PICTORIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF MONKEYS
AND SIMIANESQUE CREATURES IN GREEK ART

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the
Degree Doctor of Philosophy

by
ELIZABETH GRAFF WOLFSON

Dr. Susan Langdon, Dissertation Supervisor

MAY 2018

© Copyright by Elizabeth Graff Wolfson 2018

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

PICTORIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF MONKEYS

AND SIMIANESQUE CREATURES IN GREEK ART

presented by Elizabeth Graff Wolfson

a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Susan Langdon

Professor Kathleen Slane

Professor Marcus Rautman

Professor David Schenker

To my family, for all their love and support,
and in loving memory of Gigi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Susan Langdon, for providing me with crucial feedback throughout the researching and writing processes and providing me with a much-needed ear. I am also thankful for the funding resources that made this dissertation possible, including the John Pickard Fellowship in Art History and Classical Archaeology and the Charles D. Folse Memorial Fellowship in Classical Archaeology, which were generously provided by the University of Missouri's Department of Art History and Archaeology, and my WI position at the University of Missouri's Writing Center.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
List of Illustrations	
1. Categories	iv
2. Figures	viii
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
2. Survey of Monkeys and Simianesque Creatures in Greek Art	42
Category 1: Bronze Age Simians	44
Category 2: Geometric Minor Arts (ca. 8 th century BCE)	48
Category 3: Early and Middle Archaic Vases and Gems (700-530 BCE)	50
Category 4: Late Archaic and Classical Vases (530-400 BCE)	63
Category 5: Monkeys in Hellenistic Art	70
Category 6: Simianesque Creatures on Geometric Vases	72
Category 7: Simianesque Creatures on Archaic Vases	74
Category 8: Simianesque Creatures on Classical Vases	78
3. Comparative Images of Simians and Simianesque Creatures in Egyptian and Near Eastern Art	88
4. Interpretation of the Greek Monkey and Simianesque Material	130
5. Conclusion	185
Appendix	
1. Tables	197
Works Cited	200
Illustrations	
1. Categories	222
2. Figures	248
Vita	261

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Category	Page
Cat. 1.1. Round Sealing, ca. LM 1A. From Knossos. (http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/browser/index.php?view[layout]=siegel_item&objektsiegel[item]=261&objektsiegel[thumb_item]=0)	222
Cat. 1.2. Gold Ring Seal, ca. LM I-II. From the Tombe dei Nobili at Kalyvia near Phaistos. (Crowley 2013, E143)	222
Cat. 1.3. Offering to the Seated Goddess, fresco, ca. LM 1A. From Room 3a of Xeste 3 at Akrotiri. (Pareja 2015, fig. 1.2A).....	223
Cat. 1.4. Gold Earrings, ca. 17 th century BCE. From the Aegina Treasure. British Museum 1892,0520.13. (Fitton <i>et al.</i> 2009, fig. 21).....	223
Cat. 2.1. Argive Steatite Disc, ca. 8 th century BCE. From the Heraion at Megara. Athens National Archaeological Museum 11750. (Langdon 2008, fig. 3.31)	224
Cat. 3.1. Villanovan Clay Ossuary, ca. 700-575 BCE. From the Arnoaldi-Veli Necropolis, Bologna. Bologna Museo Civico. (Gozzadini 1877, pl. 1.1)	225
Cat. 3.2. Terracotta House Model, ca. 6 th century BCE. From Sellada, Thera. Thera Archaeological Museum. (Schattner 1990, pl.24.3)	225
Cat. 3.3. Ithacan Long-Necked Object, ca. 7 th century BCE. From Aetos, Ithaca. (Heurtley 1933, Fig. 10).....	226
Cat. 3.4. Proto-Corinthian Aryballos, ca. 640 BCE. Attributed to the Chigi Painter. British Museum 1889,0418.1. (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=399476&partId=1&searchText=1889,0418.1&page=1)	226
Cat. 3.6. Apulian Geometric Amphora, ca. 5 th century BCE. Berlin Antiquarium, Castellani Collection F3912. (Agnes Schwarzmaier, via email)	227
Cat. 3.7. Tragliatella Oinochoe, ca. mid-7 th century BCE. From a necropolis near Tragliatella in Caere. (http://capitolini.net/object.xql?urn=urn:collectio:0001:foto:F:00889).....	227
Cat. 3.8. Proto-Corinthian Aryballos. From the Delion at Paros. Paros Museum 0158. (https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1166699?q=affe&resultIndex=42)	228
Cat. 3.9. Ithacan Fragments of a Building Model, ca. 8 th -7 th c. BCE. From Aetos. (Heurtley <i>et al.</i> 1948, pl. 45 no. 600e [photo] and Morgan 2006, fig. 8 [drawing]).....	228

Cat. 3.10. Athenian Black-Figure Kylix, ca. 6 th century BCE. From Kerameikos. Athens National Archaeological Museum 1054. (McDermott 1938, pl. 3 no. 316).....	229
Cat. 3.11. Etruscan Hematite Scarab, ca. 6 th century BCE. State Hermitage Museum ГР-20753. (https://www.hermitagemuseum.org/wps/portal/hermitage/digital-collection/18.+Carved+Stones/1068247/?lng=en)	229
Cat. 3.12. Green Jasper Gem, ca Archaic Period. From Tomb 3 at Tharros. (Barnett <i>et al.</i> 1987, pl. 55h no. 583)	230
Cat. 3.13. Greco-Egyptian Engraved Carnelian. Louvre 2162. (Imhoof-Blumer and Keller 1889, pl. VXII no. 17).....	230
Cat. 3.14. Terracotta Gem. From Cyprus. New York, Cesnola Collection. (Imhoof-Blumer and Keller 1889, pl. XIV no. 58)	230
Cat. 3.15. Relief Vase Fragment, ca. 7 th century BCE. From Tenos (Kontoleon 1970, pl. XVIII.1)	231
Cat. 3.16. Laconian Black-Figure Kylix, ca. 565-550 BCE. Cabinet des Médailles 189. (Simon 1976, pl. 38/XV)	231
Cat. 3.17. Attic Black-Figure Neck Amphora, ca. 550-500 BCE. Attributed to the Painter of the Vatican 365. Orvieto 2711, Faina Collection 84. (Wojcik 1989, fig. 93.1 [photo] and Von Bothmer 1986, fig. 112 [detail]).....	232
Cat. 3.18. Caeretan Black-Figure Hydria, ca. 530-530 BCE. Vienna 3577. (Robertson 1958, 34 [photo] and Bonaudo 2004, fig. 39 [detail])	232
Cat. 3.19. Proto-Attic Black-Figure Fragments, from Aegina. Aegina Museum 484. (Morris 1984, pl. 22 [photo] and Pallat 1897, fig. 31 [drawing])	233
Cat. 3.20. Laconian Black-Figure Kylix, ca. 7 th century BCE. From the Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia. Sparta Archaeological Museum. (Droop 1929, pl. 9).....	233
Cat. 3.21. Attic Black-Figure Kylix, ca. 540 BCE. Attributed to the Amasis Painter. Metropolitan Museum 1989.281.62. (https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/255939).....	234
Cat. 3.22. Archaizing Cypriot Gem, ca. 5 th century BCE. Private Collection. (<i>BAGD</i> no. 232)	234
Cat. 4.1. Caeretan Black-Figure Hydria, ca. 530-520 BCE. Louvre E 696. (Walsh 2009, pl. 47 and fig. 3a)	235
Cat. 4.2. Caeretan Black-Figure Hydria, ca. 530-520 BCE. From Tomb I at Via Dirocata, Cerveteri. Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia. (Hemelrijk 1984, pls. 81-2)	235

Cat. 4.3. Attic Red-Figure Olpe, ca. 525-475 BCE. From Etruria. Louvre G241. (http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/cartelfr/visite?srv=car_not&idNotice=13315)	236
Cat. 4.4. Athenian Red-Figure Cup, ca. 525-475 BCE. From the Tomba della Panatenaica, Vulci. Vulci 64224. (Brijder 1988, fig. 1)	236
Cat. 4.5. Athenian Red-Figure Cup, ca. 500-450 BCE. Louvre G265. (<i>LIMC III</i> , s.v. <i>Dionysus</i> , no. 389)	237
Cat. 4.6. Attic Red-Figured Askos, ca. 470-400 BCE. British Museum 1770,0320.560. (Brijder 1988, fig. 2)	237
Cat. 4.7. Attic Red-Figure Neck Amphora, ca. mid-5 th century BCE. From Capua. British Museum 1873,0820.364. (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/ collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=460757&partId=1&searchText=1873,0820.364 &page=1)	238
Cat. 4.8. Athenian Red-Figure Chous Fragment, ca. 450-400 BCE. From Eleusis. Eleusis Archaeological Museum. (<i>BAPD</i> 9033664)	238
Cat. 4.9. Attic(?) Red-Figure Chous, ca. late 5 th century BCE. Leo Mildenberg Collection (Kozloff 1981, fig. 130)	239
Cat. 5.1. Megarian Mold-Made Bowl, ca. 3 rd century BCE. From Volo. Rhode Island School of Design 25.018. (Ashmead <i>et al.</i> 1975, pl. 46f).....	240
Cat. 6.1. Argive Bottle, ca. Middle Geometric I-Late Geometric II. From the Nikolopoulos Plot on Gournari Street, Argos. Argive Museum 10321. (Pappi 2006, figs. 6 [drawing] and 9 [photo]).....	241
Cat. 7.1. Proto-Attic Black and White Caeretan Krater, ca. 7 th c. BCE. Attributed to the Oresteia Painter. Berlin Antikensammlung A32. (<i>CVA Berlin Antiquarium I</i> , pl. 19.1) 242	
Cat. 7.2. Proto-Attic Black and White Conical Stand, attributed to the Polyphemos Painter. Berlin Antikensammlung A40. (<i>CVA Berlin Antiquarium I</i> , pls. 28.2 [photo] and 29 [drawing])	242
Cat. 7.3. Ionian Wild Goat Oinochoe, ca. mid-7 th century BCE. From Rhodes. Laon 37.786. (Cook 1990, fig. 1 [drawing] and pl. 9.2 [photo])	243
Cat. 7.4. Attic Black-Figure Exaleiptron, ca. 570-565 BCE. Attributed to Painter C. Louvre CA 616. (Simon 1976, pl. 59)	243
Cat. 7.5. Attic Black-Figure Amphora, ca. mid-6 th century BCE. From Orvieto. Penn Museum MS3440A. (https://www.penn.museum/collections/object/205627).....	244
Cat. 7.6. Attic Black-Figure Column Krater, ca. 540 BCE. From Campania. Louvre 11260. (<i>CVA Musée du Louvre</i> 12, pl. 390.2)	244

Cat. 7.7. Athenian Black-Figure Amphora, ca. mid-6 th century BCE. Hermitage Museum Hermitage Museum T 1950 (B 179). (<i>LIMC IV</i> , s.v <i>Hephaistos</i> no. 139c)	245
Cat. 7.8. Athenian Black-Figure Amphora, ca. late 6 th century BCE. From Vulci. Munich Antikensammlungen 1576. (<i>CVA München Antikensammlungen</i> 8, pl. 390.2)	245
Cat. 7.9. Etruscan Red-Ware Fragment, ca. 6 th century BCE. Heidelberg University E85/6. (Ridgway 2010, no. DB1a).....	246
Cat. 8.1. Attic Black-Figure Oinochoe, ca. 500-475 BCE. From near Thebes. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston 98.924 (http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/oinochoe-153540) ...	247
Cat. 8.2. Kabiric Black-Figured Skyphos, ca. mid-4 th century BCE. From the Kabiroi Sanctuary in Thebes. Metropolitan Museum 1971.11.1. (http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/browser/index.php?view[layout]=siegel_item&objektsiegel[item]=261&objektsiegel[thumb_item]=0)	247

Figure	Page
Figure 1. Amuletic Bangle, ca. 2000-1800 BCE. British Museum 1891,0509.84. (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=111517&partId=1&searchText=1891,0509.84&page=1)	248
Figure 2. Limestone Double Relief, ca. 19 th Dynasty. From the Tomb of Merymery at Saqqara. Rijksmuseum AP6. (Janssen and Janssen 1989, fig. 14)	248
Figure 3. Egyptian Magic Wand, ca. 1981-1640 BCE. Metropolitan Museum 30,8,218. (https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/545740).....	249
Figure 4. Egyptian Blue-Glaze Staff, ca. New Kingdom Period. British Museum 1895,0511.54. (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=171783&partId=1&searchText=1895,0511.54&page=1).....	249
Figure 5. Egyptian Jasper Scarab, ca. 15 th -14 th centuries BCE. From the Uluburun Shipwreck. Bodrum Museum of Underwater Archaeology 45.6.95 (KW 3699). (Pulak 2008, no. 228)	250
Figure 6. Babylonian Clay Stele, ca. 2000-1600 BCE. Baghdad Museum. (Stol and Wiggerman 2000, fig. 1)	250
Figure 7. Ceramic Lamp, ca. Late Antique Period. From Medinet el Faijum. (Kaufmann 1915, pl. 29 no. 221)	251
Figure 8. Babylonian Terracotta Plaque, ca. Old Babylonian Period, Iraq Museum. (Opificius 1961, pl. 18 no. 584)	251
Figure 9. Babylonian Hematite Cylinder Seal, ca. Old Babylonian Period. Pierpont Morgan Library. (Porada 1948, no. 315E).....	252
Figure 10. Babylonian Hematite Cylinder Seal, ca. Old Babylonian Period. Pierpont Morgan Library. (Porada 1948, no. 388)	252
Figure 11. Babylonian Alabaster Cylinder Seal, ca. 2 nd Millennium BCE. From Geoy Tepe, Iran. Metropolitan Museum 86.11.1. (https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/321625 [image] and Lehmann-Haupt 1907, fig. 3b [detail])	253
Figure 12. Neo-Babylonian Faience Seal, ca. late 7 th /early 6 th century BCE. British Museum 1931,1010.53. (Spycket 1998, fig. 3).....	253
Figure 13. Drawing of Assyrian Seal, ca. 7 th century BCE. (Spycket 1998, fig. 1)	254
Figure 14. Assyrian Tablet, ca. Neo-Assyrian period. From Nimrud. Metropolitan Museum 61.197.12. (https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/325355).....	254

Figure 15. Elamite Door Sealing, ca. 2500 BCE. Louvre Museum. (Porada 1965, fig. 13)	255
Figure 16. Elamite Green Stone Seal, ca. 2000-1500 BCE. Private Collection. (Seidl 1990, fig. 2)	255
Figure 17. Elamite Cylinder Seal, ca. 13 th century BCE. From Chogha Zanbil. Louvre Museum. (Porada 1948, fig. 23)	256
Figure 18. Syrian Cylinder Seal, ca. 19 th -17 th centuries BCE. Pierpont Morgan Library. (Porada 1948, no. 930).....	256
Figure 19. Drawing of Syrian Obsidian Seal, ca. 1800 BCE. Johnathan P. Rosen Collection. (Collon 1990, fig. 23).....	256
Figure 20. Syrian Cylinder Seal. From Qatna. Damascus National Museum MSH02G-il976. (Pfälzner 2009, no. 138)	257
Figure 21. Egyptianizing Hematite Seal, ca. Late Bronze Age. From Kition Tomb 9/205 in Cyprus. (Porada 1974, fig. 1).....	257
Figure 22. Cypro-Phoenician Silver Bowl, ca. 7 th century BCE. From the Bernardini Tomb in the Colomella Necropolis, Praeneste. Villa Giulia N61565. (Sannibale 2014, no. 192)	258
Figure 23. Cypriot Pitcher, ca. 700-600 BCE. Cyprus Museum 1961/XII-9/8. (Karageorghis <i>et al.</i> 1979, no. SIX.2).....	258
Figure 24. Painted Fragments, from Aetos in Ithaca. (Robertson and Heurtley 1948, pl. 23 no. 381)	259
Figure 25. Anatolian Sealings on Cuneiform Tablet, ca. 20 th century BCE. From Kanesh/Kültepe. Metropolitan Museum 66.245.16b. (Larsen 2008, no. 37b).....	259
Figure 26. Anatolian Cylinder Seal, ca. 20 th century BCE. From Kanesh/Kültepe. (Özguç 1965, pl. 1.1)	260

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Primates are visually disturbing to many—at least I thought so when I was young. Their physical and behavioral similarities with humans were uncomfortable and jarring to my developing mind. As an adult, however, I have become fascinated by these “disturbing” qualities and how they facilitate human interactions with, reactions to, and beliefs about the animal. While visiting the St. Louis Zoo, for example, I watched children display an array of emotions—laughter, fear, excitement, and confusion—when viewing chimpanzees. They noticed especially the similarities between “us” and “them:” their hands, which have five fingers; their gesticulations; and to some extent their eyes, which are intense and emotive. Adults notice these parallels as well, but in less innocent ways: for instance, there is a silverback gorilla named Shabani, located at the Higashiyama Zoo and Botanical Gardens in Nagoya, Japan, that draws crowds of women who find his buff physique, piercing eyes with visible sclera,¹ and gentle manner towards his young both handsome and alluring.² In other words, women are attracted to him because he vaguely resembles a muscular, fatherly, human man.

Despite the parallels between our species, which we understand is the result of evolution,³ we are still conscious of the differences between us, as humans, and them, as animals. This is because we live in an era that gives us unlimited access to information of all kinds. Simians,⁴ in particular, we study in school, can research on the internet, or visit nearly any species at a local zoo. What about an ancient person, however, who perhaps

¹ Sclera is a tough outer coating of the eyeball, which forms the white of the eye. These are very pronounced in humans but not primates. Shabani is one of a handful of gorillas born with visible sclera, which makes his eyes appear more human.

² Tayag 2015, 3 July.

³ Certain large apes, like the chimpanzee, share common ancestors with modern-day humans (Smithsonian Institute 2017, 24 May).

⁴ I use this word to denote monkeys and baboons in particular.

only knew about primates through imported art and travelers' tales? Would they have known the difference? If so, to what extent?

Though simians are not native to Greece or the Mediterranean, they are frequently represented in Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Phoenician, Cypriot, and Anatolian art, while the Greeks occasionally depicted monkeys.⁵ The Greek renditions, in particular, encompass a broad range of media: vase painting, relief, portable sculpture (terracotta, bronze, stone, ivory, gold, silver, bone, amber, lapis lazuli, glass), pithemorphic aryballoi, seals, fibulae, mosaic, gems, and jewelry. Greek monkeys crouch or squat, touch their mouths or heads, embrace their young, eat and drink, and perform various human activities (*e.g.* ride horses, play music, dance, make bread, wear clothing, and hold man-made objects) and lewd actions (*e.g.* masturbation, “flipping the bird,” and copulation). Such images are likely inspired by the art of Egypt and Mesopotamia, where simians were imported, sanctified, worshipped, illustrated, and kept as pets for thousands of years prior to their appearance in the visual materials of Greece.

For this dissertation, I analyzed two-dimensional, or pictorial, representations of monkeys in Greek art. Every example exhibits two distinct similarities: first, they are consistently **marginalized**, or rendered as a peripheral character, within larger narratives. This occurs in one of two ways: with respect to their 1) physical *location*, or placement on the object (*e.g.* on/near frieze lines, between borders or frames, among ornamentation, or beneath handles) or 2) bodily *form* (*e.g.* most are nude, hairy, and ugly); this latter category includes lewd or lowly postures and gestures (*e.g.* genital rubbing, pointing,

⁵ Even though Greek texts discuss both monkeys and baboons, I refer to most of the Greek-made simians as “monkeys” since most are small and scrawny, unlike the muscular, dog-headed baboons we see in Egyptian art. As I will explore in Chapter 2, however, the simianesque creatures resemble both monkeys (**Cat. 7.2**) and baboons (**Cat. 7.1** and **8.1**).

dancing, crouching, and tight-rope walking). The second similarity these creatures share is **iconographic inconsistency**: their physical bodies, postures, gestures, sizes, and levels of detail differ within each image; no two are alike. Since all pictorial representations of Greek monkeys are marginalized and iconographically inconsistent, I have included all the ones I discovered in this survey. Three-dimensional objects, like sculpture, are often too fragmentary to label with certainty and thus were not considered.

One of the clearest examples of locational marginalization occurs on the MacMillan aryballos (**Cat. 3.4**): a lion-spouted vessel, only 6.8 centimeters high, that was used for the storage and the application of salves and ointments, likely by athletes in the gymnasium. The body features scenes of processing warriors, horsemen, and animals. Between the legs of one of the cavalrymen crouches a small monkey, who waves its fist as the rider passes by. As a diminutive element on a small vase, the monkey is nearly imperceptible to the naked eye, which is a strong indication that the maker deliberately chose to include it among the humans, horses, and other animals. Conversely, physically marginalized monkeys are rendered in larger, more noticeable ways. A clear example is featured on a red-figure olpe, now in the Louvre (**Cat. 4.3**): a thin, nude, emaciated simian reaches for a young, beautiful boy's apple; the boy physically turns away from the creature, either out of disgust or to protect his snack.

Previous scholars, like Greenlaw (2011) and McDermott (1938), have surveyed simian art in the Mediterranean but none of their publications attempt to explain the method of representation and/or meaning of monkeys in Greek art. In general, such

images are dismissed as humorous interpolations or ornamental filler,⁶ like the birds and small animals that appear on many Geometric, Proto-Attic and Corinthian, and Archaic vessels.⁷ Though seemingly insignificant within larger narrative contexts, I believe these marginalized creatures hold meaning.

In addition to monkeys, a series of simianesque creatures, or humanoid figures with monkey-like characteristics, are also marginalized in larger narratives. Puzzlingly, only a few occur prior to the representation of monkeys in the experimental Proto-periods; most appear in Archaic and Classical art. Scholars often identify them as human, satyr, or monster; they are rarely associated with simians even though they share distinct similarities with the animal, like face shape, posture, and gesture. Additionally, as with the monkey motifs, scholars rarely attempt to explain their locational and physical marginalization, and corpora on Greek simian imagery do not make note of them because they do not represent the animal for certain.

This dissertation surveys pictorial representations of monkeys and simianesque creatures in Geometric, Archaic, and Classical art in an attempt to explain the creature's presence as a secondary, marginal element in larger narratives; the Bronze Age and Hellenistic Period are explored as bookends to this phenomenon. It seems evident that the use of simians in Greek art is deliberate and significant based on the following: Greek authors' disdainful acknowledgement of the similarities between humans and simians, the

⁶ For example, Morris (1984, 33) refers to the creature on the Aegina fragments (**Cat. 3.19**) as decorative, while Greenlaw (2011, 67) believes the monkey on the MacMillan aryballos (**Cat. 3.4**) is a comedic flourish.

⁷ For examples that feature small animals squeezed into larger narratives, like *horror vacui*, see CVA Athens III, pls. 40-41; CVA Athens IV, pl. 37.3-4 and pl. 39.3-4; CVA Altenberg II, pl. 64.5; CVA Bochum II, pl. 58.1-2; CVA Bochum II, pl. 22.6; CVA Munich Museum Antiker Kleinkunst I, pl. 32 nos. 3-4; and CVA New York Met. II, pl. 2.2d. For birds, see CVA Athens III, pl. 2.1-2; CVA Athens IV, pl. 11.1-4; CVA Berlin Antiquarium I, pls. 42-44; CVA Berlin Antiquarium IV, pl. 200.4; CVA Bochum III, pl. 29.1; CVA Paris Bibliotheque Nationale Cabinet I, pl. 30.3; CVA Enserune, Musée National, pl. 18.2-3, 19.1, and 21.2; and CVA Louvre III, pl. 13.6 and 9.

locational and physical marginalization of these creatures in art, and the clear disconnect between these motifs and the Eastern sources that inspired them.

In an attempt to explain the presence of these marginalized and iconographically inconsistent monkeys in Greek art, I developed the following questions, which I will work to answer over the course of this dissertation. 1) Are the visual and textual representations of monkeys disconnected, or is there a unified view? Textual descriptions of simians are often derisive and judgmental, but are these sentiments evident in Greek art as well? 2) The Greeks' monkey and simianesque motifs were obviously influenced by imported Eastern and Egyptian art, which had been flooding westward since the Bronze Age. Were the meanings and functions of these foreign simian motifs, which often had religious undertones, imported as well? If so, how long did these influences last? 3) How are these creatures represented when part of decorative systems, or larger narratives, in pictorial Greek art? What are the uniformities and inconsistencies? 4) There is evidence of taxonomic tension in Greek texts regarding the classification of simians, *i.e.* they are simultaneously human and animal. Does this tension suggest other, pre-existing models by which to understand these motifs? If so, which ones relate most to simians and why?

SIMIANS: A BRIEF INTRODUCTION

Simians were imported into the Mediterranean from various areas in Africa, India, and Afghanistan due to the proximity of their habitats.⁸ Cybele Greenlaw surmises that five species of Old World monkeys and baboons, or *Cercopithecinae*, were imported, into Egypt and Mesopotamia especially, as exotic pets and sanctified emblems of gods:

⁸ Greenlaw 2011, 2.

the Hamadryas and Anubis baboons, the Vervet monkey, and the Barbary and Rhesus macaques. Larger anthropoid apes, like gorillas, chimpanzees, and orangutans, would have been unknown to the Mediterranean peoples because their habitats are very far and there is no faunal evidence to suggest such creatures were imported.⁹

The Hamadryas baboon is a small, ground-dwelling simian with a pink face and red hindquarters; males are silver while females are brown. They were native to the Red Sea coasts of Nubia and mythical Punt and were likely imported into Egypt from there.¹⁰ Like the Hamadryas, Anubis (or Olive) baboons were imported into Egypt between the Pre-Dynastic and Hellenistic eras,¹¹ though they stem from the African Savannah. These creatures are easily distinguishable from the Hamadryas because they have black faces, olive fur, and dark hindquarters. Since baboons were associated with the Egyptian scribe-god Thoth, the animal was sanctified and worshipped at many Egyptian sites, such as the Ptolemaic necropolises at Touna el-Gebel and Saqqara.¹² These creatures were also frequently represented in Egyptian art as embodiments and associates of Thoth, adornments on cosmetic vessels, and comical human imitators.¹³ They are less certainly represented in Mesopotamian art.

Though baboons were favored among the Egyptians as sacred emblems of Thoth, imported monkey species made popular pets throughout the Mediterranean. An example is the Vervet (or Green) monkey, which is a type of Patas. These animals have dark faces and hands with fluffy white cheeks; males are light grey while females are greenish-

⁹ Ibid., 61 and Vespa 2017, 415 n. 9

¹⁰ Greenlaw 2011, 3.

¹¹ Ibid.; Greenlaw 2006, 63; and Bleiberg *et al.* 2013, 43.

¹² Boutantin 2014, 326-327.

¹³ Greenlaw 2011, 52.

brown. The Egyptians likely imported the animal from Nubia and Punt before passing it on to the Minoans,¹⁴ who painted blue Vervets frolicking in lush landscapes.¹⁵

Another common pet species that occurs in Mediterranean art is the tailless Barbary, a type of macaque whose coat ranges from brown to grey. Though they are native to Morocco and Algeria today, they once lived in Carthage and Tunisia.¹⁶ The species was most popular in Mesopotamian art, but it was eventually imported into Egypt in the Persian Era and various Mediterranean sites by the 5th century BCE, perhaps by Phoenician traders.¹⁷

The Rhesus macaque, or common brown monkey, was also frequently owned and represented. These animals have a medium-length tail, brown fur, and a reddish face. They lived in the plains and foothills of India and what is now modern-day Afghanistan, which was where the Bronze Age Minoans obtained their lapis lazuli.¹⁸ While this Asian species was imported into Mesopotamia, where they are depicted on terracotta plaques from Ur,¹⁹ there is no evidence that it was ever brought to Egypt.²⁰

In addition to these five species, a sixth was native to Egypt prior to the Dynastic Era: the Patas (or Red) monkey. These animals are long-tailed *guenons*, or African

¹⁴ Greenlaw 2006, 63 and *ibid.*, 4.

¹⁵ Janssen and Janssen 1989, 22-23. One such fresco, which dates to the MM IIIB period, was discovered in the House of the Frescos at Knossos (Morgan 2005, pl. 5.1-2). Within this house, excavators found 84 trays of fragments, which depicted six monkeys, eight birds, waterfalls, streams, rocky terrain, and non-native plants (*e.g.* papyrus, marsh plants, crocuses, and lilies) (Greenlaw 2011, 50). The monkeys featured here show no signs of domestication, rather they are likely meant to evoke a wild, foreign setting. Other examples were found on the Thera settlement of Akrotiri: one, discovered in Room 6 of Building Complex Beta, depicts a series of anthropomorphic monkeys frolicking in an exotic landscape (Pareja 2015, figs. 2.9-13). Greenlaw (2011, 47-48) believes they are Vervets based on their physical appearance: long tails and black, furless faces.

¹⁶ Greenlaw 2011, 2.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 42; Connors 2004, 181; McDermott 1938, 55; Vernus and Yoyette 2005, 616; and Boutantin 2014, 323.

¹⁸ Greenlaw 2011, 42 and Mackay 1937, 293.

¹⁹ Mendleson 1983, 82 and Greenlaw 2006, 64.

²⁰ Greenlaw 2011, 3.

monkeys, with bright red fur, white bellies, a light-colored face, and mustached upper lip. They could survive without water for long periods, which enabled them to live in the deserts of Egypt. Once the Egyptian swamps dried up, their habitat ranged from the Upper Nile Valley to the South Saharan.²¹ Though they may have been kept as pets prior to the Dynastic Era, scholars have difficulties distinguishing them from the Rhesus and Vervet in Egyptian art.²²

It is important to note that none of these species are certainly represented in Greek art. Although images of these simians were imported into Greece from abroad, most Greek representations of monkeys and simianesque creatures lack the necessary details for species identification: they are ill-rendered, distorted, and plain. Greenlaw (2011) has attempted to identify specific species in the Greek corpus, but I do not think the realistic representation of these animals was a priority, or perhaps within the control, of these ancient craftsmen. The inconsistent depiction of monkeys in Greek art makes them very difficult to interpret and necessitates the review of textual sentiments about them. While the visual examples are varied and puzzling, textual descriptions of simians unanimously portray them as stupid, ugly, funny, and primitive creatures.

ANCIENT SOURCES

Though art provides invaluable information regarding Greek beliefs about animals, including exotica like simians, written materials, when investigated in conjunction with art objects and the archaeological record, can provide additional evidence about how these ancient peoples contemplated animals: their physical appearance, their potential uses, their divine/celestial associations, and their presumed

²¹ Osborn and Osbornova 1998, 41-42.

²² Ibid., 42.

intelligence. We must acknowledge, however, that most ancient Greek texts were written by and for elite and/or educated persons and thus do not necessarily speak for the entirety of the population. For example, the wide array of animal names present in the Greek and Roman language were likely coined by people with expertise in nature, animals, or even zoology (*e.g.* hunters, gatherers, fishermen, farmers, breeders, veterinarians, and physicians)²³ and read by people with the ability, leisure, and wealth to do so.

Though not all ancients were literate, Greek texts are abundant with information on native animals and, to a lesser extent, importees, which could indicate that some of this knowledge was common and/or related orally. In such texts, animals are discussed in a variety of practical, spiritual, and mythological ways: as objects of domestication, breeding, and husbandry (*e.g.* horses, sheep, goats, cattle, and pigs);²⁴ as hunters (*e.g.* dogs and cats) and the hunted (*e.g.* boar, deer, hares, and birds);²⁵ as coveted pets of children (*e.g.* dogs and cats) or showpieces of elaborate menageries (*e.g.* monkeys, lions, tigers, and bears);²⁶ as implements in warfare and games (*e.g.* horses, snakes, rodents, dogs, and insects);²⁷ as implements of religious matters, including magic, divination, and sacrifice (*e.g.* sheep, cattle, goats, pigs, and birds);²⁸ and as subjects of lore, including metamorphoses²⁹ (*e.g.* the spider) and monsters³⁰ (*e.g.* the cenoccephalus).³¹

²³ Bodson 2014, 569.

²⁴ For information on the domestication and breeding of animals, see Howe 2014, 99-108. For husbandry, both domestic and game farming, see Kron 2014, 109-135.

²⁵ For information on hunting animals/using animals for hunting, see MacKinnon 2014, 203-215.

²⁶ For information on pets in ancient Greece, see *ibid.*, 269-281.

²⁷ For information on the use of animals in warfare, see Mayor 2014, 282-293. For games, with particular reference to horses, see Bell and Willekes 2014, 478-490.

²⁸ For information on the use of animals in magic, see Ogden 2014, 294-309 and Galoppin 2016, 142-167. For divination, see Struck 2014, 310-323 and, with special reference to birds, Maras 2016, 85-114. For sacrifice, see Ekroth 2014, 324-354.

²⁹ For information on metamorphosis in Greek and Roman literature, see Thumiger 2014, 384-413.

³⁰ For information on monstrous animals, see Beagon 2014, 414-440.

³¹ See Chapter 4, pp. 135-136.

Non-native animals are featured in the surviving literature as well, sometimes to the same extent as the locals, though they appear less often in the archaeological record. For example, the bones of lions, crocodiles, and camels appear at some Greek sites, but rarely and in small quantities.³² They were likely specially imported from abroad or dedicated by foreign visitors, for there is no evidence of large-scale animal importation in the Archaic and Classical Periods.³³ Their rarity, however, indicates that most people only knew of them through local and imported art and perhaps oral stories.

Monkeys and baboons inhabit a category of their own. Not only are they foreign to the Mediterranean world, nonexistent in the archaeological materials, and abundant on imported objects, they are also startlingly humanlike; this may be why Greek authors, unlike craftsmen,³⁴ apply sex and personality to the simians they write about. The most learned Greeks (poets, playwrights, philosophers, geographers, and mythographers),³⁵ who likely had access to simian-related images, texts, and stories imported from abroad, were vaguely aware of the visual and behavioral similarities between their species. The ancients did not, however, view these likenesses with adoration and respect, like their Bronze Age predecessors.³⁶ Rather, they viewed these creatures as inferior versions of themselves—ugly, daft, and absurd—and used them as metaphors for unsavory persons, behaviors, and physical traits. The 3rd century CE poet Ennius, quoted by Cicero (*de*

³² Ekroth (2014, 337) notes that wild animals, sometimes foreign in origin, appear in Greek sanctuaries, but their remains rarely comprise more than 10% of the total organic material found.

³³ See n. 81 below.

³⁴ Greek representations of monkeys and simianesque creatures rarely exhibit sex characteristics, like phalloi (see Chapter 2, p. 42).

³⁵ Many Greek sentiments about simians are preserved and shared by Roman authors; thus, most of the textual evidence presented here stems from imperial and Late Antique Rome.

³⁶ See Chapter 2, pp. 44-47.

Natura Deorum 1.97), perhaps puts it best: "the simian, how similar that ugly creature is to us."³⁷

Archaic

Archaic era texts about simians are few but unanimous in their negative outlook on the creature, especially monkeys. Most examples, aside from Semonides of Amorgus' treatise on women,³⁸ occur in Aesopic fables, or moralizing and socially-critical³⁹ stories that feature talking animals.⁴⁰ They are named after Aesop, a Thracian/Phrygian slave believed to have authored these stories in the 6th century BCE, though he may, like Homer, have been a fictitious figurehead for the genre.

Though most extant fables exist as reiterations of 1st-3rd century CE Roman authors, like Phaedrus, Aelian, Lucian, and Babrius,⁴¹ such narratives are believed to originate with Archaic, Aesopian tales because they "conform to the stylistic stereotypes of the fable," which include moralistic undertones and talking animals with stereotypical traits.⁴² *e.g.* the "clever fox," the "brave lion," the "vain stag," and the "gullible goat."⁴³

Though most scholarship on fables denies these stories contain realistic information

³⁷ As cited in Beard 2014, 162.

³⁸ Semonides describes different types of women and the animals Zeus used to create them. The woman who stems from the monkey is ugly, comedic, and deceitful: "...this is the biggest plague of all that Zeus has given to men. Her face is hideous...She is short in the neck; she moves awkwardly; she has no bottom, and is all legs...She knows every trick and twist, just like a monkey; she does not mind being laughed at, and will do no one a good turn, but...spends the whole day planning, how she can do someone the worst possible harm" (Trans. Lloyd-Jones 1975, 50). Not many texts describe simians as cunning tricksters. Semonides may have made the connection because he was comparing the animal with women, who are regarded by countless authors as both devious and animalistic. The first textual instances of devious monkeys occur in the Roman era, when these animals were associated with the Kerkopes (see p. 21 below). However it is possible, since the Kerkopes were represented as early as the Archaic period, that the connection existed prior to the Roman era in a now-lost oral tradition.

³⁹ Lefkowitz 2014, 18. Similarly, some scholars believe the Roman fabulist Phaedrus was working to give voice to voiceless slaves through animals, though it is equally likely that he was preaching complacency in order to quell anxieties relating to social status in imperial Rome (19).

⁴⁰ Not all fables feature animals: some portray plants, gods, personifications, and humans (both imaginary and historical) as well (ibid., 5).

⁴¹ Ibid., 2-4 and Greenlaw 2011, 68-69.

⁴² Lefkowitz 2014, 11.

⁴³ Ibid., 14.

about animals, or were meant to teach people about them, Jeremy Lefkowitz disagrees.

He argues:

...in granting animals the power of speech, fables become fantastic, obvious fictions; on the other hand, by drawing attention to the limits of animal speech and emphasizing the ways in which animals tend to devour one another from time to time, fables also depend on implicit assumptions about how real animals behave in the real world.⁴⁴

This is especially true in fables where predators are interacting with prey: the predator will look for reasons to eat the prey, which, in turn, will counter with excuses.

Eventually, the predator asks: “Am I to forgo eating you just because you always have some plausible excuse?”⁴⁵

Lefkowitz also comments on the implications of human-animal interactions in fables: when humans try to elicit non-verbal responses (*e.g.* music playing, singing, and dancing) from an animal companion, they usually fail. This, Lefkowitz believes, highlights “the difficulties of human-animal intercourse, drawing attention to the folly of anthropomorphizing and the potentially disastrous results of confusing animal and human behavior.”⁴⁶ This idea is clearly reflected in the anthropomorphic monkey: both visually and behaviorally similar to humans, Aesopic monkeys that attempt to imitate other animals and humans fail disastrously. Thus, their repeated stereotype is stupidity, for they are often tricked by other animals, ridiculed by humans, and/or killed by their desire to imitate; and since the Greeks believed stupidity and ugliness were concurrent traits, Aesopic monkeys are often ugly as well.

When monkeys are tricked by other animals, the culprit is usually the clever and beautiful fox, which acts as a contrast to the monkey’s ugliness and stupidity. One story,

⁴⁴ Ibid., 11.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 12-13.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 13.

for example, tells of a monkey that makes a good impression on other animals and is thus elected king. A clever fox, however, grows jealous of the monkey and convinces him to take meat from a hunter's trap. When the monkey becomes ensnared, he complains to the fox, who taunts him in return: "O you monkey! How can you rule over the dumb beasts when you yourself are such an idiot?" (81).⁴⁷ In another fable, a fox bests a monkey yet again, this time because he is ugly: when the monkey asks if he might borrow part of fox's beautiful tail to cover his bare behind, the fox nastily refuses, proclaiming: "Even if my tail grew longer than it is now, I would sooner drag it through filth and thorns than share even the smallest part of it with you!" (533).⁴⁸

Gods and humans also mock the animal's appearance. For instance, when Zeus organizes a beauty contest for infants, numerous species partake, including a monkey, whose baby is snub-nosed and naked. All the animals laugh at her, prompting her to snap: "The winner is for Zeus to decide! But in my eyes this one is the most beautiful of all," (364).⁴⁹ The moral implies that every parent believes their child is the most beautiful, but the author, Babrius, makes a point to label the monkey "ugliest of all animals."⁵⁰ A similar story is written by Phaedrus, except in this example, the ridiculer is human: a man, upon glimpsing a monkey hanging in a butcher shop, asks the keeper what the meat tastes like. The shopkeeper jokes: "Well...its taste is a perfect match for its face!" (496).⁵¹ Phaedrus goes on to remark that this must be a comedic story, for he knew of hideous people with great personalities and vice versa. This statement, however, is not sympathetic towards ugly monkeys, but rather unattractive people.

⁴⁷ Trans. Perry 1965.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Greenlaw 2011, 68.

⁵¹ Trans. Perry 1965.

Finally, some fables mock monkeys' desire to imitate in sadistic ways. For example, a monkey, after watching a fisherman cast a net into a river and retrieve fish, tries the motion himself. Instead of receiving fish, however, he becomes entangled in the net (78).⁵² As he drowns, he proclaims that his fate is deserved because his actions were foolish. In another deathly scenario, a monkey and his owner are shipwrecked. Before he drowns, the monkey is saved by a dolphin, who mistakes him for human. As they reach Athens, the curious dolphin asks if the monkey knows Piraeus, to which he responds: "yes, Piraeus was a near and dear friend..." (73).⁵³ The dolphin, realizing he has been duped, ditches the monkey, causing him to drown. A third example, told by Aelian (*On the Nature of Animals* 7.21), tells of a simian that attempts to bathe a child in imitation of a nurse. Unfortunately, the simian did not know to test the water for temperature and accidentally "poured boiling water over the wretched baby and caused it to die miserably."⁵⁴

Only one example of simians mimicking humans, as told by Lucian (463),⁵⁵ is more humorous than sadistic: an Egyptian king once attempted to teach some monkeys the Pyrrhic dance. The animals learned quickly and wore costumes to authenticate the role. The audience loved the spectacle, and the dancing troupe performed well, until one spectator threw nuts at them. Almost instantly, the monkeys forgot about the dance, ripped off their costumes, and lunged for the proffered food, like the animals they truly were. In an equally derisive series of stories, animals imitate monkeys with disastrous

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Trans. Scholfield, 1959.

⁵⁵ Trans. Perry 1965.

results: for example, a camel is ridiculed and driven away by other animals after attempting to mimic a monkey's dance moves (83).⁵⁶

Classical

The early Archaic Period was a time of visual and textual experimentation: the Greeks established traditions that later generations continued to use for centuries. The reason for this is explained well by Mary Beagon: "Traditional ideas, rather than being destroyed by new discoveries, were frequently enhanced by them, while the new discoveries were themselves shaped and interpreted by being viewed through the lens of tradition."⁵⁷ This is especially true for the monkey: the poets, playwrights, and philosophers of the Classical era regarded simians as hideous, primitive, and distasteful animals, thus continuing the marginalizing traditions established by the authors of previous eras. Instead of discussing the animal itself, however, Classical authors used simians as comparatives for unflattering physical qualities, like ugliness, and personality traits, like buffoonery. It is possible that Greek authors were inspired by comedic representations of simians in Mesopotamian texts⁵⁸ and Egyptian art,⁵⁹ but the condescending tone of these texts is directly influenced by previous Greek authors, like the Aesopic fabulists.

For example, in the 5th century BCE, the comedian Aristophanes compares ugly old women to monkeys in his *Ekklesiazousai* (1069-1072). In this play, a youth catches sight of an old woman who had addressed him from behind. Abhorred by what he sees, he exclaims "Oh Heracles! oh Pan! oh Corybantes! oh Dioscuri! Why, she is still more

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Beagon 2014, 435; see also p. 30 below.

⁵⁸ See Chapter 3, p. 113.

⁵⁹ See Chapter 3, pp. 91-92.

awful! Oh! what a monster! great gods! Are you an ape plastered with white lead, or the ghost of some old hag returned from the dark borderlands of death?”⁶⁰ Additionally, in his *Knights* (877-890), the playwright coined the term *pithekismos* to describe the thin boundary between fraud and flattery.⁶¹ The word is showcased in a verbal battle between a man named Cleon and a sausage seller: Cleon asks if the seller would stoop to apish trickery, to which the seller retorts, “No, it is your own tricks that I am borrowing.”⁶² This prompts Cleon to reply, “Oh! You shall not outdo me in flattery!”

Comparable to Aristophanes’ *pithekismos*, Pindar, in his *Pythian Odes* (2.72-75), uses the monkey to describe cunningly “persuasive speech.”⁶³ He says, “To children, you know, an ape is pretty, always pretty. But Rhadamanthys has prospered, because his allotted portion was the blameless fruit of intelligence, and he does not delight his inner spirit with deceptions...”⁶⁴ In other words, children, who do not know better, may love simians, but Rhadamanthys, the judge of the underworld, is not fooled by them.⁶⁵

Finally, Plato remarks upon the creature’s ugliness and innate buffoonery in his 4th century BCE *Hippias Major* (289A-B): he notes that “the most beautiful monkey is ugly” and “the most learned of men, compared to god, will appear a monkey.”⁶⁶ He also compares buffoonery to simians in his *Republic* (10.620c) when he reveals that the ugly warrior Thersites desires to be reincarnated as an ape.

⁶⁰ Trans. Oates and O’Neill, 1938.

⁶¹ Beard 2014, 161.

⁶² Trans. Oates and O’Neill, 1938.

⁶³ Beard 2014, 161.

⁶⁴ Trans. Svarlien, 1990.

⁶⁵ Beard 2014, 161.

⁶⁶ As cited in Lissarrague 1997, 458.

Conclusion

As these texts imply, the human-like appearance and behaviors of simians were very obvious to Greek authors. Rather than attempting to learn more about these complex creatures, however, the Greeks—normally known for their unquenchable thirst for knowledge—chose to remain ignorant about the biological, cognitive, and social aspects of these animals and instead laughed about their hideousness and stupidity. Mary Beard explains why: “While the creature may ape the human...and seem very like the human in particular respects, it never fully crosses the boundary that divides it from our species, and that's what makes us laugh.”⁶⁷ The question remains: was their decision to laugh, rather than learn, the result of discomfort or indifference? As I will discuss in Chapter 4, the iconographic inconsistency and constant marginalization of monkeys in Greek art imply the Greeks were uneasy about this human-like creature, equating it with othered beings, like monsters and demons, rather than animals.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the following survey, I consider a variety of sources that relate both directly and indirectly to simians. These include discussions about textual and visual renditions of simians in Greece, Italy, Egypt, and Mesopotamia; general surveys about animals in Greek art and thought; scientific books and documentaries about monkey behavior; sources on posture and gesture as exhibited by humans in Greek art; overviews on monsters, personifications, and demons in the Mediterranean world; and sources on apotropaic paraphernalia and the types of objects, entities, and people they protected.

⁶⁷ Beard 2014, 166.

Simians

Much of the secondary scholarship on simians in the Mediterranean attempts to catalog the visual and/or textual material or identify species. The earliest and most complete corpus is McDermott's lengthy book *The Ape in Antiquity* (1938). McDermott surveys representations of what he calls "apes" in Egypt and the Near East, catalogs nearly all known representations in Greek art, discusses how the ape's image spread across the Mediterranean, and explores nearly all available primary and secondary sources on the animal through 1930. His goal is to provide a full account of visual and textual representations of apes in the Mediterranean world: from their origins in Egypt and Mesopotamia to their eventual spread westward into Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. Though he provides interpretations for some of the more famous materials, like the MacMillan aryballos (**Cat. 3.4**), they often are not his own; most objects are simply described. Furthermore, McDermott improperly uses the categorical term "ape" to describe these creatures: apes are large primates, including gorillas, chimpanzees, and orangutans, which, as I mentioned earlier, would have been unknown to the residents of the Mediterranean.

Though McDermott's catalog is impressively thorough for such an early work, his source material is very out-of-date. This is why Cybele Greenlaw, who co-owned a primate sanctuary in her youth, wrote an updated corpus of simian imagery in the Mediterranean: *Representations of Monkeys in the Art and Thought of Mediterranean Cultures* (2011). This book is a product of her dissertation and a series of articles she wrote in 2005 and 2006. First and foremost, Greenlaw's book aims to identify species of simians that appear in Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Greek, and Roman art and from where

the species originate. She also thoroughly explores East-West connections, Greek and Roman sources, and provides an updated bibliography of secondary source material. Like McDermott, however, she does not usually interpret the imagery she presents; rather, she describes what previous scholars have said and makes notes when she agrees or adjustments need to be made about particular species identifications.

While McDermott and Greenlaw are the only two scholars to write thorough corpuses on simians in Mediterranean art, numerous scholars have written smaller studies. These works tend to focus on the animal's comedic tendencies, their physical and behavioral similarities to humans and satyrs, and their connections with the East and West. Brijder (1988), for example, explores representations of comedic anthropoids in Greek vase painting. He believes most representations of humanesque simians, like those featured on an Athenian red-figured cup from Vulci (**Cat. 4.4**) and a red-figured askos (**Cat. 4.6**), depict humans dressed as monkeys⁶⁸ and could embody Dionysus' ecstatic followers. Regardless of whether these figures embody monkeys or costumed humans, Brijder does not explain why this animal was used in place of more commonly used characters, like padded dancers and satyrs. Furthermore, while he explores literary evidence about simians, he does not always connect these texts with the visual material. Lissarrague (1997) also discusses simians in comedic and symposiastic contexts, but he explicitly explores the similarities between humans, satyrs, and the animal in question—

⁶⁸ The theme of monkey costumes appears elsewhere in Greek art, especially Corinthian vase painting, which often features dancers disguised as monkeys, men dressed as women, and/or men dressed as monkeys (Smith 2010, 34-35). For example, a mid-7th century BCE transitional olpe, now in the Villa Giulia, features a dancing monkey-like creature with an S-shaped body and deformed foot (Brijder 1988, 64, fig. 3 and Steiner 2016, 133, fig. 5.4A). The main scene features hunters pursuing hares, while the simianesque figure is isolated at the edge of the frieze, beside the handle. Walsh (2009, 145) calls the creature an "ape" because it has simian qualities, like facial features, but I think it more closely resembles other human figures in the scene, which is why I have chosen to not include it here. Another example of a deformed monkey appears on a Caeretan black-figure hydria (**Cat. 3.18**).

an idea that many scholars, like McDermott, scoff at, but I think holds credence.⁶⁹ He, like Brijder, reviews simians in Greek literature before comparing and contrasting both textual suppositions about and visual renditions of the animal to satyrs.

In the 1990s and early 2000s, Langdon (1990), Vandervondelen (1994), and Connors (2004) explored simians' East-West connections. Vandervondelen studied a series of Cretan figurines that depict squatting monkeys. She argues that though there is no faunal evidence of simians on Crete, the island was importing Egyptian and Egyptianizing representations of them, which influenced their own renditions of the animal. Such images, however, disappear from Greece after the Bronze Age, which is what makes Langdon's research so useful: she explores how, when, and why simians make their way back into Greece after a 400 year absence. She analyzes 12 Late Geometric bronze figurines of simianesque creatures, which were discovered in sanctuaries at Elis, Laconia, Arcadia, Euboia, Rhodes, and in Central Italy. She believes they are the first representations of simianesque creatures since the Bronze Age and that they were transferred to Greece via Phoenician traders. Bouzek, who commented on these figurines in 1974, refers to them as demons but does not explain what this might mean.⁷⁰

In addition to the Greek-East connections discussed above, Connors' research focuses on simians' connections with the Euboean colony of Pithekoussai: an 8th century BCE Euboean⁷¹ trading post on the island of Ischia, off the western coast of Italy. It was the earliest Greek settlement in the western Mediterranean and it claimed great wealth by

⁶⁹ See Chapter 2, pp. 67-70.

⁷⁰ I discuss the demonic implications of simian iconography in Chapter 4.

⁷¹ According to Strabo (*Geography* 5.4.9), Pithekoussai was founded by Euboean colonists from Chalcis and Eretria.

smelting Etruscan iron and exporting it back east.⁷² Pithekoussai's name is believed to have originated from one of two words: *pithoi* (large storage jars), or *pithekoi* (monkeys),⁷³ for numerous authors claim that apes resided there, including the simianesque Kerkopes.⁷⁴

Connors does not discuss many visual representations, but she thoroughly explores texts that mention simians, the simianesque Kerkopes that relate to the colony, and Athenian sentiments about what she calls “monkey business,” perhaps after Barnett's (1973) article of the same name. Pithekoussai was a wealthy island, rich in natural resources; in fact it was so prosperous that it became conflated with the scheming Kerkopes, whose unruly ways functioned as foils to “traditional elites.” Thus, in the same way that demons were believed to embody inverted human behaviors opposed to the norm,⁷⁵ monkey business, as performed by the Kerkopes, and thus Pithekoussai's money-making schemes, were distorted, inauthentic, and thus an inversion of traditional order. Connor's theories are interesting, but we must remember that the Kerkopes, though they appear in Greek art as early as the Archaic Period, are not certainly connected with simians until the Roman era. With the exception of Semonides of Amorgos' 7th century BCE treatise on women, Greek literature does not describe simians as lying, thieving tricksters; rather, they were viewed as ugly, banal, and more primitive versions of humans.

While numerous authors have discussed visual and textual renditions of simians in detail, Steiner (2016) is the only author to acknowledge their liminal status in larger

⁷² Connors 2004, 186.

⁷³ Ridgway 1992, 36.

⁷⁴ Lyconphron *Alexandria* (688-693); Ovid *Metamorphoses* (14.89ff); and Harpocration *Lexicon of the Ten Orators* (s.v. Kerkopes, K 42).

⁷⁵ Johnston 1995, 364. See also the section on “Demons” in Chapter 4.

narratives: she argues that the simian's "marginality" and "'extraterritorial' status" in certain vase paintings (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.8** and **3.18**) has made him "unfit for inclusion at the symposium, and for the civic world beyond, he is effectively banished..."⁷⁶ Her interpretation stems from a fragment by the 7th century BCE Ionian "iambographer" Archilochos (185–187 w.; see also Fable 81), which speaks of a monkey that was isolated from other animals after being outsmarted by a fox.

Though Steiner's argument is convincing, she uses a singular poetic fragment as evidence for the visual materials, which I think is insufficient. I find the animal's deformity, or physical inadequacy, to be more relevant to its ostracism. This idea is emphasized in Marco Vespa's article "Why Avoid a Monkey: The Refusal of Interaction in Galen's *Epideixis*" (2017). Vespa notes that in the Roman era, name avoidance was used to protect against diseases, misfortunes, and grotesque people. There is evidence to suggest that simians were included among these taboo subjects,⁷⁷ which implies their marginalization was directly related to their appearance and behaviors and not merely references to comedic texts. Though Galen was writing in the Roman era, his sentiments align with those of the Archaic and Classical Greeks.

As simians appear in Etruria and Apulia in addition to Greece, there is also scholarship on Italic representations of these creatures, whose inception is often connected with North Africa or Greece. Bonacelli (1932), for example, wrote a lengthy article on representations of simians in Etruria, especially bronze implements, figurines, and painting. He suggests that the figurines, in particular, exhibit Punic influence due to the precious materials from which they are made (amber and ivory) and their physical

⁷⁶ Steiner 2016, 138.

⁷⁷ See Chapter 4, pp. 152-153.

representation (many are made without tails). Using Bonacelli's research, Rebuffat-Emmanuel (1967) writes on representations of monkeys from the Roman colony of Mauretania Tingitana in North Africa. Her aim is to identify the iconographic origins of strange, standing monkey figurines found there. She believes the squatting simian was likely imported into Punic Carthage from further East, like Mesopotamia and Egypt. The Carthaginians, in turn, passed the animal on to the Etruscans, who portrayed it as both crouching and standing; this iconographic adjustment, she argues, may have encouraged the creation of the standing monkey-god in Punic art. This explains why the simians rendered by the Romans at Mauritania Tingitana closely resemble 6th century Etruscan figurines: the colony's craftsmen were likely influenced by Etruscan-inspired Punic art.

Though these sources convincingly work to pinpoint foreign influencers for Italic simian art, they do not explore the strong relationship between simians and horses.⁷⁸ In both Greece and Etruria, squatting simians are often represented on or alongside horses and horse implements. In some cases, this association facilitates the physical and/or locational marginalization of the animal: the monkey is ridiculous if it rides the horse (or other large animal) and it is ostracized if rendered beneath or behind the horse. I explore this phenomenon more in Chapters 2, 4, and 5.

Unlike Greek monkey and simianesque art, there are numerous articles and book chapters that explore simians in Egyptian and Near Eastern art. This is likely because simians are better understood in these contexts, where there is evidence of importation, worship, and ownership of the animal. The most extensive sources on Egyptian simian art (*e.g.* Vandier d'Abbadie 1964-1966, Janssen and Janssen 1989, Osborne and Osbornova

⁷⁸ Bonacelli (1932) provides visual examples of monkeys featured on horses and horse implements, but he does not attempt to explain the relationship.

1998, and Vernus and Yoyette 2005) either catalog or overview extant imagery and/or focus on species identification, symbolisms (*e.g.* sun worship), religious significance (*e.g.* relation to Thoth and Bes), and/or human imitation (*e.g.* dancing, playing music, farming, and sailing). These texts are useful for the modern Greek scholar as general overviews on Egyptian representations of and beliefs about simians, though they do not engage much with the ancient Greek materials.

The sources on Mesopotamian simians analyze specific themes and motifs, like comedy, human imitation, and religious significance in both art (Barnett 1973, Mendleson 1983, Cline 1991, and Spycket 1998) and text (Dunham 1985). Though these sources often explore the visual and cultural connections between Mesopotamia's simian motifs and those from other eastern locales (*e.g.* Egypt, Persia, and India), there is little discussion about the Near East's influence over Greece's simian art, even though there are clear similarities.⁷⁹ An exception is Mellink (1987), who explores the link between Anatolian representations of simian libation bearers/pourers and Mesopotamian and Minoan genii, like Tawert. In this particular circumstance, the meaning of these crouching simians was transferred with their image, though in general this was not the case.⁸⁰

Animals

Since monkeys are not the only animals the Greeks depicted, I reviewed a variety of sources on the Greeks' perceptions of other animals, as featured in art and text. The *Oxford Handbook of Animals* (2014), edited by Gordon Lindsay Campbell, provides a recent and thorough overview, especially MacKinnon's article on "Faunae of the Ancient

⁷⁹ See Chapter 4 for more details.

