονίζεται καθισμένη στα κλαδιά ενός δέντρου σε διάφορες στιγμές. Η μορφή έχει ερμηνευτεί, μεταξύ άλλων, ως Βριτόμαρτυς και ως Ευρώπη.

Το πρόβλημα της ερμηνείας των παραπάνω παραστάσεων και εν γένει πολλών ακόμα αφηγηματικών σκηνών και μορφών στα κρητικά νομίσματα οφείλεται αφενός στην πληθώρα των μυθολογικών παραλλαγών που ξεπηδούν στα κλασσικά και ελληνιστικά χρόνια, ποιητική και γενικότερα καλλιτεχνική αδειά, και αφετέρου στην έλλειψη επιχωρίων πηγών για την κρητική μυθολογία. Οι υπάρχουσες πηγές βασίζονται σε εκδοχές των μύθων της κυρίως Ελλάδος οδηγώντας συχνά σε παρερμηνείες της Κρητικής νομισματικής εικονογραφίας. Ταυτόχρονα οι ελλαδίτικες επιρροές στην κρητική τέχνη, ή η από ελλαδίτικο χέρι εκτέλεση των νομισματικών σφραγίδων, περιπλέκουν ακόμα περισσότερο την κατάσταση καθώς η ιδιαιτερότητα της κρητικής

παράδοσης «μολύνεται» με ξένα στοιχεία, τα οποία απομακρύνουν ακόμα περισσότερο από την σωστή ερμηνεία των νομισματικών τύπων.

Ioannis Touratsoglou, The price of power: Drachms in the name of Alexander in Greece (On the occasion of the Thessaly/1993 confiscation), *EYΛΙΜΕΝΗ* 1 (2000), 91-118

Ο «θησαυρός» που κατεσχέθη από τις διωκτικές αρχές της Αττικής το 1993 και απαρτίζεται από τετράδραχμα Φιλίππου Β' (1 τεμ.), Αλεξάνδρου Γ' (3 τεμ.), Λυσιμάχου (1 τεμ.) και Αθηνών (2 τεμ.), δραχμές Αλεξάνδρου Γ' (37 τεμ.), Φιλίππου Γ' (6 τεμ.), Λυσιμάχου (2 τεμ.), Λαρίσης (3 τεμ.) και Φαρσάλου (1 τεμ.), ημίδραχμα Φαρσάλου (2 τεμ.), Οπουντίων Λοκρών (3 τεμ.) και Σικυώνος (1 τεμ.) καθώς και διώβολα Λαρίσης (1 τεμ.), αντιπαραβαλλόμενος προς άλλα «ευρήματα» της εποχής, επιβεβαιώνει ορισμένες παρατηρήσεις που είχαν διατυπωθεί κατά το παρελθόν σχετικά με την κυκλοφορία των νομισμάτων των μικρών, περιφερειακών νομισματοκοπειών στον αιώνα που ακολούθησε το θάνατο του Αλεξάνδρου και αποδεικνύει για ακόμη μια φορά τον τοπικό χαρακτήρα όχι μόνον των περισσότερων από αυτά, αλλά και άλλων με μεγαλύτερη παραγωγή. Επιπλέον, η μελέτη του νέου «θησαυρού» από το θεσσαλικό, όπως εικάζεται, χώρο, πιστοποιεί τη δύναμη, αλλά και το εμβόλιμο, ορισμένων, βασιλικών στην πλειονότητά τους νομισματοκοπιών (χωρίς να λησμονηθεί και η Αθήνα) με πανελλήνια εμβέλεια της παραγωγής τους.

Αφορμή και για μια γενικότερη επισκόπηση των νομισματικών πραγμάτων στην Ελλάδα κατά τους χρόνους των Διαδόχων και των αρχών που τα διείπαν, ο «θησαυρός» από τη Θεσσαλία, συμβάλλει στην κατάδειξη, κατά τρόπο παραστατικό, και του πρωταγωνιστικού ρόλου (ιδιαίτερα αυτού) των αλεξάνδρειων δραχμών ως κατεξοχήν μέσου άσκησης μιας δια πυρός και σιδήρου πολιτικής επικράτησης και επιβολής, κατά τον αιώνα των μισθοφόρων και των τυχοδιωκτών, των ριψοκίνδυνων ανταπαιτητών της εξουσίας —εστεμμένων και μη καπήλων του αλεξάνδρειου οράματος— και των ταλαιπωρημένων βετεράνων της ασιατικής εκστρατείας.

Σελήνη Ψωμά, Σκάψα και Κίθας. Η νομισματική μαρτυρία, *EYΛΙΜΕΝΗ* 1 (2000), 119-126

Dans le présent article, l'auteur a essayé de montrer que la cité de Skapsa est celle qui frappa des monnaies d'argent (tétroboles et tritértartémoria) au V^e siècle avec la légende ΚΑ- et de monnaies de bronze au IV^e siècle portant la légende ΣΚΑΨΑΪ(ΩΝ). Etant donné que les lettres σκ- peuvent alterner avec la lettre κ en grec ancien, les cités de Kapsa et de Skapsa, comme celles de Kithas et de Skithai, sont identiques. Les types avec lesquels le monnayage d'argent et de bronze de la cité de Skapsa est frappé, reproduisent ceux des autres cités de la région. La cité de Skapsa peut être localisée en Chalcidique occidentale, au sud de Potidée. Il est certain qu'elle participa à la Ligue Chalcidienne à partir de 357 av. J.-C. Il faut localiser la cité de Kithas dans la région à l'ouest d'Olynthe et au nord de Sinos et de Potidée. Il s'agissait très probablement d'une cité de la Crousie. Le didrachme de Berlin et les tétroboles de poids attique à la tête de lion au droit que Gaebler et Flensted-Jensen ont attribués aux Skithai, ont été frappés par la cité de Scionè.

David Jordan, Ψήγματα κριτικής, EYLIMENH 1 (2000), 127-131

Critical Trifles

1. α. At *PGM* XXXV 26 read τῷ φοροῦντι τὸ χαριτήσιν (for χαριτήσιον) τοῦ <το>.
- β. In the left-hand column of 31-40 read ³¹πά<ν>τα τὰ π'ν'εύ/³²ματα τῆς κοσμή/³³σεος <καί?> εὐκρα/³⁴σίας· ἐπικαλοῦ/³⁵μαι καὶ παρακαλῶ/³⁶καὶ ἐξορκίζω/³⁷ὑμᾶς, ἵνα μου ὑ/³⁸πακούσητε κ(αὶ) ἀπαραβάτους χά/³⁹[ριν δῶτ]ε τῷ φοροῦτι τὸ/⁴⁰[χ]αριτήσιν μου τοῦτο.
2. At *PGM* O 1.4 and 1.10 read not λαλήσεν (for λαλήσειν) but λαλήσε{ν} (for λαλήσαι {ν}).
3. Behind a puzzling phrase in *DTAud* 155-70 (Rome, IV-V A.D.) there probably stood the words: ὑμεῖς δέ, ἐφυδριάδες νύμφαι, αἰδώναι, ἔγχωροι κατοικοῦσαι

Nikos Litinas, A private letter of the VI A.D., EYLIMENH 1 (2000), 133-140

Ο πάπυρος είναι τμήμα μιας ιδιωτικής επιστολής, που χρονολογείται στον έκτο αι. μ.Χ. Το κείμενο μας παρέχει μία ακόμη μαρτυρία για τη λέξη μετριότης (βλ. στ. 2 σημ.) και για τις *formulae valetudinis* τον έκτο αι. μ.Χ. (βλ. στ. 2 σημ.). Πρβλ. επίσης τη λέξη στιχαροκαράκ[άλλιον στον στ. 5, η οποία μαρτυρείται για δεύτερη φορά έως σήμερα στους ελληνικούς παπύρους (βλ. στ. 4 σημ.).

Μετάφραση κειμένου

† Τις επιστολές σου κάθε τόσο, τις οποίες η μετριότητά μου [... λαμβάνει ...
 Όσον αφορά την υγεία μου, είμαι καλά με τη βοήθεια του Θεού. Μην [... Θα ήθελα να γνωρίζεις γι' αυτό που μου έστειλες] ότι το έλαβα και το στιχαροκαράκ[άλλιον [...
] πως αυτή τη στιγμή και [δεν] έχω ακόμη το δακτυλίδι [...
 [στείλε] μου [αμέσως;] ό,τι σου έγραψα [...
 † Απολλώ[...

Appendix

Τρόπος αναφοράς ενός αποστολέα στην προσωπική του υγεία και την ενημέρωση του παραλήπτη (ότι είναι δηλαδή καλά) στις ιδιωτικές επιστολές.

Μεταξύ δύο προσώπων (Α και Β) που αλληλογραφούσαν διακρίνουμε τους εξής λογότυπους:

Κατά την πτολεμαϊκή περίοδο ο αποστολέας απλά και μόνο πληροφορεί τον αποδέκτη.

A: Λογότυπος κλεισίματος επιστολής: γράφε δ' ἡμῖν περὶ ὧν ἂν βούλη

B: Λογότυπος ανοίγματος επιστολής: εἰ ἔρρωσαι καὶ τᾶλλα σοι κατὰ γνώμην ἐστίν, εἴη ἂν ὥς ἡμεῖς θέλομεν· ὑγίαινον δὲ καὶ αὐτός

Λογότυπος κλεισίματος επιστολής: γράφε δ' ἡμῖν περὶ ὧν ἂν βούλη

Κατά τη ρωμαϊκή περίοδο κυρίως μέχρι τον δεύτερο αι. μ.Χ., αλλά και σπανιότερα κατά τον τρίτο αι. μ.Χ. απαντάται στους παπύρους μία φρασεολογία παρόμοια με αυτή της πτολεμαϊκής περιόδου, αλλά η χρήση της δεν είναι εκτεταμένη.

A: Λογότυπος κλεισίματος επιστολής: γράφε περί τῆς υγείας σου

B: Λογότυπος ανοίγματος επιστολής: Συνήθως δεν υπάρχει άμεση απάντηση: σπάνια απαντά η φράση του τύπου: πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν μετὰ τῶν σῶν πάντων κάγώ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὑγιαίνω

Λογότυπος κλεισίματος επιστολής: γράφε περί τῆς υγείας σου

Από τα τέλη του τρίτου αι. μ.Χ. έως και τον πέμπτο αι. μ.Χ. ο αποστολέας δεν αναφέρει τίποτα απολύτως για την προσωπική του υγεία. Από το τέλος του πέμπτου αι. μ.Χ. και εξής η πρακτική αλλάζει. Η ευχή του αποστολέα να πληροφορηθεί για την υγεία του παραλήπτη επανεμφανίζεται στις ιδιωτικές επιστολές στο τέλος τους.

A: Λογότυπος κλεισίματος επιστολής: δηλώσέ μοι περί τῆς σῆς υγείας

B: Λογότυπος ανοίγματος επιστολής: ὑγιαίνω cὺν Θεῷ

Λογότυπος κλεισίματος επιστολής: δηλώσέ μοι περί τῆς σῆς υγείας

A: Λογότυπος ανοίγματος επιστολής: ἔδεξάμην τὰ περί τῆς σῆς υγείας

PRAXITELEAN DIONYSI¹

The aims of this study are to outline the series of dedications of sculptures representing Dionysus in the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus at Athens, to show how Praxiteles, who was linked very closely to the cultic and theatrical life of that sanctuary, developed his own interpretation of this god from the formal and stylistic teaching constituted by those sculptures, to try to individualize the representations of Dionysus carved in his workshop and finally to follow the developments and variations of Praxitelean Dionysi created in the Praxitelean legacy during Hellenistic and Roman times.

I. Statuary antecedents.

A. The most influential statues set up in the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus at Athens before Praxiteles.

1. The xoanon of Dionysus from Eleutherae.

The wooden image of Dionysus brought from Eleutherae to the Athenian sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus, probably at the time of the Pisistratids' rule in Athens, according to the scholiast to Aristophanes, *Ach.*, 243 a, is mentioned by Pausanias (1, 20, 3; 29, 2 and 38, 8), who informs also that this statue was set up usually in the archaic temple of the god in this sanctuary, that was brought in procession to the temple of Dionysus in the Academy, located along the road between Eleutherae and Athens, a ceremony which probably re-evoked the original journey of the statue to Athens, and that a copy had been set up in the temple of this god at Eleutherae.²

This statue is represented probably on two types of coins of Athens, minted respectively in 134 and in 98 BC³: Dionysus is represented bearded, standing, turning toward the left, with a long chiton, holding a thyrsus in a vertical position in his left arm, whilst his right arm is set forward and holds an object which is unclear in the first of these two types of coins and is clearly a cantharus in the second of them.

