

SATYR AND IMAGE IN AESCHYLUS' *THEOROI*

The enduring fame of Aeschylus as the earliest of the 'three great tragedians' has made him in effect the first dramatist of the Western tradition, in chronological terms at least. At the same time it is worth noting that among the ancients he also enjoyed a reputation as a master of the satyr play, as Pausanias (2.13.6–7) and Diogenes Laertius (2.133) tell us. It is to this kind of drama, which comprised one-quarter of his output as tragedian, that I would like to turn, with particular focus on his *Theoroi* or *Isthmiasai*,<sup>1</sup> and its treatment of another visual medium, the plastic arts. Our fragments of this play begin with a figure presenting a chorus of satyrs with artfully wrought images made in their likenesses which bring them a startled delight. In the second discernible scene of the fragment the chorus receives νεοχμὰ . . . ἄθύρματα ([c] col. ii 50), usually understood as athletic equipment, which the satyrs find rather more unsettling.<sup>2</sup> The following piece is primarily concerned with the first scene in which the coryphaeus urges his companions to dedicate the depictions as votives on Poseidon's temple, relishing the prospect of the comical, terrifying effect these images would have on his own mother and travellers, the latter probably on their way to the Isthmian games. At least this much is clear from the papyrus (esp. lines 1–22).<sup>3</sup> This part of the fragment has attracted a good deal of attention for the evident 'realism' of the images that excites the satyrs so much in the first place. To many, this feature has suggested a reference by Aeschylus to the rise of realism or portraiture in Greek art in the first half of the fifth century.<sup>4</sup> Here I wish to emphasize other important features in this part of the fragment. My focus will be on how Aeschylus presents these new-fangled images as potent, efficacious objects; this is clear from the opening gloss on the depictions and in the satyr-leader's response, which culminates in his decision to attach the images to the temple of Poseidon as apotropaic devices. All this, of course, comes with more than a hint of the irony one would expect from a satyr play.

Some have claimed that the *Theoroi* tells us something of Aeschylus' own tastes in

<sup>1</sup> First published by E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVIII* (London, 1941) as P. Oxy. 2162; see also frs. 78a–82 Radt *TrGF* 3 (Göttingen, 1985). The most recent edition is J. Diggle, *TrGFs* (Oxford 1998), 11–15, which is used here.

<sup>2</sup> For a useful overview, see the Appendix by H. Lloyd-Jones to vol. II of the Loeb edition of Aeschylus (Cambridge, MA, 1956), 541–56. See also J. C. Kamerbeek, *Mnemosyne* 8 (1955), 1–13; B. Snell, *Hermes* 84 (1956), 1–11. More recent discussions of the *Theoroi* in the context of satyric drama generally include: R. Seaford, *Maia* 28 (1976), 209–21, and the introduction to his text and commentary, *Euripides. Cyclops* (Oxford, 1984), 10–44, esp. 33–9; R. Ussher, *Phoenix* 31 (1977), 287–99, esp. 296–9; D. F. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1980), esp. 29–33; id. *GRBS* 22 (1981), 335–8. Cf. also M. Stieber, *TAPhA* 124 (1994), 85–93.

<sup>3</sup> Lobel's view (n. 1), 14, that the papyrus is from a satyr play has gained general currency.

<sup>4</sup> So Lloyd-Jones (n. 2), 543; G. Else, *CPh* 53 (1958), 77–8; G. Lanata, *Poetica Pre-Platonica* (Florence, 1963), 139–40; H. Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala. Der bildende Künstler und sein Werk im vorplatonischen Schrifttum* (Berlin, 1968), 28; C. Faraone, *Talismans and Trojan Horses. Guardian Statues in Ancient Greek Myth and Ritual* (Oxford, 1992), 37–8; Stieber (n. 2), 85–93; F. Zeitlin in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge, 1994), 138–9. G. Sörbom, *Mimesis and Art. Studies in the Origin and Early Development of an Aesthetic Vocabulary* (Stockholm, 1966), 41–53 argued that the fragment does not testify to the emergence of realistic portraiture, yet conceded that the satyric response is to an art that is 'vivid and full of life' (p. 45).

art, with not always convincing results. Apart from an unlikely belief that the *Theoroi* is a tragedy, Untersteiner claimed that it dealt with an agon between Theseus and Dionysus who each promoted the efficacy of sculpture and dance/poetry respectively, to conclude: 'Eschilo pone decisamente la superiorità della poesia tragica di fronte a ogni forma d' arte.'<sup>5</sup> Such a finding, however interesting, lacks textual support and relies on Untersteiner's own conjectures to back up his claims.<sup>6</sup> Recently Stieber has emphasized the role of realism in the images, and claims: '... the comic element, for the audience, arises from their own familiarity with the "novelty" [sc. of realism in works of art] and the dramatised ignorance of the characters on stage'.<sup>7</sup> This has something to recommend it and she raises some interesting points in her discussion, but her inference that the *Theoroi* implies Aeschylean fondness for the 'realism' of late Archaic art over Early Classical art is not warranted by the evidence.<sup>8</sup> Nothing in the *Theoroi* gives an indication of any such preference, and her appeal to *Ag.* 416–17—where we are told that Menelaus, in the absence of Helen, finds the χάρις of εὐμόρφων . . . κολοσσῶν hateful—likewise tells us nothing about Aeschylus' own predilections for one type of art over another. While the κολοσσοί may refer to late Archaic statues as Stieber and others claim,<sup>9</sup> her assumption that Aeschylus here is 'speaking in the person of Menelaus'<sup>10</sup> cannot be demonstrated, nor does it even appear from Menelaus' point of view to be a favourable reference to such statuary; it is in fact the chorus who calls the statues εὐμορφοί. Similarly unconvincing is Stieber's use of the late testimony of Porphyry in which Aeschylus compares his style of paean to that of Tynnichus through an analogy with sculpture.<sup>11</sup> As if to clarify Aeschylus' position, Porphyry refers to an old belief that ἀρχαία ἀγάλματα appear to be more divine than do the καινά. But such a view comes to us in a vaguely worded anecdote (Porph. *De Abst.* 2.18), and need not be construed as Aeschylus' own.<sup>12</sup>

... φασὶ . . . ταῦτα (sc. ἀρχαία ἀγάλματα) . . . καίπερ ἀπλῶς πεποιημένα, θεῖα νομίζεσθαι, τὰ δὲ καινά, περιέργως εἰργασμένα θαυμάζεσθαι μὲν, θεῖου δὲ δόξαν ἥττον ἔχειν.

... they say . . . that these (ancient statues), . . . although simply made, are considered divine, while the new ones, although admired for their skilful workmanship, have less of an appearance of the divine.

Even if we do ascribe such a view to Aeschylus, major uncertainties remain about his preferences in styles of art, chiefly concerning the sheer vagueness of the terms ἀρχαία and καινά. The former could well refer to statues that pre-date the manufacturing of late Archaic statues, while the latter might even include them, especially if Aeschylus were a young man at the time of making this supposed pronouncement. We have no indication anyway of when Aeschylus, whose life is reckoned from c. 525–456 (*TrGF* 3, T B 3–5), may have expressed such an opinion.