⁸⁰ Ibid. See also n. 98 below.

Mediterranean World.” Using the ancient source material as his guide, he surveys all animals that were native to the ancient Mediterranean, distinguishing which the Greeks would have kept as livestock, sacrificed and eaten, encountered in the wild, and traded. Since they were non-natives, monkeys are not mentioned among these creatures; the closest relation is the Egyptian mongoose, which frequently appears on Mesopotamian cylinder seals (see **Fig. 9**) and closely resembles the monkey.

MacKinnon’s other article in the handbook, on “Pets,” supplies evidence that the Greeks were importing exotic animals (*e.g.* lions, tigers, bears, dolphins, and elephants) from abroad to keep in fantastic menageries. He primarily uses Roman sources as evidence, likely because wild animal importation was not popular in ancient Greece. Though monkeys are mentioned among his list of “Tamed ‘Pet’ Wildlife and Exotics,” MacKinnon notes that they do not become common pets in the Mediterranean until the Roman era.⁸¹ This is indirectly confirmed by Ekroth in her article on “Animal Sacrifice in Antiquity:” though she mentions that the bones of imported animals, like lions and crocodiles, have been uncovered in Greek sanctuaries, simians are not among them.

Also in Campbell’s anthology is Jeremy Lefkowitz’s “Aesop and Animal Fable,” which provides background on Aesopic fables, many of which ridicule simians. Though Lefkowitz does not specifically discuss the role simians play in these stories, he does provide a thorough survey of the genre that includes common themes, the types of animals typically featured, and provides social and moral implications for such stories. A

⁸¹ One Greek author who discusses the capture of simians is Aristotle (frag. 107m as cited in Athenaeus *Deipnosophists* 10.492d). He notes that simians were caught wild, which could suggest they were worth procurement (as cited in Calder 2011, 90). In general, people who could afford such a high-maintenance pet likely used them to communicate and advertise their status, wealth, and distinction (*ibid.*, 97); they were not commonly owned in Greece. In Rome, however, exotic animals were hunted and captured, shipped to the Mediterranean, and trained on a large scale for the purposes of business and spectacle (Epplert 2015, 20-21), scientific and medical dissection (Vespa 2017, 415) and, to a lesser extent, pet ownership (MacKinnon 2014, 278).

significant note he makes is that though Fables were often exaggerated, they did attempt to teach people about animal behaviors and personalities as they were understood at the time.

More specialized texts about animals in Greek art attempt to explain their meaning and function in larger narratives. The most interesting is Hurwit's "Lions, Lizards, and the Uncanny" (2006), which details the ominous potential of lizards and birds in certain Early Greek vase paintings. According to Hurwit, interpolative lizards often appear in scenes where disaster, a conflict, and/or death are imminent. In some scenes, lizards are accompanied by a bird that appears to be hunting it. Together, Hurwit believes these animals function as omens of death and destruction. His theories about animalistic omens, birds in particular, are significant because some Greek monkeys and simianesque creatures appear alongside, or in the same locations as, birds in early Greek art (**Cat. 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, 3.9, 3.16, and 7.2**). I explore their visual connections further in Chapters 2, 4 and 5.

Since some old world simians, like the Hamadryas Baboon and Rhesus macaque, are still in existence today, I also utilized biological, anthropological, and scientific sources, which reference modern-day knowledge about these animals. The most useful were David Attenborough's docuseries on *Life* (2009) and *Natural Curiosities* (2015), Desmond Morris' book titled *Monkey* (2015), and Jane Goodall's article on "Tool Using in Primates and Other Vertebrates" (1970). From these sources, I gleaned that misinterpretations about simian behaviors can often lead to misconceptions about their advanced nature and intelligence. For example, we understand today that some of simians' seemingly primitive behaviors, like throwing stones and excrement or leaving

food to bake in the sun, are deliberate, intelligent acts. In ancient Greece, however, such actions would have been viewed as humorous and primitive and were utilized in art as such (*e.g.* **Cat. 7.1**).

Posture/Gesture

As stated earlier, ancient Greek authors acknowledged that simians shared physical and behavioral similarities with humans. There are no sources that specifically discuss simian posture and gesture in Greek art, but Bremmer's article "Walking, Standing, and Sitting in Ancient Greek culture" (1992) explores Greek ideas and values relating to human posture. According to Bremmer, crouching was the lowliest posture in Greek thought and was thus often performed by slaves in art. In the motifs surveyed here, monkeys and simianesque creatures exhibit a variety of postures but most crouch in manners akin to lowly humans (**Cat. 2.1, 3.1-7, 3.9-12, 3.14-16, 3.19, 3.21-2, 3.3, 5.1, 6.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.6-7, 7.9**).

Simians also adopt human gestures in Greek art, such as pointing, waving, genital rubbing, and flashing the middle finger. As with posture, however, scholars have not attempted to analyze these communicative motions in Greek art, but there are sources on human gesture, and their implications, in both ancient and modern society. The most thorough are Elliott's books titled *Beware the Evil Eye* (2015 and 2016),⁸² which catalog the origins of and ancient beliefs about various apotropaic gestures. His exploration of *digitus infamis* (*i.e.* giving the finger) is particularly informative: though this gesture is not certainly discussed until the Hellenistic period, it may be subtly referenced as early as the 5th century by Aristophanes.⁸³ Interestingly, anthropologist Desmond Morris connects

⁸² See pp. 33-36 below.

⁸³ See Chapter 4, n. 112.

the gesture and simians in a comment he made to the BBC (Nasaw 2012): some species of monkey are known to “flip the bird” for offensive purposes (**Cat. 4.1**).

Monsters, Personifications, and Demons

We recognize today that simians are animals with evolutionary ties to humans. Devoid of this anthropological knowledge, however, the Greeks were forced to invent superstitious theories to explain our visual and behavioral similarities. Such beliefs may have convinced them that these animals required alternate classification. Thus, I reviewed sources on representations of monstrous/mixed beings, personified concepts, and demons in Greek art, text, and thought to see if there were meaningful and/or functional similarities between simians and these fantastic beings.

Three recent and useful sources on monstrous/mixed beings include *The Centaur's Smile* (2003), edited by Michael Padgett; Aston's *Mixanthropoi* (2011); and Beagon's article on “Wondrous Animals in Classical Antiquity” (2014). Padgett's exhibition catalog, written in three parts, surveys most canonized human-animal hybrids, or monsters, in Greek art. The first article, by the editor himself, explores and compares the centaur and satyr, two human-horse hybrids. Though Padgett describes satyrs in passing—briefly surveying their iconography and unsavory personality traits—he closely analyzes the centaur, remarking how this creature, unlike the satyr, took centuries to canonically form, in both art and literature, and was potentially influenced by Eastern sources. The second article, by Childs, surveys Near Eastern composites, like the siren and griffin. He argues that apotropaic monsters were very important in Mesopotamia and believes the Greeks understood this importance and adopted both the images of these creatures and their inherent meanings accordingly. Though Childs is right to assume that

many imported *Mischwesen* held apotropaic significance in Greek art, he does not explore how these creatures were later appropriated and inserted into larger mythological narratives, like the sagas of Odysseus and the Arimaspians, making them more Greek than Eastern. The final article, by Tsiafakis, also explores Greek hybrids with origins in Near Eastern art, such as the Minotaur, but she focuses on their iconography and the ways they visually change, or remain the same, in comparison to the Eastern materials.

Similarly, Aston's book explores human-animal hybrids, though she describes them as "lesser deities" that were worshipped in addition to the Olympic pantheon. Aston is clear and steadfast when she defines what constitutes a mixed being: parts from different animals (*mixother/mixotheros*) and parts from humans and animals (*mixanthropoi*). She spends most of her text exploring the psychological composition of these so-called divinities (*e.g.* satyrs, sirens, and centaurs), themes that result from their representation (*e.g.* the contested space between divinity and monstrosity), and their metamorphic, divine, and monstrous connotations and connections. Aston ultimately allows for alternate meanings and functions to be applied to creatures that are viewed by many as wholly monstrous, frightening, and evil.

Unlike Padgett and Aston, Beagon explores hybrid monsters and fantastic animals through the lens of wonder: the "deep-seated and powerful response to the apparently unlimited inventiveness of nature..."⁸⁴ Far off-places, like Scythia, were described by Greek authors as exotic extremes, with unpredictable climates, residents, and creatures. Misunderstandings about these distant places resulted in the creation of fantastic human-animal hybrids, such as cenocephaloi (dog-headed men), sphinxes, and satyrs—all of which, to some degree, have been conflated with simians. Conversely, interest in the

⁸⁴ Beagon 2014, 414.

exotic facilitated the collection of wild species of animals, like white bears, giraffes, and rhinos. Dwarves and monkeys were also kept as pets; and though dwarves are human, Athenaeus (*Deipnosophists* 518e) refers to them, and monkeys, as “men but not men,” which, Beagon explains, is “a phrase that places pets and by extension their owners on a potentially monstrous taxonomic borderline.”⁸⁵ In essence, Beagon shows how the Greeks’ views on certain animals, like simians, were developed into traditions that “achieved a lasting stability in the collective consciousness by virtue of two apparently opposing but complementary forces: the expectations aroused by the new and the respect felt for the traditional.”⁸⁶

Though there are not quite as many resources on personifications as there are on monsters, the most thorough is certainly Alan Shapiro’s book on *Personifications in Greek Art* (1993), which stems from his dissertation. Personifications are the physical manifestations of abstract concepts and ideas, like Victory; they are rendered as human, though they sometimes feature animal parts (*e.g.* Eros’ wings, Phobos’ lion head) and carry attributes (*e.g.* Geras’ leaning stick). In his introduction, Shapiro explores beliefs about these beings in Greek thought and reviews modern scholarship on the subject. The majority of his book, however, surveys the backstories and iconographies of each known personification, from Aponia to Tyche. The most interesting personification he describes is Phobos, who was used as an apotropaic device in art. Unlike most personifications, Phobos’ form shifts in Greek art: sometimes he is rendered as human, others as a human-animal hybrid. Shapiro wisely explains why this may be: like the boogey man, “Each of

⁸⁵ Ibid., 433.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 435.

us has a conception of fear and could, given the proper stimulus, translate it into a visual image which would for him best embody the concept.”⁸⁷

Discussions on representations of Greek demons are also lacking, but Sarah Iles Johnston’s book on the *Restless Dead* (1999), which encompasses the subject of her 1995 article “Defining the Dreadful,” provides an excellent discussion of demonic concepts in Greek literature. Johnston’s three-part book explores Greek beliefs about ways the dead, in the form of ghosts, interact with the living. Part one explores Archaic and Classical views about the dead, from Homer to the 5th century BCE, as well as the types of festive and defensive rituals performed for deceased loved ones and against vengeful spirits. This part also includes a discussion about *goes*, or wizards with the power to invoke and protect against the dead, as well as reasons why they were needed.

Part 2 is the strongest and most interesting: it describes the *restless dead*: i.e. those who died violently and what she calls “Childless Mothers and Blighted Virgins;” this latter category consists of female ghosts (e.g. Lamia, Gello, and Mormo), who border on the demonic, and their victims. These ghostly, female demons died prior to successfully completing crucial life events, such as marriage and childbirth. As a result, they feel unfulfilled, cannot rest, and become trapped between the realms of the living and dead, attacking women and children who successfully completed what they could not. This is what ultimately makes them demonic: as Johnston explains, demons, unlike humans, are transgressive and hybrid. Therefore, they are seemingly caught between two taxa, like human and animal, and are thus akin to shapeshifters.⁸⁸ Due to their inconstant nature, demons are inconsistently described in texts and rarely represented in art. The

⁸⁷ Shapiro 1993, 20.

⁸⁸ Johnston 1995, 362.

best example is Lamia, a beautiful African queen who failed as a mother. Stricken with grief and guilt, Lamia transformed into a hideous human-monkey hybrid and was believed to snatch children from their beds. Though Johnston does not explore representations of this elusive demon in art, other sources do, including Vermeule's article "Herakles Brings a Tribute" (1977) and Boardman's *LIMC* article "Lamia" (1992). Lamia manifests in Greek art as simianesque, sphinx-like, and human; in total, there are five presumed images and most are scholarly guesses. It is unfortunate that Johnston did not connect her textual examples with the visual material, for it would have benefitted her discussion about Lamia's liminality.

Part 3 of Johnston's book explores connections between divinities, like Hecate, and the dead. Hecate was a goddess of liminal spaces, who, unlike most divinities, could refuse to assist those who invoked her. As a result, she, like the Lamia, became associated with the ghosts of unfulfilled women. Johnston also discusses other vengeful female beings, such as the Erinyes, Eumenides, and Semnai Theai and explores modern scholarship about them. She concludes that there is not enough evidence to presume that these entities were meant to represent dead spirits, like Lamia, Gello, and Mormo; thus, they are not demonic.

The sources reviewed above ultimately show that the Greeks did not always clearly differentiate between humans, animals (*e.g.* horses, lions, and birds), objects/ideas (*e.g.* Fear), and supernatural forces (*e.g.* ghosts), but often blurred the lines between them. For example, monsters are generally categorized as mixed beings, consisting of parts from multiple animals (*e.g.* lion and bird) or humans and animals (*e.g.* human heads/torsos with animal bodies). Conversely, personifications are, for the most part,

always human: they sometimes have added parts (*e.g.* wings) or attributes (*e.g.* staffs) to distinguish them from other humans in visual narratives, but their forms are always human, hence their title: concepts (*e.g.* victory, wealth, love) personified (made human). Finally, demons are neither human nor animal, but something trapped between. Thus, their forms constantly shift, making them difficult to render, predict, or understand. As a result, they, unlike monsters and personifications, exist primarily in text and thought rather than art; and when they are rendered, their forms are wholly inconsistent.

Apotropaia

The Greeks believed their monsters and demons were simultaneously capable of protection and harm, so I also explored a variety of sources on apotropaia, or protective devices that ward off unwanted injury and supernatural evils, and reasons the Greeks used them. For example, Faraone's book *The Talisman and the Trojan Horse* (1992), reviews the various apotropaic methods used by the Greeks for averting unwanted forces. In his introduction, Faraone distinguishes between apotropaic and talismanic images: the former were set up at gates and boundaries to ward off evil-doers and invaders as functional rather than symbolic implements, while the latter's mere presence, no matter where it was installed within a city, ensured protection. Over the next seven chapters, Faraone explores various types of apotropaia, in both text and image, and what they protected against: *e.g.* the Trojan Horse, magical papyri, animal amulets, theriomorphic (or animalistic) demons, evil gods (*e.g.* Apollo), and *lex sacra* (purification rituals against ghosts). In his Epilogue, he explores the apotropaic connotations inherent within Greek religious art (*e.g.* *palladia* and *gorgoneia*), Eastern influences, and cross-overs between apotropaia and comedy. He concludes that it is difficult to assess how apotropaic images

and ideas were used in ancient Greece, since such devices were not always the favored method of protection; but their continued and frequent use shows that Greek protective images can be understood “as efforts aimed at manipulating and persuading hostile forces to refrain from using their power, or at least focus it outward away from the city towards an enemy.”⁸⁹

More recently, John H. Elliott has written four extensive volumes on the evil eye and apotropaic methods for protecting against it; they are titled *Beware the Evil Eye: The Evil Eye in the Bible and Ancient World* (2015-2017). Though the primary goal of his multi-book project is to explore biblical discussions about the evil eye, Elliott writes his first two volumes on ancient beliefs about this concept in Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome. His extrapolations are based primarily on textual references, though he does explore some art forms as well.

The first volume, *Introduction, Mesopotamia, and Egypt* (2015), spends nearly 150 pages introducing the concept of the evil eye in the ancient world: what it means, what it entailed, why it was feared, and how people protected themselves against it. According to Elliott, “...an Evil Eye is believed to convey, project, and cast forth particles of energy that damage or destroy the object struck.”⁹⁰ The concept was closely associated with uncontrollable emotions, like envy, which could manifest evil demons. Humans, apotropaic monsters, and sorcerers who possessed the evil eye were known as Fascinators. In order to protect against them, people developed precautionary actions—*e.g.* refusal to make eye contact, concealing children and valued items, denial, restraint, sharing, and defensive gestures (*e.g.* spitting, touching one’s genitals, and *digitus*

⁸⁹ Faraone 1992, 192.

⁹⁰ Elliott 2015, 2.

infamis)—and objects, like amulets (*e.g.* replicas of phalloi). This section of Elliott's book also contains a thorough literature review about the evil eye in both ancient and modern literature. The rest of the book describes reasons for why beliefs about the evil eye manifested in Egypt and Mesopotamia (*e.g.* disease) and methods for protecting against them as described in ancient texts.

Part two of Elliott's corpus, *Greece and Rome* (2016), explores beliefs about, and methods for protecting against, the evil eye in ancient Greece and Rome. Elliott begins by exploring mentions of the concept in literature, beginning with Herodotus. The rest of his book explores Greek and Roman beliefs about the evil eye: *e.g.* unintentional vs. intentional evil eyes, the envious evil eye and the evil eye demon, those who could possess the evil eye (*e.g.* humans, gods, demons, monsters, mythological figures, animals, and exotic groups), victims of the evil eye, and methods of protection (*e.g.* apotropaic amulets, gestures, and representations of deformed peoples). It seems Elliott sought to provide an overview of ancient Mediterranean beliefs about, reasons for fearing, and protections against the evil eye (perhaps in preparation for his discussion about the Bible) rather than draw conclusions about why it manifested. The thoroughness of his overview, however, makes his series very valuable for people who know nothing about the concept and seek more information.

More specific explorations of protective devices, like the intersection between laughter and apotropaia, are explored by Clarke (2002) and Beard (2014). Clarke, while writing about sex for an anthology on *The Roman Gaze*, discusses apotropaia in relation to humorous art, specifically improper sex pairings and positions. Though he focuses primarily on Roman beliefs, his idea that laughter could disseminate particles emanated

by envious gazes in vulnerable settings applies to many of the images in my own survey, for they too would have been used in situations where the envious evil eye would have been present (*e.g.* the gymnasium, symposium, and fountain houses).

Beard, in one chapter of her book on *Laughter in Ancient Rome*, explores what makes simians funny to both Greek and Roman minds. For much of the article, she thoroughly reviews discussions about simians in ancient texts. Based on her analysis of them, she concludes that simians behave like humans but never get the gestures, postures, or actions quite right and that is what makes them funny. What her excellent study lacks is the exploration of representations of simians in Greek art, for many of them are humorous.

METHODOLOGY

For this dissertation, I surveyed all pictorial images of Greek monkeys, ca. 9th-4th centuries BCE, on vases and stone objects. I included all the images I found with the exception of two vases whose figures are ambiguous⁹¹ and two gems with complicated publication histories and find spots.⁹² I do not explore sculpted objects, like figurines, for similar reasons: most are difficult to identify, mislabeled (*e.g.* many are confused with bears),⁹³ and/or broken. Additionally, I discovered and surveyed a series of what I will call *simianesque* beings: humanoid creatures that resemble simians, satyrs, and sometimes feature parts of other animals, such as dolphins (**Cat. 7.5**) and snakes (**Cat.**

⁹¹ Supra n. 67 and Chapter 2, n. 39.

⁹² Both examples feature simians confronting lions. The first example, depicted on an Etruscan gilt silver ring from Vulci (Anonymous 1889, 171), was originally published as a drawing by an unknown author of the 19th century. Since I was unable to find a photograph of this object, I felt I could not properly analyze its motifs and thus chose not to include it. The second example, featured on a chalcedony scaraboid, was discovered in Beirut and was made by a Cypriot craftsman (Boardman 2001, pl. 385). Though it features an excellently-preserved simianesque creature, I could not justify including it here since it has nothing to do with Greece.

⁹³ See Ure 1934, 66 and Karageorghis 1994.

7.8). These mixed beings exhibit the same appearances, gestures, and postures as monkeys do in pictorial Greek art and feature in similar locations in larger narratives. Unlike the monkey motifs, however, simianesque creatures are not described in the primary source material⁹⁴ and have never been discussed as a cohesive group by modern scholars prior to this dissertation. I have included them here because I believe they are significant to understanding how the Greeks perceived human-like monkeys.

A full account of the pictorial monkey and simianesque motifs I collected is presented in Chapter 2. This chronological survey separates the material into categories based on time period: Bronze Age, Geometric, Early/Middle Archaic, Late Archaic/Classical, and Hellenistic for monkeys and Geometric, Archaic, and Classical for the simianesque. As previously stated, the Bronze Age and Hellenistic materials are used as bookends and thus are not covered in detail. Each category is further organized by date (earliest to latest) and, for the larger categories, method of representation (*e.g.* simians riding other animals). For each object I provide descriptions and bibliography, and for each chronological category I explore the types of objects monkeys and simianesque creatures adorn; the motifs, characters, and stories that accompany them; and review cultural connections (*e.g.* between Egypt and Aegina, where a monkey playing a sistrum [Cat. 3.19] was discovered), context, material, and vessel-type. This overview, based on pre-established research and notions about cultural contact and context, shows that simians appear in many locations (*e.g.* sanctuaries and tombs) and on many different types of objects (*e.g.* aryballoi, cups, and gems) seemingly randomly between the 9th and

⁹⁴ The ancient Greeks had a few equivalent terms to the English “ape-like,” but they do not encapsulate the same meaning as my *simianesque*: *pithekismos* (Aristophanes *Knights* 877-890) and *pithekoeides* (Aristotle *History of Animals* 2.498b15). Galen’s use of a similar term, *pithekeios* (*On Anatomical Procedures* 386 and 548), is most similar to *simianesque*, but he was writing in the 2nd century CE, long after these motifs were developed.

4th centuries BCE. This background assessment of the objects themselves provided me with the necessary groundwork for answering the questions I supplied above.

After my initial analysis of the visual materials, my first question was rather easy to answer: textual and visual renditions of simians are relatively unified, as both genres deliberately exhibit these animals as ugly and ridiculous. This is because traditional beliefs, especially those relating to fantastic creatures from beyond Greece, were engrained within all aspects of Greek culture and consciousness—not just the parts we can still see.⁹⁵ This connection, however, does not occur for certain until the Middle Archaic period, as the earliest renditions of monkeys and simianesque creatures (Geometric and Early Archaic) show little evidence of humor.⁹⁶ These creatures mostly crouch beneath or amongst various narratives (*e.g.* horses [**Cat. 3.4**] and humans [**Cat. 7.2**]) and decorative elements (**Cat. 3.2, 3.19**), remaining static and too small to be of notice. Most Middle/Late Archaic and Classical simians, however, exhibit overtly humorous gestures and postures, including dancing (**Cat. 4.4**), masturbation (**Cat. 4.2**), “flipping the bird” (**Cat. 4.1**), and human imitation (**Cat. 4.5**). Classical simian motifs, in particular, also contain physically unattractive details (**Cat. 4.3**) and sometimes function as the protagonists of the narratives they inhabit (**Cat. 4.6**). Classical simians are rare, however, because they were gradually being replaced by the satyr, an actual human-animal hybrid.⁹⁷

As previously stated, there is no evidence to suggest monkeys and baboons were ever imported into Greece, yet craftsmen frequently represented them in art. The

⁹⁵ Beagon 2014, 435.

⁹⁶ There is one exception: the Oresteia Krater (**Cat. 7.1**), which features a simianesque being throwing stones or feces.

⁹⁷ Supra n. 69.

explanation for this most certainly lies in the East: Egypt, Mesopotamia, Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Anatolia, with which Greece was in constant contact, were not only representing the animal, but they were also importing and worshipping it. Numerous scholars, including Aruz (2014), Boardman (2000), Burkert (1995), Dasen (1993), Davis (1995), Gunter (2009), Johnston and Villing (2006 and 2014), Markoe (1985 and 1996), and Morris (1992), have explored how Greek craftsmen borrowed images, like the griffin and sphinx, and ideas, like the apotropaic Taweret,⁹⁸ from these Eastern locales, but none have attempted to explain the existence of the Greek simian. It is apparent that the Greeks learned about monkeys and baboons from their Mediterranean neighbors, for many of the objects they imported from these locales depicted these animals⁹⁹ or entities closely related to them (*e.g.* the dwarf god Bes [**Fig. 4**]). What of Eastern beliefs about simians? Did the sanctified implications of this foreign creature travel into Greece as well?

While this theory rings true for the Bronze Age materials, where simians are featured in sanctified ways (**Cat. 1.1-4**), it does not for the subsequent Geometric, Archaic, and Classical motifs, which exhibit no religious implications in relation to their narrative contexts or find spots, with the exceptions of the chous fragment (**Cat. 4.8**) and the Aetos building model (**Cat. 3.2**). I explore this idea in Chapter 3, which surveys Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Phoenician, Cypriot, and Anatolian portable objects that feature motifs that closely resemble Greek monkeys and simianesque creatures. Though previous scholars have compared the Greek and Eastern materials before (*e.g.* Greenlaw

⁹⁸ The hippopotamus demon, Taweret, was borrowed from the Egyptian demonic repertoire and worshipped as if a Minoan divinity. As Weingarten (2012, 371) puts it: "...they didn't merely import a blank demon, but had been close enough to an Egyptian source to have understood the demon's functions and began to reinterpret her in a Minoan context." She believes this because Taweret was associated with lustration and purification in ancient Egypt, which fits well with the type of vessel she was associated with in Minoan Crete: the beak-spouted jug. Thus, Taweret was able to fit rather neatly into Minoan religious rituals after her adoption (374).

⁹⁹ See Chapter 2, n. 16.

and McDermott's surveys), they have not compared specific examples, as I do here, to resolve the question of meaning.

I believe the meaning and function of Greece's simian art is not equivalent to the Eastern motifs that inspired them. What, then, do they mean in Greek contexts? To answer this question, I explore how monkeys and simianesque creatures are typically represented in larger, decorative systems in Greek art. For my visual analysis of them (Chapter 4), I focus particularly on physique, gesture, posture, and placement within larger narratives. Though monkeys and simianesque creatures exhibit a variety of postures (*e.g.* crouching, sitting, and standing with bent knees) and gestures (*e.g.* hand waving), they do share two similarities across time and space: **marginalization**, either with respect to their location (*i.e.* a secondary, isolated element within a larger narrative) and/or appearance (*i.e.* they are comically ridiculous and/or ugly), and **iconographic inconsistency** (*i.e.* like demons, their forms, details, postures, and gestures vary from image to image).

What is the significance of the consistent marginalization and inconsistent representation of monkeys in Greek art? Greek authors describe them as humanlike, but acknowledge they are animals. In art, representations of simians, especially prior to the Classical period, do not appear to be deliberate representations of the animal. Perhaps the craftsmen making these images thought they were representing monkeys, but were not. Like the personification of Fear,¹⁰⁰ they simply imagined the animal as they saw fit: part human, part animal. Why is this?

The disconnect between the animal and the creature being represented in Greek art made me wonder whether the Greeks categorized the simian as an alternate being, or

¹⁰⁰ See Chapter 4, pp. 139-140.

as something other than an animal. Chapter 4 explores three categories of being, which I have chosen to compare with Greek representations of monkeys and simianesque creatures based on the visual idiosyncrasies they share: monsters, personifications, and demons. All of these fantastic beings have either inconsistent iconographies (and are represented as such) and/or are usually separate and/or secondary to well-established characters (*e.g.* Herakles, Odysseus, Zeus, and Athena) and the narratives that contain them (*e.g.* the Birth of Athena and heroic departure); in other words, they are marginalized.

Why, however, did the Greeks represent these creatures as anything other than animals? Chapter 4 not only explores monkeys' and simianesque creatures' taxonomic possibilities, but also their apotropaic potential: if simians were not simply animals, if they have fantastic implications, then it is possible that they were imbued with significant meaning. This is the ultimate goal of this dissertation: to analyze an animal that was foreign to Greece to determine how it was perceived and ultimately used in visual contexts from the Geometric to Classical periods; the Hellenistic period is then explored as an end to this curious phenomenon due to a shift in beliefs about animals and needs for apotropaia. Overall, I aim to prove that marginalized monkeys and simianesque creatures were presented as demonic, apotropaic beings utilized for the purpose of protection.

CHAPTER TWO: SURVEY OF MONKEYS AND SIMIANESQUE CREATURES IN GREEK ART

Monkeys and simianesque creatures are rendered in Greek art in two ways: 1) in peripheral locations, such as among ornamental friezes, beneath a main element (*e.g.* chairs, human legs, and horses), or as decorative details of an inanimate item (*e.g.* a lyre and chairs). 2) They are foregrounded within a scene or frieze while exhibiting physically ridiculous traits, such as offensive and/or parodic bodies (*e.g.* hairiness, nudity, and ugliness), behaviors (*e.g.* horseback riding, defecating, and masturbation), and gestures (*e.g.* pointing, “flipping the bird,” waving, and throwing). The majority are ambiguously gendered, though a few examples imply sex via the presence of organs (**Cat. 8.1**), clothing (**Cat. 7.6**), or narrative context (**Cat. 5.1**). Occasionally, these creatures will sit, crawl, bend over, or stand (often with bent knees), but most crouch: a posture often assumed by simians in the wild and low-statused people, like slaves, in Greek art.¹ Though these beings are iconographically inconsistent—or they differ in appearance, attributes, and form—monkeys and simianesque creatures are always locationally and/or physically marginalized in larger narratives.²

This survey is divided into the following chronological **categories (CAT)**, which mark shifts in the method of representation (*e.g.* iconography, size, and style) of monkeys and simianesque creatures in Greek art: for monkeys, categories include **Geometric** (*i.e.* the origin of the marginalizing tradition), **Early/Middle Archaic** (*i.e.* the heart of the marginalizing tradition), and **Late Archaic/Classical** (*i.e.* the shift from locational to

¹ See Chapter 4, pp. 163-164.

² See Chapter 4, pp. 130-131 for a larger discussion of these concepts and their implications.

physical marginalization and the gradual replacement of monkeys by satyrs). For the simianesque, categories include **Geometric** (*i.e.* the potential first example), **Archaic** (*i.e.* the heart of the simianesque tradition), and **Classical** (*i.e.* the Lamia as a demonic, simianesque emblem). Each category is organized according to date (earliest to latest), though **Cat. 3**, which is the largest, is further organized by method of representation: monkeys as abstract motifs, featured alongside monsters, crouching between the legs of humans or animals, riding horses or other large animals, and stationed next to the boundary lines of narrative scenes. The Bronze Age and Hellenistic Period are discussed as bookends to this tradition: the Bronze Age features simians as sanctified creatures worthy of worship, a tradition that disappears in the Iron Age, while the Hellenistic Period marks the end of the marginalizing tradition.

MONKEYS (CAT. 1-5)

Simians were not native to the ancient Mediterranean. Europe, Crete, the Cycladic Isles, and even Mesopotamia were devoid of the creature, while Egypt perhaps had one species in the Pre-Dynastic period, prior to the loss of its watery, swampy habitats: the Patas. Since it was foreign to the area, this animal was perceived as exotic, enigmatic, and ridiculous in Greek literature. Unlike the surplus of extant written accounts, Greece's repertoire of pictorial monkey art is not vast, but it does span multiple centuries (*ca.* 9th-4th centuries BCE) and artistic media (painted ceramics and carved stone). Prior to the inception of this tradition, however, simians were clearly worshipped as semi-divine beings in the visual traditions of Minoan Crete.

CATEGORY 1: Bronze Age Simians³

The Bronze Age Minoan and Mycenaean cultures have yielded numerous representations of simians in various media, such as sealings, seals, painted frescoes, and jewelry. There is a well-established tradition in modern scholarship, recently surveyed by Marie Pareja in her 2015 dissertation, which illustrates that Minoan representations of monkeys and baboons are often infused with religious connotations. The Mycenaeans, on the other hand, did not make any simian art of their own; rather, they inherited the objects made by their Cretan predecessors without considering, or perhaps caring about, their religious implications. Thus, this section aims to show that simians were infused with clear meanings that differ from the marginalizing traditions of the Geometric, Archaic, and Classical Periods.

CAT. 1.1: Round Sealing from Knossos, ca. LM IA

A simian, perhaps a baboon, sits on a stool on the far-right side of the image. It wears a belt⁴ and gestures towards a human, who stands on the far-left. In the center of the image, between the baboon and human, there is a tree, grassy landscape, and seated animal.

Bibliography:

Evans 1928, 763, fig. 491
Marinatos 1987, 127
Greenlaw 2011, 24 and 49
CMS II.8, no. 262

CAT. 1.2: Gold ring seal from the Tombe dei Nobili at Kalyvia near Phaistos, ca. LM I-II

This simianesque creature stands or kneels before a nude woman with a blobby head. The animal bears a striking resemblance to monkeys featured on Mesopotamian cylinder seals,⁵ which perform similar gestures and actions.

³ Unlike Archaic and Classical Greek art, Minoan and Mycenaean art features both monkeys and baboons, which is why I have chosen to label their motifs as “simians” rather than “monkeys.”

⁴ This is a common feature in Egyptian art as well (see Chapter 3, **Fig. 2**).

⁵ See Chapter 3, **Figs 9-10** for examples.

Bibliography:

Savignoni 1904, pl. XL no. 7 and fig. 51

Crowley 2013, 201, no. E 143

CMS II.3, no. 103

CAT. 1.3: Offering to the Seated Goddess, fresco from Room 3a of Xeste 3 at Akrotiri, ca. LM 1A.

An enlarged woman, perhaps a goddess, sits on a tripartite throne. She is flanked by a griffin and baboon, which offers her saffron. A young girl collects more saffron on the far left. The scene is set atop an architectural foundation and the background is adorned with vegetal motifs.

Bibliography:

Marinatos 1987

Ferrence and Bendersky 2004, fig. 3

Tzachili 2005, pl. 22.2

Pareja 2015, fig. 1.2A-B

Cat. 1.4: Gold Earrings, Aegina Treasure, ca. 17th century BCE. British Museum 1892,0520.13

These two identical pairs of earrings, from a Mycenaean treasure hoard, contain Near Eastern⁶ and Egyptian elements.⁷ Each features a loop in the shape of a double-headed snake, which is decorated with chains of alternating disks and owls. These loops encircle two dogs standing atop crouching monkeys. The monkeys rest their elbows on their knees and put their hands to their mouths.

Bibliography:

Marshall 1911, nos. 763-766

Benzel 2008, 105 pl. 59

Fitton *et al.* 2009, 73 fig. 21

⁶ Collon (2009, 44-45) notes that seated monkeys, with their paws to their mouths, feature frequently in Near Eastern seals from ca. 2000 BCE onward. Monkeys also feature prominently in Anatolian art, though they more closely resemble “foetal calves” or “Madagascar lemurs.” Thus, like most of the objects from this site, the earrings may have been inspired by Anatolian art. For examples of Mesopotamian and Anatolian monkeys that touch their mouths/faces, see Chapter 3, **Figs. 12, 14-15, and 26.**

⁷ The earrings feature Egyptianizing inspiration as well, for their composition mirrors that of Egyptian pectoral objects and cartouches and is embedded with pharaonic symbolism (*e.g.* the trampling poses of victors); however, the imagery belongs entirely to the natural world (Fitton 2009, 62). For examples of Egyptian simians, see Chapter 3, **Figs. 1-5.**

Discussion

As I will discuss in Chapter 3, baboons had divine connotations in Egypt,⁸ while in Mesopotamia, Phoenicia, and Anatolia, monkeys, and the similarly-shaped mongoose, were rendered as worshippers of kingly or divine figures.⁹ Though there is no evidence to suggest that simians were imported from Egypt or Mesopotamia into Bronze Age Crete,¹⁰ Minoan representations of the animal exhibit religious leanings that were clearly influenced by these far-away places. For example, many Minoan seals feature Mesopotamian motifs, like baboons worshipping (**Cat. 1.2**) and being worshipped by (**Cat. 1.1**; see also **Figs. 9** and **18**) human figures,¹¹ and Egyptian symbolisms, like the *djed pillar* (**Cat. 1.2**; see also **Fig. 1**). Similarly, Minoan frescoes, like the *Seated Goddess* at Akrotiri (**Cat. 1.3**), feature simians in relation to local religious symbolisms, like saffron: a series of red threads made from dead/dying crocuses.¹² Nanno Marinatos believes the simian featured in the *Seated Goddess* fresco may function as a divine intermediary between the goddess and the girl, who does not seem to notice her presence.¹³

As non-natives of Crete, simians would have been unfamiliar to Minoan craftsmen and the people who used their images, which may have, as Greenlaw surmises, made them akin to “fantastic beasts,” whose strange forms and rarity allotted them a “special status”¹⁴ in Minoan religion and culture. Though the nature and practice of

⁸ See Chapter 3, pp. 90-91.

⁹ See Chapter 3, **Figs. 9, 16-17**.

¹⁰ Vandervondelen 1994, 181 and Greenlaw 2011, 42.

¹¹ According to Marinatos (1987, 127), the seated simians, in particular, may be worshipping the human figures before them (due to their upraised arms), but they could also be the subject of worship, since they are seated.

¹² *Ibid.*, 124.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Greenlaw 2011, 43.

Minoan religion are unclear, as are most other aspects of their culture, it is evident that the Cretans revered monkeys based on their posture (*e.g.* sitting/kneeling), actions (*e.g.* divine communication), and relation to other religious characters (*e.g.* priests and deities) and symbols (*e.g.* saffron). They may have also been endowed with apotropaic functions, since many Minoan seals were used to protect and/or seal the contents of the objects they adorned.¹⁵

After the collapse of palatial Crete, simians' religious connotations were forgotten by the island's conquerors, the Mycenaeans. Though they collected objects featuring simians and religious symbolisms and imported them from Crete, Mesopotamia, and Egypt,¹⁶ the Mycenaeans never made any of their own. Among these imports are the pairs of earrings (**Cat. 2.2**) from the Aegina Treasure: a collection of gold jewelry and objects that may have originated from Aegina. During the Mycenaean era, this island was a "safe-haven" for sailors traveling between the Greek mainland and Anatolia, where Egyptianizing motifs of simians have been found.¹⁷ These earrings feature simians touching their mouths amongst sun-discs and crescents, gestures and symbols that appear in Egyptian and Near Eastern religious art as well (see **Figs. 5, 9, and 17**).

It is unclear why the Mycenaeans never made simian motifs of their own, especially since contact with Egypt and the Near East remained open and frequent during their domination of the Aegean, and images of Egyptian monkeys and baboons were

¹⁵ In Minoan Crete, seals were found in sanctuaries and graves (likely functioning as heirlooms rather than votives), and adorned a variety of objects, including containers (*e.g.* wood, wicker, and ceramic), folded parchment, clay tablets, jewelry, and string; many functioned as standalone objects as well. Those that were worn likely functioned as decorative status symbols, while those on tablets may have been used in administrative contexts (though this is difficult to assess). More certainly, seals secured the contents of the objects that featured them. For more information on the use of seals in the Bronze Age Aegean, see Krzyszkowska 2005, 1-23.

¹⁶ For example, Egyptian faience monkey figurines were discovered at both Mycenae and Tiryns, which date to the reign of Amenhotep II. See Cline 1991, 29-42 and pls. 1-2.

¹⁷ Collon 2008, 43. For an example, Chapter 3, **Fig. 26**.

found at both Mycenae and Tiryns;¹⁸ thus, issues relating to trade or the importation of simian objects are unlikely. Perhaps, since most of these imported goods are made of precious materials (**Cat. 1.4**), such as rock crystal, lapis lazuli, amethyst, ivory, gold, and silver, Mycenaean interest in such objects resided solely in their material, rather than their content. Whatever the reason, their disinterest in the supernatural potential of these animals could have contributed to the loss of their significance in the Iron Age and their shift in meaning in the Geometric Period, when they reemerge as isolated and ridiculous motifs in larger narratives.

CATEGORY 2: Geometric Minor Arts (ca. 8th century BCE)

Monkeys disappear from Greek art for the next 400 years, only to suddenly reappear in the Late Geometric era. This era of absence, which encompasses the 12th-9th centuries BCE, is often characterized by restricted contact with the Egyptian and Eastern worlds. There are exceptions to this rule, but they apply to very wealthy persons, homes, and burials, such as the Heroon at Lefkandi¹⁹ and the tomb of the “Rich Athenian Lady” on the Areopagus.²⁰ Thus, contact was limited between the Aegean peoples and their Egyptian and Eastern neighbors during this era and could explain the loss of simian imagery. Why the sudden reemergence? Simian iconography was quite popular with the Phoenicians during the Late Geometric era, and the distribution of simianesque bronze figurines, which were discovered in Greek and Italic sanctuaries, corresponds exactly

¹⁸ Supra n. 16.

¹⁹ This elite tomb, and the surrounding burials, yielded gifts that indicate exchange with the more advanced East Mediterranean city-states and Egypt, perhaps brought by Phoenician traders (also present at Kommos): a Syro-Palestinian juglet, Near Eastern bronze bowl, and some 10,000 faience beads.

²⁰ This tomb, which may have contained a woman who died in childbirth (Liston and Papadopoulos 2004), yielded earrings with hanging pomegranates that feature techniques of Near Eastern jewelry (*i.e.* granulation); they were likely made by Phoenicians or Greek craftsmen that were taught by an Eastern native. The tomb also contained a necklace with 1000 faience discs, likely imported from Syria.

with Phoenician trade routes.²¹ The presence of monkey and simianesque objects, both locally and foreign-made, in these sanctuary settings speaks to the rising Greek and Etruscan interest in borrowing, rebranding, and dedicating Eastern imagery, like the monkey. I will discuss this phenomenon further in Chapter 3.

**Cat. 2.1: Argive steatite disc from the Heraion at Megara, ca. 8th century BCE.
Athens National Archaeological Museum 11750**

The obverse features a male and female couple clasping a wreath and facing outward. Both hold scepters in their free hands and flank a small shrub. The disc's reverse features a horseman carrying a staff. A wreath floats beside his head while a simianesque²² creature crouches beneath his horse.

Bibliography:

Boardman 1963, pl. 16 no. G14

Foley 1988, pl. 20c

Boardman 2001, 134 no. 210

Langdon 2008, 193 fig. 3.31

Discussion

Though monkeys appear in a variety of media during this era, including bronze²³ and plastic vessels,²⁴ the Argive disc (**Cat. 2.1**) is significant to this study because it

²¹ More importantly, the Phoenicians would have known what simians looked like, for they imported baboons and other breeds from India. This is why Phoenician renditions of simians are so similar to Egyptian ones: both were working from live models (Greenlaw 2011, 59).

²² I have included this creature with the monkey motifs, and not the simianesque, because it is a very early and very fragmented example; it could go either way.

²³ Langdon (1990, 417-419) cataloged 12 examples of bronze simianesque figurines which were discovered at Elis, Laconia, Arcadia, Euboia, Rhodes, and in Central Italy. They represent seated males who either rest their hands on their knees or touch their mouths. As these seated figures are highly anthropomorphic, they probably represent humans, but many have simian characteristics, such as heavy brow-ridges, pointed ears, and elongated chins (ibid., 408-411 and Greenlaw 2011, 59). Other interpretations include demons (Bouzek 1974, 79 and Schefold 1960, 9 and 128), satyrs (Schweitzer 1971, 160-161), "apes" (Robinson 1941, 521-522), and grasshoppers (Comstock and Vermeule 1971, 14-15). The figurines with recorded contexts come from the sanctuaries of Zeus at Olympia, Athena Alea at Tegea, Artemis at Mayriki, Artemis Orthia at Sparta, and Athena at Kameiros (Langdon 1990, 408-411). Langdon suggests a date of 750-700 BCE because these simian statuettes resemble Late Geometric bronze animal figurines; and their placement in votive pits could imply they were dedicatory in nature (412 and 414). She compares these bronze monkey-men to "bottle-stopper" or "jug" figurines found in sanctuaries and graves, which exhibit similar features (see Chapter 5, pp. 190-191).

²⁴ Monkey-shaped plastic scent-bottles and pithomorphic aryballoi, which were manufactured slightly later than the bronze (ca. 7th and 6th centuries BCE), were found in many graves and sanctuaries. These vessels, which were discovered in Cyprus, Boeotia, Rhodes, and Corinth, may have functioned as toys and/or

contains a motif that bridges the gap between the Geometric and Early Archaic Periods: a simianesque creature squeezed into a larger narrative it does not relate to. Similar creatures occasionally appear between the legs of warriors, horses, and other large animals in subsequent centuries (**Cat. 3.4-14**), especially on Greek pottery, so perhaps this stone disc illustrates the beginning of this tradition.

CATEGORY 3: Early²⁵ and Middle Archaic Vases and Gems (ca. 700-530 BCE)

While monkey figurines predominated in the Geometric Period, by the end of the 8th century BCE, pictorial monkey motifs begin to appear on painted pottery and gems in five marginalizing ways: as an abstract motif (**Cat. 3.1-2**), alongside decorative monsters (**Cat. 3.3**; see also **3.8, 3.12, and 7.9**), between the legs of horses (**Cat. 3.4-6**), riding horses or other large animals (**Cat. 3.7-14**), and next to the boundary lines of narrative scenes (**Cat. 3.15-22**). All of the monkeys in question crouch, sit, or stand with bent knees. Most are too small and imprecise to identify specific breeds, which could indicate that Greek craftsmen were not working from live specimens and/or were parodying the creature, as is evident by the comedic examples (*e.g.* **3.8**). Though many of the objects presented here are Greek-made, a few were discovered in Etruscan graves (**Cat. 3.16-**

votives. Though they appear predominantly in the Early-Late Archaic Periods, they were manufactured through to the Hellenistic era. For more information, see Preston 1975, 121-126; Karageorghis 1994, 63-73; Merker 2000, 194-199; and Greenlaw 2011, 61-65 and figs. 80-88.

²⁵ Scholars often refer to this period as “Orientalizing.” According to Whitley (2014, 5622-5627), the term “Orientalizing” has three meanings: first, it refers to a period in ancient Greek history when the Greeks embraced several beliefs, motifs, and technologies from the Near East and Egypt. Second, it corresponds to an “archaeological phase” within the Early Iron Age (1100-700 BCE) or Archaic (700-480 BCE) eras, which dates to the 7th century (700-600 BCE). Finally, the term embodies a *style*, featured especially in vase painting, which depicts many motifs or images of Near Eastern and/or Egyptian origin (*e.g.* the palmette, tree of life, lion, and griffin). These motifs can be traced to Levantine prototypes, specifically in modern Syria, Palestine, Lebanon, and Egypt. Not all scholars agree about the use and meaning of the term. For example, Burkert (1995) refers to “Orientalizing” as a “revolution” specific to the 7th century BCE, while Morris (1992) deems the term obsolete because contact between the Aegean and Eastern peoples was first established in the Bronze Age and continued, uninterrupted, until the reign of Alexander the Great. I am inclined to agree with Morris, which is why I have chosen to label the 7th century material as “Early Archaic” rather than “Orientalizing.”

17),²⁶ while a handful was made by the Etruscans themselves (**Cat. 3.7, 3.11, 3.18**; see also **3.1-2, 7.1, 7.9**). The Apulian example, however, is the only one of its kind (**Cat. 3.6**). These Italic gems and vases are equally relevant to the Greek materials, for they depict monkeys in marginal locations within larger narratives. We see this in other Etruscan media as well, especially in relation to horses.²⁷

CAT. 3.1: Villanovan clay ossuary from the Arnoaldi-Veli Necropolis in Bologna, ca. 700-575 BCE. Bologna Museo Civico

This large vessel has a wide, low belly with an M-shaped handle on either side; a long, cylindrical neck that curves inward; and a large mouth with a rim that curves outward, nearly to the vessel's widest point. The long neck features all of the vessel's stamped decoration: swans, tulips, stars, S-shapes, plants, and 36 simians, which crouch just above three geometric lines. A clay sherd with a similarly-shaped crouching monkey was found in the same necropolis.²⁸

Bibliography:

Gozzadini 1877, 14-15, pl. 1.1

CAT. 3.2: Terracotta house model from a Roman tomb²⁹ in the necropolis of Sellada on Thera, ca. 6th century BCE. Thera Archaeological Museum

This bipartite, ceramic house features a bedroom, hall, and a porch with two columns surmounted by Aeolic capitals. An inscription, adorning the door jamb, reveals the name of the maker: Ἀρχιδίχας εἰμὶ ἐγώ—Ἀνδρίας με ἐποίηι (I am Arxidixas. The man made me). The walls are decorated with close-set friezes of

²⁶ See "Conclusion" section below.

²⁷ Two extant Etruscan tombs also contain paintings of monkeys, but they date much later than the Archaic materials. The first is the Tomba della Scimmia in Chiusi and dates ca. 480-470 BCE (Bonacelli 1932, pl. 16.2). In one scene, athletes wrestle and ride horses as a monkey, crouching on a stump or bush, looks on from the far right. The monkey wears a collar, from which a chain extends; this implies it may be a pet. The second tomb that features a monkey is the Tomba Golini II, near Orvieto; it dates ca. 4th-3rd centuries BCE (ibid., pl. 16.1). Amidst scenes of cooking, working, and banqueting, a monkey hangs from a pole and points downward. Bonacelli notes that a weight is tied to its left leg to limit its movements; thus it, like the Chiusi monkey, could be a pet (376). In a similar vein, McDermott (1938, 277-278) believes the pole could be indicative of a funerary stele, which signifies that the creature belongs to the deceased. Though simians had religious significance among the Carthaginians, McDermott does not believe this idea carried over to the Etruscans, though they may have had "talismanic" significance (29). In addition to the tomb paintings, Bonacelli (1932, pls. XIV and XV) published numerous Etruscan metal objects, including fibulae, amulets, tripod ornamentation, loops used to fasten armor, horse implements, and what the author calls "candelabra finials." A majority of these objects were discovered in tombs in Vetulonia (Tuscany), Tarquinia, Bologna, and Marsiliana. See also **Cat. 3.7**.

²⁸ Gozzadini 1877, pl. 16.18.

²⁹ It may have been placed there as an heirloom or was found during the construction of Roman graves.

abstract, geometric patterns. At the very bottom of the right-hand wall, there is a row of six birds (there may have been more) with long necks. While the rest of the decorative friezes on the house are consistent, the bird band is interrupted by two crouching monkeys. These tailless simians, which feature triangular torsos, stick arms and legs, round heads, and long snouts, sit atop blocks with their knees pulled into their chests. This building model is one of two that feature monkey-related imagery (see also **Cat. 3.9**).

Bibliography:

Touchais 1983, 816, figs. 133-135

Schattner 1990, 90, pl. 24.3

CAT. 3.3: Ithacan long-necked object from Aetos, ca. 7th century BCE

This long, cylindrical object is shaped like a candlestick, though its original function is uncertain. While the neck is decorated with simple, geometric designs, the body depicts two decorative sphinxes which sit statically and a crouching or cross-legged monkey with a triangular torso and skinny arms. Its round eye is rendered close to a brow line and its upper chest features two, open circles with dots inside, likely nipples. Additionally, the object features, between the body and stem, the following inscription: Κάλικλέας ποίασε (Kalikleas made me/this). See **Cat. 3.9** for an additional example from the same site.

Bibliography:

Heurtley 1933, 47, fig. 10

Payne 1933, 282-283

McDermott 1938, 215, no. 304

Robertson and Heurtley 1948, 111-112, pl. 39

CAT. 3.4: Proto-Corinthian aryballos from Thebes, ca. 640 BCE. Attributed to the Chigi Painter. British Museum 1889,0418.1

This vessel, called the MacMillan aryballos,³⁰ stands 6.8 cm high, but is adorned with three registers of detailed decoration: dogs chasing hares on the very bottom, youths on horseback in the center, and armed warriors on top. On the vessel's right side (facing front), a bird sits between the legs of a horse; its image is mirrored in the above register, where numerous warriors carry shields adorned with flying birds. To its right, on the vessel's back-center, a monkey crouches beneath another horse. It looks up at the rider as he passes overhead and seemingly shakes a raised hand.

³⁰ It was named after the man who acquired it at Thebes and later donated it to the British Museum: Malcom MacMillan.

Bibliography:

Smith 1890, 172-3, pls. 1-2
 McDermott 1938, 217 no. 306
 Amyx 1988, 32, pls. 11.1a-b
 Greenlaw 2011, 67

CAT. 3.5: Early Attic fragment, Berlin Antiquarium³¹

A small, crouching(?) monkey fills the space beneath a horse.

Bibliography:

McDermott 1938, no. 220 310

CAT. 3.6: Apulian Geometric(?)³² amphora, ca. 5th century BCE. Berlin Antiquarium, Castellani Collection F3912

This stout amphora, with a narrow neck and bowl-shaped rim, depicts three registers: the lowest features two swastikas, each surrounded by a square frame. The central register, which consumes most of the vessel's body, features youths processing on horses and a dog beneath one of the handles. The top register, which is viewed best from above, features another procession of youths on horses with a series of animals between the horses' galloping legs: birds, deer, and dogs primarily. Behind one horse, featured above one of the handles, a monkey squats. It reaches a long arm, ending in a massive hand, towards a splotch hovering beneath the horses' bottom; it could be dung. Beneath this horse, a bird perches on a thick, desolate tree with spindly branches.

Bibliography:

Furtwängler 1896, no. 3912
 McDermott 1938, 229 no. 322

CAT. 3.7: Tragliatella Oinochoe from a necropolis near Tragliatella in Caere, ca. mid-7th century BCE. Musei Capitolini Mob 358

This vessel's decoration, which appears to have been incised into the surface, depicts a procession related to the saga of Theseus and Ariadne.³³ On the back of one horse, a monkey crouches behind a rider, reaching out towards his shield. Similar horse-shaped fibulae, with crouching monkeys riding on their backs, were found in the 7th century BCE Bocchoris Tomb in Tarquinia.³⁴

³¹ I contacted the Berlin Antikensammlungen for more information on this object, but they were unable to locate the fragment in question. It was likely displaced during WWII.

³² McDermott (1938, 229 no. 322) labels this vase as an Apulian "Geometric" amphora without explanation. He simply says: "The drawing is primitive and childish."

³³ Bellelli 2010, 36 no. 8.

³⁴ Hencken 1968, 366 fig. 361. See also Bonacelli 1932, pl. XIV no 7, which comes from the Tomb of Benacci.

Bibliography:

Small 1986, 63-96, fig. 1 and pls. 20-21

Bellelli 2010, 36, fig. 5

Capitolini 0001:mob:00358

CAT. 3.8: Proto-Corinthian aryballos from the Delion at Paros. Paros Museum 0158

A procession of animals adorns the body. Beneath the handle, a simianesque figure rides a horse. It has a long snout, a leg with two joints (one at the knee and the other just below), and holds a weapon, perhaps a dagger, in either hand. It is difficult to discern whether it is clothed, but there are stripes across its arm, mid-section, and waist; the latter could be a belt.

Bibliography:

Rubensohn 1962, 117-119, pl. 21.7

Arachne no. 1166699

CAT. 3.9: Ithacan fragments of a building model from Aetos, ca. 8th-7th c. BCE

Discovered in a religious context,³⁵ this square-shaped object, which could represent a building model, features a headless monkey crouching on a horse's back as it reaches up to grab its mane with its left hand. Its knees are drawn into its chest, like the monkey from Kerameikos (**Cat. 3.10**). Long-necked birds appear elsewhere on the object. This is one of two building models (**Cat. 3.2**) that feature monkeys and birds.

Bibliography:

Heurtley and Robertson 1948, 102, pl. 45 no. 600e

Courbin 1966, 420, n. 5

Schattner 1990, 30, n. 38

Morgan 2001, 200-201, figs 1-3a

Morgan 2006, 222-223, fig. 8

CAT. 3.10: Athenian black-figure kylix from a tomb in Kerameikos, ca. 6th century BCE. Athens National Archaeological Museum 1054

A furry monkey crouches on a horse's back. With its legs pulled into its chest, the monkey grabs the horse's mane with its left hand and scratches its own bottom with its right. The Ithacan building model (**Cat. 3.9**) depicts a similar scenario.

³⁵ According to Catherine Morgan (2006, 218), much of the site has been disturbed: sherds of singular vessels are often found scattered, which makes it difficult to discern context, meaning, and function. However, there is strong evidence of 10th century cult activity in the center of the settlement, while a 7th century temple, with two 8th century Proto-Geometric predecessors, indicates there was a balance between cult and/or domestic activities. There is also an apsidal building, east of the temples, which contains evidence of internal hearths and religious vessels, like kernoi and terracotta tripods. This implies, according to Morgan, that most of the sherds discovered at the site have religious connotations—or, at the very least, their contexts do.

Bibliography:

McDermott 1938, 30-31, pl. 3 no. 316

CAT. 3.11: Etruscan hematite scarab, ca. 6th century BCE. State Hermitage Museum, GP-20753

A sow walks with her piglet while a crouching monkey and bird ride on her back. The monkey holds a staff-like object, which it extends towards the bird.

Bibliography:

Furtwängler 1900, 35, pl. VII no. 42

McDermott 1938, 320 no. 586

CAT. 3.12: Archaic green jasper gem from Tomb 3 in the Phoenician necropolis at Tharros. British Museum 1856,1223.605

This gem features a recumbent, wingless sphinx wearing a crown and a breastplate. A monkey crouches, with its knees drawn into its chest, atop the sphinx's rump. Opposite the pair sits an incense burner.

Bibliography:

Walters 1926, pl. VII

McDermott 1938, 319-320, no. 583

Barnett and Mendelsohn 1987, no. 3/22, pl. 55h

CAT. 3.13: Greco-Egyptian engraved carnelian of uncertain date.³⁶ Louvre 2162

A crawling monkey rides a two-humped camel, which is being led by a dog or jackal.

Bibliography:

Keller 1887, 35

Imhoof-Blumer and Keller 1889, 108, pl. XVII no. 17

McDermott 1938, 320 no. 588

CAT. 3.14: Terracotta gem of uncertain date³⁷ from Cyprus. New York, Cesnola Collection

A crouching monkey drives a chariot. An Egyptian ankh floats beside the horse's head.