The iconography of Dionysus and in particular his characterization with the thyrsus and the cantharus must have qualified this god as Eleuthereus. Not by chance, Dionysus bearded in long chiton, with thyrsus and/or cantharus, is represented often in late-archaic and early-classical Attic imagery, especially in vase-painting.⁴

¹ A previous version of this article has been delivered as a lecture in the Institute of Classical Studies, London, in 22 October 1997. This research has been conducted thanks to grants of the Hellenic Foundation and the Leventis Foundation.

² See H. A. Shapiro, *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens* (Mainz am Rhein 1989), 84-100.

³ See C. Gasparri and A. Veneri, «Dionysos», *LIMC* (3, 1986), 429-431, nos. 62-63 and 85-86 (with previous bibliography).

⁴ The earliest evidence is collected by Shapiro (n. 2). These features appear also in images of Dionysus collected by Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 414-514, nos. 6-9; 21; 23; 43; 49-55; 149-151; 161-163; 180-182; 253-263; 281-314; 325-333; 348-353; 362-369; 382-401; 404-428; 435-456; 463-465; 467-470; 472;

2. The chryselephantine statue of Dionysus by Alcamenes.

Alcamenes made a chryselephantine statue of this god for the same sanctuary, probably sometime in the 20s' or 10s' of the V c. BC, destined to be set up in the most recent temple of the god, which is dated variously between 410 and 340 BC (Pausanias, 1, 20, 3).⁵ The statue is represented probably on a coin type of Athens, minted in 90 BC⁶: Dionysus is represented bearded with a long robe, seated on a throne and holding thyrsus and cantharus. The Lemnian artist, *aemulus* of Pheidias (Pliny, 34, 49), was inspired clearly by the Zeus of Olympia. The general idea of this creation may be suggested by the St. Petersburg Dionysus, because his configuration is the same as that of the image on the coins⁷ (fig. 1): this statuette shows the desire to reproduce as many peculiarities of the drapery as possible in a miniature representation and for this reason the richness of the drapery of the prototype is thus here probably emphasized. A more faithful derivation from that prototype is constituted probably for the head by a type of head of Dionysus in Vatican Museums, Galleria delle Carte Geografiche.⁸ This head is in fact very close to Alcamenes' Hermes Propylaeus, while the St. Petersburg statuette may be related, in the features of the drapery, and especially of its folds, to the Prochne with Itys and to the Aphrodite in the Gardens, as identified by Delivorrias.⁹

Alcamenes must thus have strengthened the identification of Dionysus Eleuthereus as a god with the attributes of the thyrsus and of the cantharus. Moreover, the interpretation of the god with a pathetic image and with a rendering of the surfaces (hair, face, beard and drapery) through play of light-and-shade, must have educated the Athenians to appreciate images of Dionysus in this style. The heritage of Alcamenes and in particular his chiaroscuro rendering were to be deepened by Praxiteles, according to a link already noted by Pausanias, 8, 9, 1.

3. The Hope Dionysus.

The Hope type of Dionysus must now be considered. The archetype of this series of sculptures was set up at Athens, as Dionysus with this iconography is represented on a coin type of this city minted before Sulla.¹⁰ Dionysus on that coin shows the slightly sinuous configuration, the relation of his body with the two attributes, a thyrsus, held in his left hand, and a cantharus, held in his right hand, and the clothes, short chiton and boots, which characterize the Hope type. The original statue would be dated perhaps around 420 BC, because a Dionysus with the same configuration as the Hope type is painted on an Attic oinochoe of those years,¹¹ nor can that prototype be earlier, because of the theatrical conception of its image, of its sinuous rhythm, of the light-and-shade

474-480; 494-507; 509-519; 552-583; 585-595; 598; 603-605; 609-621; 625-628; 640-649; 708-717; 756-776; 785-790; 803-833; 839; 845-849; 859-862; 869-871.

⁵ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 446, no. 214.

⁶ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 437, no. 133.

⁷ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 438, no. 136.

⁸ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 443, no. 184.

⁹ See A. Delivorrias, «Alcamenes», *EAA* (Suppl. 2, 1, 1994), 172-179, with previous bibliography.

¹⁰ See E. H. Bunbury, «On some unpublished Coins of Athens and one of Eleusis», *NumChron* (3, 1, 1881), 73-90.

¹¹ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 430, no. 80.

rendering of its surfaces and drapery and of the anatomy of its face, which cannot be earlier than the so-called rich style and the development by Alcamenes of a style revealing a theatrical inspiration.

That statue was probably set up in the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus, because the god of this type is represented on a relief from the area of the theatre dated around 390 BC¹² as well as on the Hadrianic relief re-used in the bema of Phaedrus in the theatre.¹³ Derivations are known, as are copies¹⁴ (fig. 2) and variations.¹⁵ The prototype must have remained at Athens during the Roman times, because it is represented in that city still in the Hadrianic age, on the bema relief and also because derivations come from other Greek cities.¹⁶ However, the Athenian workshops making copies or variations derived from this prototype must have worked pre-eminently for the Roman market, because most of the known examples come from that area.

The representation of Dionysus according to the Hope configuration in the context of his visit to Icarius on the relief of Phaedrus' bema, suggests that the god of the original statue was also shown as going to be received by this Attic hero, in travelling clothes, as the short chiton and the boots are: this journey was one of many made by Dionysus around the earth, in order to bring the gift of the vine to humans. It is not fortuitous that Dionysus is also represented young, with short chiton, himatium, pardalis, boots and thyrsus in his left hand in another Attic representation of his visit to Icarius, of early Hellenistic times.¹⁷ It is thus possible to suggest that the original statue of the Hope type, set up in the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus around 420 BC, was a votive offering related to a dramatic representation of that mythical episode: the visit to Icarius is in fact known in Attic imagery from the times of Pisistratus¹⁸ and is narrated by writers (Apollodorus, Hyginus and Athenaeus are the most important),¹⁹ who usually take evidence from theatrical writings. Moreover, that episode, since it is related to the introduction of the cult of Dionysus in Attica, is pertinent to the world of the theatre and we may think for these reasons that this myth was probably re-evoked in theatrical performances at Athens during the V c. BC.

¹² See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 494-495, no. 853. This relief has been also dated to later periods. See D. Bonanome, *Il rilievo da Mondragone nel Museo Nazionale di Napoli* (Naples 1995), 182-3.

¹³ See C. Gasparri, «Dionysos/Bacchus», *LIMC* (3, 1986), 559, no. 254.

¹⁴ Lists of copies and bibliography in Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 436-437, no. 128, and in G. B. Waywell, *The Lever and Hope Sculptures* (Berlin 1986), 72-73, no. 6. The torso in Vatican Museums, Mus. Greg. Prof., no. 4, 349 (Pigna's Garden) = Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 431, no. 83, and 437, no. 128 e, is thought usually to be derived from an Alcamenean prototype, identified sometimes with the chryselephantine statue of Alcamenes (Langlotz and Delivourias: see n. 9).

¹⁵ See Gasparri (n. 13), 543, no. 17; Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 434, no. 108.

¹⁶ From Corinth (Gasparri (n. 13), 543, no. 17) and from Argos (Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 437, no. 128 f).

¹⁷ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 495, no. 855.

¹⁸ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 490, nos. 803-805 (see also 495, nos. 856-858). In these images, Dionysus is represented bearded and wrapped in a himation, according to the oldest iconographical interpretation of the god in this visit.

¹⁹ See W. H. Roscher, «Ikarios», *Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie* (2, Leipzig 1890), 111-112.

The original of the Hope type may have been created perhaps in the stylistic current of Alcamenes: the slightly sinuous rhythm, the left arm resting on a vertical support set to one side, the forward position of the right forearm, the rendering of the drapery with effects of light-and-shade, the inclined head, the features given to the face and the stage-like character of the image, disclosed to the viewer with an ample breadth, relate this creation to the mature production of the Lemnian sculptor: the closest comparanda for general conception of the image, rhythm and style, are the Aphrodite in the Gardens, as identified by Delivorrias, the Procne and the Cherchel type Athena.²⁰ Moreover, the position of the two arms, one raised and the other brought down and forward recall the analogous positions of the arms of the Hope/Farnese type of Athena and, also if reversed, of the Velletri and Louvre/Naples («Frejus») types. The two corkscrew locks falling down on the shoulders are again very similar to the analogous ones of the Hope/Farnese Athena. The mantle falling down on a side and creating saw-like folds, is very close to the analogous feature of the Aphrodite in the Gardens (Smyrna/Gortys/Borghese type). It is thus possible that the style of the workshop of Alcamenes was frequented by patrons of sculptures dedicated in the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus, as his chryselephantine Dionysus indicates, and that the workshop charged with this important dedication felt obliged to make it according to the style of the Lemnian master.

The Hope type of Dionysus would thus be put at the beginning of the diffusion of the interpretation of this god as young and beardless, with his head crowned with ivy-leaves, with a sinuous body, with his left arm holding a thyrsus, with his right arm down with his forearm projecting slightly, in order to stretch out a cantharus, the surfaces interpreted through play of light-and-shade. This statue will be, as I shall show, the starting point of the re-definition of the god made by Praxiteles. The common opinion that the Hope type Dionysus should be dated around 370 BC and reflect the artistic environment of Cephisodotus the Elder²¹ seems contradicted, in my judgment, by the vase painting of around 420 and by the relief perhaps of around 390 mentioned above, in which Dionysus is represented already according to this iconography, as well as by the stylistic features indicated above.

Representations of the Olympians as young adolescent figures had been created already in the Attic world during the second half of V c. BC: see, e. g., the girlish Athena with Marsyas by Myron and the girlish Artemis represented by Strongylion for the Megarians. Dionysus is represented as a young beardless god from around 460 BC and this iconography became popular after its adoption in the Dionysus of the E pediment of the Parthenon and especially during the rich style, characterized by representations of deities and heroes as gentle beings.²² Moreover, the chiasmus shown by the configuration of this Dionysus suggests he be placed still under the influence of the Polyclitan *quadratio* and before its modifications by the followers of the Argive master.

²⁰ See n. 9.

²¹ See e. g., L. Todisco, *Scultura greca del IV secolo* (Milan 1993), 248, no. 100.

²² Artemis of Strongylion: see P. Moreno, «Strongylion», *EAA* (7, 1966), 518-519. V c. BC representations of Dionysus as young and beardless: see Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 434-495, nos. 111; 115; 138; 141; 157; 189; 193; 198-199; 315-318; 334-335; 343; 371-372; 493; 543-544; 560; 629-630; 660; 719-720; 738; 801; 834-838; 841 and 863.

Finally, the copy which preserves more the classical style of the prototype, the Vatican torso (see n. 14), seems still close to the Parthenon's heritage and particularly to the spirit of the frieze and of the E pediment, as well as to the Alcamenean works mentioned above, as has been stressed especially by Langlotz and Delivorrias (n. 14).

4. The Sardanapallus type of Dionysus.

Another statue which was probably also in the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus as a votive offering can be attributed to the workshop of Cephisodotus the Elder: the original of the «Sardanapallus» type of Dionysus (fig. 3). The god is represented standing, old and bearded, with a fat body, wrapped in a long chiton with thin folds and by a heavy himation wound on the left arm brought to his left hip, while the right arm was brought forward and holding an attribute, probably a cantharus, as I shall argue below. The metallic rendering of the surfaces, appreciable particularly in the folds of the drapery, suggests that the original statue was made in bronze. As the best copy, still of I c. BC, comes from the area near the theatre of Dionysus,²³ and as the oldest variation of this type is constituted by the Dionysus in relief on the triangular base of a choregic monument found near the Street of the Tripods, which can be attributed to the workshop of Praxiteles,²⁴ it is logical to suppose that the original statue was set up also in the area of this sanctuary or nearby. It is possible that the statue was moved to Rome, perhaps at the time of Sulla, and substituted by the copy found in that area, which seems in fact to be dated to I c. BC, since copies of Roman Imperial times seem to depend from an original placed in Rome.²⁵ The fact that Dionysus in the earliest variation known, from the street of the Tripods, holds a cantharus in his right hand suggests that the original statue was also characterized by that attribute.

