

SOME ASPECTS OF ARCHAIC EAST GREEK ART
AND THEIR INFLUENCE

A thesis submitted for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of Oxford

by

BERYL E. BOWEN

Somerville College

Michaelmas Term 1972 [ie 1973] HY

ABSTRACT

The thesis is concerned with the position of East Greek art in the later 7th and the 6th centuries B.C.

Its aim is two-fold: First and foremost, to try to establish by detailed examination and analysis, as factually and objectively as possible, what characteristics in the topics investigated are genuinely East Greek. Second, to use the conclusions gained to test the validity of some current views on the status of East Greek art, and to see whether any influence from East Greece in the fields studied, on other Greek, and to some extent on Etruscan art, may fairly be claimed.

The Introduction refers briefly to the decline in prestige suffered by East Greek art from the period of 'Pan-Ionism' in the late 19th and early 20th centuries to the present day, so that from being considered the artistic leader of Greece in the archaic period, East Greece is now most frequently thought of as largely under the influence of mainland art. The writer's belief is stated, that this reversal of fortune is due almost as much to partisanship and mistaken or incomplete assessment of evidence as was its former exalted reputation. The topics to be studied are outlined, together with the writer's reasons for thinking them important. They are: I, Gorgons and Gorgoneia, which because of their popularity in all schools of archaic art offer much material for study and comparison, and therefore the hope of reaching definite conclusions, and II

Representations of scenes from the Trojan Cycle and from the exploits of Herakles, which also offer considerable scope for comparison, in a broader area, with material from the rest of Greece.

Chapter II, Gorgons and Gorgoneia, begins with a 'catalogue raisonne' of all the East Greek examples known to the writer. These include examples found in East Greece itself and in Ionian colonies, and also any examples found elsewhere in Greece or in Etruria which seem, because of their direct connections with examples from East Greece, to be themselves East Greek (this applies, for example, to some of the 'gorgoneion' plastic vases). The catalogue is divided into categories according to materials; within each category, gorgons are listed first, then gorgoneia. The categories are: plastic vases; pottery; architectural terracottas; sculpture; bronzes; ivories; gems; miscellaneous; and finally a category containing examples found outside East Greece which, though without direct connection with similar examples from East Greece itself, seem overwhelmingly likely to be East Greek, or are generally considered so. The items on the last category are not included in the analysis of characteristics which follows. The total number of examples, excluding the last group, is ninety-three. A catalogue of Cycladic gorgons and gorgoneia is appended at the end of the East Greek catalogue; these were treated in detail in the hope of establishing their position vis-a-vis East Greece and the mainland, and it was found that, though they showed characteristics derived from both areas, they remained in many ways a law unto themselves; there was certainly no ground for incorporating them with the East Greek examples.

The catalogue is followed by a brief analysis of the gorgons and

gorgoneia from each of the main artistic regions of Greece. This was considered necessary to provide an adequate background for the discussion of the East Greek examples. The schools discussed are: Corinthian; the 'Argive-Corinthian' shield-bands; Boeotian; Laconian; 'Chalcidian'; Sicilian and South Italian; Campanian; Etruscan; Cycladic; Attic. The date and type of the earliest examples is noted, together with the development throughout the archaic period; where possible, general characteristics are outlined, but important individual examples are also mentioned. Possible outside influence, including any from East Greece, are also noted.

In the final section, the East Greek examples are discussed in detail. It is noted that only one example has the strongly-stylized facial features typical of Corinthian and Corinthian-influenced gorgoneia. The salient characteristics of the East Greek type, in order of importance, are found to be (i) Looped hair-snakes, (ii) Fangs close to, or touching the tongue, (iii) Disc ear-rings. It is found that, though most examples show one of these characteristics, the majority of those with looped snakes and one or both of the other features are from Ionia and S.Aeolis, with an 'appendix' formed by the 'Rhodian' plastic vases. There are two 'fringe' groups, neither showing strong mainland features. The southern group, composed of gems, though lacking the specific 'central group' characteristic of looped snakes, is clearly related in general type. The 'pear-shaped' face is noted as a subsidiary characteristic. It is established that, though the main body of the examples is later than 550, the 'East Greek' type with all three characteristics appears before this, and the looped snakes are already

evident in the late 7th century. By means of these conclusions, the opinion of Åkerström, that it is impossible to distinguish mainland and Ionian types, is refuted. Payne's belief, widely followed by later scholars, that East Greece took its gorgoneion-type from the mainland, and especially from Athens after the mid-6th century, is argued to be wrong, for the following reasons: First, the 'East Greek' type appears well before the mid-6th century, while no similar type is found in Attica before the late 6th century; Second, this 'East Greek' type is the only one of any importance in East Greece, and East Greek examples show a very marked homogeneity; in Attica, however, the basic gorgon- and gorgoneion-type is the Corinthian, and where hair-snakes appear, as often among the gorgons, these vary greatly in type. Only at the end of the 6th century, and notably in early Rf, do some examples appear with all three of the characteristics outlined for the East Greek group, and even then other types remain. From this it is argued that, so far from being influenced by Attica in this respect, East Greece evolved its own characteristic type, which was adopted in Athens towards the end of the 6th century. These conclusions are also taken to indicate that the gorgoneia of 'East Greek' type which appear in the West after the mid-6th century, are genuine signs of East Greek influence.

At the end of this chapter are six appendices dealing with matters which have arisen out of the study of the gorgons, but which are not directly connected:

Appendix I discusses the sandalled-foot aryballos from Samos (A.11a), whose gorgoneion emerged as the only example from East Greece of the 'Corinthian-Attic' type. The shape of mouth of the aryballos, and the

types of decorative motifs used on it, are found also to have their closest parallels in Corinthian and Attic vases of the second quarter of the 6th century. An Attic origin therefore seems likely.

Appendix 2 deals with 'eye-cups'. It is argued that the 'part-faces' of 'Rhodian' plates and of East Greek, 'Chalcidian' and Attic eye-cups, were regarded as forms of gorgoneia.

In Appendix 3, it is argued that the Didyma marble gorgons (D.i) belong, not to the NW and SE corners, as generally assumed, but to the NW and NE corners, of the archaic temple. Some comments are made on the objects held by the gorgons.

Appendix 4 consists of a discussion of the character and origin of the Carchemish and Olympia shields, and a comparison of their animals with each other and with examples in Near Eastern art. This is intended to establish, (a) that the Olympia shield cannot be mainland or Cycladic work, and (b) that the Carchemish shield cannot be a non-Greek (Near Eastern) imitation of East Greek work.

Appendix 5 discusses a bronze shield-device in the form of a horse-head, from Olympia, which seems stylistically related to the gorgoneion shield-device, J.1. It is argued that the type of bit worn by the horse is distinctively East Greek, and a list of examples is given. A lion-head shield-device is associated with the group.

Appendix 6 discussed disc and stud ear-rings in the archaic period, with special reference to the East Greek examples, the problem of representations on Chiot pottery, and whether East Greek men wore ear-rings. The conclusions reached are, (i) that almost all known

representations of disc ear-rings outside East Greece (and Cyprus) could be due to East Greek influence; (ii) that stud ear-rings, used occasionally on the mainland for gorgons and sphinxes, may also be eastern importations, and (iii) that some East Greek men probably did wear disc and stud ear-rings.

In Part Two, Chapter III examines Trojan Cycle scenes, Chapter IV, some Herakles scenes. The method is the same for all. A description of the East Greek scenes in question heads each section. There follows an analysis of the characteristics of the scene in archaic art generally (including Etruscan art); apparent regional peculiarities are noted. Finally, an attempt is made to decide whether the East Greek version has any original features (apart from specifically East Greek details, which are also noted), and whether or not it can be proved to be dependent on the mainland versions.

Chapter III. The earliest vase-representations are on Chiot chalices: Sections A,C,D,F, and G2. The interpretation of D and F (Ambush of Troilos, Achilles and Memnon), is certain. They are approximately contemporary with the earliest mainland versions, and, although not strikingly different in composition, are not obviously derivative (this latter observation applies to most of the later scenes also). The Ambush of Troilos particularly shows original features; however, the late representation of this subject, on a Clazomenian sarcophagus, seems clearly related to the Leagros Group.

In Section A, the interpretation of a Naukratis sherd as Aphrodite protecting Aeneas is supported. The presence of an arm holding a spear, indicative of a warlike setting, is noted.

In Section C, it is argued that the fragmentary scene on Side B of the Troilos chalice represents the Ransom of Hector. Achilles is considered to be seated, as in Homer, and not reclining, as in Attic versions.

The remaining vase-representations are on Clazomenian pottery. In Sections B and E, two fragments probably from the same hydria are discussed. The view of Friis Johansen, that an Attic original must be presupposed for B (Achilles dragging Hector's body) is opposed. Appended to this section is a list of East Greek chariots, with a brief excursus on other chariots of non-mainland type. In Section E, the 'Pursuit of Troilos' interpretation is discussed, and the 'Introduction of Herakles to Olympus' is offered as an alternative.

The last Clazomenian scene, Odysseus and Circe, is treated briefly in Section H.

Section G deals with a fragmentary bronze relief of the late 7th century, from Samos, with part of the Blinding of Polyphemus. The group of reliefs, mostly from Olympia, to which the Samos bronze belongs, is discussed in some detail, with comparisons between the different members of the group, and with East Greek art in general. Several reliefs are rejected from the group, and others, with representations of animals, are proposed as members, or at any rate as East Greek.

Chapter IV follows the same procedure. None of the East Greek Herakles-scenes discussed is very early, and most resemble mainland examples closely in composition, though no direct links can be traced.

Section A, Herakles and Pholos, lists examples in stone sculpture (Assos), and terracotta revetments (Larisa, Akalan), and the subject is

identified on a Fikellura fragment from Istros. Possible examples of the scene are also listed, including one from Thasos with signs of East Greek influence.

The examples in Section B (Herakles and Nessos) are a panel of one of the bronze reliefs discussed in Ch. III G, and an Ionian Little Master cup.

In Section C, Herakles and Nereus/Triton, it is argued that the merman on the Assos frieze may be Nereus. It is suggested that the schema with Herakles astride the merman may be an invention of Attic bf vase-painters.

Section D, Herakles and Lion, deals with a late bf amphora from Rhodes. The composition has no exact parallel on the mainland, and is shown to be close to Near Eastern models. The arrival of the East Greek lion-type in Attic bf and rf towards the end of the 6th century is discussed.

In the final chapter, a brief survey is made of the conclusions of Parts One and Two, and the implications for archaic East Greek art as a whole are outlined. The general impression gained from both the gorgons and gorgoneia and the mythological scenes of before 550, was of independent development, though the mythological scenes clearly drew on a common Greek stock of 'patterns'. There was no definite evidence of influence from the mainland, nor, on the other hand, from East Greece to the mainland, in this period. After 550, the mythological scenes, with the probable exception of that on a Clazomenian sarcophagus, still show no clear evidence of mainland domination; this applies to the vase-scenes too, despite the adoption of the Bf technique. The importance

of the clearly-demonstrated spread of the gorgon- and gorgoneion-type to Attica and the West in the second half of the century, for the study of apparent 'East Greek elements' in later Attic vase-painting is stressed. The significance of the groups of bronze-reliefs, which have hitherto been rather neglected, is emphasized. Finally, it is noted that the evidence from the gorgoneia and other individual motifs such as the lion-type, and the development and influence of East Greek art, agrees with what is already known from sculpture and architecture; the evidence from the mythological scenes does not contradict this. Further, Ionia is indicated as the artistic centre of East Greece, at least for the topics studied.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank the following people and institutions who have helped me in the preparation and completion of this thesis:

Professor Martin Robertson, for his patient supervision and constant encouragement.

Mr. J. Boardman, (who suggested the study of the gorgons and supervised me for two terms), and Dr. C.M.Kraay, for helpful discussion.

The Ministry of Education for my State Studentship, Somerville College for the Woolley Fellowship (1965-66), and the Craven Committee for a travel grant for a visit to the Louvre in 1971.

Professor J.M. Cook of Bristol University, Professor M.Mellink and Dr. Dian Duryea of the Bryan Mawr College excavation team in Lycia, Dr. B. Schmaltz of the German Institute in Athens, and Miss Elisabeth Waszink of the Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam, for their special efforts and kindness in providing me with photographs and information.

Mr. R.Wilkins for photographic facilities.

Mr. Colin Lovatt for helping with the printing of the photographs.

Mr. R.F.Ovenell and all the staff of the Ashmolean Library for much ready assistance.

My typists, and particularly Mrs. Audrey Appleton, who willingly undertook many last-minute chores.

Friends in Oxford, and especially Anna and John Davies, Jane Osborn, and Stephanie and Martin West, who offered me ungrudging hospitality and viewed my comings-and-goings with tolerance and equanimity; without them this thesis would certainly never have been completed.

My husband, Keith, who, besides boosting my morale and accepting my frequent flights to Oxford with just the right degree of cheerfulness, developed and printed most of the photographs, supervised their mounting, numbered the plates, and performed countless other essential tasks in the last throes of the work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page no.
CHAPTER I: Introduction	1
<u>Part One</u>	
CHAPTER II: Gorgons and Gorgoneia	
<u>Catalogue</u>	
A. Plastic Vases	9
B. Pottery	23
C. Architectural Terracottas	33
D. Sculpture	54
E. Bronzes	60
F. Ivories	73
G. Coins	78
H. Gems	93
I. Miscellaneous	103
J. Almost certainly East Greek	107
Cycladic	112
<u>Analysis</u>	
I Corinth	125
II Shield -bands	130
III Boeotia	134
IV Laconia	136
V 'Chalcidian'	141
VI Sicily and South Italy	143
VII Campania	150
VIII Etruria	152
IX Cyclades	156
X Attica	160
XI East Greece	168
Position of the East Greek gorgon/gorgoneion in archaic art	177

Notes	190
Appendix 1: A sandalled-foot plastic vase	228
Appendix 2: 'Eye-cups'	235
Appendix 3: (i) The position of the Didyma gorgons	241
(ii) The objects held by Didyma gorgons	243
Appendix 4: The Carchemish and Olympia Shields	246
Appendix 5: Other East Greek Bronze Shield-Devices from Olympia	254
Appendix 6: Some Observations on Disc and Stud Ear-rings	263

Part Two Mythological Scenes

CHAPTER III: The Trojan War and the Odyssey	275
A. Aphrodite and Aeneas	275
B. Achilles dragging the body of Hector	284
List of East Greek chariots	292
Excursus on 'hybrid' chariots	298
C. Ransom of Hector	304
D. Ambush of Troilos	316
E. Pursuit of Troilos?	336
F. Achilles and Memnon	344
G. Blinding of Polyphenus	361
Style and Workshop of the Samos Bronze-relief	364
H. Odysseus and Circe	385
Notes	390
CHAPTER IV: Some Herakles Scenes	451
A. Herakles and Pholos	451
B. Herakles and Nessos	471
C. Herakles and Nereus/Triton	477
D. Herakles and the Nemean Lion	486
Notes	498
CHAPTER V: Conclusions	515
Abbreviations	521
List of photographs	522

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The basic problem with which this thesis is concerned, is one which has intrigued archaeologists for many years, namely, the question of the place and importance of the art of East Greece in the over-all picture of archaic Greek art. The period dealt with here is from the later seventh century to c.480 B.C.

For the 'Pan-Ionists' of the years around the turn of the century, of whom Furtwängler was the chief, 'Ionia' was the custodian of the relics of Mycenaean culture, the source from which 'orientalizing' art flowed to the rest of Greece in the 7th century, and in general the teacher and leader of Greece in art, as well as in literature and science, in the archaic period. 'Durch Reichtum und Macht allen anderen voraus üben die Griechen Kleinasiens, speziell die sich Ionier nannten, den tiefgreifendsten Einfluss auf die übrigen Hellenen. In der ganzen Kultur und Kunst des siebten Jahrhunderts ist der von den Ioniern ausgehende Strom bei weitem der stärkste. Dies bedeutete den Sieg des orientalisierenden Stiles in Griechenland.' Thus Furtwängler in Die Antiken Gemmen (vol.3, p.68). For Zahn, and for other eminent scholars after him, the red-figure technique of vase-painting was an Ionian invention.

This over-enthusiastic and partisan view produced the inevitable reaction in course of time, particularly as excavation and research revealed more of the achievements of mainland Greek art. 'Pan-Ionism' was rightly discredited by such scholars as Rumpf and Payne, who then, however, tended to err in the opposite direction. The swing of the pendulum to the other extreme is typified by the often contemptuous attitude of R.M.Cook, an expert in the field who sees archaic East Greek art in most of its aspects as 'one of the byways of Greek culture' (Encycl. World Art VII, 86), and denies almost every possibility of its having influenced the rest of Greece and Etruria.

Though few, if any, modern scholars openly express so low an opinion of East Greek art as Cook, it has on the whole suffered in recent years from neglect and from superficial judgments; few students, apparently, have thought it worth the trouble of a close examination, and the opinions of the victorious 'Mainlanders' have received uncritical acceptance and repetition.

There is a genuine dilemma here. On the one hand, the brilliance of East Greece in the archaic period in poetry and philosophy is undeniable. There is also plentiful literary evidence for the trading and colonizing activities of East Greeks, in the west as well as the east, and for their contacts with the great powers of the Near East, if only as mercenaries serving in their armies. We know that East Greek poets and intellectuals were eagerly sought after by such culture-loving mainland tyrants as the Peisistratidae. The achievements of East Greece in architecture and also in the development of the female

statue-type, and their influence on the rest of Greece, and especially on Attica, in the 6th century, are generally, if sometimes grudgingly, acknowledged. This not unnaturally leads to high expectations for the other arts also.

On the other hand, much of the actual material from East Greece itself, infinitesimal in amount when compared with that from Athens and Corinth, at least as far as pottery is concerned, is undeniably of mediocre quality, shows certain indications of mainland influence (as, for instance, in the adoption of the black-figure technique), and apparently fails to confirm, or even give much support to, the expectations aroused by the undoubted East Greek achievements in other fields. Even though research into archaic East Greek art has been hampered by insufficient excavation, by the slowness of excavators in publishing their material, and, in a few instances, by the destruction or loss of finds in war, these excuses are not entirely adequate. There seems at first sight, among the best-known material, little to put on the other side of the balance against Cook's criticism of the 'almost uniform depravity' of Chiot black-figure, or his description of Clazomenian sarcophagi as 'these deplorable monuments' (particularly as he is just in recognizing the quality of, for instance, the Ionian Little Masters, and the best Fikellura!).

Nevertheless, there remain details or motifs in the art of the rest of Greece, and not least of Attica, from about the mid-6th century, which have constantly been noted (not only by Pan-Ionists!) as 'East Greek' in style or type, and, although we may have given up the idea

of the Andokides Painter as an 'Ionian', we may think that a more adequate explanation is required for these phenomena than that put forward by Cook for the appearance of some shield-aprons on early red-figure vases, that these pieces of equipment must just then have been introduced into the Athenian army.

A number of scholars acknowledge these 'East Greek' characteristics (as, for instance, Martin Robertson, Greek Painting 74, '... the influence of East Greek artistic ideas is prevalent all over Greece and in Etruria during the late archaic period...'), but there has been a shortage of definite evidence to back them.

The need seems to be, therefore, for a very specific examination of all the material from East Greece itself, with particular reference to motifs and iconographical details, and a detailed comparison with mainland material, to try to find out exactly what may be said to be East Greek. It is important that all branches of art should be taken into account. No-one would dispute the preeminence of Corinth and Athens in vase-painting, and the exceptional importance and quality of their pottery industries has naturally led to concentration on this medium, but this should not be allowed completely to overshadow other forms of craftsmanship (Cook's tendency, for instance, is to judge almost entirely from the pottery). If by careful investigation even small details or motifs can be determined as East Greek, it should be possible to work outwards with greater confidence, and to base any claims for or against East Greek art and its influence on solid fact, rather than on opinions and impressions, which, however correct, can

always be decried as subjective.

J.Boardman, for instance, has done precisely this for East Greek gems, putting observations often first made by Furtwängler in AG on a sound footing, classifying and presenting the material clearly, and attending to all its facets.

There are many aspects of archaic East Greek art which would benefit from such attention, and this thesis attempts to examine one or two of them.

Gorgons and gorgoneia seemed to offer a promising field, as being one of the most widespread and popular subjects or motifs in Greek art of all regions. They have also, in general, received a great deal of attention, so that there was a considerable body of collected material and varying view-points on which to work. The first really detailed and comprehensive account was Furtwängler's, in Roscher's Lexikon, and this, despite his determination to attribute every detail to Ionia, is still basic and valuable. Some scholars, such as Payne, and recently Karagiorga, have done good work on individual schools, but in general, pronouncements on East Greek gorgons have been few, vague, and usually simply derived from Payne's views, instead of being based on a personal observation of the evidence. Some of these opinions are quoted in Chapter II. (J.M.Hemelrijk should be mentioned here as an honourable exception: in the course of his article on disc-and-cap ear-rings, BABesch. 38, 1963, 47, he makes some very accurate observations on the East Greek gorgoneion-type).

One of the reasons for the lack of sufficient attention to East Greek gorgons and gorgoneia is, no doubt, that they have never been collected together really comprehensively, with illustrations, in the way that Payne dealt with the Corinthian ones. This is partly at least because they are widely scattered, and largely in media which do not normally arouse such interest as painted pottery and fine marble sculpture. (Besig's list in 'Gorgo und gorgoneion...' (1939) is useful, but by no means complete).

It seemed essential, therefore, to begin with a detailed catalogue of all the examples found in East Greece (including Ionian colonies in the Black Sea and settlements in Egypt), or found elsewhere but directly connected with examples from East Greece itself, so that all the necessary information for an analysis might be to hand. I also thought it necessary to give a brief account of gorgons and gorgoneia in other Greek schools, as background to the discussion of the East Greek examples. My hope was, both to establish whether there was a specifically East Greek type of gorgon and gorgoneion at any time during the 7th and 6th centuries, and to use the evidence to decide on the truth of the most clearly expressed modern view of the East Greek type as derived from the mainland, and without influence elsewhere.

The second part of the thesis is more general in approach, being concerned with a number of different mythological scenes.

It seems certain that there was a much greater enthusiasm for human figure-scenes in mainland art (vase-painting being again the chief criterion) than in East Greek art in the 7th century, even if

few representations can definitely be accepted as mythological before the last quarter of the century. In the 6th century also, animal- and abstract decoration continued to play a much more important part in East Greek vase-painting than in that of the mainland. The great corpus of the shield-bands also survives as 'evidence' of mainland superiority. As with gorgons and gorgoneia, therefore, recent opinion has tended to consider the East Greeks' portrayal of mythological scenes as principally imitation, of Corinth in the beginning, and later of Athens. The fact that most East Greek vase-painting schools adopted the black-figure technique from the mainland in the 6th century has been thought to confirm this belief.

A representative view is that of Friis Johansen, Iliad 41, discussing archaic illustrations of the Iliad: '...It is most unfortunate from the point of view of our investigation that early Ionian art should have failed us so utterly on this point, not so much because of the insufficiency of the finds as because Eastern Greek vase-painting is so conservative that it keeps up its purely decorative character far into the archaic period, only in rare cases - and then probably influenced by the mainland - admitting representations of a narrative character.'

Convinced by the Pitane chalices, the Naukratis sherds, and the Kavalla krater that Chiot vase-painting at least is greatly under-rated as regards both its quality and the range of its representations, I hoped, by fairly broad examination of some of the more complete mythological scenes surviving in East Greek art of the late 7th and 6th centuries,

and by a comparison of them with their counterparts in the rest of Greece and to a certain extent in the West, to assess their degree of dependence or independence with greater precision.

It seemed best to classify the scenes by subject rather than by fabric, and the study has been confined to the Trojan Cycle and some Herakles scenes. These form conveniently coherent groups, and have abundant mainland counterparts; it seemed that here, therefore, there was the greatest prospect of obtaining definite and useful results.

PART I

CHAPTER II
GORGONS AND GORGONEIA

CATALOGUEA. PLASTIC VASES

This section is based on the lists given by J. Ducat in 'Les Vases Plastiques Rhodiens Archâiques en Terre-cuite' (1966).

The only examples omitted by him are the terracotta-technique aryballos from Naukratis, A.7, and the fragment A.1c. Full descriptions are given, because it is sometimes difficult to see all the details, particularly of snakes, from photographs, and because Ducat's descriptions are incomplete and sometimes inaccurate (see especially A.5 and 6).

A.1a. Berlin (West), Staatliche Museen, Inv. 1961.4

'From Etruria' (seller's claim). Pl. 1.

Ht. 7.4 cms. Bottom surface 6 cms. x 4.1 cms.

A. Greifenhagen, Berl.Mus.Ber. 1963, 6-8, Abb.1-4. J.Ducat,

Les vases plastiques rhodiens archâiques en terre-cuite

(henceforth Ducat), 51,156, pl.VII.4 (type A of his four Gorgoneion types).

Clay red-brown, glaze dark grey-brown; added colours light red and white. Janiform, the faces are very flat, with squashed, wrinkled leonine nose and bestial expression. Hair in curls across the brow; on either side of the central

parting a pair of straight vertical lines on the forehead. Ears set extremely high and almost frontal. Fangs at edges of mouth. Beard. Four snakes, two dark ones appearing from the top of the head and descending to curl under the ears, and two shorter ones with black spots, springing from the corner of the jaw and coiling below the first pair. Incision: for 'frown-lines' and teeth; short vertical lines on eye brows, chevrons on nose, zig-zags on beard.

Greifenhagen believes the vase to be East Greek, but of a different school from the later plastic vases. Ducat compares (i) for a very close likeness (perhaps same mould), no. 1b. below, and (ii) for general resemblance, no. 2 below.

Date: Late 7th cent. B.C. (Ducat: c.610 B.C.)

A.1b Vathy, Samos, Museum ?

From the Heraion, Samos.

Pl. 1.

No measurements given.

AM 76, 1961, note at foot of p.59, Beil.35.3,4. (K.Vierneisel).

Ducat 51, n.1.

This fragment receives a very brief mention in AM. No details of clay or paint are given. It is apparently broken from a kernos (a little of the base-ring remains). Curling snakes at the side of the face, and beard with zig-zag incisions, appear identical with those of no.1a, and the two must certainly be from the same workshop.

A.1c Vathy, Samos, Museum ? T 495.

From the Heraion.

Pl. 1.

Ht. 3.8 cms.

AM 76, 1961, 50, Beil. 19.

This fragment is described by Vierneisel as a fragment of a female head: 'Erkennbar sind linkes Ohr, Ansatz der Braue, ein Stirnkranz von schräg liegenden 'Korkzieherlocken', getupftes Haarband.' The fragment is of pinkish brown clay 'like that of the Group T 28,1004, 1209', with a fine black glaze, and red in the ear. It is hollow, mould-made, and thin-walled. Vierneisel stresses its fine quality. I believe it to be part of a gorgoneion-aryballos of the A.1 type, possibly part of A.1b. The size appears to be right. The 'spotted hair-band' is actually a snake. The hair looks the same. Finally, what to my mind puts the matter beyond doubt, the remaining fragment of eyebrow has incised lines across it in the manner of A.1a: something most improbable for an ordinary female head. The visible difference between A.1a and this fragment is that the snake is reserved with black spots here, as opposed to black with reserved or white spots in A.1a. However, the chin snakes of A.1a are reserved with black spots.

Date: late 7th century B.C., as A.1a.

No date is given for A.1b. A.1c is assigned by Vierneisel to about the same date as the late 7th century kernos from the Heraion, op, cit. Beil. 24-32.

A.2. New York, MMA 41.162.74.

Bought in Rome, 1929.

Pl. 2.

Ht. of aryballos: 7.5 cms; L. 6 cms.

CVA USA 8, Fogg Mus. and Gallatin Coll., pl.USA 381.4.G.M.A. Richter, Archaic Greek Art, Fig.74. Ducat 7, 51, 156,
pl.I.1. (Helmeted Head series A.1).

Clay, buff; added red and white; black glaze. In relief on the brow of the helmet of a 'Helmeted Head' aryballos. Eyebrows, pupils and tongue are black, snakes black with white spots; the rest reserved. The two pairs of fangs touch the tongue. No ears are visible. Three pairs of snakes: one descending from the top of the head, framing the face and curving upwards at cheek-level, one curving outwards from the chin, while the centre pair, looped, spring from the corners of the jaw.

Date: c.610 B.C. (Ducat).A.3. British Museum A 1125. (1948. 11-10.8)

From Vulci (bought 1836)

Pl. 2.

Ht. 6.5 cms.

Higgins II, 18, pl.9 no. 1619. Ducat 52, 156, pl.VII.5

(Gorgoneion type B).

Clay pale brown, glaze orange-red; added colours red, dark purple, white. The hair, in red glaze, is in curls across the brow, and falls

at sides and back in slightly wavy locks from the crown of the head. The nose is squashed-looking but human. The two pairs of fangs are slightly closer to the tongue than to the edges of the mouth. A snake rises from behind each ear, framing the face; its head rears above the outermost brow-curl and faces its partner. Below the ears, hugging the jaw-line, are two more pairs of snakes, both looped. The lower pair has two heads, one facing outwards, the other inwards under the chin. All the snakes are open-mouthed.

Date: c. 610-600 B.C. (Ducat).

A.4a. Vienna, Kunsth. Museum (IX.1. 54-ref. in AA to position in display).

From Siana, Rhodes.

Ht. 7 cms. (AA).

J. Six, De Gorgone (1885), pl.1, III 1b ('From Halicarnassus').

AA 7, 1892. 116, no.112. Maximova II, no. 98. Ducat 52, 157.

A.4b. Berlin (West), Staatliche Museen, V.I. 3703.

From Rhodes.

Pl. 4.

Ht. 6.7 cms.

A. Greifenhagen, Berl.Mus.Ber. N.F. 13, 1963, 8, Abb.5-6.

Ducat 52, 157, pl.VII.6 (his Gorgoneion type C). Charlottenburg,

Führer 1968, 44.

Clay? ; black glaze; added red and white. This type has a clearly shaped neck, beginning to curve out to the shoulders. The hair falls

in long, slightly wavy locks from the crown of the head, with three locks at each side in front; there is a central parting, and there are no brow-curls. The two pairs of fangs are slightly closer to the tongue than to the edges of the mouth. A pair of snakes rises from behind the ears to the top of the head very much as in 3. above (Ducat); in 4a. these are white-spotted. (In the side-view, Berl. Mus.Ber. Abb.5, it looks as though there may be two pairs rising to the top of the head, as well as a short pair springing from the ears in a U-shape). From the corners of the jaw two pairs of snakes emerge, curving in a deep U; the inner pair end facing each other open-mouthed under the chin, the outer pair turn outwards onto the hair below the ears.

Date: c.590 B.C. (Ducat).

A.5a. Boston, MFA Inv. 99.510.

Ht. 7 cms.

Pl. 3.

Fairbanks 175, no.498, pl.49. A.Lane, Greek Pottery pl.21c.

Ducat 52, 157, pl. 8.1.

The description of clay and paint given by Fairbanks is: 'Clay pale dull red, of even texture, containing fine particles of stone..... Decoration in brown to black glaze, with applied red for pupils of eyes and interior of mouth, and white for eyeballs and teeth.'

The vase is a bust to just below the tops of the shoulders.

The face has large eyes, a neat nose, and an upcurving mouth which

fills the whole of the face beneath the nose. The mouth is full of small teeth, the protruding tongue is small, with a slight central depression, and there is a pair of fangs midway between the tongue and the edges of the mouth. There is a double ridge for the eyebrows, and an extra ridge of wrinkle round the mouth, running from the nostrils. The hair falls in long locks from the crown of the head; three of the locks fall in front of each shoulder. Over the brow the locks seem to be arranged in pairs, with a small curl at the end. Two pairs of snakes rise from behind the ears and rear to face each other, open-mouthed, over the centre of the brow. (N.B. Ducat is wrong in saying that there are no snakes in this position). There are three pairs of snakes round the lower part of the face: two emerge at ear-level and two at the corners of the jaw, coiling in a deep U-curve with heads facing outwards over the side-hair; the third pair spring from beneath the lower jaw and curve inwards to face each other open-mouthed under the chin.

A.5b. Boulogne, Musée Municipal 501.

Pl. 3.

Le Musée II, 269, 264 Fig.6. Ducat 52, 157 (his Type D).

This vase is classed with A.5a. by Ducat.

Date: c.590 B.C. (Ducat).

A.6. Rome, Palazzo dei Conservatori, Inv. 306 Ca.

From ?

Pl. 3.

Ht. 9 cms.

H. Stuart-Jones, Cat. of Ancient Sculptures preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome, Sculptures of the Palazzo dei Conservatori (1926), 197, pl.76 no.18. Maximova 164. Payne, NC 179, n3. Ducat 52, 157. CVA Musei Capitolini 2, pl.1.3.

'Pasta chiarissima, biancastra, farinosa. Vernice bruno-nerastra.'

The surface is rather worn, and most of the colour has gone.

Ducat classes this vase with Boston 99.510 and the Boulogne aryballos (A.5a,b). It is not, however, identical with these, though it resembles Boston closely. It is 2 cms. higher than Boston; this is probably largely accounted for by the greater amount of shoulder shown (compare the female bust aryballoi, Ducat pls. iv-vi, for similar variations). The hair is the same length as that of the Boston example with three locks over each shoulder, and a mass of slightly wavy locks falling at the back from the crown of the head. The hair over the brow is clearly similar too. Like the Boston aryballos, it has snakes in very low relief climbing from the ears to the hair over the brow. The three pairs of snakes round the lower part of the face, however, are not U-shaped, but fully looped, like those of A.3. The heads of the upper two pairs turn outwards over the hair, those of the lowest pair probably face inwards. The mouth differs slightly in size and in shape; the two pairs of fangs are in

the same position, midway between the tongue and the edges of the mouth, but are not quite so upright.

The vase-mouth differs from the most common East Greek plastic vase type without handle-plate. The 'handle-plate', however, is not of the Corinthian or 'sandalled foot' type, but seems rather to be a pierced lug, resembling, e.g. BM 1607 and 1633, both from Camirus (Higgins II pls. 4,14).

Maximova, misled presumably by bad photographs, thought the gorgoneion had a beard and no snakes, and pronounced it Corinthian. Payne answered this decisively. There can be no doubt that the vase is East Greek, contemporary with the Boston example A.5a.

Date: early 6th century.

A.7. British Museum, B 339 (88.6-1.94).

Excavated at Naucratis, 1885/6.

Pl. 4.

Ht. 8 cms.

Naucratis II, pl.xv.10. Higgins I, 46,pl.9, no. 52.

Karagiorga, GK 136 (a mention only).

Technique and material of this 'terracotta-technique' aryballos are thus described by Higgins: 'Back roughly moulded. Vase-mouth missing. Worn. Clay: pale orange, with mica. Decoration: red on hair and back'.

The vase resembles the matt-painted examples, A.8 and 9, in having shoulders and upper torso to just below the breasts, but the

gorgoneion is much closer in type to the glaze-painted examples (especially A.4,5 and 6) than are the other terracotta-technique gorgoneia (A.8,9,10). The face, which is very flat, looks slightly negroid, with spreading nose. The two pairs of fangs touch the tongue. There is a deep wrinkle round the mouth. The hair falls in three locks, close in to the sides of the jaw, over each shoulder, and there is a row of small curls across the brow. There appear to be two pairs of snakes in the hair, one rising from behind each ear and curving upwards with head turned outwards and mouth open, the second rising from behind the brow-curls. The heads of this last pair are lost: they may even have coiled round the vase-mouth. Two snakes curve outwards from under the chin (in contrast with those of the glaze-painted aryballoi, which coil inwards, their heads meeting under the chin).