³⁶ The old publications that feature, and the museums that house, this gem do not relay a specific date. However, since the motif of monkey riders has been dated to the Archaic Period (**Cat. 3.7-10, 3.12**), I have chosen to include this gem here.

³⁷ Ibid.

Bibliography:

Imhoof-Blumer and Keller 1889, 83 no. 3b, pl. XIV no. 58
McDermott 1938, 319 no. 578

CAT. 3.15: Relief vase fragment from Tenos, ca. 7th century BCE.

Three women, perhaps goddesses, stand in procession. One holds the leash of a crouching monkey. The monkey reaches its right arm towards its owner and extends its left downwards, towards the ground. It appears to be dancing or agitated.

Bibliography:

Kontoleon 1970, 30, pl. XVIII.1

CAT. 3.16: Laconian black-figure kylix from Vulci, ca. 565-550 BCE. Cabinet des Médailles 189

This vessel, also known as the Arkesilas cup, was discovered in an Etruscan tomb and features an unparalleled scene in its tondo: the king of Cyrene, Arkesilas II, weighing wool or silphium.³⁸ The king is surrounded by workers and various exotic animals (four birds, a lizard, and a panther). In the top right corner of the scene, a collared monkey crouches among the birds, two of which perch on either side of him.

Bibliography:

Simon 1976, 60, pl. 38/XV
Boardman 1998, 187, fig. 420
Schaus 2006, 176-177, fig. 1
Villing and Schlotzhauer 2006, 8

CAT. 3.17: Attic black-figure neck amphora from Orvieto, ca. 550-500 BCE. Attributed to the Painter of Vatican 365. Orvieto 2711, Faina Collection 84

A departing warrior bids farewell to friends and family while, high up on the vessel's shoulder, a monkey tightrope walks along the reins of chariot-bound horses. Two spears cross in front of its body.

Bibliography:

Von Bothmer 1986, 218, fig. 112
Wojcik 1989, 196, fig. 93.1

³⁸ This much sought-after plant, which grew south of Barea and Eusperides (a Libyan territory), was used for nutritional and medicinal purposes (Austin 2008, 210).

CAT. 3.18: Caeretan black-figure hydria, ca. 530-520 BCE. Vienna 3577

This is one of three Caeretan vessels (see also **Cat. 4.1-2**) that depict marginalized monkeys. The obverse shows the return of Hephaestus: the god rides a donkey to the left as Dionysus, wearing a panther skin and extending a kylix, and a maenad carrying a snake trail after. A peculiar aspect of this scene is Hephaestus' feet which are both shrunken and deformed. This trait may be mirrored on the reverse of the vessel, which features cavorting satyrs and maenads: at the very bottom of the vase, off-center, beneath a handle, and sandwiched between an ornamental frieze and sunburst pattern, a small collared monkey with a seemingly deformed foot crawls. It is tied to the register line that separates the two areas of decoration by a leash. A similarly deformed creature may appear on a Middle-Corinthian aryballos from Locri.³⁹

Bibliography:

Robertson 1959, 34
Hemelrijk 1984, pl. 38d
Brijder 1988, 63-64
Bonaudo 2004, 75-76, fig. 39
Walsh 2009, 109 and 145
Steiner 2016, 108-109 and 138

CAT. 3.19: Proto-Attic black-figure fragments from Aegina. Aegina Museum 484

These sherds depict a variety of seemingly unrelated elements: a running figure with long strands of curly hair secured under a headband, a bridled horse without a rider, and an open-mouthed lion. In one corner, towards the top of the vessel, a grinning monkey crouches on a decorative motif and extends a thin, vertical object in front of him; it may be a sistrum.⁴⁰ The fragmentary nature of this vessel prevents a secure reading of its larger narrative, but the monkey's close proximity to the vessel's ornamental flourish assures its marginalization.

Bibliography:

Pallat 1897, fig. 31
Morris 1984, 33, pl. 22
McDermott 1938, 216 no. 305

³⁹ Brijder 1988, 64, fig. 4. According to Brijder's drawing, the scene may depict a small, monkey-headed figure wearing a chitoniskos. It exhibits a misshapen foot and is in the presence of a padded dancer. I have chosen not to include this object in my survey because the image is poorly-preserved and uncertainly represents a simian or a person dressed as one.

⁴⁰ An Egyptian percussion instrument, often made of metal or faience, which was sacred to the love-goddess Het-Heru. It was shaken during certain temple rituals by gods, pharaohs, priests, and priestesses (Harris 2016, 51-52).

CAT. 3.20: Laconian black-figure kylix from the Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia, ca. 7th century BCE. Sparta Archaeological Museum

The cup's tondo features the four winds with wings attached to their ankles. They walk in a circle, heads facing backwards towards the preceding figure. Between two of the winds stands a small tree, perhaps to indicate an outdoor setting. Between the other two, just above the tree, is a static monkey. Rather than crouch, the creature sits atop a block or stump; it may also be defecating. Additionally, two other simianesque objects were discovered at the site: an ivory monkey figurine⁴¹ and a stamp motif featuring a capering figure, whose head and muzzle are rather simian in appearance.⁴²

Bibliography:

Droop 1929, pl. 9

McDermott 1938, 222

CAT. 3.21: Attic black-figure kylix, attributed to the Amasis Painter, ca. 540 BCE. Metropolitan Museum 1989.281.62

This cup, possibly made by an Egyptian craftsman,⁴³ features a moment from Homer's *Iliad* (13.45), where servants of Poseidon, rendered in various sizes, prepare his horses (underwater?) for the Battle of the Ships.⁴⁴ Featured on the vessel's obverse, the scene depicts a Doric frieze inhabited by animals: birds, a panther, a dog, and three monkeys. The first, situated just above a climbing youth, crouches as it touches the border that confines it. Though it does not have a tail, its snout is elongated and it crouches like many other monkeys in Greek art (**Cat. 3.4**). The second monkey, situated just above a youth calming a rearing horse, stands on all fours, with its hips lifted high and head pointed downwards. Though its snout is small, its body type and gestures are simianesque. The third monkey is on far-right side, just above Poseidon; it appears to be climbing down from the decorative border onto a nearby Doric capital. It has an elongated snout, tubular body, and no tail. An archer, situated at the far right, aims an arrow at the third

⁴¹ Droop (1929, pl. CLXIX no. 3) refers to the creature as a squatting man or monkey but does not attempt to interpret or understand its presence at the site.

⁴² Ibid., pl. CLV no. 4.

⁴³ It is generally assumed that the Amasis Potter and the Amasis Painter are the same person, though the craftsman known simply as "Amasis" never signed as potter on any of his extant vessels. Regardless of their association, during the era the Amasis Painter was active, ca. 560-515 BCE, there was a pharaoh reigning in Egypt by the same name (ca. 569/68-526 BCE). An earlier Egyptian king was also called Amasis, as were numerous Egyptian people. Though the Amasis Painter was working in Athens, he may have had Egyptian origins, having arrived at Athens via Naucratis. Some Greeks, however, did have foreign names, so the name "Amasis" on its own is not a firm indicator of the craftsman's Egyptian origins. Moreover, his intimacy with simian imagery could be the result of familiarity with imported Egyptian art and tales, rather than his own ancestry. For a larger discussion on the pedigree of Amasis and his contemporaries, see Von Bothmer 1985, 30-31.

⁴⁴ This theory originates with Marjorie Milne, when the cup was first loaned to the Metropolitan Museum in the 1960s (ibid., 219).

monkey; this may be why it is moving. Though the archer's features are human, there appears to be a tail emerging from his lower back.

Bibliography:

Hoffman 1964, n. 24 and 1971, 112
Jucker 1966, 41-42, n. 132
Boardman 1974, 56 and 2002, 179-180, fig. 164
Simon 1976, 84-85, pls. 70.2 and 71.1-2
Von Bothmer 1985, 217-218, pl. 60
Pedley 1987, 70-71, fig. 10
Schefold 1992, 245-246, figs. 300-301
Moore 2004, 39-40 and 60 n. 31, figs. 7-8
Picón *et al.* 2007, 421 no. 77
Marconi 2009, 8-9
Mertens 2010, 84-87

CAT. 3.22: Archaizing Cypriot gem,⁴⁵ ca. 5th century BCE. Private Collection, London.

Two nude male figures stand over a krater. One holds a ladle while the other grasps a cup. On the far left, floating in mid-air, a small monkey crouches.

Bibliography:

Raspe and Tassie 1791, 22 no. 232
BAGD no. 232
LIMC Suppl. I, s.v. *Atalante*, no. 105F
LIMC Suppl. II, s.v. *Atalante*, no. 45 add.4

Discussion

Many of the Greek and Etruscan materials discussed here feature Egyptian elements in addition to the monkey:⁴⁶ motifs (*e.g.* the ankh, sistrum, sun disc, and sphinx), character references (*e.g.* Horus), wild beasts (*e.g.* sphinxes and lions), and themes (*e.g.* the heart-weighing ceremony). Of the objects with clear provenance and/or distinguishable makers, we can presume how these eastern motifs may have appeared on these western objects.⁴⁷ For example: the monkeys featured on the Thera house model

⁴⁵ A cast of the gem was made by the 18th century artist James Tassie; copies are now in the Victoria and Albert and State Hermitage Museums.

⁴⁶ See "Egypt" in Chapter 3.

⁴⁷ I will provide specific comparisons in Chapter 3.

(**Cat. 3.2**) resemble representations of Hor-pa-khered (*i.e.* Horus the Child), which depict the god crouching with his knees pulled into his chest, one arm extended, and a hand to his mouth.⁴⁸ This comparison is evidenced by indications of contact between Thera and Egypt, which occurred as early as the Bronze Age.⁴⁹ Alternatively, Horus' iconography may have been transported from Egypt into Thera by the Phoenicians, who, as stated earlier, were responsible for the importation of simian imagery into Geometric Greece.⁵⁰ Another comparison comes from the Uluburun Shipwreck (see **Fig. 5**), which contained a scarab that features a baboon in a similar position: crouched while seated on a box or symbol. Though this object never made its way into Greece, ones featuring similar motifs may have been imported via ship.

Similarly, the Aegina fragments (**Cat. 3.19**), which feature a monkey holding a sistrum, were likely inspired by a specific Egyptian locale: the emporion of Naucratis, with which Aegina was in constant contact. For example, Herodotus claims the Aeginetans had a sanctuary of Zeus at Naucratis, which was used exclusively by them, though it has yet to be located.⁵¹ Moreover, it is possible that the numerous Attic and Corinthian wares discovered at Naucratis, which heavily influenced the art of the Aeginetans,⁵² were carried to Naucratis by the islanders themselves.⁵³ Objects of Greco-Egyptian origin were found at Aegina as well, including scarabs, faience figurines, and

⁴⁸ For examples, see Odhner 1978, 176.

⁴⁹ According to Marinatos (2015, 45-46), the style and shape of vessels discovered at Akrotiri closely match Egyptian images of Minoan men (called Keftiu) carrying cups in their hands. They are featured, for example, on frescos from the tomb of Senemut, who lived during the reign of Hatshepsut (ca. 1508-1458 BCE).

⁵⁰ For example, we find the crouching, infant Horus on 8th century Cypro-Phoenician bronze bowls, which feature Egyptianizing themes (see Markoe 1985, 274-275, pl. E1).

⁵¹ Croix 2004, 404-405.

⁵² Morris 1985, 115-119.

⁵³ Croix 2004, 404.

painted pottery in the “Naucratis” style.⁵⁴ Although no other monkey images have been found on the island, it is clear that Aegina’s close relations with the emporion of Naucratis allowed Egyptian images, iconography, and symbols to spread there.

Laconia also had connections with Naucratis, for their painted fine ware, ca. 6th-5th centuries BCE, was found across the emporion;⁵⁵ one of their painters is even named after the site, based on a kylix discovered there.⁵⁶ Their pottery has been found on other sites connected with Naucratis as well, including Aegina, which actively traded Laconian wares, and Cyrene.⁵⁷ This could explain how a monkey ended up on the cup from the Orthia sanctuary in Sparta (**Cat. 3.20**) and why the Arkesilas cup (**Cat. 3.16**) evokes yet another Egyptian theme: the Book of the Dead, specifically where Osiris weighs the heart, or soul, of deceased persons in the underworld.⁵⁸ Additional aspects that are shared between the Arkesilas vessel and Osiris scenes include the birds, which could be indicative of the sun-god Horus, and the monkey, which was often featured in heart-weighing scenes as Astes, an assistant of the scribe-god Thoth.⁵⁹

What of the Italic materials? Iron Age Apulian pottery (ca. 7th-5th centuries BCE) (**Cat. 3.6**), which evolved independently of the Villanovan and Etruscan materials, was likely influenced by Greek wares, including Corinthian and Rhodian.⁶⁰ In both locales,

⁵⁴ Ibid., 404. Croix does not reveal specific dates for these objects.

⁵⁵ Not much Laconian pottery (the painted fine ware) was found at this Greek emporion in Egypt (less than 1% of all ceramics), but the vessels were used over a long period of time, from the beginning of the 6th century BCE to the end of the 5th (Bergeron 2014, 2-3).

⁵⁶ Ibid., 6.

⁵⁷ Since a vast amount of this boldly-colored pottery was discovered in Cyrene, scholars originally believed they were Cyrenaic rather than Laconian in origin. The discovery of this pottery at the Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia cleared up this misconception (ibid., 2).

⁵⁸ Schaus 2006, 176. He also notes that Arkesilas’ pointed hat and scepter relate to Osiris’ own attributes. Villing and Schlotzhauer (2006, 8), Boardman (1998, 187), and Simon (1976, 60) agree, though the latter two argue that the scene’s composition and humorous impression are fundamentally Greek.

⁵⁹ Schaus 2006, 177.

⁶⁰ Whatmough 2015, 310-311.

we find monkeys painted on vases (**Cat. 3.4**) and sculpted as figurines.⁶¹ Are the Greeks, however, also responsible for the Egyptianizing elements, like the monkey, featured on the Etruscan-made materials? The motifs on the pre-Etruscan objects, like the Villanovan ossuary (**Cat. 3.1**), were likely inspired by Syro-Cypriot art, which had strong Phoenician connections,⁶² or North African art, which shares visual similarities with early Italic art.⁶³ The Etruscan objects, however, like the Caeretan vessels (**Cat. 3.18**; see also **4.1-2**), were most likely influenced by both Greece and Egypt.

The term “Caeretan” applies to a group of 40 hydriai, ca. 530-500 BCE, which may have been made by a pair of Ionian⁶⁴ ceramicists that fled the Persian occupation in the second half of the 6th century BCE and settled in Caere, Etruria (modern Cerveteri). These craftsmen may have passed through Egypt as they headed westward⁶⁵ or were already familiar with Egyptian motifs and themes, for, in the previous century, Phocaea was among the Greek cities that helped found Naucratis.⁶⁶ These connections would account for the Egyptianizing elements that appear on other Caeretan vessels in addition to monkeys: sphinxes,⁶⁷ the myth of Busiris,⁶⁸ and Egyptian natives.⁶⁹

The Greek and Etruscan gems feature different Egyptianizing elements than the pottery. According to Boardman, these motifs were imported into Cyprus by the

⁶¹ Supra n. 24.

⁶² Hencken 1968, 589-590.

⁶³ See Greenlaw 2011, 66; Rebuffet-Emmanuel 1967, 644; and McDermott 1938, 28-30.

⁶⁴ These vessels depict East Greek features, like flesh color, and appear to be uninfluenced by local styles, which point towards Greek origins and manufacture. It is possible, however, that Etruscan assistants executed certain details using templates (Hemelrijk 1984, 160 and Campbell 2007, *s.v. Pottery*).

⁶⁵ Hemelrijk 1984, 160.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 163.

⁶⁷ Ibid., pls. 4.6 and 11.23

⁶⁸ Ibid., pls. 118-121.

⁶⁹ Ibid., pls. 122-123.

Phoenicians, who founded numerous cities and workshops all across the island.⁷⁰ Rather than importing the Phoenician-made objects into Greece and imitating them locally, however, he believes that Greek craftsmen, who were also well-established on Cyprus, learned from the Phoenicians themselves, for no examples of gems adhering to the correct date and style (*e.g.* 6th century BCE anatomically-inaccurate scarabs with hatched borders) have been found anywhere in Greece.⁷¹

The cultures that inspired Etruscan gems are also difficult to pin down: while it is possible that these Italic peoples learned about gem engraving, and their associated motifs, from the Greeks,⁷² they may have been made by Greek craftsmen living in Etruria or by Etruscans either imitating Greek examples or learning from the makers themselves.⁷³ Though the nationality of the makers is not clear, the chain of communication is: once Egyptianizing motifs were brought to Cyprus by the Phoenicians,⁷⁴ they were spread to the Greeks and later the Etruscans;⁷⁵ and it makes sense to assume that the monkey was one of these motifs.

CATEGORY 4: Late Archaic and Classical Vases (530-400 BCE)

As we enter the years leading up to, and during, the Persian Wars (ca. 490-480 BCE), representations of monkeys decline significantly; by the Classical era (480-400 BCE), they are rare. When monkeys are depicted in these later periods, they are larger than in previous centuries, sometimes functioning as the protagonists of the scenes they inhabit, and often exhibit humorous postures (*e.g.* standing upright, sometimes walking,

⁷⁰ Boardman 2001, 140. Markoe (1985, 67) and Karageorghis (2002, 144) confirm these sentiments (see also Chapter 3, pp. 118 and 122).

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 140.

⁷² See “Conclusion” section below.

⁷³ Boardman 2001, 153.

⁷⁴ I discuss Cyprus’ role in the transmission of the monkey in Chapter 3.

⁷⁵ Boardman 2001, 140.

with bent knees—a physical impossibility for simians in the wild). With the advent of comedic theater in the 5th century BCE⁷⁶ and the goatish satyr, it seems authors⁷⁷ and craftsmen alike began to depict the creature as an uglier, dafter, and sillier version of themselves. In other words, they became less mysterious, exotic, and ominous, like the dark-skinned beings that crouched statically in corners, between legs, and amongst ornamentation in the Early and Middle Archaic Periods (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.18-21** and **7.2**). It seemed the Greeks had finally learned to accept the similarities between their species, even if they still despised them.

CAT. 4.1: Caeretan black-figure hydria, ca. 530-520 BCE. Louvre E 696

This is one of three Caeretan vessels (see **Cat. 3.18** and **4.2**) that depict marginalized monkeys. Here, the heroine Atalanta fights the Calydonian boar with two male servants. The servants hold clubs while Atalanta wields a bow. They collectively rush towards the boar, which has torn the group's canine companion in half. The dog's lower body hangs above the monster's back, as if to imply it was hit hard enough to take flight. On the far right, a small, furry monkey observes the chaotic scene as it makes two obscene gestures: rubbing its genitals and flashing its middle finger.

Bibliography:

Morin 1911, 92-94

Hemelrijk 1984, pl. 52f

Walsh 2009, 46-47, pl. 47 figs. 3a-b

Steiner 2016, 138, figs. 5.6A-B

⁷⁶ Old/Archaic Comedy (ca. 6th-5th centuries BCE) was closely associated with festivals, like the Great Dionysia (Hughes 2012, 17-19). The genre is best characterized by Aristophanes' works, which contained "a ribald mix of farce, politics and fantasy" (Hart 2015, 128). Most of the simians in question emerged during this comedic style, though a few later examples crossover with Middle Comedy (ca. 4th century BCE), for which we have more visual than literary evidence. The remaining fragments suggest Middle Comedy encompassed burlesque myth, realistic comedy, and satire (Hughes 2012, 30-36). The period ended with a foray into situational comedies about everyday life. This ultimately led to the final comedic stage, New Comedy (ca. 323-260 BCE), which was grounded in irony, tragedy, and realism (*ibid.*, 216-217).

⁷⁷ See Chapter 1, pp. 11-16.

CAT. 4.2: Caeretan black-figure hydria from Tomb I at Via Diroccata in Cerveteri, ca. 530-520 BCE. Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia

This is one of three Caeretan vessels (see **Cat. 3.18** and **4.1**) that depict marginalized monkeys. This scene features the rape of Deianeira, Herakles' second wife.⁷⁸ In the center of the vessel, the centaur Nessos molests Deianeira. On the far left, beneath one of the handles, Herakles aims his bow, presumably at Nessos. On the far right, below the other handle, a monkey crouches behind a bush with a running hare. It appears to be holding its phallus in its right hand, but it may also be grasping the bush, which occupies its left hand as well. Behind the monkey, Odysseus and his men blind Polyphemus.

Bibliography:

Hemelrijk 1984, pls 81-2

Bonaudo 2004, no. 20

Stansbury-O'Donnell 2006, 167-9

Walsh 2009, 45-46

Steiner 2016, 138 and 141

CAT 4.3: Attic red-figure olpe from Etruria, ca. 525-475 BCE. Louvre G241

The vessel depicts a youth clothed in a long robe and crowned with a wreath as he leans on a stick. He holds an apple in his left hand, which a nude simian reaches for. The animal appears to be parodying the "up-down" gesture, often evoked in *erastes-eromenes* scenes,⁷⁹ or it could be the boy's pet. The creature's ugly, snouted face and thin, gangly body sharply contrasts with the boy's handsome features.

Bibliography:

McDermott 1938, 227 no. 319

Lissarrague 1997, 463, fig. 8

Mitchell 2009, 108-109

⁷⁸ Hesiod's fragmentary *Wedding of Keyx* is the earliest surviving work to relate the myth behind this image: after marrying Deianeira, the couple went to Trachis, where they had to cross a river. Nessos, a conniving centaur, offered to take the lady but attempted to rape her along the way. In retaliation, Herakles shot the centaur with arrows he had dipped in the hydra's blood. As he lay dying, Nessos told Deianeira that his blood was an aphrodisiac, which she could give her husband if he ever strayed. This moment ominously foreshadows what is to come, for Nessos' interaction with Deianeira initiates a string of events that ultimately lead to Herakles' demise. Other authors relate the second half of this story (Kreophylus, *Capture of Oichalia* and Sophocles, *Women of Trachis*): Deianeira uses the "love" potion, in various conniving ways, to kill her husband when she presumes he has been unfaithful.

⁷⁹ See Shapiro 1981, figs. 10-2 for examples.

Cat. 4.4: Athenian red-figure cup from the Tomba della Panatenaica in Vulci, ca. 525-475 BCE. Vulci 64224

A group of humanoid monkeys balance on a see-saw, knees bent and arms extended outward as they try to remain upright. The central figure holds a krater while the one behind grasps a drinking horn. The remaining characters wave their arms about, hands open and fingers spread.

Bibliography

Falconi Amorelli and Riccioni 1968, 40-41, fig. 24b
Brijder 1988, 62, fig. 1
Lissarrague 1997, 463-464
Mitchell 2009, 109
Steiner 2016, 141, fig. 5.2A

CAT. 4.5: Athenian red-figured cup, ca. 500-450 BCE. Louvre G265

This vessel depicts Dionysus holding a thyrsus and a simianesque creature brandishing a stick or weapon as it rides a mule. It likely represents a monkey, rather than a satyr, because it features a distended snout. Moreover, if the creature is crouching atop the mule, with its legs pulled into its chest, its posture is comparable to the horse-riding monkeys of the Early-Middle Archaic Periods (Cat. 4.9-10).

Bibliography:

Beazley 1963, no. 416.9
CVA Vienna Wien Universität I, pl. 12.2
LIMC III, s.v. *Dionysus*, no. 389

CAT. 4.6: Attic red-figured askos, ca. 470-400 BCE. British Museum 1770,0320.560

This vessel features two humanoid monkeys crawling on their hands and knees; one holds a drinking horn. Their bodies are strangely proportioned, their limbs are oddly bent; they have no genitalia, tails, or body hair; and they have humanistic hands and feet; only their faces are distinctly simian. This vessel is the only extant askos that depicts monkeys.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Most askoi of this particular shape and size feature animals like birds, felines, deer, hares, fish, and bulls; the occasional satyr and/or nude youth; and female heads. For examples, see British Museum 1814,0704.501, which features a satyr and bull (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=493151001&objectId=461203&partId=1) and 1836,0224.208, which depicts a bird and nude youth (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=493214001&objectId=461172&partId=1). Though simians are uncommon on Greek askoi, comedic monkeys appear rather frequently on terracotta lamps from the Roman imperial period. They are commonly featured with jugglers, among menageries of wild and domestic animals, and imitating human activities, like fishing, driving chariots, fornicating, eating, and wearing clothing. For a list of examples, see McDermott 1938, nos. 514-564. For a visual example, see British Museum 1814,0704.54, which depicts a monkey mounting a woman

Bibliography:

Smith 1896, 359, no. E740

Brijder 1988, 62-63, fig. 2

**Cat. 4.7: Attic red-figure neck amphora from Capua, ca. mid-5th century BCE.
British Museum 1873,0820.364**

The vessel's obverse features a woman, swathed in fabric from head to toe; only her eyes and feet are visible. She stands in front of a baboon or macaque, which squats on a cube, box, or crib and wears a fillet. On the reverse, a bearded man, who wears a wreath and is draped in fabric, extends his arm forward, presumably towards the woman.

Bibliography

Keller 1887, 2

Smith 1896, 221 no. E307

Lissarrague 1997, 463, fig. 6

Mitchell 2009, 109

Calder 2011, pl. 20

CVA British Museum VII, pl. 55.1a

**Cat. 4.8: Athenian red-figure chous fragment from Eleusis, ca. 450-400 BCE. Eleusis
Archaeological Museum**

The vessel depicts an monkey-like creature, which is simultaneously tied to, and presumably pulling, a small cariole or sled as a child leads it by a leash.

Bibliography:

Lissarrague 1997, 463

BAPD 9033664

**Cat. 4.9: Attic(?) red-figure chous, ca. late 5th century BCE. Leo Mildenberg
Collection.**

This miniature vase depicts a hairy monkey crouching among foliage as it brandishes a stick or rattle.

Bibliography:

Kozloff 1981, pl. 130

Lissarrague 1997, fig. 7

Discussion

The rarity of monkeys in the Late Archaic and Classical periods, as well as the representational shift from locational marginalization (*i.e.* their peripheral placement on the objects they adorn) to physical marginalization (*i.e.* their bodies are often ugly and actions ridiculous), may be because the satyr was a more favored, familiar, and indigenous character in Greek comedic, symposiastic, and Dionysiac art. Satyrs (or silens)⁸¹ are unruly companions of the wine-god Dionysus and consorts of wild and feverish maenads.⁸² These creatures had the ears, tail, and sometimes feet of a horse or goat; a low brow; balding head; unkempt beard; and an enlarged, often erect phallus. These unideal characteristics were accompanied by the mental shortcomings of immorality, cowardice, lust, and drunkenness.⁸³ In vase painting, satyrs dance, drink, and crouch, which is a pose reserved for defecation, slaves, and monkeys.⁸⁴ While crouching, satyrs often spread their legs to expose their genitals; perform coitus on an unsuspecting maenad, animal, or object; and/or masturbate.⁸⁵ In general, their unsavoriness functioned as a visual foil for the normative behaviors and appearances of Greek male citizens.

Since satyrs were uncomely, parodic, and anthropomorphized animals, ancient and modern scholars have compared them to monkeys; and these similarities can be used to explain why the method of marginalizing monkeys shifted and the animal vanished from Greek art in the 5th century BCE. Francois Lissarrague⁸⁶ provides the best explanation: he says that while the genetic origin of satyrs should not be sought in

⁸¹ These terms are used interchangeably in Greek literature (Hedreen 1992, 1).

⁸² Just as satyrs were a foil for men, maenads (like *hetairai*) behaved in a manner opposed to women's normative roles in Greek society (Neils 2000, 206).

⁸³ Lissarrague 1990, 54 and Mitchell 2009, 157. For more on the sexual life of satyrs, see Lissarrague 1990, 52-81; regarding their relation to Dionysus, see Lissarrague 1992, 207-220.

⁸⁴ Lissarrague 1990, 56. See also Chapter 4, pp. 164-165.

⁸⁵ Lissarrague 1990, 56.

⁸⁶ Lissarrague 1997, 466.

simians, the Greeks did play with the “mythical opportunity” to combine these two species, especially geographers and naturalists, who often describe the distant margins of the Greek world. For example, Pliny in his *Natural Histories* (7.2) says:

Among the mountainous districts of the eastern parts of India, in what is called the country of the Catharcludi, we find the satyr, an animal of extraordinary swiftness. These go sometimes on four feet, and sometimes walk erect; they have also the features of a human being.⁸⁷

Though simians were not capable of walking erect, according to some of the motifs featured here (*e.g.* **Cat. 4.1-4**), they could; and, as described in Chapter 1, simians were described as having human features and behaviors in Greek literature.

The thematic crossovers between simians and satyrs, in both art and literature, are numerous.⁸⁸ These include, but are not limited to, parodic imitation, mockery, music, ugliness, obscenity, zoological nomenclature, drunkenness and wine,⁸⁹ komast dancing,⁹⁰ as well as physical and behavioral similarities with humans. As Torelli justifiably states, the satyr is an “animalistic man” while the monkey is a “humanized animal.”⁹¹ What scholars have failed to recognize, however, is the significance of these thematic crossovers in art: the physical appearance of satyrs (*e.g.* large phalloi, nude bodies, squished faces, and copious amounts of hair) deliberately dissociates them from other animals and humans. Additionally, they are oftentimes featured in isolative locations (*e.g.*

⁸⁷ Bostock and Riley 1855, trans. Aelian (*On the Nature of Animals* 16.21) voices similar sentiments.

⁸⁸ Lissarrague 1997, 466.

⁸⁹ Louise Calder (2011, 89) notes that simians’ association with wine in ancient literature (Pliny *Natural Histories* 23.44 and Aristotle frag. 107, as cited in Athenaeus *Deipnosophists* 10.429d) could imply that they, like satyrs, were made drunk at symposia to entertain people and provide “another opportunity for the humans to rejoice in their sense of superiority.”

⁹⁰ Brijder (1988, 62-63) believes that certain representations of satyrs or komast dancers may actually depict comedic actors wearing monkey masks, like those featured on the red-figure cup from Vulci (**Cat. 4.4**) and the British Museum askos (**Cat. 4.6**). I think these creatures could represent monkeys or humans dressed as such. After all, if the ancient Greeks thought simians acting like humans was hilarious, why not humans acting like monkeys?

⁹¹ Torelli 1994, 124-125.

beneath handles and among decorative elements).⁹² These are the same forms of marginalization exhibited by monkeys in Greek art of the Archaic and Classical periods. Thus, the gradual decline of the monkey in pictorial art of the 5th century BCE seems to indicate that this animal was ultimately replaced by the Greek-made, less-physically-ambiguous satyr: a creature with clear origins in Greek mythology,⁹³ clearly identifiable parts (human and goat), and clear functions (comedic, wine-loving, sex-obsessed followers of Dionysus). In other words, the Greeks now had a new, canonized creature to suit the same needs the monkey once did, though, as I will discuss in Chapter 4, these animals remain objects of ridicule in literature for centuries to come.

CATEGORY 5: Monkeys in Hellenistic Art

In the centuries following the Classical Period, despite reignited contact between Greece and the East, no doubt spurred by Alexander the Great's conquests and the foundation of the Ptolemaic Dynasty, monkeys disappear from most artistic media apart from terracotta figurines, which primarily occur in Greek graves and sanctuaries,⁹⁴ and a single vessel. Even the literature of this period, which is highly animal- and nature-

⁹² Satyrs are marginalized beneath horses (CVA Boston II, pl. 72) and within larger narratives (Richter 1966, no. 285 and Chiaro 1966, 13, no. 72). In most instances, they crouch rather than sit, stand, or walk (see CVA Schloss Fasanerie Adolphseck II, pl. 65.5; CVA Adria Museo Archaeologico Nazionale II, pl. 44.6; and CVA Athens National Museum IV, pl. 64.5-6 for examples). In south Italic art, satyrs do not normally crouch, but stand or sit as they passively or actively observe an unfolding narrative. For examples, see Trendall 1967, 1/85; Picón 2007, no. 177, and Taplin 2007, figs. 14-15.

⁹³ Depending on the tradition, satyrs were the offspring of the Hekaterides (Strabo, *Geography* 10.3.19), the Daktyloi (Strabo, *Geography* 10.3.19), and various rustic gods, like Hermes (Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 14.113), Silenos (Xenophon, *Symposium* 5.7), and later Pan (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* I.193, 6.392, and 14.637).

⁹⁴ For example, an early Hellenistic monkey head was discovered at the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth (Merker 2000, 268 no. V8). It stems from an Archaic and Classical comedic theme, which illustrates semi-human monkeys (like the Geometric Bronze figurines) performing every day activities, like grinding grain, eating cake, and wearing wreaths. They may parody cult activities once performed at the site. Though multiple monkey figurines were discovered at Rhodes, those found in the Potter's Quarter at Corinth (Stillwell 1948, 108 nos. 77-78 and pl. 43) feature humorous undertones. Langdon (1990, 419-420) believes that such figurines may have been symbols of fertility and apotropaia that helped women perform their domestic duties, while simultaneously causing a ruckus. The monkey head from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore may apply here because its mouth is open (Merker 2000, 199).

centric, hardly acknowledges the animal at all.⁹⁵ Clearly, the monkey had long since served its purpose, a phenomenon I will discuss further in Chapter 4.

CAT. 5.1: Megarian mold-made bowl from Volo, ca. 3rd century BCE. Rhode Island School of Design 25.018

Odysseus and Circe battle in a centralized scene flanked by columns, which represent the sorceress' palace. Between each of the columns squats the hero's defeated companions, who feature human bodies and animal heads, including pig, donkey, and ram. One man has been turned into a monkey, for he has a bald head, elongated snout, and tufts of fur protruding from his back. He wears a chlamys and leans a spear against his right shoulder. Above his head, an inscription reads "θεοφον ἑταῖροι" (Godly One).

Bibliography:

Ashmead and Phillips 1976, 35, pl. 46f

CVA Museum of Rhode Island School of Design I, pl. 31

Discussion

Megarian mold-made bowls were invented by Athenians as a less expensive version of Ptolemaic silver plates, though they can be found across much of the Hellenistic world, including Macedonia, which Athens was subject to in the 3rd century BCE.⁹⁶ Though the earliest vessels were non-figural, depicting primarily lotus and palm leaves, later examples feature mythological scenes, including events from epic poetry (Cat. 5.1).⁹⁷ Such scenes, however, do not always adhere to the written traditions that inspired them: the marginalized monkey⁹⁸ featured in the Odysseus scene is proof of this, for Homer does not mention this animal among those at Circe's house. However, there is earlier artistic evidence to suggest that simians were occasionally included in the story's

⁹⁵ See "End of a Tradition" in Chapter 4.

⁹⁶ Pollitt 1986, 256.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 256.

⁹⁸ Luce (CVA Museum of the Rhode Island School of Design I, 47) refers to this creature as an "ape," but Ashmead and Phillips (1976, 35) call it a rooster. I am more inclined to agree with Luce (though not his chosen term) for two reasons: the creature's simianesque iconography (*e.g.* snouted face, furry head, and crouched posture) and the presence of the inscription, "godly one," which may be a reference to Thoth, the Egyptian baboon god.

visual tradition. For instance, Hoffman believes one red-figured bell-krater, now in Syracuse, depicts satyrs being turned into monkeys by the witch Circe:⁹⁹ in typical monkey and satyr fashion, these creatures dance, ride animals, and shield their eyes in the *apokopein* gesture, which was often performed at “divine epiphanies.”¹⁰⁰ Even if this mold-made bowl was inspired by the marginalizing traditions of the Archaic and Classical periods, there is no evidence to suggest that other Hellenistic craftsmen followed suit. Thus, this vessel ultimately marks the last breath of this curious phenomenon.

SIMIANESQUE CREATURES (CAT. 6-8)

While I recognize all the motifs discussed above as monkeys or humans dressed as the animal, there is a series of creatures, featured solely on Greek and Etruscan vases, which share physical similarities with humans, simians, and occasionally other animals as well. The similarities they share with Greek monkey motifs, however, is evident in a number of ways: they are marginalized between human legs, beneath chairs, and within borders; they exist as “decorative elements” of objects featured within larger narratives; and/or if they should be a part of a main scene, their strange physical forms, which are wholly inconsistent, disassociate them from the other figure(s) present.

CATEGORY 6: Simianesque Creatures on Geometric Vases

While terracotta and bronze figurines bridge the gap between the Bronze and Geometric eras, figurative narratives did not re-appear on Greek ceramics until the Late

⁹⁹ Hoffman 1964, 69 and pl. 19.3.

¹⁰⁰ Corbeill 2012, 2.

Geometric Period (ca. 750-700 BCE).¹⁰¹ The most pottery-heavy locales of this era were graves and funerals. This may account for the limited repertoire of themes that were represented: funerals and games, warriors fighting, and (less often) ships connoting power, battle, and/or trade. This raises the question: why were funerals and death the first figural narratives to reappear? It seems likely that these representations, which were associated with elaborate processes of elite funerals, sent permanent messages that extended and monumentalized the funerary process.¹⁰² Moreover, figural scenes allowed visitors and loved ones to go back and relive the experience, for memory, legacy, and remembrance were very important concepts in Greek culture.¹⁰³

The object featured here, which depicts a sea of geometric animals and humans, features one figure whose form, gesture, posture, and placement on the vase are very similar to marginalized monkeys. Thus, I have included it here even though it may very well represent a human.

CAT. 6.1: Argive bottle, from the Nikolopoulos Plot on Gounari Street in Argos, ca. Middle Geometric I-Late Geometric II. Argive Museum 10321

This vessel, discovered in a wealthy cist tomb that contained a variety of vases and weapons, features a number of animals (a horse, birds, a lion, scorpion, deer, a fawn, and schematic fish) and humanoid figures (crouching/seated, standing, capering, and lying down). One figure, located between a miniature standing figure and a full-sized standing figure, is seated in a crouched position with its hands to its face.

Bibliography:

Pappi 2006, 234-235, figs. 6-11

Langdon 2010, 128-129, fig. 10.

¹⁰¹ Benson (1970, 3-13) identifies three potential origins for the reintroduction of figurative art: contemporary and earlier Near Eastern art, artisans' direct observation of their surroundings, and/or a return to a tradition first established by the Mycenaeans.

¹⁰² Langdon 2008.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

Discussion

While the gesture made by the crouching figure could symbolize mourning, other Geometric vessels, like the Dipylon kraters and amphoras, place the mourners' hands on their heads. Moreover, the other figures in the scene do not appear to be mourning, though the figure lying atop the horse could be a deceased person. All the human figures represented here have odd bodily proportions; this could be due to experimentalism or because these figures were intended to be *horror vacui* like the birds and snakes that fill the spaces between the animals' legs. That said, the crouching position of the figure in question is evocative of contemporary simianesque figurines found in Greek sanctuaries¹⁰⁴ and, as the creature is featured in an unparalleled scene, it does make one wonder if it is entirely human.

CATEGORY 7: Simianesque Creatures on Archaic Vases

Interestingly, the period that has yielded the most marginalized simianesque creatures is the Archaic (ca. 700-480 BCE), which also produced the most monkeys. There is a potential reason for this: the Archaic era was one of canonical experimentation (*e.g.* Proto-Attic and Corinthian) and solidification (*e.g.* black and red figure), as well as artistic recognition, like signatures and labels; innovation, like foreshadowing and perspective; and freedom to stray from textual narratives. It seems highly probable that some of the craftsmen making these images intended to create simians, but simply did not know how (**Cat. 7.1-4, 7.7**), while others resorted to using parts of animals or humans to create monstrous *mixothers* that could serve the same purpose as a marginalized monkey (**Cat. 7.5, 7.8-9**).

¹⁰⁴ Supra ns. 23-24.

CAT. 7.1: Proto-Attic black and white krater, attributed to the Oresteia Painter, ca. mid-7th century BCE. Berlin Antikensammlung A32

On the body of this fragmented vessel, a bearded male stabs another man in the head with a sword as he throws a net over his body; this moment may represent the death of Agamemnon or Aegisthus. Two females and one male look on; they could be Clytemnestra, Artemis, and Apollo. Beneath the handles, subsidiary to the main scene, three solid-black individuals—a solitary figure and a pair—juggle balls in their hands, which may exemplify stones or feces. The pair is human, with pointy beards, black skin, and medallions wrapped around their waists, like belts. They are unlike the male figures depicted in the main scene because their skin is darker and they wear less clothing. The solitary figure, though anthropomorphized, is hairy, has a long snout, round head, and tufts of fur hanging from its face, like a baboon. It may also be clothed in a short chiton. This simianesque creature stands within a frame lined with crawling grasshoppers or ants and the body of an advancing figure (Apollo?), whereas the space occupied by the pair is not enclosed by a physical border.

Bibliography:

Lo Porto 1964, 123-124
Morris 1984, 61, pl. 13
Prag 1985, 8
Beazley 1986, 8
Lissarrague 1997, 462-463
Ogden 1997, 41
Walsh 2009, 39-48, figs. 1a-b
CVA Berlin Antiquarium I, pl. 19.1

CAT. 7.2: Proto-Attic black and white conical stand, attributed to the Polyphemus Painter. Berlin Antikensammlung A40

At the very top of the stand, five sphinxes process; three are leaping and one is crouching. Below the sphinxes, two pairs of fully-armed warriors duel. Both groups wield shields, swords, and/or spears. Beneath one of the spear-bearing warriors, a nude figure crouches as it points upward; this posture recalls Geometric and Archaic monkeys that crouch between the legs of warriors and horses (**Cat. 2.2, 3.4-6**). Long ears or hair adorn its head, while its body is thin and emaciated. Featured on the same fragment is the head of a small bird; it peeks out from behind a missing portion of the vase and looks down upon the crouching creature. Bird-monkey pairings are also featured on other objects in this survey (**Cat. 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, and 3.16**).

Bibliography:

Morris 1984, 33
CVA Berlin Antiquarium I, pls. 28.2 and 29

CAT. 7.3: Ionian Wild Goat oinochoe from Rhodes, ca. mid-7th century BCE. Laon 37.786

On the body, an archer hunts game while a creature, with a chain connecting its mouth and hand to a hare's leg, hovers on the margins. It does not crouch, but rather spreads its legs as it raises staff-like objects; it may be running or standing. The creature features a round belly that contains an unfilled ring and a black circle. Its head is flat with a patch of hair covering the back of its neck and a combined mouth and nose, like a snout. Its appearance, though schematic, seems to recall Egyptian baboon iconography, specifically the snout and round belly.

Bibliography:

Cook 1990, 55, fig. 1 and pl. 9

Cook and Dupont 1998, fig. 8.4

CAT. 7.4: Attic black-figure exaleiptron (or tripod *kothon*), attributed to Painter C, ca. 570-565 BCE. Louvre CA 616

This scene depicts the birth of Athena: Zeus, as he gives birth to the goddess, is seated on a backless throne with a tight cover ending in fringe. Below the seat, a small, naked, humanoid creature crouches. Rather than being present within the scene, the creature likely exists on a decorative panel inserted between the legs of the throne.

Bibliography:

Richter 1966, 17-18, fig. 605

Simon 1976, pls. 58-59

Demargue 1984, no. 345

CAT. 7.5: Attic black-figure amphora from Orvieto, ca. mid-6th century BCE. Penn Museum MS3440A

This scene depicts the birth of Athena: Zeus, as he gives birth to the goddess, is seated on a lion-footed throne, surrounded by Hermes, Poseidon, Apollo, Ares, and three female figures. Beneath the god's throne, a winged-creature with a human body and dolphin head crouches/crawls to the right. It may exist on decorative panel inserted between the legs of the throne

Bibliography:

Hall 1912, 72 and 75, fig. 36

Luce 1921, 75, no. 107

Richter 1966, 18

CAT. 7.6: Attic black-figure column krater from Campania, ca. 540 BCE. Louvre 11260

This scene depicts the birth of Athena: Zeus, as he gives birth to the goddess, is seated on a stool, surrounded by Aphrodite, Eros, Himeros, and others. Beneath the god's stool, a small, draped, beardless youth crouches. Panels were usually inserted between the legs of thrones,¹⁰⁵ not stools, so it is difficult to tell whether this figure is physically present within the scene or part of the stool's decoration.

Bibliography:

Richter 1966, 18

CVA Musée du Louvre XII, pl. 168.2

CAT. 7.7: Athenian black-figure amphora, ca. mid-6th century BCE. Hermitage Museum B 1950 (B 179)

The vessel depicts the Return of Hephaestus: on the obverse, Hephaestus rides a mule led by Dionysus, while maenads and satyrs happily dance around them.¹⁰⁶ Beneath Hephaestus' mule, a thin, nude figure crouches, extending its left arm forward as its right rests on his knees. Unlike satyrs, it lacks a tail. It is difficult to make out the details of its head because the lower half of its face is missing, but it appears to have a hairline across its forehead (this could also be a crack). Its posture recalls Geometric and Archaic representations of monkeys crouching between/beneath the legs of warriors and horses (Cat. 2.1, 3.2, 3.4-6).

Bibliography:

Gorbunova 1983, 83-84, no. 59

LIMC IV, s.v. *Hephaistos*, no. 139c

CAT. 7.8: Athenian black-figure amphora from Vulci, ca. late 6th century BCE. Munich Antikensammlungen 1576

This scene features Apollo Citharoedus in the presence of Artemis, Leto, Hermes and Poseidon. The right arm (and presumably the left) of Apollo's lyre is shaped like a reptilian creature with an open, beak-like mouth and large, beady eye. It extends one hand towards the strings and the other towards its mouth. Though black-figure representations of Apollo's lyre often feature strange creatures hanging from one or both arms,¹⁰⁷ they are rarely as anthropomorphic as the one featured on this vessel.

¹⁰⁵ Richter 1966, 17-18.

¹⁰⁶ The reverse depicts a centralized Dionysus surrounded by his followers (Gorbunova 1983, 84 no. 59, right), a theme often associated with simians.

¹⁰⁷ For similar but more schematic examples, see *LIMC II*, s.v. *Apollon*, nos. 639, 645a-b, 654, 694, 745-747, 777a, 779, 783, 787-a, 818-819a and c-d, 823, 826, 833e, 845, and 861; and Maas and McIntosh-Snyder 1989, 71 nos. 1-2, 72 nos. 3-4, 73 no. 5, 74 no. 8, and 78 nos. 18-19.

Bibliography:

Maas and McIntosh Snyder 1989, 45 no. 8 and 66
CVA München Antikensammlungen VIII, pl. 390.2

CAT. 7.9: Etruscan red-ware fragment, ca. late 6th century BCE. Heidelberg University E85/6

The extant scene depicts galloping horses and perhaps a chimera and panther. Among these processing animals is a frontal, squatting figure with spread legs and raised arms. There are no details to indicate species or gender, but its posture is reminiscent of crouching satyrs and monkeys. Other vessels feature monkeys in the presence of monstrous felines as well (**Cat. 3.3, 3.8, and 3.12**).

Bibliography:

Jannot 1980, 607-624
Bruni 1986, 46-55
Ridgway 2010, 81 no. DB1a
CVA Heidelberg Universität I, pl. 54.6

Discussion

Unlike the Archaic Period objects that feature monkeys, most of the vessels listed here only exhibit Greek motifs and narratives; there are no visible Egyptianizing or Eastern symbolisms or themes with the exception of the red-ware fragment, which depicts wild cats. This may be because simianesque creatures do not represent simians, which were closely associated with Egypt and Mesopotamia, for certain. In addition, these vessels do not connect in any way except for their inconsistent iconographies, locational marginalization, and physical marginalization, which mirrors contemporary representations of monkeys. These features, however, do closely align with Greek beliefs about shape-shifting, fringe-dwelling demons. I discuss these connections further in Chapter 4.

CATEGORY 8: Simianesque Creatures on Classical Vases

The strange attributes and iconographies of marginalized simianesque creatures disappear from Greek art in the Classical era. This is not surprising because in the Late

Archaic period, vase painting begins to reflect more scenes of daily life, specific moments of battles, human nature, as well as fussy patterns; mythological narratives, which are where many of these creatures are featured, appear less frequently. These sentiments continue into the next few decades, as the Persian Wars, tyranny, and democracy become trends in the art and thought of Greek craftsmen and authors. There is, however, a rare motif that occurs on a series of black-figured vessels which may depict a simianesque demon, Lamia,¹⁰⁸ in the presence of other mythological entities, like Herakles, satyrs, and sphinxes. She is included here, among simianesque creatures, because she features monkey-like characteristics and exhibits iconographic inconsistency and physical marginalization in the larger narratives that feature her.

CAT. 8.1: Attic black-figure oinochoe discovered near Thebes, ca. 500-475 BCE. Attributed to the Athena Painter. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston 98.924

Herakles leads a hairy, wingless sphinx by a leash. The creature's tail is very long, thick, and hairy at the tip, like a monkey's.

Bibliography:

Vermeule 1977, 295, 298-299, 301, and pl. 80.1-2

CAT. 8.2: Kabiric Black-figured Skyphos from the Kabiroi Sanctuary in Thebes, mid-4th century BCE. Metropolitan Museum 1971.11.1

This scene shows a big-footed monkey-woman chasing a traveler. The traveler has dropped his baggage as he runs for a tree, where two others have taken refuge, having abandoned what could be a plough. On the other side, a clothed man wearing a wreath lounges on a couch, gesturing to another figure with a secondary wreath. Two other figures, one wholly nude with a large belly, converse on the opposite side of the room. Though all the figures are rendered in an exaggerated style, Lamia is unlike the rest: her body is nude, wholly covered in hair, and yields pendulous breasts, which sway as she runs. She also has massive hands and a distended snout, like a monkey or baboon. Two additional vessels have yielded hairy monkey women,¹⁰⁹ while fragments from Aetos and Cyprus may depict Lamia-like creatures as well (see **Figs. 23-24**).

¹⁰⁸ For a complete discussion on Lamia, see Chapter 4, pp. 147-148.

¹⁰⁹ Another black-figure fragment, also from a Kabiric vessel, yields the head of a similarly hairy monkey-woman (McDermott 1938, no. 324, pl. IV.1), while a black-figure lekythos from Eretria features a woman

Bibliography:

LIMC II, s.v. *Aphrodite* no. 1432

LIMC VI, s.v. *Lamia* no. 3

Discussion

I will explore the visual and textual implications of Lamia and her sister demons (Gello, Mormo, Empousa, and the Striges) in Chapter 4.

CONCLUSION

In Bronze Age Crete, simians had religious implications, functioning as both worshippers of divine entities (**Cat. 1.2-3**) and beings worthy of worship (**Cat. 1.1**). The animal disappears from Greek art after this period, however, and does not reappear for 400 years, when, in the 8th century BCE, the first simian exhibiting locational marginalization manifests. Featured on a steatite disc, this creature crouches beneath the legs of a horse (**Cat. 2.1**) and seems unrelated to the narrative it accompanies. In the following era, a series of vase paintings and gem faces depict monkeys in marginal locations, always disconnected from the main scene (**Cat. 3.2, 3.4-6, 3.15-22**); many ride large animals, like horses (**Cat. 3.7-14**). This tradition of marginalizing simians within larger narratives persists, especially in Greek vase painting, throughout the Archaic Period when craftsmen began experimenting with Egyptian and Eastern themes (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.16**), motifs (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.12, 3.14, and 3.19**), characters (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.2**), and monsters (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.3 and 3.9**). Contemporaneously, Etruscans begin collecting simian-adorned

with black skin and massive breasts tied to a tree as she is tortured by satyrs (Mayer 1891, pl. IX). Recently, Rotroff (2014) has argued that a cup adorned with the head of a grinning African woman may represent the Lamia as well. In terms of the latter two examples, it is important to note the following: the Lamia was once a beautiful African princess made ugly by her misfortunes. While representations of African subjects appear occasionally on Greek vases (*e.g.* the Ethiopian king Busiris), their images become far more popular in the Hellenistic period, when Greek colonies crop up in Northern Africa. The exaggerated visages of Graeco-Roman renditions of African subjects were likely the Greek's way of showing racial difference, rather than racial prejudice, as many scholars before have assumed (see Masségia 2015, 160 n. 12). For a larger discussion of this phenomenon and African subjects in Hellenistic art, see *ibid.*, 159-184.

vases (**Cat. 3.16-17, 4.3-4**) and making their own (**Cat. 3.18, 4.1-2**); a few also crop up in other Italic locales (**Cat. 3.1** and **3.6**).

Towards the end of the Archaic Era, and throughout the Classical, simians take on a comedic flavor, appearing as both amusing animals and actors donning their guise. These creatures are marginalized due to their grotesque appearance and behavior (**Cat. 4**), though we do occasionally see them isolated within larger narratives (**Cat. 4.5**). Eventually, marginalized simians completely disappear from pictorial Greek art in the Hellenistic era, with the exception of a Megarian mold-made vessel (**Cat. 5**), perhaps because they had been wholly replaced by satyrs and were no longer needed.¹¹⁰

In addition to representations of monkeys, simianesque creatures, which take on the airs of humans (**Cat. 6.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.6**), simians (**Cat. 7.1, 7.3, 7.7, 7.9, 8.2**), and sometimes other animals (**Cat. 7.5, 7.8, 8.1**), also appear in the Archaic and Classical periods on vases that depict mythological narratives. Sometimes, such creatures exist simply as decorative elements (*e.g.* **Cat. 7.4-5**), but most appear to be physically present within the scenes they adorn. Though not all have overt, simian characteristics, they are unanimously marginalized and feature inconsistent characteristics. Since these creatures exist alongside monkeys and are marginalized in similar ways, it seems logical that the monkeys and simianesque creatures presented in this survey function in the same manner.

While all monkeys and simianesque creatures are marginalized (physically and situationally) and exhibit iconographic inconsistency from the 9th-4th centuries BCE, there are large discrepancies between the types of objects they adorn, the places they are found (if known), and the supposed functions of each object. **Tables 1** and **2** show these

¹¹⁰ I discuss these implications further in Chapter 4.

discrepancies quite plainly: they survey the types of objects on which these motifs appear, the quantity of each object, and the known find spots in which they occur.

Object Type

As **Table 1** shows, marginalized monkeys and simianesque creatures appear on a variety of vases and gems, though they rarely make more than a few appearances on each type. For example, they are most frequently rendered on amphoras (**Cat. 3.6, 3.17, 4.7, 7.5, 7.7, and 7.8**), totaling six appearances. Next, these creatures appear less frequently, but more than once, on the following objects: four times on kylixes (**Cat. 3.10, 3.16, and 3.20-31**), three times on hydrias (**Cat. 3.18, 4.1, and 4.2**) and oinochoe (**Cat. 3.7, 7.3, and 8.1**), and twice on aryballoi (**Cat. 3.4 and 3.8**), terracotta building models (**Cat. 3.2 and 3.9**), cups (**Cat. 4.4-5**), kraters (**Cat. 7.1 and 7.6**), and chous (**Cat. 4.8-9**). Finally, monkeys and simianesque creatures appear once on the following ceramic types: bottles (**Cat. 6.1**), clay ossuaries (**Cat. 3.1**), conical stands (**Cat. 7.2**), long-necked objects (**Cat. 3.3**), fragments (**Cat. 3.19**), relief vases (**Cat. 3.15**), red-ware (**Cat. 7.9**), exaleiptrons (**Cat. 7.4**), skyphoi (**Cat. 8.2**), olpes (**Cat. 4.3**), askoi (**Cat. 4.6**), and mold-made bowls (**Cat. 5.1**). Of the monkey-adorned gems, each is made from a different material: hematite (**Cat. 3.11**), jasper (**Cat. 3.12**), carnelian (**Cat. 3.13**), terracotta (**Cat. 3.14**), and unknown (**Cat. 3.22**). Finally, one simian appears on a steatite disc (**Cat. 2.1**).

While simians occur most often on amphoras and kylixes, it is difficult to draw patterns based on groups of 5 or less. Moreover, we must keep in mind that these vessel types occur over vast amounts of time (ca. 9th-4th centuries BCE) and span multiple styles (*i.e.* Middle/Late Geometric, Apulian Geometric, Proto-Attic, Proto-Corinthian, Ionian Wild Goat, Laconian black-figure, Caeretan black-figure, Attic black-figure, Attic red-

figure, and Athenian black-figure). Thus, as demonstrated in **Table 3**, those six amphoras listed above become split into four groups: Apulian Geometric(?) (1), Attic black-figure (2), Attic red-figure (1), and Athenian black-figure (2); and the four kylixes can be split into three: Laconian (2), Attic black-figure (1), and Athenian black-figure (1). As a result, I do not think these numbers are solid enough to draw conclusions about monkeys and simianesque creatures based on object-type.

Find Spots

The relationship between simian-related iconography and their find spots is also uncertain. As demonstrated in **Table 2**, 18 of the objects presented here are without provenance and another 14 are vaguely listed by publishers and museums as originating from Greek (Aetos, Aegina, Eleusis, Rhodes, Thebes, Tenos, and Volo), Italic (Etruria, Vulci, Orvieto, Campania, and Capua), and Cypriot contexts. The handful of objects with provenance was discovered in Greek sanctuaries (4) and in both Greek (4) and Italic tombs (4); the group from uncertain contexts in Etruria (7) may have also come from tombs as well.¹¹¹

The majority of sanctuaries that have yielded marginalized monkeys and simianesque iconography are female-oriented, both in terms of gods and cult (*e.g.* Hera at Argos, Artemis at Orthia, the Delion at Paros, and Demeter and Kore at Eleusis) and primarily contain Greek-made offerings (with the exception of Hera at Megara).¹¹² In such contexts, it is possible that these objects were dedicated as votives (to female goddesses) or, in the case of the pottery finds, used as cultic implements in on-site rituals,

¹¹¹ Osborne 2001, 277.

