Accepted version: forthcoming in L. Coo and A. Uhlig (eds.) *Aeschylus at Play*, *BICS* 62.2.

REPRESENTATION AND NOVELTY IN AESCHYLUS' *THEOROI*

OLIVER THOMAS

Abstract

This article argues in favour of the view that in *Theoroi* (aka *Isthmiastai*) the satyrs had absconded from Dionysus' choral training, and dedicate a set of votive masks on Poseidon's Isthmian temple. I propose that at the end of fr. 78c Dionysus offers them javelins and suggests that they dance a *pyrrhikhe*. This plot rests on a blurring of the distinctions between satyr, human character and human performer. I interpret how Aeschylus managed plot, scenery, masks, costume and language in order to transform this blurring to elicit from the audience humorous reflection on the nature of dramatic innovation and of drama as a representational medium.

Plot

Until Lobel published *POxy.* 2162 in 1941, little was known about *Theoroi* (*Festival Delegates*), though testimonia recorded the title and its alternative *Isthmiastai* (*Participants at the Isthmia*: Aesch. T78, fr. 81) and suggested it was a satyr play (fr. 79, see below). The papyrus from Oxyrhynchus forms part of the set of Aeschylean works copied by scribe 'A3' in the second century CE.[1] It comprises two substantial fragments (78a and 78c Radt), whose relative position – long suspected – was demonstrated by Henry and Nünlist (2000), based on the alignment of margin and fibres when the *kollesis* visible in 78c.7 is identified with that visible in 78a.67. 78a covers the first of three consecutive columns and the foot of the second, while 78c covers the upper parts of the second and third. This leaves us with the gist of nearly 100 lines, besides a line, a half-line, two individual words, and two further scraps from the papyrus (frs. 79, 82, 80-81, 78b and 78d respectively). I shall hereafter call the whole of the main fragment '78c', and use the continuous line-numeration found in Radt and in Sommerstein 2008.

I begin with how I would extract the plot from fr. 78c. As will become apparent, the fragment leaves room for so many disputes that a discussion of this length cannot aim to be definitive or to cover every interesting question. My aim instead is to lay enough of a foundation to render plausible both a new suggestion about what the 'new toys' offered in line 86 are for, and the interpretation of the scene which follows.

The first part of the fragment (ll. 1-22) picks up at the end of a speech by an unidentifiable character. Line 2 summarizes: ὅπῃ δ' ἂν ἔ̣[ρ]δῃς πάντα σοι τάδ' εὐσεβῆ̣, 'However you [singular] act / perform them, all these things are proper for you'. Lobel (1941) aptly compared Electra's query about formulating a prayer for revenge at *Cho.* 122, ταῦτα μοὔστιν εὐσεβῆ ('Are these things proper for me?'). This suggests that the speaker has given, and has authority to give, ritual advice, most likely relating to the action which follows, as described in lines 18-20: 'Come on, behold [plural] the house of the maritime

I would like to thank the editors, the anonymous referees and Rebecca Lämmle for their advice, as well as the audience of the initial version of this paper at the University of California, Davis in 2014.

[1] On this set see Johnson 2004: 18-20; Carrara 2013.

earth-shaker, and each of you nail up a […] messenger of your beautiful form.' I will return to the form of these nailed-up portraits below, and here merely note that the dedicators must be the chorus. Throughout fr. 78c, including in the instructions just quoted, a singular leader of the chorus plays a major role; I will call him the 'coryphaeus', but with scare-quotes to remind us that it could in most places also be Silenus.[2] His instruction shows that there was a *skene* (implying, in my view, a mature play) and that it represents a temple of Poseidon, evidently the one at the Isthmus given the play's titles. The archaic Isthmian temple burnt down c. 470-450 and its replacement was not finished until long after Aeschylus, but I cannot progress beyond simple speculation that the fire gave the play some contemporary resonance.[3]

With the chorus facing the *skene* (18) ready to nail up the images, the 'coryphaeus' prays to Poseidon to be their guardian (22).[4] Poseidon is lord of the sea, shaker of the land (18) – a global power. Nevertheless as they hail his protection, a threat to their safety enters behind their backs.[5] The new speaker's identity becomes clear from l. 68 on, where he berates the 'coryphaeus' for spreading disrespect about his femininity, for impugning a popular festival that he convenes (72-74), and for not honouring ivy but instead becoming an Isthmian athlete (75-76, cf. 34-35). It is therefore Dionysus, who has come from elsewhere to track down the chorus (23). He wishes that the 'coryphaeus' had been practising his customary dancing (33 τοὔρχημα, focusing on the feet); instead, he has been exercising his arm (35 βραχ{ε}ί̣ο̣[ν' ἀ]σ̣κ̣εῖς) – partly in athletics such as discus-throwing, one imagines, and partly in hammering up his image in front of Dionysus. The 'coryphaeus' has done something with 'these possessions for the assistant of your labours', *i.e.* for Poseidon, while ruining Dionysus' own 'goods'.[6] The most plausible account for why the satyrs absconded from a situation in which Dionysus had entrusted them with goods, and then insulted a festival that he describes by synecdoche as 'these two-row [dances]' (74), is that he had been training them to be a chorus and that they found it unpleasant (boring, arduous?).[7] They have then taken his choregic outlay such as costumes and garlands, run

[2] In line 13, the speaker's consideration of his mother suggests a satyr speaking with Silenus among his addressees: Ferrari 2013: 199 n. 2; Conrad 1997: 79-82.

[3] For the dates see Gebhard and Bentz 1998; Gebhard and Hemans 1998: 10.

[4] ἐπίτροπο̣[ς δ'] ὑ̣φ̣[ίστασο. The verb (Mette) appears to be the only imperative which fits metre, sense, and traces.

[5] It is visually and sonically interesting for the satyrs to actually nail up the images, either just before or after 22. The stage-business builds suspense and humour the longer they are unaware of Dionysus' presence. It gives extra point to l. 35 (see below), and avoids having unused images littering the acting-area if he interrupts them.

[6] 35-36 χρήματα φθείρων ἐμά | κτεα[c.8]ε ταῦτ' ἐπηράνω̣ι πόνων̣. The]ε looks like a particle in second position, so I suspect an unattested compound such as κτεα[νοδοτῶν τ]ε. O'Sullivan and Collard (2013: 275 n. 15) equated ἐπηράνωι with Dionysus, which involves an irregular shift of case. The interpretation that Dionysus is commenting on the act of dedication to Poseidon produces a smooth antithesis and aligns κτεα[with epigraphic uses of κτέανα in contexts of dedicating a part of one's wealth (*CEG* 205, 251, 264).