Date: c. mid-6th century B.C.

A.8. New York, Eric de Kōlb Coll.

Bought from an antique dealer in Basel. Pl. 4.

Ht. 11 cms.

Auktion Basel XXVI, Oct. 1963, 36, pl.23, no.76. Ducat 53, pl.VIII.2. ('Terracotta technique' Type 1.).

Clay orange-brown, according to Aukt.Basel (Ducat, 'ocre rose, micacée'); the colours are not glazed, but unfired: traces of red remain on the flesh, black on the dress. This is a bust, to just

below the breasts, the head and neck being almost as wide as the shoulders. The hair is scalloped across the brow; the back locks fall straight, with deep incised lines between them, and end in a straight line across the shoulders. Ducat states that only the front is mould-made, the back being flat, smoothed-off with a spatula, and the hair incised. I am not sure that this is correct: the locks of the hair certainly appear to be in relief at least where they touch the shoulders. There are no fangs or snakes. The ears are very large, with disc-ear-rings in the form of many-petalled rosettes. Ducat maintains that the clay is definitely Rhodian. Certainly the hair-style and ear-rings have many parallels in East Greece.

Date: Mid-6th cent. (Ducat dates the terracotta-technique plastic vases to the mid-6th cent. or later, after the production of plastic vases with fired colours had stopped.)

A.9. Florence, Museo Archeologico Inv. 79242. Unpublished.

From Rhodes.

Pl. 4.

Ht. ?

Maximova 163. Auktion Basel XXVI, Oct. 1963, 36, note.

Ducat 53 (no details). Karagiorga GK (1970), 136, pl. 22 g.

Maximova's is the only description, though the vase has been mentioned as a parallel for the De Kólb example (A.8.), and the photograph recently published by Karagiorga is a great help. Maximova describes the clay and paint as follows: 'Son argile, d'Asie Mineure,

contient une grande quantité de paillettes, on aperçoit des traces de couleur rouge.'

It is clear from the photographs that the de Kolb vase and this one are at least very similar; the form, an apparently neckless bust to about breast-level, with arms squashed to body, is the same. The features are generally similar. Both have very large ears, though those of Florence 79242 protrude considerably more, and have no modelled ear-rings. There are no fangs or snakes. The hair-styles do not appear absolutely identical, but again Maximova's description shows that they must be extremely similar: 'Les cheveux retombent dans le dos en longues mèches égales, partant du front' - an East Greek style, as already remarked.

Date: probably, like the de Kolb example, later 6th century, perhaps c.525 B.C.

A.10. Marseilles, I.4.1.

From Marseilles.

Pl. 5.

Ht. ?

F. Villard - La céramique grecque de Marseille 53-54, pl.41.1,3
pl.42.2. Ducat 53 ('Terracotta technique, Type 2').

The clay is thus described by Villard: 'terre brun pâle, légèrement micacée, sans peinture'.

This gorgoneion has no ears, teeth, fangs or snakes (some of these details may once have been painted-in). A fringe of curls

across the brow is the only clearly-delineated hair.. The shape of the vase possibly indicates wig-like hair spreading to the shoulders. The back of the head is very flat.

As far as can be seen, there is nothing definitely East Greek about this gorgoneion-type. The vase-type, however, is certainly East Greek.

Date: Villard, 'mid-6th century or third quarter'. This would fit with Ducat's dating of terracotta-technique vases (see A.8.). Ducat himself considers this type probably later than his Type 1, remarking that the treatment is very much more schematic in this example. So perhaps c.535-525 B.C.

A.11a. British Museum, B 587 (54.3-10.5.)

From Samos (bought 1854)

Pls. 5, 53a.

A 'sandalled foot' aryballos with gorgoneion on the vertical handle-plate at the back; ht. of the aryballos, 9 cms, ht. of the handle-plate c.3 cms.

Higgins II, 32, pl 22, no.1655. Maximova 93, 176, pl.XXVI, no. 99. Ducat 181. Besig 94, no.182 Payne, NC 88, n.3:

'this gorgoneion might have been copied directly from that of the Corinthian krater no.1452, fig. 27c'.

Clay, pale orange, with mica; black glaze, added red over the glaze on hair, white for ears, nose and teeth; incision. The face is divided very sharply into separate areas by the heavy black cheek-bone

lines and the use of colour (e.g. white for ears and nose, and black with incision for the small moustache). The hair reaches to below the ears, but does not quite meet the beard. The fangs are at the outer edges of the mouth. There are no snakes.

As Payne notes, the gorgoneion resembles very closely a Late Corinthian type, both in the emphasis on pattern in the stylization of the face, and in the shape of all the features. In these aspects it is unique among East Greek gorgoneia.

Date: The sandal of the aryballos is of the type with fewer and heavier straps (Ducat, Type A). Higgins considers this to be earlier than the type with a network of fine thongs (Ducat, Type B), but Ducat believes both types contemporary, and dates them c. 560-550 B.C.

See Appendix 1

A.11b. Warsaw, National Museum Inv.199233.

Ht. 7.9 cms., L. 9.5 cms.

CVA Warsaw 2, pl.43.5. R. Lullies, Antike Kleinkunst in

Königsberg 42, no.94. Ducat 184.

Clay: 'jaune foncé rougeâtre' (CVA), 'leather-brown' (Lullies).

Hardly any colour remains. The gorgoneion is said to be 'presque effacé et peu lisible' (in fact, Lullies believed that there was a cock or dove on the handle-plate!).

Date: as for A.11a. The sandalled-foot is of Type B.

B. POTTERY AND CLAZOMENIAN SARCOPHAGI

Gorgons

B.i. British Museum A 748 (604.42). A 'Rhodian' plate.

From Camirus.

Pl.6.

Diam. of plate, 38.5 cms.

A/H/S 280, pl.29. A full bibliography given here up to 1962.

Add to this: Besig 51, 96, no.191; Spartz

Kunze, AM 78, 1963,76; Kardara, RA 204; Ch.Christou,

Potnia Theron (1968) 137; P.Zazoff, AA.1970, 160-161;

Karagiorga GK 77-78. ¹

Clay, buff, with cream slip; glaze fired red-brown; added purple; a little incision. The Gorgon, holding a water-bird by the neck in each hand, strides barefoot to her left in a long robe which is belted and deeply-pouched at the waist; the skirt falls open down one side, leaving the left leg bare. Small dot-rosettes and a cross appear like tattoos on her bare arms and leg, and a fringe of bobbles (hanging from her invisible sleeves?) can be seen at the top of each arm. She apparently wears a bracelet on each wrist. She has two pairs of wings, straight along most of their length but sharply curled at the tips; one pair extends horizontally across the front of her body where neck and shoulders should be, the other slopes downwards and outwards from behind them. The head is enormous,

grotesque and strongly stylized (the chin and nose, e.g., ending in volutes). A fillet binds the brow, and three long, lank locks spring from above it and hang down to shoulder-level on each side of the head. From the jaw-line hangs a beard of similar straggly locks. There are only two fangs, curving upwards from the extreme outer edges of the mouth, which has small teeth also. There are no snakes.

Date: c. 620-600 B.C.

B.ii Bucharest, National Museum of Antiquities.

From Tariverde (Rumania), the site of a native settlement, about 20 km west of Istros. Pl .6.

BCH 82, 1958, 349, fig. 20 (reversed). J. Boardman,
Arch.Reps. 1962-63, 39, fig.15 - 'probably not Attic'.

A sherd from a Bf cup with off-set rim. On the interior surface is a Gorgon, running to her left. Her flesh is white, apparently with black glaze beneath. She wears a short, foldless chiton reaching to mid-thigh, and over it an animal-skin.² On her feet are boots with a downward-curving wing on the front. A large pair of wings springs from her shoulders. Her face is summarily rendered: she has no tongue, fangs or snakes. Her hair is at least shoulder-length. There is added purple on wings, tunic, and possibly boots. The foot of another running figure remains at the right hand edge of the sherd: either Perseus, or another Gorgon.

Date: c. 560-550 B.C. ?

B.iii. Bucharest, National Museum of Antiquities.

From Istros.

Histria I 395, 401.

A Fikellura sherd. The upper edge of the sherd comes at the figure's shoulder-level, and there is nothing to prove that this is a Gorgon rather than, say, Iris.

A winged female figure moves to her left, 'knee-running'. The wings, which must have been of sickle-type, are attached behind. The figure's left arm is extended in front of her (the hand is cut off by the edge of the sherd). She wears a long chiton with split skirt (both edges visible), leaving the left leg bare. There appears to be a shawl over her shoulders, unless it is simply the sleeves of the chiton.

Date: c.550 B.C.B.iv. British Museum, 88.2-8.13, 30,41. (BMC B 106.9a & 17).

Fragments of a situla.

From Tell Defenneh.

PL.6.

Ht. of vase as restored, 15.6 cms.

Tanis II, pl.26.10. R.M. Cook, CVA BM 8, 31,34, pls. GB 598,601.

Black-figure technique; purple for hair-snakes and tongue. The fragments, of one side of the neck of a situla, are in a very poor state of preservation. The gorgon has hair falling to her shoulders,

and around the outline of the hair, approximately from ear to ear, are seven looped snakes. It is difficult to decide whether two 'locks of hair' with upcurving ends, which fall in front of the shoulders, are really hair, or actually snakes. No head-markings can be seen. She holds a writhing snake in each hand, apparently by the tail. One at least of these snakes is looped in the centre³. One pair of wings curves gently upwards from behind her shoulders; there does not seem to have been a second, lower, pair. No teeth or fangs are visible.

Date: third quarter of the 6th century. (Cook)

Gorgoneia.

B.1. Istanbul, Arch. Mus.

From Pitane (Çandarlı). Unpublished. Pl .6.

In the shallow bowl of a small standed dish. Diam. of tondo (including border), c.8 cms. Ht. of foot, c.5 cms.

The dish has a cream slip, the paint is brown, and there is no incision. The exterior is simply decorated with a few narrow bands of paint. The gorgoneion is unique, and extremely stylized. It has no hair, and the outline of the face is rendered by a succession of 'bumps', not quite symmetrical. The nose is short, thick, and probably meant to be leonine; two spotted snakes with open mouths spring from its bridge, curve outwards like eyebrows, then back again

to face each other over the top of the head. The mouth is small for a gorgon, and straight. There is a large protruding tongue with a double line down the centre. Two fangs only, very large, point upwards from the lower jaw on either side of the tongue, reaching nostril-level.⁴ There are four teeth in the upper jaw, between the fangs. On the cheeks are strange areas of paint (facial hair?!)⁵, two at the right side, apparently only one at the left. The bottom of the tondo, below the tongue, is lost; the face as it survives occupies approximately the upper two-thirds of the tondo, so there may have been more snakes to fill the space. The tondo-border, alternating dots and vertical lines, is a common one in East Greece (cf. B.3.).

Date: Late 7th century B.C.? The fierce-looking, very 'uncanonical' gorgoneion looks as though it cannot be much later than 600 B.C. I have found no close parallel for the dish, with its very small bowl, but it bears a general resemblance to dishes of the late 7th and early 6th centuries from Emporio on Chios.⁵ It may even be a Chiot import to Pitane (both potting and painting are of good quality); it is certainly East Greek.

B.2 Chios Museum

From Chios

K.Kourouniotis, Adelt II 1916. 204, fig. 21. Besig 95, no.184.

This is a fragmentary vase with twisted handles and plastic heads, and

rows of typical Chiot Bf sphinxes and lions (the lions wearing what R.M.Cook calls 'ham frills'). The gorgoneion, which is very roughly done, is painted in the space between two plastic heads. It has a black tongue, and 'it appears that from its head on each side springs one small snake' (Kourouniotis). These snakes hang down straight at the sides. Kourouniotis compares the situla-gorgon, B.iv above, but there is very little resemblance between the two.

Date: second quarter of the 6th century, nearer to 550 B.C.

B.3.

A Fikellura cup.

From the Heraion, Samos.

Pl .7.

Original diam. of the cup: c.25-27 cms.

E. Kunze, AM 59, 1934, 118, 122, Beil. 11.1. R.M. Cook, BSA 34, 1933-34, 46 (dates 'middle of the third quarter' of 6th century). E.Homann-Wedeking, AA 1964, 86 (à propos of the bronze votive shield, E.3 below). Besig 94, no.183.

Kunze says that clay and slip are typical of Fikellura; there is added red for the mouth, and white for spots on the snakes; incision on the hair and snakes' heads. The gorgoneion, which is very fragmentary, occupied a large tondo in the centre of the cup. The hair is in fine strands across the brow. All round the head (except directly below the chin, where there is a lotus) are looped snakes. Those around the hair are fairly small, with closed mouths,

while those round the lower part of the face are large, with open mouths filled with teeth. The lowest pair turn inwards to face each other; these are also the only ones with the loop in the middle of the body, like those of the Samos votive shield, rather than at the tail. The total number of snakes must have been thirteen or fourteen. The gorgon may wear a disc ear-ring. No teeth or fangs are visible, though these possibly existed. There can have been no beard.

Date: c. 550 B.C.

B.4. Brussels, Musée du Cinquantenaire, Inv. M.831. Clazomenian.

From the area of Clazomenae, bought in Smyrna. Pl.61a

Size of the sherd, 8 cms. x 6.5 cms.

R. Zahn, AM 1898. 38ff, pl.VI. CVA Brussels, Musée du

Cinquantenaire 3, pl. II D 4.5 (Belgique 106.5). Besig 95.no.188.

Clay pinkish-red; cream slip with mica; the black glaze only slightly lustrous; added red and white. On the sherd, which is from the shoulder of a Bf hydria, appears Achilles dragging Hector's body (see Chapter III). The gorgoneion is the device on Achilles' shield, and is very small (diam. perhaps c. 1cm.). It has hair, apparently not falling below the ears. The protruding tongue is shown, but no teeth or fangs. There are snakes all round the head, ten in all; the two beneath the chin are looped, the rest alternately unlooped and looped. They are very large in proportion to the size of the head.

Date: third quarter of the 6th century.

B.5. Istanbul, Archaeological Museum no.1427.

Clazomenian sarcophagus.

Pl.7.

From Clazomenae.

G. Dennis, JHS 4, 1883, 16, pl.31 K.Friis Johansen,

Acta Arch. 6, 1934, 183, fig.12 Akurgal, KA 281, fig.250

(a good photograph). R.M. Cook, CVA BM 8, 35,45,54,

'a Clazomenian sarcophagus of markedly East Greek

black-figure style' (a fragment of the head-piece is in the

B.M.). Besig 95, no.189.

By the Borelli Painter.

Like no. B.4 above, this gorgoneion is a shield-device, painted in white. At first sight it appears to have no hair, but a vague blur visible around the top of the head in Akurgal's photograph may possibly be hair. There are looped snakes all round the head, twenty-two in all; some turn inwards towards the face, some outwards. Those round the jaw-line are larger than the hair-snakes. There is no tongue, and no teeth are visible. At the centre of the mouth are two pairs of large, curving fangs, overlapping each other.

Date: c. 525 B.C.

B.6. Stockholm, Clazomenian sarcophagus.

From Clazomenae.

L.Kjellberg, Jdl 19, 1904, 152, fig.1. Besig 95, no.185

See also M.Launey, Mon.Piot 35, 1936, 47, on the importance of 'corner-gorgons' to the East Greeks.

The gorgoneion is on one of the outer corners of the sarcophagus-walls, painted on the leaf of a 'Lesbian' cyma. It is very faint and damaged. No hair, ears, teeth or fangs are visible, but thin looped snakes are clearly to be seen all down one side of the face to the chin.

Date: third quarter of the 6th century.

B.7. Oxford, Ashmolean Mus., Inv.1954.352.

From Al Mina, Levels 5-7.

Pl.7.

Size of face, c.11 cm. across centre, x c.4.5 cm.

C.M. Robertson, JHS 60, 1940, 10 fig.5g (cf.j.).

On a fragment of a 'Rhodian' standed dish, the upper part of a face appears, rising from the ground-line of the decorative zone. Two sharp tusks spring from the base-line, but there is no mouth. The monster has large eyes, a wrinkled, rather leonine nose, heavy eyebrows meeting in the centre, and an inverted 'drop' beauty-spot in the centre of the brow. Filling-ornaments in the form of a swastika, joined blobs and dots, are sprinkled all over the face. On either side of the face are rays.

Date: last third of the 7th century.

See Appendix 2

Note:- Perseus without the gorgons

An excerpt from the Perseus story (without gorgon), appears on a 'Rhodian' plate of C.575 B.C.: Berlin F 3917, BSA 34, 1933-34, 60,67, pl.19 ('transitional piece between earlier East Greek and Fikellura'). Perseus runs from left to right in winged boots of 'Ionian' type (according to Yalouris' classification), carrying the empty kibisis. A dog accompanies him. The interpretation is disputed, the dog being apparently the main stumbling-block (e.g. K.Schauenburg, Perseus in der Kunst des Altertums (1960), 38; Kardara, RA 252).

C.

ARCHITECTURAL TERRACOTTAS

This section is based on Å. Åkerström, Die Architektonischen Terrakotten Kleinasiens. The only examples not mentioned by him are C.14, C.15. For a review with criticism of his late dating, see N. Bookidis, AJA 72, 1968, 81.

C1. Antefix-fragments.

From Didyma. Found in the filling layer SW and NW of the temple. This filling was laid during and after the building of the last temple. Both Wiegand and Åkerström believe that they are from the Naiskos, the small temple for the cult statue, which stood inside the large temple, at the west end. Pl.8.

Size: c. 19 cms. wide, 13 cms. high, pentagonal in shape.

Th. Wiegand, Didyma I, 149-150, pl. 223. Åkerström, ATK, 109, 113, pl.57.

The antefixes have a white slip, and red-brown glaze for the decoration. There are fragments from three moulds, very similar, obviously contemporary, but certainly distinct:

(a) P. 673 e.

The only example illustrated by Åkerström. The outline of the face not pear-shaped, as in P673 b,c,d. There is a beard, consisting

of three tufts at each side of the jaw-line, with a gap in the centre. The two pairs of fangs touch the tongue. Two bearded snakes, looped in the middle of their bodies, coil down the side of the face from the ear. Almost certainly the ear has a disc ear-ring.

(b) F 673 b,c,d.

Three fragments of the lower part of the face. This type has a pear-shaped face, and no beard. The fangs, (two pairs), touch the tongue. There are disc ear-rings. There are two bearded, looped snakes beneath each ear, tucked in further under the chin than in F 673 e.

There is a moulded cable border along the bottom edge of the antefix.

(c) F 673 a.

A fragment with the centre and top of the head. There is no hair. Four looped snakes and part of a fifth remain round the top of the head. There are two pairs of fangs, touching the tongue. This is not from either of the preceding moulds - the eyes and mouth are smaller, the fangs neater.

Date: second half of the 6th century. Åkerström inclines to a late date, tentatively assigning the gorgoneion-, lion- and lotus-antefixes to a renovation of the Naïskos before the installation of Kanachos' bronze cult-statue near the end of the century.

C.2. ? (Bonn, Akad. Kunstm., Inv. D816, a fragment). Antefixes.

From Miletus (Kalabaktepe). Found on the temple-terrace, and possibly, but not definitely, attributable to the small anta-temple there. Pl .8.

Ht. 13.5 cms, width. 19.5 cms. Pentagonal.

A.von Gerkan, Milet 1:8, 24 ff., Beil. IIc. Åkerström, ATK 103-104, pl 53.2. Besig, 93 no. 172. Antiken aus dem Akademischen Kunstmuseum, Bonn² (1971), 49 no. 56.

Eight examples remain, but no information is given about moulds; only one example is illustrated. (Material of the Bonn example:- Pink clay with much mica; traces of black paint on eye-brows, pupils, snakes and ear). The gorgoneion has no hair or beard. There are two pairs of fangs, touching the tongue. In the centre of the forehead is a small vertical depression. The ears have disc earrings. There are two large looped snakes at each side of the jaw, and six smaller ones, also looped, round the top of the head. A moulded cable borders the bottom of the antefix.

Both Wiegand and Åkerström compare the Didyma antefixes with these, and Åkerström attributes them to the same workshop.⁷

Date: second half of the 6th century; (Åkerström: last quarter).

C.3.

Antefix

From Miletus, near the temple of Athena. Fl .8.

Ht. 9 cms. Pentagonal.

P. Hommel, Ist.Mitt. 9-10, 1959-60, 61-62, pl.68.

Slip light brown? ('lehm Braun'); brown-black glaze for details and border. The antefix was made in a mould. Almost exactly half the face, which is pear-shaped, remains. One pair of fangs is left, at the central break, and doubtless they touched the tongue. There is no hair or beard. Two large bearded, looped snakes frame the jaw, and three smaller beardless looped snakes remain round the top of the head. There can have been nothing immediately under the chin, as the cable border at the right-hand edge of the antefix shows. It is difficult to tell whether the gorgoneion wears a disc ear-ring, or whether the ear-lobe is simply stylized.

Hommel points out the differences between this and the antefixes from Kalabaktepe (C.2. above), and adds that this is generally of higher quality. For the shape of the face and the lower snakes (but not for the quality) the closest parallel is the Didyma antefix-type F 673 b,c,d. The general effect is less coarse and bestial than in the other examples.

Date: second half of the 6th century. (Hommel).

C.4.

Antefix

From Miletus, near the temple of Athena (found in the same archaic deposit as the preceding example). Pl. 8.

L. of the sloping side ('Schrägseite'), 8 cms.

P. Hommel, Ist.Mitt. 9-10, 1959-60, 61-62, pl. 68

This is a previously unknown type of antefix. There is no relief: the gorgoneion is simply painted in dark glaze on the light background. The paint of the border continues onto the edges. All that remains of the gorgoneion is a trace of the edge of the face, bordered by six (or perhaps only five - the topmost 'snake' is not absolutely certain) looped snakes. Their tails do not quite curl far enough to close the loops. They are beardless, and their mouths are closed. Their eyes and a small patch on the head are reserved. Hommel compares the snakes of the Fikellura cup, B.3. above.

If the antefix, supposing it to be an antefix, was pentagonal like the others, there would apparently have been a large gap between the top of the gorgon's head and the apex. In fact, the remaining snakes, in their uniformity, look as if they should border the top of the head; the extreme left-hand 'snake' could then be the top of an ear, and the general position looks more plausible. The antefix might then be hexagonal?

Date: second half of the 6th century. (Hommel)

- C.5. Istanbul, Archaeological Museum, and Stockholm. Sima.
 From 'Larisa' on the Hermos. Pl. 8.
 Ht. 21.5 cms.; width, ear to ear, 20 cms.
Larisa I, 148, fig. 31 (Schefold); Larisa II, 91-94, pls. 44, 45
 (Åkerström). Åkerström, ATK 54, 60ff., pls. 30, 32. Besig 93,
 no. 170.

From a gutter-sima (Sima IX) which also has lion-heads. The gorgoneia are mould-made, with cream slip, black glaze, and added white. Round the top of the head is a mass of coiling, intertwined snakes; there appears to be no hair apart from these. Just beneath each ear is a looped snake, and another stretches down each side of the face from the ear to end in a loop beside the chin. Schefold in his description says that there are twelve snakes in all, painted black with white spots. There is a fine set of small, neat teeth, white with black outline, and two pairs of fangs touching the tongue. On the nose are three V-shaped wrinkles, modelled and painted. The disc ear-rings are painted with patterns which vary from one gorgoneion to another.

Åkerström assigns the gorgoneion-sima IX to his 'echtjonisch' group 3, which includes the Rider-, Centaur-, and Banquet-friezes (ATK pls. 26-28), most of which he believes to be from the archaic temple. He dates the group to c. 530-20 B.C. by means of various comparisons, the most important of which is with the Caeretan hydriae. The parallels which he chooses for the gorgoneion (p. 61, aegis-gorgoneion by Andokides-Painter, Ffuhl, Muz III, fig. 314; Acropolis

antefix, Buschor, Pondächer II, 41, pl.5) are rather poor, though his dating may be correct. Of the East Greek examples, the closest are nos. C.2. (Miletus) and E.4. (Samos).

For artistic quality this is easily the best of the architectural terra-cottas.

Date: third quarter of the 6th century.

C.6. Istanbul, Archaeological Museum ? Sima.

From 'Larisa' on the Hermos.

Width of head (estimated) c.25 cms.

Larisa II, 91, 93-93, fragments 5,6, pls. 43.5, 44.5 (Åkerström).

Cream slip, black glaze. The fragment is almost entirely painted: of the surviving features, apparently only the eye-brow and eye-rim are in relief. The lower left corner of the face remains, with a trace of the left eye and eye-brow at the break. The mouth is large, with irregular, pointed teeth in the corner, then, nearer the centre, a pair of overlapping fangs, also irregular in shape. Part of the upper lip still closer to the centre remains, but there is no sign of more teeth. There is a disc ear-ring, with decoration of painted lines dividing it into quarters, and a dot in each quarter. An area of black glaze round the outline of the face is presumably part of hair, beard or snakes - it is impossible to say which.

Schefold, whose opinion is quoted (p.94), believed the fragment to belong to the chariot-sima VIII, which has painted heads,

figures, and vegetable motifs between the chariots (Larisa II pls. 34-44). Quite apart from the contrast in technique and size with the moulded gorgoneia of Sima IX, the slip, glaze, and thickness of the slab, he maintained, differed from this frieze and suited Sima VIII. Åkerström, however, assigned the fragments to Sima IX, though with considerable reservations, and with the suggestion that they may be later repairs. This seems the only possible explanation if Åkerström's attribution is correct, but if so, the restorers made very little attempt to match the styles - the arrangement of hair and/or snakes is clearly different. Yet the fragments seem to be very rough and inferior work compared with the painted figures of Sima VIII, and the slab, though thicker than those of the gorgoneion-sima, is thinner than those of VIII.

In fact, all that can certainly be said of the fragment is that it corresponds in some details (ear-rings, position of fangs) with the regular East Greek type, but may differ in hair style.

Date: third quarter of the 6th century (or later!)

C.7. Izmir, Arch.Mus., Inv. nos. 1245, 1249, 1252, 1260. Sima.
From Temnos (inland, about 15 miles north of Izmir). Pl.10.
Size; judging from the fragments, particularly no.1249, pl.14.4
ht. 19 cms., the complete gorgoneion should be about 25 cms high.
Åkerström ATK 38-41, nos. 6-9, pl.14. 3-6.

The clay is coarse, but of good, firm quality, fired hard. There is a cream slip, with dark-brown glaze.

Very little remains, but the gorgoneia clearly have looped snakes (a double row, or a single row of double-looped snakes? round the brow), and do not appear to have hair besides.

This gutter-sima also had panther-heads, like the Larisa one, C.5. Åkerström draws attention to other archaic juxtapositions of these two types.

Date: c. 525 B.C. (Åkerström, p.41, dates the palmettes on the sima c.525 or a little later).

C.8. Lesbos, Mytilene Museum?

Antefix

From Antissa (Lesbos). Exact findspot unknown.

Åkerström, ATK 31, No photograph.

'Erhalten die rechte Hälfte des grinsenden Gesichtes mit einem Teil des Schlangengewirres, mit Ohr, Hälfte des Auges, Winkel des Mundes und drei perlformigen Haarsträhnen'.

From this it is clear that the gorgoneion had snakes round the top of the head. These may have been looped: Åkerström uses 'Schlangengewirr' for the snakes of, e.g. C.7. and C.9., which are looped. No ear-rings are mentioned. The position of the fangs, (if there were any), is uncertain, but at least they cannot have been at the edge of the mouth. Long hair at the sides is rare among East Greek gorgoneia (apart from the Gorgoneion aryballoi).

The only other example known to me from East Greece combining long hair at the sides with snakes round the top of the head is the antefix from Smyrna, C.14; the Olbia antefix, C.10, seems to have long hair, but no snakes (though see the Catalogue on this).⁸ East Greek gorgoneia with snakes round the top of the head normally have them below the ears too, as if taking the place of hair.

Date: Åkerström: 'archaic style'. Probably second half of the 6th century?.

C.9. Lesbos, Mytilene Museum. Antefix-fragment.

From Klopedhi (Lesbos), perhaps from the 'smaller temple' on the site of Ag. Taxiarchoi.

Ht. 9.5 cms, width, 12 cms. (Åkerström); (ADelt., ht. 9 cms.) ADelt 9, 1922-25, Parartema, 44.2.

Praktika 1928, 131, fig. 7,9. Åkerström ATK 28,29,31-32.

Clay red; Åkerström says that it is of a kind typical at Neandria (Troas). The fragment is described in ATK as '...das meiste eines Gorgoneions mit dem Schlangengewirr', and it is just possible to see from the very poor photograph in Praktika that the snakes are looped. There seems to be no hair, but certainty is impossible; nor is it possible to say whether there were ear-rings or fangs.

Date: c.500 B.C. (Åkerström). (Though the general appearance in the Praktika photograph recalls the Miletus and Didyma antefixes).

C.10. ? Sima-fragment.

From Olbia. 'Bought in Olbia in 1908' -RM. Pl .9.

Ht. 16 cms.

RM 30, 1915, 24, fig. 7. Åkerström ATK 3, pl.1.6.

Besig 93, no.173.

A stray fragment, the oldest surviving architectural terracotta from Olbia. All that remains is the top of the head, the left eye and ear, and part of the left cheek. There is no ear-ring. There is a row of curling locks over the brow, and probably a lock of hair below the ear. A kind of halo round the head, of a lighter colour than the rest of the background, perhaps once had something painted on it (snakes?). Or could there have been moulded terracotta snakes, added separately (cf. Tarentine antefix, Arch. Class. 6, 1954, pl. LXX.2)?

Date: later 6th century.

C.11. Bucharest, National Museum of Antiquities. Fragment of a semicircular antefix. Pl .9.

From Istros, from a temple of Aphrodite ('temple A') on the acropolis. Est.ht. c. 20 cms, est. width c. 26 cms.

Histria, Monografie Arheologica I, 1954, 258, fig.105.

BCH 82, 1958, 343, fig.11 (a good photograph). Åkerström

ATK 3, fig.1. E. Condurachi and C. Daicoviciu, The Ancient Civilisation of Romania (1971) fig.59.

The hair is in stylized waves or scallops over the brow; there is no side-hair. A pair of large spotted snakes emerges at the sides of the neck. There are small, neat teeth, but no fangs are visible (and almost certainly there were none). There is no ear-ring. The eyes look to the left.

Date: second half of the 6th century. (Åkerström dates to the first half of the 5th century, without giving reasons. Condurachi and Daicoviciu (pp.76 and 234) date the level in which it was found, Histria Level III, to the second half of the 6th century on the basis of the pottery: '...in addition to Rhodian B ware it includes many Fikellura-type vases, sherds of Clazomenian and Corinthian ware of the later period, and many Attic black-figure vases.').

C.12a. Citadel on Cal Dag, Troad.

Antefix.

Ancient Cebren?

Pl.9.

Wdth. 34 cms.

Åkerström, ATK 7, no.2 (a brief reference, saying that the antefix and other fragments from the site are to be published by Prof. J.M. Cook).

Åkerström states that there are traces of dark glaze on the cheeks. The antefix is semicircular, with a frame in two zones, an inner one of tongues or 'eggs', and an outer one of small dentils. The gorgoneion has an almost circular face, with three rows of snail-

curls over the brow. Four looped snakes frame the hair, their heads seeming to curve inwards onto the hair and brow (cf. B.5. Clazomenian). Two more pairs of snakes, not fully looped, but curled round so that their heads touch their tails, frame the jaw. The mouth is stretched sideways in an oval shape; the large, protruding tongue fills most of it, and an untidy pair of fangs sprouts from each corner. The longish nose has inverted-V wrinkles, and there are wrinkles in relief on the forehead. The eyes are almond-shaped, with thick rims and heavy brows. The ears have disc ear-rings modelled as rosettes. The gorgoneion is coarse and repulsive, and very provincial-looking. It is easily the poorest in quality of the terracottas, if not of all the East Greek examples.

Date: Early 5th century? Professor Cook (to whose kindness I owe the photographs of C.12a and b), informs me that Professor Åkerström in a letter suggested the first half of the 5th century, but that the pedimental fragment also listed in ATK is dated by Åkerström to the second half of the 6th century. Cook adds that the other terracottas from the site which he has seen would fit with the later 6th century, (and the other fragments mentioned by Åkerström include parts of chariot- and banquet- scenes, so that the repertoire clearly resembled that of sites such as Larisa). A rough, provincial work such as this is, of course, difficult to date,

This example is of the archaic type, but could be of almost any date from the late archaic period onward! In my opinion, it is most unlikely to be earlier than 500 B.C.; the complex arrangement of hair over the brow looks late, but especially, the very large tongue and the awkward, ostentatiously-sprouting fangs recall examples which are certainly very late, or sub-archaic, and are using these means to try to look fierce. Cf., for example, the far superior C.14, and, from other areas, e.g. Koch, DK pl.VI-1 (Capua); Andr en pl.10.36 (Caere); L. Bernab  Brea, Sizilien 45, (Syracuse).

C.12b A fragmentary antefix photographed on the same site by J.G. Pedley in 1968. Pl .9.

The fragment is the left side of the face, from eye to chin. It is clearly not another example of 12a, but because it is so fragmentary, I have given it the same number. No frame is visible. The face seems to be broader across the jaw than 12a, and has a very large, slightly upcurving mouth. Two huge fangs may be seen, a little way from the corner of the mouth: 12b shares with 12a the peculiarity that the upward-pointing fangs appear to be set in the upper jaw, and viceversa. All around the outline of the face may be seen snakes which are either looped, or curled like those of 12a.

Date: late archaic. This example looks more genuinely archaic, and closer to other East Greek examples such as C.1 and 2, than does 12a, but it is impossible to judge accurately from the photograph.

C.13. ?

Antefix.

From the Heraion, Samos.

Pl.10.

Deutsches Inst. phot. Samos 936. Besig 93, no.171.

Besig's description is 'Sowie erhalten, nur "Zwickelschlangen"'. These are the snakes which spring out on either side of the chin. According to Besig, the Samos gorgoneion has a milder expression than the Larisa one (C.5), but can scarcely be later in date.

Date: c. 525 B.C. ?

C.14. Paris, Louvre Inv. CA 614.

Antefix.

Bought in Smyrna (Izmir) in 1894. Pl .10

Ht. 24 cms, L. 19 cms.

S. Mollard-Besques, Catalogue Raisonné des Figurines et Reliefs en Terre Cuite du Musée du Louvre, Vol. I (1954), 54, pl.XXXVII, B347.