The re-use of that type on a Praxitelean relief, its close relation with the iconographical schemes of the Mantinean Muses,²⁶ of the Uffizi type of Kore²⁷ and of the Arretium type of Athena,²⁸ and especially the close analogy of this creation with the Eirene of Cephisodotus the Elder in the scheme of the figures, in the rendering of the drapery, still enveloping the body, in the anatomy of face and in the hair, suggest an attribution of this Dionysus to Cephisodotus the Elder. The same Mantinean Muses may perhaps have been conceived in my judgment by Cephisodotus the Elder for his group of Muses on Mt. Helicon²⁹ and only re-made for the Praxitelean relief of the base of the Apollinean triad at Mantinea,³⁰ because of the relation between drapery and body, which

²³ On this type, see Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 431-432, no. 89; Gasparri (n. 13), 545, no. 37; Todisco (n. 21), 444, no. 296; and W. R. Megow, «Sardanapallos», *LIMC* (8, 1997), 1075-1077; P. Zanker, *Ein Kunst für die Sinne* (Berlin 1998), 17-22.

²⁴ It is the base Athens, National Museum, no. 1463: see Todisco (n. 21), 435, no. 288. Its attribution to the workshop of Praxiteles is based on *IG*, II², 3089 (see my book *Prassitele* (1, Rome 1988), 25-27, no. 13).

²⁵ See Gasparri and Veneri, cited in n. 23.

²⁶ See Todisco (n. 21), 436-437, no. 289.

²⁷ See Todisco (n. 21), 433-434, nos. 286-287.

²⁸ See my article «Prassitele», *EAA* (Suppl. 2, 1, 1996), 460-462.

²⁹ See Pausanias, 9, 30, 1.

³⁰ See Pausanias, 8, 9, 1. The original pertinence of the Mantinean slabs to the base of the Praxitelean Apollinean triad has been demonstrated with conclusive argumentations by W. Amelung, *Die Basis des Praxiteles aus Mantinea* (München 1895). One type from Mantinean Muses, the so-called «Urania», adopted

is basically the same as that of the Cephisodotan Eirene. Moreover, both the Eirene and the Sardanapallus seem to express the same pious and conservative Athens, characterized by belief in gods conceived as wise beings, taking care of the city protected by them and in a religious and devote city, destined to be for this reason also prosperous. However, the specific reason motivating the creation of the Sardanapallus is of course unknown.

B. The Cephisodotan Hermes carrying Dionysus.

I have to consider also a bronze group, which was one of the main creations of Cephisodotus the Elder, according to Pliny, 34, 87: the bronze group of Hermes holding the baby Dionysus on his left arm, identified with the group known through the copies of Madrid, Prado Museum, of Rome, from the Palatine, in the Roman National Museum, and of Athens, in the Agora Museum, which can be dated to 380-370 BC, whose rhythm seems close to the Cephisodotan Eirene³¹ (fig. 4) and which is also reproduced on Roman coins of Pautalia and Anchialus, echoing probably copies from this prototype.³² It would be stressed that this mythical episode was popular in Spartan imagery from late archaic times, as it had been represented by Bathykles of Magnesia on the throne of Amyclae,³³ that the workshop of Praxiteles was characterized by an oligarchical orientation,³⁴ that relations of patronage between Sparta and this workshop are known otherwise,³⁵ that the group Prado/Palatine/ Athens represents Hermes on a hermaic pillar, which was adopted often in order to mark borders of agorai³⁶ and that Cephisodotus must have been particularly renowned for statues set up in agorai, as can be deduced from the Eirene carrying Plutus in the Athenian agora.

All these observations support in my judgment the identification of Cephisodotus' Hermes carrying the baby Dionysus with the *Hermes Agoraios Dionyson pheron paida* seen by Pausanias, 3, 11, 11, in the agora of Sparta.³⁷

The baby Dionysus can be appreciated partially thanks to the fragment belonging to a copy of this group from the Palatine, in which the child is almost completely

also for the representation of Kore, appears already on Panathenaic Amphoras dated to the 350s' or 340s' BC: see N. Eschbach, *Statuen auf Panathenäischen Preisamphoren des 4. Jhs. v. Chr.* (Mainz am Rhein 1986), 71-80, nos. 47-48 and pls. 20-21 and M. Bentz, *Panathenäische Preisamphoren* (Basel 1998), 174-175.

³¹ See G. Siebert, «Hermes», *LIMC* (5, 1990), 321, no. 393, and Todisco (n. 21), 240, nos. 90-91.

³² See G. E. Rizzo, *Prassitele* (Milan 1932), 7-10 and pl. iv, figs. nos. 3-4.

³³ See Siebert (n. 31), 319-320, no. 375.

³⁴ See H. Lauter, «Zur Wirtschaftlichen Position der Praxiteles-Familie im spätklassischen Athen», *AA* (1980), 525-532; H. P. Müller, «Praxiteles und Kephisodot der Jüngere, zwei Griechische Bildhauer aus hohen Gesellschaftsschichten?», *Klio* (70, 1988), 346-377.

³⁵ See Choricus, *Declamationes*, 8.

³⁶ See H. Wrede, *Die antike Herme* (Mainz am Rhein 1986), 8-12 and 63-67 and J. M. Camp, *The Athenian Agora* (London 1992), 74-77.

³⁷ It is possible that representations of Hermes holding the baby Dionysus on Spartan coins of III c. AD (see F. W. Imhoof-Blumer, P. Gardner and A. N. Oikonomides, *Ancient Coins illustrating lost Masterpieces of Greek Art* (Chicago 1964)), 55 and pl. N, nos. V-VII) are derived from the Cephisodotan group, as the relationship between Hermes and Dionysus is the same and as the staff held by the mature god in his right arm may be a bunch of grapes, which would be in keeping with Pliny's description of Cephisodotan group. However, the representations on the coins are not faithful miniature copies of a statuary group, as the running rhythm of the Hermes and his chlamys brought behind, very far from his body, are not plausible for a group of sculpture and should be thus considered rather free interpretations of the same iconography.

preserved³⁸ and moreover to the most faithful fragmentary copy from the Athenian agora, in which the lower part of Dionysus is preserved.

He seems close, as to regard iconography, rhythm and style, to the Plutus of Cephisodotus as well as the antecedent of the baby Dionysus carried by the Hermes of Olympia.

The chlamys thrown over the Hermaic pillar is also the clear antecedent of the chlamys on the three-trunk of the Hermes of Olympia.

The hermaic pillar seems an imitation of the Hermes Propylaeus of Alcamenes,³⁹ which emphasizes the continuity from Alcamenes to the late-classical Praxitelean workshop, expressed also by Pausanias, 8, 9, 1.

That group shows the research by Cephisodotus to give ample breadths to his sculptures. Moreover, the probable representation of the bunch of grapes held by Hermes in his hands, as may be argued by the numismatic evidence (see n. 37), by the definition of this group by Pliny, 34, 87, as *Mercurius Liberum patrem in infantia nutriens*, as well as by the later representation of the same episode by Praxiteles, suggests to the viewer that this episode happens outside the city in the countryside, in keeping with the legend that Hermes had brought the baby Dionysus to the Nymphs of Nysa through remote lands, in order to save him from the vengeance of Hera.⁴⁰

The hermaic pillar, on the contrary, would probably allude to the actual setting of the statue, perhaps, as I have suggested, in the agora of Sparta.

In any case, the «Spartan» and oligarchical meaning of this group must have been clear, since this episode was represented at Sparta on a monument as famous as the throne of Amyclae (see n. 33), and must consequentially have involved the adoption of this iconography by Peloponnesian oligarchic states: in fact the oligarchs of the Arcadian city of Pheneus represented Hermes carrying the baby Arcas with the same iconography on their coins in 362-330 BC⁴¹ and the oligarchs of Elis, where Dionysus was worshipped more than any other deity, after the restoration of their rule, due to the help of the Arcadians, whose most important god was Hermes, in 343 BC, dedicated probably an allusive group of Hermes carrying Dionysus made by Praxiteles, an up-dated re-creation of Cephisodotus' work, in the most conservative and traditional temple of Olympia, the temple of Hera.⁴²

II. Literary antecedents:

Dionysus represented by Euripides in the «Bacchae».

The conception and the iconographic definitions of Dionysus in late-classical Athens cannot be understood without focusing on the very influential image of this god defined by Euripides in the «Bacchae», presented in Athens for the first time around 406 BC.⁴³

³⁸ The best photo can be found in Rizzo (n. 32), pl. XIII, fig. no. 2.

³⁹ See Delivorrias (n. 9), with previous bibliography.

⁴⁰ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 417 and 478-488, nos. 664-695.

⁴¹ See Siebert (n. 31), 320, no. 389.

⁴² See my article «The Hermes of Praxiteles», *NumAntCl* (25, 1996), 131-153.

⁴³ On the last tragedy of Euripides, see H. Gregoire, J. Meunier and J. Irigoien, *Euripide, 6, Les Bacchantes* (Paris 1993), with previous bibliography.

The god in this tragedy is represented as spreading desire of love through his eyes (vv. 236 and 459). His hair is curly, full of locks (vv. 455-456 and 493-494) and he carries a wreath of ivy-leaves as do his followers (vv. 81; 106; 177; 253; 313; 324; 341-342; 363; 376; 384; 531-532; 702-703; 1054-1055). He is smiling (v. 439). The colour of his facial skin is reddish (vv. 236 and especially 438), showing his passionate temperament and his wine-drinking habit. He wears a nebris (vv. 136-137) and holds a thyrsus (vv. 495-496). The gaze of the god is a central feature of the Euripidean Dionysus: he is «wine-flushed, Love's witching graces in his eyes» (v. 236) and characterized by «Bacchic frenzy» and «ecstasy» (vv. 298-299).⁴⁴ The god is moreover represented as drinking wine often (vv. 279-285; 378-385; 421-423; 651; 707; 771-774), associated thus with vases, like the cantharus, devoted to this function. He is depicted, in a long passage of the tragedy, in the grove of Cithaeron, in the context of the Dionysian revels celebrated by the Maenads on the mountain (vv. 1043-1052).

Another salient feature of the Euripidean Dionysus is his association with the bull. It characterizes the god already in Aeschylus.⁴⁵ Euripides defines him «a god bull-horned» (v. 100), thus giving emphasis to his wild and animalist nature and this is in keeping with the habit of addressing this god at Argos and Elis as «Dionysus bull».⁴⁶

The image given by Euripides to Dionysus, with emphasis on the expression of a sentiment felt in his soul and on his gaze, and related iconographic features are destined to condition his later imagery and particularly the re-definition put forward by Praxiteles.

III. Dionysi by Praxiteles.

From his early days Praxiteles' work is closely linked with performances in the theatre of Dionysus Eleuthereus.

His Pouring Satyr, a work of his youth, was set up in the Street of the Tripods and was the central statue in a choregic naiskos, according to Pausanias, 1, 20, 1-2 (see also Athenaeus, 13, 591 b). It is possible that his group of Methe (*Ebrietas*) with the Periboetos (Very famous) Satyr, included by Pliny, 36, 69 among his bronze works, also belonged to a choregic monument. The Satyr defined «Very famous» would be thus identified with the most frequent Satyr in the copyist production, i. e. the Resting Satyr, whose Praxitelean style has been stressed by generations of scholars.⁴⁷ The iconography of Dionysus who receives his drinking cup from one of his servants was defined and elucidated by our sculptor throughout his long activity.

He portrayed the figure of the servant, leaving the completion of this figure with the representation of Dionysus to the imagination of the viewer, with his Pouring Satyr. The association of this iconography to the representation of the master served by this figure is made apparent in late/classical reliefs, in which the Pouring Satyr is represented from the back, having in front his master, usually reclining, and ready to drink.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Transl. Loeb.

⁴⁵ See Gregoire, Meunier and Irigoin (n. 43), 26-28.

⁴⁶ See V. Mitsopoulos-Leon, «Zur Verehrung der Dionysos in Elis», *AM* (99, 1984), 275-290, and Gregoire, Meunier and Irigoin (n. 43), 30-32.

⁴⁷ See P. Gercke, *Satyrn des Praxiteles* (Hamburg 1968); Todisco (n. 21), 65-79 and 249-250, nos. 101-102, and 283-284, nos. 135-136; and my article «Prassiteles» (n. 28), 456-462.