[7] A tempting possibility is that Dionysus' festival was an Athenian one; Kamerbeek (1955: 10) speculated that satyr-choruses adopted a two-row formation often enough that '*these* two-row [dances]' would be both anaphoric to what has just been described, and deictic to the Athenian performance setting; cf. Voelke 2001: 136. Pollux 4.108-09 claims that 3x4, 3x5, and 4x6 formations were typical of tragic and comic choruses. The Isthmia seem however to have fallen substantially after the City Dionysia: Andrewes 1981 on Th. 8.9.1.

away to the Isthmus and, at least as Dionysus infers, exchanged it for the votives to Poseidon whose dedication he has just witnessed.[8]

The satyrs' initial rationale for going to the sanctuary is hinted at in 22 (cited above) and 79-80 when they refuse to leave: they have sought asylum. Probably this process involved a supplication being accepted by someone with local authority – the priest of the sanctuary, or a local king (Sisyphus?); this figure of religious authority may be the 'adviser' of ll. 1-2, who is called πρόφρων (3, 'supportive'), an adjective also applied to *e.g.* Peleus and Apollo when they accept an asylum-seeker (*Il.* 9.480, Aesch. *Cho.* 1063). The pre-existing evidence that *Theoroi* was a satyr-play, amply confirmed by the plot of fr. 78c, was a character commenting on 'these old-fashioned σκωπεύματα' (fr. 79) – a dance in a look-out posture, familiar from vases of satyrs and explicitly connected to Aeschylean satyrs in Photius.[9] Such a dance must have featured when the chorus, newly arrived at the Isthmus, was keeping watch against Dionysus.

Even if the satyrs initially came to seek asylum, the fact that they are now in athletic training suggests a double function for their votive images – not only to thank Poseidon for protection, but also to win him over in their quest of a prize in the games. Indeed, this implication energises the description of the images as both messenger and herald (20), since heralds had specific roles at athletic contests, such as officially announcing the victors.[10] The satyrs' attempts to master unfamiliar athletic disciplines presumably had hilarious consequences in the middle of the play, which would make this aspirational function of their dedication seem absurd.

Other satyr plays suggest that this story of the satyrs abandoning Dionysus' choral training for Isthmian athletics would have been attached to a known myth; the foundation of the Isthmian games seems the most likely candidate. Both Sisyphus and Theseus – the founders of the Isthmia in two common versions – were popular figures in satyr play.[11] Welcker (1824: 339) already suggested that *Isthmiastai* might have come from the same production as *Athamas*, whose titular character was the father of Melikertes, whose death the Isthmia commemorated in the normal myth. Now that we have a substantial fragment, we can see a significant part of the play where the mythological frame played little or no role – one of many signs of how freely a satyr-chorus could adapt to new mythical habitats.[12]

After Dionysus has berated the satyrs and they have refused to return, the final section of fr. 78c (ll. 85-98) presents someone offering them 'toys newly created from adze and anvil', *i.e.* made of wood and metal (86-87 ἀθύρματα | ἀπὸ [σκε]πάρνου κἄκμ[ονος ν]εόκτ[ιτα). The identities of both toys and speaker have been disputed; let me sound a note of caution before tackling what recent articles have called 'Gli oggetti misteriosi' and

[8] Dionysus' inference need not be correct, and in l. 3 the 'coryphaeus' expresses great indebtedness to their adviser. But it seems more likely that the images have been paid for.

[9] Phot. σ 400. See Ath. 14.629f, Hsch. σ 1218; Jucker 1956; Lämmle 2013: 197-98.

[10] Wolicki 2002; Crowther 1994.

[11] Lämmle 2013: 247-74 (with many comments on Theseus), 306 n. 6 (Sisyphus). For the myths see Paus. 2.1.3, Plu. *Thes.* 11. The latter involves Theseus securing some Athenian *prohedria* at the Isthmia, and raises the tantalizing possibility that *Theoroi* engaged with Athens-Corinth relations rather as *Eumenides* does with Athens-Argos relations.

[12] Cf. Lissarrague's recipe for satyr play: 'take one myth, add satyrs, observe the result' (1990: 236).

'Oggetti non identificati'.[13] There is now a fair degree of consensus that the speaker is still Dionysus: he is addressed as deictically present in 84 (σύ, ταῦτ[α]), and it is most unlikely that a different character arrived unannounced at the exact moment of Dionysus' departure. The discourse of athletics as a novelty remains the same in 85 (καινὰ ταῦτα μ̣α̣[νθά]νειν) as it was in 34 (τρόπους και[νοὺς μ]α̣θών̣), as does the colloquial mode of address (90 ὦγαθέ, cf. 23 ὦγαθοί: only here in Aeschylus).[14] The speaker then asks the chorus to join in with the Isthmia using their new athletic profession (92-94) – something that does not need saying by their athletic patron.

At 77-78 Dionysus threatened the 'coryphaeus' with tears, perhaps caused by some visible objects.[15] In 85-89 the things by which the leader feels threatened are labelled 'toys' by Dionysus (86 ἀθύρματα, and probably 88 π̣α̣ι̣γ̣[νίω]ν̣), who explains in 92-94 that one can be used as part of a suitable form of athletic joint participation in the Isthmia (ταύτη[ι] π̣ρέπ̣[ει] … ξυνισθμιάζειν [. . . . ( )] ἐμμελέστατο̣ν̣).[16] Di Marco (1992) argued forcefully that Dionysus should not make a sudden *volte-face* and start supporting the satyrs' athletic efforts, but inferred that his reference to 'toys' and joint athletic competition must be profoundly sarcastic and menacing, and that the objects could involve something like a chariot to which the satyrs will be yoked humiliatingly.[17] This reconstruction is uneconomical in assuming that Dionysus has entered with a set of clunky yokes and a chariot pulled by unspecified acolytes, and the idea that (all?) the satyrs will be yoked makes one wonder how they performed the rest of the play.

Scholarship has neglected the possible positions for Dionysus between an abrupt *volte-face* and uninterrupted aggression. The apparent menace in talking of 'toys' could be designed to prolong the tension before a release in which he proposes a compromise solution, if one can find such a solution. A number of points favour the possibility that Dionysus is presenting the satyrs with javelins, and not for a pentathlon, nor merely as a threat, but for the ideal compromise between athletic and choral training – an armed dance.

Javelins match the description of the 'toys': they are made of wood often with a metal tip (87), and apt to threaten tears until Dionysus explains an unexpected way of using them.[18] They give point to the 'coryphaeus' asking Dionysus to 'send them' elsewhere (84

[13] Cipolla 2011; Ferrari 2013. For older identifications see Di Marco 1992.

[14] For the mildly passive-aggressive tone of ἀγαθέ in Plato, Menander and often Aristophanes, see Dickey 1996 *s.v.*, esp. 113, 119, 139.

[15] Line 78 begins παρόντα δ' ἐγγὺς οὐχ ὁρᾶις, but may have ended with a word like 'troubles'. Cipolla (2011: 242-43) compared Ar. *Av.* 1018. For the threat as a reminder of the degree to which Dionysus is the satyrs' master, see Uhlig, this issue.

[16] ἢιπερ (but not ὥσπερ) fits the gap: 'using it [*i.e.* athletics], you should … jointly participate [as] is most harmonious'. I return to ἐμμελέστατον below.

[17] Di Marco envisaged the 'first toy' (88) as portable stocks that will be used like a yoke to make the satyrs pull Dionysus' chariot. Ferrari (2013: 207) identified it with a horse-bit. Kawasaki (1995) thought of a war-chariot, which is not athletic enough. The menacing 'toys' perhaps resonate with Dionysus' own experience of the Titans distracting him by toys in order to tear him apart (see Levaniouk 2007). For the phrasing compare Cratinus *PCG* fr. 152 νεοχμόν τι παρῆχθαι ἄθυρμα.