'Clay red-brown, poorly-refined, well-fired, Slip.' There is a thick cream slip, peeling to show very pink clay. The antefix is completely flat at the back, and about one inch thick. The face of the gorgon is very slightly concave. She has hair waving gently and falling from a central parting to cover the tops of the ears. At each side the hair falls in a thick, flat tress ending in a large curl. Ten coiled, rather than looped, bearded snakes border the top of the head, facing outwards, with two very small ones

filling the gap in the centre. The features are neat and finely-modelled. There is a vertical depression in the centre of the forehead, giving the effect of a frown. A pair of fangs springs out from each corner of the mouth. In the ears are pyramid earrings, and across the neck between the two large curls is a bead-necklace.⁹

Date: Mme. Mollard dates the antefix to the first half of the 6th century, saying 'Le type smyrniote rappelle beaucoup celui du relief d'ivoire trouvé à Samos, représentant le meutre de Méduse..' (F.i). As far as I can see, the only resemblance between them is that both are gorgons. In the display in the Louvre the antefix is dated 'mid-6th century'.

In my opinion, the antefix cannot be earlier than the early 5th century (c.480 or later) for the following reasons:

- (1) The general appearance is too human and genteel for an earlier date, the only concession to bestiality being the incongruous-looking fangs. One has only to set the antefix beside any of the others in this catalogue to see the contrast.
- (2) The hair-style, with its rather free, soft waves across the brow, is comparable with that of very late archaic and early classical sculpture and terracottas, rather than with the more formal, stylized version worn by earlier female figures (for example, compare Payne/Young pls. 1, 18, 53 with pls. 78, 85, and with e.g. Higgins I Pl.27 no 147, pl.151 no. 1090, early-5th century terracottas).

This is the only gorgoneion antefix (or indeed, gorgon) known to me with pyramid ear-rings - disc ear-rings are the usual type; though this ear-ring is not in itself an indication of late date, isolated examples being known from the late 7th and the 6th centuries (Higgins, Jewellery, 102, 126), it gained in popularity from the early 5th century on, and may have some significance here, contributing as it does to the lady-like aspect of its wearer.

The rest of the catalogue, and references throughout the chapter, were completed before I found the following entry, and for that reason I have not incorporated it in its correct chronological place.

C.15. Prague.

Antefixes

Bought in Smyrna, said to be from Clazomenae. Pl .10.

No measurements given.

E. Walter-Karydi, 'Aeolische Kunst' in Studien zur Griechischen Vasenmalerei (1970), 16-17, pl.7.2.

There are two antefixes from the same mould, with cream slip and red paint. The example illustrated is splendidly-preserved. The modelling is strong, with both nose-wrinkles, and, more unusually, frown-lines, in relief. The cheek-lines, however, are simply painted. The antefix is described as semicircular, but is actually midway between that and pentagonal: there are slight angles at the apex and halfway along the curving sides. It is wider in proportion

to its height than the other complete gorgoneion-antefixes (C.1 and 2, probably from the same workshop), and has no decorative border across the bottom.

Head and shoulders of the gorgon are visible, rising from the lower edge of the antefix. The over-sized head is slightly pear-shaped, with prominent chin. The large, slightly upcurving mouth is full of neat teeth, and has two pairs of fangs close to its edges. The large, protruding tongue has a vertical furrow. The nose is long, with horizontal wrinkles on the bridge, and large, V-shaped wrinkles cover the brow. The ears are adorned by disc ear-rings. There is a row of six large curls around the top of the head, and above them, four spotted, looped snakes, heads facing outwards. The two inner snakes are looped in the middle of their bodies. A pair of large, curving snakes rises from the corners of the jaw, and the gorgon raises her hands and grasps them. A fourth pair of snakes emerges from beneath the chin and turns outwards in a U-curve. There is a large pair of horns above the ears. Further painted wrinkles appear on the nostrils, beneath the nose, at the outer corners of the eyes, and across the cheeks. The gorgon has (snake?) bracelets on her wrists (cf. B.i.), and seems to wear a sleeved chiton with a border at the edge of the sleeves.

There are five dot-rosettes in the field, and a lotus at each of the lower corners.

Date: Walter-Karydi dates to 'the later second quarter of the

6th century', saying that the gorgoneion looks more archaic (urtümlicher) than the Larisa example C.5, and is less mild than South Ionian examples (mentioning B.3, E.4, A.1a (!), A.3,4,5 and 8). The horns also, she thinks, increase the primitive character of the gorgoneion.

Dating is difficult, as both the antefix-shape, and certain details of the gorgoneion, are unique among the East Greek examples. A first impression that Walter-Karydi's dating was too high, is not supported by definite evidence, and there are features which seem to confirm her dating.

Unusual details for an East Greek gorgoneion, and possible signs of mainland influence, are the long nose, and the painted lines along the cheekbones which recall the Corinthian type (which, however, has the lines curving down from the nostrils to the corners of the mouth, then rising again to the ear in a more decided division of the face). Several East Greek gorgoneia have an extra line or ridge round the mouth itself (e.g. A.5,7; B.3,5; D.1), but only A.11, the Sandalled-foot gorgoneion, has real cheek-bone lines. A somewhat similar effect of wrinkles is given by J.i, the Delphi gold plaque gorgon. The position of the fangs is rare, though not unknown, in East Greece. There are no other certain examples of horns, otherwise familiar in Laconian gorgoneia (there are possible examples on two gems, H.xii,xiii). The horizontal lines on the nose recall the ivory gorgon, F.ii. The gorgon's gesture in grasping two of the snakes attached to her head is unique (the position recalls that of the

gorgon on the Pontic amphora in Reading).¹⁰ Undoubted East Greek features are the shape of the face, with its wide jaw and large chin, the ear-rings, the looped snakes and the arrangement of the snakes generally, (see pp. 174 ff.).

The lotus-flowers with broken calyx and separate petals of inverted drop shape are called 'echt äolisch' by Walter-Karydi. I am not entirely convinced of this, but, in any case, their closest parallels do seem to be before or around 550 B.C. Cf., for example, Fairbanks pl. 3⁴.318,³ a krater-herd from Naukratis (dot-rosettes too). Some of the earliest Clazomenian sarcophagi, by the Borelli Painter, have similar, though not identical, lotuses: these are dated to the third quarter of the 6th century by Friis Johansen (Acta Arch. 13, 1942, 20, fig. 10; 21, fig. 11; 28ff), and c. 525 B.C. by K.M. Cook in CVA BM 8, and look as if they may be rather later than those on the antefix (more sophisticated and stream-lined).

A similar antefix-type, from Didyma, with no lower border, and with a similar lotus, is dated by Åkerström (ATK 112, 113, pl. 56.4) c. 575-550 B.C.

The fierce expression, though not proof positive of an early date, recalls some Attic and Laconian gorgoneia of the second quarter of the 6th century. For a general resemblance, with a slightly less fierce expression, cf. the bronze D.4.

It seems, therefore, that Walter-Karydi's dating is justified. This means that C.15 is the earliest of our architectural gorgoneia.

It is in any event a most important addition to the numbers of East Greek gorgoneia, for its quality, state of preservation, and iconographic details.

D.

SCULPTUREGorgons

D.i. Istanbul, Arch.Mus., Inv.2182, and East Berlin, Staatl. Mus.

From Didyma.

Pl.11.

Ht. of Istanbul gorgon (= ht. of architrave-block), 90.9 cms;
estimated ht. of Berlin gorgon, c.117.1 cms (ht. of architrave
block, i.e. ht. of gorgon's body, plus ht. of head estimated
from bodily proportions of both gorgons: 90.9 cms + c.26.2 cms).

E. Pontremoli and B. Hausoullier, Didymas, Fouilles de 1895 et
1896, 189, pl.XX, plans pls. III,IV. Th.Wiegand, Didyma I,
125 (discussion by H.Knackfuss), pl.215; Didyma I Zeichnungen,
pl.83a, Z611. G. Mendel, Musées Impériaux Ottomans, Cat. de
Sculptures I, 555, no. 239. E. Langlotz, Frühgriechische
Bildhauerschulen 103ff, pl.60. Besig 92, no. 165.

G. Gruben, Jdl 78, 1963, 142-147. 'Gorgon-Potnia': AM 78, 1963,
76 (Kunze); Ch.Christou, Potnia Theron 151; Karagiorga GK 61.

The two gorgons are carved in relief on two rectangular marble blocks
thought to come from diagonally opposite corners of the architrave
of the archaic temple: the Istanbul gorgon is attributed to the S.E.
corner, the Berlin example to the N.W. The figures, in 'knee-running'
position, are spread with rather strange effect over two sides of
the block: the right arm, leg and wings on the short side, the left

arm, leg and wings on the long side, the breast and head facing outwards from the corner between. The Istanbul gorgon is the same height as its architrave-block, but the Berlin gorgon's body only, to the shoulders, fits onto its block, the head and wing-tips being added, and thus overlapping the architectural member (the cyma) above the architrave. A hole for the clamp to attach the head can be seen in the top of the torso as preserved. A further difference is that the back-ground of the Istanbul block is perfectly flat, while the Berlin block has the three fascias usual in Ionic architraves. Both gorgons wear the chiton and himation, with fine pleats and zig-zag folds. Both probably wore winged sandals (Berlin has a sandalled right foot, but the wing is 'hidden' behind the drapery; Istanbul has a wing on the right heel, but the block is so damaged at the bottom that any details of foot or footwear have gone). Both have two pairs of large, upcurving wings at the back. Both hold in their right hands, at their sides, a mysterious oblong object: that held by Istanbul has rounded ends and appears to be complete, that held by Berlin is broken off, and may be the same shape but seems to curve upwards slightly at the broken end.

The remaining description is of Istanbul, as Berlin has lost the members in question. The left arm is raised from the elbow, with the hand upright and open, fingers together. The large ears are adorned by disc ear-rings. The hair waves across the brow, then descends in long, wavy tresses, three of which at each side fall over the shoulders and end in a curl. Eight large, looped, bearded

snakes encircle the hair from ear to ear. The face is very battered, but Mendel says that two fangs can be seen at left and right of the mouth; this is well enough preserved for one to see from the photographs that the fangs are not at or near its edges, therefore they must be near the centre, which is more damaged. The face is 'pear-shaped', and the expression fierce and bestial, in strange contrast with the delicate hair and drapery.

To the left of the Istanbul figure, on the broken long side of the block, are part of the mane and crossed forepaws of a large reclining lion, the top of whose head would have reached the top of the block. The head was probably frontal, and separately attached. A raised rough patch at the broken edge of the Berlin block is thought to be a trace of a similar animal.

Date: c. 540-520 B.C.¹¹

See Appendix 3

D.ii London, British Museum, Inv. B 237-239, 242.

From Ephesus, from the 'Croesus' temple-parapet.

Ht. of the parapet, 88 cms.

D.G. Hogarth, B.M. Excavations at Ephesus, Atlas, pl.XVII.10,

11,14,16. Cat. of Sculpture in the B.M., vol.I (1) 67-68,

92-94, nos. B 237-239, B 242,243,244.

These are fragments of marble relief-sculpture, with drapery and

looped, bearded snakes with open mouths, and parts of one or more winged figures. Part of a female head with disc ear-ring appears on B 237. B 242 consists of the right shoulder, in chiton, and part of the right wing of a figure which could well be in the same attitude as the Didyma gorgons. In fact, it could be a gorgon like those from Didyma, and the resemblance is certainly striking. The fragments with snakes (B237-239) do not seem to be from the same figure. As the B.M. Cat. points out, they look as if they belong to a figure wearing a large aegis, rather than to a gorgon, but they are included here because of the snakes and their uncertain interpretation.

B 242, then, could simply be a Nike or an Iris, but could equally be a gorgon like those from Didyma.

Date: c. 510 B.C. (B.M. Cat.) The fragments look a little later in style than the Didyma gorgons.

Gorgoneia

D.l. Chios, Museum, no.287. Marble relief-moulding.

From Managros (Phanae), Chios. Pl.11.

Ht. of block as preserved, 17 cms.

K. Kourouniotis, Adelt. 1, 1915, 86, figs.27-28.

J. Boardman, AntJ. 39, 1959, 178, 189ff., pl.XXIXc, no.17

(with full bibliography).

On the white marble relief-moulding are the gorgoneion and some egg-and-dart. The moulding is a wall-crown from an inside corner, the

gorgoneion being actually on the corner. All the top of the head is gone. The fangs touch the tongue. There is a disc ear-ring, and a short, fat snake emerges from behind the ear and curves in a U-shape.

Boardman dates the fragment to the early 5th century by the form of the egg-and-dart, placing it in his Moulding Group IIC: '... pointing of the eggs had already begun in Ionic in the 6th century, but we cannot say whether in Chios it had reached the stage shown in Group II by the end of the century.' He notes, p.178, that Kourouniotis and D.S. Robertson dated the moulding to the late 6th century, and were followed by L.T. Shoe and W. Lamb. The gorgoneion, though clearly late archaic, cannot be dated independently.

Date: late 6th century or early 5th.

D.2. Chios, Museum (no number). Marble fragment.

From Phanae. Pl.11.

L. as preserved, 12 cms.

J. Boardman, AntJ. 39, 1959, 178, 189, pl.XXIXb, no. 18

The fragment is of white marble. Only part of the mouth and chin of the gorgoneion remains. It is comparable in size with no.17 (D.1), but differs in details: the lower teeth are shown as well as the upper; the fangs do not touch the tongue, but must be either midway or nearer to the tongue, judging by the distance between them and the outer edge of the mouth. There was perhaps a small beard?

(Boardman calls these traces 'chin-creases').

Date: this is dated by Boardman to the early 5th century, like no.17. It looks earlier, and though this criterion can be dangerous, I should prefer to assign it to the later 6th century.

E.

BRONZESGorgonsE.i. Paris, Louvre, Br.2570.

From the sea off Rhodes.

Pl.12.

Ht. of figure (kneeling), 40 cms; ht. of head, 9 cms;

total ht. including the lion's paw, 55 cms.

A.de Ridder, Cat. des Bronzes II, 98, pl.92. EncyclopédiePhotographique de l'Art: Louvre, Bronzes, 75 C. (photograph).Riccioni, 176, 178, fig.66. Besig 96, no.195. U. Jantzen,Griechische Greifenkessel 67,80).

Surface of the bronze is very badly corroded in parts, making it difficult to discern some details. The gorgon kneels with hands flat on the fronts of her thighs. She wears a straight ankle-length robe, apparently belted at the waist; on its bodice is an incised scale-pattern (visible only at the front). Either the robe has sleeves reaching halfway down the upper arm (clearest on the right arm), or she is wearing a shawl (compare, for example the 'Auxerre goddess', Lullies pl.6, who also, incidentally, has an incised scale-pattern on her bodice). The gorgon is possibly booted, though the worn state of the bronze unfortunately makes certainty impossible. The face is large, almost round, and fairly

flat, with a slight vertical depression in the centre of the brow. The staring eyes originally had inlaid pupils. There was probably, but not certainly, a protruding tongue; the teeth are shown, and a pair of fangs at each corner of the mouth. The right ear remains, and has no ear-ring. Around the jaw-line is a small fringe of beard (a few tufts are visible on the object itself). The hair is arranged in six large curls across the brow, and here, at the right side, where the original surface is well preserved, the fine incised hair-strands give an indication of the first-rate quality of the work. A hair-band binds the hair at the back only, behind the ears, and below it the hair falls in heavy beaded locks onto the breast (three tresses at each side), shoulders and back. It is interesting to see how evenly the hair falls, instead of being divided very decidedly, as is usual, into front and back hair, leaving the tops of the arms bare. The gorgon has neither wings nor snakes.

That she was one of the supports for a bowl or tripod,¹² or other similar utensil, is shown by the lion-paw with two attached struts which rests on a low 'polos' or cushion on top of her head. The broken end of another strut is visible just above the hair-band at the back of the head.

The very fine incision of the hair on the top of the head, and the treatment of the curls, recalls such works as the ivory kneeling boy from Samos (AltSam. St. IV, figs. 238-240). The pattern on the 'polos', which consists of groups of about four vertical lines with

a square space between them, is well-known in several slightly-differing versions in East Greek bronze-work and pottery (see pp. 372, 380 and pls. 74, 75, 78). These details have, however, many parallels in mainland Greek art also.

Date: Second half of the 7th century, perhaps c. 625 B.C.

(Roughly contemporary with the 'Auxerre goddess').

Eii. Paris, Louvre, Br. 4456 (formerly de Clerq Coll.)

'From Cilicia'.

Pl. 12.

Ht. 8.6 cms., width across wing-tips 10 cms.

A. de Ridder, Coll. de Clerq III (Bronzes), 235, pl. 53.

Perachora I, 105.

The gorgon is made for front view only: she is modelled only at the front, is very thin in section, and completely flat and plain at the back. She is in the 'knee-running' position on a thin rectangular base, and has a strip of metal sticking out horizontally from the back of the head; further, as Payne observed, the tops of the wings are flattened. A krater-handle is possible, but it is perhaps more probably that she was attached to the neck of a bronze vessel, with wings fitting beneath the rim. The large pair of wings points downwards. She wears a short tunic, apparently with short sleeves; it is belted at the waist, and covered with an incised scale pattern except for a border with zig-zag incision at the hem. She is booted, and has bracelets on her wrists. Her arms are in the

'elbows-out' position, her closed hands at her waist, but no snakes are visible. Her face is large and round; her tongue protrudes, but she has no fangs. Her hair is swept straight back from the brow, and falls in three straight locks over each shoulder.

Payne compares our gorgon with the two bronze gorgons from Perachora (op. cit., pls. 34, 42, dated to the middle or third quarter of the sixth century): ^{(Pl. 32 c, d):} 'The style is somewhat similar to that of our gorgons, but obviously earlier; the technique is far less fine, and there is no proof that the figure is Corinthian, though this seems far from improbable.'

In my view, a Corinthian origin is unlikely. The Perachora gorgons are clearly related to each other, not only in such matters as the number and position of wings but, more important, in body-type (thin and wiry), and in shape of face and relation and proportion of features. The 'Cilicia' gorgon is superficially similar because of its attitude (though even here the arm-position differs), but otherwise there seems little connection. The body is plump and fleshy (and no hint of its forms is visible through the skirt), while the difference between the heads is even more striking: the face is round and moon-like, the features very superficially-placed and related quite differently to the whole (note especially the mouth). These characteristics, and the swept-back hair which is so like that of many sixth-century East Greek figures, seem to point to an origin in the East Greek area, though the primitive and rather 'provincial'

appearance of the piece perhaps excludes the major artistic centres.

Date: first half of the 6th century?

E.iii Leningrad, Hermitage.

From Martonosha (or Mastanosch), nr. Odessa, S. Russia.

Ht. c. 9 cms. Ht. of handle, 21 cms.

E.H. Minns, Scythians and Greeks in South Russia (1913), 173

(with previous bibliography), 375, fig. 278. R. Joffroy,

Le Trésor de Vix, 26. Besig 92, no. 163.

The gorgon is on the base of the handle of a large bronze volute-krater, in the same attitude as E.iv. She is barefoot, and wears a short, sleeveless tunic with slight overfall at the waist and fine folds between the legs. She has four wings at the back, all with up-curved ends; one pair extends horizontally from the shoulder-blades, the second pair is attached behind the first, and points downwards. There are two more wings on the side of the handle, which may have been intended to look as if belonging to the gorgon when the handle was viewed from the side, though they are not actually attached to her. This is paralleled on one of the Trebenische kraters, as well as on E.iv below.¹³ The tongue protrudes, but apart from this the face is almost normal, though the neck is short and thick. There are no fangs. The hair waves gently over the brow, and falls in a compact mass at each side, behind the shoulders.

A ribbon or circlet passes over the top of the head. The gorgon stands on a platform whose ends curl under into volutes; she does not herself hold snakes, but a rearing snake at each side connected the platform with the vase.

E.iv. Paris, Louvre, Br. 4467 (formerly de Clerq Coll.)

'From Cilicia'.

Pl. 13.

Ht. (of gorgon) 11 cms. Ht. of handle 21 cms.

A.de Ridder, Coll. de Clerq III (Bronzes), 268, pl. 58.

R. Joffroy, Le Trésor de Vix, 26, pl. 23, (wrongly labelled as the Martonosha handle). Besig, 92, no. 164.

This is extremely similar to the Martonosha handle, with a few slight differences in detail: the tunic has short sleeves instead of none, and a higher neck with a decorative border; there is a belt at the waist; the face is a little smaller proportionately, and the mouth a little larger. The figure is 2 cms. taller than her 'sister'. The base on which she stands is treated in the same way, but instead of snakes to connect it to the vase, it has griffin-heads on long, serpentine necks.

Apart from the find-places, there seems to be nothing to connect these two handles with East Greece. Both style and iconographic details point to the Greek mainland, and link them more or less closely with the bronze volute-kraters with gorgon-busts on the handles.

Date: Late 6th century.

GorgoneiaE.1. London, British Museum.

From Carchemish ('House D').

Pl.14.

Diam. of shield, c. 70 cms.

L. Woolley, Carchemish II, 123 ff., pl. 24. E. Kunze,Ol.Berg.V (1956), 46-50. J. Boardman, The Greeks Overseas,

75, 132.

The shield is of very thin metal with repoussé decoration, incised on the right side; it must have been backed with leather. In the centre is a gorgoneion, most of which is preserved. The nose, brow and one eye have gone, and part of the chin. The mouth is large and grimacing, but not turned up at the corners. A full row of teeth is revealed at top and bottom, with a space between. There appears to be no tongue, but springing from the centre of the bottom jaw and curving outwards and upwards are two large fangs. There seems to have been some kind of incised pattern on the forehead just below the hair-line and too high for eye-brows. Across the brow there was apparently a row of small bead-like curls, topped either by a row of fat curls with snakes springing from them, or simply by fat coiled snakes. Round the lower part of the face from ear to ear are long snakes (seven preserved, probably originally eight), which curl round so that their heads touch their bodies about halfway along their length, but which are not actually looped. A double engraved line runs down one side of their bodies. There are dot-

rosettes between the snakes.

Around the gorgoneion are five concentric zones of running animals, crowded, and summarily drawn. The two inmost rows are certainly dogs, the fourth some long-eared creature (deer?), and the fifth apparently horses (Woolley says 'Dogs, hares, gazelles and horses'). The zones are divided by single rows of 'dots', (circles, incised, and punched from behind).

Date: Not later than 605/4 B.C. Found in the ruins of Carchemish, in 'House D', the best-built house found, which must have stood at least two storeys high. The house contained many Egyptian objects, including sealings with the name of Necho; the shield was found in the most important room in the house. The Pharaoh Necho had conquered Carchemish in 608 B.C., and the city was destroyed by the Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar in 605/4 B.C.

See Appendix 4.

E.2. Olympia, Museum, Inv. B 1800.

From Olympia.

Pl. 14.

Diam. of shield, c.96 cms; diam. of central tondo, c.34 cms.

E. Kunze, Ol.Ber. V (1956), 46-50, pls.12-14.

This is a fragment of a shield of similar type to that from Carchemish, with decoration in repoussé work, incised on the front.

All that remains of the central gorgoneion is part of one snake, but this is enough to show that the snake was looped. It has open mouth and forked tongue, and finely-incised scales. There were four concentric zones of running animals, with dot-rosettes between them or under their bellies. There is no difficulty in identifying them, as they are well-spaced and carefully drawn. In the inmost band are dogs, one of which sinks its teeth into the haunches of a hare in front of it. Next is a band of ostriches, striding with raised wings, then a zone of 'wild goats', and finally a zone either of goats again, or of does. Between the zones are single rows of dots, punched into relief from behind as well as incised, and the two outermost zones of decoration are incised radial lines, and a single cable.

Date: dated by Kunze 'third quarter of the 7th century at the latest.'

See Appendix 4

E.3. Samos, Vathy Museum, Inv. B 1286.

From the Heraion.

Pl.15.

Diam. of shield, 23.7 cms.

AA 1964, 83, fig. 7 (G.Kopcke and E. Homann-Wedeking).

AM 83, 1968, 286, pl. 115.1, no.104 (G.Kopcke, 'Die Kampagnen 1961/65 im Südtemenos').

This is one of several small votive shields found at the Heraion, all with the same border - three rows of punched and incised dots (or small circles). The gorgoneion fills the whole shield apart from the border, and is in repoussé work, incised on the front. The face is rather damaged, but most of the features can be made out. There is a row of small, tight curls across the brow. The ears, which are large and prominent, have disc ear-rings. The large, up-curving mouth has neat teeth, protruding tongue, and two pairs of fangs touching the tongue. The head is encircled by ten long looped snakes, those on either side of the chin being considerably larger than the rest. The loops occur in the middle of their bodies. The snakes have open mouths with teeth and forked tongue, and there is a double incised line down one side of their bodies. The actual head of the gorgon is relatively small, the snakes taking up most of the area of the tondo.

Date: c. 570 B.C.? See below.

E.4. Samos, Vathy Museum, Inv. B 933.

From the Heraion.

Pl. 15.

Diam. not stated, but approx. same as the previous entry.

ADelt. 18, 1963, Chron., 292, pl. 337b, (H. Walter, 'Die Ausgrabungen im Heraion 1952-62'). AM 83, 1968, 286, under no. 104. Possibly also Neue Deutsche Ausgrabungen 1959 216 (Buschor).

This votive shield has the same border as the previous one, though the dots are in higher relief. The relief in general looks slightly higher, but this may be because of the better state of preservation of this example. The artistic quality is much better, and the head is perfectly designed to fit the tondo. The face is pear-shaped, with a fringe of large curls across the brow; the ears are relatively small, and no ear-rings are visible, though both lobes are damaged. There are two V-shaped wrinkles on the nose. The large, up-curving mouth has neat teeth and protruding tongue. There is some damage to the centre of the mouth; two fangs are visible, both in the upper jaw, on either side of the tongue, close to though not touching it: possibly they were the only fangs. The snakes are less wild in appearance than those of B 1286. All are looped in the middle of their bodies. Six smallish ones frame the top of the head, while two much larger pairs spring from the ear and the corner of the jaw. Something filled the gap beneath the chin: it was almost certainly another pair of looped snakes, but the damaged surface makes complete certainty impossible.

Date: c. 560-550 B.C.

I have been able to find no more complete publication of B 933 than the brief reference in Adelt., which gives no size or find-place, dates simply to 'the Rhoikos period', and compares the Samos Mikellura cup (B.3. above). Kopcke, publishing B 1286 in AM 83, 1968, 286, mentions 'other votive-shields ... from Samos' and gives

a reference to Adelt; however, he also gives the reference to AA 1964, 83, Abb.7 (which is B 1286, the shield he is publishing), so there is perhaps some slight confusion here. Buschor in NDA refers to two 'bronze discs', one with an eagle (216 fig.20), and one with a gorgoneion, found in 'Arbeitsplatz 8', roughly halfway along the north side of the Rhoikos temple, between it and the North Stoa; this is very probably B 933.

B 1286 was found in 1961 in the 'pre-Rhoikos alluvial deposit' in the south temenos. It was very high in the deposit (Kopcke, 'VrSch. (hoch) +72'): in fact, in the plan, op,cit. 309, Abb.36, this point seems to be in the layer above. Kopcke, however, both here and in AA 1964, definitely assigns the shield to the 'pre-Rhoikos' period, whose end he puts c.570 B.C. Homann-Wedeking, who writes the preliminary notice with Kopcke in AA 1964, says that the shield was in 'die obere, graue, spätere Schicht', adding that the style is consistent with this: it looks earlier than the Samos Fikellura cup, but seems too late in style for the pre-Rhoikos period. While agreeing with his first statement on style, I would dispute his second: I see no stylistic or iconographic reason why the shield could not be earlier than 570 B.C. Comparing the two votive-shields, B 1286 looks earlier, or, at any rate, more primitive. B 933 is certainly closer to the Fikellura cup in general proportions. However, the general similarities between the two shields are striking; and the fact that the Heraion has produced a number of such votive-shields, bearing different devices but with the same border, makes

a local origin seem possible.

E.5. Once in Berlin.

From Neandria (Troas).

Pl.13.

Diam. 6 cms.

A. Furtwängler in Roscher's Lexikon, 'Gorgo', col. 1718.

Furtwängler suggests that this small bronze disc with relief decoration was once set into something. Within a cable border is a face with large, grimacing (but straight) mouth showing two rows of clenched teeth and a protruding tongue; there are no fangs. The nose is short and thick. Round the brow, taking the place of hair, are eight open-mouthed, rearing snakes, with tails curled but not looped; they face each other, four and four, across the centre 'parting'. Round the rest of the face is a beard with curled locks. The general impression is masculine, and the treatment of the beard recalls that of some Bes-figures (e.g. Riccioni 136, fig.9, an Egyptian limestone relief head of Saite date, Louvre E 28127).

Date: late 6th century? (Furtwängler, 'definitely still 6th century.')

F. IVORY RELIEFS

F.i. Athens, National Museum (since 1944), Inv.S.201, Nr.726.

From the Heraion, Samos. Found 1928, in the deposit of debris ('Schuttschicht') beneath the steps of the Polykrates Temple. Pl.16.

Size: ht. 10.6 cms. l. 10.2 cms., thickness 1 cm. (Est. original ht., over 15 cms., l. without borders, 14 cms. - Freyer-Schauenburg 38.).

B.Freyer-Schauenburg, Elfenbeine aus dem samischen Heraion (1966), 4, 30ff., pl.6a, inv.E.1 (=V.30): the definitive publication, giving the extensive bibliography up to 1966. J. Boardman, Gnomon 39, 1967, 844ff., review. E. Marangou, Lakonische Elfenbein- und Beinschnitzereien (1969), 74.

The relief-plaque was originally attached to something, probably a box of some kind, as decoration. Freyer-Schauenburg gives a very detailed description and discussion; the description here, therefore, will be brief. Perseus is shown beheading Medusa; a figure, thought to be Athena, stands behind him, encouraging him. Only the upper part of the Gorgon remains. She is falling towards Perseus, and was probably on her knees. At the broken lower edge are three narrow parallel bands which are presumably her belt, and above these

is a large sickle-wing, entirely covering the front of her body above the waist. Her left hand and part of the arm appear in front of the wing. She has no neck, and her head is enormous. She has five or six large, flat curls across the brow, and the hair runs back from behind this fringe in narrow parallel strands; at each side of the face is a long, thick lock or mass of hair, horizontally layered. The large, prominent ears are set high, and a long, thick snake emerges from behind each. The eyes stare, and the flattened nose has at least one V-shaped wrinkle. The grimacing mouth is relatively small; it is full of neat teeth, and the tongue protrudes, but there are no fangs.

Date: Dates assigned to the plaque range from c.630-20 (Schefold) to c.590 (Hampe);¹⁴ the head of Perseus finds close parallels in the last phase of Middle Daedalic and in Late Daedalic,¹⁵ but could well be a little later, while the gorgon-head is close to that of the Syracuse terracotta relief. There is no definite reason to suppose the plaque as late as 590: it is certainly stylistically earlier than the Corfu pediment. Kunze¹⁶ ('about the turn of the century') and Freyer-Schauenburg ('shortly before the turn of the century') are probably closest, but in any event the plaque must lie somewhere in the last quarter of the 7th century.

The general consensus of learned opinion is that the plaque is not East Greek work, and most of those who have commented on it (e.g. Hampe, Kunze, Freyer-Schauenburg, Marangou) are convinced of its Laconian origin. Schefold inclines towards Spartan origin, but

believes that 'The delicate modelling of rounded forms...has an East Greek quality which the artist has incorporated into his own style.' The ivories from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia naturally invite comparison, partly because they are the only large body of archaic ivory reliefs known, and partly because they include a very similar representation of the death of Medusa (generally considered later than the Samos relief, but dated slightly earlier by Marangou, op.cit.). Boardman, however (op.cit.) seems to me right when he remarks that there is no real reason for saying that the relief is Laconian (he calls it 'most probably Peloponnesian' and believes the gorgon-head to be closest to Corinthian examples). There are certainly resemblances between the Samos ivory and those from Sparta, but none so overwhelming as to be conclusive. The gorgoneion-type is not very close to the Laconian 'norm' (whereas, in my opinion, that of the Sparta relief is): on the other hand it cannot definitely be assigned to another school (~~see pp. — below~~).

There is nothing specifically East Greek about the relief.

F.ii. Lost in the Second World War.

From the Heraion, Samos. Found 1932, in the Pl.16.

ash-deposit below the Rhoikos altar.

Ht. 6 cms., L. 3.8 cms., thickness 0.8 cms. Face from chin to top of head, 4 cms.

B. Freyer-Schauenburg, Elfenbeine aus dem samischen Heraion (1966), 5, 39-41, pl. 8b; no.7, E.10 = V.95: the definitive

publication, giving bibliography up to 1966. J. Boardman, Gnomon 39, 1967, 844ff, review. E. Marangou, Lakonische Elfenbein- und Beinschnitzereien (1969), 197, nn, 1113a, 1114, Abb.58. Besig no.162.

A fragment of a relief-plaque. Again, Freyer-Schauenburg has a detailed description and discussion. Most of the face and part of the left shoulder remains. The nose is heavily-wrinkled, but less bestial in appearance than that of the previous example; the mouth is small, with only a slight upward curve, and has small, neat teeth and protruding tongue, but no fangs. The method of rendering the hair on the brow, in fine strands which every so far end in a curl, is not uncommon in small figures in various materials at this time: the kneeling ivory boy from Samos¹⁷ and the Rhodes bronze gorgon, (B.i.) are earlier examples, and very close is a terracotta head from the Heraion,¹⁸ dated by Buschor to the early 6th century; a terracotta antefix from Thasos, C.3., provides a later 6th century instance. It is, however, very rare to find the long hair at the side of the face treated in the same manner. In the place of the left ear is a kneeling, hooved animal, rather pot-bellied and unfortunately headless. From the broken surface of the ivory it looks as though the animal had long ears; Freyer-Schauenburg notes this, but thinks that the animal can only be Pegasos. The pattern of lines on the Gorgon's shoulder was taken by Besig to be the folds of her dress; this, if correct, would have been a happy indication of East Greek origin. Freyer-Schauenburg, however, points out the difficulties of this interpretation,

and proposes wing-feathers, though she cannot explain how the Gorgon's wings would have looked in this case. It might be possible to explain the wing as belonging to Pegasos, if the Gorgon were holding him as she does in a few mainland and Western Greek examples; (the composition would be somewhat different).¹⁹ The 'pearl necklace' worn by the Gorgon is rare but not unparalleled.²⁰

Date: c.575 B.C. (The relief comes from the ash-deposit below the Rhoikos altar, and therefore cannot be later than c.550-540 B.C.)

Freyer-Schauenburg believes the relief to be Samian. Marangou (n.1114) is dubious, but sees Laconian influence in the Gorgon-type; incidentally, she says in note 1113a that Boardman calls the relief Ionian: this is a misunderstanding of his remark, op.cit., '... I am not sure that it is stylistically so different from the Samos Perseus-plaque that it can be declared Ionian'.

As with the Perseus plaque, there is nothing specifically East Greek about this relief; unlike the Perseus plaque, however, it has no real points of similarity with other schools.

G. COINS²¹Earlier 6th Century

G.la. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum. ? Miletus.

EL stater, wt.14.05 gm., L. 2 cm., wdth. 1.7 cm. Pl.17.

Aukt. Basel, September 11th, 1958. Given by Dr. E.S.G. Robinson.

Rev. An incuse oblong between two incuse squares, all three filled with crossing lines.

Obv. Two gorgoneia, chin to chin.²² They have no ears, and almost certainly no hair (a group of striations around the edges of the die is probably not intended for hair). They have staring eyes, short noses, fairly small mouths with a slight upward curve, protruding tongue (which they share!), and a single fang, in the lower jaw, at each side of the tongue.