But if we cannot infer Aeschylus' personal tastes in art from the *Theoroi* (or elsewhere), we can still consider how the piece presents visual imagery at a time of great artistic innovation and interest in this medium. Whatever their findings, Untersteiner and Stieber are at least right in seeing that ideas about art are important in the *Theoroi*. It will be argued here that the satyrs' actions entail a comically

<sup>5</sup> M. Untersteiner, *Dioniso* 14 (1951), 33.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

<sup>7</sup> Stieber (n. 2), 91.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 94–9.

<sup>9</sup> Stieber (n. 2), 104–6, here follows E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1950), ad loc., but differs from him by seeing the statues as portraits of Helen.

<sup>10</sup> Stieber (n. 2), 105.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 97–9.

<sup>12</sup> As evident in the use of the passive infinitive νομίζεσθαι, as Stieber (n. 2), 98 concedes.

overdetermined response to their painted depictions, and invoke a number of ideas found in Greek literature which impute some efficacy to visual images and artworks. I will suggest that such use of widespread ideas makes this scene typical of satyric drama—a medium which, as Seaford in particular has emphasized, involves frequent comic encounters between satyrs and aspects of civilized culture.<sup>13</sup> Indeed, the antics of Aeschylus' satyrs can be understood, as Lissarague has said of satyr plays in general, as 'a means to explore human culture through a fun-house mirror' and the *Theoroi* can be seen to contain an element that 'plays with culture first by distancing it and then reconstructing it through its anti-types, the satyrs'.<sup>14</sup> This playing with culture and ideas, I intend to show, is felt in the different aspects of the image that come to the fore in its reception as an object of pleasure and terror, as a toy and as a quasi-apotropaic device. Significantly more than the rise of realism in art is thus at issue in our fragments of the *Theoroi*.

# I

The early fifth century, during which the *Theoroi* was produced, ushers in not only major naturalistic innovations in the plastic arts, but also witnesses increased interest in the nature and effects of vision and visual imagery.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, Aeschylus himself was associated with such trends in antiquity. Aristophanes' *Frogs* and the *Vita Aeschyli*, for instance, link the tragedian's stage effects with *ἐκπληξίς*.<sup>16</sup> Vitruvius (*Arch.* 7 *praef.* 11–12) and Pliny (indices to books 34–5 of his *HN*) tell us of a number of painters, sculptors, and architects from the sixth to fourth centuries who wrote about their own works and media; and notable here is the painter Agatharchus who, Vitruvius tells us, designed a *scaena* for Aeschylus' dramas, and left a commentary

<sup>13</sup> For satyrs as essentially rustic, see Seaford (n. 2), 212–13, and his introduction to the *Cyclops* (n. 2), 18, 21, 30–2, and F. Lissarague in J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin (eds), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context* (Princeton, 1990), 228–36, esp. 235.

<sup>14</sup> Lissarague (n. 13), 235.

<sup>15</sup> Fascination with the powers of visual phenomena is evident in Homeric epic, especially when glossed as a *θαῦμα* (*Il.* 5.725, 18.377, 18.549; *Od.* 6.305–7, 7.44–5; cf. *Od.* 19.226–31, etc.). Interest in vision and/or visual artworks is attested widely from the late sixth century onwards (all references to Presocratics and Sophists are from the sixth edition of *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, edd. H. Diels and W. Kranz [Berlin, 1951–2]), e.g. Heraclitus B101a; Empedocles A86, A92, B23, B84, B86, B87, B89; Anaxagoras B21a; Polyclitus B1, B2; Gorgias B3.86–8, B4, B5, B26, B28, *Hel.* 15–19, *MXG* 979a11–980b21; Leucippus A29, 30, 31; Democritus A135, B5h, 28a; Hippas A2. Agatharchus' commentary on the *scaena* he designed for Aeschylus is said to have influenced Anaxagoras and Democritus (*Vitr.* 7 *praef.* 11). Euripides incorporated visual artworks into some plays, e.g. the ephrases in *Ion* (184–218, 1141–80), *Electra* (452–75), and *Phoenissae* (1104–40); this last is a suspected passage, but see D. Mastronarde, *Phoenix* 32 (1978), 105–28 and id., *Euripides. Phoenissae* (Cambridge, 1994), 456–9 for detailed defences of it. For the prominence in Euripides' dramas of imagery and terms drawn from artistic sources, see S. Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides* (London, 1971), 57–60 with nn.

<sup>16</sup> See *Vita Aeschyli*, 332, 333 *OCT* (ed. D. L. Page). At *Frogs* 962–3 the *ἐκπληξίς* of Aeschylean style is implied when Euripides contrasts himself to the older playwright, in saying: οὐδ' ἐξέπληττον αὐτούς (sc. the audience). The reference here is probably to Aeschylean dramaturgy rather than his poetry; see O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford, 1977), 76–7, 422–3, and A. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes. Frogs* (Warminster, 1996), on *Frogs* 963. Philostratus, *VS* 1.9.1 parallels Aeschylus' theatricality and Gorgias' rhetorical style, also noted in antiquity for its capacity to induce *ἐκπληξίς* (Gorgias A1, A4). Both the *Suda* (s.v. *Δισχυλος*) and Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius* 6.11 (= *TrGF* 3, T 106) draw attention to the dramatist's visual innovations onstage.

about it.<sup>17</sup> Evidence from Aeschylus' own writings similarly suggests his interest in ideas on the efficacy of visual artifice. The pivotal scene of the *Septem Contra Thebas* (375–719), for instance, is largely taken up with descriptions of warriors and their armour whose shield images are given special prominence. While many have dwelt on the symbolic meaning of these images for the *Septem*,<sup>18</sup> Aeschylus continually stresses their status as wrought artworks. We may note, for instance, the comment on the style of the making of Eteocles' shield (465), or the reference to the *σηματοουργός* who wrought Hippomedon's shield-image (491–2), and the occurrence of terms such as *κόσμος* and *εἰκῶν* to describe the apparel of Tydeus (397) and shield image of Parthenopaeus (559). The opening of our *Theoroi* fragment, then, may be taken as another example of Aeschylean interest in visual imagery and artifice, borne out clearly in the extensive number of terms invoked for the images the satyrs receive: *εἰκῶν*, *εἶδωλον*, *κόσμος*, *μορφή* (*bis*), *μίμημα*.