[18] Snell (1956: 8) identified the 'toys' as javelins, but took them as solely threatening. Voelke's suggestion (2001: 103-11) that they are musical instruments used in Dionysiac worship is not scary enough. Wiles (2007: 207) thought of helmets for the *hoplitodromos*, which do not relate to an adze or Dionysus. The chorus's

ταῦτ[α π]έμπε), since πέμπω was used of throwing missiles (see *e.g.* Stes. fr. 304 Finglass with commentary). More tellingly, scholars have struggled with the 'coryphaeus' saying that the first toy has an ἐπίπλοον, an omentum or gut-casing.[19] A new javelin (especially one with a metal tip) might well be wrapped in such a way that it still looks dangerous, and a satyr would naturally compare this to the much more appealing casing of a sausage. At Aristophanes *Ach.* 1118-21 a similar analogy is made between Lamachus getting his spear from a close-fitting case and Dikaiopolis removing a sausage from a skewer.

Javelins also connect athletics (specifically pentathlon) and the range of armed dances denoted by *pyrrhikhe*, which were most often performed carrying shields and spears.[20] The satyrs may earlier have trained for the *hoplitodromos*, a race where athletes carried shields; Kamerbeek even suggested that Dionysus alludes to this in the fragmentary line 64, 'having covered with a shield' (1955: 7). Putting the two athletic props together would leave the chorus equipped for a *pyrrhikhe*. Such dances also involve the satyrs' 'new profession' (92) because of their famed athleticism. But *pyrrhikhai* were performed by a group, and Dionysus' shift from ἰσθμιάζω (75) to ξυν-ισθμιάζω (94) shows him averting the threat to the satyrs' corporate choral identity if they progress from training to competing as individual athletes. Within the drama Dionysus would be proposing a new dance, at least for the satyrs, but for the Athenian audience pre-existing connections of satyrs to *pyrrhikhai* naturalise the aetiology: Voelke has gathered passages where the *pyrrhikhe* is connected to the satyrs' primary dance, the *sikinnis*; Ceccarelli has illustrated that Athenian representations of armed dancing in c. 515-480 BCE include a fair proportion of satyrs.[21] These images also show that the Athenians were acclimatised to satyrs performing with some hybrid equipment, *e.g.* a thyrsus (or in our case a javelin) instead of a spear. The longstanding practice of armed dancing in funeral contexts (Ceccarelli 2004: 111-15) suits the likely embedding of our fragment in the myth that the Isthmia were founded to commemorate Melikertes' death. Even the detail that Dionysus had been training the satyrs for a festival involving 'two-line' dances (74) may add to the sense of a perfect compromise, since the mimesis of front-line fighting performed in a *pyrrhikhe*, at least as described at Plato *Lg.* 815a, suggests a two-row formation.[22]

---

unfamiliarity with the 'toys' implies that, if they are javelins, the play had not contained a scene of pentathlon training; Dionysus has brought them with him.

[19] 93 [τοὐ]πίπλουν μ' οὐχ ἁνδάν[ει. Henry and Nünlist (2000: 16) speculated that ἐπίπλοον had the metaphorical sense 'advertising puff'. Others have posited that the word is part of ἔπιπλα 'equipment' (very rarely singular, and very rarely transmitted ἐπίπλοα) or ἐπίπλοος (semantically hard).

[20] Ceccarelli 1998 and Poursat 1968 illustrate that where dancers are depicted carrying spears, they are of varying lengths and may or may not have a metal tip. Depictions of sporting javelins also vary in length and tip; the main difference from the iconography of *pyrrhikhai*-spears is that javelins were given spin using a thong which is often represented (see Jüthner and Brein 1965: ii.309-15).

[21] Voelke 2001: 131-57; Ceccarelli 1998: 68-69, 227-30. For the exploration of dance-forms and music in satyr play see esp. Griffith 2013.

[22] This perhaps favours a chorus of twelve. At Xenophon *Anab.* 5.4.11-14, Mossynoikians line up 'like choruses' in long paired columns (οἷον χοροὶ ἀντιστοιχοῦντες ἀλλήλοις), and march off to war 'with rhythmic march and song'. The *pyrrhikhistai* on Atarbos' base (Akropolis Museum 1338; discussion in Shear 2003) are distributed in two lines of four, but facing the same direction. For evidence of *pyrrhikhai* in tragedy see Aelian *VH* 3.8 and Σ Soph. *Aj.* 699-700; for satyr play see the ideas at Lämmle 2013: 186-91.

Finally, my reconstruction is consistent with the scrappier end of the papyrus. In 95 ('carrying … he will step in/upon') the 'coryphaeus' may express scepticism about whether carrying javelins is consistent with entering the athletic competitions.[23] Dionysus' answer probably includes 'you will lead … step by step' ( ]βάδην ἐλ[ᾱ]ις, where βάδην would pick up ἐμβήσεται from the question), then 'bearing(?) ankles' (]φέρων σφυρά). Supplying a negative in the former line gives an overall idea such as 'In fact, you won't just be walking with them, but leaping vigorously into the air', just as Plato's description of the *pyrrhikhe* includes 'high leaps out of the way' (*Lg.* 815a ἐκπηδήσεσιν ἐν ὕψει).

This interpretation resolves the difference between Dionysus and the satyrs and so allows the play to move towards a conclusion. It turns the satyrs into a functioning festival chorus, so that they become viable *theoroi* as suggested by the play's title, rather than the asylum-seekers turned risible athletes which one can otherwise reconstruct for the plot. Dionysus has a 'pyrrhic victory': he loses his choregic outlay and the performance he originally intended, but wins back the satyrs with a *pyrrhikhe.*

Representation

Within the plot as reconstructed above, a group of satyrs abandon choral training for Dionysus' festival, while the performance entails Athenian choreuts entering choral training for the City Dionysia at Athens.[24] While the choreuts don their partially bestial costume and 'become' satyrs, the satyr-characters become more like free citizens with their athletic aspirations, which correspond to some degree to the orderly physical efforts demanded from the choreuts in an Aeschylean tetralogy. Hence the choreuts and their characters make complementary movements towards each other – movements which complicate the obvious oppositions around which the visible part of the plot is structured: Dionysus/Poseidon, Dionysia/Isthmia, satyr/athlete, chorus-training/athletics, traditional/ new, and so on.[25] Fragment 78c gives us an opportunity to see how this structural feature of the plot plays out onstage at the level of individual actions and phrases, and in particular how Aeschylus used it to create his 'capolavoro di autoreferenzialità', as Marconi (2005: 77) has called it in passing. This self-reflexive quality has often been noted, but I shall try to further our understanding of it especially by teasing out the implications of a *mise en abyme* structure, by which I mean the embedding of discussion of one artistic form in a comparable (not necessarily identical) one.[26]

---

[23] For ἐμβαίνω of 'entering' a contest rather than 'embarking' on a vehicle see *e.g. Iliad* 16.94, Libanius *Ep.* 529 εἰς ἀγῶνας ἐμβαίνειν (corresponding to Snell's supplement in 95).