⁴⁸ See J. -M. Dentzer, *Le motif du banquet couché* (Rome 1982), 325-326; A. Ajootian, «Praxiteles», *Yale Classical Studies* (30, 1996), 110-113 (this latter article should be used with great care).

A. The base of a choregic monument, Athens, National Museum, no. 1463.

As Praxiteles was one of the 300 or so wealthy Athenians who were charged with *leitourgiai*,⁴⁹ he also commissioned at least one choregic monument. We know from an inscription written on the base of a choregic monument found in the theatre of Dionysus Eleuthereus (*IG*, II², 3089), that Praxiteles set up a monument supporting two tripods (and thus related to two choregic victories), and bearing the representation of the god Dionysus, as Bromius, and of Nike. As the victories were two, as well as the tripods, it is probable that two Nikai were represented. The monument can therefore be recognized in the base from the Street of the Tripods, now Athens, National Museum, no. 1463⁵⁰ (fig. 5, a, b and c), of which a Roman copy is preserved,⁵¹ which demonstrates the success of the original, as well as a high appreciation of its master.

The figures are represented, one on each of the three sides of the base. Dionysus is represented according to the Sardanapallus type, created probably by the father of Praxiteles, in a three-quarter position, holding a thyrsus in his left hand and stretching out a cantharus in his right. On the other two sides, two Nikai are carved. One is holding an oinochoe and is about to pour wine into the cantharus of the god, to whom she turns, while the other holds a phiale. The iconography of both Nikai is derived from figures of girls of the Parthenon frieze.⁵²

Rhythm, style, the quiet attitude of the figures, details of drapery and especially the folds falling down from the right arm of the three figures can be compared individually with the Eirene holding Plutus, the Sardanapallus, the Mantinean Muses, the Arretium type of Athena, the Uffizi type of Kore, i. e. Cephisodotan formal presentation and its continuity in the Praxitelean workshop. However, the consistence of the bodies under the draperies is also apparent and reveals a new approach.

For these reasons, I think that this monument should be placed in the mature youth of Praxiteles, when he was still very indebted to the Cephisodotan heritage, yet having initiated a more personal approach to art (around the 360s').

As there is a considerable gap between the conception of the three figures, which reveals a very talented sculptor, and their actual manufacture, which is not so good, I think that this relief was conceived by Praxiteles, but physically produced by assistants in his workshop.

B. The Sambon/Grimani type of Dionysus.

The neo-sophist Callistratus, in his ekphrastic book *De statuis*, described, in ekphrasis no. 8, a bronze Dionysus by Praxiteles. This long description is reported here in the Loeb translation:

«1. Daedalus, if one is to place credence in the Cretan marvel, had the power to construct statues endowed with motion and to compel gold to feel human sensations, but in truth the hands of Praxiteles wrought works of art that were altogether alive.

⁴⁹ See n. 34.

⁵⁰ See n. 24.

⁵¹ See E. Berger, «Dreiseitiges Relief mit *Dionysos* und *Niken*», *AK* (26, 1983), 114-116 and P. Zanker (ed.), *Dionysos*, (München 1997), 69-70.

⁵² See E. Berger and M. Gisler-Huwiler (ed.), *Der Parthenon in Basel. Documentation zum Fries* (Mainz am Rhein 1996), pls. 130 and 139 (= east side of the frieze, slabs 3, fig. 11, and 7, fig. 60).

2. There was a grove, and in it stood Dionysus in the form of a young man, so delicate that the bronze was transformed into flesh, with a body so supple and relaxed that it seemed to consist of some different material instead of bronze: for though it was really bronze, it nevertheless blushed, and though it had no part in life, it sought to show the appearance of life and would yield to the very finger-tip if you touched it, for though it was really compact bronze, it was so softened into flesh by art that it shrank from the contact of the hand.

3. It had the bloom of youth, it was full of daintiness, it melted with desire, as indeed Euripides represented him when he fashioned his image in the «Bacchae». A wreath of ivy encircled the head - since the bronze was in truth ivy, bent as it was into sprays and holding up the curly locks which fell in profusion from his forehead. And it was full of laughter, nay, it wholly passed the bounds of wonder in that the material gave out evidence of joy and the bronze feigned to represent the emotions.

4. A fawn-skin clothed the statue, not such as Dionysus was accustomed to wear, but the bronze was transformed to imitate the pelt; and he stood resting his left hand on a thyrsus, and the thyrsus deceived the beholder's vision; for while it was wrought of bronze it seemed to glisten with the greenness of young growth, as though it were actually transformed into the plant itself.

5. The eye was gleaming with fire, in appearance the eye of a man in a frenzy; for the bronze exhibited the Bacchic madness and seemed to be divinely inspired, just as, I think, Praxiteles had the power to infuse into the statue also the Bacchic ecstasy».

Callistratus wrote his «Descriptions» probably in Athens during the so-called Pagan Renaissance, around 340-370 AD. He was probably a rhetor and wrote his book for his Athenian pupils,⁵³ probably not only in order to give them examples of good rhetorical style, but also to defend pagan images from the Christian opinion that they had only material value, stressing on the contrary that they dwelt within the souls of gods represented through their magical epiphany.⁵⁴

As Callistratus seems not to specify the location of any statue which was set up in Athens (see n. 53), Praxiteles' Dionysus probably stood there. The likelihood that the other two Praxitelean statues described by Callistratus in his *ekphraseis* (nos 3 and 11) were also set up, the first probably, the second certainly, in the city, strengthens that possibility.

The theatrical theme illustrated by Praxiteles with this statue according to Callistratus (see par. 3), i.e. Dionysus in Euripides «Bacchae», leads to the possible conclusion that the *alsos* (grove) in which this Dionysus, according to Callistratus (see par. 2), was standing was the grove of the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus.

Praxiteles was very well used to the market for monuments relating to the theatrical life of this sanctuary (see the beginning of section III) and this bronze statue described by Callistratus could have been a choregic or votive dedication relating to a repeat performance of that Euripidean tragedy.⁵⁵ The close relationship of Praxiteles to Euripidean dramatic art can be argued also by his statue of Eros as Archer, which is a

⁵³ See my book *Prassitele* (2, Rome 1990), 97-100 and 190-192, n. 1527.

⁵⁴ See my article «Ideas of Ancient Greek Art in Christian Thought from Marcus Aurelius until Theodosius», *RdA* (20, 1996), 54-58.

⁵⁵ See my book *Prassitele* (2, n. 53), 106-118.

translation of the Euripidean representation of the god of Love as an adolescent archer into statuary terms.⁵⁶

The Callistratan Dionysus was also adolescent, his surfaces were reddish and soft, probably thanks to an alloy of copper and lead, according to an information given by Pliny, 34, 98. The god was «gleaming with fire», which leads to the conclusion that the expression of feelings was emphasized in this creation, especially perhaps through his face and eyes. This Dionysus is thus in keeping with the internalized conceptions of statuary figures typical of Praxiteles *agalmatopoia*. Callistratus' affirmation that this image of Dionysus corresponded to the one represented by Euripides in his «Bacchae» is confirmed by an analytical comparison between the relevant passages of the tragic poet and of the neosophist rhetor (see n. 55): the Praxitelean statue was the statuary translation of the Euripidean Dionysus also in details, such as the hair arranged in locks, the ivy-leaf wreath, the hair drooping on the forehead, the smiling mouth, the nebris around the torso, the thyrsus, on which the left arm of the god is resting, the flushed gaze, expressing the frenzied feeling of the god.

The expression of internalized feelings, S-shaped configuration of figures associated to supports (in this case, the thyrsus), tender and soft renderings are well-known features of Praxitelean art. Another repeated feature of Praxitelean statues is the adoption of vegetal elements as vertical supports on which one arm of the figure is resting, as in the cases of the Resting Satyr, of the Apollo Sauroctonus, of the Hermes of Olympia and of this Dionysus with thyrsus. This support thus alludes to the supposed ambience of the statue, i.e. the grove on remote Mt. Cithaeron where Euripides displayed Dionysus in all his compelling psychological power.

The Callistratan bronze Dionysus by Praxiteles may be the same bronze Dionysus by this sculptor mentioned by Pliny, 34, 69, as both these writers seem to depend on the art criticism of the Hellenistic age and likely derive most their information from Xenocrates' list of Praxitelean bronze works, as can be argued from their adoption of patterns of art criticism usually considered «Xenocratean» (see n. 55).

The Praxitelean bronze Dionysus described by Callistratus has been recognized as the original statue of the Sambon/Grimani type of Dionysus.⁵⁷ The Sambon bronze statuette (fig. 6), probably an early copy still of middle hellenistic times, is said to come from the Acropolis of Athens. The configuration of the god is entirely in keeping with the Dionysus described by Callistratus. The body is S-shaped: its incurving is similar to that of the Farnese-Steinhäuser Eros and of the Pouring Satyr. Its ponderation is similar to that of Cephisodotus' Eirene and of works of the youth of Praxiteles as the Pouring Satyr, the Farnese-Steinhäuser Eros, the Arles Aphrodite, the Centocelle Eros, the Dionysus and the Nike with oinochoe of the base of tripods analysed above, the Dresden Artemis and of the Pourtales Pseliumene: in all these statues in fact, the right knee is bent forward and

⁵⁶ See my book *Prassitele* (2, n. 53), 100-106.

⁵⁷ See L. A. Milani, «Dionysos di Prassitele», *Museo Italiano di Antichità Classiche* (3, 1890), 751-790; C. Anti, *Il Regio Museo Archeologico nel Palazzo Reale di Venezia* (Rome 1930), 58-59, no. 27; D. Mustilli, *Il Museo Mussolini* (Rome 1939), 187, no. 107; G. Traversari, *Sculture del V-IV secolo a. C. del Museo Archeologico di Venezia* (Venice 1973), 88, no. 35; E. Pochmarski, *Das Bild des Dionysos in der Rundplastik der klassischen Zeit Griechenlands* (Wien 1974), 101-103; I. Manfrini-Aragno, *Bacchus dans les bronzes hellénistiques et romains. Les artisans et leur répertoire* (Lausanne 1987), 58-62, figs. 24-43; my book *Prassitele* (2, n. 53), 115-118; Todisco (n. 21), 68-69 and 252, pl. no. 104; and my article *Prassitele* (n. 28), 458.

the tip of toes rests on the ground, while the left leg is straight and the whole sole rests on the ground. The left arm is brought up to hold the thyrsus, while the right one is held down, with the forearm brought forward, to stretch out the cantharus. The position is similar, but reversed, to that of the Pouring Satyr.

The body is naked, except for the nebris, whose folds are similar to those of the drapery of the Arles Aphrodite. The anatomy is similar to that of the Farnese-Steinhäuser Eros, of the Pouring Satyr, and of the Centocelle Eros, with rendering of bones and musculature as well as of flesh and of skin. The emphasis given to the right chest muscles and to its low border line can also be found, if reversed and thus on the left side, in the Farnese-Steinhäuser Eros and in the Pouring Satyr. The rendering of musculature is made more by transitions than by bordering among different parts of the body.

The nebris is rough and its surface rendering is similar to that of the Resting Satyr.

His head, slightly turned to the right and down, is addressed not toward the cantharus, which is placed more sideways, but toward a person whom we must image to be shorter than the god and who is going to pour wine into his vase. The subject is thus represented in the middle of an action, that is notoriously typical of Praxiteles. The proportions of head and of other parts of body are those usually adopted by Praxiteles (see n. 57). The hair is made of spiraliform locks and seems similar, from this peculiar point of view, to that of the Centocelle Eros.

Dionysus is beardless and conceived as an adolescent.

The Sambon Dionysus also bears an ivy-leaf wreath, and its configuration and relation with the locks of the hair, are entirely in keeping with the Callistratan description of this part of the statue. That arrangement of the hair, held up by attributes, is typical also of the Cephisodotan Eirene, of the Pouring Satyr, of the Arles Aphrodite, of the Cnidia, of the Apollo Sauroctonus, of the Pourtales Pseliumene, of the Artemis of Gabii and of the Leconfield Aphrodite. The face is oval and lengthened, as in all the Praxitelean sculptural images of which the heads are known. The lengthened nose and the oblong eyes sockets are also typical Praxitelean creations. The sinuous cheeks, with the rendering of the zygomatic dimples, and the half-open mouth can be compared with analogous features of the Cnidian Aphrodite, of the Resting Satyr, of the Vatican Tauriform Dionysus (on which, see *infra*) and of the «Eubuleus».