¹¹² See Chapter 3, p. 101 for more details about similar coastal sanctuaries.

as is believed of the ceramic assemblages at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth.¹¹³

Unlike the finds from Greek sanctuaries, about half of the tomb goods discussed here come from Etruria (**Cat. 3.16-17, 4.3-4**). The discovery of Greek vases in Etruscan tombs is not surprising, for such objects commonly lived primary and secondary lives as commodities and grave goods in Etruria.¹¹⁴ Since the simians on these Greek-made vases are minute aspects of larger narratives, it is difficult to know whether the Etruscans appropriated these vessels due to their Greek origins, because they appreciated the visual narratives (*e.g.* warrior departure), or because they enjoyed the simians that adorned them.

Function

Though many simians and simianesque creatures lack provenance, we can often assume their function based on known contexts and shapes. This is especially true of the painted vessels, which would have likely been used (prior to deposition in sanctuaries and graves) in symposia (kraters, kylixes/cups, amphoras), gymnasia (aryballoi), and domestic settings (exaleiptrons, hydrias, gems).

Three simian-adorned objects with provenance, however, confuse this theory: the chous fragment and building models. For example, though the chous is generally associated with Dionysus' Anthesteria,¹¹⁵ the one in question (**Cat. 4.8**) was discovered

¹¹³ According to Pemberton (1989, 23), the vast amounts of pottery found here, and at other Demeter/Kore sanctuaries, could imply that there were several rituals held throughout the year, which involved dining, that may have required people to bring their own vessel. These implements were then left behind as dedications.

¹¹⁴ Osborne 2001.

¹¹⁵ The chous is a vessel designated for young children and often features scenes of infants and children performing various child-like and adult activities. It was used primarily during the Anthesteria, or the "Festival of the Flowers," a three day-long holiday that celebrated Dionysus' arrival in Greece by boat. The

at Eleusis, where a sanctuary of Demeter and Kore is located. Though the exact find spot of this object is unknown, and chous are often created to please children, the ridiculousness of its simian motif does relate to an aspect of the Eleusinian Mysteries, which involved making crude jokes and gestures like the old nurse Baubo (*i.e.* Iambe) in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* (2.195-204). The building models are more puzzling: most house models are found in sanctuaries, but the models featured here were discovered in alternate locations: the Aetos building model (**Cat. 3.9**) was discovered in a religious setting, though not necessarily a sanctuary, while the Thera house model (**Cat. 3.2**) was found in a Roman grave. Though it is difficult to comment on the Aetos model, since its precise context is uncertain, the Thera model, if it was deliberately placed inside the Roman tomb where it was discovered, may have functioned as an apotropaic emblem that protected the deceased, for it is adorned with simians, which, in ancient Egypt, were related to Bes, the protector of Horus.¹¹⁶

The particular use of monkey-adorned gems, which often feature the animal riding larger animals, is easier to deduce, for many precious stones were visibly worn by Greeks as amuletic pendants, ring stones and beads to protect against unwarranted supernatural forces.¹¹⁷ There is more evidence for this phenomenon occurring in Rome, where sanctified simians are rendered alongside monstrous deities like Harpocrates and Abraxis,¹¹⁸ but the presence of at least one gem in a tomb (**Cat. 3.12**) could mean that

second day was called “Choes,” after the vessel used by children three years and older. On this day, children would compete to see who could drink wine from their chous the fastest in honor of the wine god.

¹¹⁶ I discuss this idea further in Chapter 3.

¹¹⁷ Kotansky 2006, 66 and “End of a Tradition” in Chapter 4.

¹¹⁸ The simians featured on the Egyptianizing gems are often depicted alongside hybrid (*i.e.* human-animal; see Bonner 1950, 23 and Nagy 2008, 34) deities such as Abraxas (an alectrocephalus), Chonubis, the Pantheos-deity (perhaps a relation to the Egyptian dwarf-god Bes; see Barrett 2015, 200), Harpocrates (with a snake body), and Reaper figures (see Kotansky 2006, 66 and Bonner 1950, 156); for examples, see *LIMC IV*, s.v. *Harpocrates*, no. 223 and *LIMC I*, s.v. *Abraxas*, no. 1.52a. Nearly all the stones that feature

comedic simians riding animals had apotropaic connotations when worn/placed on the body; I discuss this phenomenon further in Chapter 4. The exception to this rule is the Cypriot Archaic gem (**Cat. 3.22**), which features a crouching monkey apart from a centralized narrative. This scene is similar to painted motifs that marginalize the animal within larger narratives.

Conclusion

Though it is difficult to draw conclusions based on each of these categories individually, when object type is assessed in conjunction with its decoration and find spot, particular functions may be inferred. For example, amphoras were commonly used for storage in domestic settings, displayed at drinking parties, and sometimes given as prizes at contests; they were also dedicated at sanctuaries and deposited in tombs as gifts. In other words, the contexts in which ceramics were used constantly changed, and, in turn, so did their function and meaning. Conversely, I believe the implications of the monkey and simianesque motifs described here remained constant, regardless of what they adorned or where they appeared.

As I will argue in Chapter 4, these motifs may have been imbued with apotropaic connotations; thus, they were deliberately added to utilitarian objects, like amphoras, to protect them in any context but especially public locations where the evil eye would have been present.¹¹⁹ The same goes for unseen or private contexts, like graves, for people required protection even in death.¹²⁰ In sum, I do not think context or object type

suppliant simians in the Roman era are made of jasper, which the ancients believed could prevent menstrual bleeding (Brashear 2008, 33). Thus, perhaps the jasper gem from Tharros (**Cat. 3.12**) was worn and used by a woman. As previously stated, women and monkeys were closely connected in Egypt (see **Fig. 2**) and it seems probable that this association transferred to Archaic Greece, where simians appear as companions of women on funerary steles, votive reliefs, painted vases, and statuettes (Kontoleon 1970, 30).

¹¹⁹ See Chapter 4, pp. 154-156.

¹²⁰ See “Sculpted Motifs” in Chapter 5.

facilitates the meaning of monkeys and simianesque creatures; rather, these creatures imbued the objects they adorned with protective meanings and functions. In other words, any context that would require protection could utilize apotropaic motifs, like monkeys and simianesque creatures, to prevent unwarranted harm.

WHAT COMES NEXT?

It is possible that there are material and distribution-related patterns that have gone unnoticed here, but the ostensible randomness of the objects these motifs adorn and the contexts where they occur implies the following: monkey and simianesque imagery was not utilized for/by one region or city, for a specific vessel type, or for a specific context. That said, their repeated marginalization, in terms of location and appearance, and iconographic inconsistency are repeated on all the objects discussed in this chapter. This implies that the creature was rendered, viewed, and used similarly all over Greece.

While I have briefly touched upon ways in which Egyptianizing motifs may have appeared on Greek and Etruscan objects, it is equally necessary to analyze the objects that inspired the marginalized monkey and simianesque iconography present in this survey: Egypt, Mesopotamia, Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Anatolia have all yielded marginalized simians on portable objects that may have inspired the Greek visual materials. These Eastern images, however, tend to be strictly religious and/or mythological in nature; and much of it coincides with the Greek Bronze Age, prior to the inception of the Greek marginalized simian. Thus, to what extent was the iconography, meaning, and function of these foreign creatures transferred from east to west? Chapter 3 will explore these possibilities.

CHAPTER THREE:

COMPARATIVE IMAGES OF SIMIANS AND SIMIANESQUE CREATURES IN EGYPTIAN AND EASTERN ART

Greek monkey and simianesque imagery likely originates from Egypt and the Near East. This is evident based on the numerous images of monkeys, baboons, the visually-similar mongoose,¹ and simianesque creatures that stem from these areas. The realism and extent of this imagery suggest that Egyptian and Eastern craftsmen were in direct contact with the animal, or, at the very least, visual renderings and written accounts made by people who were. The simian² and simianesque motifs presented here are represented on a variety of objects (*e.g.* cylinder seals, stelae/plaques/tablets, scarabs, jewelry, figurines, and frescoes) and were discovered in religious, funerary, and domestic contexts. On these objects, and within these contexts, simians and the simianesque were rendered as reverent creatures in awe of a divinity or kingly figure, pets of royal and wealthy classes, fertility symbols, apotropaia, and as comical human imitators. In some places, like Egypt, they were viewed as sacred creatures worthy of worship.

In this chapter, I will analyze the meaning, function, and context of Egyptian, Mesopotamian (Babylonian and Assyrian), Elamite, Phoenician (Syrian and Levantine), Anatolian, and Cypriot portable objects adorned with iconographically-similar images to those discussed in Chapter 2. The significance of these chosen objects is twofold: 1) though none of these small finds were discovered in Greece, all of them, with the exception of the Egyptian tomb paintings (**Fig. 2**), are portable and thus suitable to travel

¹ Though these cat-like rodents do not resemble simians in real life, Eastern representations of these animals often do.

² Egyptian and Near Eastern craftsmen depicted both monkeys and baboons in their art. Therefore, I often use the more neutral term, “simian,” to describe the motifs I discuss here.

and transmission. 2) All of these objects are adorned with larger narratives that contain one or more subordinate simian and simianesque creature, which often crouch, raise their arms upwards, and/or touch their faces. To an untrained eye, they would seem unnecessarily interpolative.

As previously stated, scholars have not attempted to analyze the Greek simian materials alongside the Eastern materials that influenced them. This is an important step in the investigative process because it reveals the following: though images and descriptions of simians and simianesque creatures undoubtedly made their way into Greece from the East and, in turn, inspired the visual renditions of the animal found there, the meaning and function of these creatures does not follow subsequent to the Bronze Age.

EGYPT

The earliest representations of simian and simianesque imagery come from Egypt: a vast and powerful empire that existed prior to the Greek Bronze Age and persisted through various occupations by Libya, Saite, Persia, and Macedonia. Egyptian religion and culture was founded on “physical explanations for natural processes” (*e.g.* why the sun “crossed the sky”) and dichotomies (*e.g.* the decipherable vs. the abstract,³ life [the Nile] vs. anti-life [the desert],⁴ and order [*ma'at*] vs. magic [*hk3*]).⁵ Since recognizable experiences were comforting to the Egyptians, their pantheon featured human and animal avatars, which were native to their immediate environs (*e.g.* the hippo, cow, cat, falcon,

³ Teeter 2011, 10.

⁴ Redford 2002, ix.

⁵ Magic, according to Redford (*ibid.*, xi), “encompassed a dynamic potential available to anyone who knew the appropriate incantation...it was not inconceivable that a ‘Faustian’ magician of great aptitude might rival the very pantheon itself. The gods themselves could be threatened with the curtailment of temple service of the onset of cosmic calamity, if they did not do the bidding of him (sic) who controlled the magic spell.” Thus, magic had the potential to be chaotic and was opposed to *ma'at*.

snake, lion, and fish) and frequently imported from elsewhere (*e.g.* the baboon).⁶ Like the Greek gods, these divinities controlled both heavenly (*e.g.* the sun-god Ra) and chthonic (*e.g.* the death-god Osiris) forces⁷ and so had to be constantly fed, clothed, entertained, worshipped, and celebrated in massive temples by dedicated priesthoods.⁸

Since animals were closely associated with divine figures, chthonic forces, and the polarities of order and chaos, it is only natural that simians—a creature akin to humans—should be recognized among them. Small monkeys, like the Patas (red), were native to Egypt’s deserts in the Pre-Dynastic era, later migrating to the Upper Nile Valley and the South Saharan desert to escape the harsh conditions. They were not worshipped, but, along with Vervets (green), were kept as pets or featured in wealthy menageries.⁹ Additionally, two species of baboon were discovered and represented here: the Hamadryas and Anubis (olive). They were not native to Egypt, but were likely imported from elsewhere in Africa.¹⁰ Unlike small monkeys, these large, often mean creatures (especially the Hamadryas) were associated with a variety of divine figures from the Pharaonic era onwards: Hedj-wer, Thoth, Babi, and Hapi.

The first “baboon god” to emerge in Egypt was Hedj-wer (Great White One): a white, squatting simian rendered only in the Pre-Dynastic and Old Kingdom eras.¹¹ This

⁶ While it is unclear why certain species were connected with gods, these associations did not render the animals divine; rather, the divine power instilled within them, as a result of this connection, is what warranted their adoration (Houlihan 1996, 2). This is why sacred animals, like Thoth’s ibises and baboons, were bred at temples, sacrificed, mummified, offered as votives, and buried in necropoli: to honor the gods they were associated with (Houlihan 1996, 7 and 9).

⁷ Redford 2002, xii.

⁸ *Ibid.*, xi.

⁹ McDermott 1938, 11; Janssen and Janssen 1989, 21; Brewer 1994, 119; and Greenlaw 2006, 64.

¹⁰ The Hamadryas baboon was native to Nubia and the “mythical” land of Punt, while the Anubis baboon originated from the African savannah (Greenlaw 2011, 3).

¹¹ For a visual example, see Karetsov 2000, 169 fig. 149.

creature was indicative of ancestral worship, especially among the wealthier classes.¹²

Over time, Hedj-Wer was merged with the baboon-god Thoth, also known as the "Lord of Writing," the "Lord of Divine Words," the "Master of the Library," and "The Master of Scribes."¹³ Thoth was the god of the arts, speech, writing, science, wisdom, healing, and magic;¹⁴ the patron of scribes;¹⁵ a scribe of the sun-god Amun and associate of the moon-god Khonsu;¹⁶ companion of Ma'at (goddess of cosmic order) and Seshat (goddess of writing);¹⁷ healer of Horus;¹⁸ and *psychopomp* of Osiris, weighing the hearts of the dead and recording the results.¹⁹ Other baboon divinities include Babi (a personification of Thoth's ithyphallic and violent side)²⁰ and Hapi (one of Horus' sons associated with the mummification process; his kanopic jar usually contains the lungs).²¹

Egyptian simians, both divine baboons and pet monkeys, were represented in a variety of portable and stationary artistic media, including painting, stone sculpture, and metalwork, which provide iconographically-similar visuals to those we see in Greece. While the majority of Egyptian simians perform various human activities (*e.g.* farming, collecting fruit from trees, herding animals, ship building/steering, dancing, and playing

¹² Bleiberg *et al.* 2013, 45. More specifically, he embodied royal ancestors who were responsible for appointing new kings (Pareja 2015, 24).

¹³ Boutantain 2014, 324.

¹⁴ Osborn and Osbornova 1998, 35.

¹⁵ Bleiberg *et al.* 2013, 24

¹⁶ Osborn and Osbornova 1998, 35; Bleiberg *et al.* 2013, 45; and Boutantain 2014, 324. The Egyptians witnessed the baboon's regard for these celestial bodies every morning and evening when they would greet the sun as it rose and set with upraised arms and rallying cries (Langdon 1990, 416; Janssen and Janssen 1998, 20; Osborn and Osbornova 1998, 36; Vernus and Yoyette 2005, 618; Greenlaw 2011, 27; and Bleiberg *et al.* 2013, 44). In turn, this behavior "seemed to mark the moon god's daily retirement...since the animal appeared to be affected by the moon's phases" (Langdon 1990, 416). For a visual example, see British Museum 1888,0512.222.1 (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=710790006&objectId=113285&partId=1)

¹⁷ Bleeker 1973, 122-123.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 123-127

¹⁹ Osborn and Osbornova 1998, 35 and Boutantain 2014, 324.

²⁰ Langdon 1990, 416.

²¹ Raven 2012, 134 and Bleiberg *et al.* 2013, 45.

music),²² the ones significant to this study connote fertility (*e.g.* are featured crouched beneath chairs of women, are associated with the dwarf-god Bes, and adorn cosmetic objects) and are apotropaic (*e.g.* adorn amuletic objects, are featured alongside amuletic symbols, and are associated with Bes). This is because these objects are portable and often feature the animal as secondary and/or isolated elements in larger narratives.

Egyptian amulets have been discovered in graves, protecting the deceased in the afterlife; in houses as utilitarian objects; and in temples or shrines as votive offerings.²³ Some were used temporarily for dire situations like childbirth, illness, or perilous journeys²⁴ or worn permanently as jewelry to protect against everyday dangers.²⁵ The standard amuletic symbol in Egypt was the *wedjet* eye of Horus, which was once stolen by Seth. Since Thoth was responsible for restoring Horus' eye, he is known as the "general provider of amulets for the living and the dead."²⁶ This is likely why Thoth's baboon appears on amuletic objects along with this symbol. For example, a gold and silver amuletic bangle, now in the British Museum, depicts *wedjet* eyes, *djed* pillars (an Osirian symbol), *ankh* signs, and apotropaic animals like snakes, falcons, the horned face of Bat (a cow-god associated with Hathor), and crouching baboons (**Fig. 1**).²⁷ Such objects were used in daily rituals or religious ceremonies and dedicated in temples,²⁸ though jewelry, like this bangle, may have been worn for personal protection.

²² D'Abbadie 1964, 169-170; D'Abbadie 1965, 181-188; D'Abbadie 1966, 185-201; Brewer *et al.* 1994, 97; and Houlihan 1996, 105.

²³ Pinch 1994, 104-105.

²⁴ Their power was likely reinforced with spoken magic, though it is unknown how often this process was repeated (Pinch 1994, 105-106)

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 105.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 109.

²⁷ British Museum 1891,0509.84. Published: *ibid.*, 111 fig. 57.

²⁸ Pinch 1994, 110.

In addition to appearing alongside apotropaic symbols, like the *wedjet* eye, baboons also functioned as amuletic symbols themselves. Many of these amulets were made of faience or painted blue, a color that was symbolic of the heavens, “primeval flood,” and the sun.²⁹ Since such objects were portable and occasionally found at Greek sites,³⁰ Greenlaw wonders if they encouraged the Minoans to paint their own simians, which were often painted blue and featured in palatial and domestic frescoes.³¹ As I will demonstrate later, it is possible that such Egyptian objects made their way into Crete with the Egyptian dwarf-god Bes, whose female counterpart was absorbed into the Minoan Genius with Taweret.³²

While divine baboons were frequently used as amuletic images to ward off unwanted evils, monkeys were often represented underneath chairs in tomb frescoes and reliefs. These objects were not portable but their iconography resembles Greek marginalized simians. In such contexts, the monkey could appear sitting, standing, crouching, and eating fruit;³³ in the presence of other animals, like dogs, cats, and geese;³⁴ or with dwarf caretakers.³⁵ In most of these circumstances, they are leashed by the neck or waist. In the Old Kingdom, dogs and monkeys were the only animals represented under chairs, and the owner was often male;³⁶ in the New Kingdom, cats and monkeys were most frequently represented under a woman’s or couple’s shared chair.³⁷ Though the motif appears beginning in the 4th Dynasty, it was far more popular in the

²⁹ Greenlaw 2011, 27.

³⁰ See Chapter 2, n. 16.

³¹ Greenlaw 2011, 48; see also **Cat. 1.3**.

³² Weingarten 2012.

³³ For examples, see D’Abbadie 1966, figs. 22-37.

³⁴ El-Kilnay and Mahran 2015, 249 ns. 26-29. For examples, see D’Abbadie 1964, figs. 8 and 24-25.

³⁵ El-Kilnay and Mahran 2015, 258-264. For examples, see D’Abbadie 1966, figs. 39-43.

³⁶ El-Kilnay and Mahran 2015, 264, Table 2.

³⁷ Ibid.

New Kingdom era, when Vervets—the species most commonly represented under chairs³⁸—were imported from Nubia and Punt with great frequency.³⁹

A few examples, which feature lone monkeys crouching beneath the chairs of women, occur in the New Kingdom tombs of May (Maya) and Merymery. The 15th century BCE Tomb of May (TT130), a harbor master under the reign of Thutmose III, is located in the Sheikh ‘Abd el-Qurna tomb complex in Thebes.⁴⁰ The most famous image from this tomb is of a cat who sits under a chair as it bats at its leash and hungrily eyes a bowl of meat,⁴¹ but a monkey appears here as well: it sits beneath the chair of a woman and pulls tightly on its leash.⁴² A similar motif appears on a limestone double relief in the 19th Dynasty Tomb of Merymery at Saqqara: here, a monkey squats beneath a chair, to which it is fastened with a belted leash (**Fig. 2**).⁴³

It is important to note that representations of simians beneath chairs occur primarily on tomb frescoes. Once sealed inside the tombs they adorn, these images would not have been accessible to locals, let alone foreign visitors. Despite the invisibility and non-portability of these frescoes, the images they feature are significant: as discussed in the previous chapter, we find representations of monkeys and simianesque creatures crouching between the legs of humans, horses, and chairs (**Cat. 2.1, 3.4-6, 7.2, 7.4-7**). Thus, it is highly probable that the Egyptian chair-bound monkey may have been featured on non-funerary, portable objects—like cylinder seals or plaques—or spoken about in travelers’ tales.

³⁸ Ibid., 249.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Lowe 2004-5, 10, Table 1.

⁴¹ Ibid., 9 fig. 4.

⁴² D’Abbadie 1966, fig. 25.1.

⁴³ Rijksmuseum AP6. Published: Janssen and Janssen 1989, 22 fig. 14.

While the image of the chair-bound simian likely travelled to Greece from Egypt, its meaning did not. In Egypt, monkeys (rather than baboons),⁴⁴ were featured beneath chairs for a few reasons: first, they were comedic creatures that served as frivolous distractions for their human masters.⁴⁵ Second, especially in relation to their female owners, monkeys were often associated with women's sexuality and rebirth in both Egyptian texts and art because they were lascivious;⁴⁶ this is likely why they are depicted, with some frequency, on cosmetic objects used by women in their toilettes.⁴⁷ Greek monkey motifs, on the other hand, often lack sexual and fecund connotations, even when they are attached to narratives with fertile implications (**Cat. 3.18**). Whether the Greek's dismissal of simians' fecundity was deliberate or accidental, it is clear that the animals' significance in Egyptian culture and religion did not transfer to pictorial simian art after the Bronze Age.

Another avenue through which the simian may have traveled into Greece is portable statuettes of the Egyptian dwarf-god Bes: an apotropaic kourotrophos and fosterer of women and children. He originated in Egypt,⁴⁸ was transmitted to various Greek locales,⁴⁹ and was made locally. Scholars often refer to him as a "dwarf-demon," for he is represented in a manner akin to underworld monsters: frontal and grimacing.⁵⁰ In addition to his frightening expression, Bes' façade displays other apotropaic attributes,

⁴⁴ There is one baboon represented under the chair of its master in the 18th Dynasty tomb of Userhat; it appears to be eating an onion (see El-Kilnay and Mahran 2015, 249).

⁴⁵ El-Kilnay and Mahran 2015, 256.

⁴⁶ Houlihan 1996, 108 and Bleiberg *et al.* 2013, 43.

⁴⁷ Janssen and Janssen 1989, 21-22 and fig. 13.

⁴⁸ Bes first appears in the Middle Kingdom as a "lion-man" with mane, round ears, and a tail (Dasen 1993, 57; for a potential example, see Baines 1985, fig. 85). In the New Kingdom, around the time of Hatshepsut's reign (18th Dynasty, ca. 1500-1450), his slender, leonine form is replaced by a bow-legged dwarf.

⁴⁹ See pp. 99-101 below.

⁵⁰ See Chapter 4, n. 108.

including thick lips, an open mouth, sharp teeth, and an exposed tongue.⁵¹ As a minor god of fertility, as well as protection, Bes is represented with a short, stocky body; wears a plumed headdress set atop a flat abacus, a lion skin over his shoulders, loincloth, and/or wig; and he often sports one or two sagging “breasts.” Many of the images that represent Bes also include small monkeys, which crouch at his feet, sit on his shoulders, and/or are cradled by him, as if children. Thus, monkeys help to facilitate the dwarf-god’s role as an apotropaic fecundity figure.

Bes’ portly build does not manifest until the New Kingdom period. His large midsection is accompanied by protruding ribs or muscles, thin limbs, an exposed tongue, and a headdress made of ostrich feathers;⁵² kilts, jewelry, wings, weapons, and his grinning face come later.⁵³ As a household guardian,⁵⁴ New Kingdom images of Bes were often featured on domestic objects, such as faience figurines, gold amulets, magic wands, headrests (for chairs and beds), bowls, and mirrors.⁵⁵ In this same era, Bes was also a popular musician and dancer, playing the tambourine, lyre, flute, or lute.⁵⁶

Though the dwarf demon was frequently represented as a solitary figure in Egyptian art, he was also rendered alongside other characters, all of which emphasize his kourtophobic nature: these include his female counterpart Beset, who either stands beside

⁵¹ Due to their frontality, fearsome facades, and grotesqueness, Tsiafakis (2003, 85) believes that the Greek Gorgon is a composite of the Mesopotamian Lamastu and Humbaba, the Egyptian Bes and Hathor, and the Assyrian wind demon Pazuzu.

⁵² Many different types of feathers were employed in ancient Egypt, especially the ostrich, though raven, crow, waterfowl, and pigeon feathers were also used. Many gods were depicted wearing ostrich feathers, especially Maat (though strangely, she seems to have had no associations or interactions with the demon-god Bes), while the Egyptians used them to make fans (see Lucas and Harris 2012, 28-29).

⁵³ Dasen 1993, 58 and 59 and Romano 1989. For examples, see Brooklyn 37.544E (<https://www.brooklynmuseum.org/opencollection/objects/117187>) and 37.921E (<https://www.brooklynmuseum.org/opencollection/objects/4084>).

⁵⁴ Fischer 1987, 19.

⁵⁵ Dasen 1993, 59.

⁵⁶ *LIMC III*, s.v. *Bes*, 106 and *ibid.*, 77.

him, holds him, and/or breastfeeds a child-like version of him;⁵⁷ Taweret, an Egyptian hippopotamus demon with pendulous breasts; pregnant females and/or human children;⁵⁸ Horus as both an adult and child;⁵⁹ musicians;⁶⁰ and small, crouching monkeys.⁶¹ Wilson thinks Bes' association with simians began in the New Kingdom, when baboons were first associated with the sun-god Ra,⁶² which Bes himself was coupled with later.⁶³ Bes is also featured with a wedjet eye, a solar disc or scarab, and the uraeus snake, which further connects him with the sun-god and thus to simians.⁶⁴

The primary purpose of demons like Bes⁶⁵ was to mollify people's fears of unforeseen supernatural forces, which manifested in infants and children as death and deformity.⁶⁶ Ancient Egypt, from the Pre-Dynastic era through to the Roman period, suffered from high infant mortality rates,⁶⁷ which were the result of poor diet, unsanitary conditions, and waterborne and infectious diseases like hepatitis, dysentery, and

⁵⁷ Beset has leonine hair (though no tail) and sagging breasts, grasps various reptilian creatures (*e.g.* snakes and lizards), and wears ornamentation (*e.g.* collars, bracelets, and anklets); for an example, see Weingarten 2013, Fig. 5. Beset was not depicted nearly as often as Bes, for there are only 20 images of her from the Middle Kingdom (Weingarten 373). She and Bes, however, are often featured together in Ptolemaic art. For examples, see *LIMC III*, s.v. *Bes*, nos. 9-15.

⁵⁸ Bes' primary function in Egypt was an apotropaic mascot of women and children who both dedicated and accompanied his image. See Dasen 1993, pl. 7.1 and *supra* n. 53.

⁵⁹ See British Museum EA36250 (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?partid=1&assetid=1613167268&objectid=101738) and Metropolitan Museum 50.85 (<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/546037>) for examples.

⁶⁰ See Dasen 1993, pl. 7.2 for an example.

⁶¹ Tassignon (2013, 8) believes that Bes' iconography may have been obtained from the Sudanese, for his associations with the animal could be an allusion to the monkeys that were brought to Egypt from Nubia.

⁶² *Supra* n. 16.

⁶³ Wilson 1975, 82. Dasen (1993, 78) additionally notes that Bes' musical routines may have been associated with sun-worshipping baboons, who performed a "dance" as they greeted the sun each morning (*supra* n. 16).

⁶⁴ Similarly, Late Period bronzes show Bes standing on a papyrus shaft, raising a sword in his right hand and holding a uraeus or falcon—symbols of Re and Horus. Sometimes, he is also shown surrounded by uraei (Dasen 1993, 65). For an example, see Pinch 1994, 129 fig. 69.

⁶⁵ Other Egyptian fertility demons were female: these often nude, voluptuous figures have large breasts and elaborate headdresses. They stand or crouch and sometimes point to their genitalia or hold their large stomachs. In the Ptolemaic period they become conflated with Beset. For examples, see Bailey 2008, nos. 3130-3143.

⁶⁶ Dasen 1993, 68.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* and Scheidel 2001 (especially chap. 2).

tapeworms;⁶⁸ poisonous wild animals and insects, like snakes and scorpions, were also a dangerous reality.⁶⁹ These dangers prompted the creation of apotropaic amulets, which were used by the most vulnerable members of the population, like pregnant women and young children.⁷⁰ These amulets were often adorned with images of Bes and sanctified baboons, whose crouched postures and mixed appearance closely resemble the Greek monkey and simianesque motifs.

In Egypt, one of the most popular amuletic objects used by women and children is the magic wand or knife: a curved device made of hippo ivory that functioned as an apotropaic weapon (**Fig. 3**).⁷¹ Wands were likely placed under beds or waved over a mother's pregnant body to mark "magically safe" places.⁷² Most feature apotropaic demons, like Taweret and Bes, but also animals, like knife-wielding lions and snake-wrangling baboons. These combative simians embodied "protective magic" and were evocative of eroticism, fertility, and regeneration, especially when depicted on cosmetic objects used by women,⁷³ like kohl pots.⁷⁴

Other amuletic objects feature Bes as an apotropaic kourotrophos. These devices show the god holding a child-like version of himself while surrounded by crouching monkeys. One New Kingdom example, now in the British Museum, is a blue glaze staff that depicts Bes holding a miniature version of himself. Two monkeys crouch on his

⁶⁸ Dasen 1993, pp. 51-104.

⁶⁹ This is why Bes and his more human counterpart, Ptah-Pataikos, are often featured wrangling snakes (Fischer 1987, 18).

⁷⁰ For examples, see Fischer 1987, pl. III no. 11 and Dasen 1993, 69 fig. 6.1.

⁷¹ Metropolitan Museum 30,8,218. Published: Aruz 2008b, no. 86.

⁷² Dasen 1993, 69.

⁷³ Langdon 1990, 416.

⁷⁴ For an example, see Dasen 1993, pl. 4.4.

shoulders and a third crouches between his legs (**Fig. 4**).⁷⁵ All the monkeys seem to represent the same species: a small green monkey from Ethiopia (the Grivet), with narrow nostrils, white beard, and long tail; they were likely imported from Nubia, the Sudan, and Abyssinia.⁷⁶ These monkeys, like Bes, were associated with fertility, birth, the sun, and creation (in the form of Thoth); and, like dwarves, they were emissaries of Ra and were often magically invoked when women were in labor.⁷⁷ Additionally, some Bes-monkeys hold disc-like objects or rosettes, a motif found on several toiletry items connected with the New Year's feast and birth. Jeanne Bulté thinks they may represent the sun or a tambourine, which both Bes and monkeys play in Egyptian art and myth.⁷⁸

Though images of sacred simians were imported into Greece beginning in the Bronze Age, Bes was not imported until the 8th century BCE, while locally-inspired representations were first manufactured in the second half of the 6th century BCE.⁷⁹ A few decades later, terracotta and wood statuettes of dwarfs appeared in various sanctuaries and tombs on the Greek mainland, the islands, and colonies, which were made locally.⁸⁰ Many seem to be formally inspired by the humanesque Ptah-Pataikos

⁷⁵ British Museum 1895,0511.54 (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=864717001&objectId=171783&partId=1). For other examples of Bes holding monkeys, see Benndorf 1889, 89 fig. 86 and Bulté 1991, pl. 1 nos. a-d, pl. 4 no. c, pl. 5 nos. a and d, pl. 6 nos. a-d, pl. 7 nos. b-c, pl. 8 nos. a and c, pl. 9 no. c, pl. 10 nos. a and b, pl. 11 no. a, and pl. 12 nos. b and d. For examples of monkeys playing the role of Bes, see Bulté 1991, pl. 16 nos. a-d, and pl. 17 nos. a-e. For examples of monkeys with female fertility figures, see Bulté 1991, pls. 23, 25-26, and pl. 32 no. d.

⁷⁶ Bulté 1991, 80.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 100.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 100-101.

⁷⁹ Wilson (1975, 85) argues that Bes was likely transmitted to Cyprus from Phoenicia (*i.e.* Syria and the Levant), where the god appears on scarabs, cylinder seals, and faience amulets between the 16th and 14th centuries BCE. For Greek examples, see Dasen 1993, 78-80.

⁸⁰ For an example, see Dasen 1993, pl. 78.1a-c. This wood statuette comes from a workshop on Samos, which Davis (1981, 80-81) believes was the place of diffusion for the Egyptian canon; Dasen (1993, 202-203) agrees with this assessment in relation to dwarf figurines, for Egyptian examples of Bes were also discovered at Samos (see Jantzen 1972, pl. 19).

(*e.g.* forward-bent legs, fists clenched against chest, human faces that smile)⁸¹ and functionally inspired by the kourotrophic and apotropaic Bes (*e.g.* they carry small children, food trays, weapons, snakes, or simply clench their fists).⁸² Bes' more exotic attributes, like his plumed headdress, lion skin, grimacing face, and tongue are usually absent on Greek-made dwarves.

Based on the above assessment, the clear difference between the Greek and Egyptian versions of Bes is his grotesqueness: in Egypt, his grimacing façade was a trademark of his ability to protect. In Greece, his face is relaxed, sometimes smiling, like Ptah. This begs the question: for whom were these figurines made? Some were discovered in the tombs of Greek children at Samos, Megara Hyblaea, Selinus, and Syracuse.⁸³ These may have protected and fostered children in the afterlife,⁸⁴ as many are corpulent,⁸⁵ carry trays of food,⁸⁶ and appear shortly before Tanagran nurse figurines.⁸⁷ The use of Bes-Ptah figurines in child tombs, however, is heavily outweighed by their dedication in sanctuaries of female divinities, nearly all of which specialize in marriage,

⁸¹ Ptah-Pataikoi was an apotropaic and kourotrophic god who was generally depicted as an "achondroplastic" dwarf: fully human, nude, with a distended belly, short legs that bend at the knees, a long nose, and a flat-topped head. He usually appears on amulets with a pillar-like form against his back and/or a loop sticking out of his neck. Most Ptah statuettes are made of faience, ivory, steatite, and semi-precious stones (see Dasen 1993, pl. 13.3a-b). Like Bes, Ptah is sometimes depicted with attributes (*e.g.* a scarab beetle, plumed headdress, snakes, crocodiles, knives, or Janus head) (ibid., 86 and pls. 12.2-4 and 13.1); and, like Bes, there are numerous manifestations of him, so it is unclear whether he represents a singular divinity or multiple of the same kind (ibid., 84).

⁸² See ibid., 201 and pl. 80.1-4 for examples.

⁸³ Ibid., 203.

⁸⁴ For additional examples of figurines from the site, see Sinn 1983, 92 and figs. 7a-b. It makes sense that a tamed version of the dwarf-demon would be associated with children in ancient Greece, where nursing entities often took the form of beautiful young women and smiling old women (see Wolfson 2018 and n. 87 below for examples).

⁸⁵ For examples, see Sinn 1983, fig. 2 and Dasen 1993, pl. 79.3.

⁸⁶ Many of these figurines were discovered at Samos and carry baskets on their heads, which are filled with cakes (see Sinn 1975, fig. 6a-b). Sinn (1983, 88-89) believes the food is not meant to be an offering, since the tray is not round (*i.e.* a *kanoun*); rather, its likely food for a child, a notion expressed by the figurine's fatness, which guaranteed *eutrophia*, or adequate nutritional development. This might be true for the figurines in tomb settings, but those in sanctuaries likely functioned as food-offerings to the gods.

⁸⁷ For more information on and examples of Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic kourotrophic Tanagras, see Neils and Oakley 2003, 225-229.

birth, and fertility: *e.g.* Hera at Samos, Argos, and Perachora; Aphrodite at Gravisca and Naucratis; Athena at Lindos; Artemis at Paros and Ephesus; and Demeter at Katania.

There were obviously complex trade networks in place that carried Egyptian products to the whole of Mediterranean, but how and why did so many Bes figurines make their way into these particular sanctuaries?

I think Demetriou provides the most believable answer: she says that Bes' presence in sanctuaries like Hera at Samos and Aphrodite at Gravisca and Naucratis is not surprising since

One of the common features of coastal sanctuaries, especially ones established in multiethnic emporia, is that there was no specialization in the worship of divinities; rather, these sacred spaces were multifunctional, allowing worshippers who visited and lived there to venerate divinities in whatever manner they chose.⁸⁸

All the sanctuaries mentioned above are connected to the coasts of the regions they occupy, which is likely why they contain more diverse offerings than sanctuaries further inland.

Since most of the Bes figurines discovered in Greece (both Egyptian and Greek-made) were recovered from coastal sanctuaries, it seems probable that they were dedicated by sea-faring men (*e.g.* merchants, travelers, and soldiers) as opposed to women and children. For example, though many of the sanctuaries that feature Bes figurines are dedicated to female divinities with kourotrophic and reproductive leanings, some of these goddesses have additional divine functions, such as protecting sea-farers and facilitating economic activity.⁸⁹ Additionally, most of the Egyptian-made Bes votives in question do

⁸⁸ Demetriou 2012, 99.

⁸⁹ The version of Aphrodite worshipped at Naucratis, for example, presided over sea-faring, economic activity, and hetairai (Schultz 2003, 240-241 and Höckmann and Möller 2006, 15). Additionally, she

not feature children or women;⁹⁰ rather, they brandish weapons,⁹¹ musical instruments,⁹² or simply feature a grinning/grimacing countenance.⁹³ Finally, locally-made examples found within these coastal sanctuaries and the surrounding settlements imply that the Greeks were making Bes and Ptah figurines for people to buy and dedicate; some are kourotrophic, while others are simply corpulent and/or carry trays of food. It is possible that locals purchased these figurines for dedication within the sanctuary or use within tombs, but it seems equally probable that they were provided to the sea-faring men responsible for bringing the Egyptian-made examples into Greece. Thus, subsequent to leaving the shores of Egypt, the apotropaic dwarf-god Bes acquired a new class of people to protect: men navigating tumultuous waters.

How do simians fit into this picture? Though none of the extant Egyptian-made Bes figurines discovered in Greek contexts feature simians, it seems likely that his associations with the animal travelled with him. For instance, some of the examples from the sanctuary of Athena at Lindos feature simian, rather than leonine, features.⁹⁴ Additionally, the sanctuary of Demeter at Katania has yielded pinakes in the shape of simianesque nurses holding children;⁹⁵ and other Bes-yielding sites, such as Hera at Perachora,⁹⁶ have generated locally-made monkey figurines. These examples, which

acquired the epithet “Pandemos,” implying she was “for all the people” (Höckmann and Möller 2006, 16), not just women and children.

⁹⁰ Occasionally, Egyptian-made examples discovered in Greece do feature women: a bronze figurine, for instance, features a sword-toting Bes sitting on the shoulders of a woman with a child at her feet (Parlasca 1953, pl. 46). These examples, however, are rare.

⁹¹ Of 48 mounted-warrior figurines, which come from Samos, eight depict Bes (Waldstein 1905, 13). For an example, see Jantzen 1972, 14, pl. 19, B1226 (he no longer holds a weapon, but his extended arm could imply he once did).

⁹² For an example, see Jantzen 1972, pl. 18.

⁹³ For examples, see Blinkenberg 1931, pl. 53 nos. 1231-1233 (Athena at Lindos); Rubensohn 1962, pl. 31.2 and 35.1 (Artemis at Paros); and Hogarth 1908, pl. 44.1 (Artemis at Ephesus).

⁹⁴ Blinkenberg 1931, pl. 51 no. 1232.

⁹⁵ Rizza 1961, fig. 22 nos. 8-9.

⁹⁶ Payne *et al.* 1940, 172-173.

show no outward reference to Bes, imply that the Greeks appropriated images of this animal—perhaps based on Egyptian-made examples of the dwarf god—and used them for their own purposes. This choice is evidenced in imagery the Greeks borrow from Mesopotamia, Cyprus, and Phoenicia as well.

One question still remains: where were these sea-faring dedicators of Bes figurines coming from? The Egyptians rarely traveled beyond the confines of their desert home; thus, there must have been middlemen who transferred Bes' image between Egypt and Greece. Wilson notes that Bes was likely transmitted to Cyprus from Phoenicia (i.e. Syria and the Levant), where the god appears on scarabs, cylinder seals, and faience amulets beginning ca. 16th-14th centuries BCE. In these locales, the god is often rendered as a squatting, clothed, and leonine figure with various Egyptian attributes (e.g. the feathered headdress) and Syro-Phoenician iconography.⁹⁷ The Phoenicians also developed their own version of Bes as a “master of animals:” while the god often wrangles snakes in Egyptian iconography, the Phoenicians depict him wrangling lions.⁹⁸

Bes first appears in Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age, when objects of Egyptian and Phoenician origin were being imported and emulated.⁹⁹ Beginning in the Iron Age, Cypriot versions of Bes and Ptah appear which seem to have been inspired by the Babylonian Humbaba and the Assyrian Pazuzu.¹⁰⁰ Derek Counts believes such images are evidence of “the *longue durée*” of the interactions and complex cultural relations between Egypt and Cyprus and “the predisposition of artists in Cyprus to appropriate

⁹⁷ For examples, see Wilson 1975, 85 figs. 2.1-3.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 88-90. Bes does not wrangle lions in Egyptian art until the 7th century BCE, perhaps inspired by the increased Mediterranean connections of the early Archaic Period (*LIMC III*, s.v. *Bes*, 106).

⁹⁹ Wilson 1975, 93. She does not specify the date of these Egyptian and Phoenician objects.

¹⁰⁰ Later on, in the Archaic Period, their iconography is merged with the Greek satyr and gorgon. See Wilson 1975, 93; Childs 2003, 65; and *LIMC III*, s.v. *Bes*, 94 nos. 161 and 164.

myriad divine images and assimilate them into a local, yet multifaceted, religious tradition.”¹⁰¹ Cyprus’ convenient location between the Eastern states and Greece likely resulted in the arrival and manufacture of Bes figurines in Greece, and, as I will discuss later, monkey iconography as well.

The amuletic powers of Bes, and the baboon emissaries previously mentioned, are significant because, as I discuss in Chapter 4, simians may have apotropaic connotations; but I believe this meaning arose independently in Greek art. For one, Bes is apotropaic because of his divine connotations and frightening features. He is also a kourotrophic entity that fostered women and children; and though the pinakes from Katania feature simianizing nurses, there are not many examples of these. Similarly, Egyptian baboons are apotropaic because of their sanctified status and associations with divine figures (*e.g.* Bes, Amun, Thoth) and amuletic symbols (*e.g.* *djed* pillars and *wedjet* eyes). As previously established, Greek simians lose their religious significance after the Bronze Age and appear primarily in vase paintings in narratives without clear apotropaia and themes to which they do not relate. Additionally, Greek simians are not iconographically consistent, whereas amuletic baboons are rendered with relative consistency and realism, for such images are based on the actual animal. Similarly, Bes’ appearance varies only slightly over the course of centuries. Thus, the reason for simians appearing in Greece can be related to Egyptian baboons and Bes, but I do not think their apotropaic tendencies can be certainly applied. Rather, the Greeks used simians as apotropaic entities in different ways and for different reasons.

Even before Bes was transported into Greece, there is evidence that simian imagery was being imported into various Mediterranean locales by ship; and shipwrecks

¹⁰¹ Counts 2008, 5; see also the section on “Cyprus” below.

are especially helpful for discerning what was being transported, from where, and when. One of the most famous, and intact, discovered thus far is the Uluburun Shipwreck: a 14th century BCE vessel which sank off the coast of Anatolia near the city of Kas. The ship, which was likely coming from Cyprus,¹⁰² contained objects from Syro-Palestine, Cyprus, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Italy, and the Aegean: copper, tin, and blue glass ingots; pottery from Egypt, Cyprus, Syro-Palestine, and the Aegean; Canaanite jewelry, bronze weapons, tools, and jars filled with resin and beads; Egyptian scarabs; Mesopotamian cylinder seals; bronze weights, fishing nets, and stone mace heads; and various precious materials, like ivory, ebony, amber, and ostrich eggshells.¹⁰³ Scholars are unsure if it was “a private merchant ship perpetually circling the Aegean in a counter-clockwise route, a wealthy private merchant ship with a specific port of origin and destination in mind, or an official emissary carrying cargo of royal gifts to a specific destination in Greece, Crete, Rhodes, or the Cyclades.”¹⁰⁴

One of the objects discovered on this wreck is an Egyptian jasper scarab with a crouching baboon engraved on its surface (**Fig. 5**).¹⁰⁵ In the image, the baboon sits on a stool, standard, or the hieroglyph *neb* while facing the name of the Pharaoh (either Thutmose III or Ramses III). Above his head hovers a crescent moon and lunar disc, which means he could represent Thoth or one of his assistants. As I will discuss later, Anatolian art contains plenty of Egyptian symbolism and motifs, such as crescent moons and simians, so perhaps it was obtaining this imagery from scarabs such as this one,

¹⁰² The ship contained 354 ingots (10 tons) of copper, stone anchors, pottery, pithoi, wall brackets, and coriander. All of these objects are Cypriot and Syro-Canaanite in origin (Pulak 2008, 290-297).

¹⁰³ Cline 1994, 100.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Bodrum Museum of Underwater Archaeology 45.6.95 (KW 3699). Published: Pulak 2008, 361 no. 228. Though it comes from a 1300 BCE context, it was manufactured between the 15th and 14th centuries BCE.

headed from Egypt via Cyprus. This seems probable when we compare this baboon's form to some of the Greek motifs: the Thera house model (**Cat. 3.2**), for example, features crouching monkeys sitting atop boxes or symbols with their knees pulled into their chests.

MESOPOTAMIA

Unlike in Egypt, monkeys were never native to Mesopotamia,¹⁰⁶ yet the creature consistently appears in the art of Babylon, Assyria, and neighboring Elam. Monkeys likely arrived in the Near East as tribute or gifts for wealthy patrons who displayed them in elaborate menageries; thus, like in Egypt, they were exotic commodities whose presence emphasized wealth, as well as the power and influence of the king.¹⁰⁷ Also similar to Egypt, Mesopotamian simians connoted religious devotion, divinity, and fecundity, especially when in the presence of gods, kingly figures, and celestial symbols (like the crescent moon). When rendered as imitators of human endeavors, however, they also embodied music and humor.¹⁰⁸ In art, they were often featured on cylinder seals in elaborate scenes depicting royal and divine entities, religious rituals, war, and nature; stela, plaques, and tablets were also adorned with the creature, or perhaps a similar crouching animal, the mongoose. In nearly all circumstances, the simian or mongoose crouches or stands with bent legs and appears to be a secondary element within a main scene, just as simians and simianesque creatures are rendered in Greek art.

Babylon

Simians first appear in Babylonian art in the First Dynasty (ca. 19th-16th centuries BCE). They manifest primarily on cylinder seals, stela, and plaques that feature

¹⁰⁶ Dunham 1985, 234.

¹⁰⁷ Evidence for this comes from Middle and Neo-Assyrian texts (ibid., 236).

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 242-248.

religious scenes, but their function and meaning are uncertain.¹⁰⁹ Most of these objects were discovered in graves¹¹⁰ and may have been apotropaic due to the primate's "grotesque and burlesque" appearance.¹¹¹ Since many of the simians depicted in Mesopotamian art are awkwardly rendered, it is possible that local craftsmen had never seen the animal in person and were thus drawing from their imagination, other ill-rendered examples, or the oral and textual descriptions of others.¹¹²

The inaccurate renditions of Mesopotamian simians may have inadvertently led to the creation of simianesque creatures, whose grotesqueness and adoring gestures are reminiscent of Greek simian iconography. One of the earliest Babylonian examples appears on clay stelae (ca. 2000-1600 BCE) that depict the goddess Nintu flanked by a group of gaunt figures (**Fig. 6**).¹¹³ In Sumerian mythology,¹¹⁴ Nintu had many names in textual sources, including she who "sets birth-giving going," the "mother, mistress of creating, who performs her task in the belly, the place of darkness," and "the mother of the land."¹¹⁵ As a goddess of the womb, Nintu determined the fate of unborn children, known (in literature) as *kūbu* (fetus), *edamukku* (unborn child?), and *kirsu* (clot).¹¹⁶ In art, Nintu is often represented with emaciated crouching creatures that hold their hands to their enlarged heads, like fetuses do in the womb; this is why many scholars associate Nintu's withered companions with unborn children.¹¹⁷ However, it seems likely that the

¹⁰⁹ Van Buren 1939, 23.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, xlviii. McDermott (1938, 17) thinks this conclusion is too broad, but since the Greeks did view simians as inferior versions of themselves, this theory may not be wholly incorrect.

¹¹² Dunham 1985, 235 and Van Buren 1939, 24.

¹¹³ Baghdad Museum. Published: Stol and Wiggerman 2000, 28 fig. 1.

¹¹⁴ Sumer was under the control of Babylon after Hammurabi conquered it in the early 18th century BCE; thus, they shared deities between them.

¹¹⁵ Stol and Wiggerman 2000, 75.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹¹⁷ Porada 1964, 164-166; Stol and Wiggerman 2000, 28 and 80; and Harris 2003, 9.

Babylonians would have known what fetuses looked like due to unsuccessful or terminated pregnancies, so it is equally possible that these creatures, due to their grotesque appearance and lowly posture, may not represent the fetuses themselves but rather apotropaic guardians of children in the womb.¹¹⁸ This is especially true if Nintu functioned more as a demonic, protective entity than a nurturing fertility goddess.¹¹⁹

Though embryonic representations were quite popular in the Medieval Period and later,¹²⁰ the closest parallel to Nintu's *kubu*, in both date and appearance, is featured on a Late Antique lamp from Medinet el Faijum (**Fig. 7**).¹²¹ These emaciated, wide-faced creatures crouch in the center of the vessel, raise their stubby arms above their heads, and grin slightly as they look out at the viewer. Carl Kaufmann¹²² describes these creatures as "embryos" and compares them to similar images of frogs and toads, which were viewed as symbols of fertility (like Nintu and her *kubu*) due to their excessive procreative abilities.¹²³ The grotesqueness of the fetus-like creatures, however, as well as the way they hang in space is also indicative of simians' appearance and behavior. Though this object is far removed from the simianesque phenomenon in Mesopotamia and Greece, other emaciated figures, like the representations of the choking Phthonoi,¹²⁴ show a continued use of this grotesque iconography in Rome, albeit for different characters and purposes.

¹¹⁸ Porada (1964) refers to the creatures that crouch at Nintu's feet as "demonic" beings and the long-necked figures in her arms as children.

¹¹⁹ Porada (ibid., 164 n. 16) discusses a fragment from a Babylonian text, which describes Nintu as a minor demonic entity. She also wonders, however, if the female represented on these plaques is not Nintu, for she appears as less frightening than the deity described in the text.

¹²⁰ See Dasen 2007.

¹²¹ Frankfurt am Main. Published: Kaufmann 1915, pl. 29 no. 221.

¹²² Published: Kaufmann 1915, 88.

¹²³ Crump 2015, 134-136.

¹²⁴ See Chapter 4, pp. 157-158.

Like simianesque creatures, representations of Babylonian simians often occur in religious, visual contexts, though their presence is always secondary to the main narrative and sometimes seemingly meaningless. For example, an Old Babylonian terracotta plaque features an enigmatically-composed scene: two nude women, whose tall frames extend the entire length of the plaque, flank two, small, bow-legged men playing instruments (**Fig. 8**).¹²⁵ Above the men and behind the woman on the right, two crouching monkey-like creatures float; a third stands behind the woman on the left, its arms bent upwards towards its head. They hover in an empty space, seemingly unrelated to the human figures that pay them no mind. That said, if the male figures are playing music, these creatures may function as amusing performers, as they often did in ancient Egypt.¹²⁶

Though this plaque appears to depict monkeys, the schematic bodies of these animals have encouraged some scholars to refer to them as mongooses, which were often used as “filler motifs” on Old Babylonian seal impressions.¹²⁷ Though the mongoose is Indian in origin, it is believed to have arrived in Mesopotamia as early as the late 3rd millennium BCE, either due to zoogeographical connections between India and Mesopotamia, human intervention, or with the aid of the Tigris and Euphrates.¹²⁸ Since the mongoose was associated with the Mesopotamian deity *Ningilin/Ninkilim* (a god of vermin), it was rather common in Mesopotamian art,¹²⁹ particularly on cylinder seals.

¹²⁵ Iraq Museum. Published: Opificius 1961, pl. 18 no. 584 and Dunham 1985, fig. 2.

¹²⁶ Dunham 1985, 246. In modern-day India, performances that feature “showmen with monkeys” are called Monkey Wallahs: trained monkeys dance to the beat of a musician’s percussion instrument (Mendelsohn 1983, 81). Though there is no evidence that such shows took place in ancient Mesopotamia, scenes like this one are certainly evocative of the modern routine.

¹²⁷ Dunham 1985, 245 and n. 53.

¹²⁸ Potts 1997, 262.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 263.

There are numerous Babylonian cylinder seals that feature crouching simians or mongooses. On most, the animal reverently crouches or kneels before a kingly or divine figure. A well-preserved example appears on an Old Babylonian hematite cylinder seal (ca. 19th-16th centuries BCE) (**Fig. 9**).¹³⁰ This seal depicts a goddess and worshipper before an enthroned king holding a cup. Between the worshipper and king crouches a small creature; Edith Porada calls it a "mongoose"¹³¹ while Dominique Collon believes it is a "monkey."¹³² The entire scene is flanked by cuneiform script while a crescent shape hovers above the seated figure. There are dozens of similar scenes of crouching/standing creatures worshipping a kingly/divine figure; most are Old Babylonian, while a few others are Cappadocian and Syrian.¹³³ One in particular closely resembles a dog-headed baboon, an animal that is often rendered as a suppliant figure in Minoan and Egyptian art (**Fig. 10**).¹³⁴

As mentioned earlier, there is a Minoan equivalent to Mesopotamian supplication scenes that feature simians or mongooses. One example is found on a Late Minoan I-II shield ring from the Tombe dei Nobili at Kalyvia, near Phaistos (**Cat. 1.2**).¹³⁵ Like Grave Circles A and B at Mycenae, these LM III A1-2 tombs were inhabited by a small group of elites that were likely associated with nearby Phaistos.¹³⁶ The scene in question depicts a standing or kneeling creature with an elongated snout and thin body. It worships a nude

¹³⁰ Pierpont Morgan Library Collections. Published: Porada 1948, no. 315E.

¹³¹ Porada 1948, 41.

¹³² Collon 1986, 119 no. 228.

¹³³ For similar examples, see Porada 1948, nos. 316, 328, 331E, 333, 341-342, 405, 414, 421, 426, 433, 467, 486, 488-489, 522E, 529-530, 535-536, 541, 543-544, 879, 904, 920, 922, 953, 961, and 927E. For examples where a monkey/mongoose crouches in alternate locations, but in a similar context, see Buchanan 1966, pl. 67, no. 1109; Collon 1986, pl. 5 no. 7, pl. 7 nos. 51 and 54, pl. 19 no. 228, pl. 20 no. 240, pl. 22 no. 286, pl. 23 no. 306, pl. 24 no. 320 and 327, pl. 27 nos. 366 and 367, pl. 30 no. 407, pl. 35 nos. 492 and 496, pl. 36 no. 516, and pl. 37 no. 523; and Ascalone 2011, pl. XXXVI no. 2B.97, pl. XLII no. 3B.45, and pl. XLV no. 3B.86.

¹³⁴ Pierpont Morgan Library Collections. Published: Porada 1948, no. 388.

¹³⁵ See Chapter 2, pp. 44-45.

¹³⁶ Privitera 2011, 175 and 183.

goddess while a clothed figure stands behind. Luigi Savignoni calls it a dog-headed demon, or jackal, which were commonly used in Hittite and Egyptian art as intermediaries between the gods and humans.¹³⁷ Additionally, there are clear compositional and iconographical similarities between the simians featured on the Babylonian seals mentioned above and the creature depicted here, but why is this?

Since elite Bronze Age graves, such as those at Kolonna, Pylos, and Mycenae, contain evidence of overseas contact, trade, and imitation, they could explain how the simian first entered Greece, as well as why the motif continues to appear in Greek art hundreds of years later: Bronze Age objects, of both local and foreign origin, were often found in Iron Age and Geometric contexts as heirlooms,¹³⁸ likely *without* original meanings attached. Thus, the eventual burial of such objects could speak to their apotropaic significance; and as sanctified emblems associated with divine forces, they may have protected the deceased after death, just as dwarf and old nurse figurines do later in the Archaic and Classical Periods.

Other Babylonian seals distinctly feature monkeys as secondary elements in larger narrative contexts. One example appears on a 2nd millennium BCE alabaster cylinder seal from Geoy Tepe, Iran (**Fig. 11**).¹³⁹ This scene depicts the sun god emerging from his temple at daybreak; beside him, bull-man attendants hold up gate posts. Behind one of these attendants, a small monkey squats atop a pillar or ledge. Richard Barnett believes the monkey's subtle presence shows that simians can "keep celestial company and be

¹³⁷ Savignoni 1972, 586.

¹³⁸ Wengrow 2011, 111.

¹³⁹ Metropolitan Museum 86.11.1. Published: Lehmann-Haupt 1907, fig. 3b; the full image was acquired from the Metropolitan Museum's website.

associated with the sun,”¹⁴⁰ just as they did in ancient Egypt. Another example, featured on a Neo-Babylonian faience seal (ca. late 7th/early 6th century BCE), features a repeated pattern: a stick-like monkey with a notched back. It plays a pipe¹⁴¹ or holds a ball¹⁴² and is interchanged with a goat or stag (**Fig. 12**).¹⁴³ A crescent shape, circles, and a star implies that the scene may have celestial and/or religious connotations.