[24] Similarly Euripides *Cyc.* 63, where the satyrs moan 'this situation is not Dionysus, not choruses', which is true within the representation but false for the performers.

[25] For satyrs represented as a foil to positive masculinity see *e.g.* Lasserre 1973: 284-88; Voelke 2001; Griffith 2005; Lissarrague 2013. Dramatic satyrs in general are not found in their 'natural' dancing conditions: see Lämmle, this issue.

[26] Steiner (2001: 47-48) and Zeitlin (1994: 138-39) have useful brief comments. Kaimio *et al.* (2001) discussed satyr drama's metatheatricality regarding comments on dancing, music, costumes and masks, and the possibility of audience-address and of allusion to previous dramatic texts.

Let us return to the images in fr. 78c.1-22. Their physical forms – which the original audience could simply see – have been vigorously debated.[27] From 19-20 it appears that each satyr has something separate to nail up.[28] The plural in 11 (εὐκταῖα … ταῦτ̣[α], 'these votives') and sung quality of 12 (syncopated iambics including εὐχά̣ν, where only α fits the trace), show that those lines are about the chorus's objects, which are therefore painted (12 καλλίγραπ̣̣τον). They are carried over as the subject of 13, and depict each satyr so that his mother would 'believe it to be me, whom she reared, so similar is this guy' (13-17; in 17, ὅδε neatly animates the depiction). Lines 6-7 appear to say that the image of the 'coryphaeus' is a μίμημα ('representation', 'imitation') of himself almost worthy of Daedalus.[29] Several scholars have recently taken this comment to imply that the image must be a statue(tte), and indeed one which moves itself. But it is not certain that Daedalus' works are invoked here for more than their vitality, and the hypothesis of a self-propelling statue poses severe problems.[30] Apart from how it was staged, it would contrast with what gets nailed up, whereas there is a strong hint that the image of the 'coryphaeus' is of the same type as the others in the parallels between 6-7 and 19-20 (μορφῆι / μορφῆς, φωνῆς δεῖ / ἄναυδον: Sonnino 2016: 50). I therefore assume a set of lifelike painted images of a single kind.

The kind of similitude implied in a mother potentially confusing her son's image with her son, even allowing for hyperbole (as counselled by Halliwell 2002: 20), suggests to me that each representation is more or less life-sized; Kaimio *et al.* (2001: 58) raised the further consideration that if they are instead significantly scaled-down, their features would be difficult to appreciate for all but the first few rows of the audience. Full-length portraits would then be very unwieldy to bring on and nail up individually, so I infer that the images are partial. Krumeich (2000: 185) raised in passing the possible objection that the satyrs focus on the depiction of their μορφή (6, 19), a word that suggests their overall physiognomy.[31] But if the head (for example) is sufficiently distinctive one can apply μορφή to it, especially where an audience can see what is being described – as in the case of the horned human Io of *Prometheus Bound*, when she complains εὐθὺς δὲ μορφὴ καὶ φρένες διάστροφοι | ἦσαν (673-74, 'Instantly my form and mind were twisted').

If only a part of the satyrs was represented, it must have included the head – the part that a mother would recognize most easily, and which can best act as a 'messenger' and

---

[27] Krumeich and Wessels (KPS 142 n. 49) give numerous references.

[28] Sonnino (2016: 51) drew attention to the unusual construction of κἀπιπασσάλευ' ἕ̣καστος: the pronoun normally takes a third singular or second plural imperative. I am not convinced of the need to read κἀπιπασσάλευ<θ>'. In any case, usage of ἕκαστος indicates that each satyr is called on to act simultaneously but separately, not that they are each to do part of a single action as Sonnino suggested.

[29] In 6 I understand '[if] this [seems] to be more of a spectre for my form than […]', with the bracketed words in the damaged part of 5, whose details are very uncertain. See Iovine 2016.

[30] I return to the point below. See Morris (1992: 215-37) for early comments on Daedalus' work, focusing on but not limited to speaking, self-propelling statues. The image of the 'coryphaeus' lacks 'only a voice' (7); the idea that it moves has been read into 10 χωρεῖ μάλα, though one can also accentuate χώρει (instructing each satyr). For the assertion that something worthy of Daedalus must be a statue, see Kiilerich 2006: 64; Iovine 2013; Ferrari 2013: 201; Sonnino 2016: 46.

[31] Krumeich's article is a useful study of the practice of dedicating portraits on *pinakes*. The consideration against scaled-down figures also tells against Sonnino's intriguing identification of the (in his view single) image as a *baskanion* (2016: 46-52), and the inferences that follow from it.

'voiceless herald' (20). Fraenkel's idea that the satyrs dedicate painted masks (1942: 245) is particularly attractive. The satyrs comment that their mother would face trouble (13), turn (15) and 'wail(?) from thinking it's me' (15-16).[32] The point is not that satyrs were such naughty children that seeing their image would reopen their mothers' psychological scars (Cipolla 2011: 237 n. 14): it is specifically the mistaken identification of the image as the real thing that makes the mother wail. Snell explained convincingly that a lifelike mask nailed to a temple would be reminiscent of the decapitated heads adorning the buildings of mythological bad eggs such as Oinomaos, Antaios and Lykourgos.[33] Masks are also a plausible dedication: we know of *theoroi* at other sanctuaries offering metal commemorative masks (Rutherford 2013: 118-19), and victorious *choregoi* at the City Dionysia could commemorate their success with dedications including masks affixed to Dionysus' temple, immediately behind the *skene* and probably within view of the upper tiers of the *theatron*.[34] Finally, the nailing up of satyr-masks could visually suggest the practice of decorating temples with silen antefixes, even if these masks are nailed on lower down the building.[35]

This brief analysis of the resonances of nailing up satyr-masks returns us to the process by which Aeschylus explores the distinction and merging of human choreut and satyr character by letting the chorus escape into the human world of the Isthmian sanctuary. The similarity to antefix decoration arises only because the satyrs have non-human features, a point that contributes to the double-meaning in fr. 78c.1 where the images are of 'inhuman' quality (εἰκοὺ[ς] οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπουσ[ ). As votives, the objects are part of a distinctively human behaviour and a means to fit in at the Isthmia. The resonance of dedicating masks after a Dionysiac victory points unsubtly to the aspiration of the choreuts and their *choregos* – a joke which might actually win over the judges. The chorus have acquired masks that replicate what they see as their beauty (19), while the choreuts are wearing masks that take them away from Athenian masculine ideals. The satyrs' emphasis on the individuality of the images toys with the fact that satyrs (as imagined in the wild, and as presented in choruses) are normally marked out as a group by a stereotyped set of features (long ears, snub noses, receding hairlines, etc). Possibly this satyr-chorus did have individuated masks, whose point is now revealed. But I think it more likely that the kind of individuation praised by the chorus was not perceptible to the audience, who had to extract

[32] α{ξ}ἰάζοιτό θ' ὡς | δοκοῦσ' ἔμ' εἶναι. The juxtaposition with 'causing trouble' is the grounds for preferring the emendation αἰάζοιτο to, say, ἀσπάζοιτο.