The triangular and slightly arched forehead, the protruding chin and the proportions of the different parts of the head are also Praxitelean.

The statue prototype of the Sambon Dionysus was certainly in bronze, as is shown by the «metallic» borders of parts of the body (see especially the inguinal furrows, the upper and lower borders of the nebris, the line dividing neck and head, the eyebrow arches and the nose).

As the Sambon bronze probably comes from the Athenian Acropolis, its bronze archetype must have been set up in the area of the Acropolis, probably in the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus, as it is the most important sanctuary of this god in Athens. The Sambon statuette was thus perhaps a small dedication in this sanctuary, i.e. a miniature copy of a famous statue of the master of that site.

The Grimani Dionysus, a Parian marble statue of I c. AD of which only the upper part is preserved, is derived from the same archetype of the Sambon Dionysus, and it also probably comes from Athens: that statue, being of life size, suggests probably the dimensions of the Praxitelean original, around 1,60 m. high. This copy shows effects of

light and shade. Finally, several variations, large size sculptures and bronze statuettes, are known and show the success of this creation throughout the imperial period (see n. 57).

This statuary creation is noteworthy because it suggests an ambience which is larger than that expressed in visual terms (the god is supposed, according to Euripides, in the groves of Mt. Cithaeron, where Maenads are carousing and one of them is about to pour wine into his cantharus), moreover because the subject is presented in the middle of a dramatic action, finally because it can be attributed to the moment in the youth of Praxiteles, when his work often related to the performances of the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus. Finally, the effects of light and shade which can be appreciated particularly in the Grimani copy, speak of the ripening by this artist of a light and shade conception of the surfaces, which was going to be investigated further in his later works.

It is thus not surprising that this creation was famous in literary tradition as well as influential in later re-creations of the figure of this god.

C. The Tauriform type of Dionysus.

Pausanias, 6, 26, 1-2, in his description of Elis, writes that «Between the market-place and the Menius is an old theatre and a sanctuary of Dionysus. The image is the work of Praxiteles. Of the gods the Eleans worship Dionysus with the greatest reverence, and they assert that the god attends the festivals which they name Thyia. The place where they hold the festival they name the Thyia is about eight stades from the city. Three pots are brought into the building by the priests and set down empty in the presence of the citizens and of any strangers who may chance to be in the country. The doors of the building are sealed by the priests themselves and by any others who may be so inclined. On the morrow they are allowed to examine the seals, and on going into the building they find the pots filled with wine. I did not myself arrive at the time of the festival, but the most respected Elean citizens, and with them strangers also, swore that what I have said is the truth. The Andrians too assert that every other year at their feast of Dionysus wine flows of its own accord from the sanctuary».⁵⁸

It is possible to argue from Pausanias that the sanctuary of Dionysus at Elis was the most important of this town. The statue of Dionysus by Praxiteles, mentioned by Pausanias as *to agalma*, «the statue», of the god, was thus perhaps the cult statue of that *hieron*. The Eleans decided to charge Praxiteles with this statue probably because the master was already famous for previous statues of Dionysus as well as of creatures of his retinue. It is likely that this statue was made by Praxiteles when he was no longer young, but in his full maturity, and when his fame was not confined to Athens, but wide-spread in the western Peloponnese and when the name of Praxiteles became in all the Greek world a guarantee of excellent quality. The desire of the Eleans to have a statue of Praxiteles can be explained also by the political relations of this city with Athens between 362 and 343.⁵⁹ As Pausanias, in his description of Elis, specifies the material of monuments only when it is not marble or stone⁶⁰ and uses *agalma* usually of marble statues,⁶¹ it is likely that this Praxiteles' *agalma* was a marble one. We know from Plutarch

⁵⁸ Transl. Loeb (with a few changes).

⁵⁹ See D. Rice, *The Greek State of Elis in Hellenistic Times* (Ann Arbor 1983), 1-24.

⁶⁰ See Pausanias, 6, 24, 6; 25, 2 and 4-5; 26, 2.

⁶¹ See my book *Praxiteles* (1, n. 24), 226-227, n. 926.

that the worship of Dionysus at Elis was presided over by 16 priestesses, holy women who were provided the branches and fillets.⁶² Moreover, this writer reports that «the women of the Eleans, when they sing hymns to Dionysus, call upon him to come to them ‘with the foot of a bull’. The hymn runs as follows: ‘Come, o hero Dionysus/ to thy Elean holy/ temple, with the Graces/ to thy temple/ with thy bull’s foot hasting. Thus they chant twice the refrain ‘O worthy bull’» and «address the god as ‘kine-born’ or as ‘bull’ (...) or (...) ‘ox-foot’». ⁶³ Finally, Plutarch reports also that «many of the Greeks make statues (*agalmata*) of Dionysus in the form of a bull, and the women of Elis invoke him, praying that the god may come with the hoof of a bull; and the epithet applied to Dionysus among the Argives is ‘Son of the Bull’», concluding that Dionysus is the god of fruitful nature, thus also of trees.⁶⁴ Bull-horns or, more generically, a bull body, characterize Dionysus according to Sophocles, Stesimbrotus, Euripides, Lucian, Philostratus and Athenaeus. According to the last two writers, figures of the god had been created in keeping with this interpretation.⁶⁵

It is thus possible to conclude that Praxiteles’ statue of Dionysus at Elis must have retained at least some bull features, in particular the feet, mentioned in the Elean hymn reported by Plutarch, and the horns, as this latter feature was the solution adopted in tragic poetry in order to characterize this god as tauriform. In fact, the great Athenian tragedians, and especially the very influential Euripides, may have promoted the adoption of a Dionysus with bull-horns in sanctuaries of this god associated with theatres, as was the one at Elis.

Some coins of Elis minted under Hadrian represent Dionysus (fig. 7) in a posture that is typical of Praxiteles’ oeuvre. Moreover, the fact that other contemporary Elean coins bear miniature representations of statues suggests we also have here the reproduction of a statuary original. Dionysus is represented frontally and has a S-shaped body. The features of the god are rather effeminate. His mantle, fastened at his neck, falls behind his naked body and around his lower limbs in full folds. His left elbow rests on a prop over which also hangs his upper garment. Beside him is on one side a panther, on the other his thyrsus and tympanum. In his left hand is a cap, in his right he lifts aloft a rhyton. He is clearly pouring wine from the rhyton into the cup. The action which had been previously conceived by Praxiteles as carried by two mythical persons and illustrated in some of his previous creations, i.e. the Pouring Satyr, the Sambon/Grimani Dionysus and the scene of Dionysus stretching out his cup to Nike who will pour wine into it, on the base from the Street of the Tripods considered above, is now summarized in the single figure of Dionysus, who is himself pouring wine into his cup.⁶⁶ The representation of Dionysus as a youth, the enlargement of the figure on the sides, the S-shaped rhythm of the figure, the theme of the pouring figure, the pattern of the figure resting on a vertical side support and the use of the mantle to create a stage-like backcloth would

⁶² See Plutarch, *Mulierum virtutes*, 15, 251 e.

⁶³ See Plutarch, *Quaestiones Graecae*, 36, 299 a-b (Loeb translation): see bibliography in n. 46.

⁶⁴ See Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 35, 364 e - 365 a (Loeb translation).

⁶⁵ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 414 and 440-441 and here *supra*, n. 46.

⁶⁶ See R. Weil, «Der Dionysos des Praxiteles in Elis», *ZeitschrNum* (13, 1885), 384-388; Imhoof-Blumer, Gardner and Oikonomides (n. 37), 73-74; L. Lacroix, *Les représentations des statues sur les monnaies grecques* (Liège 1949), 305-306, and my book *Prassitele* (1, n. 24), 162-163.

suggest the name of Praxiteles even without Pausanias noting that he was the sculptor of the Dionysus at Elis.

The wrapping of Dionysus' feet in the mantle can be explained perhaps with the religious need to cover the bull's feet of the god. In fact, as the god was going to the temple with bull's-feet, a clear symbol of strength in movement, as we know through the Elean hymn reported by Plutarch, the hiding of the feet of his cultic statue must have given the Eleans the guarantee that the god would never leave his temple.⁶⁷

Dionysus was thus surprised by the spectator in his remote mythical world, represented through the panther, the tympanum and the thyrsus, while he was attending to a normal action, not caring of human witnesses, according to a theatrical conception of the statuary creation that is typically Praxitelean.⁶⁸

The use of the drapery of the god as a backcloth would have stressed of course such a connotation of this Dionysus.

The head of the god is represented in profile, rather poorly preserved, together with the whole figure, on the two surviving Elean coins and one horn seems to me to appear on its top. The absence of the second horn is explained by the profile representation of the head. The hair seems rather short. The face seems young and beardless. It should be stressed that profile heads in coins are, when they derive from a carved figure, usually conventional representations of heads which were in fact in a three-quarter position.⁶⁹ It is thus possible that the heads of the Vatican/Albani type of Tauriform Dionysus are the copyist tradition derived from this masterpiece⁷⁰ (fig. 8). If copies had been taken, during Roman Imperial times, from statues set up at Olympia,⁷¹ near Elis, copying an important statue standing in the latter city must also have been possible. The fact that the surviving copies of this type were discovered in the surroundings of Rome does not contradict this possibility, as in many cases copyist workshops based in Athens or elsewhere in Greece and deriving their works from prototypes remaining in Greece, were working often for patrons based in or near Rome: see, e.g., the case of the Erechtheum «Caryatids», staying of course in Athens, but whose Roman Imperial copies have been found especially in the area of Rome.⁷²

⁶⁷ Similar attempts to prevent the god/goddess from escaping his/her sanctuary are: 1) the case of the Nike on the *pyrgos* of the Acropolis of Athens, who, having flown to her sanctuary on that site, had been deprived of her wings, so that she could not fly away (Pausanias, 1, 2, 4; 3, 15, 7; and 5, 26, 6); 2) the case of the Enialius of Sparta, where the cultic statue of this god of victory had been chained, so that the god, after having come to Sparta, could no longer escape (Pausanias, 3, 15, 7); 3) the statue of Dionysus of Chius, also chained, for the same reason (S. Pindar, *Ol.*, 7, 95). Evidence on other similar cases in J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece*, 3 (London 1898), 336-338.

⁶⁸ I have tried to outline the development of the theatrical conception of statuary creations in the workshop of Praxiteles in my article «Praxiteles e la tradizione mironiana», *NumAntCl* (18, 1989), 85-117.

⁶⁹ See, e.g., the Cnidian coins with profile representation of Aphrodite's head, which is in fact represented in full-face. The same difference between positions of heads in statues and in coin representations of them characterize, e. g., the Sauroctonus Apollo, the Eirene holding Plutus, the Prado/Palatine/Athens type of Hermes holding Dionysus, etc.

⁷⁰ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 441, no. 158 a-e.

⁷¹ See P. Bol, *Der Antretende Diskobol* (Frankfurt am Main 1996).

⁷² See E. E. Schmidt, *Die Kopien der Erechtheionkoren* (Berlin 1973).

From a stylistical point of view, the type can be included in the Praxitelean production of around 350 BC.⁷³ This head is characterized by its position, turned down slightly, by a young and beardless face and by its bull features, first of all its horns, but also its short, wild and bristly hair, features which seem in keeping with the head of the Elean Dionysus on the coins analyzed above. The covert smile of the face suggests also a bestial sensuality. The shape of head and face and the anatomical features of eyes, eyebrows, forehead, cheeks, nose, mouth, chin and neck recall Praxiteles' Resting Satyr,⁷⁴ even if the rendering of surfaces of the Vatican/Albani Dionysus seems slightly smoother and gentler than those of the Resting Satyr, and thus a little later, in the direction of the «sfumato» rendering typical of Praxitelean creations of the 340s' and 330s', such as the Hermes of Olympia and the Leconfield Aphrodite.

This Praxitelean creation seems thus remarkable, as the master has been able to include the bestial features of the god in a creation suggesting a sense of grace. Moreover, it appears to be one moment of the Praxitelean re-definition of deities as adolescent, graceful and joyous.