The text of the scene which concerns us runs:

- ὀρώντες εἰκοῦ[s] οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπους [  
 ὅπηι δ' ἂν ἔρ]δης, πάντα σοι τάδ' εὖσεβῇ.  
 — ἡ κάρτ' ὀφείλω τῶνδ' ἐ σοι· πρόφρων γὰρ εἶ.  
 ἄκουε δὴ πᾶς, σίγα δειθελεῖδ[.][.]. 4  
     ἄθρησον εἰπ[.][.][  
     εἶδωλον εἶναι τοῦτ' ἐμῇ μορφῇ πλέον  
     τὸ Δαιδάλου μ[ί]μημα· φωνῆς δέι μόνον.  
     τάδ[.][.][εἶ 8  
     ορα[.][.][.)(ρ[.]  
     χώρει μάλα.  
 — εὐκταῖα κόσμον ταῦτ[α] τῶι θεῶι φέρω  
     καλλιγραπτον εὐχάν. 12  
 ↔ τῇ μητρὶ τῇμῃ πράγματ' ἂν παρασχέθου·  
 {—} ἰδοῦσα γάρ νῦν ἂν σαφῶς  
     τρέποιτ' ἂν αἰάζοιτο<sup>19</sup> θ' ὥς  
     δοκοῦσ' ἐμ' εἶναι, τὸν ἐξ- 16  
     έθρεψεν· οὕτως ἐμπερὴς σδ' ἐστίν.  
     εἶα δὴ σκοπεῖτε δῶμα ποντίου σεισίχθο[νος  
     κάπιπασσάλευ' ἕκαστος τῆς κ[α]λῆς μορφῆς[.  
     ἄγγελον, κήρυκ' [ἄ]ναυδον, ἐμπόρων κωλύτορ[α,  
     [.][.][εἰσαχέσει κελεύθου τοὺς ξένο[υ]ς] φ[.] 20  
     χαῖρ' ἄναξ, χαῖρ' ὦ Πόσειδον ἐπίτροπο[ς][.][.]

... seeing the likenesses not of human [making].<sup>20</sup> And whatever you may do, all your actions are pious.

<sup>17</sup> Some have needlessly questioned the chronology of Agatharchus, given his connections with Alcibiades ([Andoc.] *C. Alcib.* 17; Dem. *C. Meidias* 147; Plut. *Alc.* 16.4) as well as Aeschylus; see: A. Rumpf, *JHS* 67 (1947), 13; J. J. Pollitt, *Art and Experience in Classical Greece* (Cambridge, 1972), 56, n. 15; cf. Taplin (n. 16), 457, n. 4; A. Brown, *PCPhS* 30 (1984), *passim*, esp. 1–2. There is no evidence that the painter could not have been active from before 456 to the 420s, which is all that is required to bear out the literary testimonies.

<sup>18</sup> For instance, P. Vidal-Naquet in *Annali del Seminario di Studi del Mondo Classico: Archeologica e Storia Antica* I (1979), 95–118 (repr. as 'Les boucliers des héros', in *Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne* II [Paris, 1986]). Both W. Thalmann, *Dramatic Art in Aeschylus' Seven Against Thebes* (New Haven and London, 1978), esp. ch. 5, and F. Zeitlin, *Under the Sign of the Shield: Semiotics and Aeschylus' Seven Against Thebes* (Rome, 1982), *passim*, esp. 45, see how the shield-scene allegorizes the main conflict, although approaching it from quite different perspectives.

<sup>19</sup> This is Page's emendation of the corrupt ἀξιάζοιτο, *CR* 7 (1957), 191.

<sup>20</sup> The translations of Lloyd-Jones (n. 2), 553 '... wrought by superhuman skill', and that of

—I am greatly indebted to you for these things; for you are very kind. Listen now, everyone be silent . . . look, say [?] . . . this image is more [like] my own form, this Daedalic representation, it lacks only a voice. These . . . look [?] . . . Come on!! I'm bringing these votives, an ornament, to the god as a beautifully-painted dedication. It would give my mother a hard time. One look at this and she'd turn away and scream for sure, thinking it's me, the one she raised; so like me is this image! Hey! Look at the house of the Earth-Shaker, Ruler of the Sea! Let each of you nail up [the image?] of your own beautiful form as a messenger, a voiceless herald, a warder-off of travellers, . . . it will halt wayfarers on the road . . . Hail, lord, hail, o Poseidon, protector.

The view that the images in the *Theoroi* are satyr-masks continues to gain ground.<sup>21</sup> Green sees here a play on dramatic illusion whereby actors wearing satyr-masks respond as satyrs to reproductions of those masks.<sup>22</sup> Fraenkel's suggestion that the images are made to function as painted antefixes on temple roofs is also plausible, notwithstanding Lloyd-Jones's objection that antefixes are not nailed to temples.<sup>23</sup> Satyr faces, corresponding at least in appearance to masks, could function as antefixes in cities Aeschylus is known to have visited.<sup>24</sup> These possibilities suggest that the *Theoroi* involves play on the use of artefacts in more ways than one. Beyond this, I wish to draw attention to how his fragment comically reworks τόποι concerning the responses which artworks are perceived to elicit: pleasure, deceit through illusion, and terror. All these play a role in how the satyrs exploit the efficacy of visual imagery, and are found in Homer, elsewhere in Aeschylus, and in other authors of the Classical period. The idea of painting as deceptive is found in Empedocles (B23.9), in the *Dissoi Logoi* (3.10), and in Plato in *Republic* 10 and the *Sophist*.<sup>25</sup> The ability of painting and sculpture to bring pleasure to the onlooker, with erotic overtones, is mentioned by Gorgias (*Hel.* 18) and Euripides (*Alc.* 348–55; cf. *Ion* 231, 245–6); Xenophon (*Mem.* 3.10.5, 8), and Alcidas (*Soph.* 27) are among many others who reiterate the pleasure-inducing aspects of visual art.<sup>26</sup> The ability of visual artifice to induce fear recurs in Aeschylus' ephrases in the *Septem* (489–90; cf. 397–9) and Euripides' *Electra* (469–70).

Moreover, other fifth-century texts, such as Cratinus (fr. 75 K-A), Euripides' *Eurystheus* (fr. 372 N) and Plato Comicus (fr. 204 K-A) involve, like the *Theoroi*, comic confrontations with artworks so deceptively realistic that they seem to walk and talk.<sup>27</sup> In chronological terms these references and the *Theoroi* undermine Ernst Gombrich's

Stieber (n. 2), 88: ' . . . not made by human hands' seem to me tenable, confirmed by the gloss on the image as τὸ Δαιδάλου μίμημα. See section II below for fuller explication of my reading of the first line.

<sup>21</sup> See: E. Fraenkel, *PBA* 28 (1942), 245; Snell (n. 2), 6; H. Mette, *Der verlorenen Aischylos* (Berlin, 1963), 165; Ussher (n. 2), 297; Sutton (n. 2), 29; J. R. Green, *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society* (London, 1994), 45. P. E. Easterling in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. P. E. Easterling (Cambridge, 1997), 49. As a parallel for the self-referential use of masks in stage action, Mette and Ussher cite Cratinus' *Seriphoi* fr. 205 K (= Fr. 218 K-A).

<sup>22</sup> Green (n. 21), 45–6.

<sup>23</sup> Fraenkel (n. 21), 245; cf. Lloyd-Jones (n. 2), 543.

<sup>24</sup> *LIMC* VIII.2, s.v. 'Silenoi' fig. 167 for a satyric model from Gela, datable to the early fifth century; cf. also figs 166, 168, 170.