[33] Snell 1956: 6-7. For Antaios see Pindar *I.* 3/4.72, where the scholia compare Oinomaos (Sophocles fr. 473a) and Euenos (in Bacchylides 20). For Lycurgus see Nonnus *D.* 20.170. Cf. Kyknos in Stesichorus fr. 166a Finglass, who builds a whole temple from skulls.

[34] For memorialization of masks see *e.g.* Aristophanes *PCG* fr. 130 ὅπου τὰ μορμολυκεῖα προσκρεμάννυται ('Where the grotesque masks are hung up', in answer to 'Where is the Dionysion?'), Green 1994: 45-46. The evidence reviewed in Wilson 2000: 236-43 also includes larger types of dedication outside the Dionysion, and *pinakes* that seem to have contained text rather than images (Plu. *Them.* 5.4, Arist. *Pol.* 1341a37; cheapskate version in Thphr. *Char.* 22.1-2).

[35] Marconi 2005 observes that around 465 silen antefixes in Sicily changed to look more like Attic satyrs.

the idea that satyrs, like mice and sheep, can differentiate between members of their species where we might struggle.[36]

A play called *Theoroi*, where the satyrs escape training for a Dionysia only to participate in another sanctuary, surely caused many in the audience to reflect on their own theoric participation as spectators at the Athenian Dionysia. My discussion of the images of ll. 1-22 so far has skirted the invitation from Aeschylus to compare them *qua* representation not only with Daedalus' statues (specifically invoked in lines 5-7) but also with drama itself. Indeed, Aeschylus inserts his agency into the passage through the wordplay in l. 12, where the images are a καλλίγραπτος vow - a 'finely painted' but also a well-written, one. In terms of audience response, the two forms of representation have noticeable similarities.[37] The satyrs' mothers and foreign travellers are imagined passing through the sanctuary, which was indeed beside the main road. The mothers will experience horror from viewing the masks, under a misapprehension that we have to decode via dramatic tropes (see above) – namely that they have entered one of satyr-drama's favoured plots, with an ogre-figure who despatches travellers, but with the tragic twist that he seems to have been decapitating the satyrs themselves. Other visitors will stop at the sight of the satyrs' images (20-21). In claiming this, the satyrs may have in mind one particular visitor whose approach they wish to halt (Dionysus), but the epigraphic trope of objects inviting the passer-by to stop to think or marvel also seems relevant.[38] These masks which give one pause to think and feel horror, and the mother's misunderstanding of what sort of dramatic plot the *skene* belongs to, connect squarely with Aeschylus' oeuvre as a whole.

In other respects, however, as in many a *mise en abyme*, Aeschylus here sets up a comparison where the cards are stacked in favour of the embedding form of representation. After all, the satyrs' images actively contribute to the embedding form (the drama), where *qua* antefix-like dedications they enhance the *skene*'s representation of a temple, and where their description draws attention to the high production-values of the props, including all masks present in the play.[39] I observed above that the 'coryphaeus' appears to compare his image to Daedalus' work in terms of being lifelike, but not necessarily of mobility. I would now add that at the level of authorial motivation, the hyperbole of the comparison has another function suited to the economy of the *mise en abyme*. As the 'coryphaeus' holds

---

[36] This irony (noted by *e.g.* Conrad 1997: 65), and the satyrs' general lack of artistic expertise, must be factored in by scholars who wish to situate fr. 78c in the development of ethical and realistic individuation in Greek portraiture. See *e.g.* Sörbom 1966: 41-53; Stieber 1994; Kiilerich 2006: 69-70.

[37] See O'Sullivan 2000 on the effects of viewing in fr. 78c.

[38] ἐμπόρων κωλύτορ[α] | ὅ[σ]τ᾽ ἐπισχήσει κελεύθου τοὺς ξένο[υς] φ ̣[, where the ending was not necessarily φο̣[β-. For the epigraphic trope, mainly on grave-markers, see *e.g. CEG* 28.2 στῆθι (= *IG* I^3 1204; c.535 BCE), *IScM* i.290 (imperial) ὁδῖτ', ἐπίσχες.... Marconi 2005: 81 observed that in currying Poseidon's favour, the satyrs must not promise to reduce footfall by frightening people out of his sanctuary. To avoid this impression in ἐμπόρων κωλύτορα, I take the primary sense to be 'someone to slow travellers down'; if the words also allude to warding off Dionysus (Setti 1952: 216), the implication may be not that the images are scary, but that they prove that the satyrs are irretrievably under Poseidon's protection.

[39] Aeschylus' scenographic practices are barely known. Vitruvius' reference to Agatharchus the Aeschylean scenographer (7 *Pref.* 11), and the claim in the *Vita Aeschyli* that the poet τὴν σκηνὴν ἐκόσμησεν ('ornamented the *skene*'), are both tantalizing but of dubious value. With the tradition that he introduced the painting of scary masks (Suda αι 357), compare the possibility that in *Eum.* 48-51 he recalls the masks of his own *Phineus* (see Hall 2006: 116-18).

his votive mask up beside his dramatic mask for comparison by the rest of the chorus, and announces through one mask that the other lacks only a voice, the audience can see very clearly that Aeschylus' creation of satyrs has the advantage not only over a mask sculpted in plaster or terracotta, but also over Daedalus' works: the latter could perhaps walk and talk (see n. 30 with references), but had an android's uncanniness rather than the identifiability of an actor embodying a part.

Novelty

We have seen that Aeschylus' plot involves humans role-playing satyrs trying to role-play human behaviour. In the process they generate an embedded form of mimesis – the images – which resonate simultaneously with satyrs through their similarity to silen antefixes, with human worshippers through votive practices, and with choreuts through choregic dedications. The embedding also invites a comparison to Aeschylus' own mimetic form in terms of (at least) creativity, effect on the audience, and verisimilitude.

A similar set of issues arise through Dionysus' insistence on a contrast of the satyrs' 'new' ways as opposed to their traditional behaviour, and a range of other kinds of 'newness' which Aeschylus here elevates even beyond its normal importance as a theme in satyr drama. They have ignored an ancient proverb (78c.32, *i.e.* to practise what one knows: Ar. *Vesp.* 1431) and instead learned new ways (34); athletics are 'new things', and Dionysus fights fire with fire using 'new … newly created' toys (85-86); their occupation now is the result of a change of preference (92 μεθείλ[ου], more likely than μεθεῖλ[ες]). On a visual level, the change has involved some recostuming: Dionysus explicitly asserts that the 'coryphaeus' is now garlanded not with ivy but with pine (75-76) – the species of Poseidon's sacred grove at the Isthmus and perhaps also, in a ridiculously aspirational touch, the species with which victors had at some point been garlanded.[40]

The chorus's *perizomata* had also changed from those traditional in satyr drama. This claim rests on the interpretation of l. 29 (ὁ̣ρ̣ῶ̣ν̣ μύουρα καὶ βραχέα τα̣[ ]̣[ ]α, 'seeing your … short and tapering'), which should be approached from the barrage of sexual innuendos in the following lines.[41] γυμνάζομαι 'I do naked exercise' (31) is straightforward. Ἰσθμιάζω (34) is close morphologically and geographically to Κορινθιάζω ('I visit a brothel'), but with a hint of a woman's anatomical ἰσθμός.[42] ἐκτρίβω (30) has a second sense similar to 'bump and grind', in view of which [πάλη]ν ('wrestling'; Tovar 1943: 439) makes a better object than [κόνι]ν ('dust') at the line-end. In this context, οὐκ ἠμελήσας ('you were not negligent') comes across as a double entendre on 'you didn't lack

[40] Pindar however refers to a celery-leaf crown in the 470s. Broneer (1962: 259-60) presented the evidence; his idea that this is a datable feature of *Theoroi* is unconvincing, not least since the satyrs have not actually won.