D. The Hermes carrying Dionysus at Olympia.

Probably a little after the creation of the Elean Dionysus, in 343 BC, the Arcadians helped the Elean oligarchics to overthrow their democratic government and to install an oligarchic rule. It was perhaps in that occasion that the Eleans dedicated a group of Hermes carrying Dionysus in the temple of Hera at Olympia. The Lacedaemonian pedigree of this mythological theme, stressed above, was of course in keeping with its oligarchical message, as well as its dedication in the most ancient and traditional of the Olympian temples, the Heraeum. The episode of Hermes who helps the babe Dionysus to escape seems thus to constitute a transparent allusion to the help given by the Arcadians, patronized by Hermes, to Elis, patronized by Dionysus. That this group was entrusted to Praxiteles seems also understandable, given the oligarchical orientation of this workshop, the fact that the father of Praxiteles had already created a similar bronze group and the fame that Praxiteles must have enjoyed in Elis after his creation of the Elean Dionysus. The group preserved is probably the original work of art and not a copy⁷⁵ (fig. 9). For the representation of the baby Dionysus, the sculptor has re-used the previous representation by his father Cephisodotus, as well as his representation of the baby Plutus carried by Eirene, and perhaps also the representation of Arcas carried by Hermes which was symbolic of the Arcadian city of Pheneus at the time.⁷⁶

In this group, Hermes is shown resting a moment in a forest, symbolized by the tree-trunk, during his visit to the remote land of Nysa, which is the final destination of Dionysus. The predilection for environments which are far from the centres where the masses live, i.e. the cities, is typical of the oligarchic culture of Greece in classical age. Later representations illustrating probably the same mythical episode evoked by

⁷³ See Rizzo (n. 32), 37-38.

⁷⁴ See A. Stewart, *Art, Desire, and the Body in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge 1997), 199-202.

⁷⁵ See n. 42. For the philosophical and mythological background of Praxiteles' group, see N. Stampolidis, «Die Gruppe Athen National Museum Nr. 257 und die Platonischen Silene», *Archaiognosia* (3, 1982), 123-161.

⁷⁶ See n. 41.

Praxiteles suggest that Hermes was holding up a bunch of grapes with his right arm, toward which the baby Dionysus stretches out his arms and upper body, thus revealing his true nature. From a formal point of view, the Dionysus of Olympia is a conservative work, characterized by the rendering as a miniature adult, while Lysippus, probably in the same years, was creating the type of the «putto» as the best way to represent a child.⁷⁷ This formal conservatism would be in keeping with the supposed political message of this group. Another significant feature of this group, if the suggestion outlined above is correct, is the consideration of this god as the symbol of a state, in keeping with the representations mentioned above of Arkas, representing of course Arcadia, as a region or as a political league, and of Plutus, another personification of an abstract concept, showing the growing trend to represent figures of babies as personifications of abstract entities, a trend typical of late classical societies. The embodiment of the god who personifies inebriation in a child results from the fact that the child better represents the life of instincts than a mature and adult man.

The Praxitelean definitions of Dionysus, considered together, flow from the great success of the cult of Dionysus in late/classical societies. Praxiteles, given his strong ties with the theatrical life, considered representations of this god as a ductile figure, defined with play of light-and-shade, with important secondary attributes, with the adoption of elements alluding to the surroundings in which the god is shown, as the most appropriate way to symbolize the hedonistical, fabulous and instinctive message peculiar to this god, felt very deeply in societies where the hetaera was a basic figure and destined to be mirrored in the near future in new comedy.

IV. The remaking of Praxiteles' legacy made by his followers.

The legacy of Praxiteles outlined above had a strong impact on representations of Dionysus created by his followers.

The two sons of Praxiteles, Cephisodotus the Younger and Timarchus, seem to have also worked for patrons of monuments dedicated in sanctuaries of Dionysus.

They carved the sculptural decoration of the altar of Dionysus at Thebes, according to Pausanias, 9, 12, 4, probably at the time of the monumentalization of the city, which followed its reconstruction in 316-315 BC.⁷⁸

Moreover, their statue of Menander, dedicated in the area of the theatre of Dionysus Eleuthereus at Athens, perhaps soon after the death of the comic poet in 291 BC, when they were probably near the end of their career, shows that the link between patrons of monuments dedicated in this sanctuary and Praxiteles' workshop continued throughout the activity of his sons.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ See P. Moreno (ed.), *Lisippo* (Milan 1995), 111-129; 166-168; 251-255; 380-383 and 388-394. It is possible that the painter Pausias preceded Lysippus in his definition of the «putto» (see P. Moreno, *Pittura greca da Polignoto ad Apelle* (Milan 1987), 136-140) and that this type has been evolved in the Sikyonian school.

⁷⁸ See A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* (1, London 1981), 185-192.

⁷⁹ See K. Fittschen, «Zur Rekonstruktion Griechischer Dichterstatuen. 1. Teil: Die Statue des Menander», *AM* (106, 1991), 243-279; P. Moreno, *Scultura ellenistica* (1, Rome 1994), 173-177; M. G. Picozzi, «Menandro», *EAA* (Suppl. 2, 3, 1995), 595-596.

A. The Woburn Abbey/Castle Howard type of Dionysus, a work of the first generation of followers of Praxiteles.

The Woburn Abbey type of Dionysus is known through no less than ten copies. Six of them, found listed in the catalogues of Pochmarski⁸⁰ and Gasparri,⁸¹ consist of a complete statue in Woburn Abbey, probably from Rome⁸² (fig. 10), a statue at Basel, of unknown provenance and of which most of the legs are missing, and four torsos, in Malaga, of local provenance, from Perinthus, at Messene, from the E side of Asclepieum courtyard, near a theatre-like building, and in Paris, also of unknown provenance. A headless torso related to the same type was discovered in 1993 in the British excavations of the theatre of Sparta,⁸³ while the Castle Howard Dionysus seems to be related to this type, even if he wears a very tight nebris. Another copy has been discovered at Stylida, near Lamia (now in the Archaeological Museum of Lamia) and another unpublished torso of the Woburn type can be found in the Finlay Collection in the British School at Athens.⁸⁴ The latter torso should share the Athenian or Attic provenance which characterizes pieces of that collection. The prevalence of provenances of the surviving examples of this type from the Greek and Aegean world suggests that the original statue stood in Greece. The probable provenance of one of these copies from Athens makes it possible that the original statue was there. Moreover, a possible presence of the original statue at Athens might well explain the range of export of copies to Asia Minor (Perinthus), to Athens itself (Finlay copy), to the Peloponnese (Sparta and Messene copies), to Central Greece (copy at Lamia), to Rome (Woburn Abbey copy) and to Spain (Malaga copy). The exact ancient location of only two of those copies is known: the copy at Sparta was standing in the area of the ancient theatre and the copy of Messene was set up in the E side of the Asclepieum courtyard, near a theatre-like building. These two circumstances suggest that the original statue also stood in a theatrical area and was related perhaps to an episode of theatrical life. As the original statue was perhaps in Athens, the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus is thus a likely candidate for having housed it.

The description of this type will be based here on the best preserved copy and that of highest quality, in Woburn Abbey.

Dionysus is represented as a naked youth standing with his weight on his right leg. His body shows an S-curve. The god rests his left arm on a tree-trunk, upon which he has draped his nebris. A snake and a wine branch envelope the tree-trunk and the god holds in his left hand a bunch of grapes. He was probably holding in his right hand a

⁸⁰ See Pochmarski (n. 57), 94-101.

⁸¹ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 435, no. 120 a-f.

⁸² See E. Angelicoussis, *The Woburn Abbey Collection of Classical Antiquities* (Mainz am Rhein 1992), 50-51, no. 12.

⁸³ See G. B. Waywell and J. J. Wilkes, «Excavations at the Ancient Theatre of Sparta 1992-4», *BSA* (90, 1995), 457, no. 1, pl. 47 b-c.

⁸⁴ On Castle Howard Dionysus, see n. 85. The British School at Athens Dionysus is displayed in the Seminar's room of the Upper House of that Institution. On this collection, see G. B. Waywell, «Some Relief Sculptures in the Museum of the British School at Athens», *BSA* (65, 1970), 271-275. For the copy in the Museum of Lamia see M.F. Papakonstantinou, «Marble Statuette of Dionysus from Stylida», *AAA* (20, 1987), 133-139.

cantharus, as is suggested by the Castle Howard copy and by variations from this prototype.⁸⁵

His head is inclined to the right and slightly downwards. His gaze is lost and dreamy. His hair is crowned with a wreath of ivy-leaves. The hair is wavy and carried to the nape, where it is gathered into a loop, while two spiraliform locks fall onto the shoulders. A fillet passes under his hair on his forehead.

The general configuration of this Dionysus seems very similar to that of the Praxitelean Resting Satyr,⁸⁶ which is conceived according to the same rhythm, but reversed. The hair-style is very close to that of the Apollo Sauroctonus and of the Cnidian Aphrodite. The anatomy seems basically the same as in the Hermes of Olympia, i.e. of the late work of Praxiteles.

The motif of the bunch of grapes held by the god characterizes again both this Dionysus and the Hermes, who was holding this attribute probably in his right hand.

The motif of the garment draped on a tree-trunk where the elbow is resting is also a feature linking the Olympian Hermes and the Woburn Abbey Dionysus.

Moreover, the latter type seems a reversed variation of the Sambon/Grimani type of Dionysus, with its S-shaped configuration now much more marked. The two flanking elements, cantharus and tree-trunk, seem also a variation of the habit of associating Dionysus with a cantharus and a vertical vegetal support, usually a thyrsus, typical of statues dedicated in the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus at Athens and particularly of the Praxitelean Dionysus described by Callistratus.

The master of the Woburn Abbey Dionysus must have taken inspiration also from the Apollo Lyceus type, whose original was probably made in the workshop of Euphranor, between 336 and 326 and dedicated in the Lyceum of Athens,⁸⁷ as Stephan Schröder has especially pointed out,⁸⁸ given the similarity of sinuous configurations between the two bodies, of the oval shapes of the two heads as well as of anatomical features. As the Apollo Lyceus was certainly one of the most important creations of his age, having been set up in a place renowned for the activity of Aristotle's School, it is more probable that the master of the Woburn Abbey Dionysus imitated this very popular masterpiece than vice versa. The creation of the original statue of the Woburn Abbey type thus falls after the end of activity of Praxiteles, who seems to have been no longer active after 334 BC⁸⁹ and died probably around 326 BC,⁹⁰ in the Praxitelean current which continued to be strong even after the death of this master. The progression of

⁸⁵ See S. F. Schröder, *Römische Bacchusbilder in der Tradition des Apollo Lykeios* (Rome 1989), 49-60. The Castle Howard copy and the Copenhagen (Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, no. 2080), Eleusis and Cyrene (Museum, no. 14, 239) Dionysi, variations of the Woburn Abbey type, hold in fact a cantharus in their right hands.

⁸⁶ See E. Simon, «Silenoi», *LMC* (8, 1997), 1130, no. 213, with basic previous bibliography.

⁸⁷ Attribution of the Apollo Lyceus to Euphranor: G. Dontas, «Ein verkanntes Meisterwerk im Nationalmuseum von Athen, Der Marmorkopf Gamma 177 und Überlegungen zum Styl Euphranors», *Festschrift Himmelmann* (Mainz am Rhein 1989), 143-150. Political and historical context of this creation: see S. F. Schröder, «Der Apollo Lykeios und die Attische Ephebie des 4. Jhs.», *AM* (101, 1986), 164-184.

⁸⁸ See n. 84.

⁸⁹ The last works of Praxiteles are probably the Aphrodite for Alexandria in Caria and the Leto of Myra, which can be dated to 334 BC (see my book *Praxiteles* (3, Rome 1992), 7-18 and 158-167).

⁹⁰ See n. 34.

sfumato rendering of surfaces, which is emphasized continuously throughout the mature and late activity of Praxiteles and reaches its peak with works of the Praxitelean school of the end of IV century, such as the Aberdeen «Heracles» and the Chian Girl, can be the only good way to fix a chronology of this creation. The sfumato rendering of the Woburn Abbey Dionysus seems similar to that of the sculptural decoration of the altar of Asclepius at Cos, to be attributed to the workshop of the sons of Praxiteles, of the Capitoline type of Aphrodite, which constitutes probably the copyist tradition of Cephisodotus the Younger's Aphrodite⁹¹ and finally of the Larnaka Artemis, which is similar to our Dionysus also for ponderation and rhythm of her body.