<sup>25</sup> One of Plato's bugbears in his criticisms of painting: *R.* 10.598c1–599a4, 602c10–d4; *Soph.* 234b5–10, 235d5–236c7. In the *Sophist* Plato consigns visual arts to the realm of misleading appearances, or φανταστική; for discussion see J. Pollitt, *The Ancient View of Greek Art* (New Haven and London, 1974), 46–7. See A. Rouveret, *Histoire et imaginaire de la peinture ancienne* (Paris, 1989), 115–27 for fuller accounts of Plato's views of σκιαγραφία.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. also Democritus B194.

<sup>27</sup> See J. C. Kamerbeek (n. 2), 4, who compares Pindar, *O.* 7.52 with Plato Comicus, fr. 204 K-A; and Sutton (n. 2), 62 for Euripides, fr. 372, which he takes to be a satyr play and the addressee to be Silenus.

views, famously put in his 'Reflections on the Greek Revolution', that 'the thrill and shock which the first illusionist images must have caused . . . did not happen before Plato's lifetime' and that Plato's 'outburst against the trickeries of painting was an outburst against "modern art"'.<sup>28</sup> Yet, although Gombrich does acknowledge that the 'Greek revolution' in depicting illusionistic images begins around the middle of the sixth century, he neglects the *Theoroi* altogether.<sup>29</sup> In any event, these other dramatic texts all mention (cognates of) Daedalus, whose handicraft is invoked to explain the statue's abilities to move and speak or at least its startlingly lifelike qualities.<sup>30</sup> Such parallels cast some light on Aeschylus' mentioning of τὸ Δαιδάλου μ[ί]μημα (7) which underscores the 'realism' of the images that so excites the satyrs. But it is worth going further to focus on how Aeschylus presents the perceived effects of such realism, and how these are evident in the response of the satyrs in the *Theoroi*.

Typical features of satyrs onstage, as scholars have noted,<sup>31</sup> are their comic encounters with a (semi-)divine invention (εὔρημα) or marvel (έρας) that becomes incorporated into human civilization, as is attested elsewhere in the *Theoroi* ([c] col. ii 49–52). In another Aeschylean satyr play, *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* (fr. 207), one satyr is about to have his beard burnt when trying to embrace fire, on seeing it for the first time.<sup>32</sup> In the Sophoclean *Dionysiskos* (frr. 171–2) satyrs become acquainted with wine, Dionysus' invention, with no doubt predictably disastrous results. Satyrs are also present at the making of Pandora in Sophocles' *Sphyrkokopoi* (or *Pandora* = fr. 482–6), the model from which the race of women is sprung, according to Hesiod (*Th.* 590).<sup>33</sup> The *Ichneutae* (frr. 314–18) involves a comic response to lyre-music played by its inventor, the infant Hermes. Here the satyrs experience ἔκπληξις (fr. 314.142–4), and Silenus runs off in terror when he hears it (205–9). But, through the god's nurse, Cyllene, Sophocles stresses the charm and pleasure that Hermes derives from the music (325–7):

καὶ τοῦτο λύπη[ς] ἔστ' ἄκεστρον καὶ παραψυκ[τ]ήρ[ιο]ν  
 κείνῳ μόνον, χα[ί]ρει δ' ἀθύρων καὶ τι προσφω[ώ]ν μέλος·  
 ἔξμῳνον ἔξα[ί]ρει γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰδόισμα τῆς λ[ύ]ρας.<sup>34</sup>

And this is his only remedy for grief and comfort to his soul, and he enjoys amusing himself and voicing some song. For the shifting tone of the lyre simply transports him in harmony with it.

This is consistent with the pleasure-giving effects of music found in Homer (esp. *Il.* 9.189, 18.526; *Od.* 1.347, 8.44–5, 8.536–43, etc.) and, appropriately enough, the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (esp. 420–6, 455, 480–6).<sup>35</sup> Indeed, the qualities ascribed to music in the *Ichneutae* recur in the Classical period in views on the effects of poetry

<sup>28</sup> See E. Gombrich, *Art and Illusion* (London, 1972<sup>2</sup>), ch. 4, 127.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 127; cf. 128–39.

<sup>30</sup> For useful discussion of these and other passages where reference is made to the apparent ability of Daedalus's statues to move, see S. Morris, *Daedalos and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton, 1992), ch. 8, esp. 221–37. As C. Collard, *Euripides. Hecuba* (Warminster, 1991), on 836–40 suggests, Hecuba apparently refers to Daedalus' speaking *automata*, which recall those made by Hephaestus (*Il.* 18.376).

<sup>31</sup> For instance, see Snell (n. 2), 8–9; Seaford (n. 2), 212–13, 216–17, and his introduction to *E. Cyclops* (n. 2), esp. 36–7; cf. Ussher (n. 2), esp. 291–3, and 297–8; F. Lissarrague (n. 13), 235, whose views are accepted by Easterling (n. 21), 41. Sutton (n. 2), 157, n. 455 is unduly skeptical of this as a feature of satyr plays, but is well countered by Stieber (n. 2), 91, n. 12.

<sup>32</sup> As the context of Plutarch's quotation makes clear (*Mor.* 2.86e).

<sup>33</sup> As Faraone (n. 4), 102 notes.

<sup>34</sup> I print here Diggle's *OCT* text.

<sup>35</sup> For more on the pleasurable, beguiling, and deceitful effects of music and song in Homer and early epic, see W. Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk* (Stuttgart, 1959<sup>3</sup>), 81–5; Lanata

and rhetoric, such as ἔκπληξις and ψυχαγωγία.<sup>36</sup> Sophocles' comic treatment of the effects of this new-fangled music is perhaps the most telling parallel afforded by other satyric dramas to the *Theoroi*, where a similar confrontation takes place, this time involving the effects of painted, skilfully wrought images of satyrs themselves.

## II

The fragment opens with an interlocutor addressing the satyrs and referring to the likenesses as οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπους . . . (1). Straightaway this puts the depictions on a divine or superhuman level, like the other attributes of civilization traceable to various gods in satyric drama, and some parodic overtones may be detected as well. Similar language on the divine provenance of great artworks was used, for instance, by Achilles who, on seeing and handling his newly made armour, delights in the gifts of the god (*Il.* 19.18–19):

τέρπετο δ' ἐν χεῖρεσσιν ἔχων θεοῦ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα.  
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ φρεσὶν ἦισι τετάρπετο δαίδαλα λεύσσω,

He took delight as he held in his hands the glorious gifts of the god. But when he had delighted himself in his heart looking at the cunningly wrought works . . .

Here δαίδαλα indicates the images on the shield, recalling what Hephaestus put on it (*Il.* 18.479, 482), and which give Achilles τέρψις. It is true that Achilles experiences χόλος when seeing his armour and the Myrmidones turn from it in fear (*Il.* 19.14–17); more will be said on these features below, but for the moment it is worth considering the aspect of pleasure in his response and how it might relate to the satyric reaction in the *Theoroi*. Apart from experiencing pleasure, Achilles expresses his appreciation of the divine artistry behind the new armour (19.21–2):

‘μήτηρ ἐμή, τὰ μὲν ὅπλα θεὸς πόρεν οἷ’ ἐπιεικές  
ἔργ’ ἔμην ἀθανάτων, μηδὲ βροτὸν ἄνδρα τελέσσαι.’