[41] Slenders 1992: 146-53. See also Voelke 2001: 401 (comic features in Dionysus' register); Moreau 2001: 43-4; Sommerstein 2008: 89 n. 7.

[42] See Ar. *Pax* 879-80 for this use. ἰσθμιάζω is also taken by Hsch. ι 923 to refer to an unhealthy lifestyle because of conditions at the Isthmia, perhaps alluded to in line 43 of our fragment; Phot. ι 203 relates the unhealthiness to excessive drinking, because one's throat is like an isthmus.

a μέλος', *i.e.* a member.[43] In sum, Dionysus looks on a short feature of the satyrs and infers that they have been exercising, with extensive puns on them having sexually exhausted themselves. Hence the feature was their phalluses.[44] The end of l. 29 was not τὰ φαλλία, since the papyrus does not have room for the scribe's very prominent φ. Deformation of the fibres makes it hard to judge the exact space available, but having manipulated the digital image to straighten things out I would analyse the traces as τα̣[ ]̣[, where]̣[is an apex, or a top right corner if one of the two letters was fairly narrow. I propose τὰ̣ [σ]α̣[υνί]α.[45] The word, normally referring to a spear, was used by Cratinus of a penis, probably a flaccid one in a phrase such as 'my spear is rotten' (*PCG* fr. 490; see Hesychius σ 273). The double-meaning fits the wordplays on athletic and sexual stamina admirably.

Dionysus' comment rests on distinctions between the normal ithyphallic state of satyrs, the shorter erect phallus on *perizomata* as they are generally depicted, and the idealized portrayal of athletes as exercising self-control and having small neat appendages – as when Aristophanes' Better Argument offers 'a big rump and a small penis' among the benefits of traditional gymnastic education (*Nu.* 1009-14; he loses). Dionysus describes their new appearance pointedly, using puns drawn from their former pursuits. His insistence that they have not previously practised athletics not only corresponded to the scenes of incompetent training which we can infer for earlier parts of the play, but also played out in their costume in the central signifier of their distance from human civility, their phallus. Whether the 'newness' of their role was also true on the level of what satyr-choruses had been up to is less clear: from Pratinas' *Wrestlers* (467 BCE) on, they often seem to brush with athletics.[46] But even if Aeschylus' relocation of the satyrs to an 'untraditional' role was itself already a 'traditional' plot-type for satyr-play, the modification to their *perizomata* may still have been an innovative twist on this particular way of using satyrs to explore male ideals with fresh eyes.[47]

The theme of tradition and innovation is applied not only to the satyrs' activities and costumes but also to dancing. I have already mentioned that in fr. 79 a character referred to the look-out dance of the 'coryphaeus' as not traditional but old-fashioned (καὶ μὴν παλαιῶν τῶνδέ σοι σκωπευμάτων), perhaps in the context of suggesting a new hobby of athletics. I also suggested that at the end of fr. 78c Dionysus proposes a compromise

[43] Archil. fr. 222 uses μέλη of the penis; cf. *Od.* 8.298 οὐδέ τι κινῆσαι μελέων ἦν οὐδ' ἀναεῖραι ('nor was it possible to move or raise any of his members'), of Ares trapped in bed with Aphrodite.

[44] Of mice and manhood: neither the normal sense of μύουρος ('tapering, slight') nor its etymology ('mouse-tailed', surely activated here) suggests to me the athletic practice of tying the foreskin upwards, as it has to many. This practice (often called 'infibulation'; Pollux 2.171 speaks of a 'dog-leash') is discussed and illustrated at Sansone 1988: 119-22. Douris' roughly contemporary psykter (British Museum E768) depicts satyrs doing acrobatic drinking-games – their normal 'athletics' – with tied foreskins, except for two who are ithyphallic.

[45] The other option I have found is βαλλία (as in Herodas 6.69). Henry and Nünlist (2000: 15) hesitantly reported the trace as a stroke curving up and right. The suggestions of Iovine (2015: 124-25) presuppose that we may have the top right-hand corner of η/κ/υ/χ or the apex of δ, and he equivocates between treating this as the second or first letter after τα̣. For the image see http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/POxy/.

[46] See *e.g.* Voelke 2001: 261-72; Pritchard 2012.

[47] The *perizomata* could have been rigged (*e.g.* by a small hook) to be alternately ithyphallic and not. Or the anthropophallism of our satyrs was visible and surprising at their first entrance, only to be clarified during the course of the play.

involving a 'new' form of dance, the *pyrrhikhe*. I would like now to add a suggestion about his description of this as the ἐμμελέστατον method of joint participation (94). The word does not seem to be casually selected. It means 'most harmonious' or 'most on the tune', pulling these satyrs back towards Dionysus' musical ambitions for them. It would be consonant with this if, by a cheeky etymology, Dionysus is also reversing the innuendo I suggested for ἠμελήσας: they will go from ἀμελ- to ἐμμελ- and get their fifth limb back if they rejoin his activities. However that may be, there is a clearer wordplay on the ἐμμέλεια. In the rigid scheme of Aristoxenus, this was the characteristic dance of tragedy, contrasting in tempo and decorum with the *sikinnis* (fr. 104). But Aeschylus is said to have used ἐμμέλεια of a satyr-chorus (fr. 424a), and a blurring of normal distinctions would be highly appropriate given what I have argued about *Theoroi*. The chorus have tried to break out of typical satyr behaviour towards something requiring more masculine self-control. Dionysus proposes in return a dance-form that has affinities with the *sikinnis*, but still expresses some of the martial civic virtues in the way that athletics did; assuming the shields for the dance were borrowed from *hoplitodromos* equipment, the chorus will indeed appear more 'human' than the satyr-pyrrhichists of vases, who generally hold the lighter crescent-shaped *pelta*.[48]