G.lb. London, Brit.Mus. ? Miletus.

From Rhodes. Pl.17.

EL 1/3 stater, wt. 4.53 gm. Diam. 1.2 cms.

Num.Chron. 1925, 13, pl. II.41, (G.F. Hill). C. Seltman,

Greek Coins, 27, pl.I.20.

Rev. 'Two oblong incuse rectangles, filled with crossing lines.

...the character of the incuses indicates southern Ionia.' (Hill).

Obv. Gorgoneion. The coin is very worn round the edges, and it is impossible to say whether faint lines which appear there were once part of hair, snakes or beard. The eyes are large and staring, the nose very short. The mouth has a slight upward curve; the tongue protrudes, and there is just one large fang in the lower jaw at each side, filling most of the space between the tongue and the edges of the mouth, but not touching either. The face is extremely similar to those of G.la., and approximately the same size. The coin clearly belongs to the same mint as G.la.

Date: First half of the 6th century, probably second quarter.

G.2. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum.

EL 1/3 stater, plated; wt. 3.88 gm. Diam. 1.1 cm.

Same provenance as G.la. Unpublished.

Rev. Two incuse squares side by side. Any inner markings obscured by a black deposit.

Obv. Gorgoneion. The face is virtually identical with those of G.la. and b: the eyebrows are more marked, but this may simply be a result of the state of wear. The reverses of G.lb. and G.2. appear to differ slightly. The coin is an ancient forgery of the type G.lb.

Date: First half of the 6th century, probably second quarter.

G.3. London, Brit. Mus.

? Parium (Mysia).

EL Euboic stater, 8.04 gm.

Pl. 17.

BMC Ionia 13, no.58, pl.II.14. BM Guide to the Principal Coins of the Greeks, 2, pl.I.3. C.M. Kraay, Greek Coins (1966), 367, no.686, pl.196. Besig III, no. 296. Riccioni, 140.

Rev. 'A stellate pattern within an incuse.'

Obv. Gorgoneion, without snakes, beard, teeth or fangs. The hair, covering the top of the head only, is rendered by three rows of dots (cf. I.1.). The heavy eyebrows are immediately below the hair-line, and between them appears to be a crescent-shaped 'beauty-spot'. A circular dot on the bridge of the nose may be another, or it may be caused by an attempt to show a wrinkle on the nose. The lips are thick, and seem to be slightly parted, but are quite straight. The bulge beneath the lower lip is probably just the chin, and not a protruding tongue. The left ear remains, and wears no ear-ring.

Date: c.550 B.C. (Kraay).

Kraay comments on the attribution: 'Sometimes attributed to Parium in Mysia, sometimes to the coast of Thrace, the origin of this issue remains uncertain'.

The remaining East Greek coins bearing gorgoneia are several decades later. As with most early coins, the dates assigned to them vary considerably, but none will be earlier than the last quarter of the

6th century. Some are probably post-archaic, but these have been included because they retain a fully-archaic type of gorgoneion, which cannot be distinguished on stylistic grounds from those on coins whose archaic date is certain. (Compare much of the 5th century coinage of Athens; here, however, the archaic style seems to have been kept chiefly so as not to alarm the far-flung users of Athenian coins). The catalogue continues in geographical order, from north to south, giving first the coins whose attribution is secure, then the issues of uncertain origin.

G.4. London, Brit. Mus.

Apollonia Pontica.

AR, wt. c.3.3. gm. Diam. c.1.4 cm. Pl.18.

BMC Mysia 8 no. 3, pl.II.2. J.M. Hemelrijk, BABesch. 38,1963, 45 fig.35, 47 and n.82. Other examples, e.g., Musée Archéologique de Bourgas, no.74, diam. 1.4 cm. (no wt. given); unpublished; (Bourgas no.751). A later example, AA 1967.1,75, no.62 'drachma', wt. 1.70gm. ('Die Münzsammlung der Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg'). Besig no.301.

Obv. Anchor and crayfish.

Rev. Gorgoneion in circular incuse. The face is markedly pear-shaped, with a fringe of hair over the brow. Around the top of the head from ear to ear are eight looped snakes, facing outwards from the centre, four and four. Below them come three pairs of curving,

unlooped snakes, springing from the ear, just below the ear, and the corner of the jaw. Beneath the chin are two pairs of looped snakes. There is a vertical depression in the centre of the brow. The ears are adorned by disc-and-cap ear-rings. The mouth is large with a slight upward curve. The tongue protrudes, and there is a pair of fangs at each side, touching it.

The Burgas example is very similar to the BM one, but not the same die. There is an extra row of beaded curls over the brow.

These coins are attributed to Apollonia ad Rhyndacum by BMC, which gives details of other attributions (Abydos, Astacus - an A appearing on the obv. of many issues). Apollonia Pontica, the Milesian colony on the west coast of the Black Sea, has also been suggested, and the Burgas coin supports this.

Date: c.500-480 B.C.? (BMC dates 'c.450-330' for the group; the Burgas catalogue says simply '5th century'. Hemelrijk notes the archaic type of the gorgoneion, believing it cannot be later than 480.)

G.5. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 04.1340 Cyzicus.
 EL stater, 16.10 gm. Diam. 2.2 cms. Pl.19.
Catalogue of Greek Coins in the MFA, Boston (1955), 191, no.1445,
 pl.72. A number of other examples are known, including 1/6
 and 1/12 staters: e.g. H.von Fritze, 'Die Elektronprägung

von Kyzikos', Nomisma VII, 1912, 10, no.129, pl.IV.15 (once weber Coll., London); K. Regling, Die Antike Münze als Kunstwerk, pl.5.130, and J.M. Hemelrijk, BABesch. 38, 1963, 45, fig.34, 47 n.85.

Rev. Incuse square.

Obv. Gorgoneion, with tunny below. The gorgoneion has a pear-shaped face, and hair covering the top of the head from ear to ear. Around the hair are six looped snakes, facing towards the centre, three and three. Below the ears is a larger pair of looped snakes, and a pair of unlooped snakes curved outwards from under the chin. The mouth is very large, with no, or hardly any, upward curve; there is a pair of fangs at each side, touching the protruding tongue.

Date: c.500 B.C. (Fritze put this type at the end of his archaic Group II.b.c., 550-475 B.C. The Boston Catalogue dates the type c.500B.C.)

G.6. London, Brit.Mus.

Abydos.

Nos. 1 and 2, AR, wt. c. 5.2 gm. Diam. c. 1.6 cm. Pl.18.

BMC Troas, etc., 1, pl.I. 1-3. A number of other examples are known, e.g. Brett, Boston Cat., 210, no.1617, pl.79

(dr., with ΑΒΥΔΗΝΟΝ on obverse); Hesperia Art Bulletin XXXIV, 82,83 (obols), XXXVII, 35 (drachma, a good example).

See also J.M.Hemelrijk, BABesch. 38,1963,47.

Obv. Eagle. ΑΒΥΔ ΗΝΟΝ.

Rev. Gorgoneion in incuse square. The face is pear-shaped; there is no hair, but six looped snakes around the top of the head, facing towards the centre, three and three. In some dies, there are looped snakes around the lower part of the face also, in others, a pair of thin unlooped snakes emerges by each ear, while another pair springs outwards from beneath the chin. The mouth is straight; the tongue protrudes, and there is a pair of fangs at each side, touching it. The ears are adorned by disc ear-rings.

Date: Not earlier than 480 B.C. (BMC, '480-450'; Boston, '480').

G.7. London, Brit.Mus.

Mytilene (Lesbos)

EL Phocaic 1/6 stater, wt. 2.5 gm. Diam. 1 cm. Pl.18.

BMC Treas etc., 157 no. 14, pl. XXXI. 17. Other examples, e.g., Brett, Boston Cat., 218, no.1675, pl.81, Inv.95.147, (hekte); G.Macdonald, Cat. of Greek Coins in the Hunterian Coll., Univ. of Glasgow (1901), 312, (hekte). See also J.M. Hemelrijk, BABesch. 38, 1963, 47 and n.87.

Rev. Profile head of bearded Herakles, wearing the lion-skin, incuse.

Obv. Gorgoneion, with slightly pear-shaped face. The BM example appears to have no hair, but looped snakes all round the head, facing outwards from the centre at each side. The snakes under the chin of the Boston example may be twined, but not looped. The mouth is large,

with a slight upward curve; there is a pair of fangs at each side of the protruding tongue, touching it.

Date: early 5th century? (BMC, '480-440'; Boston, '500-480').

G.8. London, Brit. Mus.

Lesbos

Billon (Base Silver). Stater, wt.14.41 gm. Diam. c.2.2 cm

BMC Troas etc., 151 no.6, pl.XXX.4, Introd.Ixiii. Pl.19.

Other examples, e.g., C.M.Kraay, Greek Coins, 368, pl.197,

no.693 (stater, Berlin, = Regling 159). See also

J.M.Hemelrijk, BABesch. 38, 1963, 47 and n.86.

Rev. Incuse square.

Obv. Gorgoneion. The hair, which covers the top of the head only, is rendered by dots and strongly-curling locks. The face is pear-shaped. The mouth is very large; the upper lip is almost straight, the lower curves sharply upwards. The tongue protrudes, but, curiously, seems to start from the roof of the mouth and barely extends below the lower lip. A large pair of fangs touches the tongue on each side. There are no snakes.

Date: c.480-450 (Kraay).

G.9. Boston, Mus. of Fine Arts, inv. 04.1000. ? Methymna (Lesbos).
 An Attic Diobol, wt.1.32. gm. Diam. 1.1 cm. Pl.18.
 Brett, Boston Cat., 217, no.1665, pl.80. Other examples,
 e.g., BMC Troas, etc., 177 no.5, pl.XXXVI.8; Cambridge,
Fitzwilliam Mus., McClean Bequest, vol.III, pl.275.31,32.
 See Kraay, Rev. Num. X, 1968, 187-8, pl.XXI.63. - a Lycian origin
 suggested.

Rev., Profile head of Athena in incuse square with dot-border.

Obv. Gorgoneion, with slightly pear-shaped face, and hair covering the
 top of the head from ear to ear. Four looped snakes border the hair;
 in some dies they appear to face outwards from the centre, two and
 two, in others, inwards. The Boston example seems to have an unlooped
 snake rising from the top of each ear, and there are two looped snakes
 facing outwards under the chin, and two more at the corners of the jaw.
 The mouth is not exceptionally large, and there are no teeth or fangs,
 though the tongue protrudes. The ears are handle-like, and the
 Cambridge examples appear to have disc ear-rings.

Date: c. 500 B.C. or later? (Boston, 'c.510-500'; BMC, '500-450';
 Cambridge, 'c.480-450').

G.10. London, Brit.Mus.

? Cebren

AR, wt. 2.05 gm. Diam. c.1.2 cm. Pl.18.

Num.Chron. 1889, 258 no.29, pl.XII.14 (= Zeit.f.Num. III, 307,

no.7, Imhoof-Blumer, list of the coins of Cebren). Other examples, e.g., Num.Chron.1886, 255 no.10; Hesperia Art Bulletin XV, no.27, '5th century'.

Obv. Ram's head.

Rev. In incuse square, gorgoneion. The face is slightly pear-shaped. No hair is visible. Four looped snakes fringe the top of the head; facing outwards from the centre, two and two. Three larger looped snakes at each side frame the rest of the face. The mouth is large and upcurving; there are two pairs of fangs which appear to touch the protruding tongue.

Date: c.500 B.C.

BMC Troas, note p.42, excludes this type from the coins of Cebren, saying that it seems to interrupt the series with obv. ram's head and rev. simple incuse square.

G.11. London, Brit.Mus.

?Glazomenae.

AR, wts. 1.94 gm., 1.17 gm. Diam. 1.2 cm, 0.9 cm. Pl.18.

BMC Ionia 18 nos. 15,16, pl.VI.4,5. Other examples, e.g.,

SMG, Sammlung von Aulock, Ionien, no.1986, pl.62, wt.1.22 gm.,

same die as BMC pl.VI.5.

Obv. Forepart of winged boar.

Rev. Gorgoneion in incuse square. The face is pear-shaped.

Both coins are rather worn, making it difficult to tell whether the gorgoneion has hair on the top of the head. Both have curving snakes around the top of the head, possibly looped. The first coin has a pair of unlooped, curving snakes springing from below the ear, and a second pair beneath the chin. The second coin appears to have three pairs of looped snakes along the jaw-line. There seems to be a pair of fangs close to the tongue at each side, and one type may have disc ear-rings.

BMC states that the attribution of these two coins to Clazomenae is only conjectural (on the strength of the obv. type). Even if they are not Clazomenian, the gorgoneion-type indicates a home in Ionia, or possibly a little further north. See discussion.

Date: Early 5th century B.C.

- G.12. a. London, Brit.Mus. ? Soloi (Cyprus).
 AR Persic stater, wt. 9.10 gm. Diam. c.2.5 cms. Pl.19.
BMC Cyprus, 68, no.1, pl.XIII.3, and pp.xlvii, cxvii-cxvii. Besig 304.
- b. Berlin (East).
 AR stater wt. 10.08 gm. Diam. 2.0-2.4 cms.
BMC Cyprus, xlvii, cxvii, pl.XXV.12. (for comparison).
 J.Six, Rev. Num. 1883, 301, no.2. J.Friedlander, Das königliche Münzkabinet (1873), no.620.

c. London, Brit. Mus.

AR stater, wt. 9.91 gm. Diam. 2.2 cm. Fl.19.

Num.Chron. 1928, 14, pl. II.13 (BM Acquisitions 1927)

'Cyprus, uncertain mint', acquired with coins of Salamis and Side.

Obv. lion-head to right, roaring.

Rev. Gorgoneion. In all three examples, the head is surrounded by thin, rather wild looped snakes (at least fourteen). The shape of head varies somewhat, (c) being very definitely pear-shaped. The mouth-shape and size varies too, but all three are very worn there, so that details are difficult to make out. (b) and (c) at least had teeth, (c) having a pair midway between the tongue and the edges of the mouth. (c) also seems to have disc ear-rings.

Date: c.500 B.C.? (a), BMC 'c,480';).

G.F. Hill in BMC notes that Six first attributed this coin-type to Soloi, then to Golgoi. Hill believes the Soloi attribution more likely, and says that if it is correct, (b) may be assigned to King Aristokypros, killed in battle on the plain of Salamis, 498 B.C.

G.13. Nicosia, Arch.Mus.

Cyprus.

From a hoard found at Larnaca.

Fl.19.

Num.Chron. 1935, 186-187, nos.531,532,pl.XV.9,10.

Obv. Forepart of roaring, leaping lion.

Rev. Gorgoneion, in incuse square with border of dots and a palmette in each corner. There are no snakes. The gorgoneion has a pear-shaped face. The hair, which covers the top of the head only, is rendered by vertical rows of small dots. The ears are adorned by disc ear-rings. The upper rim of the right ear looks crinkled, as if it might have a decorative cover (BAbesch. 38, 1963, 28ff.), but certainty is impossible at least from a photograph. There is a vertical depression on the forehead between the brows. The nose is wrinkled. The mouth is large, with a slight upward curve; it has teeth, and a pair of fangs at each side of the protruding tongue, touching it.

Date: c.480 B.C.? (The hoard is dated, op.cit. 190, to shortly after 480 at the latest. This very fine coin type looks archaic, but late in the period.)²³

G.14. London, British Museum. ?Selge (Pisidia).
AR stater, wt.c.10.2 gm., diam. c.2 cm. Fl.19.
BMC Lycia, etc., 256, pl.39.5; also, Z.f.N. 37,1927,73,
pl.II.125 (Demanhur hoard).

Rev. Forepart of lion to right, jaws open, in dotted incuse square.
The lion has bristling hairs along his back and head.

Obv. An extremely rough gorgoneion, with a row of dots for hair

framing the top of the head. The eyes and tip of the nose are rendered by blobs, and also the ear-lobes (probably not ear-rings). The mouth grimaces, but it is impossible to discern further details. In the centre of the forehead is a large, circular depression. Round the lower part of the face from the ears there appears to be a second outline, which may be a pair of snakes, or could be something like the 'tendrils' round the face of the 'Rhodian' plate gorgon, B.i. With such a rough representation, certainty is impossible.

Date: No later than c.520 B.C. (the Demanhur hoard is usually dated to the late 6th century).

G.15. ? (In the hands of a dealer, 1894) ?

AR stater, wt. c.10.6 gms. Diam.c.2.1 cms.

BMC Lycia etc., cxv, pl.xliv.20.

Rev. Frontal head of a lion in incuse square, with ruff standing out around the face.

Obv. Gorgoneion, very crude and of basic type.

Date: Sixth century B.C.

G.F. Hill in BMC suggests that this coin belongs to the same series as the ?Selge coins (G.14). The gorgoneion is completely different in appearance.

Unknown origin, possibly East Greek

A number of coins with very rough gorgoneia are attributed to the East Greek area, but may be produced by non-Greek cities in imitation of Greek coinage. They are so crude, and their origin is so uncertain, that they are not given a place in the catalogue. They include: Z.f.N. 37, 1927,85,pl.III,143, from the Demanhur hoard, so no later than c.520.B.C. - this coin is possibly Lycian, though sometimes attributed (certainly wrongly) to Abydos, Parium or Selge; also L.Anson, Numismata Graeca, pl.x, 587,599,600.

H. GEMS

I have judged it unnecessary to give a detailed description of most of the gems, as they are treated fully by J. Boardman in Archaic Greek Gems. I therefore give a brief reference for each gem, with a few words of additional description where necessary.

Gorgons

H.i. - the Gorgon-horses:

a. Whereabouts unknown. Cornelian scarab. Pl.20.

(AGG 27, no.31, pl.II.)

b. London WA 103307. Amethyst scarab from Byblos. Pl.20.

(AGG 27, no.32, pl.II.)

c. Once Finlay. Scarab, probably from Greece.

(AGG 27, no.33.)

A fourth gem with the same subject, Boston 01.7558, a large rock-crystal scaraboid (26mm. x 19mm.), (Pl. 20), is rejected by Boardman, AGG 40, n.1, as 'almost certainly modern'. G.M.A.Richter, Gems of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans, vol.I, no.145, accepts it without remark, dating it to the last quarter of the 6th century.

Boardman notes the comparatively crude cutting, and the fact that the lion's head is turned to profile. A minor point of difference is that there are ten snakes in the gorgon's hair instead of eight. The most intriguing feature is the gorgon's dress: the open edge of her robe, with its border, begins above the waist, and, instead of having one leg completely bare, she wears the oriental short skirt. From this it seems certain that an antiquarian, whether ancient or modern, has been at work.

Date of H.i.a-c: probably c.575-550 B.C. (Boardman p.30).

H.ii. Once Arndt, A 1376. Onyx scarab. Pl.21.

(AGG 31, no.38, pl.II.)

Four snakes spring from the top of the head, two from the jaw-line. The tongue seems to protrude, but no details of teeth are visible. Compare the gorgons of the Delphi gold plaques, J.i, and, for snakes in the hands, the situla gorgon B.iv, as well as Boardman's references.

Date: perhaps c.550-525 B.C.

H.iii. Cagliari 19886. Cornelian scarab from Tharros.

(AGG 33, no.44; AG pl.15.64)

The gorgon has a pear-shaped face. The tongue does not protrude.

Six snakes with open mouths spring from the head, four from the top, the other two from just below the 'animal ears' or 'horns'.

H.iv. New York, N.E.Dept. 41.160.560. Cornelian scarab. Pl.21.

(AGG 33, no.45, pl.IV.)

Three straight snakes spring from the top of the head. Very like H.iii, but less careful.

H.v. London, BM 615. Cornelian scarab from Chiusi. Pl.21.

(AGG 33, no.46, pl.III.)

Five straight snakes with open mouths spring from the top of the head.

H.vi. London, BM 471. Chalcedony scarab. Pl.22.

(AGG 34, no.47, pls.III,XL (beetle).)

The face is pear-shaped. Four snakes spring from the top of the head, two from the corners of the jaw.

H.vii. London, BM 911. Cornelian scarab. Pl.21.

(AGG 34, no.48, pl.III.)

Snakes are held in the hands. The treatment of the face resembles that of H.iv. Ten stiff, open-mouthed snakes stick out around the head. There are no ears.

H.viii. Geneva. Cornelian scarab.

Pl.21.

(AGG 34, no.49, pl.IV.)

The tongue does not protrude. Seven open-mouthed snakes spring out around the head (not under the chin).

H.ix. Unknown. Scarab.

(AGG 34, no.50. AG pl.7.36.)

Six snakes around the head.

H.x. Unknown. Cornelian scarab.

(AGG 34, no.51. AG pl.7.37.)

No wings are visible on legs or feet. The arms are apparently outstretched above the wings.

H.xi. ?. Faience scarab, from Phanae, Chios, possibly from the Naukratis factory. AGG. 34, BSA 35, 1934-35, 163,164, pl.32.no.51.

An apparently naked, two-winged figure holding a snake in each hand runs to its left. It is impossible to see whether there are snakes around the head.

H.xii. Vienna, Kunsth. Mus. IX 169. Scarab.

Pl.22.

(AGG 34, no.52, pl.III.)

The gorgon's two wings are both shown at her left side, one above the

other. Her tongue does not protrude. Two straight, stick-like projections on top of the head between her 'ears' or 'horns' are presumably snakes. The lion stands upright, apparently clawing at the gorgon's arm with its front paws, and raising one hind paw towards her knee.

H.xiii. Paris, Bibl.Nat.I.12. Cornelian cut scarab. Pl.22.

(AGG 34, no.53, pl.III.)

The gorgon has a pear-shaped face, and no snakes between her 'horns'. The lion is in a less erect position, and places one of its forepaws on her knee.

See Boardman's remarks, AGG ch.IV passim, on the connections of these gems with Near Eastern iconography, especially that of Bes. He assigns all this group of gems (my numbers H.iii. to H.xiii.) to an East Greek studio, deriving from that which produced the Gorgon-horse Group, (AGG 37). He earlier (AGG 32) mentions the possibility that the Gorgon-horse workshop may have been in Cyprus. An unattributed silver coin from the Demanhur hoard provides an interesting point of comparison with this group of gems (ZfN 37, 1927, 83, pl.III. 142, now in Berlin: diam. 1.6-1.9 cms., wt. 9.83. gm.). The design on the obverse is uncertain, but on the reverse is a naked, two-winged 'Bes' figure, running along holding two lions by a hind leg. The head is frontal, with protruding tongue and either very large ears or feathers on top.

The coin cannot be later than c.520 B.C. (the Demanhur hoard is usually dated to the late 6th century). If not an actual Greek product (and the 'pseudo-incuse' formed by cutting a square round the device on the reverse perhaps makes it unlikely to be actually Greek-made), it must, like the gems, belong to an area where Greek influence is strong, and one of the Cypriot cities seems a likely candidate. Cyprus was certainly one of the places where this weight-standard (Persic) was in use.

H.xiv. Leningrad. Chalcedony scaraboid, from Pantikapaion.

(AGG 90, no. 236, pl. XV. Besig. no. 166.

Pl .23.

The gorgon wears a long, finely-pleated chiton with short sleeves. A vertical panel with alternating dots and lines decorates the centre of the skirt, which also has a border of the same pattern. The hair, which covers the top of the head only, is arranged in two rows of dot-curls. A pair of snakes rears up at ear-level. The tongue protrudes.

Boardman believes this gem to be one of an East Greek class which influenced Achaemenid seal-engraving, rather than a Persian gem influenced by Greek art. The connection between the two is clear.

Date: Early 5th century. The gem comes from a later 5th century grave, but, as Boardman (AGG 92) and others have noted, its style is very late archaic.

There follow three gems which, though probably not Greek work, are influenced apparently by East Greek traditions, and may well be Cypriot. The last two are of Near Eastern, not Greek, shape.

H.xv. Nicosia D.15. Amethyst scarab. Pl.23.

(AGG 37, 45, 47, no.70, pl.V.)

The gorgon wears a long robe with fine folds, split from waist to hem. She appears not to be winged, but markings at the broken right-hand edge of the impression might be the tip of a wing. She has a large mouth, but her tongue does not protrude. Six snakes stand out stiffly round the top of the head; there may be another pair at the neck.²⁴

Date: Second half of 6th century, perhaps third quarter.

H.xvi. Berlin, Staatl. Mus., Vorderasiat. Abt., no.2145. Acquired in Baghdad. Grey steatite cylinder.

Verzeichnis der vorderas, Altertümer 1889, 75. A.Moortgat,

Vorderas. Rollsiegel no.781, pl.92. Furtwängler, AG pl.V.43,

vol.ii, 24. Besig 97, no.202.

Perseus, with winged heels and averted head, grasps Medusa's right wrist with his left hand; in his right hand he holds the harpè. The gorgon, also with winged heels, kneels on one knee (she is actually in 'knee-running' position, arms and all, but as if moving towards Perseus instead of away from him). Her right leg appears to be bare, while a skirt with fine folds covers her left leg. She has a large face

with huge, puffy cheeks and small mouth, long hair ending on the shoulder in 'Hathor-curls', and eight or nine thin snakes springing out around the top of the head. The musculature of both figures is heavily accentuated.

Immediately behind Perseus, head downwards, is a fish. Moortgat (op.cit.) suggests '...ein Delphin als Andeutung des Meeres (?)'. A fish possibly with this significance appears on the Island Gem, Boardman IG 50, no.180 A, pl.VII; on a Greek gem with Herakles and Acheloos, Boardman, AGG 45,46,48, no. 74, pl.V, a fish appears in a similar position, probably as an attribute of the river-god.

Date: end of 6th century.

H.xvii. Boston 95.80. A pyramidal stamp with eight-sided face, in blue chalcedony. W. 1.8 cm. Pl.23.

AG pl.VI.48, vol.ii,29. Besig 96, no.193. Boardman, AGG 41,n. 13;
Greek Gems and Finger-rings 309,351, pl.846. Iran VIII pl.2.12.
Ch.Christou, Potnia Theron 138.

The gorgon, in a long, clinging robe, grasps a lion by the tail in each hand. She has two up-curving wings. Long, thin snakes stick out all round the top of her head. She has a large, open mouth, with teeth and possibly with protruding tongue. At the left stands Herakles looking at the gorgon. He is apparently dressed in a knee-length tunic, and holds a club in his right hand, a little lion like the gorgon's

two in his left hand by the mane. (See Ch. IV. p.496).

For the interpretation of the scene, Boardman refers to Apollodorus ii, V, 12.²⁵

Date: End of the 6th century.

Gorgoneia.

H.1. New York, 49. Cornelian scarab.

(AGG 36, no.66.)

Six open-mouthed, curved snakes spring from the top of the head, facing outwards from the centre; there is another pair at ear-level, a pair at the corner of the jaw, and a third pair under the chin. The face is slightly pear-shaped. A pair of large fangs sticks out from each corner of the mouth.

H.2. London, BM 472. Cornelian scarab.

(AGG 36, no.67.)

Six snakes rise stiffly from the top of the head. The face is slightly pear-shaped. No teeth or tongue appear. There is no sign of vertical incisions marking hair across the brow, as on H.1, H.3, and H.5, but there is a similar bulge here, so that the gorgoneion is probably not intended to be bald, as Boardman believes.

H.3. London, BM 473. Cornelian scarab.

Pl.24.

(AGG 36, no.68.)

This is very similar to H.2, though slightly larger and considerably more careful. Six curving snakes rise from the top of the head, facing outwards from the centre. The mouth has teeth and tongue.

H.4. Munich, Ant. 2463. Cornelian scarab from Vulci.

(AGG 36, no.69.)

A tiny stone, with no room to show snakes.

H.5. ? Cornelian scarab, surface 1.8 x 1.25 cm.

(Aukt.Basel 40, 1969, 6, pl.1, no.5.)

Pl.24.

A slightly pear-shaped face, with hair, marked by vertical lines, across the top of the head. Five curving snakes with open mouths rise from the top of the head and face outwards, three and two. There is a pair of thinner snakes beneath the chin. The mouth is very small for a gorgon; teeth are visible, but no tongue. There is a hatched border.

Date: late 6th century; H.5. may be slightly later than the rest.

Of all the gems listed here, this group, and particularly the most detailed and carefully-worked member, H.1, are closest to definitely East Greek examples of gorgoneia such as the coins G.9, (?Methymna) and G.6. (Abydos). The only real difference is that the snakes round the hair on the gems are unlooped.²⁶

The closest parallels from the East Greek area for the wild snakes of the Gorgon-horses and many of the other gem-gorgons, are those of the Cypriot coins, possibly of Soloi, G.12. These snakes are looped, but spring out in rather similar confusion.

I. MISCELLANEOUSGorgons

I.i. Lycia, Kizilbel, near Elmali. Painted tomb. Pl.25.

The tomb chamber, covered by a low tumulus, measures c.2.45 x 2.00 m; maximum ht. of the gabled roof is 2.30 m. The block bearing the Gorgon scene is 0.50-0.40 m. high (tapering to the west end), and c.1.00 m. long. M.J.Mellink, AJA 74, 1970, 251-253, pl.61, figs.29,30; AJA 75, 1971, 246-249.

The paintings, in friezes of varying heights, are on a thin layer of lime plaster which is firmly attached to the rough surface of the wall-blocks. The colours are red (in several shades), blue, white and black. The remaining fragments of the scene of the beheading of Medusa belong to the middle frieze (of three) on the south wall, to the west of the doorway. Mellink describes them thus (from east to west): '... the wing-tip of a running Gorgon, a second Gorgon moving to the left in Knielauf, and remnants of the broken-down, decapitated Medusa. Out of her truncated neck emerge the small figures of Pegasus (unwinged) and a youthful, nude Chrysaor. The contours are in black and preliminary red...; Chrysaor is ocher red with long light hair; the Gorgons have partially blue wings; bright red is used for details of costume and shoes.'

The surviving Gorgon has a pear-shaped face with enormous mouth and protruding tongue; traces of teeth are visible. Her hair is long and wavy; there are no locks falling in front of the shoulders, but a ringlet may be seen bordering each arm to the elbow (for this last detail, cf., for example, the Berlin Painter's Gorgon on an amphora in Munich;²⁷ the Kizilbel Gorgon's leg-position is probably like this too, rather than a true 'knee-running' attitude). A short snake springs out from the hair above and below each ear; the snakes are not looped, but curve round towards each other. Their eyes and closed mouths are shown. There are traces of more snakes on top of the head, but no details can be distinguished. From the photograph, I believe there to be also two large snakes emerging beneath the chin and forming a U-curve, possibly intertwining, on the breast.²⁸ Further cleaning of the painting should elucidate these doubtful details. The Gorgon wears a long fine chiton with a coloured border at the hem. All the central part of her body is lost. Her hands too have gone, and there is no trace of any snakes which they might have held. She wears handsome boots with an up-curving wing at the back, and apparently laced at the front. She has a large pair of wings, curving up gently at the tips, at shoulder-level; some distance lower, on her left, there appears another wing-tip, just in front of Pegasus' fore-legs: it is difficult to imagine this belonging to Medusa, who is collapsed in a sitting position behind, so it looks as though our Gorgon had four wings.

As Mellink remarks, the close connection of the Kizilbel paintings generally with East Greek art is very clear, although there are other

influences, and it is impossible to prove that a Greek artist created them. Certainly this Gorgon, Pegasus and Chrysaor could be pure Greek.

This painting and the Perseus ivory from Samos are the only representations of the Perseus-Medusa myth so far found in East Greece

The Gorgon compares closely, without being identical, with her marble contemporary from Didyma, (D.i.).

Date: c. 525 B.C. (Mellink).

Gorgoneia

I.1. Rhodes, Archaeological Museum, Inv. 12316.

From Makri Langoni, nr. Camirus.

Pl.25.

A terracotta gorgoneion, ht. 6 cms., wdth. 5 cms. thickness 2.5cms.

Clara Rhodos IV, Makri Langoni Tomb CXXXIII, the pithos-burial of a child, pp. 263-265, 266, 268, fig. 293. Besig 97, no.197.

The small gorgoneion, which is flat at the back, is slightly broken around the edge of the hair and the ears. The hair is rendered by rows of circular depressions. The fangs touch the tongue, one pair at each side. The tongue has an indentation at the end, a feature found on some other gorgoneia (cf. C.1, and Giglioli, pl.52, a 6th century Etruscan bucchero oenochoe). Traces of red remain on lips and tongue, and there were disc ear-rings painted with a wheel- or rosette-pattern.

Date: The grave-goods were around the pithos (Cl.Rh. IV.266). The

most notable were: a terracotta female 'mask' of late archaic Rhodian type; a small Lydion; a Fikellura amphoriskos with net-pattern on main body-zone; an Attic 'Segment Class' cup (ABV 213.16, Rhodes 12307). The gorgoneion can therefore be dated to the second half of the 6th century, and probably to the last quarter.

J. Found on the mainland, but probably East Greek

Gorgons

J.i. Delphi, Museum?

Gold Plaques.

Excavated at Delphi, within the sanctuary.

Pl.26.

Ht. of plaque 5.5 cms, wdth. 6 cms.

BCH 63, 1939, 96 no. 23, pl.23.2,3. Karagiorga, GK 33 n.7.

There are two plaques, obviously made on the same matrix. Within a narrow bead-border, the gorgon runs to her right, holding out a large looped snake in each hand; she grasps the snakes not by their loops, but just behind the head. She is naked, and there are no indications of sex. She appears to have a girdle round her waist, from which springs a pair of upcurving wings, entirely covering her chest and shoulders. Her large head has a row of small curls across the brow, and long hair at the sides, reaching to the wings. The ears are set high. Her nose is short and spreading, her mouth very large, with a slight upward curve. She has small teeth, and a pair of fangs on either side of her small protruding tongue. Wrinkles on her brow and cheeks give her a fierce expression. Across the top of her head are four snakes, curving round so that their bodies form circles; four snakes forming similar but smaller loops coil around the lower part of her face, apparently emerging from the cheek-wrinkles.

Date: c.550 B.C.

Origin. There can be very little doubt that these plaques are East Greek, (and they are generally believed to be so). Though the snakes coil in a slightly unusual way, the gorgoneion is undoubtedly of the type which predominates in East Greece from the first half of the 6th century, and which has no parallels in other Greek art before the late 6th century. The heavy wrinkles around the mouth, turning into snakes, are unusual; however, wrinkles in this position, not quite so prominent, are visible in a number of gorgoneia from East Greece (e.g. A.5,7; B.3,5; C.15; D.1). It is possible that, as a number of scholars have believed, there is some influence here from Near Eastern art, with its wrinkled demons such as Humbaba. The closest parallel for the wrinkles is the late 6th century antefix from the Temple of Apollo at Veii (Giglioli pls. 179,181), which is certainly derived from East Greek art. The other features of the Delphi gorgons have parallels in East Greek art, though they are not exclusively East Greek: for naked gorgons, and gorgons holding snakes, see pp. 170 ff. Wings springing from the front of the body are fairly common: c.f. e.g., BMC Jewellery pl.XI, nos.1128-1130; pl.XII, 1118, 1131. Finally, the other gold plaques, and fragments of chryselephantine statues found with the gorgons have strong East Greek characteristics.

Gorgoneia

J.1. Olympia, Museum.

Bronze shield-device.

Found at Olympia.