The sfumato surfaces of our Dionysus and of these sculptures is so similar as to leave little doubt about the attribution of those works to the same workshop.⁹²

Given the relations of the two sons of Praxiteles with the sanctuaries of Dionysus of Athens and Thebes, it would be surprising if none of the famous types of Dionysus originated from them. The close relationship of our Dionysus with the Apollo Lyceus strengthens of course the possibility that the former was also dedicated at Athens. The Woburn Abbey Dionysus, as I shall show, was destined to be far more popular than the Praxitelean Sambon/Grimani Dionysus, since it was the origin of several variations. The greater success of an early/Hellenistic creation when compared to its late/classical antecedent, can be verified also in other cases: e.g., the Capitoline Aphrodite was copied much more than the Cnidian Aphrodite in late/Hellenistic and Roman times and the Sleeping Eros by Praxiteles was left in the shade in favour of later interpretations of this subject.⁹³ This phenomenon may perhaps be explained by the strong appeal of the so-called «new comedy society» of the age of Menander on the following generations, until late antiquity. With the Woburn Abbey Dionysus, the Sambon/Grimani Praxitelean creation had been up-dated in keeping with the so-called «saponification» of images, conceived now as dreamy epiphanies with vanishing outlines, typical of the Praxitelean current of first generation after the death of the great master.

B. The Richelieu/Prado type, an eclectic Praxitelean-baroque creation.

It is well known that the vogue of representing Alexander the Great with his head up-turned and with frenzied eyes addressed to the sky established a trend of figures with similar attitudes.⁹⁴ The special link relating Alexander's policy and imagery with

⁹¹ On the attribution of the sculptural decoration of the altar of Asclepius at Cos to the sons of Praxiteles, see my book *Prassitele* (2, n. 53), 181, n. 1402, with bibliography on the previous debate on that argument. On the identification of the Capitoline type of Aphrodite as the copyist tradition of the Aphrodite of the elder son of Praxiteles, see my article «L'Afrodite Capitolina e l'arte di Cefisodoto il Giovane», *NumAntCl* (21, 1992), 131-152, and E. Schmidt, «Venus», *LIMC* (8, 1997), 204-205, nos. 112-117. Pliny, 36, 24 attributes the *Venus in Pollionis Asini monumentis* to Cephisodotus the Younger and Ovid, *Ars amatoria*, 2, 613-614, after having described the area around those *monumenta* as devoted to appointments of lovers (he mentions the monument of the *Appiades*, which was one of those *monumenta*), mentions also that Aphrodite with the following words: *Ipsa Venus pubem, quotiens velamina ponit,/ protegitur laeva semireducta manu*, with clear reference to the Capitoline type.

⁹² On the Larnaka Artemis, see L. Kahil, «Artemis», *LIMC* (2, 1984), 654, no. 406.

⁹³ See M. Söldner, *Untersuchungen zu liegenden Erosen in der Hellenistischen und Römischen Kunst* (Frankfurt am Main 1986).

⁹⁴ See A. Stewart, *Faces of Power. Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics* (Berkeley 1993).

Dionysus' cults and Dionysiacal attitudes is also well known.⁹⁵ It is thus hardly surprising that a type of Dionysus was created with a similar head. This is the Richelieu/Prado type⁹⁶ (fig. 11 a), as Karl Schefold has pointed out.⁹⁷ The general configuration is not different from that of the Woburn Abbey Dionysus, even if the anatomy seems, in the Richelieu/Prado type, slightly more emphatic. However, the left arm of the god is resting on drapery, draped on a herm with a head of Hermes. The Roman copy of this type which seems the most faithful to a Greek original is in my judgement the Borghese one, at Varese, Villa Pogliaghi (fig. 11 b): in this copy, more than in the others, the drapery recalls that of the Hermes of Olympia, i.e. with late Praxitelean features. The herm seems derived from Alcamenes' Hermes Propylaeus and very similar to the herm on which the Cephisodotan Hermes carrying Dionysus was resting, as we can judge from the copy of that Hermes in Madrid. These observations show that the Richelieu/Prado type was conceived inside the Praxitelean tradition and that renowned works of early masters of the Praxitelean workshop were taken into consideration. Moreover, it is possible that the original statue of this type, just as the Cephisodotan Hermes carrying Dionysus, stood in an agora. The herm with the head of Hermes of the Richelieu/Prado type may also have alluded to the link relating Hermes to Dionysus constituted by the episode mentioned above of Hermes carrying the baby Dionysus to a safe place. This creation would thus refer to an oligarchic patron asking the sculptor to refer in some way to this typically Spartan iconography, as well as to a workshop known for having previously made representations of the episode.

However, the head speaks in favour of times later than those of Praxiteles. The best copy seems to be that in Chatsworth House. The head of the god is held slightly up and his eyes look up to the sky. The sentiment expressed through the gaze of the god is also different from that of the late/classical prototypes of that creation; the Dionysiac inebriated obsession is no longer represented moderately and gently, but at its peak and brought to an extreme. This feature seems a *contaminatio* with the tradition of the Maenad of Scopas,⁹⁸ to be put thus in the eclectic current characterized by features taken from the Praxitelean and the Scopadic styles and typical of Attic culture between the end of IV c. BC and the beginning of III BC,⁹⁹ and can be related to the new categorical imperative established by Alexander, based on the prevalence of impetuosity and vehement attitudes upon classical moderation. For this reason, I should put the Richelieu/Prado Dionysus somewhere midway between the portaiture of Alexander the Great and the Pergamene pathetic figures raising their eyes to the sky,¹⁰⁰ in the Praxitelean current when it was already eclectic and contaminated by other styles. *Rebus sic stantibus*, I am equally against both the attribution of this creation to Praxiteles, suggested notably by Rizzo¹⁰¹ and its

⁹⁵ See, e.g., A. Cohen, *The Alexander Mosaic. Stories of Victory and Defeat* (Cambridge 1997), 143-161.

⁹⁶ See Pochmarski (n. 57), 104-113 and Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 434-436 and 445, nos. 118, 122 and 201, with lists of copies and previous bibliography; Zanker (n. 23), 11-16.

⁹⁷ See K. Schefold, «Der Basler Dionysos», *ÖstJahr* (39, 1952), 97.

⁹⁸ On the Maenad of Scopas, see I. Krauskopf, E. Simon and B. Simon, «Mainades», *LIMC* (8, 1997), 784, no. 20.

⁹⁹ On this period of Attic sculpture, see A. Stewart, *Attika* (London 1979), 3-64 and 101-114, and Moreno (n. 79), 71-207.

¹⁰⁰ See Moreno (n. 79), 227-478.

¹⁰¹ See Rizzo (n. 32), 76-78.

consideration as neoclassical, suggested by Schefold¹⁰²: in fact, no formal features of this type seem later than the beginning of III c. BC and moreover Dionysus is represented according to this iconography already in a gem of III c. BC.¹⁰³

C. The Jacobsen type, a baroque re-creation.

Another variation of the Woburn Abbey type is constituted by the Jacobsen type, which is known through eight copies¹⁰⁴ (fig. 12). Ponderation, S-shaped configuration of the body, anatomy and the solution of the left forearm resting on a tree-trunk are basically the same of the Woburn Abbey type: however, a himation wrapped round the legs of the god, is brought up on his left arm and falls down on the tree-trunk, which is nearly completely hidden by the drapery. The general configuration of the himation and its presentation are very similar to that of the drapery wrapped round the Townley type of Aphrodite, which constitutes very probably the copyist tradition of the Praxitelean Aphrodite-Phryne at Delphi.¹⁰⁵ This *contaminatio* of a Praxitelean iconography of Dionysus with a scheme derived from another famous creation of the same master would most likely have been made in the Praxitelean tradition. However, as Aphrodite-Phryne of Delphi is one of the last works made by Praxiteles, this adoption of her drapery for another creation occurred thus probably after the end of Praxiteles' own career. The heads belonging to these copies, when they survive, differ greatly: the Jacobsen statue has a head in a three-quarter position and inclined downwards, while the copy in Athens has its head in a frontal position and the head of the Eleusis copy has a position in between the two mentioned. Even if the original position of the head cannot be surely ascertained, the three-quarter and inclined position seems more in keeping with the general Praxitelean style of this creation. In any case, the features of the face do not seem Praxitelean, as the forehead is squarish and the eyes are larger than in the statues of Praxiteles. Moreover, the gaze is addressed to a precise focus (probably, the cantharus held by the god in his right hand) and is not lost in the distance, as usual in late-Praxitelean creations. The tree-trunk is not set alongside the feet of the statue, as in the case of vertical supports put beside the Sauroctonus Apollo, the Cnidian Aphrodite, the Resting Satyr, the Hermes of Olympia, the Woburn Abbey Dionysus and also the Richelieu/Prado Dionysus, but is placed to the rear, a solution taken probably from the Apollo Lyceus, indeed one of the most influential and paradigmatic «creations» set up in Athens, which would put this Dionysus after the early 320s'. Moreover, the squarish forehead, the large eyes and the gaze looking hard at a particular object, can be compared with analogous solutions typical of Pergamene art of the late III c. BC. The wreath of ivy-leaves adorning the hair of this Dionysus is also remarkable for its vigorous plasticism and full relief, stylistic features which are notoriously typical of Asia Minor «baroque» sculpture.

¹⁰² See n. 97.

¹⁰³ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 434, no. 118.

¹⁰⁴ See Pochmarski (n. 57), 73-78; Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 434, no. 117, and 436, no. 126, and Todisco (n. 21), 77 and 269-270, nos. 131-132, with previous bibliography.

¹⁰⁵ See my article «The Monument of Phryne at Delphi», *NumAntCl* (26, 1997) 123-150.

The anatomy of this Dionysus is also more emphatic than that of the Woburn Abbey and Richelieu/Prado Dionysi, with a stronger rendering of the musculature.¹⁰⁶ The conclusion from these observations is that in my judgment the Jacobsen Dionysus is probably a baroque re-interpretation of a Praxitelean creation, of the late III c. BC. As most of the copies seem to come from the Greek world, the original probably stood in a Greek centre. The observation that two out of eight copies come from Attica, both from Eleusis, may suggest Eleusis or Athens as the original location.¹⁰⁷ I am against both the thesis that this creation is Praxitelean, derived from the Dionysus at Elis,¹⁰⁸ which is contradicted by the representation of this statue on Elean coins, and the idea that this creation is «an academic Roman work, in which 4th cent. elements, especially of the Praxitelean school, blend with Hellenistic motives»,¹⁰⁹ because, on the contrary, no features which can be dated after the middle Hellenism appear in this creation, which seems conceived in fact before the re-establishment of a taste for bi-dimensionally conceived sculptures, typical of the neo-Attic school;¹¹⁰ moreover, this type, although reversed, is already represented on a gem of the late III c. BC.¹¹¹

V. Copyist variations.

A. Variations of the Woburn Abbey type.

With the establishment of neo-Attic taste, the Praxitelean ideal of beauty and sculptures which were the most emblematic of it, characterized by surfaces defined by light and shade games, soft renderings, sfumato and S-shaped configurations, became very popular. It is hardly surprising that the Woburn Abbey type of Dionysus was so often copied and, even more often, a source of inspiration for variations. The so-called new comedy society of Athens in the age of Menander, and the poetry of Menander itself, are recalled with a growing nostalgia and the Dionysus most emblematic of Menander's Athenian theatrical life was probably that famous piece.

1. The Thermae type.

The Thermae type¹¹² (fig. 13) shows a re-interpretation of the Woburn Abbey type, with the substitution of the tree-trunk by a pillar on which the god has draped his nebris, a solution taken probably from the Richelieu/Prado type, and with his right hand brought to his head, a solution derived obviously from the famous Apollo Lyceus; the

¹⁰⁶ For comparisons with works of art of middle/Hellenistic baroque sculpture, see Moreno (n. 79), 209-319; 415-499; and 561-603.

¹⁰⁷ See Pochmarski (n. 104).

¹⁰⁸ See Todisco (n. 104).

¹⁰⁹ See F. Poulsen, *Catalogue of Ancient Sculpture in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek* (Copenhagen 1951), 122, no. 155.

¹¹⁰ See Moreno (n. 79), 533-763.

¹¹¹ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 434, no. 117.