‘Mother of mine, a god has given me these weapons such as are fitting to be the works of the gods, which no mortal man could produce.’

In the *Theoroi* the satyr certainly responds enthusiastically to his gift, and, like Achilles, rejoices on seeing the artwork by expressing his gratitude to the interlocutor—κάρατ’ ὀφείλω τῶνδ’ ἐ σοι· πρόφρων γὰρ εἶ (3)—and seeing the gift as a beautifully painted offering: καλλίγραπτον εὐχάν (12). We see, then, another form of τέρψις here. As well, both Achilles’ mentioning of the skill of Hephaestus and Homer’s reference to the god’s works as δαίδαλα are echoed in Aeschylus’ phrase τὸ

(n. 4), 6–13, 16–17, who also rightly links music’s effects in the *Ichneutae* (325–7) to what Gorgias attributes to λόγος (*Hel.* 8), apropos of its joy-giving and grief-banishing capacities (p. 154); W. J. Verdenius in G. B. Kerferd (ed.), *The Sophists and their Legacy* (Wiesbaden, 1981), 121–3; G. B. Walsh, *The Varieties of Enchantment* (Chapel Hill and London, 1984), ch. 1; Z. Ritoók, *Mnemosyne* 42 (1989), 333–42. C. Segal, in R. Lamberton and J. Kenney (edd.), *Homer’s Ancient Readers* (Princeton, 1992), 3–9, 22–3, 29.

<sup>36</sup> For ἔκπληξις, see Thucydides on Pericles’ rhetoric (2.65.9); Critias B25.28; cf. Gorgias *Pal.* 4 (bis). For ψυχαγωγία, see Plato, *Phdr.* 261a8, 271c10; Isocrates, *Evag.* (9.10). Interestingly, Xenophon, *Mem.* 3.10.6 sees ψυχαγωγία as a feature of sculpture; and Aristotle applies it to tragedy, and, rather grudgingly, to the visual dimension, or δῆμις, of tragedy (*Po.* 1450a33–b1, b16–17).

Δαίδαλου μ[ί]μημα which the satyr uses to describe his gift (7).<sup>37</sup> The meaning 'an image made by (someone like) Daedalus' (or 'the Cunning One') seems most likely here, due to other references to Daedalic artworks in Greek drama, noted above, for instance: Cratinus (fr. 75 K-A), Euripides' *Eurystheus* (fr. 372 N) and Plato Comicus (fr. 204 K-A). In fact, some plausibly see 'Daedalus' as another name by which Hephaestus was known.<sup>38</sup> If this is correct, then this would strengthen the implication of the divine provenance of the depictions in the phrase οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπους . . . (1).

The satyric awareness of the depiction as a wrought object does not preclude it from exercising an illusionistic charm. The image, he says, is so lifelike that it lacks only a voice: φωνῆς δεῖ μόνον (7). Formalist and illusionistic aspects of the image come to the fore here, and can be seen to underscore his pleasure on viewing the image. This, too, is akin to the θαῦμα which Homer associates with the depiction of farmers ploughing on Achilles' shield. There we see that the tension between the liveliness of the images on the shield and the knowledge that they are made of gold makes Hephaestus' work a θαῦμα in the first place. Homer makes this clear in the description of a field becoming black after being ploughed (*Il.* 18.548–9):

ἡ δὲ μελαίνεται' ὀπισθεν, ἀρηρομένη δὲ ἑώικει,  
χρυσείη περ εἰούσα. τὸ δὲ περὶ θαῦμα τέτυκτο.

It became black behind [the plough], and seemed like a ploughed field, even though it was gold. In such a way the wonder was wrought.

At the point where the illusionism of the image is stressed, attention is drawn to its formal attributes: firstly to the fact that it is a likeness, and secondly, as some have noted, to the medium of its depiction.<sup>39</sup> Although θαῦμα is not explicitly mentioned in our remnants of the *Theoroi*, the element of pleasure in the satyric response to the depictions can be seen to have precedents in Homeric epic, especially when the poet implies a certain pleasure that goes along with the wonder inspired by artfully wrought images. We may note Hephaestus' prediction (*Il.* 18.466–7) of the θαῦμα to be experienced by anyone gazing on the shield, and the *τέρψις*, mentioned above, in Achilles' response, which seems to be one manifestation of this θαῦμα (*Il.* 19.18–19). As well, the idea of amazement as pleasurable, implied by Homer, is attested more explicitly elsewhere in Greek literature. In the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* Apollo freely admits his wonder at his younger brother's enchanting music making: 'θανμᾶζω . . . ὥς ἑρατὸν κιθαρίζεις' (455). Pindar speaks of Amphitryon's θάμβος which is both *δυσφόρος* and *τερπνός* on witnessing his infant son's strength (*N.* 1.55–6), and on a number of occasions Aristotle tells us of the pleasant effects of θαῦμα (*Po.* 1460a17; *Rh.* 1371a21–2, 1371b5, 1404b11–12). The response of Aeschylus' satyrs is consistent with these notions; their pleasure and amazement at the life-like qualities of the images is accompanied by their recognition of them as works of artifice, as they literally come face-to-face with representations of themselves for the first time.

After this initial delight, the satyr goes on to focus on the 'apotropaic' powers in the images, as well as their realistic features. Here a comic paradox emerges whereby the

<sup>37</sup> Δαίδαλου is most likely subjective; cf. Morris (n. 30), 218 for other possible renderings. It seems less plausible here to read δαίδαλου as 'artwork' and hence as an objective genitive, even though δαίδαλον can be an Homeric word for art-images (*Il.* 18.479, 482, etc).

<sup>38</sup> So Lloyd-Jones (n. 2), 547–8. For Daedalus as Hephaestus' *Doppelgänger*, see R. Kassel, *ZPE* 51 (1983), 1–5.

<sup>39</sup> M. Edwards, *The Iliad. A Commentary* 4 (Cambridge, 1991), on 18.548; A. Becker, *AJPh* 111 (1990), 145.



depiction of himself that the satyr finds so handsome (καλλίγραπτον εὐχάν [12] and τῆς κ[α]λῆς μορφῆς [19]) also emerges as so terrifying that even his own mother would run off in horror on seeing it, thinking it her son (13–17):

τῇ μητρὶ τῇμῃ πράγματ' ἂν παρασχέθοι·  
 {—} ἰδοῦσα γάρ νιν ἂν σαφῶς  
 τρέποιτ' ἂν αἰάζοιτό θ' ὥς  
 δοκοῦσ' ἔμ' εἶναι, τὸν ἑξ-  
 ἔθρεψεν· οὕτως ἐμφερῆς ὅδ' ἐστίν.