Pl.26.

Diam. of circle containing gorgoneion, 34 cms. Diam incl.wings

85 cms.

Ol.Ber. I, 56, pl.13. Die Antike XV, 1939, 28ff, Abb.10-11
 (very good photo). E.Kunze, Neue Meisterwerke Griechischer
Kunst aus Olympia, 18, no.57.

The gorgoneion is enclosed in a narrow circular border decorated with lines in relief across it like the rungs of a ladder. Around the circle were three large, down-curving wings, of which two remain. The technique is repoussé, with some incision on the front.

The face of the gorgon is pear-shaped, with a very large, upward-curving mouth; the mouth has two neat rows of teeth, a protruding tongue, and two large pairs of fangs touching the tongue. The eyes were originally inlaid with ivory which was held in place by bronze pins. The eyebrows appear to be double: the two thick, curving lines in relief over each eye meet at the inner end, but seem from the photograph to remain separate at the outer end. The large, high-set ears have no ear-rings. A fringe of small curls is incised around the brow. Ten large, thick snakes encircle the head; they are strongly S-shaped, but not looped. Six of them frame the top of the head from ear to ear, facing inwards three and three; the other two pairs, which are larger, spring from behind the ears and from the corners of the jaw, framing the lower part of the face. The snakes' mouths are closed, and they have beards which are simply incised.

There is a space immediately beneath the chin. Hampe (Ol.Ber.I) sees traces of soldering, and thinks that a beard was attached there; Kunze says that it has 'einen seltsam rund geformten versilberten Kinnbart'.

Date: Kunze dates to the first half of the 6th century, noting the occurrence of the 'wing-wheel' motif on Corinthian aryballoi.²⁹ I wonder whether a date in the second half of the century may not be more likely, because of the shape of face (see below).

Origin. Kunze (op.cit.) considers the shield-device Peloponnesian. The gorgoneion, wherever made, is undeniably of East Greek type: shape of face, relative proportions of features, positions of fangs, and type and distribution of snakes, all proclaim this. Many examples in this catalogue may be compared: see especially B.3, C.2, E.3 and 4, (pls . 7, 8, 15). These, which all belong to the 'Central East Greek' or 'Ionian' group, all have looped snakes; see A.1, A.4, C.4, E.1, and several later examples among the coins (pls. 1, 4, 8, 14, 18) for unlooped snakes. The mysterious 'beard' is no obstacle to an East Greek origin: see the Didyma antefix, C.1 , and especially B.3, E.3 and 4. The Fikellura cup, B.3, has a lotus in this position (note here, also, the circular border enclosing the gorgoneion); both the Samos votive-shields have something under the chin - possibly smaller snakes in the case of E.4, but certainly not in the case of E.3. Ear-rings are frequently present in this group, but not invariably.

A curious point about this gorgoneion, if Kunze's dating is correct, is that it is much more noticeably pear-shaped than contemporary East Greek examples, corresponding in this more closely with late archaic examples such as the coins G.4,5, and gems H.3., (pls . 18,19,24). (And cf. also, for instance, the Veii antefixes, Andr n Pl.1).

As I have stated already in connection with the Carchemish and Olympia shields, there are, as far as I know, no mainland Greek parallels for this gorgoneion-type - that is, until the late 6th century, when there appear in several areas examples which I believe to be derived from East Greece (see discussion, pp. 177 ff.). It therefore seems highly probably that this gorgoneion is of East Greek make as well as type.

See Appendix 5

CYCLADICb. Pottery

(The categories are the same as for the main catalogue, but with a small initial letter).

b.1. Mykonos, Museum, Delos Bc 19. 'Cycladic' neck-amphora

From Delos.

Pl.27.

Ht. of vase, 38.2 cms.

Délos XVII, 19, no.19, pls. 12,13. Payne, NC 88. Boardman,

I Gems 50. Schefold, ML Pl. 24c.

On the neck of the amphora, a woman hands armour to a man. They hold between them a large shield, of 'Boeotian' shape though rather elongated, and the gorgoneion covers all but the rim of the shield. The face is spotted all over, except for the nose and eyebrows.³⁰ The mouth stretches straight across the whole width of the face, with teeth but no fangs. There is a small, protruding tongue. Below the 'chin' a narrow zone with vertical, slightly wavy lines is clearly meant for a beard. The rest of the space, above and below the face, is painted black; possibly the area above is intended to be hair.

Date: mid-7th century. (The vase belongs to a small group whose exact classification and dating are still uncertain. Among those who have discussed it are: J.K. Brock, BSA 44, 1949,80

(c.670); Boardman, BSA 47, 1952, 24, and IGems 90 (c.650);
F.Salviat and N.Weill, BCH 84, 1962, 347ff., 382-386 (c.650).

§.2. Athens, Nat. Mus. 3961 (911). 'Melian' amphora.

From Melos.

Ht. of the neck, 22 cms. (ht. of vase 95 cms).

A Conze, Die Melische Thongefasse pl.3. Furtwangler in Roscher's
Lexikon, 'Gorgo' col.1706. Payne, NC 88. Boardman, IGems 50.

A/H/S 277, pl.22. (with full bibliography). Besig 95, no.187.

On the neck of the vase is a hoplite duel, apparently over a set of armour. The gorgoneion is the device on the round shield of the right-hand warrior. It is very imprecisely and roughly drawn, in marked contrast with the rest of the scene, which means that the formless and unkempt effect is intentional. The head is surrounded by irregular tufts for beard and hair. There are heavy eye-brows, and the eyes are large and close-set. The gaping mouth is painted red, and is perhaps intended to have a protruding tongue; there appear to be three fangs, irregular in shape and position. The mouth is set very high, so that there is a large expanse of cheeks and chin below it, and the whole face has a rather frog-like appearance. The left ear is definitely human. Furtwangler believed that a frontal animal-head, probably a lion, was intended, but the only feature which is at all leonine is the 'ruff'.

Date: c. 625 B.C.

c. Architectural Terracottasc.1. Thasos, Museum, and Athens, Nat.Mus. Antefixes.

From Thasos: (a) the building with polygonal walls in the Herakleion; (b) the Necropolis; (c) the Prytaneion. Pl.27.

Ht. 17 cms.; wth. 27 cms.

AM 33, 1908, 245 pl.X (Necropolis). CRAI 1914, 295, fig.6, (the two left-hand fragments, Prytaneion). M.Launey, Études Thasiennes I (1944), 44ff, pl. X, fragments of six antefixes, and Guide de Thasos (1968) 103 fig.49 (building with polygonal walls). Åkerstrom, ATK 12. C.Picard, Mon.Piot 38, 1941, 61, on the doubtful provenance of some of the antefixes.

Black glaze on the frame, for the hair and for most details; red added on the frame for alternate tongues, and also for lips, gums and tongue of the gorgoneion; white for eyeballs and teeth. The antefix is semicircular, with a frame in two zones, an inner one of tongues, an outer one of dentils. The gorgon's broad, fleshy face has hair arranged in waves over the brow, and in masses with faint horizontal divisions at the sides. The wide mouth has a pair of fangs at each side, midway between the tongue and the edges of the mouth. The eyebrows are raised; wrinkles are modelled in relief and picked out in paint on the brow, and above them there is a painted 'beauty-spot' (a dot in all the illustrations except the drawing of AM 1908, where a more elaborate, almost lotus-like one is shown). There is a painted dot-rosette on the bridge of the nose; there are also painted eye-lashes and cheekbone-lines. There are disc ear-rings, divided into

quarters with a dot in each (cf. C.6.). I am not sure whether the gorgoneion is bearded: on, e.g., Launey pl. X.1, there may be traces of beard-tufts in shallow relief beneath the chin. The expression is impressively fierce.

Date: c.540-520 B.C. (Launey 38, 51, 223).

c.2. Thasos, Museum? Antefix-fragment.

From the Prytaneion ?

CRAI 1914, 295, fig.6, at right.

This is clearly a different type from the other fragments in fig.6, which are examples of c.1. The hair is scalloped over the brow in a similar way, but eyes and nose are shaped differently, the mouth and tongue are neater, and the small fangs touch the tongue. There may be a disc ear-ring. Though there are no snakes, this fragment is closer in appearance than c.1. to East Greek examples such as those from Miletus and Didyma (C.1 and C.2.).

Date: probably roughly contemporary with c.1, c.540-520 B.C.

c.3. Thasos, Museum? Antefix-fragments.

From the Prytaneion, Thasos.

BCH 45, 1921, 141. Besig 93, no. 169.

These antefixes are the same shape as c.1, semicircular with a zigzag or toothed outer border. The treatment of details is finer, and

the general effect less bestial. The side-hair does not survive, but on top of the head the hair is rendered in groups of fine engraved lines which end in curls on the brow, a stylization quite common in the archaic period; a roughly contemporary gorgoneion-example is g.2.b, the Neapolis coin. In the centre of the brow are two smaller curls, falling below the general hair-line. The neat fangs are midway between the tongue and the corners of the mouth. There are disc ear-rings.

Date: late 6th century. (This type appears later in style than c.1).

c.4. Thasos, Museum, Inv.803π. Antefix-fragment?

Chance find at the Herakleion.

Remaining ht. (brow to chin) 20.5 cm.; width c.30 cm.

BCH 79, 1955, Chronique 368, fig.51.

This fragmentary terracotta has traces of black glaze and red paint.

It is more human in appearance than the other Thasos terracottas.

The mouth is straight, the teeth neat, and there is a pair of fangs at the surviving corner of the mouth. Traces of modelling at cheek-level at the broken edges of the fragment look as though they could represent snakes, but there can be no certainty, at least from the photograph.

Date: probably late 6th century.

d. SculptureGorgons

d.i. Paroikia, Paros, Arch.Mus. Marble relief.

From Paros.

E.Loewy, AEM XI, 155, pl.V. Besig 91, no.161.

The gorgon, in 'knee-running' position, moving to her left, is in very low relief on the front of a three-sided marble stelebase (shaped like an E with the central bar missing). The relief is worn, so that few details remain, and the facial features are completely obliterated. Nevertheless, the high quality of the work is still clear. The gorgon has a pair of sickle-wings behind the shoulders, and wears a short tunic, belted at the waist. The belt or girdle appears to have two intertwined loops at the centre (?bow, or ?buckle). Two folds appear at the arm-pit, and there are fine stepped folds, five in number, arranged symmetrically and with straight edges, between the legs. The gorgon's arms are akimbo, and she holds a snake, which is also twined round her lower arm, in each hand at waist level. She had long hair.

Date: third quarter of the 6th century, probably nearer 525 B.C.

Gorgoneia

d.1. Delos, Museum, Inv. A 728. Marble Kouros-base.

From Delos.

G.Bakalakis, BCH 88, 1964, 539ff., in an article assigning the

base to the kouros-torso A 4052, gives the earlier bibliography, which consists chiefly of brief remarks and some misunderstandings (the gorgoneion taken for a second lion-mask). For the dating of the inscription, L.H.Jeffery, Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, 291 fig.55.3, 304.3.

The rough triangular base, and its statue, were made and dedicated by a Naxian, Euthykartides. At the front corner is a ram-protome, and at the two back corners, very close together because of the shortness of the side, are the gorgoneion and a lion-mask. Both have protruding tongues; the lion can, however, be distinguished not only by its pointed ears, but also by its square jaw-line and generally squarer profile.

The gorgoneion has the basic features: large eyes, squashed nose, large, gaping mouth. The mouth is almost straight, and a horizontal line across it above the tongue shows that it is meant to be full of teeth; it has no fangs. There are no snakes.

Date: last quarter of the 7th century.

The general effect is very bestial but rather characterless, and there is no stylistic resemblance to d.2, the (presumably Naxian) antefix of the early 6th century.

d.2. Delos, Museum.

Antefixes.

From Delos, the Oikos of the Maxians.

Pl. 27.

BCH 45, 1921, 234 fig.4. P.Bruneau and J.Ducat, Guide deDélos (1965), 79. Besig 92, no.167.

This Oikos is one of the oldest buildings, but the antefixes seem to belong to a reconstruction of the early 6th century. They are of marble, semicircular, with the gorgoneion finely engraved upon them. She has hair waving gently from a central parting to the ears, then falling in one thick lock at each side and ending in a large curl (so-called 'Hathor-locks'). She has a small beard: three tufts on either side of the chin. Her nose is of 'layer' type, and her face is carefully divided by lines running from the nostrils into an upper and a lower area, rather in the Corinthian manner. She has teeth, and two fangs only, pointing downwards from the upper jaw and touching the tongue.

Date: early 6th century B.C.g. Coins

g.1. London, British Museum, formerly

Athens, Coll. of Prof. N.Petsalis.

? Melos.

Acquired on Melos, from an inhabitant.

Pl. 28.

AR stater, wt. 14.02 gm.

Num. Chron. 1939, 19, pl.I.18; 1955, 139.

Rev. A very rough incuse square.

Obv. Gorgoneion. The coin is very worn around the edges, so that only the centre of the face is really clear. The brows are carefully marked, and there is an almost diamond-shaped 'beauty-spot' placed vertically between them. The eyes stare. The short nose has a swelling bridge. The mouth is large and upcurving. There are teeth, including two in the upper jaw above the tongue. The tongue itself protrudes, and has a vertical depression in the centre. There is a pair of fangs very close to the tongue on each side. Markings around the edges seem to indicate that the gorgoneion originally had hair, snakes, or beard. (G.K. Jenkins, reporting the acquisition of the coin for the BM in Num. Chron. 1955, suggests an attribution to Seriphos because of the importance of this island in the gorgon-myth. Seriphos has 4th century coins with a gorgoneion; however, 5th century gorgoneion coins are certainly attributable to Melos.).

Date: first half of the 6th century, perhaps second quarter. This is an exceptionally fine angry-looking gorgoneion of an early type, which can be compared closely with pre- or c.550 types from ? Miletus (G.1), and ? Neapolis (g.2). The thick, irregular flan also points to an early date.

g.2a. Boston, Mus. of Fine Arts, inv.00.128. ? Neapolis.

AR Phoenician didrachm, wt. 7.29 gm. Diam. 1.2 cm. Pl. 28.

Brett, Boston Cat., 75, no. 556, pl.31.

Rev. Incuse square.

Obv. Gorgoneion. Only the centre of the face appears, with possibly a trace of the right ear. No trace of the hair remains. The eyebrows are strongly marked, the eyes staring. The nose appears to have wrinkles on the bridge, between the eyes. The mouth is fairly small; it curves upwards, and teeth are visible in the upper jaw above the protruding tongue. A pair of fangs, the inner one very long, appears very close on either side of the tongue. The whole expression is very fierce.

Date: c.550 or earlier (Boston). The type and technique closely resemble those of ? Miletus (G.1) and ? Melos (g.1). Brett puts this at the head of the Neapolis series, saying 'Unique coin, attribution uncertain'. It is certainly similar to the late archaic Neapolis gorgoneia, though clearly considerably earlier. The rev. four-part incuse square differs from those of the Neapolis coins in not being of the 'mill-sail' type. The weight-standard is different from that of the later coins, being the same as that of g.1.

g.2b. London, Brit.Mus.

Neapolis.

AR stater, wt.9.53 gm. Diam. c. 1.9 cm. Pl. 28.

BMC Macedonia etc., 83, no.1. BM Guide to the Principal Coins

of the Greeks, pl. 3.6. Many other examples: see, e.g.

Brett, Boston Cat.; C.M.Kraay, Greek Coins, 334, pl.140,

no.433 (private coll.). Besig no.307.

Rev. Incuse square, divided sometimes into four smaller squares, sometimes diagonally.

Obv. Gorgoneion. There are no snakes or beard. The hair covers the top of the head only. It is usually rendered by fine vertical wavy lines, some of which end in curls. The nose is heavily wrinkled. The mouth curves strongly upward, and lines around it increase the effect of a violent grimace. The tongue protrudes; there are teeth in the upper jaw above it, and a pair of fangs touches it at each side.³¹

Date: c.520 B.C. for the earliest examples? There are four examples in the Demanhur hoard (Z.f.N. 37, 1927, 32, pl.1.17). The type grew gradually less archaic-looking and less fierce.

h. Gems

h.i. Whereabouts unknown. A lentoid of a 'greenish translucent stone', from Melos. Diam. c.1.7 cm.

Known from a drawing in AM, 1886, pl.6.13. Furtwängler, AG pl.V.31, vol.ii, 23. Boardman, IGems 50, no. 179, pl.VII. Besig 91, no.160. Karagiorga, GK 51, fig. 5.

The gorgon runs to its right, naked and apparently hairy or feathery on back and thighs. There is no indication of sex. Two sickle-wings sprout from the front of the shoulders, and the arms emerge below them, almost at waist level. The hair sticks up straight round the top of the head; the eyes are round and staring, and the mouth is large and straight with protruding tongue.

Date: second half of the 7th century. (Boardman, IGems 91, 'Class C').

h.ii. British School at Athens. An amygdaloid of pale green, mottled steatite. 'Probably from Melos'. L.2.4 cm. Pl. 28.
Boardman, IGems 50, no. 180A, pl.VII; Greek Gems and Finger-rings pl. 265A.

The 'gorgon', armless, walks to her right, wearing a short, unbelted tunic. A large, rather elaborate pair of sickle-wings stretches across the front of the shoulders, in the same way as the upper wings of the 'gorgon-potnia' of the plate from Camirus (B.i). The face has a very large, round, open mouth, without tongue or teeth; there is no nose, but, above a horizontal line which divides the face into two parts, are semicircular eyes. There is a short, stiff fringe, (presumably hair and beard) all round the head.

On one side of the 'gorgon' is a four-spoked wheel, on the other a fish. Boardman suggests that these may signify ability to travel over land and sea.

Date: c. 600 B.C. (Boardman IGems 91, 'Class D early').

h.i. British Museum, BM Cat. no. 231. A hemispherical seal of green steatite. Diam. 1.6 cm. H.B. Walters, Cat. of the Engraved Gems in the BM, no.231, pl.5. Payne, MC 88. H.von der Osten, Samml. von Aulock 61, fig. 6.56 (taken for Near Eastern of the 3rd mill.). Boardman, IGems 83,89, no.357, pl.XIII.

The gorgoneion has an almost-round face, slightly pointed at the chin. It has no hair, beard or snakes. The mouth is a straight line, with a protruding tongue, and apparently with two large fangs at each corner. The eyes are almond-shaped, and there is a 'wart' at the junction of the eye-brows. Two small excrescences on the sides of the face at mouth-level may be intended for ears.

Date: before 650 B.C. perhaps second quarter of 7th century.

(Boardman, IGems 91, 'Class A'; - cautionary comment on style, 89).

Analysis of the types of archaic gorgons and gorgoneia.

I. Corinth

The earliest gorgoneion appears before 650 B.C., and there are four in all from PC pottery.³² The finest and most lively examples belong to this period and to the EC period. The earliest gorgon (and the earliest representation of the Perseus story) was on a painted clay metope, now extremely fragmentary, from Thermon, probably c.630-20 B.C.³³ Some of the early examples are slightly 'uncanonical' when compared with the whole surviving Corinthian production (the earliest, for instance, on the lion aryballos from Syracuse, has horns), but the main characteristics are present from the beginning, and remain remarkably consistent throughout.

The main facial features are common to both gorgons and gorgoneia. The face is sharply divided into separate areas by the eyebrows and cheek-bone lines; often these areas are further differentiated by the colouring. There is great accent on pattern and line, the over-all effect being generally very stylized. A notable feature of Corinthian noses from the Syracuse aryballos on, is the way in which they swell out in the centre: again the emphasis on rhythmic, curving line. Hair over the brow is either in scalloped waves or in large curls.³⁴ Disc ear-rings are unknown, although possible stud ear-rings occur.³⁵

A high proportion of examples have fangs, which are almost invariably at the outer edges of the mouth (the only example with fangs touching the tongue is the odd little PC gorgoneion, Besig 32, which has only one pair of very large fangs).³⁶

Snakes on the heads of both gongons and gorgoneia are very rare. The earliest known example of a gorgoneion with snakes is the Thermon metope, (pl. 29a). Besig 14.³⁷ It has a large, thick pair springing from the sides of the face at mouth-level, and hugging the head to eyebrow-level, where the heads turn outwards. An extremely fragmentary metope from Kalydon,³⁸ of about the same date, seems to have snakes springing from the neck, rising behind the ears, and curving down above the eyebrows. There are occasional examples in the late 7th and early 6th centuries, with short, thick snakes springing up round the top of the head from behind the hair,³⁹ or with two or three longer snakes trailing down at the sides,⁴⁰ (pl. 30c). A most interesting example, recently discovered, is the terracotta antefix from Mon Repos, Corfu, (pl. 29b) dated about 600 B.C.⁴¹ Here there appears to be no hair on top of the head, and the snakes writhe, intertwined, across the brow. It is the only Corinthian example known in which the snakes (a) replace the hair, and (b) are entwined; it recalls two of the shield-band gorgons,⁴² and, in the general effect of the snakes, though not in their precise arrangement, provides a link for the Corfu gorgon. The gorgon of the Corfu pediment⁴³ is the only Corinthian gorgon known to me with snakes in the hair (pl. 29c). As well as a large pair emerging from the sides of the neck, she has a small pair just

above the ears, and six large coiled and looped snakes taking the place of curls across the brow. Though looped snakes appear in other schools, notably East Greek, there are none of precisely this type. Behind the fringe of snakes, the hair on top of the head is normal. At this point it is necessary to make distinction between gorgons and gorgoneia:

Gorgoneia. There are two types, the 'round' and the 'oblong', depending mainly on position. 1. Round - 'tondo- and shield-gorgoneion': Hair on top of the head only; beard from ear to ear; moustache very common, often meeting up with the beard, (pl.30,31)⁴⁴
2. Oblong - 'handle-plate and alabastron gorgoneion': Hair long, falling usually in thick, straight locks, or in masses with horizontal divisions; beard still very frequently from ear to ear, but occasionally just around the chin; usually no moustache, (pl.31b).⁴⁵

'Beauty-spots' in the centre of the forehead (dots, palmettes, rosettes), occur several times in the EC and MC periods. (Pl.31c) ⁴⁶

Gorgons. (pl.32). Again there are two facial types, this time depending chiefly on date. ~~1.~~ Like the 'oblong' gorgoneia: about three examples, two being EC.⁴⁷ 2. Long-haired, beardless, and generally more 'human' in appearance: these are later, MC, LC, plastic vases, the Corfu gorgon, and the Perachora bronze statuettes.⁴⁸

In all cases but one, the tunic is very short (at most, halfway down the thighs), with edge in a single convex curve, and only in the

Perachora bronzes (Pl.32c,d) is there any indication of folds. A small group in MC and LC, and the Corfu gorgon, show the back hem of their tunic between the legs. This peculiarity is shared by one of the shield-band gorgons, by many of the C Painter's gorgons, (Pl.51a) and by a few other Attic examples, mostly close to the C Painter in date, and by three Chalcidian gorgons. (Pl.40c).⁴⁹ Considering the influence of Corinthian vase-painting at this date, it is probably a Corinthian characteristic.

A fragment of a relief-vase from the Argive Heraion departs from the short tunic 'uniform'.⁵⁰ It shows Perseus pursued by the two bereaved gorgon-sisters, who wear long robes opening down one side from the waist to show their bare right legs as they rush along. A parallel is afforded by the Nereids on a late MC krater in the Louvre⁵¹. The sherd is dated by Herson 'just before the middle of the 6th century', and clay and slip are said to be identical with that of fragments from the Potters' Quarter and elsewhere at Corinth. It is interesting to note the differences from the gorgons on the painted vases (incidentally, Herson is wrong in saying that most Corinthian gorgons have only one pair of sickle-wings).

A few gorgons, later than 600 B.C., have snakes twined round the waist; some, but not all, also grasp the snakes as they rear upwards.⁵²

As far as winged boots are concerned, most of the examples arrange themselves in a (possibly misleading!) chronological sequence: The earliest (EC, two) have no boots, and no wings on the feet.⁵³ Next

come boots with one down-curving wing at the front (MC, one, and the Corfu gorgon),⁵⁴ followed by boots with one up-curving wing at the back.⁵⁵ The Perachora bronzes have two wings on each boot, one at the front and one at the back.⁵⁶ The gorgons of the relief-sherd upset the neat sequence by having bare, wingless feet.⁵⁷

As to wings, the EC examples have one pair of sickle-wings; so have the relief-vase gorgons and some LC examples.⁵⁸ Of the rest, most have four wings, sometimes all sickle,⁵⁹ sometimes one pair pointing downwards.⁶⁰ The Corfu gorgon alone has two downward-pointing wings only.⁶¹ The Perachora bronzes have one of their pairs of wings at the front.⁶²

The great majority of Corinthian examples are from one medium, painted pottery. The very few surviving examples from other media, with their differences in certain respects from the main corpus of Corinthian gorgons and gorgoneia, remind us to be cautious in our conclusions as to what is typical of Corinthian art as a whole, as opposed to Corinthian vase-painting. They also raise the feeling that perhaps craftsmen in media other than vase-painting were more open, or more amenable, to influences from other artistic schools.

Payne's masterly description and analysis of Corinthian gorgons and gorgoneia (NC 79-89) remains valuable, though later finds have invalidated some of his arguments (see pp.178ff).

II. SHIELD-BANDS

Pl. 33.

The bronze shield-bands (part of the arm-grip), found mostly at Olympia, are attributed by Kunze, who publishes them, to 'the Argive-Corinthian artistic circle'. It is quite easy to observe general stylistic connections with figures on Corinthian pottery of the first half of the 6th century, and there are direct links in the form of shared scenes with a type of mirror found at Corinth but not at Argos. There seems also, however, to be a true connection of some kind with Argos, as some matrices had inscriptions in the Argive alphabet.⁶³ Unfortunately, very little Argive art survives with which to compare the shield-bands. For gorgons, only two possibly Argive examples are known to me: a 7th century ivory seal from the Argive Heraion,⁶⁴ and a black-figure sherd of c.600 B.C. from the Agamemnoneion at Mycenae.⁶⁵ The seal, which is fragmentary, shows two strange figures with grotesque frontal heads and long robes, which afford no sort of parallel with the shield-bands. The black-figure gorgon is much closer to the usual established late 7th and early 6th century type, but, as J.M. Cook remarks, it 'has no especially close affinities'.

The shield-band gorgons certainly resemble contemporary Corinthian ones in the emphasis on pattern and line in their faces. They have similar short, plain tunics with simple curved edge, and one (XXXg) shows the back hem of her tunic between her legs. For this last characteristic, see the discussion of Corinthian skirts, p.127-128.

All the gorgons except one, the earliest, have long hair, and

all are fangless and beardless. There does not seem to be quite the same softening of the fierce, bestial expression as is visible in Corinthian gorgons with the passage of time; here, however, the medium may be at least partly responsible, and also it is perhaps unwise to read too much into the expressions of drawings copied, however painstakingly, from originals which are often very battered. Three of the fourteen gorgon-types have snakes in the hair (XXIXd, VIIe, XXXg). One, (XXIXd)⁶⁶ is part of a scene of the beheading, with Perseus on one side and Athena on the other; Perseus, head averted, prepared to apply his sword, and both hero and goddess grasp large snakes which emerge from behind the hair at temple-level. Two smaller snakes rear on top of the gorgon's head. The composition is as on the Amasis Painter's olpe;⁶⁷ the way in which Perseus grasps the snake recalls the Samos ivory plaque, F.i,⁶⁸ and also the metope from Temple C at Selinus⁶⁹ (no snakes are visible on this, but Perseus' left hand is in exactly the position to grasp one on top of the head - the only alternative being that he was grasping a lock of hair which, like the hypothetical snake, would have been painted on the background). The shield-band XXIX is dated by Kunze to 575-550 B.C.

The other two gorgons with snaky hair, VIIe and XXXg, dated to the second quarter and middle of the 6th century respectively, are extremely similar, and almost certainly from the same workshop.⁷⁰ (pl. 33f, g) Both have two sickle-wings with two straight wings below them. Both wear winged boots, and are the only known shield-band gorgons certainly to have this item of dress (XXIXbis g⁷¹ is rather a puzzle, and several examples have feet damaged beyond recognition); VIIe has boots of

'Ionic' type, with an up-curved wing at the back, while XXXg's boots seem to have a wing at the front too.⁷² Both gorgons grasp two long, thin snakes which twine round the waist and extend their heads far out to each side (other examples,⁷³ different in other ways, have similar snakes). Finally Kunze states that VIIe definitely, and XXXg almost certainly, have no hair on top of the head: the fringe of snakes, heads facing outwards, takes its place. According to the drawings, the snakes are not quite looped, but their tails curl right over to touch their bodies.

Apart from tiny shield-devices, there is only one shield-band gorgoneion, XXVIz,⁷⁴ dated to the first quarter of the 6th century. Like the two gorgons just described, it has no hair on top of its head - simply a fringe of snakes, whose tails curl over, but whose bodies, except for the large outer pair, are in a C- rather than an S-shape. The gorgoneion has a fine beard in flame-like tufts, and three rather uneven fangs at each end of the upper jaw. These three, with the terracotta antefix from Mon Repos, Corfu,⁷⁵ are the only known examples outside East Greece of gorgons or gorgoneia whose hair-snakes actually replace the hair, and the arrangement and shape of the snakes of the two gorgons is very close to East Greek examples. Yet there is nothing remotely East Greek about the faces, which are of the heavily-stylized, square type. Also the form of XXXg's skirt, mentioned above, indicates a close link with Corinth. Boots with an up-curving wing at the back may be originally and predominantly East Greek, but, as Yalouris stresses, they are by no means confined to this area later, and, as we

have seen,⁷⁶ they appear in LC pottery, contemporary with the two shield-bands. So East Greek influence in the matter of the snakes is perhaps unlikely.

The earliest of the shield-band gorgons, XIVc,⁷⁷ dated to the last third of the 7th century, embraces Pegasus and Chrysaor in a composition recalling the Corfu pediment and the Syracuse gorgon-relief.⁷⁸

III. Boeotia

There are very few surviving Boeotian gorgons and gorgoneia, and most are peculiar. Despite their small number, they range in date from the first half of the 7th century to the late 6th.

The strangest, and one of the earliest, is the long-skirted horse-Medusa being slain by Perseus on a relief-pithos. (Pl. 35a) 79

She has a rather triangular face, with round eyes (these appear to stare because of the frontal view of her head, but this effect may not be deliberate: Perseus' eye is of exactly the same form, and cf. other frontal figures on relief-pithoi).⁸⁰ Her mouth is small and straight, and full of teeth, though her tongue does not protrude. She has long hair. She is probably the earliest known gorgon, and there is nothing of the lion-mask about her face. The earliest Boeotian gorgoneion, also dated before 650 B.C., is in relief on a plaque of thin bronze from the Kabirion. (Pl. 34b) 81 It is equally strange, and not unlike the pithos gorgon's head: particularly close are the shape of the face, the mouth with its jagged teeth and no tongue, and the way the hair comes down very low on the forehead. The gorgoneion has animal-ears, however, and two trailing snake-like locks at each side of the head (no snake-heads). Fine incised lines below the chin seem to indicate a beard, and the whole face is covered with a mesh of incised lines. The nose looks more animal than human.⁸²

A gap follows, until c. 575 B.C., when three Bf tripod-pyxides have gorgons on the legs. Two of these⁸³ are unusual in having long robes. They both also wear boots with a down-curving wing at the

front, and have a pair of sickle-wings; in the Thebes example, one wing is attached in front. The head of the Thebes gorgon is fairly conventional, with short hair, bulging cheeks, and prominent human ears, but the Boston gorgon (Pl.34a) recalls the Kabirion plaque, with animal-ears, and a straggly beard. The gorgons of the third tripod-pyxis, (Pl.35b)⁸⁴ chasing Perseus round the pot, are close to contemporary Attic examples, though still slightly strange, with two large fangs projecting from the upper jaw.

A very wild and odd example of the second half of the 6th century appears on Bf sherds from Haliartos. (Pl.35c)⁸⁵ She has sickle-wings at the front, and large snakes rearing from waist, shoulder, and behind the head; hair and beard appear to form a sort of ruff round the face.

Two other 6th century examples, of extremely poor quality, and completely Attic in type, may be Boeotian.⁸⁶

It is impossible to draw firm conclusions from so few examples. It does seem, however, that there may have been some tradition of triangular faces and animal-ears at least in the early archaic period. The Atticizing gorgons of the Berlin tripod-pyxis share wings attached at the front, a generally rare detail,⁸⁷ with the Haliartos gorgon, so this too may be a local preference, (the trait being possibly derived originally from oriental or East Greek sources). It seems too that Boeotia had an independent gorgon-tradition, and retained a measure of its own ideas on that score even while producing direct imitations of Attic types in its 6th century black-figure.⁸⁸

IV. Laconia

Laconian representations of gorgons and gorgoneia are found in ivory and bone (mostly 7th century), lead, bronze, stone, terracotta, and, the largest surviving class, on painted pottery. There are a number of examples in the third quarter of the 7th century, with one or two probably before 650 B.C.⁸⁹ The range of quality, as well as of material, is very wide. The finest examples are in bronze and on pottery; the latter medium, however, also produces many of the poorest examples.

The Laconian school never becomes as uniform as, for instance, the Corinthian, and the proportion of 'uncanonical' examples is high. These, however, are mostly early: ivory or bone objects, probably to be dated c.650-600. They have in common the grimace and protruding tongue; most of them also have long hair, and no snakes. The finest, on an ivory plaque, has the body of a winged lion;⁹⁰ another, rather earlier, on a circular ivory seal,⁹¹ has a snaky body with a pair of sickle-wings at the front. A variety also appears on lead votive-shields, probably mostly 6th century;⁹² these are of poor quality, and, of course, extremely small. There are examples with beards and without, with tongue and without, with snakes and without. Among the clay votive-masks from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia too, are some which probably represent gorgons, though it is sometimes difficult to draw the line.⁹³

With the 6th century Laconian gorgoneia 'settle down' a little more. Corinthian influence may be seen in painted pottery gorgoneia,

in the stylization of the areas of the face; (Pl.37a)⁹⁴ unlike Karagiorga, however, I can see no clear signs of this in the non-pottery examples. Even in the painted gorgoneia, apparently local characteristics appear beside the imported ones: note, for instance, the 'Corinthianizing' tondo-gorgoneion, BSA 28, 1926-27, 67, fig.11a (K.20), which, quite apart from the 'target' on its nose, has a straight mouth which is not Corinthian, and appears in many Laconian examples, (cf. Pl.36b,66).

Most examples, apart from those in tondos, have long hair. The majority of the pottery examples are bearded, and some have moustaches also;⁹⁵ among 6th century gorgons and gorgoneia in other materials, these two features are rare. Fangs are almost all, as in Corinthian, at or near the edges of the mouth.⁹⁶

Snakes are far more common than in Corinthian, especially among painted gorgoneia. They are never substituted for the hair, but usually fringe it, curving or curling vigorously. Several examples have long snakes springing from behind the ears,⁹⁷ sometimes also trailing down at the sides. (Pl.37a,b)⁹⁸ One tondo-gorgoneion⁹⁹ of the second quarter of the 6th century, otherwise very Corinthian-looking, has curling snakes all round its head, bordering the hair and beard (cf. the Tocra tondo, (Pl.36b),¹⁰⁰ and the gorgoneion on a hydria from Vulci,¹⁰¹ which, apart from its snakes, is very like Corinthian 'handle-plate' gorgoneia). There are no looped snakes. One or two examples have 'snakes' with unusual heads.(Pl.37c)¹⁰²

Ear-rings are unknown.