Dionysus picks up on one last kind of 'novelty' that adumbrates Aeschylus' own claim to innovation, namely the 'fresh' insults of l. 69. These have just followed on from earlier criticisms of Dionysus as being an effeminate γύννις and 'a nothing at the [craft] of iron' (67-68), and consisted of attacking him and his festival (71-72). Shortly before this, Dionysus has introduced the topic with ῥηματίζεις εἰς ἔμ' ἐκτρ̣̈[(66).[49] The verb here is a *hapax*, while denominative verbs in -ίζω often have the sense 'I create X': τραυματίζειν is to produce a wound, χρηματίζεσθαι to make money, and so on. The context supports the idea that ῥηματίζεις came across as a coinage for 'you coin words', since both σιδηρῖτις and γύννις in the following two lines are unusual. σιδηρῖτις is first extant here, and the only common applications are to lodestone or various plants, neither of which are suitable. Lobel's supplement σιδηρῖτι[ν τέχνην], 'craft of iron', is very plausible: the phrase is the lemma of Hesychius σ 596, where the sense 'war' is given first, before a reference to a blacksmith in Eupolis (*PCG* fr. 283, Pollux 7.106). Possibly Eupolis recalled Aeschylus' phrase but bathetically literalized it. A reference to war as ironwork complements not only my interpretation of Dionysus' 'toys' as spear-like and made partly on the anvil, but also the satyrs' other charge that Dionysus is a 'feeble γύννις': Lycurgus wielded the word γύννις against Dionysus in *Edonians* (fr. 61), in an effect which also finds an echo in comedy, at Aristophanes *Thesm.* 136.[50] Possibly Theocritus had our passage in mind at 22.69 where Amycus denies that he is a γύννις in an athletic context, where he and Polydeukes flyte before their boxing match. These considerations suggest that Dionysus' uses of σιδηρῖτις and γύννις are meant to exemplify the inventiveness of the 'coryphaeus'

[48] Lucian *Salt.* 22 claims that satyrs also invented the *emmeleia*. In Suda π 3225, the *pyrrhikhe* replaces the *emmeleia* in the normal trio of dramatic dance-forms. For the vase-images see Ceccarelli 1998: 68-69, 227-30, as mentioned above.

[49] If ἐκτρέπων 'distorting' followed, it would suit the following argument that the line reflects on Aeschylus' linguistic innovation.

[50] The relative chronology of *Edonians* (where fr. 58 implies a stage-building) and *Theoroi* is unclear.

in insults, and indeed seemed marked to later writers. But Dionysus, in using ῥηματίζεις, may add his own new-fangled word to describe new-fangled words. Behind this lurks Aeschylus' own notorious love of neologism: after all, he is ultimately responsible for all these words finding their way onstage.[51] This leaves us with the patron deity of both Aeschylus and the 'coryphaeus' character criticizing them for inventing new negative ways to characterize him, as they attempt to lead the satyrs away from a 'traditional' choral role in his train.

Conclusions

In this reading of the fragments of *Theoroi*, as well as taking sides on various established debates in the reconstruction of the plot, and suggesting some new ideas on points of detail and on the general trajectory at the end of fr. 78c, I have emphasized two themes – representation and novelty – and the sense in which Aeschylus is reflecting on them.

The portion of the play in fr. 78c revolves around the appropriate position for this satyr-chorus on the spectrum from human athlete to 'wild' Dionysiac satyr: the plot brings them away from the latter pole towards human behaviours, though presumably they did not carry these out quite as human athletes would do. Their votives simultaneously echo aspects of sanctuary decoration that rely on non-human characteristics (the silen antefixes), human ones (dedications in thanks for protection), and specifically choregic ones (mask dedications). Their phalluses also bring the satyrs out of the wild, and signify not (as Dionysus jokes) that their insatiable libido has been sated but that it has been mastered, at least for now. They have abandoned one old dance, and look as if they will have to learn a new one that will balance the need to keep Dionysus happy about his satyrs (both as characters and as performers) with their newfound desire to exhibit some of the athleticism and self-control of the choreuts.

The plot, with its to-and-fro between human and satyr, and its idea that the chorus had been training for a Dionyisia before becoming *theoroi* at another festival, therefore creates a much richer field for self-referential play than a simple opposition of performer and role. This richness creates numerous opportunities for a clash of perspectives, from which Aeschylus generates humour. The satyrs' masks seem beautiful to them, less than beautiful to the audience; remarkably individuated to them, probably stereotyped to the audience. The masks are worthy of comparison with Daedalus' art to the satyrs, just one piece of Aeschylus' superior art to the audience; athletics and *pyrrhikhai* are unfamiliar to them, part of a tradition of putting satyrs in unfamiliar roles (including *pyrrhikhai* and perhaps athletics) to the audience; several words are deployed or criticized for their rarity by the characters, but are recognized by the audience as a stylistic feature endorsed by Aeschylus' practice. We have also seen more complex ways in which knowledge of dramatic conventions seeps into the characters' perspective, as in the satyrs' fear that their mothers will misinterpret what sort of (typically dramatic) myth the *skene* belongs to.

The main fragment of *Theoroi* sets off a fizz of interpretative possibilities and takes some tantalizing steps in the direction of self-referentiality, but of course stops short of a

[51] Dionysus' ἐπήρανος in l. 36 is also unusual, and see above, n. 6. For ancient perceptions of Aeschylus' use of neologism see *e.g.* Raeburn and Thomas 2011: lxi-lxii, with further references.

straightforward message from Aeschylus about his own representational art or his claim to innovation: where would the satyrical fun have been in that?

University of Nottingham

Abbreviations and works cited

CEG: Hansen, P. A. 1983: *Carmina epigraphia graeca saeculorum VIII-V a. Chr. n.*, Berlin.
IScM: Pippidi, D. M. (ed) 1983: *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor grecești și latine, vol. I: Histria și împrejurimile*, Bucharest.
KPS: Krumeich, R., Pechstein, N., and B. Seidensticker (eds) 1999: *Das griechische Satyrspiel*, Darmstadt.
PCG: Kassel, R., and C. Austin 1983-2001: *Poetae comici graeci*, Berlin.

Andrewes, A. 1981: *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, vol. 5: Book VIII*, Oxford.
Bastianini, G., and A. Casanova (eds) 2013: *I papiri di Eschilo e di Sofocle*, Florence.
Broneer, O. 1962: 'The Isthmian victory crown', *AJA* 66.3, 259-63.
Carrara, P. 2013: 'Eschilo ad Ossirinco: copie di drammi eschilei nel II sec. d.C.', in Bastianini and Casanova 2013, 185-98.
Ceccarelli, P. 1998: *La pirrica nell'antichità greco-romana: studi sulla danza armata*, Pisa.
Ceccarelli, P. 2004: 'Dancing the πυρρίχη in Athens', in P. Murray and P. J. Wilson (eds), *Music and the Muses*, Oxford, 91-117.
Cipolla, P. 2011: 'Gli "oggetti misteriosi" dei Θεωροὶ ἢ 'Ισθμιασταί', in M. taufer (ed), *Contributi critici sul testo di Eschilo*, Tübingen, 233-49.
Conrad, G. 1997: *Der Silen: Wandlungen einer Gestalt des griechischen Satyrspiels*. Trier.
Crowther, N. B. 1994: 'The role of heralds and trumpeters at Greek athletic festivals', *Nikephoros* 7, 135-55.
Dickey, E. 1996: *Greek Forms of Address*, Oxford.
Di Marco, M. 1992: 'Sul finale dei *Theoroi* di Eschilo (fr. 78 c, 37ss. R.)', *Eikasmos* 3, 93-104.
Ferrari, F. 2013: 'Oggetti non identificati: riflessioni sui *Theoroi* di Eschilo', in Bastianini and Casanova 2013, 199-215.
Fraenkel, E. 1942: 'Aeschylus: new texts and old problems', *PBA* 28, 237-61.
Gebhard, E. R., with appendix by J. L. Bentz 1998: 'Small dedications in the Archaic Temple of Poseidon at Isthmia', in R. Hägg (ed), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Archaeological Evidence*, Sävedalen, 95-115.
Gebhard, E. R. and F. P. Hemans 1998: 'University of Chicago excavations at Isthmia, 2', *Hesperia* 67.1, 1-63.
Green, J. R. 1994: *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society*, London.
Griffith, M. 2005: 'Satyrs, citizens, and self-presentation', in G. W. M. Harrison (ed), *Satyr Drama: Tragedy at Play*, Swansea, 161-99.
Griffith, M. 2013: 'Satyr-play, dithyramb, and the geopolitics of Dionysian style in fifth-century Athens', in B. Kowalzig and P. J. Wilson (eds), *Dithyramb in Context*, Oxford, 257-81.