Assyria

Since primates were not native to Mesopotamia, Assyrian kings¹⁴⁴ obtained monkeys and baboons from Egypt, Phoenicia (Byblos, Tyre, and Sidon), and North Syria.¹⁴⁵ As with Babylonian simians, scholars believe the grotesque appearance of Assyrian simians may have apotropaic significance¹⁴⁶ like many of the other mixed beings that originate here, such as Pazuzu or the lamasu. Since the Assyrians occupied, or were commercially connected to, Cyprus for a time in the 7th and 6th centuries BCE, it is thought they may have used the Phoenicians to spread goods, of both Assyrian and Cypriot origin, elsewhere in the Mediterranean, perhaps even as far west as Greece.¹⁴⁷

The objects of significance here are portable media, especially tablets, which feature sealings or reliefs of simians crouching within larger narratives. Their inclusion appears to be comedic or religious in nature, but in some circumstances, their purpose is

¹⁴⁰ Barnett 1973, p. 3.

¹⁴¹ Spycket 1998, 3. She compares the scene with one that appears on a seal in the Pierpont Morgan Collection (fig. 4).

¹⁴² The British Museum identifies the object as such.

¹⁴³ British Museum 1931, 1010.53. Published: Spycket 1998, fig. 3; see also fig. 5.

¹⁴⁴ For example, one Assyrian relief shows tributaries (Phoenicians, based on their costumes) bringing gift-monkeys to king Assur-nasir-apli (Rubuffat-Emmanuel 1967, 643).

¹⁴⁵ Monkeys were not native to Phoenicia or Syria either, so these peoples likely imported them from Egypt before exporting them elsewhere (Dunham 1985, 239).

¹⁴⁶ Van Buren 1930, xlviii.

¹⁴⁷ Reyes 1994, 52-55 and Karageorghis 2002, 152. Assyrian cylinder seals have been discovered on Crete and the Greek mainland among the other Mesopotamian imports (West 1995, 16-22).

not readily evident. Assyrian renditions of simians are not nearly as common as Babylonian ones, but their visual similarities with the Greek motifs are worth noting.

One sealing, found impressed on a 7th century BCE tablet from Nimrud, depicts two monkeys playing flutes; one wears a collar, implying he is domesticated (**Fig. 13**).¹⁴⁸ According to Agnes Spycket, the creatures are presented in human attitudes, which was a common theme in both the art of Early Dynastic Ur (Sumer) and Neo-Elamite Susa.¹⁴⁹ Interestingly, the only concrete written evidence we have for the meaning of these monkey-musicians comes from an Old Babylonian “scribal school curriculum”¹⁵⁰ called the “Monkey Letter:” in it, a young monkey writes to his mother that he is often very hungry, for he spends most of the day “sitting behind the door of the chief musician’s house.”¹⁵¹ Though brief, this narrative insinuates monkeys’ humorous connection with music¹⁵² and may reflect the actual use of monkeys in Mesopotamian entertainment.¹⁵³ Monkeys are connected with music in Greek literature as well, but with added elements of mockery, failure, and primitiveness.¹⁵⁴ Thus, even if the Greeks obtained this humorous connection from Mesopotamia, they altered the narrative to suit local beliefs.

Another tablet from Nimrud, this one Neo-Assyrian (ca. 8th-7th century BCE), features a monkey in relief (**Fig. 14**).¹⁵⁵ This small (10.49 x 5.59 cm), Phoenician-style plaque depicts the Egyptian lion-headed goddess Sekhmet. In front of her, a small monkey crouches on a lotus capital. Though the subject-matter is Egyptian, the style is

¹⁴⁸ Published: Spycket 1998, fig. 1. Dual simians also appear on a seal from Mochlos, Crete (Aruz 2008, fig. 100) and an Egyptianizing seal without provenance (Aruz 2008, fig. 101).

¹⁴⁹ Spycket 1998, 2 and figs. 2, 10, and 15.

¹⁵⁰ Dunham 1985, 245.

¹⁵¹ Spycket 1998, 10.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ Dunham 1985, 245.

¹⁵⁴ See “Ancient Sources” in Chapter 1.

¹⁵⁵ Metropolitan Museum 61.197.12. Published: Aruz 2014, 122 fig. 3.9.

not: there is no uraeus and sun disk on Sekhmet's head but rather a "crest" between her ears. Prudence Harper wonders if the sculptor confused the lioness with the dwarf-god Bes, who is frequently shown wearing a plumed headdress and is commonly associated with simians.¹⁵⁶ Alternatively, she wonders if the sculptor intended to represent a feathered headdress often worn by Egyptian goddesses and queens. Since Sekhmet was a goddess of war and the hunt, the monkey's presence in this image is not readily evident. Perhaps, if Bes was used as a model for the goddess, the sculptor used an image that included simians.

Elam

The Elamites were not part of the region known as "Mesopotamia;" rather, they were one of several groups inhabiting southwestern Iran between the Bronze Age and Early Islamic eras. Occasionally, they were under Mesopotamian control, while other dynasties arose in the regions of modern-day Fars, Khuzistan, and southern Luristan.¹⁵⁷ Though Elam was a longtime-adversary of Babylon, Assyria, and Akkad, they spoke a variety of Ancient Near Eastern languages, including Elamite, Sumerian, and Akkadian.¹⁵⁸ Moreover, they were in close contact with the Ur III state in the 21st century BCE,¹⁵⁹ and there is evidence that Mesopotamian deities, many of whom relate to the storm-god Adad, were worshipped at the Elamite city of Susa.¹⁶⁰ Other connections are visible in their art, particularly images carved on cylinder seals, which feature cramped

¹⁵⁶ Harper 1971, 323.

¹⁵⁷ Potts 2012, 37.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ This contact occurred until there was a shift in power dynamics, and the "stupid monkey in the foreign land struck against Ibni-Sin, the king of Ur" in 2004 BCE (ibid., 41-42). Obviously, monkeys had comical, rather than sacred, implications in Elam.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 48.

compositions comprised of Mesopotamian and Elamite deities, kings, warriors, animals, and plant motifs.

Though the monkey is not prominent in Elamite religion and culture,¹⁶¹ it does appear on a variety of portable cylinder seals in a manner akin to those made by Mesopotamians: as secondary elements within larger narratives, but their purpose is not readily evident. One rather complex example dates to 2500 BCE and was discovered on a door sealing from Susa (**Fig. 15**).¹⁶² The scene is comprised of battling warriors and creatures, both Mesopotamian and Elamite.¹⁶³ Among the chaos, a lone monkey plays a flute. He is isolated from the main narrative, seemingly acting as filler, a composition also popular on cylinder seals from Babylon,¹⁶⁴ Neo-Assyria,¹⁶⁵ Cappadocia,¹⁶⁶ Syria,¹⁶⁷ and Mittania.¹⁶⁸

In ancient Mesopotamia and Elam, sealings were sometimes used to seal doors, like storerooms, for bureaucratic, political, and economic purposes.¹⁶⁹ The presence of powerful warriors and a sacred monkey on the Susa example, however, could imply the seal was protective as well, which is how many functioned in Bronze Age Greece.¹⁷⁰ It is unclear whether the Minoans applied seals to doorways, but later Greeks and Romans fastened objects to and performed rituals before thresholds to protect rooms and houses from malevolent demons, which were believed to reside in liminal spaces like

¹⁶¹ Aruz, Harper, and Tallon 1992, 97.

¹⁶² Louvre Museum. Published: Porada 1965, p. 38, fig. 13

¹⁶³ Amiet 1986, 128.

¹⁶⁴ See Dunham figs. 3-6 and Porada 1948, pl. LI nos. 351-353 and pl. LXVII no. 480; see Aruz, Harper, and Tallon 1992, 157 no. 104; and Buchanan 1966, pl. 34 no. 489 and pl. 36 no. 534.

¹⁶⁵ See Porada 1948, pl. CXIII no. 752.

¹⁶⁶ See *ibid.*, pl. CXXXV no. 895 and pl. CXXXVII no. 906E.

¹⁶⁷ See *ibid.*, pl. CXXXVIII no. 917 and pl. CXLVI no. 968.

¹⁶⁸ See *ibid.*, pl. CLVI no. 1025E.

¹⁶⁹ Pollock 1999, 159.

¹⁷⁰ See Chapter 2, p. 46-47.

doorways.¹⁷¹ Though there is no evidence that the Greeks applied simians to doorways for protective purposes, they do place them in marginalized locations on other objects. I discuss the significance of this phenomenon further in Chapter 4.

A slightly later green stone seal (ca. 2000-1500 BCE), which is now in a private collection, is poorly preserved but no less intriguing: a seated figure receives offerings from suplicants while a monkey crouches on a pillar on the far right (**Fig. 16**).¹⁷² The scene contains Babylonian and Elamite elements, which again speaks to the close contact between these neighboring cultures. Moreover, the monkey's location atop a pillar also appears on the Babylonian seal from Geoy Tepe mentioned earlier (see **Fig. 11**). Though the green stone seal has been published twice, neither scholar bothered to explain the monkey's presence.¹⁷³ Perhaps, since it is not making a gesture of worship, it could be a gift for, or a pet belonging to, the seated figure.

Some Elamite seals depict simianesque creatures as well. For example, one cylinder seal from Chogha Zanbil, ca. 13th century BCE, features a strange, anthropoid creature of uncertain identification (**Fig. 17**).¹⁷⁴ The scene features a worshipper and his servant who fans him. Between the chair of the master and the legs of the servant crouches a little "goblin, more human than ape-like," which, according to Porada, is a

¹⁷¹ For example, in ancient Greece, Athenians anointed their doors with pitch and "chewed buckhorn" (a plant used to repel malicious magical arts) during the Anthesteria to protect pregnant mothers and newborn children from roaming spirits. Similarly, in ancient Rome, doorposts and thresholds were struck with branches of the arbutus tree to keep the carnivorous *striges* at bay (Ovid *Fasti*, 6.155) while frogs were hung to protect grain (Pliny *Natural History*, 28.142). Finally, according to Pliny (*Natural History* 28.85), nails were taken from graves and pounded into thresholds to protect against "night frenzies" and spells cast by magi. For more information on threshold protections, see Ogle 1911, 255-256.

¹⁷² Private Collection. Published: Ascalone 2011, 318 no. 3B.240 and Seidl 1990, 133 fig. 2.

¹⁷³ Ibid.

¹⁷⁴ Louvre Museum. Published: Porada 1948, 48 fig. 23.

common motif found on Elamite Seals.¹⁷⁵ The creature may function as the floating monkey does on Mesopotamian seals; however its cramped location and complete disconnect from the larger narrative could also imply that it is mere filler, like the diamond shape between the seated figure and the one standing on the left.

Numerous Babylonian, Assyrian, and Elamite seals have been discovered at Greek sanctuaries (like the Heraion at Samos),¹⁷⁶ on Crete, and the Greek mainland.¹⁷⁷ Thus, it seems very likely that the isolated monkey motif, as it appears in Geometric, Archaic, and Classical art, may have been transferred to Greece via these portable objects. Since there are Bronze Age Cretan seals that portray dog-headed baboons in adoring poses (**Cat. 1.1**), it is likely that the creature's original meaning, like that of Tawert, was transferred to the island with its image. Monkey and simianesque motifs that appear on the mainland at a much later date, however, are not featured in religious scenes, nor do they evoke a sense of reverence and respect for the divinities and people that surround them in larger narratives. Rather, it seems the Greeks developed their own opinions about the simian and utilized it in new ways, unique to Greece, which is also what we see in Elamite art as well: the compositions are similar, but the religious implications are absent.

PHOENICIA

The Phoenicians comprised a group of maritime traders, rather than a concrete country,¹⁷⁸ with major cities in Tyre, Sidon, Byblos, and Arwad. These cities first emerged ca. 1500 BCE, and continued, relatively uninfluenced by internal and external

¹⁷⁵ Porada 1965, 48. For a similar Luristan example of a crouching, tailless "goblin" from Teheran, see Porada 78, fig. 49.

¹⁷⁶ Collon 1990, 30.

¹⁷⁷ West 1995, 16-22 and examples 1-6.

¹⁷⁸ Markoe 2000, 11.

forces, until the Hellenistic Period (ca. 300 BCE).¹⁷⁹ They were largely responsible for the transportation of goods around the ancient Mediterranean, including Mesopotamia, Anatolia, Cyprus, Egypt, Crete, and Greece.¹⁸⁰ Their contact with mainland Greece and Crete, in particular, was facilitated by Greek trading settlements in coastal Turkey, Egypt, and the Levant¹⁸¹ and by Phoenician posts on Cyprus through which many goods travelled before heading westward.¹⁸² That is not to say that the Phoenicians were exclusively responsible for trade in these parts, for many of the foreign dedications at Greek sanctuaries were transported to the Aegean world by both Phoenician and Greek merchants.¹⁸³

As with Mesopotamia, monkeys and baboons were not native to the Levant. The Phoenicians likely imported them from India, both for local use and trade around the Mediterranean.¹⁸⁴ They represent the creature on a variety of portable objects, some of which have appeared in Greek locales.¹⁸⁵ As with Mesopotamian and Elamite motifs, Phoenician simians are rendered as seemingly minor elements within larger compositions. However, the added presence of Egyptian and Mesopotamian religious symbolisms within these scenes, like the crescent moon, implies the Phoenicians adopted reverent sentiments about these creatures along with their image.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

¹⁸⁰ Simian art has been found in all of these locations.

¹⁸¹ Gunter 2009, 128.

¹⁸² For example: the Phoenicians founded an *emporium* at Kition, a pre-established Cypriot town, likely in search of natural resources and protection from the infringing Assyrians, before expanding westward (Karageorghis 2002, 144). This seems to imply that, for them, Cyprus functioned as a good basecamp between the East and West.

¹⁸³ Boardman 1999, 35-54; Coldstream 2003, chap. 15; Braun 1982, 1-14; Sherratt and Sherratt 1993, 361-378; and Gunter 2009, 128. See also Langdon 1990, 419 and Greenlaw 2011, 59.

¹⁸⁴ Karageorghis 1994, 64.

¹⁸⁵ Syrian cylinder seals have been found on Crete and the mainland (West 1995, 16-22).

One of the objects in question is a Syrian cylinder seal, which dates between the 19th and 17th centuries BCE (**Fig. 18**).¹⁸⁶ It features two gods: one holds a mace, while the other wields a saw. Both face a prayerful goddess, whom they may be worshipping. A star, crescent, and simian, perhaps a baboon, fill the spaces between the figures, while griffins and sphinxes line the outer edges, as is common in both Mesopotamian and Greek imagery. The star and crescent shapes imply these creatures likely functioned as astral embodiments of the divine, for the crescent in particular is symbolic of the Egyptian moon god, with whom baboons were related.¹⁸⁷

A more chaotic scene, featured on an obsidian seal (ca. 1800 BCE), depicts a combination of Egyptian and Syrian motifs: hawks, monkeys, a sphinx, a young Horus, and the lotus pattern are Egyptian, while the guilloche and segmented animals and birds are typical of Syrian art (**Fig. 19**).¹⁸⁸ The seal is inscribed with the owner's name: Iaush-Addu, King of Buzuran, a city near Mari on the Euphrates. As the seal contains royal imagery—*e.g.* a crowned sphinx trampling enemies and pony-tailed youths indicative of heirs—and since it is made of precious obsidian, it may have been intended as an imperial gift, for other seals inscribed with the king's name have been discovered in Cyprus, Crete, and Carthage.¹⁸⁹ The simians could be religious in nature because the scene does contain a crescent moon, though they could also imply wealth and prosperity as entities of large menageries.

A third example, which emerged from a royal tomb in Qatna, features various human figures, bearded heads of heroes, crouching animals (*e.g.* lions, birds, sphinxes),

¹⁸⁶ Pierpont Morgan Library Collections. Published: Porada 1948, no. 930.

¹⁸⁷ *Supra* n. 16.

¹⁸⁸ Johnathan P. Rosen Collection, NY. Published: Collon 1990, 36 fig. 23.

¹⁸⁹ Tiessier 1996, 26 no. 136.

and symbols representing divine entities (**Fig. 20**).¹⁹⁰ Among these images, a small, solitary monkey crouches above a series of crescents. The 18 symbols and 73 images presented here do not appear to convey a unified message: Peter Pfälzner, for example, believes the scene is mainly decorative.¹⁹¹ The presence of the moon god's crescents in line with the singular monkey, however, could infer an underlying religious significance, as there are numerous Mesopotamian seals, which feature monkeys amongst divine symbolisms as well (see **Figs. 9, 11 and 14**).¹⁹²

CYPRUS

Cyprus is known not only for their artistic prowess, but also the melting-pot of cultures that resided there, among them Greek speakers, Phoenician West-Semitic speakers, Assyrians, and Eteocypriots (the aboriginal population whose origins and language are unclear).¹⁹³ Though open to outside influences, the Cypriots were selective in what they adopted and imitated from other cultures, “borrow[ing], modif[y]ing, and reject[ing] outside ideas, customs, and artifacts on the basis of what might work best in their context.”¹⁹⁴ It is this very hybridity, or the island's desire to harmonize aspects from varying outside forces, that characterizes Cypriot tradition, for their art shows evidence of Western Greek, Phoenician, Egyptian, Assyrian, and southern Levantine influence.¹⁹⁵ In

¹⁹⁰ Damascus National Museum MSH02G-i1976. Published: Pfälzner 2008, 228 no. 138.

¹⁹¹ Pfälzner 2008, 228.

¹⁹² See also Porada 1948, no. 903; Buchanan 1966, pl. 56, no. 905; Collon 1986, pl. 33 no. 465 and pl. 34 no. 476; Collon 1990, 57 fig. 43; and Ascalone 2011, pl. XXX no. 2B.11 and pl. XXXV no. 2B.88. Two additional examples feature small, squatting, simian-like creatures that Porada (1948, nos. 902 and 917E) calls “manikins,” or small people.

¹⁹³ Whitley 2014, 5622-5627.

¹⁹⁴ Counts *et al.* 2011, 1.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

other words, “they functioned as a filter for foreign practices that passed through their island, removing, modifying, and reassigning many elements.”¹⁹⁶

To the Cypriots, simians, along with lions, referenced a “non-domestic” or “exotic” realm, apart from their own.¹⁹⁷ This may be why simians are not common in Cypriot art: some motifs found on the island were made by the Cypriots themselves, but others suggest Egyptian and Phoenician influence and/or craftsmanship. As with the Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Phoenician examples discussed earlier, the objects featured here are all portable and depict simians in marginalized locations with respect to main narratives.

One of the objects in question, a hematite seal from the Late Bronze Age Tomb 9/205 at Kition, was heavily influenced by Egyptian art, both in terms of subject and style¹⁹⁸—to the extent that it may have been crafted by an Egyptian working on the island (**Fig. 21**).¹⁹⁹ The scene depicted on the seal features two kingly figures with a Seth animal between them. In the panel to the right, two monkeys with bent knees flank a tree below two kneeling figures. Porada dates the seal to the 19th Dynasty (ca. first half of the 13th century BCE) based on Egyptian scarabs that emerge from the same era which feature monkeys in and around trees.²⁰⁰ Interestingly, standing monkeys in Greek art often feature bent knees as well (**Cat. 3.17** and **4.1-2**).²⁰¹

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 2.

¹⁹⁷ Shapland 2010, 113 and 123.

¹⁹⁸ Porada 1974, 164.

¹⁹⁹ Published: *ibid.*, fig. 1.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 164.

²⁰¹ See Chapter 4, pp. 166-167.

Another pertinent example, a silver bowl, hybridizes Cypriot and Phoenician styles and themes (**Fig. 22**).²⁰² It was likely made from by a Phoenician craftsman living on the island.²⁰³ This vessel comes from the Bernardini Tomb in the Colombella Necropolis at Praeneste: one of many Italic contexts where Phoenician metal bowls have been unearthed.²⁰⁴ The 7th century BCE silver bowl in question features the "Ape Hunt" legend, otherwise known as "Hunter's Day":²⁰⁵ a simianesque creature attacks a prince while he prepares a sacrifice for a goddess, who ultimately slays the animal to protect her suppliant. Since the scene is not represented in any known literature, it is thought to depict a Greek song from Cyprus²⁰⁶ or an ancient Syrian or Phoenician mythological legend now lost.²⁰⁷ Alternative theories claim that such scenes feature a "cosmic journey," or a hero's journey around the universe.²⁰⁸

There are also numerous theories regarding the identity of the hairy creature that attacks the prince: Peter Blome, for example, calls it an apish, stone-throwing caveman.²⁰⁹ Similarly, Antoine Hermary calls it a monster-gorilla hybrid,²¹⁰ but Greenlaw notes that the Cypriot peoples would not have been in contact with such primates.²¹¹ The vessel was likely created by a Cypriot or Phoenician who had never before seen a baboon but was aware of its similarities to humans, for the creature

²⁰² Villa Giulia N61565. Published: Markoe 1985, 279 E2 and Sannibale 2014, 322 no. 192. A similar, less-preserved example comes from Kourion (see Markoe 1985 Cy7).

²⁰³ Markoe 1985, 67.

²⁰⁴ Markoe 1985, 127-148.

²⁰⁵ Guterbrock 1957, 70. Conversely, Barnett (1969) believes the scenes relates to the legend of Melquart the Hunter, a Tyrian god associated with Herakles.

²⁰⁶ Burkert 1995, 104.

²⁰⁷ Barnett 1977, 169 and Markoe 1985, 68.

²⁰⁸ Bonnet 1988, 330 and 340 and Marinatos 2001, 381-416.

²⁰⁹ Blome 1985, 576.

²¹⁰ Hermary 1992, 133-136.

²¹¹ Greenlaw 2011, 61.

resembles a cross between the two species: it has a hairy body and face, like baboons, and an upright posture, like humans.

Blome additionally notes that these ill-rendered simians share uncanny similarities with the hairy creature featured on the contemporaneous Proto-attic Oresteia krater (**Cat. 7.1**): they all have hairy bodies, tufts of fur hanging from the neck/chin (he incorrectly identifies these as beards), and they all hold, what he believes are, stones in their hands as potential weapons;²¹² I think the human-baboon hybrid could alternatively be throwing excrement.²¹³ Beginning in the 9th century, Syro-Phoenician bowls were imported into Attica. Many have been uncovered in the Kerameikos cemetery and feature parading animals reminiscent of the Praeneste hunting scene, such as fawns, hares, cows, and lions.²¹⁴ This connection provides some of the best evidence for simians' importation into Greece by the Phoenicians, potentially through Cyprus.

Some Cyprio-Archaic ceramics, made by the islanders themselves, have also yielded simianesque imagery. One example is depicted on a small pitcher, which dates to the White Painted IV period (ca. 700-600 BCE).²¹⁵ Opposite the handle, the vessel features a lone creature rendered as ithyphallic and standing (**Fig. 23**).²¹⁶ It extends both arms forward and appears to be wearing a bonnet or helmet of some sort. Vassos Karageorghis and Jean des Gagniers think the creature may be a man or monkey,²¹⁷ though they do not attempt to explore the origins of the iconography. Without a head, it is

²¹² Blome 1985, 576.

²¹³ See Chapter 4, pp. 172-173.

²¹⁴ Blome 1985, 577-578.

²¹⁵ Karageorghis and Gagnier 1979, 28.

²¹⁶ Cyprus Museum 1961/XII-9/8. Published: Karageorghis and Gagniers 1979, 28 no. SIX.2.

²¹⁷ Karageorghis and Gagnier 1979, 28.

difficult to confirm if the creature is simian, but its gangly, seemingly hairy limbs are certainly reminiscent of an monkey-like creature.

A contemporaneous creature with a similar, monkey-like form was discovered in Aetos, in Ithaca (**Fig. 24**):²¹⁸ thought to be locally-made,²¹⁹ the 7th century BCE fragment features a headless, nude, hairy creature, which stands upright with its palms facing upwards. Aetos' excavators believe the fragment depicts a "lion with curling tail," but the feet and joints face in the wrong direction for this to be true. When compared to the Cypriot vase discussed above, the creature is likely simian in nature, perhaps a baboon. The closest Greek parallels are late Classical depictions of the demoness Lamia (**Cat. 8.2**), but without larger narrative contexts for either image, it is difficult to identify both the Cypriot and Greek figures as such. Moreover, Aetos' link with Cyprus is not readily evident, though both islands were in regular contact with Pithekoussai, perhaps through Euboea.²²⁰

As previously stated, Cyprus was a commercial command center within the larger Mediterranean. Their craftsmen often interpreted, adapted, and adopted Egyptian and Eastern motifs as they saw fit. Thus, they inadvertently determined how these popular images appeared to audiences not in direct contact with their cultures of origin. That said, simian imagery, of the sort relevant to this study, is scarce on Cyprus: the Cypriots made simian and simianesque images of their own, but if they were not buried on the island, as with the Kition seal, they were usually sent elsewhere, like the Praeneste bowl. Thus, it seems probable that the Cypriots did not find a use for simians, or wish to utilize their

²¹⁸ Published: Robertson and Heurtley 1948, pl. 23 no. 381 (image source). In this excavation record, the fragment is paired with a second one, which features a swirl pattern and geometric shapes, but I fail to see how they connect iconographically.

²¹⁹ Payne 1933, 282-283 and Robertson and Heurtley 1948, 111.

²²⁰ See Coldstream 1994, 77-86.

image as the Egyptians and Mesopotamians did. Rather, they allowed for the transfer of simian motifs across the Mediterranean and eventually into Greece.

ANATOLIA

Due to its centralized location in the eastern Mediterranean, non-Greek Anatolia's art, culture, and religion share many similarities with those of Mesopotamia, Elam, Cyprus, Crete, and Egypt. This hybridity most clearly manifests in its cylinder seals which often depict a variety of Mesopotamian divinities performing an action, processing, or being worshipped; in the latter case, they are offered food and/or drink.²²¹ Among these ritualistic scenes are background motifs which include celestial ornamentation, like the Egyptian sun disc and moon crescent, and various animals, like birds, fish, quadrupeds, and seated monkeys who raise their forepaws in reverence of the storm god. These "monkeys" resemble the crouching "mongoose" that appears on Syrian and Old-Babylonian cylinder seals.²²² We also see Minoan genii, like Taweret, carrying branches and other cultic implements.²²³ Is important to note, despite these numerous crossovers, the Anatolian seal designers did not simply copy the simian images they imported but blended them with local themes and iconographies to create original compositions.

Two sealings, which come from Kanesh/Kültepe, illustrate this fusion of Mediterranean cultures well. The first was found imprinted on a 20th century BCE cuneiform tablet, now in the Metropolitan Museum (**Fig. 25**).²²⁴ This tablet features four scenes: the top portion depicts a procession of figures presenting offerings to a large,

²²¹ Mellink 1987, 65.

²²² Ibid., 66.

²²³ Ibid., 71-72.

²²⁴ Metropolitan Museum 66.245.16b. Published: Spar 1988, pl. 132, seal 57 and Larsen 2008, 74-75 no. 37b.

seated figure. Between the last two figures, an anthropomorphic creature, perhaps a monkey, crouches with a vessel; it wears a crown or has tufts of fur emerging from the top of its head. The creature is very similar to crouching, suppliant monkeys that appear on other Anatolian seals.²²⁵ Neither source that publishes this object,²²⁶ nor the Metropolitan Museum's website, provides suggestions for what this creature may represent or why it was rendered in this scene. Since the creature is not unique but appears on other cuneiform tablets,²²⁷ it seems possible that it functions as a suppliant filler image, as it does on other Anatolian, Mesopotamian, and Elamite seal and sealings.

The other Kanesh/Kültepe example is featured on a 20th century BCE cylinder seal, which emerged from Anatolia's Karum II period, when Assyrian traders (*karum*) established trading posts throughout the territory (**Fig. 26**).²²⁸ The scene depicts two seated monkeys as subsidiary worshippers of a tall, frontal figure. These monkeys share affinities with the suppliant simians that appear on Mesopotamian cylinder seals of the same period.²²⁹ Nimet Özguç notes that though the monkey is not definitively associated with a god, it appears primarily in divine settings, especially with weather and water gods.²³⁰ Machteld Mellink, however, believes that these mongoose-looking simians have sacred connotations, functioning as magical attendants that mimic human ritual bearers (like priests and kings). They may also function as bulls and lions do in Elamite art, adding "animal potency to the action they perform while warding off evil from the human

²²⁵ See *ibid.*, 66-68 for examples.

²²⁶ *Supra* n. 224.

²²⁷ For similar examples of crouching creatures on 3rd/2nd millennium BCE cuneiform tablets, see Spar 1988, pl. 129 seal 32 (monkey), pl. 131 seal 52 (an anthropomorphic creature), and pl. 132 seal 58 (perhaps a monkey).

²²⁸ Published: Özguç 1965, pl. 1.1.

²²⁹ Mellink 1987, p. 65.

²³⁰ Özguç 1965, 74.

being they stand for.”²³¹ Though animals, simians inhabit the realm of the demonic and monstrous because they “perform unnatural or supernatural roles.”²³² This seems potent because these seals also contained elements of the Minoan Genius. However, whether the meaning of these creatures (*i.e.* supernatural and protective attendants) traveled with these objects is unclear, though there is evidence to suggest that marginalized, Greek-made simians of the Archaic and Classical periods have apotropaic connotations.²³³

CONCLUSION

Scholars have always known that Egypt and the Near East heavily influenced Greek art from the Bronze Age to the Hellenistic Period.²³⁴ As a popular eastern motif, it seems obvious that simians were among the many deities, animals, and monsters that were borrowed by Greek craftsmen. Scholars, however, have never attempted to compare the iconography of Greek marginalized simians with specific Eastern examples; and that is precisely what I have attempted to do here. I wanted to know whether the meaning of these sanctified creatures travelled with their image; and though I think the Phoenicians and Anatolians adopted both image and meaning, the Greeks, like Elam and Cyprus, did not.

The objects discussed in this chapter are significant in three ways: 1) all come from regions in direct or indirect contact with Greece (*i.e.* Egypt, Mesopotamia, Elam, Phoenicia, Cyprus and Anatolia), 2) all are portable (with the exception of the Egyptian tomb scenes), and 3) all feature monkeys, baboons, mongooses, and simianesque creatures as secondary elements within larger narratives and/or with iconographies that

²³¹ Mellink 1987, 67.

²³² Ibid.

²³³ See Chapter 4 for more details.

²³⁴ See Chapter 1, pp. 28-30.

closely mirror the Greek motifs. To an untrained eye, their inclusion seems haphazard, but the majority has larger religious connotations, including king-worship (*e.g.* **Figs. 17-19**) and celestial symbolisms (*e.g.* **Figs. 9, 12, 20, and 26**). Additionally, certain motifs—such as the simians crouching beneath chairs in Egyptian tomb paintings (**Fig. 2**), Bes figurines (**Fig. 3**), the Egyptianizing scarab with baboon (**Fig. 5**), the Babylonian dog-headed worshipper baboons (**Fig. 9**), the baboons on the Cyprio-Phoenician bowl (**Fig. 22**), the simianesque creature on the Cypriot fragment (**Fig. 23**), and the standing monkeys on the Kition seal (**Fig. 21**)—have direct and indirect parallels in Greek art (**Cat. 1.2, 2.1, 3.2, 3.4-6, 4.1-2, 7.1-2, 7.4-7 and Fig. 24**) and connections with specific Greek locales, like Aegina, Kerameikos, Samos, and Aetos.

Though Greek craftsmen followed the Eastern habit of squeezing monkeys and simianesque creatures into larger narratives, their inclusion is not religious in nature, like the worshipping simians and mongooses on Mesopotamian and Anatolian cylinder seals. Rather, their relation to the scenes they inhabit is more ambiguous and enigmatic. As a creature unfamiliar to the ancient Mediterranean, Archaic and Classical representations of monkey and simianesque motifs were infused with new forms and functions specific to ancient Greek modes of thought; they were not, as many scholars claim, simply elements of *horror vacui*. But what, then, were they meant to represent and for what purpose were they added to the margins of narratives?

Before the visual meaning of the Greek motifs can be inferred, it is necessary to discern where the monkey was believed to exist in the realm of Greek thought: was it simply an animal or did its human behaviors and physical traits confuse the matter? Chapter 4 explores alternate Greek categories of being and their contexts: monsters

(myth), personifications (abstract), and demons (folklore). Interestingly, all of these categories overlap, in some capacity, with apotropaia. Thus, I will also explore various forms of protective devices (*e.g.* amulets and humor) and the invisible hazards they fight against (*e.g.* the evil eye and envy). My goal is to explore how monkey and simianesque imagery was used and viewed in Greek visual contexts, as compared to their origins in the East.

CHAPTER FOUR: INTERPRETATION OF THE GREEK MONKEY AND SIMIANESQUE MATERIAL

As I have demonstrated, monkey and simianesque imagery appears somewhat frequently between the 9th and 4th centuries BCE. Unlike the religion-infused simian art of Mesopotamia and Egypt, the precise meaning of the Greek motifs is not readily evident. The negative sentiments about simians, as expressed by Greek authors, as well as the unassuming size and location of many of the motifs only confuse the issue. As a result, many scholars dismiss monkey and simianesque imagery as ornamental flourishes, filler devices, and/or humorous interpolations.¹ These assumptions, however, fail to explain why these creature-motifs share two distinct similarities across space (Greece and Italy) and time (the Geometric, Archaic, and Classical Periods): **iconographic inconsistency** and **marginalization**.

Iconographic inconsistency is the erratic representation of a repeated image; the non-canonical condition of such images makes them difficult to spot, identify, and interpret. Greek depictions of human figures, monsters, and animals are normally consistent enough to enable viewers to clearly identify what they are seeing. Horses, for example, are usually painted black; have long, slender bodies with mane, tails, hooves, and snouts; and are harnessed to chariots, ridden by people, and/or adorn amphoras in truncated form. Even Geometric depictions of horses, though simple, were visually and contextually consistent enough to prevent confusion. Conversely, monkey and simianesque imagery assumes many physical forms and features (*e.g.* human, simian, and dog), postures (*e.g.* standing, crouching, and sitting), gestures (*e.g.* pointing, flashing the

¹ See Chapter 1, n. 6.

middle finger, and waving), and attributes (*e.g.* sistrum, stick, and rope). They also seem out of place within their visual contexts, which shift as well. No two images are alike, which implies they were not solidified in Greek thought and myth to the same extent as local animals,² like the horse, or even monsters, like the centaur. Rather, they align with folkloric creatures like Lamia, whose forms constantly shift from one image to the next.

Though simians' lack of iconographic conventions is not significant on its own, the second similarity they share, in addition to inconsistency, helps solidify their significance: marginalization. In the Medieval era, the margin was viewed as "an edge, [or] a border; that part of a surface which lies immediately within its boundary, esp[ecially] when in some way marked off or distinguished from the rest of the surface."³ It was regarded, as Kathryn Smith explains, "as a zone of structural, semantic, or esthetic significance, and as integral to the entity in which it formed a part."⁴ In the 20th century, the term "marginal" also referred to an "individual or group, isolated from the dominant society or culture, whether in perception or actuality, and at a disadvantage with respect to status and resources or even persecuted."⁵ This includes the sociological concept of the "marginal man," who "belong[s] partly to two differing social groups or cultures" yet is "not fully integrated into either;" he is thus "uncertain and fluctuating."⁶

² To an ancient Greek, simians were unlike domesticated farm animals (*e.g.* horses), pets (*e.g.* cats and dogs), hunters (*e.g.* panthers, lions, bears, and wolves), and/or wild creatures that often functioned as *horror vacui* (*e.g.* birds, rabbits, stags, fish, goats, and dolphins) (Hurwit 2006, 128). Such faunae were consistently and frequently represented from the Bronze Age to the Hellenistic Period, likely due to their accessibility: they were integrated into Greek culture in many visible and public ways, such as religion, art, and domestic life (MacKinnon 2014, 156-179). Simians, on the other hand, were rare and exotic and feature inconsistent iconographies.

³ *OED*, s.v. *margin*, 1.a, as cited in Smith 2012, 30.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *OED*, s.v. *margin*, 5.1, as cited in *ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, 31.

Though both of these definitions stem from cultures that post-date ancient Greece, I believe they relate to the motifs in question based on the marginalizing ways monkeys and simianesque creatures are described in texts (*e.g.* stupid, ugly, comedic, and primitive) and appear in larger narratives: *i.e.* they are isolated from, and thus subordinate to, the main characters and stories they appear alongside (*e.g.* relegated to enclosed frames, space beneath handles and between legs, and subsidiary ornamentation) and/or made to look physically ugly (*e.g.* hairy, gangly, nude), ambiguous (*i.e.* they blur the line between human and animal), and ridiculous (*e.g.* many poorly imitate human behaviors or perform obscene gestures). More importantly, their repeated presence implies they are integral parts of the seemingly unrelated narratives that house them. They are *not* meaningless filler.

Based on the consistent marginalization and inconsistent representation of monkeys and simianesque creatures in pictorial Greek art, the aim of this chapter is two-fold: 1) to analyze the forms of these creatures to discern what they are supposed to represent (*i.e.* monster, personification, or demon), and 2) discern how they were meant to function in Greek decorative systems by analyzing their appearance, the locations where they normally occur in larger narratives, and their humorous potential.

FORM

As Greek texts imply, simians were not viewed as typical animals, like the dog and bear, but rather as primitive, humanlike creatures. How, then, did the Greeks categorize them among their various concepts of being? The classifications I have chosen to discuss below reside in various realms of Greek thought (myth, abstraction, and folklore) and, as stated in Chapter 1, were selected based on the visual idiosyncrasies they

share with monkeys and simianesque creatures: many have inconsistent iconographies and are usually separate and/or secondary to well-established characters (*e.g.* Herakles) and narratives (*e.g.* the Birth of Athena). As I will demonstrate below, monkey and simianesque motifs are unlikely to have embodied mythical monsters or abstract personifications, but their physical appearance and visual contexts align quite well with folkloric demons: both are iconographically inconsistent and represented in marginalizing ways.

Monsters

The Greeks had numerous words to denote monstrous beings: *teras* (Latin *monstrum*)⁷ was their basic word for “monster,” “prodigy,” or “unnatural being,” but additional words were used to describe their otherness as well, including *pelor* (bulk), *diphues* (dual nature or form), *hemibrotos* (half man), *mixother/mixotheros* (part/mixed beast), and the Late Antique word *mixanthropos* (human-animal hybrids), which was used especially in relation to centaurs.⁸ As hybrid entities with multiple human and/or animal parts, monsters were thus equivalent to “lesser deities” and “symbolic” entities.⁹ Similarly, the Greek *teras* encompassed a variety of meanings, from “human beings with abnormal formation,”¹⁰ to animal composites, to human-animal hybrids, most of which resided in the mythological sphere. Of these categories, only abnormal, or deformed, humans share similarities with simians, but this is only because some were confused with baboons.

⁷ The Latin root implies that monsters were viewed as facsimiles of calamity, or “portentous signs and evil omens” (Weingarten 2011, 134).

⁸ Aston 2011, 12-14.

⁹ Ibid., 16.

¹⁰ Lenfant 1999, 198.

Deformed humans were deemed monstrous because they lack familial resemblances or “deviate[d] from the characteristics of their species;”¹¹ and, as both Plato (*Cratylus* 394a) and Aristotle (*Generation of Animals* 769^b8 and 770^b5) have argued, they more closely resemble animals than humans. “Monstrous people” were classified in two ways: Greeks born with deformities and non-Greeks living in transgressive, fringe societies that often possessed strange physical characteristics. The latter group, believed to reside on the margins of the known world in locations like Scythia and India, is most relevant here, for fringe peoples were believed to be monstrous in both appearance and behavior, which Greek writers attribute to their extreme distance from the civilized city states of Greece.¹²

Prior to Hellenistic and Roman descriptions of “dog-headed” and “dog-faced” creatures,¹³ the 5th century BCE historians Herodotus and Ctesias describe dog-headed men, or *cenocephaloi*, of the Far East. For example, Herodotus (*Histories* 4.191) mentions dog-heads among a list of fantastic *human* races:

It is here that the huge snakes are found—and lions, elephants, bears, asps, and horned asses, not to mention dog-headed men, headless men with eyes in their breasts (I merely repeat what the Libyans say), wild men and women, and a great many other creatures by no means of a fabulous kind.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² This phenomenon is illustrated most clearly in medieval cartography. On such maps, monstrous peoples are depicted nude and/or perform barbaric acts, have deformed or animalistic body parts, and are confined to the margins, particularly regions labeled Ethiopia and Scythia. Medieval Europeans believed that the edges were the “limits of God’s creation,” which made them dangerous not only in terms of liminal geography and temporal extremes, but also because of the (presumed) monsters residing there (Camille 1992, 14). We see this kind of marginalization occur in manuscript illumination as well: here, exotic, monstrous peoples are enclosed in registers or frames (as with the Oresteia krater [Cat. 7.1]), isolated in borders, frontally-inclined (like apotropaic Greek monsters), and/or hovering in a desolate landscape (Friedman 1981, 132). Monkeys are represented as marginalia in manuscript illumination as well (see Janson 1952, pl. XIIa for an example).

¹³ See p. 178-179 below and Aelian, *On the Nature of Animals* (4.46 and 10.30).

Ctesias, in his *Indica* (F45), goes into more detail about the dog-heads that reside in the mountains of India, describing them as if they were a tribe of wild people:

...in these mountains live men who have the head of a dog. Their clothes come from wild animals and they converse not with speech, but by howling like dogs, and this is how they understand each other. They have larger teeth than dogs and claws that are similar but longer and more rounded. They live in the mountains as far as the Indus River and they are black and very just, like the rest of the Indians with whom they associate. 114 Since they understand what the other Indians say but cannot converse, they communicate by howling and making gestures with their hands and fingers like the deaf and mute. The Indians call them Kalystrioi which in Greek means Cynocephaloi ('Dog-Headed People'). They have 120,000 people in their tribe.¹⁴

The *cenocephaloi* discussed above were monstrous in appearance and behavior because they were different and distant. Their forms bordered on the fantastic because the authors who wrote about them never saw them in person. In reality, what Herodotus and Ctesias call monstrous peoples were most likely baboons,¹⁵ which physically resemble humans but behave and look like animals; the ancient Egyptians even described them as “dog-headed” in their culture.¹⁶ To an untrained eye, larger simians could have easily been confused with humans, as some species are known to exhibit human behaviors, like cooking food in the sun,¹⁷ and many feature tufts of fur hanging from their chins, like beards (see **Cat. 7.1**).

¹⁴ F45 Phot. Bibl. 72 p. 45a 21 – 50a 4 (T10), as cited in Nichols 2008, 113 no. 37. Ctesias also mentions these creatures in his *Testimonia* (T19 Gell. N.A. 9.4, as cited in Nichols 2008, 57 no. 9): “...in the mountains of India there are men with the heads of dogs who bark and feed on birds and wild animals taken in the hunt.”

¹⁵ Friedman 1981, 24. It is well-known that the Phoenicians imported simians from India (Langdon 1990, 415; Karageorghis 1994, 64; and Greenlaw 2011, 60); and the Mesopotamians imported visually-similar mongooses from there as well (Potts 1997, 262). In the Archaic Period, Scythian territory extended just north of India, where simians are known to reside. This could account for their presumed presence there.

¹⁶ Vernus and Yoyette 2005, 615.

¹⁷ Attenborough 2009.

With the exception of the Oresteia Krater (**Cat. 7.1**), which may depict a human-baboon hybrid,¹⁸ I do not think these fantastic monkey-people, as described by Herodotus and Ctesias, connect with the monkey and simianesque motifs of the Archaic and Classical periods, despite the fact that both are confined to the margins of their respective visual and textual worlds. For example, the textual descriptions clearly imply that these creatures are *human*, whereas the visual motifs are usually small, nude, and/or crouching; more closely resemble monkeys rather than dog-headed *cenocephaloi*; and seem to imitate human activities for the purposes of comedic relief and ridicule,¹⁹ like those described in Aesopic fables. One must also take into consideration the possible disconnect between authors and craftsmen: well-known, orally-spread epics, like Ajax and Achilles Playing Dice, were frequently represented, but the accounts written by Herodotus and Ctesias were likely confined to upper-class literary folk. There is not nearly enough evidence to make such a connection.

What of the *mixothers* and *mixanthropoi*? There are three chronological stages of monstrous development and inclusion, which are visible in Greek art: the Dark Ages, when centaurs and sphinxes are most popular; 9th/8th century BCE Crete, when sphinxes, “bovine hybrids,” and griffins flow in from Cyprus; and late 8th century BCE Greece, when we start to see the full repertoire of creature art.²⁰ In the 7th century BCE,²¹ when mythological motifs and stories first appear in Greek vase painting, home-grown

¹⁸ See Chapter 3, pp. 122-123.

¹⁹ For a larger discussion of this phenomenon, see “Monkeys and Humor” below.

²⁰ Kourou 1989, 118. In the latter period, contact escalates between Greece, Cyprus, and the Levant, which allows for the increased importation of Eastern and Egyptian objects (119).

²¹ In this period, monstrous imagery was likely coming from the Peloponnese, specifically Corinth (Tsiafakis 2003, 97), which adopted eastern motifs earlier and more quickly than other Greek cities (Weinberg 1943, 90-92).

concepts (*e.g.* the centaur)²² and ones taken from abroad (*e.g.* the griffin and sphinx) function solely as protective emblems (a fact emphasized by the largeness of their eyes),²³ without larger myths attached to them (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.3**).²⁴ Additionally, in this early period, monstrous iconographies are not wholly solidified: gorgons, for example, appear as saucer-headed, Assyrian-dressed, and long-legged femme-fatales in the first quarter of the 7th century BCE,²⁵ only to become canonized five decades later as grinning, stocky, snaky, and winged creatures.²⁶ It is during this era of experimentation that we first see representations of monkey and simianesque creatures, but can we rightfully call them monsters?

Certain creatures, which I discussed in Chapter 2, are obviously *mixanthropoi* and thus may have been perceived as monstrous, but this is only because they are not ostensibly simian. Rather, they feature identifiable combinations of animal (*e.g.* dolphins, birds, goats, and snakes) and human parts. The first example appears on the black-figured amphora from the University of Pennsylvania's Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (**Cat. 7.5**). This one-of-a-kind hybrid creature has the head of a dolphin, wings of a bird, and the body of a man. It crouches and/or crawls beneath Zeus' chair as the god gives birth to Athena from his head. Scholars interpret this figure as a fertility symbol, defensive emblem, and/or a personification of the rivers near which Athena was

²² See Chapter 5, p. 190.

²³ Though most of these beasts are not frontally-inclined, the largeness of their eyes, which are plastered to the sides of their profile heads, seems to suggest they are meant to protect. See Boardman 1998, 69 fig. 120.2 and 98 fig. 189 (the Anatalos Krater) for examples.

²⁴ We see this, for example, on early Archaic pottery, which features static rings of profile sphinxes, griffins, sirens, and wild cats; these both cover whole vases (see Simon 1976, pls. 9-10) or take up a single register above and/or below the main action (see *ibid.*, pl. 39).

²⁵ See Simon 1976, pl. 5 (Polyphemus Painter Amphora).

²⁶ See *Ibid.*, pl. 44 (Nessos Painter Amphora).

born.²⁷ As a marginalized *mixanthropos*, however, it is most likely monstrous and thus protective. Satyrs, which are highly akin to simians, are also human-animal hybrids (half man, half goat or horse)²⁸ and are marginal with reference to their behavior: they are usually rowdy, ithyphallic, and/or frontally-inclined, all of which are apotropaic characteristics of monstrous beings.

The other creature in question is featured on the Athenian black-figure amphora from Vulci (**Cat. 7.8**). The vessel depicts Apollo Citharoedus in the presence of Artemis, Leto, Hermes and Poseidon. The right arm (and presumably the left) of Apollo's lyre is shaped like a reptilian creature with an open, beak-like mouth and large, beady eye. It extends one hand towards the strings and the other towards its mouth. Martha Maas and Jane McIntosh Snyder note that the inner arm construction of the Greek lyre is sometimes exaggerated, which "makes one think of the eye (created by painting a small circle at the end of the upper protrusion) and open mouth of a bearded snake—a symbol that would be appropriate for Apollo's *kithara*, since it was he who slew the Python of Delphi, represented as a bearded serpent."²⁹ Though Apollo's lyre often features a strange creature hanging from one or both arms, they are rarely as anthropomorphic as the one featured on the Vulci vessel.³⁰ What does this mean? Snakes were chthonic creatures of the underworld; symbols of the gods Hephaestus, Apollo, and Asklepius; and attributes of monsters, like the chimera. This marginalized creature appears to be a *mixanthropos*, or part man, part snake. Thus, it may have had apotropaic undertones, protecting not only the instrument but also the god as he played.

²⁷ Hall 1912, 72 and 75; Luce 1921, 75; and Richter 1966, 18.

²⁸ See Chapter 2, pp. 67-70.

²⁹ Maas and McIntosh Snyder 1989, 66.

³⁰ See Chapter 2, n. 107.

Though the dolphin and snake hybrids can be identified as monstrous because they consist of identifiable human and animal parts, we cannot rightfully label the majority of monkey and simianesque motifs as monstrous *mixanthropoi* or *mixothers*. This is because simians do not have consistent iconographic forms on Greek vessels, appearing in a variety of shapes and sizes with varying amounts and kinds of detail (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.4, 3.19, and 4.1**); some even appear to be less animalistic and more human (*e.g.* **Cat. 7.1-2**). Even though monsters, *mixanthropoi* especially, embody both human and animal characteristics, they consist of decipherable parts (*e.g.* horse and human), whereas simians, to an untrained eye and mind, appear as if *simultaneously* human and animal; and Greek authors confirm this sentiment.

Though marginalized simians are not inherently monstrous, they may share similar functions with monsters, as many appear alongside apotropaic felines, like sphinxes and chimeras, with relative consistency. The connection between simians and monstrous felines may relate to the Lamia, who is often sphinx-like in art,³¹ or perhaps Egyptian motifs, which sometimes feature simians and cats together.³²

For example, the long-necked object from Aetos (**Cat. 3.3**) features a gangly simian crouched beside a sphinx. These creatures do not interact but rather adorn the vessel's body as decoration. Similarly, the jasper gem (**Cat. 3.12**) from a tomb at Tharros features a monkey crouched atop a sphinx's rump. The upper-half of its body is cut off but it may be touching its mouth or waving a stick, like the monkey on the Etruscan hematite gem (**Cat. 3.11**), or a sistrum, like the creature on the Aegina fragments (**Cat. 3.19**). Another example combines the two species: the Attic black-figure oinochoe (**Cat.**

³¹ See n. 74 below.

³² See Chapter 3, p. 94.

8.1), from near Thebes, depicts a sphinx-like Lamia with a simian tail. Other examples of simian-feline combos occur in monstrous processions. For example, the Proto-Corinthian aryballos (**Cat. 3.8**), from the Delion at Paros, features a horse-riding simian processing alongside wild cats, like lions and panthers. Similarly, the squatting figure on the Etruscan red-ware fragment (**Cat. 7.9**) is situated among a row of wild cats, including a chimera.

Personifications

Unlike monsters, the Greeks did not have a specific term for personifications,³³ or representations of non-human entities, usually in female form. Such entities include natural phenomena (*e.g.* bodies of water), measurements of time (*e.g.* seasons), bodily states (*e.g.* sleep and death), emotions (*e.g.* love, hate, and fear), and political ideas (*e.g.* peace and war).³⁴ Some personifications, like Hypnos (Sleep) and Thanatos (Death), are mentioned as early as Homer,³⁵ while personified divinities, like Nike, Themis, and Hygeia, first appear with frequency in 5th century BCE Athens, after democracy is established.³⁶ Scholars seem to disagree on the degree to which these concepts compare with the Olympian pantheon, whose members received cult, prayers, and sacrifices. Though some personifications received regular worship, not all did,³⁷ and most were wholly unattached to larger Greek myths.³⁸ This same inconsistency is evident in their visual illustration: some concepts are represented uniformly with recognizable, canonical

³³ Shapiro 1993, 12.

³⁴ Stafford and Herrin 2005, XIX.

³⁵ Shapiro 1993, 12. Webster (1954, 10-11) describes well the sheer excess of personifications in Homer. In this context, however, these figures exist exclusively in an abstract sense—as a way to visualize the Homeric universe. They are not visually rendered in Greek art until the 6th century BCE, after monstrous iconographies are canonized.

³⁶ Webster 1954, 13.

³⁷ See Lehmann 1947, 138 (as cited in Shapiro 1993, 12 n. 5) and Hamdorf (1964, 69-70).

³⁸ Shapiro 1993, 16.

attributes (like Nike),³⁹ while others cannot be distinguished from other human, heroic, and divine characters without inscription (like Aponia).⁴⁰

As Alan Shapiro notes in relation to Homer's nondescript personifications, every individual has a personal conception about abstract concepts and could, given the proper stimulus, translate them into visual images which would best suit their appearance for him/her.⁴¹ This is especially true of *Phobos*, or Fear, who is represented in two ways: as an armed warrior fighting in battle or as a lion-headed (and occasionally lion-bodied) beast.⁴² There are certainly crossovers: for example, Envy is always ugly, Slander is always beautiful, Old Age is always old, and Repentance is always in mourning.⁴³ The specifics of these representations, however, are left up to individual craftsmen.

The same could be said for monkey and simianesque imagery: no two images of these creatures are the same, which implies they may have come from the imaginations of their makers. Iconographic inconsistency, however, is the only similarity these motifs share with personifications. Thus, it seems unlikely that monkeys and simianesque creatures were indicative of a specific concept (or concepts) since they are never labeled. And although their ability to believably imitate human behavior did not go unnoticed by the Greeks, simians were never mistaken for human; and nearly all personifications, even

³⁹ It is important to note that personifications are not regularly depicted with attributes until the Hellenistic period (Stafford 2007, 72). This means that during the Archaic and Classical periods, or the eras where we see the most monkey and simianesque iconography, personifications were still a fluid and evolving visual subject matter that had yet to solidify.

⁴⁰ Shapiro 1993, 16.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁴² This idea is most clearly illustrated in the *Aspis*, or the *Shield of Herakles*, a fragmentary text by an unknown poet of the mid-late 6th century BCE (Stafford 2012, 65). On the shield described by the author, Fear appears four times: once as a man in the company of Ares and Deimos (195); once alone, with "eyes cast backward and a mouth full of white teeth" (144-146) (Shapiro 1993, 208); as a personified god (155); and finally above the heads of the Gorgons as they pursue Perseus (237) (as described in Shapiro 1993, 208). This last description is vague, but it brings to mind images of the dwarf-god Bes when he appears as a frontal, apotropaic, and floating head above Horus (see Chapter 3, n. 59).

⁴³ Shapiro 1993, 17.

those with unsightly or animalistic parts, were human at their core.⁴⁴

Unlike simians, a few of the simianesque creatures, which I mentioned in Chapter 2, are physically human and, in some circumstances, partially clothed. Examples include the two black-skinned stone-throwers on the Proto-Attic Oresteia krater (**Cat. 7.1**), two male figures that crouch beneath Zeus' throne as he gives birth to Athena (**Cat. 7.4** and **7.6**), a creature that crouches beneath Hephaestus' horse as he returns to Olympus (**Cat. 7.7**), and the nude squatting figure on the Etruscan red-ware fragment (**Cat. 7.9**).⁴⁵ The issue with translating these characters, even the clothed youth (**Cat. 7.6**), as personifications is twofold: first, most of them are male, naked, and have no attributes to associate them with any particular concept, like Phobos. Second, most feature locational marginalization in larger narratives (**Cat. 7.1, 7.4, and 7.6-7**). While personifications can be primary or secondary elements within a main scene, they are never outcasts. Thus, we cannot believably apply the term "personification" to any of these ambiguous figures, despite their anthropomorphic forms.

Demons

Though monstrous and personified beings have little in common with monkeys and simianesque creatures, demonic concepts and creatures compare well with the motifs in question. In ancient Greece, the word *daimon* embodied "the power and activity of divinity as revealed in nature" and was "associated with ideas of fate, destiny, and

⁴⁴ Some personifications, like Komos and Phobos, had both human and non-human forms (Smith 2012, 440).

⁴⁵ The squatter on the Etruscan fragment also falls short of this classification for many reasons: it is completely nude, is ambiguously gendered, and is frontal. Jannot (1980, 607-624) identifies frontal squatters, like this one, as birth goddesses with apotropaic connotations in certain contexts, however male characters, like satyrs, are known to frontally squat as well. Even if this figure was derived from Egyptian fertility motifs—as Jannot claims—that does not mean these implications traveled with the image into Etruria. Since the creature is frontal, like apotropaic monsters, and since its gender is not clearly delineated, it seems less like an abstract concept and more akin to a demon, like Bes or Tawert.

fortune.”⁴⁶ The word is first applied in Homer (*e.g. Iliad* 1.222) to refer to the Olympian gods, but later, in Greek tragedy, *daimons* are accused of causing unpleasant and/or harmful situations.⁴⁷ That said, *daimons* were not wholly bad, for there are two types regularly expressed in literature: *eudaimon*⁴⁸ (good) and *kakodaimon* (evil). Both are related to moral, astral, and supernatural forces⁴⁹ and were believed capable of either protecting or destroying a person’s life.⁵⁰ Though “demon” is a familiar term used even today to describe a variety of beings—from benevolent spirits to minions of Hell—the meaning of the word changes depending on the context in which it is used. In other words, the demons in Greek religion and thought are quite dissimilar to those of Christian lore, even though they were believed to manifest in similar ways.

After the advent of Christianity, demons became exclusively negative and evil entities, which many ancient authors⁵¹ describe as “fated to eternal punishment, hostile to man, responsible for many vices, tempter(s) of body and soul, and the cause of diabolic possession.”⁵² Christian demons, like Greek monsters, were believed to dwell in wild, uninhabited places, beyond the borders of civilized societies. Thus, “devil worship”⁵³ was

⁴⁶ Smith 1978, 432.