And so, proudly flaunting his own ugliness, he urges the others (19–22):

κάπιπασσάλευ' ἕκαστος τῆς κ[α]λῆς μορφῆς .[  
 ἄγγελον, κήρυκ' [ἄ]ναυδον, ἐμπόρων κωλύτορ[α,  
 .[.], ἐπισχῆσαι κελεύθου τοὺς ξένο[us] φ.[  
 χαῖρ' ἀναξ, χαῖρ' ὦ Πόσειδον ἐπίτροπο[s] .][

Snell compared the function of the satyr-images here to the severed heads displayed by Oenomaus as a warning (or threat!) to his daughter's suitors of the price of failure, and Faraone, who also mentions this possibility, suggests that the mother's fear would result from believing her son to have been decapitated.<sup>40</sup> This may have some truth in it, and we may see in this gesture another satyric parody of heroic myth. For instance, Scholia BD on Pindar *Isthm.* 4.92a (= Sophocles, fr. 473a) say Oenomaus put the severed heads on Poseidon's temple. The same source tells us that Pindar and Bacchylides have Antaeus and Evenus respectively do the same to their victims. If Snell's and Faraone's suggested parallel with Oenomaus' decorative touch holds, we would see important features of visual imagery at work—deceit and fear-inducing powers—when the satyr imagines his mother's response. If she sees it as the severed head of her son whom, moreover, she reared (τὸν ἐξέθρεψεν), she will have been deceived into thinking he is dead and thereby driven to flight. Her misguided reaction would be the butt of the humour, at least as the satyr sees it.

Green, however, suggests a different, but no less plausible, parallel: Aristophanes (fr. 130 K-A), where actors' masks are hung in the temple of Dionysus after a performance; such votives are unlikely to be mistaken for severed heads.<sup>41</sup> Other comic elements, rather than a joke on a mother's mistaken reaction, may thus be at work in the *Theoroi*. We should note, firstly, that the satyr imagines his mother's reaction simply when he is looking at the image for the first time, before he decides to attach it to the temple. Some perceived similarity between representation and prototype is all that is required to elicit the mother's terrified reaction, were she to see the image as the face of her son. In this process there is assumed an illusionistic 'deceit' combined with the abilities of the portrait to induce fear through the accurate depiction of an ugly face. Aristophanes provides us with another telling parallel here. At *Knights* 230–2 we are told that the σκευοποιοί are too terrified to make a mask of the Paphlagon. We need not infer the use of accurate portrait masks in Old Comedy from this, or even that Cleon himself had ugly facial features, which may be implied by Cratinus (fr. 228 K-A).<sup>42</sup> But, true to the spirit of *ad hominem* abuse in Old Comedy, Aristophanes' jibe

<sup>40</sup> Snell (n. 2), 7–8; Page (n. 19), 191 makes the same inference; see Faraone (n. 4), 37–8.

<sup>41</sup> Green (n. 21), 182, n. 60.

<sup>42</sup> D. Welsh, *CQ* 29 (1979), 214–15, saw references here to Cleon's ugly eyebrows; however, S. D. Olson, *CQ* 49 (1999), 320–1, most recently claims that Cratinus' comment refers to Cleon's menacing use of his eyebrows.

is that Cleon is so ugly that anything that could represent him is going to be so hideous it will terrify even its makers. Dover, rightly rejecting political overtones to the mask-makers' fear, plausibly suggested that the joke could mean that even a completely revolting mask would fall short of depicting Cleon accurately because he is so ugly.<sup>43</sup> In any event, the Aristophanic barb is predicated on the perceived abilities of depictions of 'ugly' faces to induce fear, and much the same idea can already be seen in the Aeschylean satyr's anticipation of his mother's response. A neat joke on the satyr's conventional ugliness and buffoonery thus comes into play here: he has a face not even a mother could love, yet he blithely continues to see his depiction as beautiful, even when he decides to use it as an apotropaic device on Poseidon's temple (18–21). Whatever way the satyr's mother is to see the image—as her son's severed head or otherwise—she would not see it as a work of artifice, it is true. But the satyr does see it in these terms, and Aeschylus has presented it to the audience as such. The satyr's anticipation of how his mother would respond plays on the deceptive potentialities of the artwork and its capacity to induce fear on more than one comic level.

In imagining his mother's reaction, the satyr implicitly transfers his own experience of its powers onto others, but with a twist. He is struck by the close resemblance between the depiction and himself, but what delighted him on illusionistic grounds he expects not only to terrify his mother, but anyone who might look on it: τοὺς ξένο[us] (21). These ξένοι obviously have no familial ties with the satyr, so their anticipated response assumes the sheer fear-inducing powers of the image *per se*, even if it is not taken as a severed head of a real satyr; if it is, deceit will again be involved. Interestingly, the ξένοι may not be just any passers-by but Isthmians coming to the games. That the satyrs themselves have been training as athletes for the Isthmian games is evident in the interlocutor's words, especially ([a] col. i 30–1, 34–5):

ὥς ἐξέτριβες Ἰσθμιαστικὴν [...] ν  
 κούκ ἡμέλησας ἀλλ' ἐγυμνάζ[ου κα]λῶς.  
 ...  
 σὺ δ' ἰσθμιάζεις καὶ τρόπους καὶ νου[ς] μ[α]θῶν  
 βραχί[ο]ν' ἀσκεῖς, χρήματα φθείρων ἐμά

So, you have been training for the Isthmian contest, not wasting time, but have been exercising splendidly. . . . You're playing the Isthmian competitor and, now that you've learnt new ways, you're training your arm, wasting my money . . .

This censure comes from a figure plausibly identified as Dionysus, who sees himself slighted by the satyrs' new interests.<sup>44</sup> The comic notion of satyrs' engaging in athletics seems confirmed if the second novelty presented to them is correctly interpreted as athletic equipment ([c] col. ii 50–3).<sup>45</sup>

— ἐγὼ [φέ]ρω σοι νεοχμὰ [...] ἀθύρματα  
 ἀπὸ [σκε]πάρνου κᾶκ[μ]ονος ν[ε]όκ[ι]τα.  
 του[τ]ι τὸ πρῶτόν ἐστὶ σοι τ[ῶ]ν παιχ[ν]ίων  
 — ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐχί· τῶν φίλων νείμὸν τι.

<sup>43</sup> K. J. Dover, *Greek and the Greeks. Collected Papers*, vol. I: *Language, Poetry, Drama* (Oxford and New York, 1987), 273.

<sup>44</sup> Lloyd-Jones (n. 2), 545; Seaford (n. 2), 34, 35. More than one interlocutor has been identified in the *Theoroi*, but the actual identity does not affect my approach.

<sup>45</sup> As suggested by Snell (n. 2), 8.

—I'm bringing you newly made playthings, freshly wrought from the anvil and adze. This is the first of your toys.

—No, not for me. Give it to one of my friends.

The idea that satyrs might be athletes is just the sort of incongruous humour we would expect of this kind of drama (to say nothing of exactly how they have been training their arms!<sup>46</sup>), and is not refuted by the naïve and hesitant reaction shown by the chorus here; indeed, such a response would be typical of satyrs. If, then, these satyrs view the *ξένοι* as potential rivals at the Isthmian games, their plan to frighten them would heighten the importance of the images by making their supposed apotropaic powers a feature of the dramatic action.