Typically Laconian features, often noted,¹⁰³ are horns, and large 'beauty-spots' in the centre of the brow, in the shape of an oval, a drop, or a V.¹⁰⁴ There are horned examples from Sparta itself on pottery, (Pl.37b),¹⁰⁵ and in terracotta,¹⁰⁶ marble,¹⁰⁷ lead¹⁰⁸ and bone,(Pl.36a),¹⁰⁹ the earliest being well before 600 B.C. 'Beauty-spots' are, of course, common in other schools (notably Corinthian and Attic), but usually in the form of small dots.¹¹⁰

Eyelashes, very unusual though not unknown elsewhere, are quite common in Spartan gorgoneia.¹¹¹

As already mentioned, the straight mouth too seems particularly popular at Sparta.¹¹²

A number of gorgons and gorgoneia, found outside Laconia, have been assigned to Sparta on the strength of their horns, and these usually have at least one of the other 'Laconian' characteristics also. The most important are the bronzes. The early 6th century hydria-handle gorgoneion from Trebenishte, (Pl.38a),¹¹³ a splendid creation, looks unmistakably Laconian, with square face, horns, 'beauty-spot', eyelashes, and straight mouth. The late 6th century gorgon-busts from the handles of volute-kraters,¹¹⁴ trying to look fierce, are less striking per se (though their kraters are impressive enough!). Only one of them has horns.

Most Laconian examples are listed and discussed by Th.Karagiorga in her article in Adelt. 19.1,1964. She omits a number of interesting examples, the best of which are: (i) A fine pottery fragment from Artemis Orthia,¹¹⁵ with horns and trailing snakes. (Pl.37b)

(ii) Another fine painted fragment with captivating eyelashes, probably Laconian, on a terracotta 'votive-shield' from Taranto (Pl. 37c)¹¹⁶ (iii) A third painted fragment, from a cup, with rearing, crossing snakes, of superb quality, (Pl. 36c)¹¹⁷ This last omission may have been deliberate, because of the odd appearance of the 'face' of the 'gorgoneion'. It is difficult, however, to imagine what else such snakes could have bordered, and the two crossed snakes are probably at the top centre.

In her book, Gorgeie Kephale, Karagiorga has a photograph of an unpublished bronze tripod-leg from Olympia, (Pl. 38c)¹¹⁸ of the late 7th century, showing a magnificent gorgon with horns, large 'beauty-spot', feathered eyebrows, and a pair of snakes rearing at ear-level. She is wingless, clad in a long robe, and seated on what looks like an Ionic capital; in her arms she holds a little sickle-winged Pegasus. This splendid example is surely Laconian, and a most important addition to the sparse ranks of Spartan gorgons.¹¹⁹

Finally, three bronze gorgoneia, two unattributed, which resemble Laconian examples in certain respects: (i) The first¹²⁰ which is almost certainly Laconian, is from the base of a hydria-handle, (Pl. 38b). As is noted, its closest parallel is the Trebenischté hydria-gorgoneion, though this is earlier. It has square face, horns, nose with V-shaped wrinkles, a large 'beauty-spot', and also the crossed fangs which appear in several examples. The broken scroll at one side of the head may possibly be the remains of a snake like those on the plemochoe, K.40. (ii) The second¹²¹ is in a circular tondo on a fragmentary bronze-

relief from Cyrene, of unknown purpose, (Pl. 39 b). It has wavy hair over the brow, and a beard with straight, incised strokes from ear to ear. The mouth is almost straight, with fangs near the edges, and there is a large, drop-shaped 'beauty-spot' on the forehead. All round the head are pairs of entwined snakes (22 snakes in all). Entwined snakes occur in Attic more than in any other school,¹²² but they are known in Laconian, and the general appearance of the gorgoneion is not notably Attic. The date is probably the second quarter of the 6th century. (iii) The third¹²³ is also a fragmentary bronze relief, of unsurpassed quality, (Pl. 39 a). It was bought at Xylokastro near Sikyon. The upper right side of the head remains, to the jaw-line. The fangs must be slightly closer to the corners of the mouth than to the tongue. The top of the head appears to be rather flat, and the ears are set very high. Two rows of finely-incised curls cover the brow. Four large snakes remain rearing over the top of the head, the inmost two crossing. A fifth coils round the ear, and a sixth, small, and in incision only, is to be seen on the face beside the ear, head facing inwards and close to the corner of the eye.

It is impossible to assign this with confidence, but it seems most unlikely on present evidence to be Corinthian; of the types with snakes, it is closest to Attic and Laconian (rather than East Greek), and the arrangement of the snakes is certainly reminiscent of some Laconian examples.¹²⁴

I can see little evidence of the 'Laconian influence' detected by Karagiorga in the Tarentine antefixes; the lotus 'beauty-spot' on some early examples may be a sign.¹²⁵

V. 'Chalchidian'

Seven gorgons survive (two on one amphora) in Chalchidian, spread over the whole period of production, from just before the middle of the 6th century until close to its end.¹²⁶ None is involved with Perseus. They show strong Corinthian or Corintho-Attic influence. The facial type is the same as MC and LC examples (with long hair, and beardless); only one example definitely has fangs, at the corners of the mouth (Rumpf no.152), though a second (Rumpf no.151) may have them. All have four wings, and all but one have short tunics. Three, all assigned by Rumpf to the early 'Group of the Belly-amphoras',¹²⁷ show the back hem of their tunic between their legs, as observed in some Corinthian and Corinthian-influenced Attic examples of the second quarter of the 6th century.¹²⁸ Four of the seven are pure 'Corinthian' types:¹²⁹ four wings, two sickle and two downward-pointing, short tunic, and boots with a down-curving wing at the front, (Pl.40_{a,b}). The remaining three show varying degrees of 'originality': Rumpf no.152, (Pl.40_c),¹³⁰ otherwise conforming, and sharing a hanging hem with two 'conventional' gorgons, has boots with an upward-curving wing at the back, a down-curving one at the front, Yalouris' 'Ionico-Attic' type.¹³¹ Before and behind her a large snake wriggles vertically; she does not touch them, but clearly they belong to her. Rumpf no.151, (Pl.41_a),¹³² grasps a large snake in each hand, also gripping its body in the crook of her elbow in a similar manner to the curious LC gorgon of the Gotha oenochoe,¹³³ whose snakes also, however, encircle her waist, and to the later Paros marble-relief gorgon, (d.i.).¹³⁴

The latest and one of the best, unfortunately damaged, is Rumpf no.19, (Pl. 416), on a skyphos of the Group of the Phineus Cup.¹³⁵ She wears boots like those of no.152, and a long robe with decorative borders and central strip.

There is one gorgoneion, a shield-device on an early amphora,¹³⁶ which is a version of the Corinthian-Attic tondo-type.

From this it appears, as might be expected, that at first Corinthian influence predominates (it seems to me that the gorgons are slightly closer to Corinthian than to Attic models, though it is a moot point), while the later examples show a little more independence, or more influence from other quarters. The long robe for gorgons, for instance, is now recognized to be not as exclusively 'Ionian' as Furtwängler believed, but nevertheless, its appearance on a later Chalcidian pot, at a time when other small signs of possible East Greek influence may be observed in Chalcidian and Etruscan art and in Western Greek art generally, is surely significant.¹³⁷

See Appendix 2 for 'eye-cups'.

VI. Sicily and S. Italy.

Almost all the surviving examples are in terracotta, and most are antefixes (as the western Greeks imported most of their fine painted pottery from the motherland). Early examples show strong Peloponnesian influence (probably Corinthian in Sicily at least); an indeterminate phase follows, until, as in Etruria, at the end of the century East Greek influences appear.

Gorgons. The two earliest are on terracotta relief-plaques, possibly some kind of architectural decoration, or from votive altars. Medusa, long-haired and beardless, with sickle-wings, and wearing a short tunic and boots with a down-curving wing at the front, runs along holding Pegasus under her right arm. One of these is the late 7th century plaque from Syracuse, (Pl. 42a)¹³⁸ one of the finest of all gorgons, the other a perhaps slightly later, very fragmentary example from Gela.¹³⁹ Both are strongly Corinthian in type, and there is no need to stress their affinities with the Corfu pediment and, one of the early shield-band reliefs¹⁴⁰ (as well as with the later Selinus metope). The Syracuse plaque is usually considered, no doubt rightly, as actual Corinthian work, like the later horse-riding gorgon plastic vase also found at Syracuse.¹⁴¹ An unusual feature is the split skirt of her tunic, echoed on a much later terracotta-relief gorgon from Gela.¹⁴²

Most of the other examples, probably of the later 6th century, though it is sometimes difficult to judge, are fragmentary, mediocre, and without distinctive characteristics, neither particularly close to each other nor obviously related to any other school. Three are

from clay votive-altars, from the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinus;¹⁴³ A fourth, probably also from an altar, is from Gela, and wears a split tunic like that of the Syracuse gorgon, as well as a snake-girdle.¹⁴⁴ A complete late 6th century example from Acragas is of higher quality:¹⁴⁵ the gorgon has four sickle-wings, boots with a down-curving wing at the front, a short tunic with central folds, and two large snakes knotted round her waist and wound round her arms (Pl. 42 d).

In other materials, a well-known example, probably no earlier than c.540, is that of the limestone metope from Temple C at Selinus,¹⁴⁶ in composition recalling the much earlier ivory plaques from Samos and Sparta.¹⁴⁷ The gorgon is barefoot, and wears a short tunic. Her head is 'conventional', (though still markedly over-sized), beardless and with long hair. No snakes appear, but, judging by the position of Perseus' left hand, there may have been at least one hair-snake painted on the background, (what about wings too?). This work may be considered clumsy and provincial, but it is vastly superior in quality to most of the terracottas which survive from this region.

An attractive bronze gorgon (ht. 7 cm.), dated c.550, from Gela, is probably a western Greek work, (Pl. 42 c).¹⁴⁸ She is shown 'knee-running' on a base ending in ~~palmettes~~^{palmettes}. She wears a short chiton, has a pair of sickle-wings, and her hands are at her waist: she is said to be holding 'some small object pressed tightly against the body'. Her back is flat, but carefully-finished, so she is not an appliqué, like the Louvre gorgon E.ii. ^(pl. 12). The back of the base only is

rough; perhaps the figure once stood at the base of a vase-handle (or on a rim?). The style contrasts interestingly with those of the bronze handle-gorgons E.iii and iv, and of the gorgon-bust handles.

Summary of Characteristics: The heads of all surviving Sicilian gorgons are beardless, long-haired, and, with the possible exception of the Selinus metope, snakeless; fangs are at or near the edges of the mouth, but not close to the tongue. All wear short tunics, and almost all have boots with one down-curving wing at the front. The number and type of wings varies, without any clear pattern. Several gorgons hold snakes in their hands, sometimes having them also knotted at the waist.

Gorgoneia. (Sicily). For quality, the picture is very much the same as with the gorgons, but the number of examples, mostly late, is far greater. There are two very fine early 6th century architectural gorgoneia, a complete plaque from the archaic temple at Gela, (Pl.42b)¹⁴⁹ and a very fragmentary one thought to be from the pediment of Temple C at Selinus.¹⁵⁰ They compare well with the early gorgon-plaques. Both have long hair, and neat little curled beards from ear to ear; Gela has large fangs midway between the tongue and the corners of the mouth, and a large beauty-spot (resembling those of some Laconian gorgoneia)¹⁵¹ in the centre of her brow. The unusual rendering of the beard¹⁵² is a link between the two, though details of hair and noses at least are different.

The late archaic examples, all antefixes, are mostly undistinguished, although the technical quality is good on the whole. They are

generally very tame-looking, sometimes trying to look fierce by sporting a wrinkled brow or obtrusive fangs sprouting from the corners of the mouth.¹⁵³ The old-fashioned, 'square' type of gorgoneion, snakeless, remains,¹⁵⁴ but new types, adorned with snakes, now appear. Some have just one large snake at each side, springing from jaw or ear, occasionally looped.¹⁵⁵ Others have a row of S-curve snakes, pale shadows of their East Greek forebears, framing the hair around the top of the head, (Pl.43c).¹⁵⁶ One of the finest examples, lacking none of the 'East Greek' characteristics, is from Sabucina, the site of a 'Siculo-Greek' city near Caltanissetta, (Pl.43a).¹⁵⁷ Disc ear-rings are also common among this group.¹⁵⁸ East Greek influence (or, the influence of East Greek art) is certainly responsible for the second type of snaky gorgoneion, and possibly also for the first.¹⁵⁹ The double row of snail-curly which also makes its appearance with the second type (to be seen in the Tarentine antefixes too) may also be East Greek, though this is more difficult to prove.¹⁶⁰

Some of the most interesting recently-discovered antefix-types are from Morgantina:¹⁶¹ two at least have looped or twined snakes, (Pl.43b).

Gorgoneia. (S.Italy). From South Italy comes the Tarentine series of antefixes, and a number of uninspired late archaic examples from other cities which seem to be modelled on the Tarentine types (from, e.g., Caulonia, Croton, Metapontum, Rhegium).¹⁶²

Most of the great number of small antefixes from Tarentum were found in the area of the ancient necropoleis, and are thought to be from Naiskoi. There are two very distinct types of archaic antefix, which I shall call the 'Peloponnesian' and the 'East Greek'. Each type has many variants. There is a fairly full discussion of the antefixes,

with useful illustrations, by C.Laviosa,¹⁶³ but her dating is generally very late, and sometimes almost incredible. She makes no mention of East Greek characteristics in her discussion.

The semicircular 'Peloponnesian' type begins earlier: Laviosa says not before 550,¹⁶⁴ G.M.A.Richter believes early 6th century.¹⁶⁵ I can see no reason for dating fierce archaic types like Laviosa pl.68.5 to the early 5th century ('archaizing'), and would put them at the start of the series, sometime in the first half of the 6th century, (Pl.44 a). The features of the type are: long hair, in horizontally-divided masses or in beaded locks at the sides, arranged in a sort of scalloping or in large curls across the brow; a tufted beard from ear to ear, usually with a gap beneath the prominent chin; fangs at or near the edges of the mouth; and, in what I consider the earliest examples, a lotus 'beauty-spot' in the centre of the brow.¹⁶⁶ This type goes on into the 5th century, continuing alongside the second type, and at the end of the archaic period variants appear which show other influences: the fangs sometimes touch the tongue, and a pair of large snakes emerges at ear-level, as in some late archaic Sicilian antefixes.¹⁶⁷

The 'East Greek' type, which must have appeared towards the end of the century, not before 525 B.C., also has several variants. One is a sort of hybrid,¹⁶⁸ combining details from the old and the new: ~~(Pl. —)~~ the hair is long, in beaded tresses, the fangs are at the edges of the mouth, and there is a beard; but the beard is beneath the chin only, the shape of the face is the new round one instead of

the squarer old type, and there are looped snakes all round the outline of the hair. Variants of this in turn have no beard, or fangs touching the tongue, ^{(Pl. 44a).} The main type, however, is circular, the face of the gorgoneion is round or very slightly pear-shaped, with short hair ^{(Pl. 44c).} (one or two rows of curls, sometimes snail-curls), ^λ Looped snakes are all round the head, perhaps with the exception of the two under the chin, which may be merely curved.¹⁶⁹ A horrific provincial imitation comes from Lavello (Potenza)¹⁷⁰. (Pl. 44f).

The difficulties in dating both types are great, as they seem to change so little, and yet have a large number of tiny variations. For the first type, I would agree with Laviosa in putting most examples after 550 B.C., but would disagree in putting the examples like her pl. 68.5 before 550 B.C., instead of in the early 5th century.¹⁷¹ The main body looks roughly contemporary with the main Campanian antefix-series,¹⁷² and also with the antefixes from Thasos (c. 1, 2, 3) and the Ptoion and Athenian Agora,¹⁷³ with their beardless but otherwise generally similar gorgoneia, but it seems impossible to be more precise. One may perhaps guess that the gorgoneia of the first type whose fangs touch the tongue are not earlier than the earliest gorgoneia of the second type.

The problem may be further illustrated by a disagreement over the dating of an antefix of the 'East Greek' type: A magnificent circular antefix in Heidelberg, (Pl. 44e),¹⁷⁴ with all the East Greek features (including disc ear-rings, which are not otherwise very common in the series), but also with a little beard, is dated to the second half of

6th century by Hampe and Gropengiesser, but 'towards the mid-5th century' by Laviosa. In this case, it seems to me that Laviosa is likely to be nearer the truth. The antefix cannot be earlier than c.525 B.C.; the East Greek examples to which it seems closest are the early 5th century coins such as G.4 and G.5;¹⁷⁵ and to me it recalls the early 5th century 'East Greek type' gorgoneia of the Berlin Painter and the hydria BM E 180 (Pl.49d)¹⁷⁶. The precise form of the looping of the snakes is, I think, unparalleled in surviving East Greek art; the only exact parallel I have found is on an antefix from Palaikastro in Crete,¹⁷⁷ which has very mild features and cannot be earlier than the very end of the archaic period. The gorgoneion on the aegis of the marble statue of Athena (probably Attic), from the west pediment of the Temple of Apollo at Eretria, had very similar snakes, but lying flatter.¹⁷⁸ (Pl.50c).

VII. Campania.

From Campania comes a group of architectural terracottas with gorgoneia, almost all from ancient Capua. The antefixes, of an apparently indigenous type, consisting of a flat or shallow semi-circular disc with central decoration usually of a palmette or a gorgoneion, with a frame of tongue pattern in low relief, have been ably discussed by Koch and Andrén.¹⁷⁹

Two of the examples illustrated by Koch seem from their appearance to be fairly early (pre-550?). They have fat, bestial faces; the fangs of one are midway between the tongue and corners of the mouth, those of the other touch the tongue.¹⁸⁰

The main type, which has several variants, may have begun shortly before 550, and certainly continued beyond the end of the archaic period. It is basically 'Corinthian', with long hair in two or three locks at each side, and a flame-like beard from ear to ear, (Pl. 45). In earlier examples, the hair over the brow is arranged in flat, hook-like strands,¹⁸¹ while late examples have a double row of 'snail-curls (compare the Laurentine antefixes).¹⁸² Fangs, when present, are usually at the edges of the mouth in earlier examples,¹⁸³ while late ones sometimes have huge fangs which fill all the space not taken by the tongue.¹⁸⁴ There are no snakes. Some late examples wear disc ear-rings.¹⁸⁵ These antefixes have great charm and individuality, and it seems that they were appreciated by the Etruscans, who controlled Capua and the hinterland of Campania at that time, as isolated examples have been found at Caere and Satricum.¹⁸⁶

An interesting painted ridge-antefix has a very rare feature, eye-lashes, and also appears to have stud ear-rings.¹⁸⁷

The enormous late archaic and early classical Etruscan antefixes with very large tongue-frames¹⁸⁸ are almost certainly developed from the Campanian type - though André points out¹⁸⁹ that antefixes with (small) tongue-frames are not unknown elsewhere (Thasos and Neandria, for example).

A gorgoneion in relief on a bronze horse-frontlet in Karlsruhe is extremely similar to the antefix-types (Pl. 45a)¹⁹⁰.

One fine gorgon-antefix type is known. The gorgon, (Pl. 45e), is of 'mainland' type, with the same hair and beard as those of the gorgoneia. She wears a polos,¹⁹¹ knee-length tunic, and high boots with a wing at front and back at ankle-level.¹⁹² She has a pair of sickle-wings, one in front and one behind.¹⁹³ In each hand she holds a spotted snake with looped body.¹⁹⁴ One example comes from Capua,¹⁹⁵ another, identical but half the size, from the Sanctuary of Dea Marica at Minturno¹⁹⁶ on the Latio-Campanian border.

The Campanian antefixes, though they remain of 'mainland' type throughout, admit a modicum of East Greek influence, (possibly, of course, not direct), in the form of the disc ear-rings worn by some late archaic examples.

In the early 5th century the full 'East Greek' type of gorgoneion appears in some terracotta plaques with a gorgon-bust flanked by sphinxes.¹⁹⁷

VIII. Etruria.

Etruscan gorgons and gorgoneia show mixed parentage and many peculiarities; they are a motley collection of individuals, rather than a homogeneous group, and here, if anywhere, it seems to me impossible to trace any clear local development or type.

Examples appear on bucchero-ware, black-figure pottery, jewellery and metal-work of various kinds, and above all on architectural terracottas, which account for almost all of the few really fine examples.¹⁹⁸

Generally speaking, the quality is mediocre, and both gorgons and gorgoneia have a 'basic' face, not clearly attributable to any particular Greek school. One might say that the earlier examples look more dependent on mainland Greek types, or, independent of East Greek influence, while later some clear examples of East Greek influence appear.

Gorgons. These are few in number, and mostly odd-looking. Probably none is earlier than the second quarter of the 6th century. Not all are winged, but those who are show the Etruscan fondness for wings attached at the waist.¹⁹⁹ Short tunics predominate, though one or two later ones are long.²⁰⁰ Most of the gorgons are long-haired; beards are very rare.²⁰¹ Several have no fangs; in the rest, as with gorgoneia, the position of the fangs varies without a clear predominance for any one position.

At least one, and possibly two, of the 'gorgons' are male: the strange being of the bronze disc from Canino,²⁰² semi-naked, snakeless

and accompanied by lions, and the horned figure from a bucchero oenochoe in Palermo,²⁰³ who wears a loin-cloth only.

The bucchero gorgon just mentioned may owe its horns to Laconian influence: the head strongly resembles Laconian types, including, for instance, the clay gorgoneion from Cumae.²⁰⁴ A bronze handle with rough but effective winged-gorgon bust at the base, must be inspired by 'Laconian' examples, (Pl. 47a).²⁰⁵

The gorgon of the Reading 'Pontic' amphora,²⁰⁶ and the late archaic tripod-gorgon from Vulci,²⁰⁷ carry 'dumb-bells'; a possible connection with the objects carried by the Didyma architrave gorgons has been discussed in Appendix 3, p.243. Both also wear the 'Ionian' long-sleeved chiton.

The bronze relief-fragment from Perugia,²⁰⁸ probably from a chariot, which bears a squatting, but otherwise orthodox, gorgon, is a first-quality piece of work, (Pl.46 b). But by far the finest and most interesting of the Etruscan gorgons are those on the painted terracotta plaques from Caere, (Pl.46a),²⁰⁹ the remains of a representation of the beheading of Medusa (the blade of Perseus' sword may be seen, aimed at her neck). These would not look out of place in Attica, and are magnificent specimens by any standard. They are probably not bearded, the locks visible on their shoulders being long hair. Their fangs touch the tongue, but their features generally are close to the Attic type adapted from the Corinthian. The 'beauty-spot' on the brow of one sister also recalls Attic examples.²¹⁰ For the twined snakes encircling the head, there are Attic parallels: on gorgoneia

by the Gorgon Painter (Pl.48c)²¹¹ in the early 6th century (not identical), on a gorgon by the C. Painter,²¹² and in the later 6th century, rather curiously, among aegis-snakes.²¹³ Entwined snakes are comparatively rare, the greatest number occurring in Attica; there are, however, examples in other schools: the antefix from Mon Repos, Corfu, (Pl.296)²¹⁴ of c.600 B.C., has a type of entwined snake, for instance.

Strange features of the Caere gorgons are the partial hairiness of their arms (their hands, and parts of some arms, being apparently smooth), and the two little snakeless gorgon-heads, presumably belonging to baby gorgons clasped by Medusa in front of her chest.

Snakes generally seem rather rare among gorgons and gorgoneia alike. The gorgon of a 6th century bronze strip from Canino (a shield-band?) has a pair rearing at ear-level; the Ruvo greave gorgon holds a pair in her hands.²¹⁵

Gorgoneia. The remarks on the hair, beards²¹⁶ and fangs of gorgons apply to the gorgoneia also. Fangs midway between the tongue and the edges of the mouth are more numerous among the gorgoneia.

There is a fair number of fine examples here. In some of the earlier examples a fondness for bestial, 'layered' noses appears (as in the Caere gorgons). The gorgoneia in medallions on a bucchero oenochoe have V-shaped 'beauty-spots';²¹⁷ these adornments are otherwise rare.

Fine early (pre-550) antefixes come from Vignanello, (Pl.476),

Rome, and recently from Poggio Civitate.²¹⁸ André calls the first two 'Corinthian type', probably correctly, as they bear a considerable resemblance to late 7th century Corinthian examples.²¹⁹ This also applies to the fine fragmentary tufa shield-gorgoneion from Chiusi.²²⁰

Much later in the century, the two shield-gorgoneia of the Monteleone chariot are fine 'basic' examples.²²¹

In all this time no definite East Greek influence is detectable.

Finally, at the end of the 6th century, there appear a few examples of gorgoneia of 'East Greek' type, with looped and S-curved snakes, pear-shaped face, disc ear-rings, and fangs touching the tongue. The most notable are the antefixes from the temple of Apollo at Veii; (Pl.47c);²²² there is another antefix, more ordinary, from Caere.²²³ And, on one of the bronze-reliefs from the arm-grip of a shield, found in the Tomba del Guerriero at Vulci, and showing the ambush of Troilos, we find a gorgoneion (unfortunately damaged) with looped snakes of pure East Greek type, (Pl.68a). Judging by the fountain, this relief was at least made in Etruria.²²⁴ Although these few late examples are undoubtedly of East Greek character, there is no direct link with any of the known East Greek terracotta gorgoneia.

IX. The Cyclades, including the colonies of Thasos and Neapolis.

A catalogue was prepared for the Cycladic gorgons and gorgoneia, in the expectation that they might show interesting connections with both East Greece and the mainland, and that the Cyclades might prove to be a meeting-ground for types and characteristics from both sides of the Aegean. This hope was not entirely vain; the total number of surviving examples from the area is, however, disappointingly small. They fall into two groups, one early, the other late, archaic.

Most of the members of the first group are distinguished solely for their extreme oddity. These are, the three 'Island gems, of which h.1 may belong to the first half of the 7th century, and the two shield-devices from painted vases: two gorgons and three gorgoneia. The 'uncanonical' nature of early examples in other schools has already been noted,²²⁵ and here it is even more marked. No two examples are alike, although they are linked by certain basic characteristics: gaping mouth, protruding tongue, sometimes fangs, and a 'hairy' appearance. The 'Melian' gorgoneion, b.2, looks like a cross between a lion (the ruff) and a frog, the gem-gorgon, h.i, is naked and appears to have hairy or feathery thighs, while h.ii, which may be as late as the early 6th century, is even more extraordinary. Both of these have sickle-wings attached at the front, an unusual trait among mainland examples.²²⁶ The two pottery examples and the gem h.ii are certainly bearded. It was these examples, plus a few others which he considered Ionian, which led Payne (NC 88) to state that East Greece contributed nothing towards 'the development and popularization of the archaic

gorgon type'.

From these examples it certainly seems that there was no established tradition in the Cyclades until the end of the 7th century at least; however, the examples are very few, and possibly the Island gems should be treated with caution, as being slightly apart from the mainstream of Cycladic art.

A much more conventional example appears towards the end of the 7th century, on the Euthykartides base from Delos (d.1). This is of the 'lion-mask' type, (though carefully distinguished from the lion-mask on another corner of the base - see cat.), but with little detail. We cannot be sure, for instance, whether it was intended to have a beard, though it does not seem so.

The last member of the early group, and by far the first in quality, is d.2, the engraved antefix from the Oikos of the Naxians on Delos. It resembles the 'Corinthian' type in having a sharp division of the face along the cheek-bones; the layer-nose is found in Attic examples of the second quarter of the 6th century.²²⁷ The form of the long hair, 'Hathor-locks', possibly shows the influence of Near Eastern art;²²⁸ the little tufted beard under the chin only, and the fangs touching the tongue, recall East Greece (though one pair of fangs only is unusual in any school).

The peculiarities of the 7th century examples have vanished, and the quality of the remaining examples is high, though again, the numbers are small.

Two coins follow, possibly in the second quarter of the century.

The ?Neapolis coin, g.2a, will be treated with the later coins of this city. The ?Melos stater, g.1, has a short nose, and fangs close to the tongue, but bears no general resemblance to East Greek examples (early coins, like gems, seem to be something of a law unto themselves: cf. the coins G.1, ?Miletus, and G.3, ?Parium). The ?Melos coin-gorgoneion has a very clear 'drop'-shaped beauty-spot between its bushy brows; these are most common on Laconian gorgoneia (see p.138), but are occasionally found elsewhere.²²⁹

All but one of the examples from the second half of the 6th century are from Thasos and Neapolis. The exception, the relief-gorgon from Paros, d.i, unfortunately has no face. Her body, however, is of 'mainland' type, with short tunic, and wings attached at the back. The snakes wound round her arms possibly derive originally from an Eastern type (see B.iv and note 3).

The antefix-gorgoneia, c.1-3, from Thasos, show a definite mixture of characteristics. The antefix-type is found in East Greece;²³⁰ and though the gorgoneia have no snakes, the fangs are close to or touching the tongue, and c.1 and c.3 at least wear disc ear-rings (see the cat. on c.2 for general appearance). c.1 may be bearded, but under the chin only. The late archaic terracotta fragment, c.4, has fangs at the corners of the mouth, but seems to have had looped snakes. The Neapolis coins also have fangs which touch the tongue.

This examination seems to show that the Cyclades followed the usual 7th century pattern in having gorgons and gorgoneia which were 'uncanonical' but nevertheless recognizable, but with an unusual variety

in the examples. This view is perhaps distorted by the scarcity of the later examples: if, for instance, there had been a flood of surviving early 6th century 'conventional' examples, as at Athens or Sparta, the early representations would probably not have seemed so disproportionately odd. In b.2 we see clear hints of lion, and beards are in evidence. The wings of the gem gorgons, and the nakedness of h.i., are orientalizing.

From the end of the 7th century, here as elsewhere, the 'canonical' type, whatever its origin, is established. No clear Cycladic style is discernible, and no very clear dependence on other schools. In the second half of the century, however, in the Thasos and Neapolis examples, there are definite signs of East Greek contacts: the rarity of disc ear-rings and of fangs touching the tongue in other schools may safely be taken as evidence for this. There was considerable East Greek interest in N.Greece and Thrace at this time,²³¹ and artistic influence would be a likely result.

X. Attica.

The discovery of the Eleusis amphora²³² in 1954 gave Athens gorgons, and a representation of the myth, earlier than any surviving Corinthian example, and possibly as early as the first known Corinthian gorgoneion. Like the other very early gorgon, that of the approximately contemporary Boeotian relief-pithos, (Pl. 35a),²³³ the Eleusis sisters are extremely unorthodox by later Greek standards. Yet they have snakes (including a pair emerging from the neck), fearsome-looking teeth and a protruding tongue. For the moment, however, they are a flash in the pan. When we next meet Attic gorgons and gorgoneia, in the work of the Nessos Painter²³⁴ at the transition from Protoattic to Black-figure, they are transformed: (Pl. 48a); they have all the basic features of the Corinthian 'lion-mask' type, first seen in Protocorinthian, and compare closely in details of beard, fangs, wings and dress with their contemporary, the gorgon of the MC aryballos from Delos.²³⁵ Yet they are subtly different: quite apart from their large scale, they are less rigid, as may be seen in the drawing of the wings, and in the face, where Corinthian features have been adopted without the extreme stylization in the division of the face into areas shown by Corinthian examples. The splendid gorgoneia by the same painter in the lekanai from Anagyros (Pl. —) ²³⁶ show the same dependence and independence, as, on a humbler scale, does the gorgon of a late Protoattic plate from Vari²³⁷ (these last examples also have their hair bound with a fillet, like the gorgon of the Rhodian plate, B.i).

So, although the unmistakable Corinthian type appears in Attic art before the end of the 7th century, the gorgons and gorgoneia of the first half of the 6th century are generally closer to Corinthian examples. Many gorgons show the extreme stylization of the face,²³⁸ and there are some very close imitations of Corinthian types in the early 6th century, especially in the work of the O Painter and his contemporaries. (Pl. 51a,b). Certain very particular Corinthian details, such as the showing of the back hem of the tunic between the legs, are faithfully reproduced.²³⁹

The short tunic remains de rigueur throughout Bf, although some gorgons wear it knee-length, slightly longer than seems usual in Corinthian.²⁴⁰

The Corinthian type of tondo-gorgoneion, (usually without moustache), is very popular right to the end of Bf²⁴¹ (indeed, it becomes almost a stereotype). (Pl. 49a). Almost all the gorgoneia, and very many of the gorgons until about 540 B.C., are bearded, and the majority of those with fangs have them at or near the edges of the mouth, as in Corinthian. 'Beauty-spots' (real, circular spots, very often in pairs) are common among the gorgoneia,²⁴² and these also were probably originally borrowed from Corinth.

Among the gorgoneia, as well as the straight imitations, there is a group of magnificent adaptations, in the best Attic tradition, in the second quarter of the century (surviving examples by Kleitias, Nearchos and Lydos). (Pl. 48b,d).²⁴³ Their luxuriant beards and handsome curly locks are richly decorated with added purple, and white is used

for ears as well as for teeth and eye-balls. They, and a number of other gorgoneia, have spots on their ear-lobes which must, I think, be some kind of stud ear-ring. I have not found this in any of the gorgons. (See Appendix on ear-rings).

Early gorgons favour one pair of sickle-wings;²⁴⁴ after about 550 B.C., two pairs of wings, one sickle- and one downward-pointing,²⁴⁵ (which appear as early as the C Painter) become more popular, though single pairs of wings of either kind are still quite common.²⁴⁶

Almost all gorgons wear boots,²⁴⁷ usually with one down-turning wing at the front. An additional wing at the back, also usually down-curving,²⁴⁸ appears later. A number of gorgons wear an animal-skin over their tunic, the ends hanging down between the legs. (Pl. 52_{a,c}). This starts as early as the C Painter (it is also common for maenads, and an assortment of other personages are similarly clad), and continues as far as the Berlin Painter, with a large proportion of the surviving examples in later Bf.²⁴⁹ Furtwängler, who noted this peculiarity, implies that examples (though fewer) occurred in other schools. I have found two possible non-Attic cases, but in each there is doubt.²⁵⁰

A fairly high proportion (about one-third of my sample) of Attic gorgons either have a snake-girdle, or hold snakes in their hands. The earliest are the François Vase gorgons. (Pl. 51_c). The girdle-snakes at least are probably derived from Corinth, or at any rate from the N. Peloponnesian circle which includes Corinth and the shield-bands.²⁵¹

The only really important difference in iconography between

Corinthian and Attic gorgons and gorgoneia, is in the matter of snakes in the hair. These were popular in Attic from the first, despite the adoption of the Corinthian type, and they become increasingly so as the 6th century passes. They are never substituted for hair or beard, but always emerge from behind these, (Pl.48,51).

Between a half and a third of the gorgons in my sample have snakes round the top of the head, and one or two examples also have a pair at ear- or neck-level.²⁵² They are spread over the whole Bf period (from the Gorgon Painter), with a higher concentration in the later 6th century. There are no looped or coiled examples in the first half of the century, four (just under one-fifth of the total with snakes) in the second half.