⁴⁷ Kidd 1995, 218.

⁴⁸ The Greek word *eudaimonia* means “having a good demon.”

⁴⁹ Smith 1978, 433.

⁵⁰ For example, in Plato’s *Apology*, Socrates reveals that his *daimon* is responsible for his imminent execution, for it never told him what he should do, only what he should not: “I have had this from my childhood; it is a sort of voice that comes to me, and when it comes it always holds me back from what I am thinking of doing, but never urges me forward. This it is which opposes my engaging in politics,” (Trans. Fowler, 31e).

⁵¹ These include Tatian, Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Eusebius (see Kidd 1995, 224).

⁵² Kidd 1995, 223-224.

⁵³ According to Smith (1978, 427), devil worship “functions primarily as a locative term, which establishes outer limits or distance much as wild men or monsters are depicted as inhabiting the borders of antique maps.” For example, the locales of India and Scythia were believed to reside unfathomably far from the civilized center of the world (Europe). As a result, such places were also believed to be inhabited by monstrous beings, like griffins, and uncouth peoples, like the one-eyed Arimaspians (see Herodotus *Histories*, 4.27; Pliny *Natural Histories*, 7.2; and Aeschylus *Prometheus*, 804-807).

performed in wild and untamed locales, like the woods, a belief that intentionally coincided with Christian conceptions about places of pagan worship.⁵⁴ As evil beings, demons required unholy forms of worship, such as human and animal blood sacrifice. The practice of devil worship, as Jonathan Smith explains, “does not refer to people worshipping devils or demons, but it is a measure of distance, a *taxon* or label applied to distinguish ‘us’ from ‘them.’”⁵⁵ Thus, Christian demons were usually visualized as hybrid monsters, or *proteans*, capable of shapeshifting into different forms of varying extremes.⁵⁶

Though the Greeks did not believe in devils or Hell, their belief in evil demonic forces was vaguely similar to their Christian successors. In ancient Greek lore, demons were believed to be concrete beings with visible forms, as well as abstract markers of negativity (*e.g.* chaos, rebellion, and distance) and social boundaries (*e.g.* hybridity, deviance, and adjacency).⁵⁷ Those with concrete forms were often described as hybrid shapeshifters with “superfluous parts.”⁵⁸ According to Sarah Iles Johnston, who has written extensively on Greek demonic concepts, the most telling aspect of demons is their liminality, or the fact that they are situated between two mutually exclusive taxa, like human and animal, and retain the most “threatening characteristics of both

⁵⁴ Smith 1978, 427.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 428.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 430.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 435-439. According to Plato, for example, Greek philosophical demons represented a variety of natural and supernatural forces, including Golden Age governors appointed by Kronos (*Laws* 713d1ff), deceased men that deserve veneration (*Cratylus* 397eff), “guardian angels” that watch over a person throughout their life (*Phaedo* 107d5-108b3 and *Republic* 617d6-e5, 620d8f, and 621b1-4), interpreters between the human and divine (as simians are thought to have functioned in Bronze Age Crete) (*Symposium* 202d13ff), and elementals (*Epinomis* 984-985). For more information on this topic, and specific excerpts from these texts, see Kidd 1995, 218-224.

⁵⁸ Smith 1978, 435-439.

components.”⁵⁹ As liminal creatures who reside on the boundaries of classifiable categories, many are believed to gather in doorways, which were themselves liminal: neither inside nor outside a house or room, but somewhere in between. Thus, demons were perceived to be in direct opposition to humans, for, as Johnston notes, they “can serve as a concave mirror for the human world...one in which perfect inversions of behavioral or physical *desiderata* (desired things) are held up to view.”⁶⁰ In other words, normal behaviors of demons are akin to the abnormal behaviors of humans. Anything that falls into this “liminal realm,” be it an object, person, or behavior, is considered dangerous, demonic, and inverted, or opposed to the standards and regulations of the civilized world.⁶¹

The ancient Greeks speak of three types of demons that they regarded as malevolent: restless spirits, such as *aoroi*, *bi(ai)othanatoi*, *agamoι*, and *ataphoi*; child-snatching female entities, like Lamia and Gello; and theriomorphic demons, or disease-spreading beings that take on animal forms.⁶² Each demonic class had different functions and implications in Greek society, both as a whole and within the minds of individual authors and craftsmen. Due to their undeveloped and inconsistent representation in Greek

⁵⁹ Johnston 1995, 363.

⁶⁰ Johnston 1995, 363.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 364.

⁶² Some scholars argue that certain “evil gods,” or those with malicious intentions, like the Erinyes, Hades, Thanatos, Keres, Phthonos, and Phobos, could be construed as demonic as well (Nock and Ferguson 1944, 171). While the Greeks did not always distinguish between *theoi* and *daimon*, such words were not exclusively used in the negative sense. If they were, one could argue that all the Olympian gods had demonic tendencies, for most were capable of both positive and negative acts: *e.g.* Apollo was both a god of plague and healing. Moreover, unlike the Lamia, most of these so-called “evil gods” have extensive mythologies and relatively set iconographies in Greek art. In terms of entities like Phobos, the idiom “personification” seems more suitable than “god” or “demon,” even if said entities are inherently negative, for reasons I discussed above. For more information on the difference between “good” and “bad” Greek demons, see Herter 1950, 112-143.

art and literature, demons resided more firmly in the realm of folklore than myth,⁶³ which makes their stories more difficult to piece together and interpret.

The “restless dead,” as Johnston calls them, are people who die “before their time,” often while still young. The *aoroi*, for example, are known as the “untimely dead:” they consist of women and children who died young, prior to fulfilling their life goals, like marriage and childbirth.⁶⁴ For the women who failed to marry and have children, their deaths ostracized them from both the living and the dead, which is why they “wander restlessly” between the two worlds in limbo, making them easy targets for magicians who wished to summon them.⁶⁵ Since they were unfulfilled, such spirits were associated with envy and believed to cause serious problems for pregnant women, such as miscarriage, toxemia, stillbirths, puerperal fever, and infant death syndrome.⁶⁶ In a similar vein, the *agamoι*, or “un-wed,”⁶⁷ are women who died prior to getting married and they were believed to cause similar problems among married and/or pregnant women. Other spirits are restless because they die by violent means: *bi(ai)othanatoi*, for example, are people who were murdered or committed suicide; those who perish in battle

⁶³ Folklore is defined by Seymour-Smith (1986, 120) as “traditional knowledge, customs, and oral and artistic traditions among any community (or sector of the community) united by some common factor such as a common occupation, co-residence, or a common language or ethnicity... The essence of folklore is its spontaneous or organic nature; that is to say, it is the result of the experiences and interpretations of experience of persons engaged in social action.” These ever-changing beliefs, like demonic concepts, alter as they travel between people, cultures, locales, and across time, though certain features ultimately remain consistent (e.g. the general negativity, danger, and fear surrounding malevolent demons) (Elliott 2015, 19). Thus, unlike mythological stories, which described a legendary past filled with heroes and monsters, folklore was very much an in-the-moment trend.

⁶⁴ Ogden 2009, 146.

⁶⁵ Johnston 1995, 370. Magical practices were considered negative and anti-social, for they “inverted the accepted (religious) ritual forms” (Marinatos 2008, 12) via immoral practices, such as blood sacrifices, invocations of the dead, writing curse tablets, the creation of voodoo-like wax figurines, and the use of “charms and drugs” (Collins 2008, 62). Thus, magicians were believed to be responsible for all manner of negative happenings, such as lowering moods, eclipsing the sun, controlling the weather, resisting age, and necromancy (ibid.).

⁶⁶ Johnston 1999, 184 and 193.

⁶⁷ Ogden 2009, 146.

and executed criminals are excluded from this category. Finally, the *ataphoi* are souls deprived of burial. This condition often results in restless wandering, as exhibited by Odysseus' companion Elpenor in Homer's *Odyssey* (11.51-80).

Like *aoroi* and *agamoï*, child-stealing demons evolved from spirits of unhappy women who failed to have children or, if they procreated, failed to care for their young in socially-acceptable ways. The most infamous child-snatcher was Lamia (pl. *lamiai*):⁶⁸ a beautiful Libyan princess who was loved and pursued by Zeus. Unfortunately, Hera grew jealous and, as punishment for stealing her husband, the marriage-goddess killed Lamia's children, which made her appear as an inadequate mother and caretaker.⁶⁹ This loss ruined the princess, turning her into an ugly, odorous,⁷⁰ liminal, cave-dwelling, and child-stealing demon⁷¹ with a hairy body, pendulous breasts, male genitals,⁷² clawed fingers, and fire-breath; and in some traditions, she is also a theriomorphic shapeshifter and the mother of the man-eating Skylla.⁷³

⁶⁸ Lamia was both a singular entity (a hairy monkey woman) and a horde (like the Erinyes) called *lamiai*, meaning "devourers." Burkert (1992, 82-87) and West (1991, 361-367) think Lamia's name and function derive from the Eastern demons Lamashtu (a female demon, monster, and/or goddess who attacked women during childbirth and children while they were breastfeeding) and Gallu (male demons who kidnapped people of all genders and ages and dragged them into the underworld). Johnston (1999, 169-170) disagrees, for she notes that "beliefs that express a culture's fears, as demonic beliefs frequently do, are more deeply embedded in that culture's cognitive map than are techniques and rituals. Moreover, whereas new techniques and rituals can frequently be used in concert with old ones, completely new beliefs cannot. A new belief must either align closely with an old one—in which case it cannot be so new—or be [able] to displace an old belief by other significant changes within the culture." In other words, the Greeks' appropriation of Mesopotamian and Egyptian ideas and art was aided by changes that occurred in their *own* culture, and while it is prudent to make comparisons, Johnston warns: "when we seek specific genealogies for Greek demonic beliefs in other cultures, we...are likely to miss observations that might shed light on Greek beliefs themselves."

⁶⁹ The scholiast on Aristophanes *Pax* 758 provides the most complete extant story of her rise and fall (see Johnston 1995, 367).

⁷⁰ Aristophanes (*Vespae* 1177) claims she is flatulent in public and has filthy testicles.

⁷¹ Horace, *Ars Poetica* 340.

⁷² In addition to her hermaphroditism, she was also imagined as bisexual, which was as undesirable as ugliness (Johnston 1995, 372).

⁷³ Steisichorus *PMG* frg. 220, as cited in *LIMC* VI, s.v. *Lamia*, 189.

As a demonic entity, Lamia had no set form in Greek mythology and thus is not often represented in art. She is (uncertainly) featured on a few Greek vases (**Cat. 8.1-2**), always as a simianesque woman or sphinxlike⁷⁴ creature, which is a clear indication that she did not have set iconographical attributes besides copious amounts of hair and pendulous breasts.⁷⁵ As a *mixanthropos* with a disputed appearance, Lamia was not a mythological monster, but a demonic folktale used by mothers to scare their children into behaving.⁷⁶ Such stories persist among older generations in modern Greece, though, in addition to hunting children, Lamia has developed murderous tendencies towards men.⁷⁷

Similar female demons, with no known representations in Greek art, also haunted, snatched, and killed women and children: they include Mormo/Mormoluke,⁷⁸ Empousa,⁷⁹

⁷⁴ Timotheos of Gaza (RE VIA2 s.v. *Timotheos* Nr. 18, 1339, 47ff, as cited in Vermeule 1977, n. 25) and Pliny (*Natural Histories* 8.30) both compare simians and sphinxes. The former's description of the West African simian, the *cercopithecus Diana*, reads: "A small, sphinx from the realm neighboring the Land of the Dead." Similarly, the latter notes: "Eithiopia produces lynxes in great numbers, and sphinxes with brown hair and a pair of udders on the breast." For additional examples, see Meyer 1885, 199ff, pl. 7.2; *LIMC VI*, s.v. *Lamia*, no. 1; and Vermeule 1977, pl. 80.3 (a hairy simianesque woman confronts a sphinx-like beast); Vermeule 1977, pls. 80.4 (a youth leads a massive, hairy creature out of its cave-dwelling) and 81.1 (Herakles leads a hairy, dolled-up female walking on all fours).

⁷⁵ Perhaps, like the Mesopotamian demon Lamashtu, representations of Lamia functioned as apotropaic emblems to ward her off, as well as similar demonic entities: Johnston (1995, 377) notes that amulets depicting the body parts of asses were used to ward off Lamashtu, who herself had ass-like parts. Thus, like is used to trump like (*i.e. similia similibus*); see "Function" below for more details.

⁷⁶ The scholiast on Aristides makes this claim about the demon Mormo (as cited in Johnston 1999, 174 n. 28). See also *LIMC VI*, s.v. *Lamia*, 189 and Rotroff 2014, 170.

⁷⁷ Lawson 1964, 174-178; see also Stewart 1991, who discusses how such beliefs exist alongside, and among, Christian ones.

⁷⁸ According to the scholiast on Aristides (as cited in Johnston 1999, 174 n. 28), Mormo (pl. *mormones* or "fearsome ones") was a Corinthian woman who ate her children and then flew away; and like Lamia, she is invoked by mothers wishing to scare their children (Plato *Republic* 381e.1-6). Additionally, she is theriomorphic, with multiple faces and body parts that stem from different animals, like the ass and wolf (hence her other name *Mormoluke* or "werewolf") (Johnston 1995, 375). Mormo was also connected with the horse, which is why West (1995, 301 and text no. 5) believes she was associated with Hecate, like Empousa. Patera (2015, 124-129), however, disagrees, and instead relates Mormo to the child-fearing Gorgo, Medusa's goatish sister. Though Mormo was meant to be a terrifying entity, Aristophanes used the word *mormolykeion* to connote "hobgoblins" (*Thesmophoriazusae* 417) and comedic masks (frags. 31 and 131), which suggests an overlap between comedy and the apotropaic (as cited in Faraone 1993, 38 and 122).

⁷⁹ Empousa's name comes from the Greek word *empuew*, "to suppurate" (in terms of a wound and "blood blisters") and, like Mormo, she is a theriomorphic demon with asinine parts and traits (Johnston 1995, 374 and 377 and West 1995, 301). Since the Mesopotamian demon Lamashtu is associated with the ass, it is tempting to think Empousa stems from her; but Empousa is said to have the legs and feet of an ass, not ears

and Strix,⁸⁰ but the most relevant is Gello (pl. *gelloudes*). Like Lamia, Gello also died unfulfilled, but not as a mother: she was an *aore*, or a woman who died prematurely, prior to marriage and childbirth.⁸¹ Trapped in limbo, Gello was believed to attack newborn babies, haunt/kill children, and cause the deaths of virgins who had not yet married.⁸² There is little information on Gello in Greek literature and no known representations of her in art prior to the Christian era, when she was turned into an “evil” demon,⁸³ but even those images are not wholly consistent.⁸⁴ This seems to imply that she resided solely in the realm of folklore.

Unlike the restless dead and child-snatchers, theriomorphic demons are not human. Rather, these creatures had animal forms and were believed to be disguised demons and divinities which had the ability to spread the plague and cause mental illness.⁸⁵ There were numerous ways that these demons could manifest: for example, Hippocrates, in his 5th century BCE text *On Sacred Disease* (1.32-38), notes that the force responsible for disease reveals itself theriomorphically in a sick patient’s mad or demented behavior. Additionally, in the eastern Mediterranean, it was believed that

and teeth (like Lamashtu). Her asininity, however, could be what makes her a seductress and destroyer of young men (Johnston 1995, 377-378). She is mentioned less often than the other child-snatching demons, perhaps because she was thought to be a henchwoman of Hecate rather than her own entity (West 1995, 300-301).

⁸⁰ Strix (pl. *striges*) is the Roman version of the child-snatching demon (Johnston 1995, 365). This creature is described by authors as a ferocious owl that would use its massive talons to snatch children, rend their flesh, and drink their blood (West 1995, 310). Like Empousa, the strix was not often mentioned in literature.

⁸¹ Patera 2015, 145.

⁸² Zenobius, *Proverbs* 3.3, Hesychius, s.v. *gellō*, and Michael Psellus and John Demascenus, nos. 5-6, as cited in Johnston 1999, 165-166.

⁸³ Hartnup (2004, 88), based on the texts of the 15th century scholar Leo Allatios, notes that the Gello can fly, shapeshift (like monsters), and is unclean (like Lamia); thus, she is both demonic and evil.

⁸⁴ Patera (2015, 200-201, figs. 12-13) discusses Christian amulets that were used by women and children to protect against Gello. They may feature the demonic spirit snatching children (fig. 12) and being trampled by saints (fig. 13).

⁸⁵ Faraone 1992, 44.

demonic forces could take the forms of “generic” animals and leave plague and death in their wake.⁸⁶

Theriomorphic demons exist primarily on “metrical charms,” which have been preserved on Greek and Phoenician house amulets, though they contain defensive verses and names, like Pazuzu and Lamashtu, rather than images.⁸⁷ Such charms were used to protect pregnant women and infants especially, just as images of Bes and Taweret in ancient Egypt. Though there do not appear to be any physical representations of these creatures in Greece, Christopher Faraone believes that the *gorgoneion* and satyr mask, which were “all-purpose amulets” of protection, may have been used to avert animal encroachment or attack, both real and demonic.⁸⁸ He further argues that ancient Greek fears about the power and influence of animalistic demons may have arisen in early agrarian settlements in the eastern Mediterranean, where the dangers of animal predators (*e.g.* wild dogs, wolves, bears, and lions) against humans and livestock, and the destructive power of insects and goats on crops, were still strong possibilities.⁸⁹

As stated earlier, Johnston defines demonic behavior as abnormal human behavior: in order to avoid classification among demons, people must adhere to accepted standards of behavior and appearance.⁹⁰ Unlike humans, demons delight in transgressive behavior and take on the form of liminal hybrids, such as the human-animal werewolf. In this way, they are seemingly caught between two taxa, like human and animal.⁹¹ This is why marginal spaces, like doorways, were believed to be favorite gathering spots for

⁸⁶ Ibid., 45.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Johnston 1999, 172.

⁹¹ Ibid., 362; see also Smith 1978, 435-439.

such creatures. What differentiates demons from other Greek beings is their visual manifestation, or iconographic inconsistency. While centaurs, gorgons, griffins, sphinxes, sirens, and the personification of Fear are all hybrid beings and thus unclassifiable, they consist of identifiable, understandable, and constant parts: horse and man, lion and eagle, woman and bird, man and lion; and since they are frightening, they function as defensive emblems to protect and/or ward off unwanted supernatural phenomena. These factors, however, does not make them “marginal;” such a term is better suited to creatures with inconsistent iconographies, attributes, and forms—like Gello.

As stated earlier, Gello is a female, shape-shifting spirit that haunted pregnant women and children. As a restless soul who died prematurely, she was often blamed for the deaths of those who died before their time. Life and death were acceptable states for the soul to exist, but as the restless spirit of a woman who died young, Gello was believed to be a semi-corporeal, transformative, undead creature and thus resided in the margins between worlds;⁹² and since she cannot be classified among appropriate categories of being, Gello is a demon. Similarly, theriomorphic demons were not represented in art but simply believed to exist freely, and surreptitiously, among earth’s natural phenomena; thus, their appearance was both inconsistent and unpredictable, ranging from locusts to bears. Charms and effigies were crafted to ward them off, sometimes in the very form of the animal it was meant to protect against (*i.e. similia similibus*). Later, in the Roman era, authors used “name avoidance” to protect against taboo objects and creatures: according to Marco Vespa, “on some occasions (at dawn, during the ritual or something else), it is far better not to use certain names and words to designate some usual objects or living

⁹²Supra n. 83.

beings.”⁹³ To avoid using taboo names of such dangers, like diseases, misfortunes, and grotesque people, other names were used so as “not to attract the misfortune which was normally attached to them or which they could elicit.”⁹⁴

Based on extrapolations from Greek texts and images, it seems monkeys and simianesque creatures were demonic in form and behavior. For one, their bodies vaguely resemble humans, but they are hairy, ugly and physically frightening. Additionally, they behave like humans but in animalistic and uncouth ways, killing themselves (*e.g.* Fables 73 and 78) and others (Aelian *On the Nature of Animals*, 7.21) in stories and masturbating (**Cat. 4.1**) and drinking (**Cat. 4.4**) in art. Therefore, one could say that these creatures are in a constant state of conversion between human and animal, which could be why they are placed in the margins of images: like the intangible Gello, they are unclassifiable demons and thus must reside on the outskirts of established realms (*i.e.* the narrative frieze). This idea is expressed most clearly in representations of simianesque beings that appear as if more human than animal in form (*e.g.* **Cat. 7.2, 7.4, and 7.7**). Additionally, some Roman-era authors protected themselves against monkeys by using name avoidance. For example, a few passages written by Galen describe monkeys as *kalleias* (beautiful) and *euethes* (benign).⁹⁵ This goes against what many earlier Greek authors have said about the animal—including Galen himself.⁹⁶ Similarly, in a list of taboo entities that should be avoided, Lucian (*Pseudologistes* 17) mentions the monkey among unsightly human defects, like malformed feet;⁹⁷ this is likely because simians

⁹³ Vespa 2017, 419.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ *Hipp. de fract. comm.* and *Hipp. progn.* III 7, *CMG* V 9.2, as cited in Vespa 2017, 418-419.

⁹⁶ See Galen, *On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body* (1.58-59 and 194).

⁹⁷ As cited in Vespa 2017, 422.

share physical traits with humans, or closely resemble them.⁹⁸ Thus, monkeys were akin to negative portents, like birds and lizards, with the potential to cause supernatural harm.⁹⁹ While this belief was perpetuated by the Romans, it may have begun in Greece, when the simian was first described as ugly and a danger—to itself and others.

Since monkey and simianesque iconography adorns numerous Greek objects in often obscure ways, I believe their demonic images may have been used as apotropaic emblems to ward off unwanted supernatural forces, like monsters, child-snatchers, and disease-ridden theriomorphic demons—perhaps even creatures like themselves, which were inherently portentous as well. In the following pages, I will explain how and why this may be.

FUNCTION

Most demons, in both art and literature, have apotropaic tendencies, or the means to protect against tangible and intangible dangers. The word “apotropaic” derives from the Greek verb *apotrepein* (to turn away or avert) and its accompanying adjective *apotropaios* (that which averts); the latter term is also an epithet of the god Apollo meaning “averted of evil.”¹⁰⁰ Apotropaic devices were displayed at entrances and/or boundaries of a city or building for the purpose of frightening off unwanted harm or evil.¹⁰¹ Such objects functioned as figurative advertisements of protection and/or literal defense mechanisms. It is difficult to differentiate between these two types, however, as beliefs about apotropaia, and what they could protect against, changed rather rapidly over

⁹⁸ Ibid., 424-428.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 423.

¹⁰⁰ Faraone 1992, 4.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 4 and 7.

time.¹⁰² Another term of protection is *tetelesmenon*, a participle of the verb *telein* (to complete or to consecrate), from which we get the modern word “talisman.”¹⁰³ It is important to note, however, that *apotropaion* and *tetelesmenon* were not used by Greek authors to describe physical objects imbued with powers of protection; rather, these are modern insights into ancient words.¹⁰⁴

Apotropaic objects were used to avert all forms of real and supernatural evils: physical attack, disease, hauntings, monsters, demons, and even malevolent dispositions. The most feared of these attackers were negative emotions, like envy, avarice, anger, and malice which could be felt and released by the most unassuming people, oftentimes against their own will.¹⁰⁵ Such dispositions were “believed to convey, project, and cast forth particles of energy that damage or destroy the object struck” through one’s eyes.¹⁰⁶ This unseen evil ultimately coined the phrase *baskanos* or “evil eye” (*invidia* in Latin). The term was used by Greek authors to provide explanations for otherwise inexplicable mishaps: illness, death, destruction of crops, the loss of battles and contests, and the deterioration of reputations and honor.¹⁰⁷ Fear of this seemingly omnipotent force led to the production of apotropaia in the form of images (*e.g.* ugly, deformed, grotesque, ithyphallic, frontal,¹⁰⁸ or transgressive figures),¹⁰⁹ amulets and charms (defensive,

¹⁰² Ibid., 10.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 4.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. The earliest references to *tetelesmenon* are by Late Antique authors, who use the word to describe “magically protective statues.” Conversely, *apotropaia* was used exclusively as a divine epithet of protection and, on occasion, to “describe a form of ‘averting’ sacrifice.”

¹⁰⁵ Elliott 2015, 2-3 and Elliott 2016, 56-60.

¹⁰⁶ Elliott 2015, 2-3; see also Elliott 2016, 18.

¹⁰⁷ Elliott 2015, 2-3.

¹⁰⁸ According to Bonna Wescoat (2012, 175-176), who writes on Greek architectural sculpture, “The front face breaks the spatial boundary of the narrative plane to engage the viewer directly. Creatures such as the gorgon have frontal faces that shock and quite literally petrify the viewer; the visceral confrontation of monster and viewer completes the image and gives it power.” Such images are apotropaic because the Greeks believed they could frighten off real and supernatural forces. This phenomenon may have originated in ancient Egypt, where most mortal and divine figures were depicted in profile, with the exception of Bes,

productive, and malevolent),¹¹⁰ words (both spoken and written),¹¹¹ and gestures (*e.g.* *digitus infamis* or the “notorious/disreputable finger”,¹¹² pointing, and the extended tongue),¹¹³ many of which functioned in accordance with the ancient concept of *similia similibus*, or “like influences like.”¹¹⁴

Though early authors like Homer (*Iliad*, 1.102-105), Hesiod (*Works* 195-196), Pherecrates (Frag. 189),¹¹⁵ Aristophanes (*Knights* 103 and *Wealth* 571), Pythagorus (Frag. 11.2.136),¹¹⁶ Pindar (*Pythian* 11.55-56), and Aeschylus (*Agamemnon* 832-839 and *Persians* 81-82) discuss the potential dangers associated with vision and eyes, the term *baskanos* is not mentioned until the late 5th/early 4th centuries BCE, when it is used to

Hathor (in bull form), and the chthonic monsters of the underworld. According to Dasen (1993, 63), the “monstrous appearance” of these creatures “was often meant to be frightening” and that “some demons have names referring to their fearful faces, such as ‘combative of face’, ‘savage one of face’, and ‘black of face.’”

¹⁰⁹ Elliott 2016, 249.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 222-233.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 161.

¹¹² *Digitus infamis* is one of many Roman names for extending the middle finger; others include *digitus impudicus* (shameful/wanton finger), *digitus verpus* (penis finger), *digitus medius* (middle finger), and *digitus obscaenus* (obscene finger) (ibid., 189). This lewd gesture is meant to resemble an erect penis (the middle finger) and testicles (the remaining fingers) (Nasaw 2012, quoting zoologist Desmond Morris) or the shape of a bird (head as penis, plumage as testicles), which ultimately prompted the modern phrase “flipping the bird” (see Bergen 2016, chapter 3). *Digitus infamis* is attested in Greek literature as early as the 5th century BCE (Elliott 2015, 189-191), though the brazen monkey on the Louvre Caeretan hydria (**Cat. 5.1**) could imply it was used even earlier. In Aristophanes’ *Clouds* (652), for example, the juvenile Strepsiades, when asked by Socrates to explain dactylic rhythm, says: “What else but this finger? Formerly, indeed, when I was yet a boy, this here!” to which Socrates replies: “You are boorish and stupid” (trans. Halliwell 2015). Halliwell (2015, 264) believes Strepsiades made an obscene gesture using his middle finger, which he followed by flashing his penis. A more certain reference occurs later, in the 3rd century BCE, when Diogenes Laertius mentions the following event in his *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers* (6.34): the Cynic philosopher Diogenes of Sinope (ca. 412-323 BCE) once lifted his middle finger at Demosthenes and said “There goes the demagogue of Athens” (as cited in Elliott 2015, 190). For additional ancient Roman references to this gesture, see Morris *et al.* 1979, 82.

¹¹³ Sticking out the tongue was an imitation of the gorgon Medusa and the dwarf demon Bes (Elliott 2016, 163 and 174), while pointing was an apotropaic gesture used in ancient Egypt to protect cattle from crocodiles and other dangers (See Dominicus 1994, 131-150). It may have been adopted by the ancient Greeks for a similar purpose.

¹¹⁴ Elliott 2015, 4. This type of formula “employs a persuasive analogy” that works to inflict harm on a person or thing and/or ward them off (Faraone 1997, 5). For example, a person can wish an enemy becomes “cold and lifeless,” like a dead body, or fashion an image of an animal, like a wolf, to repel that same animal from attacking (Faraone 1992, 45).

¹¹⁵ As cited in Elliott 2016, 7.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

describe “someone who possesses or casts an Evil Eye,” a “slandering person,” and/or “slandering speech.”¹¹⁷ The sister term *baskanion* was used simultaneously to denote an “anti-evil eye device” or apotropaic object that shielded bronze-workers from *baskania*.¹¹⁸ Eventually, in the Hellenistic period, the evil eye is turned into a verb, *baskanein* (“to bewitch” or “cast the evil eye”),¹¹⁹ and is personified as a goddess of fascinator and fascination.¹²⁰

Though it was primarily an invisible force, *baskanos* could also manifest as demonic entities, like the theriomorphs, which were capable of physically attacking people and their loved ones.¹²¹ Thus, the word also appears in conjunction with *daimon* to connote the “evil eye demon” (*ho baskanos daimon*). Such demons were believed to cause misfortune, physical injury, and death, especially among infants and children, like the child-snatching Lamia and Lamashtu.¹²² This malicious “evil eye demon” was later conflated with the “envious demon” (*ho phthoneros daimon*).¹²³ Greek and Roman authors like Democritus, Empedocles, Plato, Plutarch, Xenocrates, and Chrysippus all discuss *baskanos* and *phthonos* together,¹²⁴ for one was believed to bring about the other.

Envy (*phthonos*) is the intense desire to possess a specific person or thing and, if it is held by another, the simultaneous wish for the desired object to be lost or destroyed. This feeling, akin to jealousy (*zelos*) and zeal, was believed to overlap with other

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 13.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 15 n. 48.

¹¹⁹ Walcot 1978, 79.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 17 and 21. A term commonly used to describe possessors of the evil eye is “fascinator” (see Elliott 2015, 2-3).

¹²¹ Elliott 2015, 25.

¹²² Elliott 2016, 14 and 138.

¹²³ Ibid., 14.

¹²⁴ As cited in Ibid., 14 n. 38.

negative emotions, such as hatred, anger, resentment, and malice;¹²⁵ it had no positive connotations. The creation of envious, evil-eye demons, however, was deliberate. As Johnston explains, the purpose of making demons (like the child-snatching *aore*) envious was to exclude them from both worlds (living and dead), forcing them to wander. She goes on to say:

If ghosts evolved so as to display behaviors and traits that were the opposite of those encouraged among humans, there could be no better outsider on whom to pin blame for misfortune, no safer outlet for suspicion, anger, and retaliation that would have otherwise sought an object within the victim's own group.¹²⁶

In other words, evil eye and envy demons were made into scapegoats and held responsible for community troubles so as to prevent people from turning on each other.

Like the personification of Fear (*phobos*), Phthonos was personified as an unattractive human whose iconography is not wholly consistent. Though he is heavily discussed in Greek literature, he is not represented or personified until the Roman era, when he appears in mosaic and sculpture. These images are based on descriptions in contemporary texts, where the entity is described as emaciated, pale, sunken, frowning, enraged, distorted, choking, and/or self-mutilating.¹²⁷ In some cases, these textual descriptions are all that remain of an image. For example, Lucian (*Cal.* 5) refers to one of the figures in Apelle's *Calumnia* as pale, with a piercing gaze, misshapen body, and sickly countenance.¹²⁸ Additionally, Pseudo-Demosthenes (25.52) mentions that Phthonos is present in a variety of underworld paintings among impious people.¹²⁹

¹²⁵ Ibid., 87-91.

¹²⁶ Johnston 1999, 193-194.

¹²⁷ Dunbabin and Dickie 1983, 26.

¹²⁸ Ibid. (7) make this connection.

¹²⁹ As cited in *ibid.*, 8.

The only surviving mosaic that certainly depicts the unhappy figure was found in a 3rd century CE Roman villa on Skala (an island off Kephallenia).¹³⁰ The figure in question is labeled, so we know the maker intended for him to represent Envy. In the scene, Phthonos is attacked by four beasts which tear at his flesh from all sides. He is covered in blood and losing his entrails from a hole in his abdomen. Additionally, the figure holds his hand to his throat, as if choking or gasping. The scene seems to imply that Phthonos's "destructive power" is felt by the envier as well as the envied.¹³¹ Additionally, Katherine Dunbabin and Matthew Dickie believe that a series of 1st-4th century CE sculptures of emaciated men choking themselves represent this destructive concept as well.¹³²

Though *baskanos* and *phthonos* were both malevolent and feared concepts, not all apotropaia made to combat them are frightening, like the choking sculptures. Some are quite humorous, for laughter, to both the ancient Greeks and Romans, had the same apotropaic potential and power as fear.¹³³ Laughter, as defined by Mary Beard, is a noise accompanied by "facial and bodily contortions,"¹³⁴ which renders humans akin to animals. In ancient Greece, apotropaic laughter was a form of ritual laughter, or aischrology (obscenity),¹³⁵ though some scholars, both ancient and modern, believe it was not practiced with consistency, nor was it an approved method of protection. According to Stephen Halliwell, the only ancient account that attests to the purifying power of laughter comes from the sketchy *Suda*, which, in a discussion on Alexandrian mockery,

¹³⁰ See *ibid.*, pls. 1-2.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹³² *Ibid.*, pls. 2-6.

¹³³ Patera 2013, 126-128.

¹³⁴ Beard 2014, 159.

¹³⁵ Halliwell 2008, 199.

notes how the process of laughter “purifies” the soul and “wards off” evil.¹³⁶ There are two late-Greek authors who discuss the concept of aischrology in more detail: Plutarch (*Moralia* 361b, 417c, and 587f) and Xenocrates (Frgs. 229-230), and the former is simply paraphrasing the latter.

Xenocrates, a mid-4th century BCE philosopher, is thought to have invented the idea that “true gods” do not take pleasure in ritual laughter, only “the worst sort of ‘spirits’ or ‘demons,’” and that “obscene language deflects the capacity of such spirits to do something worse.”¹³⁷ The philosopher also states that ritual aischrology was used to “ward off” evil spirits, though he seems to imply that such religious phenomena were in opposition to humor cults, like those of Demeter and Dionysus. He argues instead that these practices are evidence of a dark underbelly to Greek religion.¹³⁸ In a summary of Xenocrates’ writings, the biographer and essayist Plutarch, writing a few centuries later, describes apotropaic laughter as “laughterless,” which Halliwell interprets as restrictive and perhaps ignorant. He argues that both Plutarch and Xenocrates may be disregarding the “positive traits of ritual laughter in order to posit an alternative, ‘demonological’ account of apotropaic aischrology.”¹³⁹ Halliwell concludes that ritual obscenity and apotropaic laughter were not commonly associated, for “ritual” implies “values of purity, shame, reverence, and careful speech,” while aischrology embodies the opposite.¹³⁹

Halliwell’s interpretation, which is confined to a few specific texts by upper-class Hellenistic authors,¹⁴⁰ seems shortsighted in light of obscene visual materials from both

¹³⁶ As cited in *ibid.*

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 199-200.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 201.

¹⁴⁰ The sentiments of “high literature” do not necessarily mirror that of the populace, or people of mid-to-low socioeconomic status. Though Plutarch’s voice could be construed as a “happy medium” between the classes, (Walcot 1978, 81), Xenocrates (to whom these sentiments belong) was not.

religious and secular contexts in Greece. As stated previously, genitalia were perceived as apotropaic because they are obscene: as John Elliott puts it, “the genitals of males and females were regarded as the locus of ultimate human power, namely the power of reproduction, the power to produce progeny, extend the bloodline, and ensure the continuation of families, tribes, and people.”¹⁴¹ As a result, human sex organs are symbolic of male hostility and female shame and function as positive emblems of fertility and apotropaia.¹⁴²

Genitalia become humorous in the realm of comedy: dildos with eyes on Greek vases,¹⁴³ grinning actors and komos dancers (figurines and paintings) wearing strap-ons,¹⁴⁴ Baubo statuettes comprising of heads and vaginas,¹⁴⁵ and ithyphallic satyrs masturbating and copulating.¹⁴⁶ All of these images are apotropaic due to the presence of genitalia, which are inappropriate and thus funny, and many were used in cultic contexts, like those of Demeter. For example, Baubo (*a.k.a.* Iambe) was said to make Demeter laugh by making a “quip and jest” that was likely sexual in nature (*Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 2.195-204);¹⁴⁷ this is why obscene figurines of woman-headed vaginas have been discovered at Priene,¹⁴⁸ where a sacred building to Demeter and Kore is located. The chous (**Cat. 4.8**), from Eleusis, may also be evidence of this humor cult, as are some

¹⁴¹ Elliott 2015, 192.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ McKeown 2013, 38.

¹⁴⁴ For examples of actor figurines, see Metropolitan Museum nos. 13.225.13, 16, 20, 27, and 28 (<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/248763>). For examples of vase paintings that feature actors and komos dancers, see Metropolitan Museum 24.97.104 (<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/251532>) and Walsh 2009, fig. 2e.

¹⁴⁵ See Olender 1990, figs. 3.1-5.

¹⁴⁶ See Mitchell 2009, fig. 79 and Walsh 2009, fig. 5b.

¹⁴⁷ In accordance with Baubo figurines, it is believed the old nurse lifted her skirt and pointed to her vagina to make Demeter laugh (Blackledge 2004, 20).

¹⁴⁸ Supra n. 145.

of the monkey-headed figurines from Demeter's sanctuary at Corinth.¹⁴⁹ Even if the concept of apotropaic laughter was not religiously acceptable to some Greek authors, it was still used by certain cults in certain locations as evidenced by the archaeological remains.

Where do monkeys and simianesque creatures fit into this larger framework of apotropaia? There are a variety of factors, as seen in the visual material, that contribute to the classification of these non-human beings as demonic and apotropaic: their iconographic inconsistency, their lowly posture, their marginalization in larger narratives, and their comedic potential. These factors, combined with Greek authors' struggle to visually comprehend the real-life animal, implies that monkeys and simianesque creatures were perceived as demonic, apotropaic entities meant to protect the objects they adorned and the people who used them.

Appearance

Greek-made monkeys and simianesque creatures manifest in a variety of ways. The forms of these creatures range from simple humanoid outlines with elongated snouts, to silhouettes with little detail, to sculpted attempts at realism. Despite their formal commonalities, no two images are the same, which aligns well with Greek beliefs about demons.

The simple outlines only occur on the earliest Greek examples: the Argive disc (**Cat. 2.1**), the Argive bottle (**Cat. 6.1**), and the terracotta house model from Sellada (**Cat. 3.2**). Some early Etruscan simians, like the stamps on the Villanovan vase (**Cat. 3.1**), the etching on the Tragliatella oinochoe (**Cat. 3.7**), and the reliefs embedded on the Etruscan red-ware fragment (**Cat. 7.9**) also fit into this category. In such cases, it seems

¹⁴⁹ See Chapter 2, n. 94.

the Greeks (and Etruscans) were still experimenting with the forms of both humans and simians, resulting in deliberate or accidental human-animal hybrids.

In the Archaic and Classical periods, the Greeks become more comfortable representing human and animal figures, but the bodily forms of monkeys and simianesque creatures continue to vary. Though more detailed than in previous centuries, each rendition is often clunky and inaccurate. Between the 6th and 5th centuries BCE, these creatures are represented in two ways: 1) black silhouettes with varying levels of detail and 2) semi-realistic animals that genuinely work to capture the creature's true appearance.

Silhouetted monkeys and simianesque creatures, which appear primarily in the Archaic Period, are wholly black (**Cat. 3.4, 3.9, 3.11, 3.13-14, 3.18, 3.21, and 4.2**) and sometimes feature minute, singular details: teeth (**Cat. 3.19**), hair (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.9** and **Cat. 7.1**), facial features and/or musculature (**Cat. 3.3, 3.20, 3.2-4** and **3.7**), and/or a collar/leash (**Cat. 3.15-16** and **3.18**). In nearly all cases, the creature is small in stature, has an elongated snout, and extends one or both arms outwards. Though the majority resembles monkeys and dog-headed baboons, some blur the line between human and animal: **Cat. 7.2, 7.4, and 7.7**, for example, all look more human than simian.

In the Late Archaic and Classical periods, less black is applied and more details are added. These details include distinct facial features (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.21-22**), hair (**Cat. 3.10, 3.12, 4.1. 4.8-9, 7.1-2**), musculature (**Cat. 3.17, 3.20. 4.3-7**), and adornment (**Cat. 3.8, 7.1, and 7.6**). We see similar attempts at realism later, on the Megarian mold-made bowl (**Cat. 5.1**), which shows tufts of fur emerging from the simian's neck and head.

Posture and Gesture

The postures adopted by monkeys and simianesque creatures vary as well; but regardless of their chosen attitude, these creatures are always rendered in inferior ways to the humans that share their scenes. This is ultimately due to postural hierarchy: as Jan Bremmer explains in an article on gesture and gait in Greek art, "...the body served as an important location for self-identification and demonstration of authority."¹⁵⁰ The Greeks attributed certain values to walking, standing, sitting, and squatting which helped the upper echelons of society distinguish themselves from the lower classes and foreigners in specific contexts.¹⁵¹ As I will discuss below, figures that stand or sit in chairs are oftentimes more important than those who sit or crouch on the ground. This hierarchical distinction is best illustrated on an Athenian red-figure hydria,¹⁵² which depicts a school scene: a young man and his tutor sit facing each other as they play musical instruments. Other students and tutors, who both sit and stand, inhabit the scene as well; therefore, sitting and standing seem to hold equal weight in this particular context. Behind the aforementioned student, however, a small servant with a bowl-shaped haircut, perhaps a child, crouches as he/she shyly turns to the right. It is clear that this child servant is the lowliest person in the scene because he/she neither sits nor stands but crouches on the floor behind a chair.

Gesture, or actions and movements performed with the body, can also be utilized to establish social hierarchies. If we return to the slave child on the Athenian red-figure hydria, he/she exhibits lowly gestures, which further distinguish him/her from the other, nobler characters. For example, the slave's limbs are pulled tightly into their body, as if

¹⁵⁰ Bremmer 1992, 27.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² British Museum 1864,1007.84.

to make them look as small as possible; they shyly turn their head to the right, away from the boy they sit behind; and gently touch their mouth, as if forbidden to speak.

Conversely, the students and teachers meet one another's gazes and openly gesticulate as they communicate and/or perform; this stark contrast makes the slave child seem even more insignificant. We see similar contrasts in images of gods and lesser beings. For example, in scenes that feature Dionysus with maenads and/or satyrs, the god often exhibits gestures that are far more subdued than his ecstatic devotees, who dance, drink and wave with gusto.¹⁵³

Monkeys and simianesque creatures also feature lowly and lewd postures and gestures that work to distinguish them from, or (in terms of monsters) associate them with, the characters they appear alongside. Though some sit and stand with bent knees, the majority crouch/squat with limbs pulled tightly into their bodies, like the child servant on the red-figure hydria. In nearly all cases, these creatures perform some kind of wild hand gesture (waving, pointing, grasping, and mouth-touching) and/or action (walking/crawling, jumping, dancing, and playing), like Dionysus' drunken maenads and satyrs. When compared to the human characters that share their scenes, the postures exhibited by monkeys and simianesque creatures imply they are the least significant figures, with respect to postural and gestural hierarchy, in their respective narratives.

The majority of monkeys and simianesque creatures crouch in Greek art (**Cat. 2.1, 3.1-7, 3.9-12, 3.14-16, 3.19, 3.21-2, 3.3, 4.9, 5.1, 6.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.6-7, 7.9**). Crouching, or squatting, is a lowly posture that involves bringing the knees into the chest while the upper body tilts forward slightly. In the case of squatting, the legs are splayed, rather than

¹⁵³ See Simon 1976, pls. 120-125 for an example.

pressed together, exposing the genitalia.¹⁵⁴ In Greek art, the position is assumed by human beggars, suppliants, initiates, slaves, mourners, and people defecating¹⁵⁵ and was evocative of self-abasement and pity.¹⁵⁶ For unideal, uncivilized, and parodic monkeys and simianesque creatures, however, it was commonplace and perhaps expected, for it is the default pose monkeys and baboons assume in the wild.¹⁵⁷ Additionally, a small percentage of simians crawl rather than crouch (**Cat. 3.13, 3.18, and 4.6**), which is also indicative of their primitive and animalistic nature.

In Greek art, crouching simians perform a variety of gestures that further marginalize them in their respective narratives. For example, the monkey on the MacMillan aryballos (**Cat. 3.4**) waves wildly at a horse and rider as they pass overhead. Similarly, the creature on the Proto-Attic conical stand (**Cat. 7.2**) points upward, towards the genitals(?) of the warrior that looms above. Another monkey, featured on the Amasis Painter cup (**Cat. 3.21**), grabs the frame of its metope as it waves its arms about. Other examples touch their mouths (**Cat. 3.2**), wave implements (**Cat. 3.19**), or scratch their bottoms (**Cat. 3.10**). Some of these gestures are overtly apotropaic, like pointing, while others are laughable and thus full of apotropaic potential.

Beginning in the 6th century BCE, sitting on chairs and reclining on couches was reserved for gods and citizens of high rank, whereas sitting on the ground was equivalent to crouching.¹⁵⁸ Due to the elevated status of this posture, only a couple of simians assume this pose and mostly during the Bronze Age, when they were revered and/or

¹⁵⁴ Satyrs often assume this position (see Chapter 2, n. 92 for examples).

¹⁵⁵ Bremmer 1992, 25-26.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ See Greenlaw 2011, figs. 1-7, which are modern day images of Old World monkeys in their natural habitats.

¹⁵⁸ Bremmer 1992, 25.

associated with divine forces (**Cat. 1.1**).¹⁵⁹ Only two Archaic simians sit, though not on chairs. In the first example, the animal crouches down, in a chair-like pose, and defecates on the ground (**3.20**); alternatively, it may be sitting on top of a pre-made pile of excrement. In the second example, the monkey straddles a horse (**Cat. 3.8**). Since both scenarios are ridiculous, there is nothing dignified about their postures; they are meant to be laughed at.

The rank of those who stand falls somewhere between sitting and crouching. In Homer's epics, for example, both gods and heroes are described as standing, but the importance of this posture declines in the 6th century BCE, when an increasing number of seated gods were manufactured and aristocrats began to recline at dinner tables and symposiums, a custom which may have been acquired from the East.¹⁶⁰ In Greek art, one finds people of every rank and status standing, except perhaps the lowest classes. The key to gentlemanly, aristocratic behavior, then, was embodied in specific combinations of posture, bodily position, and gait. Bremmer describes the complicated process: "In classical and later times...the proper male behavior in public walking required a leisurely but not sluggish gait, with steps that were not too small, with the hands firmly held and not upturned, the head erect and stable, the eyes open, steadfastly, and firmly fixed on the world."¹⁶¹

Though simians have hands and feet, like humans, they are not capable of standing upright; when moving, they walk on all fours.¹⁶² The fact that Greek simians stand and walk erect (**Cat. 3.17** and **4.1-3**) further proves that their makers did not

¹⁵⁹ See Chapter 2, pp. 43-46.

¹⁶⁰ Bremmer 1992, 24.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 23.

¹⁶² For an example, see Morris 2013, 137.

encounter these creatures in person. Rather, keeping in mind the visual and behavioral similarities between humans and simians, they may have made the assumption that these animals were capable of maintaining this type of posture. That said, to distinguish them from civilized humans, these animals are featured with bent knees and hunched postures; they are almost human, but not quite. This feature may have also been inspired by bow-legged images of the dwarf-god Bes (see **Fig. 3**), with whom Egyptian simians were associated, or bent-legged simians on Egyptianizing seals (see **Fig. 21**).

Like the crouching motifs, standing monkeys and simianesque creatures usually perform obscene and/or humorous gestures, such as throwing excrement (**Cat. 7.1**), masturbation (**Cat. 4.1-2**), “flipping the bird” (**Cat. 4.1**),¹⁶³ tight-rope walking (**Cat. 3.17**), jumping (**Cat. 3.21**), begging (**Cat. 4.3**), dancing (**Cat. 4.4**), and running (**Cat. 7.1, 7.3, and 7.2**). Their actions could reference both textual explanations of their behavior as well as representations of Egyptian and Eastern simians, which were commonly depicted performing human activities.¹⁶⁴

Location

Despite the fact that simians vary in appearance, posture, and gesture, they are always represented in marginal or peripheral locations, both on the object itself and within larger narratives. These locations include between legs of humans, horses, and chairs (**Cat. 2.1, 3.4-5, 7.2, 7.4, and 7.6-7**); on the backs of other animals (**Cat. 3.7-14**); among ornamentation beyond the narrative frieze (**Cat. 3.18-19, 3.21, and 5.1**); beneath a handle, sometimes cordoned off by lines (**Cat. 3.3-4, 4.1-2, and 7.1**); in a far corner (**Cat.**

¹⁶³ Interestingly, some anthropologists believe this gesture was performed prior to humans by certain species of monkeys for offensive purposes (Nasaw 2012, quoting Desmond Morris).

¹⁶⁴ For examples, see Chapter 3, pp. 91-92 and n. 22.

3.2 and **3.16**); and in the center of a narrative as a secondary element (**Cat. 3.7, 3.15, 3.20, 3.22, and 7.3**).

There is one aspect of the simian's marginalization that requires further attention: its tendency to be depicted near, on, or in imitation of horses. Horses had a variety of functions in Greek art: they were chthonic entities related to funerals, fertility, and elite status in the Geometric Period,¹⁶⁵ and later, in the Archaic and Classical eras, they were symbolic of protection (*e.g.* on shields), politics, war, games (*e.g.* funerary), the gods (especially Poseidon and Hades), and status (particularly of elite persons).¹⁶⁶ When paired with simians, the themes of the encompassing narratives are commonly war (**Cat. 3.7 and 7.2**), games (**Cat. 3.4 and 3.6**), and apotropaia (**Cat. 3.8 and 7.9**). Figurines of simians riding horses were popular grave offerings, both in Greece and Etruria,¹⁶⁷ though whether the pairing relates to the "status of the dead or chthonic character of the horse" is unclear.¹⁶⁸

In examples that feature horse-centric narratives with numerous characters (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.4 and 7.2**), simians usually appear as secondary or marginalized elements. Thus, they could connote one of two things: 1) apotropaia that protect the characters within the scenes (as all are competing, processing, or battling) and the users of the vessels, or 2) omens that foreshadow the failure and/or death of the warriors they sit near, like some

¹⁶⁵ Langdon 2010, 10-11.

¹⁶⁶ See Bell and Willekes 2014, 478-483.

¹⁶⁷ For Greek examples, see Winter 1903, 224 fig. 9; Roes 1931, 122 fig. 129; Ure 1934, 62 and 65-66 (horses with riders), 85 (grave 96), 86 (grave 101b), and 89 (grave 145); and McDermott 1938, 170 no. 61. For Etruscan examples, see Bonacelli 1932, pl. 15. See also "Sculpted Motifs" in Chapter 5.

¹⁶⁸ Calder 2011, 89.

birds and lizards featured in early Attic vase painting.¹⁶⁹ The presence of birds in many simian-adorned scenes (**Cat. 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, 3.9, 3.16, and 7.2**) could confirm this.

Discussion

The four factors, discussed above, imply that monkeys and simianesque creatures were viewed as demonic, apotropaic entities. The first, and most obvious, is their varied appearance: in Greek art, demonic entities, like Gello, were not represented because they were unclassifiable, liminal shapeshifters that resided between realms; and the demonic entities that were visually rendered, like Lamia, were not represented with consistency. This is because folkloric demons were often facilitated by entire communities whose members each pictured them differently. Thus, like the personification of Fear, they had no set form but manifested in ways that best suited each individual's perception of them. This is why representations of monkeys and simianesque creatures vary drastically and appear as if more human than animal: each is based on the makers' own assumptions.

The second telltale sign is posture and gesture: monkeys and simianesque creatures, for the most part, crouch, which was a lowly and unsavory position for a human to assume. Since most Greeks never saw monkeys in person and created images that vastly differed from the realistic motifs of the Egyptians and Mesopotamians, crouching may have been adopted by craftsmen to highlight these creatures' otherness, transgressive nature, and culpability for invisible evils with seemingly no source. This scapegoating, as previously mentioned, was necessary to prevent in-fighting in community settings.

Additionally, monkeys and simianesque creatures tend to perform apotropaic gestures

¹⁶⁹ Hurwit (2006, 128 and 130) has produced a similar argument in relation to birds and lizards featured in early Greek vase painting: he argues that birds were omens or prophetic promises of certain death, while lizards were symbols of death, "an incarnation of malevolent powers," and/or "an incarnation of power itself, a fearsomely protective talisman or apotropaic device." Thus, their seemingly irrelevant presence in certain narrative contexts was in fact indicative of death and doom.

(e.g. *digitus infamis* and pointing) and humorous/obscene actions (masturbation, dancing, begging, crawling on all fours, and stone/feces-throwing), which, like demonic apotropaia, were capable of warding off evil.

Finally, these creatures are usually located on the fringes of narrative scenes, like demons trapped between worlds. As I stated earlier, demonic entities were liminal creatures that resided in limbo, between the realms of the living and dead. Thus, they were thought to manifest and reside in liminal spaces, like doorways, and perform transgressive behaviors opposed to the civilized norm, like kidnapping and murder. By physically isolating monkeys and simianesque creatures in marginal and/or cordoned off locations on Greek objects, there is an implication that they, like demons, are physical and social outcasts with no possible entry into civilized society, which is embodied in the narrative scenes they border. Similarly, the creatures that take up more space and/or function as protagonists were rendered as ugly hybrids that, like Lamia, dangerously straddled the line between human and animal.

Monkeys and Humor

In addition to being visually inconstant and marginalized, simians are also funny. The question is, as Beard herself asks: “Why were monkeys so funny?”¹⁷⁰ As discussed in Chapter 1, the Greeks clearly comprehended simians’ strange behavior and appearance, which they viewed as distasteful, banal, and humorous; this is why they often related the animal to negative concepts like deception, mimicry, cunning speech, fraud, and flattery. These same negative connotations were later applied to simians by Roman authors, such as Strabo (*Geography* 17.3.4), Plutarch (*Morales* 64e), Cicero (*De natura deorum* 1.97), Aelian (*On the Nature of Animals* 4.46, 5.26, 6.10, 7.21, and 10.30), and

¹⁷⁰ Beard 2014, 161.

Galen (*On the Usefulness of Parts of the Human Body* 1.22, 1.58-59, and 1.194) but with the addition of ugliness and inferiority. Their ability to imitate was, as Galen believed,¹⁷¹ inherently humorous, yet can we rightfully argue that the laughter produced by the appearance and behaviors of simians was apotropaic?

As stated earlier, ritual aischrology and apotropaic laughter were concepts held by the ancient Greeks, though they seem to have been unpopular among authors. The obscene and humorous images represented on vases, figurines, and sculpture, some of which were exhibited/used in religious and theatrical settings, tell a different story: *e.g.* Baubo figurines, obscene actors, and ithyphallic satyrs. Similarly, obscenity, as a form of inducing laughter, was not pleasing to Romans either: Strabo (*De situ orbis* 2.252), for example, argues that “Funny faces are beneath our dignity...Obscenity is scarcely for a gentleman’s dinner party, let alone for the Forum.”¹⁷² Mimicry was the only acceptable way to encourage laughter, but only if it was “surreptitiou[s] and in passing.”¹⁷³ As was the case in Greece, however, some of Rome’s artistic themes and motifs suggest otherwise.

According to John Clarke, using obscenities to induce laughter for apotropaic purposes was practiced in places where people would have been subject to *baskania* (*invidia* in Latin), like brothels and bath houses. He provides an excellent explanation of these powers at work in relation to eight wall paintings,¹⁷⁴ which were represented in the apodyterium of the Suburban Baths at Pompeii. In this changing space, where people

¹⁷¹ In his treatise, *On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body* (1.58-59 and 194), Galen explains that simians are physically ridiculous and thus, by default, intrinsically as well.

¹⁷² As cited in Beard 2014, 119.

¹⁷³ Ibid.

¹⁷⁴ The scenes are laughable due to their implausibility in an ancient Roman context: *e.g.* a man performing oral sex on a woman (Jacobelli 1995, pl. 5), two women having sex (ibid., pl. 6a and Clarke 2002, fig. 87.1), a threesome with two men (ibid., pl. 7), a foursome with two men and two women (ibid., pl. 8), and a man exhibiting massive testicles (ibid., pl. 9).

would have disrobed, one would have exposed themselves to the envious or desirous gazes of others (*invidia*).¹⁷⁵ The Romans believed hazardous particles could emanate from the eyes of a visually aggressive person and invade the body of the one they beheld. Such particles could cause sickness and even death. The best way to counteract this effect was laughter, which, Clarke believes, was the purpose of these erotic paintings: the “artist violated sexual expectations to provoke (apotropaic) laughter, accomplishing his purpose by playing with norms of sexual behavior that differed according to the viewer’s gender.”¹⁷⁶

Most of the monkey and simianesque imagery discussed here exhibits subtle and obvious humorous elements in their facades and behaviors, perhaps for the purpose of inducing laughter in visually-hazardous contexts. This seems probable because they are represented comically in three ways: as the only funny element in a scene, perhaps to lighten up otherwise dark narratives; as protagonists poorly imitating human behavior; and as subtly comical elements rendered humorous by their gestures, behaviors, and appearance.