From delighting its owner/subject as a beautifully crafted and illusionistic artwork, the depiction is now expected to function as a baleful omen to others, consistent with many crafted images, such as satyr-masks themselves. Green, for instance, points out that satyr-masks were used in the fifth century for apotropaic purposes, much like *μορμολυκεία*, as a chous from Eleusis (c. 420 B.C.) shows, on which one child terrifies or at least taunts another with a satyr-mask.<sup>47</sup> The treatment of the satyr-images in the *Theoroi* as *μορμολυκεία* therefore suggests they are the sort of things that would frighten children. Writers such as Xenophon (*HG* 4.4.17) and Lucian (*Philops.* 2) also bring out the childish dimension to the effects of the cognate term *μορμώ*.<sup>48</sup> So the images, in the hands of these satyrs, become frightening toys. In addition, this apotropaic element read into the satyrs' depictions extends the play on dramatic illusion suggested by Green. Now it appears that actors wearing satyr-masks are toying with the same kind of masks (in the form of the satyric depictions) for the purposes of terrifying, or at least playing jokes on, others.

### III

Put to apotropaic use on Poseidon's temple, the satyr believes his depiction will spell out a visual message clear enough to stop travellers in their tracks. The language to denote this is particularly interesting, as it draws on lyric and tragic poetry, and suggests some overlap between visual and aural media in terms of their intended efficacy. The satyr calls his image: ἄγγελον, κήρυκ' [*ἄ*]ναυδον ἐμπόρων κωλύτορ[α], and goes on to say that it: . . . ἐπισχῆσει κελεύθου τοὺς ξένο[us] φ.[...] (20–1). That he calls his 'portrait' a messenger and voiceless herald picks up the earlier reference to its lacking only a voice: φωνῆς δεῖ μόνον (7). But this silence is not perceived as a hindrance to its efficacy, since the satyr is confident that it will send out a visual message of terror much like the *ἔκπληξις* which Sophoclean satyrs experience on hearing Hermes' music in the *Ichneutae* (fr. 314.142–3). In describing the artwork as a messenger of sorts, Aeschylus invokes analogous aural terminology—a technique found in another of his dramas where the talismanic force of visual depictions is a dominant issue. In the *Septem* the triumphant *σῆμα* depicting Zeus on the shield of the Theban defender Hyperbius has no words on it, as do some shield *σήματα* (*Septem* 434, 468–9, 646–8), yet is called a *λόγος* all the same (519). Even when emphasizing the silence of the satyr's depiction, Aeschylus presents it as sharing some

<sup>46</sup> Cf. ὁρῶν μούρα καὶ βραχέα τὰ φ[αλλί]α (29). See W. Slenders, *Mnemosyne* 44 (1992), 145–58, for a study of sexual innuendo and *double entendre* in Aeschylean satyr plays (esp. 146–51).

<sup>47</sup> Green (n. 21), 79, fig. 3.16.

<sup>48</sup> LSJ s.v. *μορμολυκεῖον* 2; and s.v. *μορμώ*.

of the powers of aural media in its ability to instil fear into others, and, as the parallel with the *Septem* suggests, implicitly gives it mock-heroic status.

We may see further parodic nuances in Aeschylus' use of ἄγγελον, κήρυκ' [ἄ]γανδον here, as it echoes various τόποι. Theognis speaks of a fire-beacon as an ἄγγελος ἄφθογγος which πόλεμον πολύδακρυν ἐγείρει (549). The chorus members in Euripides' *Orestes* register their terror at the sight of smoke billowing from the palace which they say 'announces'—προκηρύσσει—Orestes' murderous intentions (1541–2).<sup>49</sup> More tellingly, Aeschylus himself provides specific verbal parallels to the gloss on the images in the *Theoroi* in his *Septem* (82) where the sight of the dust raised by the Argive army induces fear in the chorus as ἀναυδος σαφῆς ἔτυμος ἄγγελος. Danaus in Aeschylus' *Supplices* (180) sees the dust churned up by the army on the move in similar terms: ὁρῶ κόνιν, ἀναυδον ἄγγελον στρατοῦ. These τόποι have led one commentator to consider such language to be traditional,<sup>50</sup> but Aeschylus' handling of the idea deserves more comment. For there are further close verbal connections between expressions in the *Theoroi*, *Septem*, and *Supplices* as appositional phrases.<sup>51</sup> Aeschylus in fact uses such phraseology elsewhere in the *Septem* for certain apotropaic images on the warriors' shields. For instance, the moon on Tydeus' shield is glossed as πρέσβιστον ἄστρων, νυκτὸς ὀφθαλμός (390); so too the depiction of Typhon on Hippomedon's shield which breathes out black smoke, presented as: λιγνὸν μέλαιναν, αἰόλην πυρὸς κάσιν (494). We can see another parallel to the *Septem* in the opening gloss on the satyr portraits as οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπους . . . (1) which matches the description of Capaneus' threats against Thebes in the *Septem*: οὐ κατ' ἄνθρωπον (425). The warrior seems to be more than mortal in his raging, rather like Homeric warriors who are sometimes called δαίμονι ἴσος in moments of particular warlike fury (*Il.* 5.438, 16.705, 786, etc.). It was noted how the opening expression of the *Theoroi* echoes an Homeric idea on the divine provenance of Achilles' armour, but the parallel from the *Septem* suggests that the satyr play here is comically invoking tragic diction and implying that the images are somewhat alarming for the recipients themselves. By incorporating such grandiose language, paralleled especially in his own tragedies, Aeschylus here gets more comic mileage from the 'dramatized ignorance' of the satyrs and ironically elevates the satyric portraits to a quasi-heroic level. Our ignorance of the date of the *Theoroi* prevents us from saying that it directly parodies these Aeschylean tragedies, yet much in it can clearly be seen to illustrate Demetrius' oft-quoted gloss on satyric drama as τραγωιδία παίζουσα (*Eloc.* 169).

Further epic motifs receive some comic reworking in the *Theoroi*. One consequence of the mock-apotropaic element in these satyrs' images is that they, like μορμουλκεῖα, are now cast in the role of an epic *Gorgoneion*, such as on Agamemnon's shield (*Il.* 11.36–7):

τῇ δ' ἐπὶ μὲν Γοργῷ βλοσυρῶπις ἐστεφάνωτο  
δεινὸν δερκομένην, περὶ δὲ Δεῖμός τε Φόβος τε.

And grim-faced Gorgon was embossed on it, glaring terror; by her too were both Horror and Fear.

<sup>49</sup> Professor C. Collard draws my attention to Euripides, *Hec.* 1215 where the smoke of Troy signifies its destruction.

<sup>50</sup> G. O. Hutchinson, *Aeschylus. Seven Against Thebes* (Oxford, 1985) on *Septem* 81–2.

<sup>51</sup> H. Friis Johansen and E. Whittle, *Aeschylus. The Suppliants* (Copenhagen, 1980, 3 vols) on *Suppl.* 180 note the verbal similarity between these three passages but neglect the significance of *Theoroi* (20) as an appositional phrase.