Hall, E. 2006: *The Theatrical Cast of Athens: Interactions between Ancient Greek Drama and Society*, Oxford.

Halliwell, S. 2002: *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*, Princeton.

Henry, W. B. and R. Nünlist 2000: 'Aeschylus, *Dictyulci* (fr. 47a Radt) and *Isthmiastae* (fr. 78a-d)', *ZPE* 129: 13-16.

Iovine, G. 2013: 'Sugli oggetti di scena nei *Θεωροί* eschilei (fr. 78a R.^{2})', *Eikasmos* 24, 67-76.

Iovine, G. 2015: 'Dioniso indaga: note ad Aesch. fr. 78a 23-36 e 78c 1 s. R.', *SemRom* n.s. 4, 119-34.

Iovine, G. 2016: 'Nota ad Aesch., fr. 78a, 5-7 R.^{2} (i *Θεωροί*)', *RCCM* 58.3, 301-09.

Johnson, W. A. 2004: *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto.

Jucker, I. 1956: *Der Gestus des Aposkopein*, Zürich.

Jüthner, J. and Brein, F. 1965: *Die athletischen Liebesübungen der Griechen*. Graz.

Kaimio, M. *et al.* 2001: 'Metatheatricality in the Greek satyr-play', *Arctos* 35, 35-78.

Kamerbeek, J. C. 1955: 'Adnotationes ad Aeschyli *Isthmiastas* (Ox. P. 2162)', *Mnemosyne* 8, 1-13.

Kawasaki, Y. 1995: 'Aeschylus, fr. 78a, c Radt: *Θεωροὶ ἢ Ἰσθμιασταί*', *JCS* 43, 1-11.

Kiilerich, B. 2006: 'The satyr portraits in Aeschylus' *Theoroi*', *Polis* 2, 61-72.

Krumeich, R. 2000: 'Die Weihgeschenke der Satyrn in Aischylos' *Theoroi oder Isthmiastai*', *Philologus* 144.2, 176-92.

Lämmle, R. 2013: *Poetik des Satyrspiels*, Heidelberg.

Lasserre, F. 1973: 'Le drame satyrique', *RFIC* 101, 273-301.

Levaniouk, O. A. 2007: 'The toys of Dionysus', *HSPh* 103, 165-202.

Lissarrague, F. 1990: 'Why satyrs are good to represent', in J. J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin (eds), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*, Princeton, 228-36.

Lissarrague, F. 2013: *La cité des satyres: une anthopologie ludique (Athènes, VI^e-V^e siècle av. J.-C.)*, Paris.

Lobel, E. 1941: 'No. 2162', in E. Lobel, C. H. Roberts and E. P. Wegener (eds), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XVIII (Nos 2157-2207)*, London.

Marconi, C. 2005: 'I *Teoroi* di Eschilo e le antefisse sileniche siceliote', *Sicilia Antiqua* 2, 75-93.

Moreau, A. 2001: 'Le drame satyrique eschyléen est-il "mauvais genre"?', *Cahiers du GITA* 14, 39-62.

Morris, S. P. 1992: *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*, Princeton.

O'Sullivan, P. 2000: 'Satyr and image in Aeschylus' *Theoroi*', *CQ* 50, 353-66.

O'Sullivan, P. and C. Collard 2013: *Euripides' Cyclops and Major Fragments of Greek Satyric Drama*, Oxford.

Poursat, J.-C. 1968: 'Les représentations de danse armée dans la céramique attique', *BCH* 92.2, 550-615.

Pritchard, D. M. 2012: 'Athletics in satyric drama', *G&R* 59.1, 1-16.

Raeburn, D. A. and O. Thomas 2011: *Aeschylus' Agamemnon: A Commentary for Students*, Oxford.

Rutherford, I. C. 2013: *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.

Sansone, D. 1988: *Greek Athletics and the Genesis of Sport*, Berkeley.
Setti, A. 1952: 'Eschilo satirico II', *ASNP* 21, 205-44.
Shear, J. L. 2003: 'Atarbos' base and the Panathenaia', *JHS* 123, 164-80.
Slenders, W. 1992: 'Intentional ambiguity in Aeschylean satyr-play', *Mnemosyne* 45, 145-58.
Snell, B. 1956: 'Aischylos' *Isthmiastai*', *Hermes* 84, 1-11.
Sommerstein, A. H. 2008: *Aeschylus: Fragments*, Cambridge MA.
Sonnino, M. 2016: 'Rifugiarsi nel santuario di Poseidone: note ai *Theoroi* di Eschilo (P. Oxy. 2162, fr. 1a. col. i.1-22 = Aesch. fr. 78a, vv. 1-22 R.)', *ZPE* 200, 39-60.
Sörbom, G. 1966: *Mimesis and Art: Studies in the Origin and Early Development of an Aesthetic Vocabulary*, Stockholm.
Steiner, D. 2001: *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, Princeton.
Stieber, M. 1994: 'Aeschylus' *Theoroi* and realism in Greek art', *TAPhA* 124, 85-119.
Tovar, A. *et al.* 1943: 'Review of E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, *Part XVIII (Nos. 2157-2207)*', *Emerita* 11, 435-60.
Voelke, P. 2001: *Un théâtre de la marge: aspects figuratifs et configurationnels du drame satyrique dans l'Athènes classique*, Bari.
Welcker, F. G. 1824: *Die Aeschylische Trilogie Prometheus und die Kabirenweihe zu Lemnos nebst Winken über die Trilogie überhaupt*, Darmstadt.
Wiles, D. 2007: *Mask and Performance in Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge.
Wilson, P. J. 2000: *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: the Chorus, the City and the Stage*, Cambridge.
Wolicki, A. 2002: 'The heralds and the games in Archaic and Classical Greece', *Nikephoros* 15, 69-97.
Zeitlin, F. 1994: 'The artful eye: vision, ecphrasis and spectacle in Euripidean theatre', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*, Cambridge, 138-96.