Almost all the gorgons without hair-snakes have a beard from ear to ear, while the gorgons with snakes almost all have either no beard, or a beard under the chin only.

Snakes in the hair are less common on gorgoneia, though here also they become more common in the second half of the century. It is mainly shield-gorgoneia which have them, round the top of the hair; sometimes they curve gently upwards like those of some of the East Greek gems (H.ii, H.1,3,5).²⁵³ One or two examples have straight snakes trailing below the beard.²⁵⁴

Entwined snakes, rare elsewhere, are a recurring feature (just under a quarter of the total with snakes have them), though almost all the examples are in the first half of the century. (Pl.48c)²⁵⁵

The earliest Bf example known to me with true looped snakes of

'East Greek' type, is a gorgon by the Heidelberg Painter, in the tondo of a Siana cup found in Rhodes in a grave which is probably not earlier than 550 B.C. (Pl. 52a)²⁵⁶ She is a fascinating mixture: Attic-Corinthian in dress, with short tunic and skin, she combines a splendid beard from ear to ear with fangs touching the tongue (the only Bf gorgon in my sample certainly to have this detail), and with four pairs of snakes round the hair: of the central pair only the heads remain, but the next two pairs are looped, the last simply curved. She also holds a pair of looped snakes.²⁵⁷ The other gorgons with coiled or looped snakes all belong to the Antimenes Painter; (Pl. 52c);²⁵⁸ one of these, (Medusa), also holds a pair of looped snakes in her hands. Their dress is Attic.

It is necessary to treat archaic Red-figure (up to c.480 B.C.) separately, as some striking differences emerge.

Gorgons are almost non-existent: the Berlin Painter's (Pl. 52d)²⁵⁹ gorgon is a lonely survivor. Her dress is no longer the short chiton, but the long one (calf-length) with himation, although she still wears an animal-skin. Her face may be discussed along with the gorgoneia.

Faint traces of the Corinthian tradition remain in most of the aegis-gorgoneia which now become popular: their faces are still often divided into separate areas by eyebrow- or cheekbone-lines.²⁶⁰ They are absolutely basic, usually with no fangs or beard. beards in general disappear almost completely after the Andokides Painter.²⁶¹

It is the shield-gorgoneia which are the interesting class. Where they have fangs, which is rarely, these nearly always remain at the edge of the mouth; hair is still invariably present, though almost always on top of the head only. The snakes, however, undergo a notable change of character. There are one or two examples of true looped snakes all round the head, (Pl. 49c, 64c),²⁶² and several examples of thin, wiry snakes, heavily-coiled, encircling the head, and having very much the effect of looped snakes. (Pl. 49d)²⁶³ The faces of these gorgoneia are often slightly pear-shaped.

Disc ear-rings appear on the Berlin Painter's gorgon and gorgoneion, and on the gorgoneion of the hydria London E180, (Pl. 49d), and of a cup by Hieron and Makron.²⁶⁴

The Berlin Painter retains 'beauty-spots' (which have slipped to the end of the nose of his shield-gorgoneion on the Basel amphora!).

The great majority of Attic gorgons and gorgoneia are on painted pottery. However, a few exist in other materials.

The earliest, dated by Douloupa²⁶⁵ to the second quarter of the 7th century, is a sheet-bronze figure from the Acropolis, over one foot high, incised, partly in relief, and standing within a circle, (~~Pl. —~~). She was perhaps originally flanked by animals. She has shoulder-length hair and a small beard, a wide, straight mouth with a pair of large fangs at each edge, and a protruding tongue. Her dress is long, and she has a pair of up-curving wings springing from her waist at the front. Though she is not of the Corinthian type, she has all the features of the fully-developed general Greek gorgon-type, and I think that, although 7th century, she is much later than Douloupa's date. Douloupa believes that she is not a gorgon, and suggests that she may be a priestess in a mask, and with wings' fastened to her belt';²⁶⁶ are we to suppose that the 'gorgons' being attacked by Perseus on the Samos ivory plaque²⁶⁷ is also a priestess dressed-up?

Most of the remaining examples, all 6th or early 5th century, need not be mentioned in detail, as they exhibit the same characteristics and development as the pottery ones. They include the fine marble gorgon-head of c.575 B.C., (Pl. 50c), part of an akroterion from the Acropolis (hands grasping a knotted snake-belt also remain from this figure),²⁶⁸ a grave-relief,²⁶⁹ some of the early silver coins of Athens, (~~Pl. —~~)²⁷⁰ and a number of late bronzes,²⁷¹ marble gorgoneia,²⁷² and terracotta antefixes.²⁷³ One of the antefixes, of a type long known from the excavations at the Ptoion, has recently been shown

to be Attic by finds in the Athenian Agora. (Pl. 50 b)²⁷⁴ It has a pair of beauty-spots on the brow, like many of the pottery gorgoneia. One of the bronze gorgoneia, the remaining antefix, (Pl. 50 c) and the marbles, (Pl. 50 c,d), all late 6th or early 5th century, have looped snakes and other 'East Greek' features.²⁷⁵ These will be discussed in the section on East Greece.

XI. East Greece.

The earliest surviving East Greek gorgons and gorgoneia belong to the last quarter of the 7th century.²⁷⁶ The types of objects on which they are found differ sharply in proportions from those of the mainland in general, and in particular from those of Corinth and Athens, where painted pottery provides an overwhelming majority of the examples. From East Greece comparatively few examples on pottery survive. Gorgoneion/gorgon-bust plastic vases, of a type unknown elsewhere, form a considerable proportion; there is a high proportion of architectural terracottas and marbles; and coins and gems, both very rare elsewhere, are other large groups.

These differences are caused in part by the fact that East Greece is a large area, comprising many cities, while Corinth and Athens are simply one city: one would not, for instance, expect to find so many different coins or architectural terracottas from a single city as from many. As far as pottery is concerned, at Athens and Corinth this was a flourishing major industry, with its own strong and often persistent traditions. Its outstanding quality made it a vital export, produced in great quantity, highly prized, and preserved in countless tombs. East Greek pottery was never so important, and therefore less plentiful; it also had a stronger tradition of animal-figure decoration ('Wild Goat'-Fikellura), so that human-figure scenes were proportionately fewer. Unfortunately also, the finest narrative school, Chiot, was a delicate fabric which does not preserve well. Another contrast with Attic is in the date of the examples. Though the earliest examples are late

7th century, the bulk of the East Greek material is post-550; Attic Bf produces many more examples than East Greece in the first half of the century. For this, however, the nature of the materials is probably largely responsible, combined with the troubled history of the East Greek cities at this time. The pre-550 East Greek examples are of fine quality and fully-developed type, and there is no reason to suppose that they were alone.

Over the whole East Greek area, the gorgons and gorgoneia are by no means completely homogeneous, but certain very definite characteristics emerge. One of the chief points to be noted is that, unlike their Attic and Laconian counterparts (not to mention small groups such as the shield-bands and Chalcidian), the East Greek examples are free from obvious Corinthian influence. The strong stylization of line and love of pattern which mark Corinthian gorgoneia are almost entirely absent; one result of this is that the mask-like, inhuman effect is lessened. The one gorgoneion from East Greece which does show undoubted 'Corinthian' traits (A.11, the sandalled-foot aryballos), stands out strikingly from the rest.²⁷⁷

In general among all gorgons and gorgoneia from the East Greek area, beards are extremely rare, and, where they exist, grow beneath the chin only (A.1, A.11, C.1,); the exceptions are the bronze gorgon, E.i, and the bronze disc E.5. This is a marked difference from Corinthian and Attic, where, though the gorgons are often beardless, gorgoneia with beard from ear to ear are easily in the majority. The only example with a moustache is A.11, mentioned above.

'Beauty-spots' are extremely rare, and unlike any of the mainland varieties. The plastic vase, A.1a, has a pair of vertical lines on the forehead on either side of the central parting; these are incised and painted, and it is difficult to guess their significance. Two of the coin-gorgoneia, G.3 (Parium) and G.14 (?Selge), have forehead-marks, G.3 a crescent on its back, G.14 a large circle. Several of the examples in relief have a single vertical 'crease' in the centre of the brow: A.10; C.2, C.10, C.14; E.i; G.4, G.5.

A number of examples have wrinkled noses: A.1a, C.5, E.4 and F.i have V-shaped wrinkles; B.1 and C.2 have a pair of horizontal lines across the bridge of the nose; C.15 and F.ii have horizontal lines all down the nose. Only the noses of A.1a, B.1, look non-human.

The details of the dress and 'equipment' of the gorgons also show a great deal of consistency.

The proportion of naked gorgons is far higher than elsewhere,²⁷⁸ thanks to the gems: H.ii,v, viii-xi,xiii. These are not completely isolated, however, if the Delphi gold plaque, J.i, be East Greek. This characteristic must be attributable to oriental influence.

Most of the clothed gorgons have a long or longish robe, in the case of the gems often open down one side of the skirt. The exceptions are B.ii, E.ii,iii,iv. This is in direct opposition to other schools or regions, where short skirts are very much in the majority.²⁷⁹

Almost all the winged gorgons have upcurving wings, the number varying between two and four; the exceptions are B.ii, E.ii, which have one pair of downward-pointing wings. The earliest winged gorgon

B.i, the 'gorgon-potnia' of the Rhodes plate, has four wings; this contrasts with the earliest winged gorgons of other schools (approximately contemporary), who have only two wings.²⁸⁰

Not all the gorgons by any means are booted, but those whose boots or feet are winged, with one possible exception, have a single up-curving wing at the back.²⁸¹ Some of the seal-gorgons appear to have winged feet: H.i, ix, xiv, xvi. B.ii is once more an outsider: she has what may be a down-curving wing at the front of her boots; it may, however, simply be a tongue.

There are no snake-girdles. Eight gorgons, mainly on seals, hold snakes in their hands²⁸² (two of these, H.iii,iv, hold only one snake). In one case, B.iv, the situla gorgon (two cases, if the Delphi gold plaque, J.i, be East Greek), the snakes are looped, though they are not held by their loops as in the two Attic examples.²⁸³ Six gorgons hold something other than snakes (four, lions,²⁸⁴ H.i,xii, xiii, xvii; one, birds, B.i; one, the Didyma gorgon, D.i, a mysterious object).²⁸⁵ The gorgon of the antefix C.15, uniquely, holds a pair of her own head-snakes.

Before going on to analyse the more specific distinguishing characteristics of the East Greek group, I should like to mention, briefly, a small number of examples whose style in some way seems to belie their East Greek find-places. For the sandalled-foot aryballos, A.11, see Appendix 1. And for the cup-fragment B.ii, see the catalogue-entry.

The bronze gorgons, E.i-iv, and the ivories, F.i, ii, cause

uneasiness: they have none of the important East Greek characteristics, and some at least seem to have definite connections with mainland work. This applies most strongly to E.iii,iv, the bronze handle-gorgons, with their close resemblances to Peloponnesian bronze-work. Though later, they are of the general type of some of the shield-band gorgons, and their handles are extremely similar to some of those of the 'Laconian' volute-kraters with gorgon-busts²⁸⁶ (though their faces are not strikingly similar). E.ii, though without specifically East Greek features (with the doubtful exception of the hair-style) may be a local 'provincial' work: its rough quality perhaps makes it unlikely that it would have been imported.

E.i should for the moment be given the benefit of the doubt: she is early, has no positive characteristics which definitely point away from East Greece (two certain East Greek examples have beards), and her dress seems to favour an East Greek (or Cycladic, or Cretan) origin. The hair-style, with hair-band at the back only, holding the hair behind the ears, is by no means uncommon in mainland art, but the similar combination of dress and hair-style on the bronze-relief with Clytemnestra and Cassandra from the Argive Heraion²⁸⁷ is intriguing. For scholars' opinions on F.i and ii, see the catalogue.

As there can be no certainty about the origin of these examples, they are included as East Greek in any statistics quoted.

When the East Greek examples have been roughly grouped according to style, a study of the find-places and cities of origin shows that there is a main group whose centre is the central coastal area of

Asia Minor and the islands, between Lesbos and Miletus (that is, southern Aeolis and Ionia), with a scatter further afield, including a strong 'Rhodian' sub-group composed almost entirely of plastic vases. Besides, there is a small northern 'fringe' group, and a larger southern one.

The 'northern fringe group' consists simply of two architectural terracottas, a sima-fragment and an antefix, C.10,11, from Milesian colonies on the Black Sea, Olbia and Istros. These are likely to be local work, and are very different from the antefixes from Miletus itself (though see the catalogue for the light band around the head of the Olbia fragment). The Istros antefix, with a pair of snakes emerging from under the chin, is of a type which appears in other parts of Greece;²⁸⁸ it may not be without East Greek connections,²⁸⁹ but examples from Asia Minor are so far lacking.

The coin-gorgoneion, G.4, from another Black Sea colony of Miletus, Apollonia Pontica, fits with the main group. The gem from Pantikapaion, H.xiv, was almost certainly not made there; the same applies to B.ii (from Tariverde) and E.iii, (from Martonosha).

The Thasos and Neapolis gorgoneia, listed among the Cycladic examples, should perhaps be mentioned briefly here. They are in some ways closer to mainland types,²⁹⁰ but have certain links with the East Greek group: c.1-3, and g.2b all have fangs near or touching the tongue, and c.3 also has disc ear-rings. The tongue-and-dentil frame of c.1 and 2 recalls the upper borders of the simas of Åkerström's Group 3 from Larisa;²⁹¹ cf. also the antefix from Cebren, C.12. The terracotta fragment c.4 seems almost certainly to have had looped snakes.

The 'southern fringe group' is composed of seal-stones. These show strong oriental influence in iconography and sometimes in seal-type, and clearly come from an area where Greek and oriental cultures met directly. Boardman has pointed this out, and discussed it admirably, in AGG.²⁹² Cyprus seems a distinct possibility for the home of the gems (though somewhat later Cypriot coin-types, G.12,13, fit with the main group). The Tables, as well as the eye, show that the gems, though sharing some characteristics of the main group, notably the love of snakes, are in many ways distinct. In some respects, the absence of fangs, and ear-rings, for instance, and possibly even of looped snakes, the size of the stones could be responsible; this cannot, however, apply to the gorgoneia.

The most distinctive feature of the main East Greek group (which consists largely of gorgoneia) is the snakes. Gorgoneia with mixed looped and unlooped snakes in the hair and around the lower part of the face are among the earliest known East Greek examples in the late 7th century (A.1-3; A.6). Before the mid-6th century are two bronze votive-shields from Samos (E.3,4) bearing gorgoneia with one row of small curls over the brow, and an almost complete circle of large snakes, looped in the middle of their bodies, round the head. E.3 also displays two other features which are common among East Greek examples, especially of this group, but very rare elsewhere: disc ear-rings, and fangs which touch the tongue instead of appearing at the corners of the mouth. This is the earliest surviving example with disc ear-rings, but fangs touching or very near the tongue also occur on three of the gorgoneion aryballoi (A.2-4), which are earlier. The antefix C.15, probably

also slightly earlier than 550, has mixed looped and unlooped snakes (and disc ear-rings).

The position and arrangement of the snakes varies slightly within the group, and there are various combinations of straight and looped snakes. This applies to examples in all materials. Almost invariably, however, the snakes around the lower part of the face are larger than the rest. Some examples have snakes regularly all round the head (B.4,5; G.7,10,12), while more have a gap immediately under chin, sometimes filled by a beard (C.1, E.3?) or a lotus (B.3). Four of the gorgoneion aryballoi have a pair of snakes springing from the corners of the jaw and meeting below the tongue: in A.4,5, these snakes are U-shaped, in A.3,6, they are looped. In C.15 the pair of chin-snakes extends outwards; there are a number of similar examples after 550 B.C. (A.7, C.13), and this type continues on gems (H.1,5) and in several of the coin-gorgoneia (G.5,6,9,11). The aryballoi have no snakes actually growing from the top of the head: those visible there have crawled upwards from behind the ears.

The Larisa sima gorgoneion, C.5, is unique in having tightly-entwined snakes around the top of the head.

The Didyma gorgon, D.i, has snakes around the top of the head only; the situla gorgon, B,iv, and the Kizilbel gorgon, I.i, have them beneath the chin too.

An interesting point is that a number of the gorgoneia with looped snakes have no hair: two examples on Clazomenian sarcophagi, five or more antefixes, and four or five coins (B.4,5; C.1,2,3,5?,7,9?,12?;

G.5,6,7,10,?11). This is exceedingly rare elsewhere, and no exact parallel is known: the shield-band gorgons, VIIe and XXXg, (Pl.33f,g), have snakes instead of hair over the brow, but hair at the sides (cf. cat.C.8); while the shield-band gorgoneion XXVIz, (Pl.33h), and the Mon Repos antefix, (Pl.29b) have snakes over the brow, and a large beard from ear to ear.

The majority of the members of the main group, are later than 550 B.C. (in the case of some of the architectural terracottas, perhaps not quite so much later as Åkerström suggests):²⁹³ these are, the architectural terracottas (except C.15), and sculptures, most of the painted examples, and most of the coins.²⁹⁴ A high proportion of them, far higher than in any other school, have fangs touching the tongue, and a fair number, also far greater than in any other school, wear disc ear-rings. Further discussion of these details follows below.

A development of the later 6th century is the 'pear-shaped' face. Its beginnings are visible in such mid-6th century examples as the bronze E.4, and the pottery gorgoneion B.3, and in the third quarter of the century the Didyma gorgon, D.i, and various antefixes (e.g. C.1,3) show a mild form of it. The fully developed form is to be seen in coin-gorgoneia such as G.4,5 of the early 5th century (cf. also the East Greek bronze shield-device from Olympia, J.1).

As with any other regional group of gorgons and gorgoneia, there are a few 'misfits' which fall within the geographical area of the group, and which, despite their unorthodox appearance, are certainly local products. Such are the Chiot Bf gorgoneion, B.2, the Pitane

dish gorgoneion, B.1, and the gorgon of the Rhodes plate, B.i; the first is a scrappy piece of filling, but the last two are bold and original designs of good quality. The bronze disc from Neandria, E.5, ^{p 13} is an enigma which, if Greek at all, is probably East Greek (see cat.).

Quite a number of the East Greek group, including some of the most interesting, have been found within the last fifteen years: e.g. A.1b, A.8, B.1, C.3,4,15, E.3,4, and, the latest and one of the most important, the gorgon from the 'Beheading of Medusa' scene in the painted tomb at Kizilbel (I.i).

The position of the East Greek gorgon/gorgoneion in archaic art.

Since Furtwängler, who in his article 'Gorgo' in Roscher's Lexikon²⁹⁵ attributed almost every type of gorgon and gorgoneion to Ionia, East Greek gorgons and gorgoneia have been sadly neglected or misjudged by even the most distinguished scholars.

A recent example is Å.Åkerström, in his discussion of the Larisa gorgoneion, C.5, in ATK 60-61. Rejecting Furtwängler's 'Pan-Ionist' view, he says: 'Es dürfte nunmehr als sicher gelten, dass es [das Gorgoneion] in Korinth entstanden ist, und dass eine typologische Klassifikation in festländische und ionische Formen undurchführbar ist. Man tut am besten, nur mit einem einzigen Typus, aber mit vielen Varianten zu rechnen.... Nach Payne ist das Gorgoneion in Ionien später, scheint erst nach 550 allgemeiner zu werden.' Furtwängler also believed that there was just one basic gorgoneion type, but that, different regions preferring different characteristics, such as beards

or animal-skins, recognizable local sub-types were produced. Åkerström, if I understand him correctly, disagrees not only with Furtwängler's view of the origin of the basic type, but also with the idea that local preferences may be consistent enough for local (or at least, mainland and Ionian) varieties to be distinguishable from one another, (op.cit. 61, '... können Vergleiche nur einen annähernden Bescheid geben.'). This is a surprising conclusion, particularly as six at least, and possibly eight, of the ten gorgoneia listed by him have looped snakes round the head.

The descriptions and tables of this chapter will, I hope, show convincingly that it is perfectly possible, broadly speaking, to distinguish between mainland and East Greek gorgons and gorgoneia, although, of course, there are exceptions to every rule.

Åkerström refers to Payne, whose opinion on this subject, as on many others, cannot be ignored, not least because of its influence (Riccioni²⁹⁶ and, most recently, Karagiorga,²⁹⁷ as well as Åkerström, follow him, despite the fact that material new since his day has thrown fresh light on the question - for instance, Payne knew neither the Samos bronze votive-shields nor many of the terracotta antefixes).

Payne says, (NC 88) '...the majority [of Ionian gorgons and gorgoneia] are works of the second half of the 6th century, and are clearly under the influence of the mainland type.

'The poverty and scarcity of the early Ionian material therefore make it quite certain that though the original stimulus from the Orient may or may not have come through Ionia, Ionian artists did nothing

towards the development or the popularization of the archaic gorgon type. The principal tradition originated in Corinth and passed to Attica; from about the middle of the 6th century an Attic or Atticizing type became common property in the Aegean area.'

It seems to me ²⁹⁸ that it is no longer so clear as it apparently seemed in his day that the influence went from west to east in the 6th century rather than vice versa. There are obviously points of resemblance between the central group of East Greek gorgons and gorgoneia and Attic examples of the not-so-Corinthian type, (that is, with snakes in the hair), but is it really true to say that the East Greek group is of 'an Attic or Atticizing type'?

In considering this question, the two most important factors to be borne in mind are: (1) Priority, and (2) Homogeneity. The chief relevant characteristics are: A. Looped snakes; B. Fangs touching the tongue; C. Disc ear-rings.

Before starting to examine these characteristics, a short digression on snakes in general: Payne, NC 86, claims for Corinth the invention of snakes in the hair of gorgons (as well as round their waists). He cites the Thermon metope, (Pl. 29a), the Corfu pediment, (Pl. 29c), two LC gorgons (snake-girdles), and 'various Argive-Corinthian bronze reliefs'.

The Thermon metope, ²⁹⁹ the earliest of these by some forty years, is not sufficient to prove the claim: it differs considerably from the 'standard' Corinthian type, and, more important, the snakes do not grow from the hair. A fragmentary metope from Kalydon, ³⁰⁰ of about

the same date, appears to have a pair of snakes springing from the sides of the neck, climbing behind the ears, and curving down above the eyebrows, but these again are not really hair-snakes. The Corinthian examples with snakes truly growing from the hair (the Mon Repos antefix of c.600 B.C., (Pl. 296)³⁰¹, which was unknown to Payne, and the Corfu gorgon) have contemporaries in several areas - East Greece, Laconia, and even Attica - so that they cannot be used to support the claim for Corinth. Account must also be taken of the Eleusis amphora,³⁰² which antedates the Thermon metope by up to forty years; we cannot be sure that the snakes growing from the gorgons' heads are simply imitating oriental animal-protomes, and not already connected with the gorgons in at least one version of the myth. The Carchemish and Olympia shields too are earlier than the Mon Repos antefix, and may be as early as the Thermon metope. In mentioning these last three examples, I am not trying to make a counter-claim on behalf of Attica or East Greece, but simply showing that Payne's claim for Corinth is far from strong, and that the question of the 'invention' of the gorgons' snaky hair must remain open.

Returning to the problem of the relationship between East Greek and Attic gorgons in the 6th century, it is necessary to examine the three important East Greek characteristics:

A. Looped snakes. The earliest surviving East Greek examples with hair snakes are at least as early as the earliest Attic ones, (Pl. 48c), with the exception of the Eleusis amphora.³⁰³ Looped snakes appear, along with simple curved ones, on these earliest East Greek examples

in the late 7th century, and are by far the commonest type of hair-snakes in the main East Greek group. From the beginning there are two slightly different types: those with the loop at the tail (the more numerous), and those with the loop in the middle of their bodies (see, e.g., B.3, C.3, for both types). Occasionally in the former type the tail does not quite touch the body (one example, C.4), and there is one late example where the snakes are coiled (C.14, 5th cent.). So far as I know, there are no exact parallels for the second variant on Attic pottery, though see p.164 for the Heidelberg Painter's gorgon, (Pl. 52a), which has two pairs of snakes which are very close. Of the first type, there are no surviving examples in Attica before c.550 (the Heidelberg Painter's gorgon again),³⁰⁴ then a few in the second half of the century, (Pl. 52c) c.525 B.C. It is only with the Rf period, and more specifically, at the end of the 6th century and in the early 5th century, that beardless gorgoneia with curled snakes all round the head gain popularity in Attic vase-painting. A few examples have true looped snakes, more have thin, spiral-coiled ones. (Pl. 49). There are also a few contemporary examples with looped snakes in other materials.³⁰⁵ (Curiously, true looped snakes appear more frequently in Attic on Athena's aegis, the earliest known to me being on an amphora by the Amasis Painter, c.540-30 B.C.) (Pl. 52b)³⁰⁶. None of the Attic examples is without hair.

It is impossible, therefore, that the East Greek looped snake could have derived from Attic examples. There is no doubt that looped snakes appear much earlier in East Greece (as well as being much commoner there, and much more consistent in type).

The only other early examples of looped snakes are Corinthian and 'Argive-Corinthian'. Very close to the East Greek type are those of the Corfu gorgon,³⁰⁷ whose date is probably somewhere in the first quarter of the 6th century. She has a fringe of snakes, looped in a unique way, framing her brow on top of her hair. She also has an unlooped pair springing out horizontally at the sides of the neck, rather like some of the East Greek gorgoneion aryballoi. The gorgoneion of the Mon Repos antefix,³⁰⁸ c.600 B.C., has rather wild, twining snakes across the brow: they bear a very slight resemblance to the looped type, in that the tips of their tails are tightly curled-over. Probably most like the East Greek ones, though not truly looped, are the brow-snakes of the shield-band gorgons, VIIe and XXXg, (Pl.33f,g).³⁰⁹

From this it seems very likely that the looped snake was an East Greek invention; however, an element of doubt must remain, as the Corinthian examples (even though they are the only Corinthian examples known with any kind of hair-snake) are close in date to the early East Greek ones.

For late examples of looped hair-snakes in other schools, see pp.146, 147, 155.

B. Fangs close to, or touching the tongue. There is a striking difference here too between the East Greek examples and those of Attica (and of other schools). Of the East Greek examples, 36 have fangs, and 26 of these have fangs close to or touching the tongue. From Attica, the numbers are 7 out of 36. The earliest East Greek example (excluding the Carchemish shield) is one of the plastic vases, A.2, dated c.610 B.C., and there are several other examples before 550 B.C.

The earliest Attic example is on the Gorgon Painter's dinos,³¹⁰ a small, almost unnoticeable pair of fangs, near the tongue. The next is the Heidelberg Painter's gorgon, (Pl. 52a), (also the earliest example with a kind of looped snake). The rest are late 6th century, and include the marble votive-shield and the terracotta antefix discussed below, p. 187 . (Pl. 50a,e).

In contrast, there are 7 out of 36 East Greek examples with fangs at the edges of the mouth, as against 21 out of 36 Attic examples. (These numbers, with percentages, are set out in the tables).

In other mainland schools the number of examples with fangs touching the tongue is negligible (one at Corinth).³¹¹

C. Disc ear-rings. These first appear on East Greek gorgons in the second quarter of the 6th century (E.3, the earlier of the Samos votive-shields, and the antefix C.15), and there are 18 examples in all, spread over the rest of the 6th century and the early 5th century. Though some Attic Bf gorgoneia seem to have stud ear-rings, the disc type first appears in Bf, along with the coiled snakes. (Pl. 49, 64c). It also appears in a few late archaic examples in other materials, but never without the looped snakes.³¹²

For disc ear-rings in general, see Appendix 6 .

These three features are the salient ones of the East Greek group, and should therefore, according to Payne's theory, be derived from Attic art. The above examination seems to establish on the contrary their priority in East Greece (and incidentally their far greater frequency there than in any other area of Greece).

The second important factor is that of homogeneity. When we compare the East Greek central group with Attic gorgons and gorgoneia (even just with those which are not of purely Corinthian descent, i.e., which have snakes), we find that the East Greek central group is without any doubt the more homogeneous.

The complete 'East Greek' type, beardless, with looped snakes, fangs close to the tongue, and disc ear-rings, appears first in one of the Samos bronze votive shields, E.3, before 550 B.C. Only seven examples from the total of thirty-five members of the main central group (the 'Rhodian' sub-group is treated below) have all three characteristics. However, twenty-two of the twenty-nine with hair-snakes have looped snakes (in three of the twenty-nine the type of snake is not known), and the proportion of these with one of the other two characteristics also, is high. In the case of fangs, for example, they appear in seventeen of the thirty-five examples, and in fourteen out of the seventeen they touch the tongue. It should also be noted that more than a third of the group are fragmentary or, (in the case of some of the coins), too small for all their features to be certain.

Excluding three very fragmentary examples (C.8, 13, D.2), there are six examples out of the thirty-five which have none of the three main East Greek features: A.11, B.2, E.5, G.1, F.i,ii. Only two of these, A.11 and E.5, actually have any feature which is prominent in another school. Two of the six, B.2, (Chiot pottery) and G.1 (early coin of ?Miletus), are certainly East Greek. See pp.171 and 176 for comments on some of these examples.

Of the twenty-six examples with one or more of the three East Greek features, three, all antefixes, also have a feature prominent in other schools: C.1 (one variant) has a beard, under the chin only, and C.14 and 15 have fangs at, or close to, the edges of the mouth.

The 'Rhodian' appendix of the main central group, consisting chiefly of plastic vases and with 12 members in all, also has a high proportion of looped, or almost-looped, snakes, and of fangs close to the tongue. There are two examples of disc ear-rings, one being A.8, the de Kolb aryballos, which has neither of the other two features. The two earliest examples, B.i, the 'Rhodian' plate 'gorgon-potnia', and A.1, have beards under the chin, and fangs at the edges of the mouth; B.i is unique, but the hair-snakes of A.1 are certainly of the East Greek type.

Nine examples from outside the geographical area of the main central group and its 'Rhodian' sub-group are closely connected in style: B.iv, E.1,2, G.4,5,6,12,13, I.i. The coin G.13 has no snakes; E.1 (Carchemish shield) and I.i (Kizilbel gorgon) have curving snakes, the rest have looped snakes. The coins of Apollonia Pontica and Abydos (G.4,6) have all three characteristics, and several others have two of the three. Two examples (G.5,6) have no hair. None has any 'alien' characteristic.

The shape of the face (the gradually-developing pear-shape), and the proportions of the features, such as the short nose and the mouth stretching beyond the outer corners of the eyes,³¹³ though less quantifiable than the characteristics just discussed, are nonetheless

typical of the group and peculiar to it (until its late archaic Attic and Western imitations).

It will be seen from this, and from the Table, which gives the details in full, that over three-quarters of the central East Greek group is remarkably homogeneous, probably as much so as the Corinthian series. It is also independent: not only do its members share characteristics which are far more frequent here than elsewhere, they also lack almost entirely the most important characteristics of other schools. Many of the members of the group which do not share the positive traits share the negative ones.

When we compare this coherent stylistic group with the Attic gorgons and gorgoneia with snakes or any of the three 'East Greek' characteristics, the picture is strikingly different. Attic examples remain very varied, with many different combinations of features of Corinthian and non-Corinthian origin. One example may have one 'East Greek' feature, a second another, but none, apart from the two discussed below (Besig 105,143), has them all combined and without other attributes derivable from a different source. For instance, the earliest Attic gorgon with looped snakes, on a Siana cup by the Heidelberg Painter, also has fangs touching the tongue, but combines these with hair and luxuriant beard of the Corinthian type, and, over her short tunic, wears an animal-skin (see B.ii). The other pottery examples with looped snakes have fangs at the edges of the mouth (e.g. Besig 141),³¹⁴ or none at all (e.g. Besig 86,133).³¹⁵ The gorgoneion by the Amasis Painter (Besig 108)³¹⁶ has fangs touching the tongue, but

has no snakes, and is otherwise 'Corinthian' in type. The examples with unlooped snakes are very often bearded,³¹⁷ and, if they have fangs, have them at the edges of the mouth.

The closest likenesses to the East Greek group are without doubt to be found among the Ef shield-gorgoneia, especially Besig 133, by Epiktetos (despite absence of fangs), and, of those with thin, spiral-curved snakes, Besig 149 (Epiktetos II), and the Berlin Painter's gorgoneia.³¹⁸

An interesting fact is that among the few gorgons and gorgoneia in other materials from Attica (thirteen in my list) are the only two examples of the full 'East Greek' type, and two more with looped snakes. All four are of the later 6th century. The two last-mentioned, (Besig 151, 157), are Attic in appearance apart from the snakes (Besig 151 is actually from Eretria, Athena's aegis-gorgoneion from the temple of Apollo Daphnephoros).³¹⁹ The two former are:

1. Pl. 50d. A fragmentary votive-shield of Island marble, from the Acropolis.³²⁰ The marble is broken below the chin, but it seems likely that the snakes encircled the head. The face is fierce, with wrinkled brow, and is slightly pear-shaped.
2. Pl. 50e. A series of terracotta antefixes from the Acropolis,³²¹ all from the same mould (two complete examples, and fragments of about nine others, with some variation in the painted details, e.g. the ear-ring pattern). The face is fat, fleshy, and slightly pear-shaped. There are no snakes over the brow, but a pair of looped ones springs outwards from under the chin. The ears are decorated by ear-

rings of a type well-known from Cypriot sculpture and from East Greek examples such as the ivory priestess from Ephesus, and Clazomenian pottery and sarcophagi.³²²

Both are of good workmanship, and the antefixes are made from well-refined clay of the kind used for vases and terracottas, instead of the coarser clay normally used for Attic antefixes.

These two isolated examples of the later 6th century can do nothing to support Payne's theory. They seem concrete proof of East Greek influence in Athens, and indeed are very probably the work of East Greek craftsmen.

This examination, I believe, shows decisively that the East Greek gorgoneia of the central group are both earlier and more homogeneous than their nearest counterparts in Attic art. Therefore Payne's theory of the Attic gorgoneion's influence on East Greece after 550 B.C. cannot stand. The factor of homogeneity would also defeat any theory of Attic influence before 550, even if it were not highly improbable on other grounds: the overwhelming influence of Corinth on Attic pottery in the late 7th and early 6th centuries makes the complete absence of an Attic model for the 'East Greek' type seem more than an accident of survival; at that time, too, Attic pottery was comparatively little exported.

In short, present archaeological evidence indicates that there are no grounds for the idea that the East Greeks adopted an Attic model for their gorgoneion, and every reason to believe that, on the contrary, the Attic type was modified by East Greek influence. There is little

definite evidence for East Greek influence on Attic art before about the middle of the 6th century, but after this it becomes gradually stronger and, in the present case, culminates in the shield-gorgoneia, which must be seen as an adaptation, albeit a thoroughly Atticized one, of the East Greek type. There is nothing surprising in this conclusion: East Greek influence on other branches of Attic art, notably sculpture and architecture, in the second half of the 6th century has long been recognized.

No other school of Greek art can claim to have been the source of, or even to have influenced, the East Greek gorgoneion-type, and indeed, in the west, just as in Attica, there is irrefutable evidence of the arrival of the East Greek type to challenge or replace the earlier 'mainland' one in the later 6th century.³²³ It seems likely, considering the date, that emigrants fleeing the Persians were responsible for this, rather than simple trade.