Similar to these figures are the monsters on Heracles' shield in the pseudo-Hesiodic *Scutum*, whose terrifying glares are emphasised (*Sc.* 144–5):

ἐν μέσσω δ' ἀδάμαντος ἔην Φόβος οὗ τι φατεῖός,  
ἐμπαλιν ὁσσοῖσιν πυρὶ λαμπομένοισι δεδorkώς·

In the middle, made of adamant, was Fear, utterly unspeakable, glaring back with fire in his blazing eyes.

Noteworthy also is Heracles' baldric (*Odyssey* 11.609–14.) whose violent, bloody images can be seen as projections of the hero's own aggressive power, and even terrify Odysseus when he is describing it to the Phaeacians (esp. *Od.* 11.613–14). These specific images clearly function as statements of heroic ferocity, which is often evident in the baleful glare of heroes themselves, both in Homeric epic (*Il.* 3.342; *Od.* 11.608, etc.),<sup>52</sup> and Aeschylean tragedy, where the dramatist uses φόβον βλέπων to describe the terrifying glare of Hippomedon in the *Septem* (498; cf. 537). It is also worth noting that Achilles' own Myrmidones were too terrified even to look at his divinely crafted weaponry (*Il.* 19.14–15), although their fear seems to result from the overall aspect of Achilles' armour, rather than any specific depiction on the shield. This brings out an apotropaic element of that warrior's armour which can be seen to embody his own powers, as it fills him with heroic χόλος, while he also delights in the divine imagery on his shield (*Il.* 19.15–19). Parallels with apotropaic images from Homer and the *Scutum* would be almost certainly strengthened if the final part of line 21 of the *Theoroi* survived, since it very likely specifies the role of φόβος, thus extending the nature of the power which the satyr reads into his portrait.<sup>53</sup> In fact, certain late Archaic amphorae show satyrs on the shields of heroes, notably in Exekias' celebrated depiction of Achilles and Ajax playing a board game, and Euthymides' portrayal of Hector arming watched by Priam.<sup>54</sup> Such visual parallels strengthen the idea that a satyric depiction might be apotropaic, and in the *Theoroi* this is further borne out in its imagined effect on the satyr's mother and intended on the ξένοι (13–17, 20–21). As far as the latter effect is concerned, Aeschylus adds a mock heroic twist to the satyrs' belief in the efficacy of their depictions; for they now gloss the images in the style sometimes used by epic, lyric, and tragedy to describe portents of war or a hero's apotropaic armour.

It has been observed that satyric drama is a 'comedy of incongruity', involving a ludicrous juxtaposition of the heroic and comic, and the action even within the opening scene of our *Theoroi* fragments bears this out.<sup>55</sup> The Aeschylean satyrs are comically, rather than terrifyingly, ugly, yet they still somehow see their portraits as beautiful. There is also something definitely misplaced about the satyr's belief in the powers of his depiction. Satyrs are hardly the most terrifying monsters to roam the earth—unless you happen to be a nymph or maenad trying to escape their amorous advances. Even then they seem pretty easy to fend off, as certain red-figure vase paintings suggest.<sup>56</sup> Satyrs onstage are often in a state of fear and/or subjugation,<sup>57</sup> as

<sup>52</sup> As noted by Faraone (n. 4), 38, and 48, n. 13.

<sup>53</sup> See Diggle's and Radt's *apparatus* for such conjectures as φόβον βλέπων and others along the same lines.

<sup>54</sup> *LIMC* vol. VIII.2, s.v. 'Silenoi', figs 187, 188; see also the catalogue of shield devices compiled by G. Chase, *HSCPh* 13 (1902), 121.

<sup>55</sup> Sutton (n. 2), 159.

<sup>56</sup> See T. H. Carpenter, *Dionysian Imagery in Fifth Century Athens* (Oxford, 1977), pl. 45b.

<sup>57</sup> On this as a theme in satyric drama, see Sutton (n. 2), 147–8; Seaford, *Euripides. Cyclops* (n. 2), 33–36.

in Euripides' *Cyclops*, and their perennial cowardice earns them a stinging rebuke from Silenus in the *Ichneutae* (145ff.), whose own terrified response when he hears Hermes' music comes as no surprise. In the *Theoroi*, too, satyric fear is more than hinted at ([c] col. ii, 50–5). These features add a comic nuance to the parallels Aeschylus draws between the satyrs' portraits and warlike images in heroic myth that are presented as genuinely terrifying. The innate cowardice and buffoonery of satyrs make their depictions more like parodies of apotropaic heroic imagery, rather like *μορμολυκεία*. Aristophanes' use of *μορμώ* to parody the Gorgon on Lamachus' shield in the *Acharnians* (582ff.; cf. *Peace* 473–4) is a noteworthy parallel here. Feigning terror at his rival's armour and shield *σῆμα*, Dicaeopolis reduces what is supposed to be a psychological weapon of war to a comical, childish image, undercutting any pretensions it might have to instilling genuine fear. Lamachus appears a blustering buffoon, more to be laughed at than feared. Similarly, the buffoonery which underlies the satyrs' games with their portraits puts the images on a mock-heroic level. Fifth-century vase paintings provide corroborative evidence of satyrs in mock-heroic pose; in this medium satyrs will sometimes appear in warrior guise, at other times they parody no less a figure than Heracles himself.<sup>58</sup>

Although it is sometimes said that analysis of humour is destined to take the fun out of its subject, I hope at least to have clarified some significant features of Aeschylus' dramatic, indeed comic, techniques in the *Theoroi*. Aeschylus here invokes *τόποι* concerning the powers of visual artifice in early epic and tragedies—notably his own—which he then presents to his audience 'through a fun-house mirror' by incorporating them into the satyric antics onstage. This scene, then, produced when there is widespread focus on optics, the psychology of perception, and visual artifice in Greek intellectual culture,<sup>59</sup> testifies to Aeschylus' interest in art significantly beyond the rise of realism. The reaction of the Aeschylean satyrs to the effect of their portraits is predictably silly, but is all the more interesting for how it is grounded in contemporary ideas on the abilities of visual images to provide pleasure, deceive the onlooker, and induce fear in heroic and not-so heroic contexts. These concepts are deftly woven into this 'playful tragedy' by the playwright not only known for his interests in the power of visual artifice,<sup>60</sup> but reckoned in antiquity as the finest exponent of satyric drama.<sup>61</sup>

University of Canterbury, New Zealand

PATRICK O'SULLIVAN

p.osullivan@clas.canterbury.ac.nz

<sup>58</sup> For the satyr-as-warrior, see G. M. Hedreen, *Silens in Attic Black-figure Vase Painting. Myth and Performance* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1992), pl. 36a; see also *LIMC* VIII.2, s.v. 'Silenoi' figs 132, 133, 138. For the Heracles parody, see T. Carpenter, *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece* (London, 1991), fig. 212.

<sup>59</sup> See above n. 15 for an outline of the evidence for this claim.

<sup>60</sup> See above n. 16.

<sup>61</sup> I am grateful to *CQ*'s anonymous referee, Associate-Professor Graham Zanker and especially Professor C. Collard for comments on earlier versions of this paper.