The most blatantly humorous monkeys and simianesque creatures appear in serious scenes. The earliest example is found on the Oresteia Krater (**Cat. 7.1**), which features three dark-skinned caricatures marginalized beneath the vessel’s handles. They throw circular objects into the main narrative splayed across the body: the death of Aegisthus or Agamemnon. As stated earlier, many scholars, like Blome,¹⁷⁷ believe they are throwing stones: stone-throwing, as both a playful and defensive action, is usually

¹⁷⁵ Clarke 2002, 156.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid. Koloski-Ostrow (2009, 242) agrees with Clarke’s assessment: she says the paintings were likely used to evoke laughter rather than function as models to follow.

¹⁷⁷ Blome 1985, 576.

performed by komast dancers in Corinthian vase painting. David Walsh believes that the ugly or “burlesque” appearance of these characters, as compared to those they attack, and their marginalization outside the main narrative “could denote the separation between the mythical world and the ‘real’ community dread they might represent.”¹⁷⁸ While the humanoid pair may be proto-stone-throwers, the lone hairy creature is more simianesque; thus, it may be throwing stones or balls of excrement, like monkeys, baboons, and apes often do in the wild.¹⁷⁹

The physical appearance and ridiculous behavior of these throwers, both on the Corinthian vessels and the Oresteia krater, seem not only irreverent but also parodic of bystanders featured in “serious” mythological narratives,¹⁸⁰ like Theseus and the Minotaur; and they are especially prevalent on scenes that include Nessos.¹⁸¹ The bent-legged, voyeuristic monkeys hiding beneath the handles of the two Caeretan hydria (**Cat. 4.1-2**) and the tightrope-walking monkey on the Vatican Painter amphora (**Cat. 3.17**) are performing a similar service by mocking, and making laughable, the serious scenes they behold: the Calydonian Boar Hunt, where a dog is cut in half and a woman runs the show; Nessos’ abduction of Deianeira, which is foiled by Herakles waiting in ambush;¹⁸² and a warrior’s departure from his family. An exception to this rule is the small monkey on the Apulian amphora (**Cat. 3.6**), which reaches for a horse’s falling excrement with a massive hand. This creature is part of a procession of youthful cavalry, but they are unarmed; they may, instead, be participating in games.

¹⁷⁸ Walsh 2009, 45.

¹⁷⁹ Goodall 1970, 201-216.

¹⁸⁰ Walsh 2009, 46

¹⁸¹ Stansbury-O’Donnell 2006, 167-169.

¹⁸² The reverse of this scene, which is to the monkey’s back, is equally violent: Odysseus and his men blind Polyphemus.

Other humorous simians are the main characters of the narratives they inhabit. The red-figure olpe, for example, which features a simianesque creature begging for an apple (**Cat. 4.3**), is laughable because of the stark juxtaposition between the beautiful young boy and his grotesque companion. Similarly, the neck amphora from Capua (**Cat. 4.8**) depicts a monkey in the presence of a swaddled woman; it presumably takes the place of a handmaiden and may be holding a bridal girdle.¹⁸³ The Attic red-figure cup from Vulci (**Cat. 4.4**), the red-figure askos (**Cat. 4.6**), and the chous (**Cat. 4.8-9**) are equally humorous because they feature simianesque creatures performing human activities (*e.g.* dancing, drinking, wielding clubs and sticks) and those commonly reserved for other animals (*e.g.* the horse). The monkeys that ride other animals and creatures (**Cat. 3.7-14**) are humorous for these same reasons: they behave in a manner that does not suit their species. Finally, the vessels that feature Lamia (**Cat. 8.1.2**) are laughable because of the absurdity of their narratives: a hairy simianesque woman chases a man half her size and Herakles, a mighty warrior, walks a sphinx-like beast on a leash.

Some monkey and simianesque humor is not noticeable (to the human eye) without magnification. For example, the small monkey crouched beneath a horse on the MacMillan aryballos (**Cat. 3.4**) is, according to Greenlaw, shaking its fist at the rider as he passes;¹⁸⁴ it might also be dancing or pointing. Similarly, the three monkey-like creatures on the Amasis Painter kylix (**Cat. 3.21**) feature bizarre postures, behaviors, and actions (*e.g.* the one that jumps down from the metopes into the main scene). The smallness of these motifs implies that they were not for the object's owners to see but rather to protect against invisible forces like the evil eye.

¹⁸³ Mitchell 2009, 109.

¹⁸⁴ Greenlaw 2011, 67.

Discussion

Monkeys and simianesque creatures were likely rendered in a humorous manner because of what they are (monkeys), how they behave (human), and how they look (hybrid). The small and unassuming examples (*e.g.* **Cat. 3.4**) that function as secondary and interpolative onlookers would have been easy to render and could be fitted anywhere, such as beneath handles, on rims, or between the legs of horses and people. The larger specimens (*e.g.* **Cat. 4.4**), which take part in the scenes that feature them, take textual sentiments to heart, rendering the creatures as ridiculous imitators that fail to convince viewers they are not animals. What they all have in common is the ability to produce laughter, which is important considering the contexts where these images would have been featured: as with the explicit paintings from the Suburban Baths at Pompeii, most of the objects that depict these creatures may have been used, prior to deposition in sanctuaries and graves, in contexts where the evil eye would have been present, such as the symposium (kraters, cups, oinochoe, and amphoras) and gymnasium (aryballoi). Thus, these motifs would have worked to protect their users in these vulnerable environs by surreptitiously and overtly inducing laughter, either within themselves or the people who threatened them with envy or ill-intent. In secondary contexts, like graves, these creatures, like the corpulent dwarf figurines, would have continued to provide protection even in death, for spirits and corpses were vulnerable to a variety of ills as well, such as wandering and magic.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁵ Supra n. 65 and pp. 146-147.

END OF A TRADITION

Representations of simians began to decline in the Classical era, but once Greece enters the Hellenistic Period, they become nearly extinct as a marginalizing form in pictorial art. I was only able to find one example of a Hellenistic marginalized monkey (**Cat. 5.1**), and its appearance in a scene from the *Odyssey*, a story this animal has no textual relation to, indicates this motif may be unique. The sudden death of the marginalized simian in the 4th century BCE ultimately raises the question: why did the Greeks stop representing these creatures in Hellenistic art?

As previously stated, the simian's decline in the Classical Period was likely due to the satyr: a Greek creation that coincided with the advent of comedic theater. The simian still fit into this new genre, however, because it shared visual and behavioral similarities with other comedic characters, like the satyr, padded dancers, and ithyphallic actors. Once Alexander the Great and Macedonia enter the picture in the late 4th century BCE, we see a drastic shift in all aspects of Greek culture and society. These shifts were, in part, due to the exponential expansion of their once small, confined world. As Jerome Pollitt explains: the Greek polis

...had been an intensely group-oriented experience, one in which the individual's ideas, aspirations, and prejudices were normally so thoroughly merged with those of the community that the possibility of leaving that community permanently in order to live a more idiosyncratic or exotic life in another country was seldom considered...¹⁸⁶

In the mid-4th century BCE, however, the Greek world—its citizens, art, and culture—was spread across the Eastern hemisphere, transforming once autonomous city states into

¹⁸⁶ Pollitt 1986, 1.

united federations of collaboration.¹⁸⁷ With this newfound society, however, came anxiety, uncertainty, and fear. As a result, the Greeks became obsessed with figures of fortune, like Tyche and Alexander the Great; philosophies that strove to remove stress, like Epicureanism; and developed an unprecedented willingness to accept and acknowledge other peoples, customs, and cultures,¹⁸⁸ for people tend to fear what they do not understand. These immense shifts in thought ultimately altered the way the Greeks expressed themselves in art and text; and the monkey, it seems, no longer had a place within this new, cultural framework.

Though Greek humor still persists in New Comedy,¹⁸⁹ new literary forms and sentiments, which contemplate and appreciate the natural world in novel ways, also develop during this period. For example, we see the birth of bucolic poetry in the 4th century BCE: established by Theocritus, these tales emphasize the harmonious relationship, and the blending of the natural lines, between human and animal.¹⁹⁰ The characters often featured in these poems are farmers, peasants, and shepherds, while animals tend towards local domesticates, like goats, sheep, and cows. Though some bucolic stories describe mythological characters and their animals,¹⁹¹ there is no mention of exotic species like simians; such animals had no place in Greek bucolic life.

Also in the Hellenistic Period we see the development of new philosophical schools of thought, such as Stoicism and Epicureanism. The Stoics adhered to the concept of *logos* (the true nature of the cosmos), inner contemplation, and individualism;

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 2-3 and 10-11.

¹⁸⁹ This style was marked by plays like Menander's *Samia*, which involved characters associated with everyday life: fed-up housewives, lustful husbands, and aggressive old women. For a textual example, see Edmonds 1961, no. 436 A.

¹⁹⁰ Guzwiler 1991, 83-89.

¹⁹¹ For example, Polyphemus' relationship with his animals is described in two of Theocritus' *Idylls* (6 and 11).

extreme emotions, like passion, were considered immature, unnecessary, and unnatural, so practitioners of this discipline preached stoicism, or calm, in the face of obstacles.¹⁹²

Followers of Epicureanism, on the other hand, endeavored to lead happy, stress-free lives; thus, anything that could induce anxiety, including pleasure-seeking, was disregarded.¹⁹³ Unlike the bucolic tales, which preached harmony with nature, these schools proclaimed that affinity with animals was not possible because they were incapable of rational, intellectual thought; this made them at odds with humans and thus undeserving of justice.¹⁹⁴

Though the schools of Stoicism and Epicureanism do not directly comment on monkeys, their belief that animals are inferior could explain why literary sentiments about Greek simians remain negative in this period. Though only a few Hellenistic authors describe wild simians, their condescending tone is equal to Archaic and Classical texts. One example comes from the 2nd century BCE author Agatharchides (*De Mari Erythraeo* 75b), who describes creatures known as “dog heads.” This could be a reference to *cenocéphaloi*, or dog-headed baboons, previously mentioned by Herodotus (*Histories* 4.191) and Ctesias (*Indica* (F45)). Unlike previous Greek authors, however, Agatharchides acknowledges that the “dog heads” are animals, but he compares them to deformed, wild men:

“The animals called ‘dog heads’ are similar to malformed men as far as their bodies are concerned, and they make manlike whimpering sounds with their voices. These animals are very wild and completely untamable. They have a rather fierce appearance because of their brows.”¹⁹⁵

¹⁹² Pollitt 1986, 9 and 105.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 8.

¹⁹⁴ Newmeyer 2011, 28-29 and 74.

¹⁹⁵ Trans. Burnstein, 1989.

Another example comes from Strabo (*Geography* 17.3.4), who also ridicules simians' appearance and behavior. His observation, however, is indirect, for he cites a comment made by the Stoic philosopher Poseidonius, who once glimpsed a colony of monkeys on the northern coast of Africa:

The country is the fruitful nurse of large serpents, elephants, antelopes, buffaloes, and similar animals; of lions also, and panthers. It produces weasels (jerboas?) equal in size and similar to cats, except that their noses are more prominent; and multitudes of apes, of which Poseidonius relates, that when he was sailing from Gades to Italy, and approached the coast of Africa, he saw a forest low upon the sea-shore full of these animals, some on the trees, others on the ground, and some giving suck to their young. He was amused also with seeing some with large dugs, some bald, other with ruptures, and exhibiting to view various effects of disease.¹⁹⁶

Though these simians were clearly acting like animals, their humanlike appearance, and the thought of such creatures exhibiting human behaviors, was, to the philosopher, both ridiculous and laughable—sentiments that were in keeping with Archaic and Classical accounts of the animal.

Based on these examples, it seems the Greeks' disdain for simians remained steadfast in certain literary strains of this period; and these sentiments even continue into the Roman era, as evidenced by authors' recitation of Aesopic fables. However, as evidenced by my singular find (**Cat. 5.1**), simians are nearly forgotten in pictorial art. This is likely because this era marked the end of classicizing figural pottery and the birth of new art forms, like the mold-made bowl; styles, like hyper-realism; and subject matters, like drunk old women. As Christine Havelock notes, Hellenistic art is incredibly diverse, "...sometimes nostalgic, sometimes revolutionary, at one time austere, at another intimate, comprehending the human tragedy and also the human comedy."¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁶ Trans. Meineke, 1877.

¹⁹⁷ Havelock 1981, 17.

We see this diversity especially in the manufacture of pottery. Greek black- and red-figure, centuries-old media on which marginalized simians normally appear, vanishes in the 3rd century BCE. It is replaced by a series of vessels whose diversity is the result of the varied locations in which they are made: West Slope Wares (mainland Greece), Gnathia Wares (Apulia), Hadra Vases (Alexandria), Centuripe vessels (Sicily), and mold-made relief bowls (Athens, Corinth, Italy, and Alexandria), to name a few. With the exception of the Centuripe and mold-made vessels, most Hellenistic pottery does not depict elaborate figural scenes of Greece's Archaic and Classical past; and most, with the exception of the Megarian mold-made bowl (**Cat. 5.1**), do not feature simians. Sculpted simians do appear in certain Hellenistic contexts,¹⁹⁸ but the animal is rarely featured until the Roman era, where it appears as a decorative element on ceramics and gems.¹⁹⁹

In addition to new ceramic styles, we also see the production of new apotropaic devices. Unlike previous periods, which utilized monsters and demons as emblems of protection, we see an increase in the production of representations of Fortune, grotesque figurines, and anti-evil eye amulets in the Hellenistic era. Though diverse, all of these apotropaic objects work to quell uncertainties and fears about prosperity. For example, Tyche, the personification of fortune, was frequently represented on coins, small-scale sculpture, and large-scale sculpture.²⁰⁰ In such images, the goddess usually wears a headdress adorned with fortification walls to signify the protection of prospering cities. Unlike personifications of the previous centuries, Tyche was also the focus of cult worship,²⁰¹ presumably as an added safety measure to remain on her good side. As Pollitt

¹⁹⁸ See Chapter 2, n. 94.

¹⁹⁹ See Chapter 2, n. 118.

²⁰⁰ For an example, see Pollitt 1986, fig. 1.

²⁰¹ Pollitt 1986, 3.

explains, “Tyche became a virtual goddess, the deity whom most men feared, because she seemed to be not only unpredictable but usually, in the long run, malign.”²⁰²

The belief in Tyche’s fickleness is likely why many of the apotropaic emblems made during this period worked to preserve people’s fortunes. For example, Greek magical papyri instruct citizens to fashion amulets in the form of pesky animals, like wolves and locusts, and bury them at city entrances to protect crops and farm animals.²⁰³ Simians are not included among these representations since they were not native to Greece. We also see the production of grotesque figurines, like Phthonos himself.²⁰⁴ Though simians were once associated with deformed persons in Classical Greece, Hellenistic grotesques focus solely on bodily imperfections. Such figurines have been described as implements of medical curiosity, entertainment, and cult,²⁰⁵ but they work best as apotropaia. For example, ever since the Archaic Period, dwarves had been associated with divine and supernatural forces, like Bes, Geryon, and Hephaestus, and emblems, like oversized phalloi.²⁰⁶ In the Hellenistic period, the purpose of such images was to induce “stress-relieving properties of human laughter,”²⁰⁷ thus dispelling the potential for misfortune and poverty. Finally, we see the production of anti-evil eye amulets during this period, though most do not survive perhaps because they were made out of perishable materials.²⁰⁸ We have many metal and stone examples from the Roman

²⁰² Ibid., 2.

²⁰³ Faraone 1992, 39-40.

²⁰⁴ Supra p. 158.

²⁰⁵ Massegia 2015, 294-295.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 295.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 296.

²⁰⁸ According to Kotansky (2006, 61), amulets were inscribed texts written on a number of media, many of them perishable, such as papyri and organic materials. We know of their existence due to conserved collections of Greek Magical Papyri, or manuals that provide instruction for how to use amulets. Most of these texts supply Roman and Christian examples, though some date earlier.

era,²⁰⁹ which include written incantations as well as representations of Egyptianizing creatures, like Harpocrates, Abraxis, and celebrant baboons.²¹⁰

The Hellenistic Period, it seems, marked the end of many Greek traditions, the marginalized simian among them. This makes sense if we consider that Hellenistic Greece was more open to outside influences than it had been in previous centuries. As a result, they no longer needed an unsettling, human-like creature to act as a stand-in for demonic terrors, comedic actions, ugliness and stupidity, or themselves; nor was the animal needed to ensure fortune and prosperity, for simians' fecund associations were native to Mesopotamia and Egypt and never made their way into Greece. Furthermore, in this new, expanded world, the simian was no longer an exotic creature of foreign lands that required marginalization and ridicule; in fact, in Ptolemaic Egypt, baboons were again worshipped as ambassadors of the god Thoth.²¹¹ Rather, these animals became one of many new pieces that made up the Greeks' ever-expanding world: in other words, without the mystery and dread that once surrounded simians, there was no longer a need to demonize them.

CONCLUSION

The simian was clearly an object of fascination among the ancient Greek peoples. Greek authors ridiculed them because of their similarity and inferiority to humans, while Greek craftsmen added erroneous renderings of them to larger, unrelated narratives in places that could have easily fitted a bird or rabbit. Similarly, comedic monkeys and simianesque creatures mimic the actions of actors, komast dancers, and satyrs, which

²⁰⁹ For examples, see Kotansky 1994, 24, 94, and 101-102.

²¹⁰ See Chapter 2, n. 118.

²¹¹ See Chapter 1, p. 6.

could have easily been used in their place. Why, then, were simians so fascinating to the Greeks? Why were they represented at all?

To an untrained eye, these creatures may seem random, but when one considers their tendency to be marginalized in larger narratives, it becomes clear that Greek craftsmen deliberately included them in their narrative compositions as demonic concepts: they are neither human nor animal, but something in-between—like demons. Demons had the power to both harm and protect, but, despite their jarring appearance, the visual contexts (*e.g.* serious and humorous) in which simians appear imply the latter: they were scary but positive emblems of protection. Whether the first images of these creatures were intentionally demonic and apotropaic, like theriomorphic demons embodying *similia similibus*, is unknowable; but the Greeks' visual misapprehension of them resulted in the construction of beings that vary in appearance, are ill-statured and statured, marginalized within larger narratives, and imbued with humor, both perceptible and imperceptible. Thus, it seems monkeys and the simianesque embody demonic concepts infused with apotropaic connotations. As the Greeks grew to understand the creature better, later representations become less frightening and more comedic but are nevertheless imbued with the same apotropaic potential: evil eye-dispelling laughter.

What Comes Next?

This dissertation focused on the demonic and apotropaic potential of *iconographically inconsistent* and *marginalized* monkeys and simianesque creatures as featured in larger narratives on Greek and Italic ceramics (**Cat. 3.1-10, 3.15-21, 4.1-8, 5.1, 6.1, and 7.1-9**), precious gems (**Cat. 3.11-14 and 3.22**), and a stamped stone disc (**Cat. 2.1**). I unlikely found every instance of these creatures in Greek and Italic art, so

more research should be conducted on archaeological finds, museum storage, and private collections to find stray examples. This, however, is a given; what else can be done to explore this strange, apotropaic phenomenon? Chapter 5 (the Conclusion) will explore additional representations of monkeys and simianesque creatures, especially figurines discovered in religious and funerary contexts, to determine if they too have demonic, apotropaic potential: though figurines are often too crude to analyze iconographic consistency and their three-dimensional nature prevents marginalization, most, if not all, are physically marginalized (*e.g.* ugly, ithyphallic, and comedic). Additionally, I will briefly explore alternate patterns that may be present in these surveyed objects, specifically in relation to object types, function, and find spots, as well as the significance of studying demons in Greek art.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Though the Greeks were convinced that simians were primitive imitators incapable of independent thought, we now know this is not the case. As David Attenborough explains in his *Natural Curiosities* series, “In the past, we used to teach monkeys how to do things, how to perform tricks. But things are different today. Today, monkeys are teaching us things.”¹ For example, capuchin monkeys, which are native to Central and South America, are known to rub acidic, spicy, and pungent plants into their fur to protect against stings and bites. When Europeans first encountered them in the wild, they thought these animals were mimicking humans; in fact, they had learned the trick themselves and had taught locals to do the same.²

Though simians are still used and appropriated, in both art and culture, in insensitive and unsuitable ways,³ our knowledge about them has encouraged appreciation rather than mockery. The ancient Greeks, however, vastly misunderstood these intelligent creatures, which resulted in their visual marginalization, conflation with demons, and use as apotropaic emblems; the existence of simianesque motifs, or monkey-like human figures, further confirms the Greeks’ confusion and anxiety about these animals. The evidence presented in this dissertation, which demonstrated how these small, ugly, and obscene motifs hold meanings that coincide with Greek beliefs about demons, has contributed to pre-existing ideas about small motifs (*e.g.* Hurwit’s study on lizards and birds) and the borrowing of Eastern motifs (*e.g.* sphinxes and griffins) and raised

¹ Attenborough 2015.

² Ibid.

³ Some people still associate apes with black people, resulting in tasteless cartoons, art, and movies (see Hund and Mills 2016, 28 February for examples). Additionally, people still own monkeys as pets, cruelly removing them from their mothers as infants, neutering/spaying them, declawing them, and removing their teeth in an effort to domesticate them (see National Geographic, *My Child is a Monkey*, 2010 for examples).

questions about the following ideas: 1) do sculpted representations of simians have apotropaic potential? In other words, is all Greek simian art apotropaic? 2) Is marginalization the only pattern in the objects featured here, or is there inherent meaning in the regional and stylistic evidence as well? 3) What can we now say about Greek beliefs regarding demons and their willingness to represent them? I will begin by exploring contributions this dissertation has made to pre-existing fields of study and finish by answering the questions posed above, which work to show the broader significance of studying simian art.

Small Motifs

The Greeks believed that simians were inherently apotropaic because of the physical and behavioral similarities they shared with humans. Thus, they were inserted into larger narratives, to which they often did not relate, to protect an object, its contents, and/or its users. Simians, however, are not the only seemingly interpolative animals that embody greater meanings: birds and lizards are used similarly in early Greek vase painting.

We know that Geometric and Early Archaic vessels featured *horror vacui*, or “fear of blank space.” Every surface was covered from top to bottom with plant motifs and real and fantastic animals which sometimes flanked a human scene.⁴ This tradition continues into the 6th century BCE, when we see remnants of animal friezes on large vessels with one or more figural scenes.⁵ Sometimes, the interpolative decoration is larger, filling gaps between one or two main scenes; these motifs occur especially on lips,

⁴ For examples, see Simon 1976, pls. 8-9 (Geometric), 15 (early 7th century BCE), 23 (mid-7th century BCE), IX (late 7th century BCE), and **Cat. 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, and 3.19.**

⁵ For examples, see *ibid.*, pls. 47 (ca. 590 BCE), 52-53 (ca. 570-565 BCE), and pl. XXII (ca. 530 BCE).

necks, and beneath handles.⁶ There is evidence to suggest that certain interpolative animals hold meaning, based on the contexts in which they occur (*e.g.* rabbits and birds in wild landscapes) and the characters/stories they appear alongside (*e.g.* fish with Poseidon). Conversely, many monkeys and simianesque creatures appear in narratives they have no relation to; and, based on the work of Jeffrey Hurwit, they appear to be part of a larger tradition of using animals as filler but with purpose.

Hurwit has explored the possibility that representations of birds and lizards in early Greek art (ca. mid-7 to mid-5th century BCE) may have ominous implications. This is because they often occur in scenes that feature impending doom or disaster. Many of these scenes, which can appear in vase painting,⁷ ceramic relief,⁸ and on metal implements,⁹ show the lizard crawling between a hero confronting a monster (*e.g.* Perseus and Medusa) or battling warriors. In many of these scenes, a soaring bird appears in addition to the lizard; Hurwit thinks such birds may be hunting the lizard to mirror the conflict presented in the main narrative.

As previously stated, we see bird-conflict pairings represented on the MacMillan aryballos (**Cat. 3.4**) and Proto-Attic conical stand (**Cat. 7.3**), which feature processing and/or battling warriors; the birds featured in these scenes, however, sit rather than fly. A perched bird also appears on the Apulian Amphora (**Cat. 3.6**), which depicts processions of youths on horses, though there is no evidence of impending conflict. Of course, birds and lizards appear in scenes that do not imply looming disaster as well (**Cat. 3.2, 3.6, 3.9**,

⁶ For examples, see *ibid.*, pls. 41 (ca. 530 BCE) and 91 (ca. 520 BCE) and **Cat. 4.1-2**.

⁷ Hurwit 2006, figs. 1-2 and 7.

⁸ *Ibid.*, fig. 4.

⁹ *Ibid.*, fig. 5.

and 3.16);¹⁰ in such cases, Hurwit believes these animals may evoke a supernatural realm not of this earth, such as the afterlife.¹¹

Simians have supernatural implications as well since they align most with demonic forces, like the Lamia and Gello. Furthermore, their consistent marginalization, both locational and physical, in larger narratives implies their use, like the lizard and flying bird, is not accidental. I think these creatures can be added to Hurwit's list of subtly relevant motifs that outwardly appear interpolative, and, as a result, further study should be conducted on the use of animals as more than mere decorative filler.

Borrowed Motifs

The marginalized simian has added to pre-existing knowledge about borrowed Eastern motifs as well. The simian, like many other monsters and animals represented in Greek art, is not native to the Mediterranean but was frequently imported into Egypt, represented in Mesopotamia, and spread, in art and travelers' tales, by Cyprus and Phoenicia. As previously argued (Chapter 2), there is strong evidence to suggest that the Bronze Age Cretans imported images of simians *and* their sanctified implications into Crete. By comparing Greek representations of simians with Eastern ones (Chapter 3), which no scholar had previously done, I also demonstrated that sacred and fecund images of this animal were still being recalled, albeit awkwardly, after the Bronze Age, but craftsmen were no longer adhering to the meanings inherent within them. After a 400 year absence from Greek art, the animal reemerged to become a prevalent motif in Archaic art, and to a lesser extent the Classical, but the Greeks were inserting their own

¹⁰ See also *ibid.*, fig. 8.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 127-128.

meanings into them. This is true of all the Eastern characters, narratives, and motifs they borrowed in the 7th-5th centuries BCE; and the simian, I think, reinforces this idea.

The Greeks' methods of visual appropriation are clearly embodied in imported images of Eastern and Egyptian monsters. Monstrous hybrids emerged in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and perhaps as far east as China.¹² It seems probable that the characteristics and myths behind these creatures were formed based on the discovery of dinosaur bones, like the beaked *Psittacosaurus*,¹³ and large animal carcasses.¹⁴

In Mesopotamia, for example, monsters were fashioned from natural phenomena and were used to ward off evil, secure good, and provide heroes and gods with enemies to battle.¹⁵ Though some monsters were associated with divinities, few were divine themselves and even fewer had mythological stories attached to them, like the chimera.¹⁶ Conversely, monsters born in Egypt were often associated with the divine;¹⁷ this includes both members of the animal-headed pantheon, like Thoth and Hathor, and lesser genii, like Bes and Taweret. Even bestial monsters, like the sphinx, had regal associations, for numerous pharaohs took on their form as expressions of power and intelligence.¹⁸

Eventually, these monstrous concepts made their way into Greece, where their visual forms, like Bes and Ptah,¹⁹ were adopted and adapted to serve local needs. Originally, in the Bronze Age, many of these motifs, like the simian, retained the meanings and functions they once held abroad. Eventually, these connotations fell away

¹² See Phillips 1955, 173 and Rudenko 1958, 101.

¹³ According to Mayor (2000, chapter 1), this particular species, which had a massive head and beaked upper jaw, was frequently found in goldmines, like those in Scythia, and likely resulted in the creation of the griffin.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, chapter 2.

¹⁵ Childs 2003, 50 and 53.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 63.

¹⁷ Fischer 1987, 26.

¹⁸ Boardman 2002, 133.

¹⁹ See Chapter 3, pp. 99-104.

and the Greeks applied their own. For example, early representations of sphinxes and griffins appear as static, apotropaic emblems, as they were often used in the East. Later, the sphinx was associated with Oedipus, who is often depicted trying to outsmart the ravenous creature.²⁰ Conversely, the griffin continued to function as ornamental filler into the Classical Era, when they appear fighting Scythian Arimaspians in vase painting.²¹ The centaur also fits into the category: there is evidence to suggest that the concept of the centaur was taken from the East,²² but early Greek representations of the creature materialize hundreds of years later and differ vastly in appearance.²³ Moreover, the centaur's two main functions in Greek myth—nurturing mentor and violent drunk—are wholly Greek.²⁴ In the latter case, they are often depicted battling heroes like Theseus and Peirithous.²⁵

As previously mentioned, the Bronze Age Greeks were far more open to adopting the meanings inherent in the Eastern images they imported. Beginning in the Archaic Period, however, the Greeks became an isolative culture²⁶ that, though open to foreign motifs, preferred to utilize them for their own purposes. I think the simian, in addition to the many other Eastern characters, monsters, and animals the Greeks rendered, helps to

²⁰ For a red-figure example, see Boston MFA 06.2447 (<http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/two-handled-jar-amphora-depicting-oedipus-and-the-sphinx-of-thebes-153615>).

²¹ Arimaspians fight griffins on ~65 Attic red-figured vessels and a few stone reliefs between 400 and 300 BCE. Though they are always described as having one eye in Greek and Roman literature, these vessels depict them in profile, seemingly with two eyes, and donned in Scythian dress. For examples, see Boston MFA 01.8092 (<http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/drinking-cup-kylix-153712>) and British Museum 1931,0113.1 (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=738534001&objectId=461396&partId=1).

²² See Padgett 2003, 129-132 and pls. 11-12 for Middle-Assyrian examples.

²³ Originally, these creatures are rendered as full-bodied men with horse rumps (see Boardman 1998, 93 fig. 174 and **Cat. 5.2** for examples). Later, their human components are restricted to their head, torso, and arms (see Simon 1976, pls. 52 and 54 for examples).

²⁴ See Langdon 2008, 70, 72-73 and 216.

²⁵ The Francois Vase (ca. 580) provides the earliest confrontation between the Lapiths and centaurs, but Theseus and Peirithous do not take part until later, most famously on the west pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia (ca. 470-456).

²⁶ See “End of a Tradition” in Chapter 4.

confirm this idea and perhaps warrants further investigation into whether all imported motifs lose their original meanings after the Bronze Age and why.

Sculpted Motifs

As stated in the Introduction, motifs of monkeys and baboons appear on a variety of Greek, Etruscan, and Italic objects: vase painting, figurines, pithemorphic aryballoi, fibulae, seals, mosaic, gems, jewelry, and metalwork. Of these, I focused on objects that portray pictorial narratives, like vase painting. I did not discuss sculpted objects, like figurines, because most are difficult to identify, mislabeled, and/or broken. Like some of the Late Archaic and Classical pictorial motifs described in Chapter 2, however, sculpted monkeys and simianesque creatures are physically marginalized (*e.g.* are ugly, ithyphallic, laughable, and perform human activities). Furthermore, in keeping with the Greek visual tradition, many assume the same positions, gestures, and behaviors as those in vase painting (*e.g.* they crouch or squat, touch their mouths or heads, and perform various human activities and lewd gestures) and appear on objects (*e.g.* horse bits) and in contexts (*e.g.* graves) that would have required protection. Though they do not exhibit locational marginalization in larger narratives (at least it cannot be proven), is it possible that sculpted simians also have apotropaic connotations due to their formal marginalization?

Let us look at examples of simianesque bronze and terracotta figurines that were discovered in sanctuary and tomb contexts, for many exhibit marginalizing forms, behaviors, and gestures, such as crouching and human imitation. For instance, a series of “bottle-stopper” or “jug” figurines have been found in votive and grave contexts in

Macedonia, Chalcidice, and Thessaly.²⁷ These creatures sit atop knobby shafts, often feature elongated snouts which they touch with their hands, and they may be drinking or playing an instrument.²⁸ They were often found in sanctuaries as votives and on the bodies of skeletons. Based on the latter context, they may have been worn around the waist as pendants or amulets during life and buried with the body for protection in death.²⁹

The same can be said for figurines of simian horse-riders: as stated in Chapter 4, horses had chthonic connotations in Greek art and culture³⁰ and often appear in funerary art, like the Dipylon vases. This dissertation surveyed images of simians riding horses (**Cat. 3.8-10**) or loitering in their immediate vicinity (**Cat. 3.4-5**); some occur in funerary settings (**Cat. 3.7** and **3.10**). In addition, there are numerous Greek and Etruscan terracotta and metal figurines and decorative objects, discovered in grave contexts, which depict simians riding horses. For example, a series of terracotta monkey-riders were discovered in graves in Rhitsona and Boeotia: some wear clothing, such as jackets and caps, while others are ithyphallic.³¹ Louise Calder believes they may relate to the previous occupation/status of the deceased and/or the chthonic nature of horses,³² but they may be apotropaic as well, protecting the deceased from harm. Additionally, horse

²⁷ For more information on “bottle stoppers,” see Bouzek 1976, p 76-77 and Langdon 1990, 413-414; for visual examples, see Bouzek 1974, 73 nos. 1-4 and 8-10; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1979, 194-208, pls. 61-72; and Langdon 1990, 413 fig. 12.

²⁸ They are comparable to bronze simianesque figurines discovered in a variety of Peloponnesian sanctuaries (see Chapter 2, n. 23 for details).

²⁹ Langdon 1990, 414.

³⁰ Langdon 2010, 10-11.

³¹ See Winter 1903, 224 fig. 9; Roes 1931, 122 fig. 129; Ure 1934, 62 and 65-66 (horses with riders), 85 (grave 96), 86 (grave 101b), and 89 (grave 145); and McDermott 1938, 170 no. 61.

³² Calder 2011, 89.

implements featuring simian motifs were discovered in a variety of Etruscan graves:³³

Such creatures crouch or stand, ride horses, and/or touch their mouths.

Though these terracotta and metal simians are not marginalized in larger narratives, like many of the examples presented in Chapter 2, they are formally ridiculous and laughable and thus may have apotropaic connotations as well. Does this mean all representations of simians are apotropaic? Unlike the pictorial motifs, I think the significance of sculpted simians is dependent on their context. For example, pictorial representations of simians appear on vases and gems that functioned as utilitarian objects prior to their deposition in tombs and sanctuaries. In other words, preceding retirement, these objects would have been used by people in domestic and public settings where the evil eye was ever-present (*e.g.* the symposium and gymnasium). Thus, regardless of where these objects were deposited after being used, demonic, apotropaic meaning was still embedded in the simian motifs they featured. Conversely, figurines are normally made for direct deposition in graves and sanctuaries. Those deposited in sanctuaries did not need to be apotropaic; they functioned solely as gifts for gods. There are, of course, exceptions to this rule: some figurines were used as toys or, like the simians found at the Demeter and Kore sanctuary in Corinth, apotropaia to assist women with domestic activities.³⁴ They may have been used inside the sanctuary or deposited afterwards as gifts. Determining the previous lives of figurines, prior to their dedication in sanctuaries, however, is tricky; it would require a thorough analysis of simian figurines, their find spots within sanctuaries, and knowledge of the types of cultic activities that occurred at each. Conversely, sculpted simians that appear in tombs have a clear reason to be

³³ See Chapter 2, n. 27.

³⁴ See Chapter 2, n. 94.

apotropaic: to protect a body and its grave. Thus, context plays a large role in how these figurines can be interpreted.

Other Patterns (in addition to the motifs)

In my survey (Chapter 2) and Appendix (**Tables 1-3**), I explored how simians appear on a broad spectrum of objects (amphoras, kylixes, hydrias, oinochoe, aryballoi, fragments, terracotta building models, kraters, cups, chous, a bottle, conical stand, clay ossuary, long-necked object, relief vase, exaleiptron, skyphos, olpe, askos, mold-made bowl, steatite disc, hematite gem, jasper gem, carnelian gem, terracotta gem, and a gem cast), which feature a variety of fabrics (Attic, Athenian, Proto-Corinthian, Caeretan, Laconian, Kabiric, Argive, Apulian, Ionian, Megarian, Etruscan, and Villanovan) and techniques (black and white, black-figure, red-figure, paint, geometric, wild goat, mold-made, red ware, stamps, incision, and relief). Moreover, the objects are spread over a wide geographic area, appearing in tombs (12) and religious contexts (6) all over Greece (Aetos, Aegina, Argos, Tharros, Athens, Paros, Orthia, Megara, Thebes, Thera) and Etruria (Vulci, Orvieto, Campania, Capua, Bologna, Caere, Cerevetri). The majority of these objects, however, are without provenance (18).

If we delve deeper into the seemingly random distribution of these objects, a subtle pattern does emerge. For example, 21 of these objects were made in Attica/Athens or by Athenian craftsmen working elsewhere. Of those with provenance, the majority was discovered in alternative contexts in Greece (Thebes, Paros, Aegina, Eleusis) and Etruria (Vulci, Orvieto, Campania, and Capua); the exception is the black-figure Kylix from Kerameikos (**Cat. 3.10**). Athens was one of the most popular makers and exporters of ceramic vessels in the Archaic and Classical periods, with Corinth and Laconia close

behind,³⁵ so it makes statistical sense that most of the vessels on this list would be Attic/Athenian. Why, however, would Athenian craftsmen have been so keen to represent simians in their art? Were they doing so at the behest of those they crafted for, like the Etruscans, who often depicted simians on grave goods? Since Athens was an important trade hub, were they inspired by simianesque animals that may have come through local markets? Are there specific Eastern imports, discovered within the city, that depict similar motifs? These are questions that can be further explored in relation to the types, techniques, and find spots of these objects.

Demonic Motifs

I think this dissertation's most important contribution relates to demons. Most scholars who discuss demons in ancient Greece explore their use in text rather than art.³⁶ This is likely because of their inconstancy: demons are abnormal, inverted, and unclassifiable beings that exist primarily in oral folklores. As a result, they exist between realms and have no set forms, making them difficult to identify. The Lamia, for example, is depicted as a woman, a giant monkey, and a sphinx in vase painting. The goal of this dissertation was to apply ideas about literary demons to art. In doing so, I discovered that Greek demons could be embodied by real creatures that were simply misunderstood: the simian, though an animal, had human qualities, like features and behaviors, which may have resulted in its demonization; people, after all, often fear what they do not understand. If simians have demonic potential, other real-world animals, objects, and peoples may have been viewed as demonic as well. As I described in Chapter 4, the key to determining demonic potential lies in **iconographic inconsistency** (*i.e.* the constant

³⁵ Four of the vessels on this list were made in these contexts (**Cat. 3.4, 3.8, 3.16, and 3.20**).

³⁶ Smith 1978, Stewart 1991, West 1991 and 1995, Johnston 1995 and 1999, and Kotanski 2000

altering of repeated forms) in conjunction with **marginalization** (*i.e.* the isolation of an image within/along borders or the rendition of something as hideous and/or obscene). I think these criteria can be used to determine if other Greek images have demonic potential. The identification of more demonic imagery would confirm that the Greeks did not fear representing demons but embraced their apotropaic potential as a means of protecting their possessions and themselves.

Final Thoughts

There are certainly more avenues to investigate in relation to the marginalized simian phenomenon. These include, but are not limited to, surveying representations of simians from imperial Rome, where the simian is still described as abhorrent³⁷ and remnants of the marginalizing tradition remain;³⁸ performing a closer comparison of text and image, including dates during which each object was made vs. when texts were written; and searching for more representations of simianesque creatures, like the Lamia, and other non-canonical demonic motifs. What this dissertation has shown is that any motif, no matter how small, can be meaningful; that apotropaic motifs can occasionally be minute and unassuming, rather than obvious and grand; that demons *were* represented but inconsistently due to their folkloric, rather than mythological, natures; and that simians, though ridiculed and misunderstood, were in fact valued by the ancient Greek peoples.

³⁷ See Chapter 4, p. 171.

³⁸ For examples, which appear on Gallo-Roman *terra-sigillata*, see Loschke 1911, pl. LXI no. 1689; and Knorr 1905, pls. 95b and XVII nos. 9-10.

APPENDIX ONE: TABLES

TABLE 1: OBJECT TYPE

Object Type	Quantity
Amphora	6
Kylix	4
Hydria	3
Oinochoe	3
Aryballos	2
Terracotta Building Model	2
Cup	2
Krater	2
Chous	2
Bottle	1
Conical Stand	1
Clay Ossuary	1
Long-Necked Object	1
Fragments	1
Relief Vase	1
Red-Ware	1
Exaleiptron	1
Skyphos	1
Olpe	1
Askos	1
Mold-Made Bowl	1
Steatite Disc	1
Hematite Gem	1
Jasper Gem	1
Carnelian Gem	1
Terracotta Gem	1
Gem (Cast)	1

TABLE 2: FIND SPOTS

Find Spot	Quantity
Unknown	18
Aetos (religious context?)	2
Thebes (unknown context)	1
Aegina (unknown context)	1
Tenos (unknown context)	1
Rhodes (unknown context)	1
Eleusis (religious context?)	1
Volo (unknown context)	1
Etruria (tomb context?)	1
Campania (tomb context?)	1
Capua (tomb context?)	1
Cyprus (unknown context)	1
Vulci (tomb context?)	1
Orvieto (tomb context?)	1
Nikolopoulos Plot, Argos	1
Tomb 3, Tharros	1
Kerameikos, Athens	1
Delion on Paros	1
Sanctuary of Artemis, Orthia	1
Heraion at Megara	1
Kaibiroi Sanctuary, Thebes	1
Roman Tomb, Sellada, Thera	1
Arnoaldi-Veli Necropolis, Bologna	1
Necropolis near Tragliatella, Caere	1
Tomb I at Via Diroccata, Cerveteri	1
Tomba della Panatenaica, Vulci	1

TABLE 3: STYLE (POTTERY)

FABRIC	TECHNIQUE	QUANTITY
Proto-Attic	Black and White	2
	Black-Figure	1
Attic	Black-Figure	6
	Red-Figure	4
Athenian	Black-Figure	3
	Red-Figure	3
Proto-Corinthian	Paint	2
Caeretan	Black-Figure	3
Laconian	Black-Figure	2
Kabiric	Black-Figure	1
Argive	Geometric	1
Apulian	Geometric(?)	1
Ionian	Wild Goat	1
Ithacan	Paint	2
Megarian	Mold-Made	1
Etruscan	Red Ware	1
Villanovan	Stamps	1
N/A	Paint	1
	Relief	1
	Incision	1

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources (not cited in Secondary Sources)

Aelian	<i>On the Nature of Animals</i>
Aeschylus	<i>Agamemnon</i>
Aeschylus	<i>Persians</i>
	<i>Prometheus</i>
Aristophanes	<i>Knights</i>
	<i>Pax</i> (schol.)
	<i>Wasps</i>
	<i>Wealth</i>
Aristotle	<i>Generation of Animals</i>
	<i>History of Animals</i>
Galen	<i>On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Human Body</i>
Harpocration	<i>Lexicon of the Ten Orators</i>
Hesiod	<i>Works and Days</i>
	<i>Wedding of Keyx</i>
Hippocrates	<i>On Sacred Disease</i>
Homer	<i>Iliad</i>
	<i>Odyssey</i>
Horace	<i>Ars Poetica</i>
Hymn to Demeter	
Ovid	<i>Fasti</i>
Kreophylus	<i>Capture of Oichalia.</i>
Lycophron	<i>Alexandria</i>
Nonnus	<i>Dionysiaca</i>
Plato	<i>Cratylus</i>
	<i>Republic</i>
Pliny	<i>Natural Histories</i>
Plutarch	<i>Morales</i>
Sophocles	<i>Women of Trachis</i>
Strabo	<i>Geography</i>
Xenophon	<i>Symposium</i>

Online Databases

Arachne	Deutsches Archaeologisches Institut (https://arachne.dainst.org/)
BAPD	Beazley Archive Pottery Database (www.beazley.ox.ac.uk)
BAGD	Beazley Archive Gem Database (www.beazley.ox.ac.uk)
Capitolini	Capitoline Museums Research (http://capitolini.net/index.xql)
CMS	Corpus of Minoan and Mycenaean Seals (http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/drupal/?q=en/node/196)
CVA	Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum (http://www.cvaonline.org/cva/default.htm)

Encyclopedias

LIMC	Lexikon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae
------	--

Secondary Sources

- Altenmüller, H. 1965. *Die Apotropaia und die Götter Mittelägyptens*. Munich: Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich.
- Amyx, D. A. 1988. *Corinthian Vase-Painting of the Archaic Period, Volume I*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Anonymous, 1889. "Erwerbungen der Antikensammlungen in Deutschland III: Dresden," AA 156-182.
- Aruz, J. 1999. "The Oriental Impact on the Forms of Early Aegean Seals," in P. Bentancourt *et al.*, eds. *Meletemata: Studies in the Aegean Archaeology Presented to Malcolm H. Wiener as He Enters his 65th Year*, 7-14. Aegaeum 20. Liège: Université de Liège.
- . 2008a. *Marks of Distinction: Seals and Cultural Exchange Between the Aegean and the Orient (ca. 2600-1360 B.C.)*. CMS 7. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- . 2008b. "Ritual and Royal Imagery," in J. Aruz, K. Benzel, and J. M. Evans, eds. *Beyond Babylon: Art, Trade, and Diplomacy in the Second Millennium B.C.*, 136-160. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- . 2014. "Art and Networks of Interaction Across the Mediterranean," in J. Aruz, S. B. Graff, and Y. Rakic, eds. *Assyria to Iberia at the Dawn of the Classical Age*, 112-124. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Aruz, J., P. O. Harper, and F. Tallon, eds. 1992. *The Royal City of Susa: Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Ascalone, E. 2011. *Glittica Elamita. Dalla metà del III alla metà del II millennio A.C. Sigilla a stampo, sigilla cilindro e impronte rinvenute in Iran e provenienti da collezioni private e museali*. Roma: L'erma di Bretschneider.
- Ashmead, A. H. and K. M. Phillips, 1976. *Classical Vases, Excluding Attic Black-Figure, Attic Red-Figure, and Attic White Ground*. Providence, RI: Rhode Island School of Design.
- Aston, E. 2011. *Mixanthropoi: Animal-Human Hybrid Deities in Greek Religion*. Kernos Suppl. 25. Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique.
- Attenborough, D. 2009. "Primates," in *Life* 1.10. Produced by BBC.
- . 2015. "Curious Cures," in *David Attenborough's Natural Curiosities* 3.5. Produced by BBC.
- Austin, A. 2008. "The Greeks in Libya," in G. R. Tsetschladze, ed. *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas, Vol. 2*, 187-217. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Bailey, D. M. 2008. *Catalogue of the Terracottas in the British Museum IV: Ptolemaic and Roman Terracottas From Egypt*. London: British Museum.
- Baines, J. 1985. *Fecundity Figures: Egyptian Personification and the Iconology of a Genre*. Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci.
- Baker, H. S. 1966. *Furniture in the Ancient World: Origins and Evolution 3100-475 B.C.* New York: Macmillan Company.
- Ballod, F. 1913. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte der zwerghäften Götter in Agypten*. Moscow: H. Liessner & D. Sobko.

- Barbash, Y. 2013. "How the Ancient Egyptians Viewed the Animal World," in E. Bleiberg *et al.*, eds. *Soulful Creatures. Animal Mummies in Ancient Egypt*, 19-61. Brooklyn: Giles.
- Barnett, R. D. 1969. "Ezekiel and Tyre." *Eretz-Israel* 9, 6–13.
- . 1973. "Monkey Business," *JANES* 5, 1-10.
- . 1977. "The Amathus Shield-Boss Rediscovered and the Amathus Bowl Reconsidered," *RDAC* 157–69.
- Barnett, R. D. and C. Mendleson, eds. 1987. *Tharros: A Catalogue of Material in the British Museum from Phoenician and Other Tombs at Tharros, Sardinia*. London: British Museum.
- Barreca, F. 1987. "The City and Site of Tharros," in R. D. Barnett and C. Mendelson, eds. *A Catalogue of Material in the British Museum from Phoenician and Other Tombs at Tharros, Sardinia*, 21-29. London: British Museum.
- Barrett, C. 2015. "Two Egyptian Figurines from the Necropolis of Delos," in A. Muller *et al.*, eds. *Figurines de terra cuite en Méditerranée grecque et romaine. Volume 2: Iconographie et contexts*, 195-208. Villeneuve-d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.
- Beard, M. 2014. *Laughter in Ancient Rome: On Joking, Tickling, and Cracking Up*. Sather Classical Lectures 71. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Beagon, M. 2014. "Wondrous Animals in Classical Antiquity," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 414-440. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beazley, J. D. 1963. *Attic Red-Figured Vase-Painters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bell, S. and C. Willekes, 2014. "Horse Racing and Chariot Racing," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 478-490. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bellelli, V. 2010. "L'impatto del mito greco nell'Etruria orientalizzante: la documentazione ceramica," in *Bollettino di Archeologia Online* Volume Speciale, 27-40.
- Benndorf, O. 1889. *Das Heroon von Gjölbaski-Trysa*. Wien: A. Holzhausen.
- Benson, J. L. 1970. *Horse, Bird, & Man: The Origins of Greek Painting*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Bergen, B. K. 2016. *What the F: What Swearing Reveals About Our Language, Our Brains, and Ourselves*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bergeron, M. 2014. "Laconian Pottery," in A. Villing *et al.*, eds. *Naukratis: Greeks in Egypt*, 2-16. <http://www.britishmuseum.org/naukratis>.
- Blackledge, C. 2004. *The Story of V: A Natural History of Female Sexuality*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bleeker, C. J. 1973. *Hathor and Thoth: Two Key Figures of Ancient Egyptian Religion*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bleiberg, E., Y. Barbash, and L. Bruno, 2013. *Soulful Creatures: Animal Mummies in Ancient Egypt*. Brooklyn: Giles.
- Blinkenberg, C. 1931. *Lindos: Fouilles de L'Acropolis 1902-1914, Les Petits Objets I-II*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & C^{ie} Libraires-Éditeurs.
- Blome, P. 1985. "Phönizische Dämonen auf einem attischen Krater," *AA* 4, 573-579.

- Boardman, J. 1963. *Island Gems: A Study of Greek Seals in the Geometric and Early Archaic Periods*. London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenistic Studies.
- _____. 1967. "Archaic Finger Rings," *AntK* 10, 3-31.
- _____. 1985. Reprint. *Attic Black Figure Vases*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- _____. 1987. "Scarabs and Seals: Greek, Punic, and Related Types," in R. D. Barnett and C. Mendelson, eds. *A Catalogue of Material in the British Museum from Phoenician and Other Tombs at Tharros, Sardinia*, 98-105. London: British Museum.
- _____. 1998. *Early Greek Vase Painting*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- _____. 2000. Reprint. *The Greeks Overseas: Their Early Colonies and Trade*. New York: Thames and Hudson.
- _____. 2001. Reprint. *Greek Gems and Finger Rings: Early Bronze Age to Late Classical*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- _____. 2002. *The Archaeology of Nostalgia: How the Greeks Re-Created their Mythical Past*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- _____. 2003. *Classical Phoenician Scarabs: A Catalogue and Study*. BAR International Series 1190. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Bobou, O. 2015. *Children in the Hellenistic World: Statues and Representations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonacelli, B. 1932. "La Scimmia in Etruria," *Studi Etruschi* 6, 341-382.
- Bonaudo, R. 2004. *La culla di Hermes: Iconographica e immaginario delle hydriai ceretane*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider
- Bonfante, L. 2011. *The Barbarians of Ancient Europe*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bonner, C. 1950. *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*. University of Michigan Studies Humanistic Series XLIX. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Bonnett, C. 1988. *Melqart: cultes et mythes de l'Héraclès Tyrien en Méditerranée*. Leuven: Peeters-Presses Universitaires de Namur.
- Bostock, J. and H. T. Riley, 1855. *The Nature History: Pliny the Elder*. London and New York: H. G. Bohn
- Boutantin, C. 2014. *Terres cuites et culte domestique: Béstiaire de l'Égypte gréco-romaine*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Bouzek, J. 1974. *Graeco-Macedonian Bronzes*. Praha: Universita Karlova.
- Brashear, W. 2008. "Hocus-Pocus in Greco-Roman Egypt," in J. C. B. Petropoulos, ed. *Greek Magic: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, 28-33. London and New York: Routledge
- Braun, T. F. R. G. 1982. "The Greeks in the Near East," in J. Boardman and N. G. L. Hammond, eds. *The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries B.C.*, 1-14. *CAH* 3.3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bremmer, J. 1992. "Walking, Standing, and Sitting in Ancient Greek Culture," in J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg, eds. *A Cultural History of Gesture*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Brijder, H. A. G. 1988. "Apish Performances in the 6th Cent. BC," in Christiansen, J. and T. Melander, eds. *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery*, 62-70. Copenhagen: Nationalmuseet, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Thorvaldsens Museum.
- Bruni, S. 1986. *I lastroni a scala*. MMAT 9. Roma: Giorgio Bretschneider Editore.
- Brunner-Trout, E. 1980. "Karikatur," in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, 337-339.
- Buchanan, B. 1966. *Catalog of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in the Ashmolean Museum, Volume I: Cylinder Seals*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Budin, 2011. *Images of Woman and Child from the Bronze Age: Reconsidering Fertility, Maternity, and Gender in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2016. *Artemis*. New York: Routledge.
- Bulté, J. 1991. *Talismans égyptiens d'heureuse maternité: Faïence bleu-vert à pois foncés*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Burkert, W. 1995. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*. Trans. M. E. Pinder and W. Burkert. Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 2004. *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture*. Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Burstein, S. M., trans. 1989. *Agatharchides of Cnidus: On the Erythraean Sea*. London: Hakluyt Society.
- Calder, L. 2011. *Cruelty and Sentimentality: Greek Attitudes to Animals, 600-300 BC*. BAR International Series 2225. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Camille, M. 1992. *Image on the Edge: the Margins of Medieval Art*. Harvard University Press.
- Campbell, G. L., ed. 2014. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carpenter, T. H., K. M. Lynch, and E. G. D. Robinson, eds. 2014. *The Italic People of Ancient Apulia: New Evidence from Pottery for Workshops, Markets, and Customs*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaniotis, A., ed. 2012. *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag.
- Chaniotis, A. and P. Ducrey, eds. 2013. *Unveiling Emotions II. Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images, Material Culture*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag.
- Childs, W. A. P. 2003. "The Human Animal: The Near East and Greece," in M. J. Padgett, ed. *The Centaur's Smile: The Human Animal in Early Greek Art*, 49-72. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Clarke, J. R. 2002. "Look Who's Laughing at Sex: Men and Women Viewers in the Apodyterium of the Suburban Baths at Pompeii," in D. Fredrick, ed. *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, pp. 149-181. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cline, E. H. 1991. "Monkey Business in the Bronze Age Aegean: The Amenhotep II Faience Figurines at Mycenae and Tiryns," *BSA* 86, 29-42.