¹¹² See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 436, no. 125; C. Augé and P. Linant de Bellefonds, «Dionysos (in peripheria orientali)», *LIMC* (3, 1986), 516-522, nos. 12-13; 24-27; 37; 85; 92 and 142; Gasparri (n. 13), 550, no. 119; 554, no. 186; 558, no. 242; S. Boucher, «Dionysos/Bacchus (in peripheria occidentali)», *LIMC* (4, 1988), 909, no. 7; 911, no. 49; 917-918, nos. 184 and 188; E. Pochmarski, *Dionysische Gruppen* (Wien 1990), 185-252 and 333-385.

position is unstable, determined by the crossing of the feet and by the position of his upper part forward and his hips backward, and there is an inebriated expression on his face. The two latter features effect the visual result of a Rococo *paignon*. I would thus explain this variation as an adaptation of that type to the Rococo taste. The conception of this creation still in a three-dimensional space and the fact that this type is used, associated with a Satyr or another figure to one side, from the end of the II c. BC¹¹³ suggest a date towards that period. The fact that the earliest example and most of the echoes of this variation come from Egypt¹¹⁴ suggests that the original was a successful statue of Dionysus in this region. This conclusion would be in keeping with the known prevalence of Rococo taste in Ptolemaic Egypt.

2. The Cyrene type.

The writer of the treatise attributed to Cicero *De ratione dicendi ad C. Herennium*, written between 86 and 83 BC,¹¹⁵ refers to the *statuas facere (...) ut (...) caput ostenderet Myronium, brachia Praxitelea, pectus Polycleitum* (4, 9), reporting thus a common belief of late-republican eclectic culture.¹¹⁶ The Woburn Abbey Dionysus was thus adapted to this new taste in the Cyrene type Dionysus¹¹⁷ (fig. 14). The arms and the tree-trunk keep their Praxitelean configuration, but the torso loses his S-shape and becomes a Polyclitan one, while the head seems an academic re-interpretation of Myronian heads, as are copies of the heads of the Zeus from Samus,¹¹⁸ of the Athenian Erechtheus¹¹⁹ and especially of the Perseus of the Master of Eleutherae.¹²⁰ Myrons' Amelung Athlete also shows a similar type of head, except for the hair, which is in the last case the hair typical of athletes, composed not of wavy locks, but of short curls.¹²¹

I think then that the Cyrene type of Dionysus is an adaptation of the Woburn Abbey type of Dionysus to the eclectic taste and precisely to the collage of features of different famous masters reported in the treatise *ad C. Herennium*.

3. The Borghese/Colonna type.

The trend of rhythmically open configurations leads to the establishment of a variation of the Woburn Abbey type, with the head of the god brought up and slightly

¹¹³ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 450, nos. 277-280, and Pochmarski (n. 112).

¹¹⁴ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 450, no. 277.

¹¹⁵ See G. Achard, *Rhétorique à Herennius* (Paris 1989), VI-XIII. I think that the attribution of this treatise to Cicero, reported by several late/antique and middle/age sources, is convincing.

¹¹⁶ This passage is reported here according to the edition of Achard (n. 115). On this passage as evidence of eclectic mentality, see F. Preissshofen and P. Zanker, «Reflex einer eklektischen Kunstanschauung beim Auctor ad Herennium», *DdA* (4, 1970), 100-119. See also N. Kaiser, «Schriftquellen zu Polyklet», *Polyklet* (Frankfurt am Main 1990), 48-78.

¹¹⁷ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 435, no. 119.

¹¹⁸ See E. Berger, «Zum Samischen Zeus des Myron in Rom», *RM* (76, 1969), pls. 30, no. 1; 34, no. 1; and 35, no. 4; see also M. Tiverios, «Zeus», *LIMC* (8, 1997), 330-331, no. 127.

¹¹⁹ See J. Dörig, «Myrons Erechtheus», *APL* (6, 1967), pls. 9-12; see also U. Kron, «Erechtheus», *LIMC* (4, 1988), 940, no. 69.

¹²⁰ See A. Furtwängler, *Meisterwerke der Griechischen Plastik* (Berlin 1893), 382-389; the re-consideration of this type by L. J. Roccas, «Perseus», *LIMC* (7, 1994), 334-335, nos. 26 and 45, and 346, should be used with great care.

¹²¹ See F. Rausa, *L'immagine del vincitore* (Treviso 1994), 103-104 and 178-180, with pl. 5.

turned to his left side: this is the Borghese/Colonna type, created probably in a Roman neo-Attic workshop and diffused at Rome (copies in the collections Borghese and Colonna), Cyrene and Pergamum (now in Istanbul)¹²² (fig. 15). Three copies out of the four known (Borghese, Colonna and Pergamum) seem to be dated to the II c. AD, the one from Cyrene seems rather of Severan period. This type could have been created at any time from the I c. BC to the Hadrianic age.

4. The Horti Lamiani/Holkham Hall type.

With the Horti Lamiani type, the configuration is reversed, the tree-trunk is placed near the right leg of the god and the left leg is set slightly backward: these changes were adopted probably in order to give the figure a position in the left wing of an architectural space. This type was probably created in a Roman workshop, given the Roman provenances of four out of the five copies which can be related to it, one from the *Horti Lamiani* at Rome, now in the Capitoline Museum, another at Holkham Hall, a third statue in the Louvre and a fourth copy in the Vatican Museums, Museo Gregoriano Profano (the only copy not from Rome is a torso, unpublished, in the Archaeological Museum of Seleucia, now Selifke, in Cilicia)¹²³ (fig. 16). This variation could have been created at any time before the Hadrianic period, in the context of the neo-Attic current of Roman sculpture.

5. The Copenhagen/Valentini type.

In a world, as is the Roman Classicistic one, characterized by the admiration of works of art because of the sense of life suggested by them,¹²⁴ the Woburn Abbey Dionysus was also adapted to this need and the so-called Copenhagen/Valentini Dionysus was created: the god is no longer standing, but walking, with his left leg set backward, in order to suggest an impression of movement. As the most important copies came from Rome and from nearby¹²⁵ (fig. 17), this type should be thought to have been created in a Roman workshop. As the copies seem to be dated to middle-imperial times, this type would have been also created somewhere between the I c. BC and the early II AD.

B. A variation of the Jacobsen type: the Dijon/Cyrene type.

The Jacobsen type also has variants, with the Dijon/Cyrene type¹²⁶ (fig. 18). The upper folds of the drapery are disposed along a diagonal line which rises from left to right, and not vice versa. The tree-trunk is substituted by a herm, which is not involved in the drapery. It is possible that the original statue of this type was created for an agora, which would explain the adoption of the herm, or that an allusion to the link between

¹²² See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 435, no. 121 a-d, and F. Carinci, «Statua di Dioniso adolescente, con pantera ai piedi», *Catalogo della Galleria Colonna in Roma. Sculture* (Rome 1990), 171-173.

¹²³ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 436, no. 123. The unpublished Dionysus pertinent to this type can be found in Cilicia, Archaeological Museum of Seleucia, now Selifke. Dr. Aise Çalik (University of London, King's College, Department of Classics) is going to publish that statue.

¹²⁴ See G. Schwarz, *Die griechische Kunst des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. in Spiegel der Anthologia Graeca* (Wien 1971).

¹²⁵ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 436, no. 124; E. Filieri, «Statuetta di Dioniso (inv. n. 78279)», *Museo Nazionale Romano. Le sculture* (I/12, 2, Rome 1995), 178-180, no. 38.

¹²⁶ See Gasparri and Veneri (n. 3), 436, no. 127.

Dionysus and Hermes was needed or that the influence of the Richelieu/Prado type of Dionysus, characterized by the herm as a support, determined this *contaminatio*. The right arm was raised and the hand probably brought to the head, which is missing in both the known copies, a pose probably the result of the influence of the popular Apollo Lyceus.¹²⁷

The great success enjoyed by the Woburn Abbey Dionysus and its variations in late-Hellenistic and Roman times¹²⁸ shows that the Praxitelean re-definition of this god was accepted and considered the obvious representation of him for all the rest of classical antiquity. This conclusion is similar to that one which can be deduced from Praxitelean statues of Aphrodite, Eros, Artemis, Apollo, etc. and constitutes the figurative equivalent of the *admiratio* towards Praxitelean gods and goddesses expressed very often in Greek Hellenistic and Roman texts.

List of Figures.

1. Statuette of Dionysus, St. Petersburg, Ermitage, 18, 832.
2. Hope type of Dionysus, St. Petersburg, Ermitage, A. 104.
3. Rome, Vatican Museums, Dionysus «Sardanapallus».
4. Hermes holding Dionysus, reconstruction in Prague, Gallery of Plaster Casts of the University.
5. Base of Choregic monument, Athens, National Museum, no. 1463 (a, b, c correspond to the three faces of the monument).
6. Sambon Dionysus, Paris, Louvre, br. no. 189.
7. AE, Elean coin minted during the reign of Hadrian (= Rizzo (n. 32), pl. LXVIII, fig. no. 1): drawing suggested by R. Weil.
8. Tauriform Dionysus, Rome, Vatican Museums, Galleria delle Carte Geografiche.
9. Hermes carrying Dionysus, Olympia, Archaeological Museum.

¹²⁷ See Schröder (n. 85).

¹²⁸ Some late-classical sculptural types of Dionysus, or indebted to late-classical imagery of this god, have not been considered here, because they do not enter strictly the line of development of the sculptural imagery of this god outlined above. These types are: 1) the Ephesus/Boboli/Mus. Greg. Prof./Sparta type (see Pochmarski (n. 57), 84-89), which seems still in keeping with the Polyclitan tradition, but already with a moderate S-shaped configuration, perhaps to be compared, from a stylistical point of view, with the Munich Oilpourer, which is probably the copyist tradition of the Youth of Strongylion (see my support of this identification in *BdA* (76, 1992), 97-101) and thus to be dated to the early IV c. BC.; 2) the Rome (Mus. Nat. Rom.)/Florence/Madrid type (see Pochmarski (n. 57), 89-94), which shows the adaptation of the Polyclitan chiasmus to a more sinuous configuration, to be attributed probably to Euphranor (see Todisco (n. 21), 93 and 344, no. 196) and in any case revealing the prevalence of the rhythmical problem rather than of the internal feeling expressed and thus made in an Attic workshop which is different from the Praxitelean one; 3) the Corsini/Copenhagen/Istanbul/St Petersburg type (see Pochmarski (n. 57), 120-122) is a boyish Dionysus, not an adolescent one, to be dated no earlier than Lysippus and to be attributed, in my judgment, to the early-Hellenistic baroque current influenced by Lysippus; 4) the Raleigh/Cyrene/Rome/Brüssel/Argos type (see Pochmarski (n. 57), 123-126) seems again a post-Polyclitean creation of the world of the Munich Oilpourer; 5) the Paris/Munich/Cyrene type (see Pochmarski (n. 57), 127-130), 6) the Paris/Rome/Aix en Provance/Sparta/Argos/Valencia type (see Pochmarski (n. 57), 130-135) and 7) the Naples/Rome/Chania/Berlin/Providence type (see Pochmarski (n. 57), 135-139) seem adaptations of the successful configuration of the Apollo Lyceus to the iconography of Dionysus, conceived in the copyist tradition of Roman Imperial times (see Schröder (n. 85)); finally 8) the Doria Palace/Vatican/Paris/Cairo/St. Petersburg type (see Pochmarski (n. 57), 139-143) consists of classicistic adaptations of the Pouring Satyr's pattern to the iconography of Dionysus.

10. Woburn Abbey Dionysus, Woburn Abbey collection.
11. Richelieu/Prado type of Dionysus, copies at Madrid, Prado Museum (a, left) and at Varese, Villa Pogliaghi (b, right).
12. Jacobsen Dionysus, Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, no. 526.
13. Thermae type of Dionysus: statuette at Roman National Museum, no. 74026.
14. Cyrene type of Dionysus, statue from Cyrene, Museum, no. 14, 230.
15. Borghese/Colonna type of Dionysus, copy at Borghese Palace, Rome.
16. Horti Lamiani type of Dionysus, copy at Holkham Hall.
17. Copenhagen/Valentini type of Dionysus, Copenhagen copy (Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, no. 2080).
18. Dijon/Cyrene type of Dionysus: copy from Cyrene, Museum, no. 14, 237.

Antonio Corso

12, Thiseos

Athens - GR 166 72



1



2



3



4



5a



5b




5c



6



7



8




9



10



11a



11b



12



13



14



15



16



17



18