- Coldstream, J. N. 1994. "Pithekoussai, Cyprus and the Cesnola Painter," in B. D'Agostino and D. Ridgway, eds. *ΑΠΟΙΚΙΑ. I più antichi insediamenti greci in occidente: funzioni e modi dell'organizzazione politica e sociale. Scritti in onore di Giorgio Buchner*, 77-86. Napoli: Istituto universitario orientale.
- Collins, D. 2008. *Magic in the Ancient Greek World*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Collon, D. 1986. *Catalogue of the Western Asiatic Seals in the British Museum. Cylinder Seals III: Isin-Larsa and Old Babylonian Periods*. London: British Museum Publications.
- _____. 1990. *Near Eastern Seals*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- _____. 2009. "The Aigina Treasure: Near Eastern Connections," in J. L. Fitton, ed. *The Aigina Treasure: Aegean Bronze Age Jewellery and a Mystery Revisited*, 43-45. London: British Museum Press.
- Connors, C. 2004. "Monkey Business: Imitation, Authenticity, and Identity from Pithekoussai to Plautus," *ClAnt* 23.2, 179-207.
- Cook, R. M. 1990. "A Wild Goat Oinochoe in Laon," in J. P. Descoeudres, ed. *Eumousia: Ceramic and Iconographic Studies in Honor of Alexander Cambitoglou*. Sydney: MeditArch.
- Cook, R. M. and P. Dupont, 1998. *East Greek Pottery*. London: Routledge.
- Cooney, J. D. 1965. "Pharaoh's Rat," *BClevMus* 52.8, 100-105.
- Corbeill, A. 2013. "Gestures," in R. S. Bagnall, et al., eds. *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, 1-2. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Comstock, M. and C. Vermeule, 1971. *Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Bronzes in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston*. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts.
- Counts, D. 2008. "Master of the Lion: Representation and Hybridity in Cypriote Sanctuaries," *AJA* 112.1, 3-27.
- Counts, D. B. and B. Arnold, eds. 2010. *The Master of Animals in Old World Iconography*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Counts, D. B., P. N. Kardulias, and M. K. Toumazou, eds. 2011. *Crossroads and Boundaries: The Archaeology of Past and Present in the Malloura Valley, Cyprus*. *AASOR* 65. Boston, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Courbin, P. 1966. *La Céramique géométrique de l'Argolide*. *BÉFAR* 208. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Cresswell, R., trans. 1902. *Aristotle's History of Animals in Ten Books*. London: George Bell & Sons.
- Croix, G. E. M. 2004. "But What About Aegina?" in D. Harvey and R. Parker, eds. *Athenian Democratic Origins and Other Essays*, 371-420. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crowley, J. L. 2010. "The Aegean Master of Animals: The Evidence of the Seals, Signets, and Sealings," in D. B. Counts and B. Arnold, eds. *The Master of Animals in Old World Iconography*, 75-91. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- _____. 2013. *The Iconography of Aegean Seals*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Crump, M. 2015. *Eye of Newt and Toe of Frog, Adder's Fork and Lizard's Leg. The Lore and Mythology of Amphibians and Reptiles*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Dasen, V. 1993. *Dwarfs in Egypt and Greece*. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2007. *L'embryon humain à travers l'histoire. Images, saviors, et rites*. Paris: Gollion.
- Davis, W. M. 1995. "Egypt, Samos, and the Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture," *JEA* 67, 61-87.
- Demakopoulou, K., ed. 1996. *The Aidonia Treasure: Seals and Jewellery of the Aegean Late Bronze Age*. Athens: National Archaeological Museum.
- Demetriou, D. 2012. *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean: The Archaic and Classical Greek Multiethnic Emporia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- DePuma, R. D. 1971. *Etruscan and Villanovan Pottery: A Catalogue of Italian Ceramics from Midwestern Collections*. Cedar Rapids: Stamats Publishing Company
- Dobbins, J. J. and P.W. Foss, eds. *The World of Pompeii*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Droop, J. P. 1929. "The Laconian Pottery," in R. M. Dawkins, ed. *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta*, 52-116. *SPHS Suppl.* 5. London: Council of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.
- Dunbabin, K. M. 1991. "Inbide calco te...Trampling Upon the Envious," in *Tesserae: Festschrift für Josef Engemann*, 26-35. *JbAC Ergänzungsband* 18. Münster Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Dunbabin, K. M. and M. W. Dickie, 1983. "Invidia rumpantur pectora: The Iconography of Phthonos/Invidia in Graeco-Roman Art," *JbAC* 26, 7-37.
- Dunham, C. 1985. "The Monkey in the Middle," *ZA* 75.11, 234-264.
- Duploux, A. 2006. *Le Prestige des Élités: Recherches sur les modes de reconnaissance sociale en Grèce entre les Xe et Ve siècles avant J.-C.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Edmonds, J. M., trans. 1961. *Menander, Fragments of Attic Comedy*: 3. Leiden: Brill.
- Egan, R. 2014. "Insects," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 180-191. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ekroth, G. 2014, "Animal Sacrifice in Antiquity," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 324-354. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- El-Kilnay, E. and H. Mahran, 2015. "What Lies Under the Chair! A Study in Ancient Egyptian Private Tomb Scenes, Part 1: Animals," *JARCE* 51, 243-264.
- Elliott, J. H. 2015. *Beware the Evil Eye: The Evil Eye in the Bible and the Ancient World. Volume I: Introduction, Mesopotamia, and Egypt*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.
- _____. 2016. *Beware the Evil Eye: The Evil Eye in the Bible and the Ancient World. Volume II: Greece and Rome*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books
- Epplatt, C. 2015. *Gladiators and Beast Hunts: Arena Sports of Ancient Rome*. Barnsley, South Yorkshire: Pen and Sword.
- Evans, A. 1921. *The Palace of Minos at Knossos*, Vol. 1. London: Macmillan.
- _____. *The Palace of Minos at Knossos*, Vol. 2. London: Macmillan.
- Faraone, C. A. 1992. *Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Greek Myth and Ritual*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- _____. 1997. "The Agnostic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells," in C. Faraone and D. Obbink, eds. *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, 3-32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Faraone, C. A. *et al.*, 1994. "Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Greek Myth and Ritual, a Review Feature," *CAJ* 4.2, 270-89.
- Faraone, C. A. and D. Obbink, eds. 1997. *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ferrence, S. C. and G. Bendersky, 2004. "Therapy with Saffron and the Goddess at Thera," *Perspect Biol Med* 47.2, 199-226.
- Fischer, H. G. 1987. "The Ancient Egyptian Attitude Towards the Monstrous," in A. E. Farkas, P. P. Harper and E. B. Harrison, eds. *Monsters and Demons in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds. Papers Presented in Honor of Edith Porada*, 13-26 Mainz on Rhine: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Fitton, J. L., ed. 2009. *The Aigina Treasure: Aegean Bronze Age Jewellery and a Mystery Revisited*. London: British Museum Press.
- Foley, A. 1988. *The Argolid 800-600 B.C.: An Archaeological Survey Together with an Index of Sites from the Neolithic to the Roman Period*. Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Fowler, H. N., trans. 1966. *Plato in Twelve Volumes. Volume I*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Friedman, J. B. 1981. *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Furtwängler, A. 1900. *Die antiken Gemmen: Geschichte der Steinschneidekunst im Klassischen Altertum I-II*. Leipzig and Berlin: Giesecke & Devrient.
- Galoppin, T. 2016. "How to Understand the Voices of Animals," in P. A. Johnston, A. Mastrocinque, and S. Papaioannou, eds. *Animals in Greek and Roman Religion and Myth: Proceedings of the Symposium Grumentinum Grumento Nova (Potenza) 5-7 June 2013*, 141-170. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Garrison, M. B. and M. C. Root, 2001. *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets Volume I: Images of Heroic Encounter*, Parts I-II. Oriental Institute Publications 117. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- Gorbunova, K. S. 1983. *Black-Figure Attic Vases in the Hermitage: Catalog* (in Russian). Leningrad: State Hermitage Museum.
- Gozzadini, G. 1877. *Intorno agli scavi archeologici fatti dal Sig. A. Arnoaldi Veli presso Bologna: Osservazioni del conte senatore G. Gozzadini, esposte alla R. Deputazione di storia patria per le Romagne, neele tornate 9 gennaio, 12 marzo, 28 maggio, e 19 giugno 1876*. Fava e Garagnani: Bologna.
- Greenlaw, C. 2005. "How Monkeys Evolved in Egyptian and Minoan Art and Culture," in C. Briault *et al.*, eds. *SOMA* 2003, 71-73. BAR International Series 1391. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- _____. 2006. "Monkeying Around the Mediterranean: A Fresh Perspective on Ancient Primates," in J. Day *et al.*, eds. *SOMA* 2004, 63-68. BAR International Series 1514. Oxford: Archaeopress.

- . 2011. *Representation of Monkeys in the Art and Thought of Mediterranean Cultures: A New Perspective on Ancient Primates*. BAR International Series 2192. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Gunter, A. C. 2009. *Greek Art and the Orient*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Güterbrock, H. 1957. "Narration in Anatolian, Syrian, and Assyrian Art," *AJA* 61.1, 62-71.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hadzisteliou-Price, T. 1978. *Kourotrophos: Cults and Representations of Greek Nursing Deities*. Studies of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society 3. Leiden: Brill.
- Hall, E. H. 1912. "Two Black-Figured Amphorae with Scenes Portraying the Birth of Athena," *The Museum Journal* 3.4, 68-75.
- Halliwell, S. 2008. *Greek Laughter: A Study of Cultural Psychology from Homer to Early Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2015. *Aristophanes—Clouds, Women at the Thesmophoria, Frogs: A Verse Translation with Introduction and Notes, Volume 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hamdorf, F. W. 1964. *Griechische Kultpersonifikationen der vorhellenistischen Zeit*. Mainz: P. von Zabern.
- Harris, E. 2016. *Ancient Egyptian Magic*. Boston, MA and York Beach, ME: Weiser Books.
- Harris, R. 2003. *Gender and Aging in Mesopotamia: The Gilgamesh Epic and Other Ancient Literature*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hart, M. L. 2010. *The Art of Ancient Greek Theater*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Havelock, C. M. 1981. *Hellenistic Art. The Art of the Classical World from the Death of Alexander to the Battle of Actium*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Hedreen, G. M. 1992. *Silens in Attic Black-figure Vase-painting: Myth and Performance*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Helck, W. and E. Otto, 1972. "Affe," in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 1.1, 83-85.
- Hencken, H. 1968. *Tarquinia, Villanovans, and Early Etruscans II*. BASPR 23. Cambridge, MA: Peabody Art Museum.
- Hermay, A. 1992. "Quelques remarques sur les origines proche-orientales de l'iconographie d'Héraclès," in Bonnet, C. and C. Jourdain-Annequin, eds. *Héraclès*, 129-40. Brussels: Institut Belge de Rome.
- Herter, H. 1950. "Böse Dämonen im frühgriechischen Volksglauben," *Rheinisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* I, 112-143 Bonn: Ferd. Dümmlers Verlag.
- Heurtley, W. C. 1933. "New Discoveries in Ithaca, the Island Home of Odysseus," in *Illustrated London News* 182.1, 45-47.
- Heurtley, W. C. and M. Robertson, 1948. "Excavations in Ithaca, V: The Geometric and Later Finds from Aetos," *BSA* 43, 1-124.
- Hinks, R. 1939. *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art*. London: The Warburg Institute.

- Hodkinson, S. 1998. "Patterns of Bronze Dedications at Spartan Sanctuaries, ca. 650-350 BC: Towards a Quantified Database of Material and Religious Investment," in W. G. Cavanagh and S. E. C. Walker, eds. *Sparta in Laconia: Proceedings of the 19th British Museum Classical Colloquium Held with the British School at Athens and the King's and University Colleges, London 6-8 December 1995*, 55-63. London: British School at Athens.
- Hoffman, H. 1964. "Some Unpublished Boeotian Satyr Terracottas," *Antike Kunst* 7, 67-71.
- _____. 1965. *Fogg Art Museum of Harvard University: Norbert Schimmel Collection*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- _____. 1971. *Collecting Greek Antiquities*. New York: Potter.
- Hogarth, D. G. 1908. *Excavations at Ephesus: The Archaic Artemisia*. London: British Museum.
- Hood, S. 1978. *The Arts in Prehistoric Greece*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Houlihan, P. F. 1996. *The Animal World of the Pharaohs*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Howe, T. 2008. *Pastoral Politics: Animals, Agriculture, and Society in Ancient Greece*. PAAH 9. Claremont CA: Regina Books.
- _____. 2014. "Domestication and Breeding of Livestock: Horses, Mules, Asses, Cattle, Sheep, Goats, and Swine," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 99-108. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2014. "Value Economics: Animals, Wealth, and the Market," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 136-155. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hughes, A. M. 2012. *Performing Greek Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Humphries, R., trans. 1983. *Ovid Metamorphoses*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hund, W. D. and C. W. Mills, 2016, 28 February. "Comparing Black People to Monkeys Has a Long, Dark Simian History." *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/comparing-black-people-to-monkeys-has-a-long-dark-simian-history-55102>.
- Hurwit, J. 2006. "Lizards, Lions, and the Uncanny in Early Greek Art," *Hesperia* 75.1, 121-136.
- Imhoof-Blumer, F. and O. Keller 1889. *Tier- und Pflanzenbilder auf Muenzen und Gemmen*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Immerwahr, S. A. 1990. *Aegean Painting in the Bronze Age*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Jacobelli, L. 1995. *Le pitture erotiche delle Terme Suburbane di Pompei*. L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Jannot, J. R. 1980. "Une déesse tarquinienne," *MEFRA* 92.2, 607-624.
- Janson, H. W. 1952. *Apes and Ape Lore in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. London: Warburg Institute.
- Janssen, R. and J. Janssen, 1989. *Egyptian Household Animals*. London: Shire Publications.
- Jantzen, U. 1972. *Samos VIII: Ägyptische und orientalische bronzen aus dem Heraion von Samos*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag.

- Johnston, A. and A. Villing, 2014. "The Naukratis Project: Petrie, Greeks, and Egyptians." *Archaeological International* 17, 69-73.
- Johnston, P. A., A. Mastrocinque, and S. Papaioannou, eds. 2016. *Animals in Greek and Roman Religion and Myth: Proceedings of the Symposium Grumentinum Grumento Nova (Potenza) 5-7 June 2013*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Johnston, S. I. 1995. "Defining the Dreadful: Remarks on the Greek Child-Killing Demon," in Marvin, M. and P. Mirecki, 361-387. *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*. Leiden, New York, and Köln: E. J. Brill.
- _____. 1999. *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jucker, H. 1966. "Bronzehenkel und Bronzehydrie in Pesaro," *Studia Oliveriana* 13/14, 1-128.
- Karageorghis, V. 1994. "Monkeys and Bears in Cypriote Art," *OpAth* 20.6, 63-73.
- _____. 1996. *The Coroplastic Art of Ancient Cyprus VI. The Cyprio-Achaic Period: Monsters, Animals, and Miscellanea*. Nicosia: Leventis Foundation.
- _____. 2002. *Early Cyprus: Crossroads of the Mediterranean*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Karageorghis, V. and J. des Gagniers, 1974a. *La céramique chypriote de style figure: Âge du fer (1050-500 Av. J.-C.). Texte*. Roma: Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici.
- _____. 1974b. *La céramique chypriote de style figure: Âge du fer (1050-500 Av. J.-C.). Illustrations et descriptions des vases*. Roma: Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici.
- _____. 1979. *La céramique chypriote de style figure: Âge du fer (1050-500 Av. J.-C.). Supplément*. Roma: Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici.
- Karetsou, A. 2000. Κρήτη-Αίγυπτος: πολιτισμικοί δεσμοί τριών χιλιετιών. Athens: Katalogos.
- Kaufmann, C. M. 1915. *Graeco-ägyptische Koroplastik: Terrakotten der griechisch-römischen und koptischen Epoche aus der Faijûm-Oase und anderen Fundstätten*. Leipsiz: H. Finck.
- Keller, O. 1887. *Thiere des classischen Alterthüms in Culturgeschichtlicher Beziehung*. Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung.
- Kennell, N. M. 2010. *Spartans: A New History*. New York, Oxford, and Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kennell, N. M. and N. Luraghi, 2009. "Laconian and Messenia," in K. A. Raaflaub and H. van Wees, eds. *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, 239-254. Wiley: Blackwell.
- Kidd, I. 1995. "Some Philosophical Demons," *BICS* 40.2, 217-224.
- Knorr, R. 1905. *Terra sigillata*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- _____. 1952. *Terra-Sigillata-Gefäße des ersten Jahrhunderts, mit Töpfernamen*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Konstan, D. 2006. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kontoleon, N. M. 1970. *Aspects de la Grèce Préclassique*. Paris: Collège de France.

- Koloski-Ostrow, A. O. 2009. "The City Baths of Pompeii and Herculaneum," in J. J. Dobbins and P.W. Foss, eds. *The World of Pompeii*, pp. 224-56. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kotansky, R. 1994. *Greek Magical Amulets. The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper and Bronze Lamella. Part I: Published Texts of Known Provenance*. Papyrologica Coloniensia 22.1. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- _____. 2000. "Demonology," in C. A. Evans and S. A. Porter, eds. *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, 269-273. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- _____. 2006. "Amulets," in W. J. Hanegraaff, ed. *Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism*, 60-72. Leiden: Brill.
- Kozloff, A. P., ed. 1981. *Animals in Ancient Art from the Leo Mildenberg Collection*. Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art.
- Kron, G. 2014. "Animal Husbandry," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 109-134. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krzyszowska, O. 2005. *Aegean Seals: An Introduction*. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Kubba, S. A. A. 2006. *Mesopotamian Furniture from the Mesolithic to the Neo-Assyrian Period (ca. 10,000 B.C. -- 600 B.C.)*. BAR International Series 1566. Oxford: Hadrian Books.
- Langdon, S. H. 1990. "From Monkey to Man: The Evolution of a Geometric Sculptural Type," in *AJA* 94.3, 407-424.
- _____. 2006. "Maiden Voyage: From Abduction to Marriage in Late Geometric Art," in E. Rystedt and B. Wells, eds. *Pictorial Pursuits: Figurative Painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery. Papers from Two Seminars at the Swedish Institute at Athens in 1991 and 2001*, 205-215. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- _____. 2008. *Art and Identity in Dark Age Greece, 1100-700 BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2010. "Where the Wild Things Were: The Greek Master of Animals in Ecological Perspective," in D. B. Counts and B. Arnold, eds. *The Master of Animals in Old World Iconography*, 119-133. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Larsen, M. T. 2008. "The Old Assyrian Merchant Colonies," in J. Aruz, K. Benzel, and J. M. Evans, eds. *Beyond Babylon: Art, Trade, and Diplomacy in the Second Millennium B.C.*, 70-94. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Lawson, J. C. 1964. *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion: A Study in Survivals*. New York: University Books.
- Lefkowitz, J. B. 2014. "Aesop and Animal Fable," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 1-23. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lehmann-Haupt, C. and C. Friedrich, 1907. *Materialien zur älteren Geschichte Armeniens und Mesopotamiens*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Lenfant, D. 1999. "Monsters in Greek Ethnography and Society in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BCE," in R. Buxton, ed. *From Myth to Reason: Studies in the Development of Greek Thought*, 198-214. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lissarrague, F. 1990. "The Sexual Life of Satyrs," in D. M. Halper *et al.*, eds. *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient World*, 52-81. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1993. "On the Wildness of Satyrs," in T. H. Carpenter and C. A. Faraone, eds. *Masks of Dionysus*, 207-220. New York: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 1997. "L'homme, le singe et le satyre," in B. Cassin and L. L. Labarrière, eds. *L'Animal dans l'antiquité*, 455-472. Paris: Vrin.
- Liston, M. A. and J. K. Papadopoulos, 2004. "The 'Rich Athenian Lady' Was Pregnant: The Anthropology of a Geometric Tomb Reconsidered," *Hesperia* 73.1, 7-38.
- Lloyd, G. E. R. 1983. *Science, Folklore, and Ideology: Studies in the Life Sciences in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lloyd-Jones, H., trans. 1974. *Simonides: Females of the Species*. Park Ridge NJ: Noyes Press.
- Lo Porto, F. G. 1964. "Ceramica dalla archaia necropolis di 'tor Pisana' a Brindisi," *AttMGrecia* 5, 111-127.
- Löschke, S. 1911. *Beschreibung Römischer Altertümer: Gesammelt von Carl Anton Niessen*. Köln: Greven & Bechtold.
- Lowe, B. L. 2004-5. "The Domestic Cat in Egyptian Tomb Paintings," *The Ostrakon* 16.1, 7-11.
- Lucas, A. and J. Harris, 2012. *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*. Mineola, NY: Courier Corporation.
- Luce, S. B. 1921. *Catalogue of the Mediterranean Section*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum.
- Maas, M. and J. McIntosh Snyder, 1989. *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- MacIntosh-Turfa, J. 2013. *The Etruscan World*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Mackay, E. J. H., 1937. *Further Excavations at Mohenjo-Daro*, Vols. I-II. New Delhi: Government of India Press.
- MacKinnon, M. 2014. "Fauna of the Ancient Mediterranean World," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 156-179. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2014. "Hunting," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 203-215. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2014. "Pets," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 269-281. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maras, D. F. 2016. "Numero avium regnum trahebant: Birds Divination, and Power Amongst the Romans and Etruscans," in P. A. Johnston, A. Mastrocinque, and S. Papaioannou, eds. *Animals in Greek and Roman Religion and Myth: Proceedings of the Symposium Grumentinum Grumento Nova (Potenza) 5-7 June 2013*, 85-114. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Marconi, C. 2009. "Early Greek Architectural Decoration in Function," in D. B. Counts and A. S. Tuck, eds. *Koine: Mediterranean Studies in Honor of R. Ross Holloway*, 4-17. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow Books.

- Marinatos, N. 1987. "An Offering of Saffron to the Minoan Goddess of Nature: The Role of the Monkey and the Importance of Saffron," in T. Linders and G. Nordquist, eds. *Gifts to the Gods: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985*. Boreas 15. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- _____. 2001. "The cosmic journey of Odysseus," *Numen* 48, 381–416.
- _____. 2008. "Magic, Amulets, and Circe," in Petropoulos, J. C. B. ed. *Greek Magic*, 10–13. London and New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2015. *Akrotiri: Thera and the Eastern Mediterranean*. Athens: Miltos.
- Markoe, G., 1985. *Phoenician Bronze and Silver Bowls from Cyprus and the Mediterranean*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1996. "The Emergence of Orientalizing in Greek Art: Some Observations on the Interchange Between the Greeks and Phoenicians in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.," *BASOR* 301, 47–67.
- Masségli, J. 2015. *Body Language in Hellenistic Art and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- May, M. T., trans. 1968. *Galen: On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mayer, M. 1885. "Lamia," *ArchZeit* 43, 119–130.
- _____. 1891. "Noch einmal Lamia," *AM* 16, 300–312.
- Mayor, A. 2000. *The First Fossil Hunters: Paleontology in Greek and Roman Times*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 2014. "Animals in Warfare," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 282–293. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McDermott, W. C. 1935. *The Ape in Antiquity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- McKeown, J. C. 2013. *A Cabinet of Greek Curiosities: Strange Tales and Surprising Facts from the Cradle of Western Civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mellink, M. J. 1987. "Anatolian Libation Pourers and the Minoan Genius," in A. E. Farkas, P. P. Harper and E. B. Harrison, eds. 1987. *Monsters and Demons in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds. Papers Presented in Honor of Edith Porada*, 65–72. Mainz on Rhine: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Mendleson, C. 1983. "More Monkey Business," *AnatSt* 33, 81–83.
- Merker, G. 2000. *The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: Terracotta Figurines of the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*. Corinth XVIII, 4. Princeton, NJ: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Mertens, J. R. 2010. *How to Read Greek Vases*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Metzger, H. 1972. "Satyres lanceurs de pierres," *RA* 1, 31–34.
- Mitchell, A. G. 2009. *Greek Vase-painting and the Origins of Visual Humour*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mittman, A. S. 2006. *Maps and Monsters in Medieval England*. New York: Routledge.
- Moore, M. B. 2004. "Horse Care as Depicted on Greek Vases before 400 B.C.," *MMAJ* 39, 35–68.
- Morford, M. P. O. and R. J. Lenardon, 2014. *Classical Mythology*. 10th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Morgan, C. 2006. "Ithaka Between East and West: The Eight Century Figured Repertoire of Aetos," in E. Rystedt and B. Wells, eds. *Pictorial Pursuits: Figurative Painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery. Papers from Two Seminars at the Swedish Institute at Athens in 1991 and 2001*, 217-228. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Morgan, L. 2005. "New Discoveries and New Ideas in Aegean Wall Painting," in L. Morgan, ed. *Aegean Wall Painting: A Tribute to Mark Cameron*, 21-44. BSA 13. London: British School at Athens.
- Morin, J. A. J. 1911. *Le Dessin des Animaux en Grèce. D'après les Vases Peints*. Paris: Henri Laurens.
- Morris, C. 2004. "Art Makes Visible: An Archaeology of the Senses in Minoan Elite Art," in N. Brodie and C. Hills, eds. *Material Engagements: Studies in Honor of Colin Renfrew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, D. 2013. *Monkey*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Morris, D., P. Collett, P. Marsh, and M. O'Shaughnessy, 1979. *Gestures: Their Origins and Distribution*. New York: Stein and Day Publishers.
- Morris, S. P. 1984. *The Black and White Style: Athens and Aigina in the Orientalizing Period*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- _____. 1992. *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Nagy, A. M. 2008. "Ancient Magical Gems," in J. C. B. Petropoulos, ed. *Greek Magic: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, 34-38. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nasaw, D. 2012. "When did the Middle Finger Become Offensive?" *BBC News Magazine*, Feb. 6. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-16916263>>.
- National Geographic, 2010. *My Child is a Monkey*. Produced by Engel Entertainment.
- Neils, J. 2000. "Others Within the Other: An Intimate Look at Hetairai and Maenads," in B. Cohen, ed. *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*, 203-226. Leiden: Brill.
- Neils, J. and J. H. Oakley, 2003. *Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images of Childhood from the Classical Past*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Neusner, J. et al., eds. 1989. *Religion, Science, and Magic in Concert and in Conflict*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nichols, A. 2008. "The Complete Fragments of Ctesias of Cnidus: Translation and Commentary with an Introduction." Ph.D. diss., University of Florida.
- Nock, A. D. and W. S. Ferguson, 1944. "The Attic Orgeones and the Cult of Heroes," *HRT* 37.2, 61-174.
- Oates, W. J. and E. O'Neill, 1938. *The Complete Greek Drama: All the Extant Tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, and the Comedies of Aristophanes and Menander, in a Variety of Translations, Volume 2*. New York: Random House.
- O'Brien, J. V. 1993. *The Transformation of Hera: A Story of Ritual, Hero, and the Goddess in the Iliad*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Odhner, C. T. 1978. Reprint. *The Correspondences of Egypt: A Study in the Theology of Ancient Church*. Bryn Athyn, PA: The Academy Book Room.
- Ogden, D. 1997. *The Crooked Kings of Ancient Greece*. London: Duckworth.
- _____. 2009. *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A Sourcebook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- _____. 2014. "Animal Magic," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 294-309. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ogle, M. B. 1911. "The House-Door in Greek and Roman Religion and Folk-Lore," *AJP* 32.3, 251-271.
- Olender, M. 1990. "Aspects of Baubo: Ancient Texts and Contexts," in D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler, and F. I. Zeitlin, eds. *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Opificius, R. 1961. *Das Altbabylonische Terreakottarelie*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Osborne, D. J. and J. Osbornová, 1998. *The Mammals of Ancient Egypt*. The Natural History of Egypt IV. Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- Osborne, R. 2001. "Why did Athenian Pots Appeal to the Etruscans?" *WorldArch* 33.2, 277-295.
- Ostrowski, J. A. 1991. *Personifications of Rivers in Greek and Roman Art*. Krakow: Nakladem Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Özgüç, N. 1965. *The Anatolian Group of Cylinder Seal Impressions from Kültepe*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Pallat, L. 1897. "Ein Vasenfund aus Aegina," *AM* 22, 265-333.
- Pappi, E. 2006. "Argive Geometric Figured Style: The Rule and the Exception," in E. Rystedt and B. Wells, eds. *Pictorial Pursuits: Figurative Painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery. Papers from the Swedish Institute at Athens in 1999 and 2001*. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Parca, M. 2013. "Children in Ptolemaic Egypt: What the Papyri Say," in J. E. Grubbs, T. Parkin, and R. Bell, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Childhood and Education in the Classical World*, 465-483. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pareja, M. N. 2015. "Monkey and Ape Iconography in Minoan Art." Ph.D. diss., Temple University.
- Patera, M. 2013. "Reflections on the Discourse of Fear in Greek Sources," in A. Chaniotis and P. Ducrey, eds. *Unveiling Emotions II. Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images, Material Culture*, 109-135. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag.
- _____. 2015. *Figures grecques de l'épouvante de l'antiquité au présent. Peurs enfantines et adultes*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Payne, H. G. G. 1933. "Archaeology in Greece, 1932-1933," *JHS* 53.2, 266-299.
- Pedley, J. G. 1987. "Reflection of Architecture in Sixth-Century Attic Vase-Painting," in J. Walsh, ed. *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World: Colloquium Sponsored by the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities and Symposium Sponsored by the J. Paul Getty Museum*, 63-80. Malibu, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Perry, B. E., trans. 1965. *Fables: Babrius and Phaedrus*. Loeb Classical Library 436. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Petropoulos, J. C. B., ed. 2008. *Greek Magic: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pfälzner, P. 2008. "The Royal Palace at Qatna: Power and Prestige in the Late Bronze Age," in J. Aruz, K. Benzel, and J. M. Evans, eds. *Beyond Babylon: Art, Trade, and Diplomacy in the Second Millennium B.C.*, 219-232. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.

- Phillips, E. D. 1955. "The Legend of Aristeas: Fact and Fancy in Early Greek Notions of East Russia, Siberia, and Inner Asia," *Artibus Asiae* 18.2, 161-177.
- Picón, C. A. et al., 2007. *Art of the Classical World in the Metropolitan Museum of Art: Greece, Cyprus, Etruria, Rome*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Pinch, G. 1995. *Magic in Ancient Egypt*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Pini, I. 1975. *Corpus der minoischen und mykenischen Siegel: Kleinere griechische sammlungen Teil I*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
- Pollitt, J. J. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1987. "Pots, Politics, and Personifications in Early Classical Athens," *YaleBull* 40.1, 8-15.
- Pollock, S. 1999. *Ancient Mesopotamia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Porada, E. 1948. *Corpus of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in North American Collections: The Collection of the Pierpoint Morgan Library*, vols. I-II. Bollingen Series XIV. New York: Pantheon Books.
- _____. 1964. "An Emaciated Male Figure of Bronze in the Cincinnati Art Museum," in *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim*. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- _____. 1965. *Ancient Iran: The Art of Pre-Islamic Times*. London: Methuen.
- _____. 1974. "Two Cylinder Seals from Tomb 8 at Kition," in V. Karageorghis. *Excavations at Kition I: The Tombs (Text)*, 163-166. Nicosia: Cyprus Department of Antiquities.
- Potts, D. T. 1997. *Mesopotamian Civilization: The Material Foundations*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 2012. "The Elamites," in T. Daryaei, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Iranian History*, 37-56. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Prag, A. J. N. W. 1985. *The Oresteia: Iconographic and Narrative Traditions*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- Preston, L. E. 1975. "Boeotian Ape Figurines from the J. Paul Getty Museum," *GettyMusJ* 2, 121-126.
- Privitera, S. 2011. "La tomba 9 della necropoli di Kalyvia a Festòs: una riconsiderazione," in F. Carinci et al., eds. *KRETES MINOIDOS: Tradizione e identità minoica tra produzione artigianale, pratiche cerimoniali e memoria del passato. Studi offerti a Vincenzo La Rosa, per il Sui 700 compleanno*, 175-186. Padova: Bottega d'Erasmus.
- Pulak, C. 2008. "The Uluburun Shipwreck and Late Bronze Age Trade," in J. Aruz, K. Benzel, and J. M. Evans, eds. *Beyond Babylon: Art, Trade, and Diplomacy in the Second Millennium B.C.*, 288-386. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Quirke, S. 2001. *The Cult of Ra: Sun-Worship in Ancient Egypt*. New York: Thames and Hudson.
- Raspe, R. E. and J. Tassie, 1791. *A Descriptive Catalog of a General Collection of Ancient and Modern Engraved Gems, Cameos, as well as Intaglios Taken from the Greatest Cabinets in Europe and Cast in Colored Pastes, White Enamel, and Sulphur*. London: J. Tassie and J. Murry.
- Raven, M. J. 2012. *Egyptian Magic: The Quest for Thoth's Book of Secrets*. Cairo and New York: The American University in Cairo Press.
- Rebuffat-Emmanuel, D. 1967. "Singes de Mauretanie Tingitane et d'Italie: Reflexions sur une Analogie Iconographique," *Studi Etruschi* 35.2, 633-644.

- Redford, D. B. 2002. *The Ancient Gods Speak: A Guide to Egyptian Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richter, G. M. A., 1966. *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Ridgway, D. 1992. *The First Western Greeks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ridgway, F. R. S. 2010. *Pithoi stampigliati ceretani: Una classe originale di ceramica etrusca*. Roma: L'erma di Bretschneider.
- Rizza, G. 1961. "Stipe Votiva di un Santuario di Demetra a Catania," *Boll d'Arte* 65.4, 247-263.
- Robertson, M., 1959. *Greek Painting*. Great Centuries of Painting Collection. Geneva: Editions d'Art Albert Skira.
- Robins, G. 2008. *The Art of Ancient Egypt*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Robinson, D. M. 1941. *Excavations at Olynthus X. Metal and Minor Miscellaneous Finds*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Roes, A. 1931. *De Oorsprong der Geometrische Kunst*. Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink & Zoon.
- Romano, J. F. 1980. "The Origin of the Bes-Image," *BES* 2, 39-56.
- Rotroff, S. I. 2014. "A Scorpion and a Smile: Two Vases in the Kemper Museum of Art St. Louis," in J. Oakley, ed. *Athenian Potters and Painters Volume III*, 165-174. Philadelphia PA: Oxbow Books.
- Rubensohn, O. 1962. *Das Delion von Paros*. Berlin: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH.
- Rudenko, S. J. 1958. "The Mythological Eagle, the Gryphon, the Winged Lion, and the Wolf in the Art of Northern Nomads," *Artibus Asiae* 21.2, pp. 101-122.
- Sannibale, M. 2014. "Levantine and Orientalizing Luxury Goods from Etruscan Tombs," in J. Aruz, S. B. Graff, and Y. Rakic, eds. *Assyria to Iberia at the Dawn of the Classical Age*, 313-329. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Savignoni, L. 1972. Reprint. "Scavi e scoperte nella necropolis di Phaestos," *MontAnt* 14, 501-675.
- Schattner, T. G. 1990. *Griechische Hausmodelle Untersuchungen zur frühgriechischen Architektur*. AM 15. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
- Schaus, G. 2006. "Naukratis and Archaic Pottery Finds from Cyrene's Extramural Sanctuary of Demeter," in A. Villing and U. Schlotzhauer. *Naukratis: Greek Diversity in Egypt. Studies on East Greek Pottery and Exchange in the Eastern Mediterranean*, 175-180. London: British Museum.
- Schefold, K. 1960. *Meisterwerke griechischer Kunst*. Basel: B. Schwabe.
- . 1978. *Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Kunst*. München: Hirmer.
- Scheidel, W. 2001. *Death on the Nile: Disease and the Demography of Roman Egypt*. Leiden: Brill.
- Scholtz, A. 2003. "Aphrodite Pandemos at Naukratis," *GRBS* 43, 231-242.
- Schweitzer, B. 1967. *Greek Geometric Art*. New York: Phaidon.
- Scurlock, J. A. 1991. "Baby-Snatching Demons, Restless Souls, and the Dangers of Childbirth: Medico-Magical Means of Dealing with Some of the Perils of Motherhood in Ancient Mesopotamia," *Incognita* 2, 137-185.
- Seeberg, A. 1966. "Astrabica (Herodotus 6.68-69)," *Symbolae Osloenses* 41, 48-78.

- Seidl, U. 1990. "Altelamische Siegel," in F. Vallat, ed. *Contribution à l'histoire de l'Iran: Mélanges offerts à Jean Perrot*, 129-135. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Selincourt, A., trans. 2003. *Herodotus: Histories*. Baltimore: Penguin.
- Seymour-Smith, C. 1986. *MacMillan Dictionary of Anthropology*. London: MacMillan Reference.
- Shapiro, H. A. 1981. "Courtship Scenes in Attic Vase-Painting," *AJA* 85.2, 133-143.
- _____. 1993. *Personifications in Greek Art: The Representation of Abstract Concepts 600-400 B.C.* Zürich: Akanthus.
- Shapland, A. 2010. "Wild Nature? Human-Animal Relations on Neopalatial Crete," *CAJ* 20.1, 109-127.
- Sherratt, A. and S. Sherratt, 1993. "Growth of the Mediterranean Economy in the Early First Millennium B.C.," *WorldArch* 24.3, 361-378.
- Simon, E. 1976. *Die griechischen Vasen*. München: Hirmer.
- Small, J. P. 1986. "The Tragliatella Oinochoe," *RM* 93, 63-96.
- Smith, A. C. 2011. *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2012. "Personification: Not Just a Symbolic Mode," in T. J. Smith and D. Plantzos, eds. *A Companion to Greek Art, Vol. I*. Hoboken, GB: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Smith, C. 1890. "A Protokorinthis Lekythos in the British Museum," *JHS* 11, 167-180.
- _____. 1896. *Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum, Band 3: Vases of the Finest Period*. London: British Museum.
- Smith, J. Z. 1978. "Toward Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity," *ANRW* 2.16, 425-439.
- Smith, K. A. 2012. "Margin," in N. Rowe, ed. *Studies in Iconography* 33, 29-44. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications.
- Smithsonian Institution. 2017, May 24. "Introduction to Human Evolution." *Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History. What Does it Mean to be Human?* <http://humanorigins.si.edu/education/introduction-human-evolution>.
- Smyth, H. W. 1926. *Aeschylus*, Vol. 1. London: Heinemann.
- Sinn, U. 1983. "Zur Wirkung des ägyptischen 'Bes' auf die griechische Volksreligion," in D. Metzler et al., eds. *Antidoron: Festschrift für J. Thimme zum 65 Geburtstag*. Karlsruhe: Verlag C. F. Müller.
- Spieser, C. 2006. "Les vases et les peaux animaux matriciels dans la pensée religieuse égyptienne," *BibO* 63, 220-234.
- Spycket, A. 1998. "Le Carnaval des Animaux: On Some Musician Monkeys from the Ancient Near East," *Iraq* 60, 1-10.
- Stafford, E. 2007. "Personification in Greek Religious Thought and Practice," in D. Ogden, ed. *Companion to Greek Religion*. Williston VT: Wiley-Blackwell.
- _____. 2012. *Herakles*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Stafford, E. and J. Herrin, eds. 2005. *Personification in the Greek World: From Antiquity to Byzantium*. Center for Hellenic Studies, King's College London 7. London: Ashgate.
- Stansbury-O'Donnell, M. D. 2006. *Vase Painting, Gender, and Social Identity in Archaic Athens*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Steiner, D. 2016. "Making Monkeys: Archilochus fr. 185-187 w. in Performance," in V. Cazzato and A. Lardinois, eds. *The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual*, 108-145. Mnemosyne Suppl. 391. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Stewart, C. 1991. *Demons and the Devil: Moral Imagination in Modern Greek Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stillwell, A. N. 1948. *Corinth XV.I: The Potters' Quarter*. Athens: The American School.
- Stol, M., and F. A. M. Wiggermann, 2000. *Birth in Babylonia and the Bible: Its Mediterranean Setting*. New York.
- Struck, P. 2014. "Animals and Divination," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 310-323. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Svarlien, D. A. 1990. *Odes. Pindar*. Perseus Digital Library.
- Taplin, O. 2007. *Pots and Plays: Interactions Between Tragedy and Greek Vase-Painting of the Fourth Century B.C.* Los Angeles: Getty Publications.
- Tassignon, I. 2013. *Le "seigneur aux lions" d'Amathonte: Étude d'iconographie et d'histoire des religions des statues trouvées sur l'agora. Études Chypriotes XVIII*. Athènes: École Française d'Athènes.
- Tayag, Y. 2015, 7 July. "The Scientific Reason the Internet Wants to Bang This Handsome Gorilla," *Inverse*. <https://www.inverse.com/article/4355-the-scientific-reason-the-internet-wants-to-bang-this-handsome-gorilla>.
- Teeter, E. 2011. *Religion and Ritual in Ancient Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thumiger, C. 2014. "Metamorphosis: Human into Animals," in G. L. Campbell, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, 384-413. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tiessier, B. 1996. *Egyptian Iconography on Syro-Palestinian Cylinder Seals of the Middle Bronze Age*. Fribourg: University Press.
- Torelli, M. 1977. "Il santuario greco di Gravisca," *PP* 32, 398-458.
- Touchais, G. 1983. "Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1982," *BCH* 107.2, 745-838.
- Trendall, A. D. 1967. *The Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania, and Sicily*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tsiafakis, D. 2003. "ΤΙΕΛΩΠΑ: Fabulous Creatures and/or Demons of Death?" in M. J. Padgett, ed. *The Centaur's Smile: The Human Animal in Early Greek Art*, 73-106. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ure, P. N. 1934. *Aryballoi and Figurines from Rhitsona in Boeotia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Buren, E. D. 1939. *The Fauna of Ancient Mesopotamia as Represented in Art*. Analecta Orientalia 18. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Vandervondelen, M. 1994. "Singes Accroupis. Étude de Quelques Statuettes de la Période Prépalatiale Crétoise," *Studia varia Bruxellensia ad orbem Graeco-Latinum pertinentia* 3, 175-183.
- Vandier d'Abbadie, J. 1964. "Les Singes Familiers I: l'Ancien Empire," *REg* 16, 147-177.
- _____. 1965. "Les Singes Familiers II: le Moyen Empire," *REg* 17, 177-188.
- _____. 1966. "Les Singes Familiers III: le Nouvel Empire," *REg* 18, 143-201.

- Van Owen, A. 2015. "The Roman City as Articulated Through Terra Sigillata," *OJA* 34.3, 279-299.
- Vella, N. 2008. "'Phoenician' Metal Bowls: Boundary Objects in the Archaic Period," *Bollettino di Archeologia Online* Volume Speciale, 22-37.
- Vermeule, E. T. 1977. "Herakles Brings a Tribute," in U. Höckman and A. Krug, eds. *Festschrift für Frank Brommer*, 295-301. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Vernant, J. P. 1980. *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. Trans. J. Lloyd. Sussex: Harvester Press.
- _____. 1983. *The Origins of Greek Thought*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Vernus, P. and J. Yoyette, 2005. *Le Bestiaire des pharaons*. Librairie Académique Perrin
- Von Bothmer, D. 1985. *The Amasis Painter and his World: Vase Paintings in Sixth-Century B.C. Athens*. New York and London: Thames and Hudson.
- Waldstein, Ch. 1905. *The Argive Heraeum II*. Boston and New York: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Walsh, D. 2009. *Distorted Ideals in Greek Vase-Painting: The World of Mythological Burlesque*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Walters, H. B. 1926. *Catalogue of Engraved Gems and Cameos in the British Museum*. London: Trustees of the British Museum.
- Webster, T. B. L. 1954. "Personification as a Mode of Greek Thought," *JWarb* 17.1/2, 10-21.
- Weingarten, J. 1991. "The Transformation of Egyptian Taweret into the Minoan Genius: A Study of Cultural Transmission in the Aegean Bronze Age," *SIMA* 88, 1-17.
- Wengrow, D. 2011. "Cognition, Materiality, and Monsters: The Cultural Transmission of Counter-Intuitive Forms in Bronze Age Societies," *J. Mat. Cult.* 16.2, 131-149.
- Wescoat, B. D. 2012. *The Temple of Athena at Assos*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- West, D. R. 1991. "Gello and Lamia: Two Hellenic Demons of Semetic Origin," *Ugarit Forshung* 23, 361-368.
- _____. 1995. *Some Cults of Greek Goddesses and Female Daemons of Oriental Origin*. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker.
- West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- West, S. 2004. "Herodotus and Scythia," in V. Karageorghis and I. Taifacos, eds. *The World of Herodotus. Proceedings of an International Conference held at the Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis, Nicosia, September 18-21, 2003*, 73-89. Nicosia: Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis.
- Whatmough, J. 2015. Reprint. *The Foundations of Roman Italy*. Oxford and New York: Routledge.
- Whitley, J. 2014. "Orientalizing Phenomenon: Greek Archaeological Perspective," in C. Smith, ed. *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, 5622-5627. New York: Springer.
- Wilkinson, T. 2010. *The Rise and Fall of Ancient Egypt*. New York: Random House.
- Wilson, V. 1975. "The Iconography of Bes with Particular Reference to Cypriot Evidence," *Levant* 7.1, 77-103.
- Winkler, J. 1980. "Lollianos and the Desperadoes," *JHS* 100, 155-181.

- Winter, F. 1903. "Die Typen der Figuralen Terrakotten," in R. Kekule, ed. *Die Antiken Terrakotten Vol. 3*. Berlin: W. Spemann.
- Wojcik, M. R. 1989. *Museo Claudio Faina di Orvieto: Ceramica attica a figure nere*. Umbria: Electa.
- Wolfson, E. 2018. "An Old Nurse from Egypt," *MUSE* 50, 17-31.
- Wriedt-Sørensen, L. 2015. "Here There be Monsters: Hybrids Painted on Cypriot Iron Age Pottery," in J. Fejfer *et al.*, eds. *Tradition: Transmission of Culture in the Ancient World*, 427-450. *Acta Hyperborea* 14. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

ILLUSTRATIONS: CATEGORIES

CAT. 1: Bronze Age Simians

Cat. 1.1. Round Sealing, ca. LM 1A. From Knossos. ([http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/browser/index.php?view\[layout\]=siegel_item&objektsiegel\[item\]=261&objektsiegel\[thumb_item\]=0](http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/browser/index.php?view[layout]=siegel_item&objektsiegel[item]=261&objektsiegel[thumb_item]=0)).

Cat. 1.2. Gold Ring Seal, ca. LM I-II. From the Tombe dei Nobili at Kalyvia near Phaistos. (Crowley 2013, E143)

Cat. 1.3. Offering to the Seated Goddess, fresco, ca. LM 1A. From Room 3a of Xeste 3 at Akrotiri. (Pareja 2015, fig. 1.2A)

Cat. 1.4. Gold Earrings, ca. 17th century BCE. From the Aegina Treasure. British Museum 1892,0520.13. (Fitton *et al.* 2009, fig. 21)

CAT. 2: Geometric Minor Arts

Cat. 2.1. Argive Steatite Disc, ca. 8th century BCE. From the Heraion at Megara. Athens National Archaeological Museum 11750. (Langdon 2008, fig. 3.31)

CAT. 3: Early-Middle Archaic Vases and Gems

Cat. 3.1. Villanovan Clay Ossuary, ca. 700-575 BCE. From the Arnoaldi-Veli Necropolis, Bologna. Bologna Museo Civico. (Gozzadini 1877, pl. 1.1)

Cat. 3.2. Terracotta House Model, ca. 6th century BCE. From Sellada, Thera. Thera Archaeological Museum. (Schattner 1990, pl.24.3)

Cat. 3.3. Ithacan Long-Necked Object, ca. 7th century BCE. From Aetos, Ithaca.
(Heurtley 1933, Fig. 10)

Cat. 3.4. Proto-Corinthian Aryballos, ca. 640 BCE. Attributed to the Chigi Painter.
British Museum 1889,0418.1. (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=399476&partId=1&searchText=1889,0418.1&page=1)

Cat. 3.6. Apulian Geometric(?) Amphora, ca. 5th century BCE. Berlin Antiquarium, Castellani Collection F3912. (Agnes Schwarzmaier, via email)

Cat. 3.7. Tragliatella Oinochoe, ca. mid-7th century BCE. From a necropolis near Tragliatella in Caere. (<http://capitolini.net/object.xql?urn=urn:collectio:0001:foto:F:00889>)

Cat. 3.8. Proto-Corinthian Aryballos. From the Delion at Paros. Paros Museum 0158.
(<https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1166699?q=affe&resultIndex=42>)

Cat. 3.9. Ithacan Fragments of a Building Model, ca. 8th-7th centuries BCE. From Aetos.
(Heurtley *et al.* 1948, pl. 45 no. 600e [photo] and Morgan 2006, fig. 8 [drawing])

Cat. 3.10. Athenian Black-Figure Kylix, ca. 6th century BCE. From Kerameikos. Athens National Archaeological Museum 1054. (McDermott 1938, pl. 3 no. 316)

Cat. 3.11. Etruscan Hematite Scarab, ca. 6th century BCE. State Hermitage Museum ΓΡ-20753. (<https://www.hermitagemuseum.org/wps/portal/hermitage/digital-collection/18.+Carved+Stones/1068247/?lng=en>)

Cat. 3.12. Green Jasper Gem, ca Archaic Period. From Tomb 3 at Tharros. (Barnett *et al.* 1987, pl. 55h no. 583)

Cat. 3.13. Greco-Egyptian Engraved Carnelian. Louvre 2162. (Imhoof-Blumer and Keller 1889, pl. VXII no. 17)

Cat. 3.14. Terracotta Gem. From Cyprus. New York, Cesnola Collection. (Imhoof-Blumer and Keller 1889, pl. XIV no. 58)

Cat. 3.15. Relief Vase Fragment, ca. 7th century BCE. From Tenos (Kontoleon 1970, pl. XVIII.1)

Cat. 3.16. Laconian Black-Figure Kylix, ca. 565-550 BCE. Cabinet des Médailles 189. (Simon 1976, pl. 38/XV)

Cat. 3.17. Attic Black-Figure Neck Amphora, ca. 550-500 BCE. Attributed to the Painter of the Vatican 365. Orvieto 2711, Faina Collection 84. (Wojcik 1989, fig. 93.1 [photo] and Von Bothmer 1986, fig. 112 [detail])

Cat. 3.18. Caeretan Black-Figure Hydria, ca. 530-530 BCE. Vienna 3577. (Robertson 1958, 34 [photo] and Bonaudo 2004, fig. 39 [detail])

Cat. 3.19. Proto-Attic Black-Figure Fragments, from Aegina. Aegina Museum 484.
(Morris 1984, pl. 22 [photo] and Pallat 1897, fig. 31 [drawing])

Cat. 3.20. Laconian Black-Figure Kylix, ca. 7th century BCE. From the Sanctuary of
Artemis Orthia. Sparta Archaeological Museum. (Droop 1929, pl. 9)

Cat. 3.21. Attic Black-Figure Kylix, ca. 540 BCE. Attributed to the Amasis Painter. Metropolitan Museum 1989.281.62. (<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/255939>)

Cat. 3.22. Archaizing Cypriot Gem, ca. 5th century BCE. Private Collection. (*BAGD* no. 232)

CAT. 4: Late Archaic and Classical Vases

Cat. 4.1. Caeretan Black-Figure Hydria, ca. 530-520 BCE. Louvre E 696. (Walsh 2009, pl. 47 and fig. 3a)

Cat. 4.2. Caeretan Black-Figure Hydria, ca. 530-520 BCE. From Tomb I at Via Diroccata, Cerveteri. Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia. (Hemelrijk 1984, pls. 81-2)

Cat. 4.3. Attic Red-Figure Olpe, ca. 525-475 BCE. From Etruria. Louvre G241.
(http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/cartelfr/visite?srv=car_not&idNotice=13315)

Cat. 4.4. Athenian Red-Figure Cup, ca. 525-475 BCE. From the Tomba della
Panatenaica, Vulci. Vulci 64224. (Brider 1988, fig. 1)

Cat. 4.5. Athenian Red-Figure Cup, ca. 500-450 BCE. Louvre G265. (*LIMC III*, s.v. *Dionysus*, no. 389)

Cat. 4.6. Attic Red-Figured Askos, ca. 470-400 BCE. British Museum 1770,0320.560. (Brijder 1988, fig. 2)

Cat. 4.7. Attic Red-Figure Neck Amphora, ca. mid-5th century BCE. From Capua. British Museum 1873,0820.364. (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=460757&partId=1&searchText=1873,0820.364&page=1)

Cat. 4.8. Athenian Red-Figure Chous Fragment, ca. 450-400 BCE. From Eleusis. Eleusis Archaeological Museum. (*BAPD* 9033664)

Cat. 4.9. Attic(?) Red-Figure Chous, ca. late 5th century BCE. Leo Mildenberg Collection
(Kozloff 1981, fig. 130)

CAT. 5: Monkeys in Hellenistic Art

Cat. 5.1. Megarian Mold-Made Bowl, ca. 3rd century BCE. From Volo. Rhode Island School of Design 25.018. (Ashmead *et al.* 1975, pl. 46f)

CAT. 6: Simianesque Creatures on Geometric Vases

Cat. 6.1. Argive Bottle, ca. Middle Geometric I-Late Geometric II. From the Nikolopoulos Plot on Gournari Street, Argos. Argive Museum 10321. (Pappi 2006, figs. 6 [drawing] and 9 [photo])

CAT. 7: Simianesque Creatures on Archaic Vases

Cat. 7.1. Proto-Attic Black and White Krater, ca. 7th century BCE. Attributed to the Oresteia Painter. Berlin Antikensammlung A32. (*CVA Berlin Antiquarium I*, pl. 19.1)

Cat. 7.2. Proto-Attic Black and White Conical Stand, attributed to the Polyphemos Painter. Berlin Antikensammlung A40. (*CVA Berlin Antiquarium I*, pls. 28.2 [photo] and 29 [drawing])

Cat. 7.3. Ionian Wild Goat Oinochoe, ca. mid-7th century BCE. From Rhodes. Laon 37.786. (Cook 1990, fig. 1 [drawing] and pl. 9.2 [photo])

Cat. 7.4. Attic Black-Figure Exaleiptron, ca. 570-565 BCE. Attributed to Painter C. Louvre CA 616. (Simon 1976, pl. 59)

Cat. 7.5. Attic Black-Figure Amphora, ca. mid-6th century BCE. From Orvieto. Penn Museum MS3440A. (<https://www.penn.museum/collections/object/205627>)

Cat. 7.6. Attic Black-Figure Column Krater, ca. 540 BCE. From Campania. Louvre 11260. (*CVA Musée du Louvre* 12, pl. 390.2)

Cat. 7.7. Athenian Black-Figure Amphora, ca. mid-6th century BCE. Hermitage Museum
Б 1950 (B 179). (*LIMC IV*, s.v *Hephaistos* no. 139c)

Cat. 7.8. Athenian Black-Figure Amphora, ca. late 6th century BCE. From Vulci. Munich
Antikensammlungen 1576. (*CVA München Antikensammlungen* 8, pl. 390.2)

Cat. 7.9. Etruscan Red-Ware Fragment, ca. 6th century BCE. Heidelberg University E85/6. (Ridgway 2010, no. DB1a)

CAT. 8: Simianesque Creatures on Classical Vases

Cat. 8.1. Attic Black-Figure Oinochoe, ca. 500-475 BCE. From near Thebes. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston 98.924 (<http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/oinochoe-153540>)

Cat. 8.2. Kabiric Black-Figured Skyphos, ca. mid-4th century BCE. From the Kabiroid Sanctuary in Thebes. Metropolitan Museum 1971.11.1. ([http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/browser/index.php?view\[layout\]=siegel_item&objektsiegel\[item\]=261&objektsiegel\[thumb_item\]=0](http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/browser/index.php?view[layout]=siegel_item&objektsiegel[item]=261&objektsiegel[thumb_item]=0))

ILLUSTRATIONS: FIGURES

Figure 1. Amuletic Bangle, ca. 2000-1800 BCE. British Museum 1891,0509.84.
(http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=111517&partId=1&searchText=1891,0509.84&page=1)

Figure 2. Limestone Double Relief, ca. 19th Dynasty. From the Tomb of Merymery at Saqqara. Rijksmuseum AP6. (Janssen and Janssen 1989, fig. 14)

Figure 3. Egyptian Magic Wand, ca. 1981-1640 BCE. Metropolitan Museum 30,8,218. (<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/545740>)

Figure 4. Egyptian Blue-Glaze Staff, ca. New Kingdom Period. British Museum 1895,0511.54. (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=171783&partId=1&searchText=1895,0511.54&page=1)

Figure 5. Egyptian Jasper Scarab, ca. 15th-14th centuries BCE. From the Uluburun Shipwreck. Bodrum Museum of Underwater Archaeology 45.6.95 (KW 3699). (Pulak 2008, no. 228)

Figure 6. Babylonian Clay Stele, ca. 2000-1600 BCE. Baghdad Museum. (Stol and Wiggerman 2000, fig. 1)

Figure 7. Ceramic Lamp, Late Antique Period. From Medinet el Faijum. (Kaufmann 1915, pl. 29 no. 221)

Figure 8. Babylonian Terracotta Plaque, Old Babylonian Period, Iraq Museum. (Opificius 1961, pl. 18 no. 584)

Figure 9. Babylonian Hematite Cylinder Seal, Old Babylonian Period. Pierpont Morgan Library. (Porada 1948, no. 315E)

Figure 10. Babylonian Hematite Cylinder Seal, Old Babylonian Period. Pierpont Morgan Library. (Porada 1948, no. 388)

Figure 11. Babylonian Alabaster Cylinder Seal, ca. 2nd Millennium BCE. From Geoy Tepe, Iran. Metropolitan Museum 86.11.1. (<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/321625> [image] and Lehmann-Haupt 1907, fig. 3b [detail])

Figure 12. Neo-Babylonian Faience Seal, ca. late 7th/early 6th century BCE. British Museum 1931,1010.53. (Spyket 1998, fig. 3)

Figure 13. Drawing of Assyrian Seal, ca. 7th century BCE. (Spycket 1998, fig. 1)

Figure. 14. Assyrian Tablet, ca. Neo-Assyrian period. From Nimrud. Metropolitan Museum 61.197.12. (<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/325355>)

Figure 15. Elamite Door Sealing, ca. 2500 BCE. Louvre Museum. (Porada 1965, fig. 13)

Figure 16. Elamite Green Stone Seal, ca. 2000-1500 BCE. Private Collection. (Seidl 1990, fig. 2)

Figure 17. Elamite Cylinder Seal, ca. 13th century BCE. From Chogha Zanbil. Louvre Museum. (Porada 1948, fig. 23)

Figure 18. Syrian Cylinder Seal, ca. 19th-17th centuries BCE. Pierpont Morgan Library. (Porada 1948, no. 930)

Figure 19. Drawing of Syrian Obsidian Seal, ca. 1800 BCE. Johnathan P. Rosen Collection. (Collon 1990, fig. 23)

Figure 20. Syrian Cylinder Seal. From Qatna. Damascus National Museum MSH02G-il976. (Pfälzner 2009, no. 138)

Figure 21. Egyptianizing Hematite Seal, ca. Late Bronze Age. From Kition Tomb 9/205 in Cyprus. (Porada 1974, fig. 1)

Figure 22. Cyprio-Phoenician Silver Bowl, ca. 7th century BCE. From the Bernardini Tomb in the Colomella Necropolis, Praeneste. Villa Giulia N61565. (Sannibale 2014, no. 192)

Figure 23. Cypriot Pitcher, ca. 700-600 BCE. Cyprus Museum 1961/XII-9/8. (Karageorghis *et al.* 1979, no. SIX.2)

Figure 24. Painted Fragments, from Aetos in Ithaca. (Robertson and Heurtley 1948, pl. 23 no. 381)

Figure 25. Anatolian Sealings on Cuneiform Tablet, ca. 20th century BCE. From Kanesh/Kultepe. Metopolitan Museum 66.245.16b. (Larsen 2008, no. 37b)

Figure 26. Anatolian Cylinder Seal, ca. 20th century BCE. From Kanesh/Kultepe. (Özguç 1965, pl. 1.1)

VITA

Elizabeth Wolfson was born in the suburbs of Chicago, IL in 1987. She attended a private Jewish high school, Ida Crown Jewish Academy, which she graduated from in 2005. In 2009, she graduated with distinction from Knox College with a BA in Art History and minors in Classics and Creative Writing. Her interest in Greek Art and Archaeology began when she visited Greece with a class the winter of her junior year; this trip ultimately changed the way she viewed ancient cultures and encouraged her to continue her studies. In 2013, she received her MA from Washington University in St. Louis, where she wrote a thesis titled “Envisioning the Unseen: Sisyphos in Chthonic Landscapes.” Her fascination with and love for monsters, demons, monkeys, and apotropaia began when her advisor showed her the Argive Steatite Disc. To commemorate the completion of this dissertation, she has tattooed one of her simian motifs on her ankle.