The simplest and most satisfactory theory, based firmly on the evidence, is that East Greece shared with the rest of Greece the basic gorgoneion with large, grimacing mouth, staring eyes, protruding tongue and fangs (whatever the origin of this type), but that from the late 7th century at least, it had its own highly individual conception of the gorgoneion's attributes, remaining throughout almost completely impervious to influence from other Greek types, and exporting its own type in the late archaic period.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Much ink has been spilled on the question of the exact significance of the 'Gorgon-Potnia', to little result. Kunze's remarks (op.cit.) are among the most sensible, and he is surely right in saying that the creature on this plate is a Gorgon, and not just some kind of nature-deity (cf., of recent opponents of this view, Schiering, op.cit.). The most recent long discussion of the 'Gorgon-Potnia', that of Christou, is extremely confused and distorted (see also H.xvii, and n.25). Speaking of this plate, he even implies that the filling ornaments support his identification of the 'Gorgon-Potnia' with the potnia theron, saying that they 'are motifs known from other representations of the goddess with animals', - Boeotian and Melian. He omits to mention that they are also part of the common repertoire of Aegean pottery at this time, occurring together on many pots (cf. only A/H/S pl.27, or Schiering, Werkstätten pl.8.1), and separately on countless others, where there is no potnia theron. Incidentally, of the eleven examples of the 'Gorgo mit Tieren' listed by him, op.cit. pp.227-228, nos. 8 and 9 are not gorgons, not belt-decoration, and not even Greek (see Spartz 51ff, H.V. Herrmann, JdI 81,1966 138, and now U. Jantzen, Samos VIII, 59ff, pl.53).
2. Although the position of the figure-decoration, on the interior of the cup, is not Attic, the gorgon herself is very Attic in

appearance. Furtwängler (Roscher, 'Gorgo' col. 1711) first noted the fondness of Attic gorgons for animal-skins: 'Häufig, namentlich auf den altattischen Vasen, ist mit dem kurzen Chiton ein Fell verbunden..' A few of the many examples, from the second quarter of the 6th century to early Rf, are: C. Painter, Vatican 335, Albizzati pl.36; Heidelberg Painter, Rhodes, no number, Cl.Rh. VIII, fig. 63; Amasis Painter, BM B 471, S. Karouzou, The Amasis Painter, pl.15; Antimenes Painter, Villa Giulia 3556, CVA VG 3, pl. III He 53; Bf pinax (Acropolis), BCH 82, 1958, 663; Berlin Painter, Munich 2312, Lullies/Hirmer, Gr. Vasen pl.56. Many other characters in Attic Bf (e.g. winged daemons, maenads, Perseus, Hermes) also wear skins over their tunics. Furtwängler's words imply that he knew of examples from other schools also. I know of only three examples (excluding B.ii) which may not be Attic, and both of these, if not Attic, are under strong Attic influence: (i) ?Boeotian Bf ?stand, 6th century, Hesperia Art Bull. XVIII.78; see p. n.86; (ii) and (iii) ?Eretrian Bf amphora (oddly thought Clazomenian by Payne, NC 88 n.3) and hydria, AJA 45, 1941, 64ff. (D.A.Amyx).

A late 6th century Bf amphora of Cypriot shape, from Amathus, CVA BM 4, pl. III He 73.3 (BM excavations, 1894, Tomb 78), has a 'Harpy' on one side and a 'Boread' on the other, wearing short chitons and skins, and with four wings. This vase is probably of local manufacture, but again, clearly influenced by Attic Bf.

The Tariverde gorgon also wears boots of the type most common in archaic Attic art (Yalouris, BCH 77, 1953, 293ff.). Her entire

appearance is consistent with an Attic origin, and alien to the other East Greek examples (admittedly few). If not Attic, she is undoubtedly Atticizing.

3. Four other examples known to me hold looped snakes in their hands: i. J.i.; ii. Campanian antefix, Koch, DK pl.36; iii. Siana cup, Heidelberg Painter (pl. 52a); iv. amphora, Antimenes Painter, CVA Villa Giulia 3, pls. III H e 53,54. The two Attic gorgons, unlike B.iv. and the other two examples, hold their snakes by the loops. A number of other examples hold unlooped snakes: e.g. H.ii,iii,v,^{vii},xi,xiv (gems); terracotta arula, Selinus, Mon.Ant. 32,191; shield-band, Ol.Forsch. II pl.40; bronze shield-device, Olympia B.4990, ADelt. 17, 1961-62, Chron.119,pl.136; Chalcidian, Rumpf, Ch.V. pl.141; Ruvo greave, Walters, Select Bronzes in the BM,pl.V; Paros gorgon, d.i; unpublished sherd belonging to Prof.C.M. Robertson, Attic, c.550. The last three have the snakes wound round their arms too. One or two examples hold one snake only: e.g. H.iv; early Bf amphora, Annali 1866, pl.R. There are no certain East Greek examples with snake-girdle. The holding of snakes in the hands, as opposed to having a snake-girdle, has been considered an oriental feature (by, e.g., Besig 54ff). Kunze, however (Ol.Forsch. II 68) believed it to be simply a variant of the Greek snake-girdle. From the above examples it seems that the type was occasionally used in most parts of Greece in the 6th century (hardly any of the above examples being before 550), in most cases doubtless without direct eastern influence. Certainly, however, earlier examples of Bes holding snakes in a similar way are

known (see Boardman, AGG 29,31, and, e.g. H.Bossert, Die Ausgrabungen auf dem Karatepe, I Vorbericht, Abb.89 (late 8th cent.), and RDAC 1971 62, fig.2, from Cyprus, early 6th cent.). I owe the last reference to Miss V. Wilson. The influence of this type on the East Greek examples, particularly the gems, seems highly likely. A 'potnia' with snakes appears on a fragmentary plate of 'Paro-Phasian' fabric from Thasos, Inv.28857.

4. Gorgons and gorgoneia with only one pair of fangs are not very rare, but seem generally to be early, and often rather odd in other ways: e.g., lower jaw: East Greek, B.i, E.1; Laconian: AO fig.47d; pl.CII; BSA 34, 1933-34, pl.38h; AE 1927-28 fig.32; Boeotian: Fairbanks pl.67; Attic Rf: FR pl.84; Graef II pl.81, no.1041. Upper jaw: PC: Payne, NC 80, no.3; EC: Perachora II 62, no.1611; Cycladic: d.2.

5. Though cf. the 5th cent. antefix from Sabucina, with rouge-like patches of paint on the cheek-bones: Fasti Arch. 18-19, 1963-64, pl.22, fig.72, (here pl. 43a).

6. e.g. Emporio 130-131, pl.40 no.403.

7. He is almost certainly right about this. The shape of the antefixes is the same, the sizes given almost identical. The gorgoneia themselves, though obviously of the same type, differ somewhat in general appearance: e.g. one of the Didyma moulds has a pear-shaped face, another a beard, and the features as a whole look rather larger and coarser than those of the one Kalabaktepe mould illustrated.

Taking into account, however, the fact that other antefix-types from the two places look identical (e.g. lotus, Miletus I.8, Beil.II B, = Didyma I pl.222 F670; frontal lion-head with front paws, Miletus I.8, Beil. II A = Didyma I pl.223, F674), the odds in favour of a single workshop seem overwhelming.

8. Could this be the 'missing link' between the East Greek gorgoneion-antefixes and those of S.Italy and Sicily? Compare the Tarentine type, Arch. Class. 6,1954, pl.70.2. C.14 may be a late manifestation of this type in East Greece.

9. This is the only surviving East Greek antefix, apart from the remarkable C.15, to show more than just the gorgoneion: it is almost a bust, rather than a simple mask. In this it recalls some Etruscan gorgoneion terracottas of the late 6th century, from Caere (Andrén pl.10.36) and Veii (Andrén pl.1), which also have necklaces, and are of East Greek type; cf.also the 'Maenad' type, such as Andrén pl.2.4. Possibly earlier East Greek examples existed (though some of the Campanian antefixes, with gorgoneia of 'mainland' type, also seem to indicate the top of the dress: e.g. Andrén pl.10.32, from Caere).

10. Perhaps the attitude owes something to figures of Bes such as the relief-sculpture from Karatepe, H.Bossert et al., Die Ausgrabungen auf dem Karatepe, I Vorbericht, Abb.89; here Bes holds up a pair of snakes (not attached to his head). The gorgon's horns may, (in this case at least), also recall the horned feather-crown worn by Bes and other eastern deities, e.g. Bossert, op.cit.Abb. 78 , or Tell Halaf III pls. 10,108?

11. Gruben dates the Berlin gorgon slightly later than the Istanbul one, (c.520 and 530 respectively), on the grounds that the drapery is freer and more skilful (he compares the Siphnian Treasury), and the treatment of the figure, with head freed from the architrave, more daring and advanced. This would mean that the east end of the peristasis was started first (Gruben produces the analogy of the Polycrates temple at the Samian Heraion).

12. Jantzen, op.cit., like Ridder and others, draws attention to the description (Hdt. IV 152) of the bronze cauldron dedicated to Hera by Kolaios of Samos about 638 B.C. This was supported by three kneeling bronze figures, unfortunately many times larger than ours (11.5 feet high!). He appears to think that the cauldron stood directly on the heads of the figures, and judges our gorgon to be a 6th century example of this type. The lion-foot and struts, however, seem to indicate a tripod such as that belonging to the cauldron from La Garenne near Vix (Jantzen, op.cit. 80ff, pl.58).

Reference is also made to Pausanias' mention (II.22.2) of a bronze bowl, not very large, supported by 'ancient statues of Artemis, Zeus and Athena', in the Agora at Argos.

A surviving example of a bronze krater 'supported' by kneeling gorgons is one of those from Trebenishte, now in the National Museum, Belgrade, Inv.174/I, (JdI 45, 1930, AA 276 ff, especially Abb.15); a more modern photograph, L.Popović, Katalog nalaza iz Nekropole kod Trebeništa, Narodni Musej Beograd, Antika I (1956), pls.23,23c.).

This volute-krater, however, is of the late 6th century, and the gorgons

are only 3"-4" high. Our gorgon is certainly one of the largest surviving cast-bronze figures of the 7th century (and indeed of the archaic period); a Late Geometric (c.700-675) 'ring-handle holder' from a tripod is 36.7 cms. (Ol.Ber.VII,151, pl.62), and some mid-7th century cast griffin protomes are about this size (U.Jantzen, Gr.Greifenkessel nos.80,81 (36 cms.), 71 (37 cms.).

13. B.Filow, Die Nekropole von Trebenische (1927), no.63, pl.8 (First Trebenische krater); K.Joffroy, Le Trésor de Vix pl.xx, Inv.Belgrade 174/1 (Second Treb.krater). Both are gorgon-busts, with no wings visible from the front.
14. Schefold, ML 36; R.Hampe, AM 60-61, 1935-36, 228
15. e.g. the bone disc, AO 219, pl.121.1 (mentioned by Kunze).
16. Ol.Forsch. II,137.
17. Altsam.St. IV, 1960, fig.240.
18. Altsam.St. IV, 1960, fig.251.
19. e.g. Langlotz, Magna Graecia pl.I; Ol Forsch. II pl.39.
20. e.g. André pl.10.36; this cat.C.14; possible Ol.Forsch II pl.25.
21. I owe my knowledge of the following coins to Dr.C.M.Kraay: G.1, G.13, G.15, and g.1' in the Cycladic section. I should like to thank him also for advising me on dates and supplying references.

22. Compare the electrum coins attributed to Miletus by Babelon, Traité pl.I 20,21 (stater, panther-heads back to back), and 22, 23 (trite, single panther head). The incuses, especially those of the staters, are very close to those of G.la. and b. (See pl. 17). For double gorgoneia, compare a green jasper scarab from Tharros, AG I pl.15.71, Riccioni fig.31, with two gorgoneia which share, not the tongue only, but the whole mouth.
23. Dr. C.M.Kraay informs me that he believes the terminal date for the Larnaca hoard to be too high. This coin-type may therefore be later than 480, especially as, in his opinion, it looks among the latest in the hoard. The fact remains, however, that the gorgoneion is pure late archaic in appearance.
24. The mysterious figure on the left recalls that on one of the gems where a gorgon kills a lion (H.xiii). Here too the figure stretches out an arm. On H.xv. however, the 'helper' holds up something which looks like a stick or sword in her outstretched left hand, as well as a mysterious object in her right hand.
25. Christou (op.cit.) obsessed with the idea that the Gorgon with animals is simply an aspect of the potnia theron, maintains that 'Herakles' on this gem is really the potnia's male consort, the potnios theron, and that the representation therefore shows that the potnia theron and the Gorgon with animals are identical!
26. An early Classical scaraboid with looped snakes, Boardman, Greek Gems and Finger-Rings, 287, no.458. This need not be East Greek,

as by this time (second quarter of the 5th century) these snakes had spread to other parts of Greece, notably Attica and Magna Graecia.

27. Lullies/Hirmer, Gr.Vasen pl.56. Cf. also two late 6th century examples from Sicilian clay arulae: Kiccioni fig.52 (Agrigento); Mon.Ant. 32, pl.35.1 (Selinus).
28. Dr. Dian Duryea now confirms this in a letter.
29. e.g. CVA Vienna 1, pl. Deutschland 228 no.9 (alabastron): a disc with three wings; J.Sieveking and R.Hackl, Die Königl.Vasensammlung zu München, no.298, pl.9 (globular aryballos): small disc with rosette, with four large wings.
30. There are a number of other spotty-faced gorgoneia, all Corinthian:
 i) Payne, NC 283, no.360; ii) NC 286, no.457, pl.20.1,2, fig.24B; NC 297, no.718 (all EC), and iv) NC 318 no.1188, fig.25D (MC). Dugas, *op.cit.* 10, suggests that the spots of Delos Bc 19 were assimilated from a panther-head associated with the gorgoneion on the object which the Cycladic painter took as his model (he has in mind a shield like those on the Monteleone chariot). As no bronze-relief lions or lion-heads of the period survive from the Cyclades, Dugas' theory cannot be tested; virtually no surviving 7th century metal-reliefs can definitely be attributed to Corinth either. It is, however, perhaps worth noting that, although considerable numbers of felines with spotty bodies appear on both Cycladic and Corinthian pottery, almost all have spot-less faces. A few have spots immediately round the mouth to denote the coarse whiskers of the muzzle (e.g. Cycladic: Dugas, *op.cit.* pl.29;

Acta Arch. 33,1962; 237,fig.6; Corinthian: NC pl.9.1). Proto-Attic is similar: see K.Kühler, Altattische Malerei pls.40,42,47, (though an example with completely spotty face occurs, A.Reugebauer, Antiken in Deutschen Privatbesitz 59 no.142). The gorgoneia, however, have spots either all over the face, or on the upper part only, leaving the mouth and chin clear, so that, if there was a borrowing at all, it seems to have been of motif only.

Whatever the origin of the spots, the break of some thirty to fifty years between the Cycladic amphora and the Corinthian group seems to preclude a direct connection, but a 'missing link' is by no means impossible. (A much later spotty-faced panther, Åkerström, ATK pl.13).

31. Four 'buttons' from Greece, in the British Museum, bear gorgoneia so very like the Neapolis coin-type that it seems probable, as Haynes remarks, that they were actually made in Neapolis: D.E.L.Haynes, 'A Pin and Four Buttons from Greece', BM Quarterly 23, 1960-61,48,pl.22, (Inv.1959 7-20 2-5). The buttons, c. 1.5 cms. in diam., consist of a bronze cup filled with clay, on which the gorgoneion is stamped in relief; they were originally gilded.

Corinth

32. Payne, NC 80, fig.23 A-C; Friis Johansen, Vs, pl.34.2.

33. NC 80, fig.23 D (AD ii pl.52).

34. NC 82-87.

35. NC 82, fig.24B; Syracuse gorgon, Langlotz, Magna Graecia pl.I
See Appendix.

36. Friis Johansen, VS pl.34.2.
37. See n.33. Boardman, AGG, for sensible remarks on oriental influence.
38. ADelt. 10,1926, Parart, 36, figs. 12,13.
39. Perachora II, 151, pl.61, no.1594.
40. ASatene N.S.21-22, 1960,86.
41. ADelt. 22,1967, 364, pl.272a.
42. Ol.Forsch.II, pl.23, VIIe, pl.54, XXXg.
43. G.Rodenwaldt, Korkyra II pls.3-5. The horse-riding terracotta gorgon from Syracuse, (Langlotz, Magna Graecia pl.12) has two snakes winding round her waist then over the shoulders and up the back of the head, but these are not true hair-snakes; she is the equivalent of a painted gorgon like NC pl.43.2.
44. NC 83, fig.25 A-C.
45. NC 82, fig,24B; 83, fig.25D.
46. NC fig.24B; CVA Louvre 8, pl.III Ca 15. 28,30; ASatene N.S. 21-22, 1960,146; JHS 6, 1885,7.
47. NC fig.24 A, C; pl.43.2.
48. NC fig.27 D,E (LC); fig.26 (Corfu gorgon); Langlotz, Magna Graecia pl.12, and Aukt.Basel 34,1967,49,pl.26, no.104 (plastic vases); Perachora I pls.40,42 (bronzes).
49. NC figs. 25 E,26,27 D,E, and ADelt. 17, 1961-62, Chron. pl.281b (Corinthian); Ol.Forsch. II pl.54 (shield-band); CVA New York 2, pl.II, ASatene N.S.21-22, 1960,210,201, CVA Louvre 1, pl.IIIHd8 (Attic); Rumpf, Ch.V. pls.110,117,145 (Chalcidian). In both

Corinthian and Attic, this characteristic also appears in some other running, or flying, figures of the same date: e.g.

ASatene N.S. 21-22, 1960, 227; CVA Cambridge 2, pl. III H 24.1.

50. S.Hersom, Hesperia 21, 1952, 275-278, pl. 72. (Dated by the vase-painting parallels for the dress. Contrast Karagiorga, GK 36, n.5, 3rd quarter of 7th century).
51. Schefold, ML pl. 70b,c.
52. NC fig. 26, 27D, pl. 43.2.
53. NC fig. 24 C.
54. NC fig. 25 E, 26. On winged boots, BCH 77, 1953, 293ff. (Gialouris).
55. NC fig. 27 D, E; ADelt. 17, 1961-62, Chron. pl. 281b.
56. Perachora I pls. 34, 42.
57. See n. 50.
58. See notes 50 and 53. Also NC fig. 27 E (LC)
59. NC fig. 25 E. ^h
60. NC fig. 27 D, pl. 43.2.
61. See n. 43.
62. See n. 56.

Shield-bands

63. E.Kunze, Ol.Forsch. II (1950), 65 ff, 213ff. A more recently-discovered example with Corinthian inscription (also from Olympia), ADelt. 17, 1961-62, Chron. 120, pl. 137c.
64. C.Waldstein, The Argive Heraion II, 351 no. 4 'Two winged gorgons holding branches'. Considered Ionian by Payne, NC 88, no. 5, and n. 2, apparently because of the gorgons' long robes.

65. J.M. Cook, BSA 48, 1953, 34,56,57, pl.17.
66. Ol.Forsch. II pl.57
67. Pfuhl, MuZ fig.216 (drawing).
68. Schefold, ML pl.17.
69. Langlotz, Magna Graecia, pl.15. See R.Ross Holloway, AJA 75, 1971, 435-436, for an attempt to date the metope to the early 6th century, explaining the stepped folds of Perseus' and Athena's garments as the result of a reworking in the late 6th century.
70. Ol.Forsch. II, pls. 23,54.
71. Ol.Forsch. II, Beil.4.
72. BCH 77, 1953, 293ff.
73. Ol.Forsch. II, Beil.5.2 (Ptoion); Olympia IV pl.39.700.
74. Ol.Forsch. II pl.55
75. See above, p. 126 , and pp. 180-182
76. See above, p. 129 .
77. Ol.Forsch. II, pl.39
78. G.Rodenwaldt, Korkyra II pls.3-6; Langlotz, Magna Graecia, pl.I. Also a very fragmentary terracotta relief from Gela, Van Buren, AFR 162.2, fig.80.

Boeotia

79. Schefold, ML pl.15b. Two examples from the moulds, known, both in Paris.
80. e.g. Schefold, ML pls. 12,13. This was simply the pithos-artist's way of rendering eyes. Cf. Riccioni 149.

81. A.de Ridder, Bronzes Antiques du Louvre I, 20, no.96, pl.11, Inv.MNC 1273. Ht. 12 cms. A good photograph, Riccioni 145 fig. 27.
82. The shape of nose, the 'beard', and animal-ears, bear a curious resemblance to those of the gorgoneion on a 7th century bone seal from Sparta: AO pl.141.3.
83. (i) Thebes K.50263, from Rhitsona, BSA 14, 1907-08, 260,pl.X, ABV 30, 'Boeotian Imitators of the KX Painter'. (ii) Boston 01.8110, Fairbanks no.559,pl.67.
84. Berlin F 1727, ABV 29.1, 'Group of the Boeotian Lancers'. A good photograph, JHS 87, 1967,pl.14. For the wings, merging into the upper part of the chiton, cf. the Messos Painter's gorgons, A/H/S pls. 18,19 - one arm behind the wing in one gorgon, pl.19; and the MC or MC alabastron, JHS 6, 1885,7.
85. BSA 32, 1925-26, pl.36.
86. (i) 'the foot of a boeotian amphora or an Attic early black Figure stand... c.590 B.C.', Hesperia Art Bulletin XVIII.78; the gorgon wears an animal-skin: see p.24 and n.2. The dating must be too early. (Now in the Greek Museum of the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne). (ii) A late Bf skyphos, with on each side the beheaded Medusa flanked by her sisters: G.Nicole, Cat.des Vases Peints du Musée Nationale d'Athènes, Suppl. (1911), 181, no.923, fig.4, Inv.12267, listed by Besig as Boeotian (no.74). Cf. also p.166.
87. Other gorgon-examples: e.g., this cat. B.i, F.i (late 7th cent.

-c.600); Laconian ivory, Marangou pl.54 (c.600); Corinthian? bronze statuettes, Ferachora I pls.34,42 (mid-6th cent.); Etruscan, bucchero, Giglioli pl.53, mid-6th cent.; bronze, Schumacher, Bronzen in Karlsruhe pl.VI.1, 6th cent.; Attic? - Pouloupa, BCH 93, 1969, 867 fig.4, pl.xx.

88. (i) The finest example artistically from Boeotia, the terracotta gorgoneion antefix from the Ptoion (J.Ducat, Les Kouroi du Ptoion (1971), 419, pl.146, no.270, Athens NM 16341), is shown to be Attic by recent finds of identical antefixes in the Agora at Athens (Hesperia 39, 1970, pl.38).
- (ii) Another gorgoneion from the Ptoion, in repoussé on a small bronze plaque, with short, tufted beard and heavy brow-curly, but with no more distinctive features, J.Ducat, *op.cit.*, 334, pl.107, no.192, Athens NM 10855.
- ~~(iii) See also p.~~

Laconia,

K = Karagiorga, and refers to the catalogue in her article, ADelt.19.1, 1964, 120-122.

89. Before 650: AO pl.139 (the curious elongated chin reminiscent of the Kabirion plaque, Riccioni fig.27).
90. AO pl.102 (K.7), Marangou figs.33,37.
91. AO pl.145 (K.1).
92. e.g. AO fig.128 (K.12).
93. AO pl.56.3. But not pl.56.2.

94. e.g. AO pl.7 (K.19); BSA 34,1933-34,pl.37a (K.21), pl.38h (K.23), etc.
95. e.g. BSA 34,1933-34,pl.37a; Riccioni fig.62 (K.26).
96. Exceptions: AO pl.102; Karagiorga pl.72g.
97. e.g. AO fig.76c (not in K.); AO pl.197.26 (K.12); Karagiorga pl.71 (K.31).
98. BSA 34, 1933-34, pl.37a (K.21); AO pl.17 (not in K.); AO fig.771 (not in K.); the ivory plaque, AO pl.106 (K.15).
99. A.de Ridder, Vases de la Bibliothèque Nationale pl.V (K.24).
100. Tocra pl.63.945.
101. Riccioni fig.62 (K.26).
102. BSA 34, 1933-34, pl.38h (K.23)?; ASatene N.S.17-18,1957, 40,fig.39: snakes with cock's comb. See n.125.
103. Karagiorga 118. _____
104. e.g. Karagiorga pl.69a (K.3); pl.68d (K.17); pl.71 (K.31); pl.73b (K.37); AO pl.7 (K.19); Tocra pl.63.945; Several examples with a vertical line on the brow: BSA 34,1933-34 pl.38h (K.23); Karagiorga pl.69b (K.32); see p.170 .
Karagiorga excludes the series of bronze gorgoneia from the base of hydria-handles, which also have 'beauty-spots' of Laconian type (Karagiorga 118 n.16).
105. BSA 34,1933-34,pl.29 (K.22); AO pl.17 (not in K.).
106. AO fig.47d (K.5); BSA 28,1926-27,67,fig.11b (both before or c.600).
107. Karagiorga pl.72g (K.41).

108. AO pl.197.26 (K.12).
109. AO pl.141 (K.4), bone, c.630?); Marangou fig.59.
110. See pp.127, 161. The palmette-like marking on the two pottery examples, Riccioni figs.61 (K.25) and 62 (K.26) may be a reflection of the Corinthian type.
111. e.g. Karagiorga pl.69a (K.3); BSA 34,1933-34,pl.37 (K.21); pl.29 (K.22): these two with feathery eyebrows also; Karagiorga pl.71 (K.31); ASAtene N.S. 17-18, 1957,40,fig.39; Karagiorga GK pl.10 (eyebrows). Karagiorga also (119 n.19) gives other, non-gorgon, examples from 'Laconian' bronzework; cf. also BSA 34, 1933-34,pl.35e, a Laconian helmeted head aryballos. Gorgoneia with eyelashes in other schools: Attic: Graef I pl.98 no.2398 (mid 6th cent.); AJA 62,1958, pl.9 (Rf, c.490, when some painters had a fondness for eyelashes); Campanian: Koch,DK pl.20; Phases: c.1. Eyebrows: cf.A.1a,c; Karouzou, Amasis Painter pl.42.
112. e.g. AO fig.47d (K.5); pl.173 (K.9); Karagiorga pl.68d (K.17); Riccioni fig.61 (K.25), and many others. Examples occur in other schools, but not with such frequency.
113. B.Filow, Die Nekropole von Trebenische pl.9, Karagiorga pl.71. For an Etruscan imitation of a similar type, also resembling the gorgon-busts, Aukt.Luzern 1,1959.81.
114. Karagiorga nos.34-39. Horns: R.Joffroy, Le Trésor de Vix pl.22.1.
115. AO pl.17.

116. ASatene N.S. 17-18, 1957, 40, fig. 39.
117. BSA 34, 1933-34, pl. 32a (referred to by Kunze, Ol. Ber. V 49, n. 34).
The cup-tondo, Tocra pl. 63.945, was published after the article.
118. p. 64, pl. 10.
119. AO pls. 8, 106, fig. 126k.
120. D.G. Mitten, Master-Bronzes from the Classical World (1968) 76,
no. 71, with bibl.
121. Libya Antiqua 3-4, 1966-67, 196 pl. 72b. Diam. of tondo
53 cms.
122. See pp. 163.
123. M. Comstock and C. Vermeule, Greek, Etruscan and Roman Bronzes in
the MFA, Boston (1971), 450 no. 660, Inv. 98.652. Preserved ht.
24.7, wdth. 17.2 cms. The relief seems to have been on a square
or rectangular sheet (original edge remaining at left). If
the square hole near the top left is an arrow-hole, like those
on the Crowe corslet (Aukt. Basel 40, 1969, frontispiece and p. 83;
A. Snodgrass, Early Greek Armour and Weapons, 154) the relief
must presumably have belonged either to some war-like piece of
equipment, or to the exterior of a building. The shape seems
wrong for a shield-device; a chariot would be suitable, but it
seems that the mainland Greeks did not use chariots for fighting
at this time (Snodgrass, Arms and Armour of the Greeks 46, 87-88).
Perhaps the relief was fixed to a gate or door, a suitable
position for a gorgoneion.
124. e.g. BSA 34, 1933-34 pl. 37; AO pl. 17.

125. Karagiorga 120; see Arch.Class. 6,1954,pl.68.5. The terracotta votive shield from Taranto, ASAtene N.S. 17-18,1957,40,fig.39, appears to have snakes with cock's combs beneath its chin: cf. 5th cent. Tarentine antefixes, Arch.Class. pl.72.2,4, but the time-gap is rather large. The antefix from Olympia (Olympia III43,pl.8.8, Van Buren,GFR 136 no.5,fig.119), is claimed as Laconian by G.Treu, who publishes it, and as S.Italian by Laviosa (Arch.Class.6,1954,225). This sounds as though there must be a connection somewhere! However, Treu's attribution seems to be based on a similarity which he sees with the marble akroterion Karagiorga pl.72g - to me largely illusory: the beaded locks and the shape of face are slightly similar. The antefix-gorgoneion does have a straight mouth, like many Laconian examples (see n.24). On the other hand, I can see no striking resemblance to S.Italian gorgoneia either.

Chalcidian

126. Rumpf,Ch.V. no.28, (two), p.72, (Group of the Hydria in Cambridge); nos. 104,109,152, p.75, (Group of the Belly-amphorae); no.151 (two),p.90, (Group of the Orvieto Hydria - name-piece); no.19, p.104 (Group of the Phineus Cup).
127. Rumpf pls.108-111 (no.104); pls.116-118 (no.109); pls.144-146 (no.152).
128. See p.128 and p.200 n.49.
129. nos. 104,109 (see n.¹²⁷2), and no.28, (two) Rumpf pls.55,57.

130. See n.127.
131. BCH 77,1953,293ff.
132. No.151, Rumpf pl.141.
133. Payne, NC pl.43.2.
134. AFM XI, pl.V.
135. Rumpf pl.39.
136. Rumpf no.1, p.54, pl.1 (Group of the Amphorae with Inscriptions).
137. The only other surviving truly long-robed gorgons of the second half of the 6th century are East Greek: cat. D.i (Didyma) and I.i (Kizilbel), and some of the gem-group (e.g. H.xvii, c.500B.C.). The Etruscan gorgon, Mon.Ant. VII, 249 fig.24, late 6th or early 5th cent., has a longish chiton, and a late 6th cent. Attic gorgon, on an amphora in the manner of the Red-line Painter, CVA BM 4 pl.III He 69.4, has a strange robe which across the legs is above the knee, and falls to ground-level between them. In the 7th cent. long-robed gorgons appear in several mainland schools, as well as in East Greek.

Sicily and South Italy

138. Langlotz, Magna Graecia pl.I, p.243 (dated c.560 B.C.). The large, pointed 'beauty-spot' on the gorgon's brow is entirely hypothetical, and presumably based on the Gela terracotta gorgoneion (n.149 below). See Mon.Ant. xxv, 614, pl.xvi (P.Orsi).
139. Van Buren, AFR 162.2, fig.80.
140. See p.133, pl.33a (Ol.Forsch II pl.39).

141. Payne, NC 81; Langlotz, Magna Graecia pl.12, N.Sc. 1951, 325, fig.51.
142. R.Kekulé von Stradonitz, Die Antiken Terrakotten von Sizilien, Abb.95. Notable examples (not on gorgons) in another school are those of the East Greek bronze-reliefs: see Chapter III pp. 364 ff.
143. Gàbrici, Mon.Ant. 32, 194 pl.33.1; 191 pl.33.2; 193 pl.35.1.
144. See n.142.
145. P.Marconi, Agrigento (1929) fig.133, Riccioni fig.52.
146. Langlotz, Magna Graecia, pl.15. See R.Ross Holloway, AJA 75, 1971, 435-436, for an attempt to date the metope to the early 6th century, claiming that the stepped folds of Perseus' and Athena's garments are the result of a late 6th cent. re-working.
147. F.i, pl. 16 ; Marangou pl.54.
148. M.Comstock and C.Vermeule, Greek, Etruscan and Roman Bronzes in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (1971), 284 no.409 (Inv.98.656). Another example, U.Jantzen, Bronzwerkestätten in Grossgriechenland und Sizilien, pl.32.
149. Van Buren, AFR 160.1, fig.78, Riccioni fig.44 (ht. 1.05m.).
150. Gàbrici, Mon.Ant. 35 (1933) col.195ff, pls,32-33, (est.ht. 2.75m.).
151. e.g. AO pl.VII; Tocra pl.63. 945; B.Filow, Die Nekropole von Prebenische pl.IX.
152. Not identical - the neat little curls point downwards on Gela, upwards on Selinus, but the normal way of showing a beard is

- by tufts or strokes. Cf. a later 6th century antefix from Morgantina, below n.¹⁶¹~~23a~~).
153. e.g. Van Buren, AFR 138.5, niccioni fig.70 (Landazzo); L. Bernabò Brea, Sizilien, 45 (Syracuse): for this characteristic, cf. C.14.
154. e.g. Kekulé von Stradonitz, Die Antiken Terrakotten von Sizilien 42.
155. e.g. Mon.Ant. 18, 147, fig.6 (Grammichele, Catania); Soc.Magna.Gr. 1930, 163-165 (Himera). Both these examples must be 5th century. (The second is quoted by Andrén, p.clxvii, as showing influence from the Campanian type of antefix, with its frame of tongues. This may be so, but with a time-lag of perhaps 25 years, and a totally different gorgoneion-type, it is hard to be sure that the influence did not come via the later Etruscan antefixes rather than direct.) An example with looped snakes, see n.¹⁶¹~~23a~~).
156. Van Buren AFR 161.3, fig.79 (Hipponium - dated too early); L. Bernabò Brea, Sizilien, 45 (Syracuse); Kekulé 42, Soc.Magna.Gr. 1932, 72, pl.IX (Agrigento).
157. Fasti Arch. XVIII-XIX, 1963-64, 316 no.4348, fig.72.
158. Bernabò Brea, op.cit.45 (Syracuse); Higgins I, pl.155, BM 1137 (Gela).
159. Most of the East Greek examples have many other snakes besides those under the chin or by the ear, so the idea of their responsibility for the two-snake Magna Graecian type should be viewed with caution. East Greek examples with only two snakes are: C.11, C.13 (?), D.i (?), H.xii-xiv, and the Acropolis antefix,

Buschor, Tondächer II pl.5. Most of these are from East Greek 'fringe' areas. Examples from other areas include: Corfu pediment gorgon (not the only snakes, but very prominent); perhaps Perachora II 1958; Laconia: AO fig.76c; fig.128m, pl.197; Trebenishte handle-gorgoneion (seen¹⁵¹ ~~14~~); Etruria: Schumacher, Bronzen in Karlsruhe pl.VI; Attica: Nikosthenes, Louvre F99, at the base of a handle, imitating a metal type like the Trebenishte one; cf. also A/H/S pl.84 (Andokides Painter). Cf. also an early classical antefix from Antikyra, BCH 79,1955, 257,262 fig.9 (called 'Corinthian' -why?). One of the most similar is the antefix from Olympia (Olympia III pl.VIII), called Laconian though Laviosa thinks it South Italian. (See p. 208, n.¹²⁵ ~~37~~).

160. See Payne/Young 62, pl.39, Acrop.660. The appearance of this hair-style with the known East Greek features (looped or S-curve snakes, disc ear-rings, and sometimes fangs touching the tongue) in Magna Graecian examples leads to the idea that they might be derived from the same source; note also the Palaikastro antefix, n.¹⁷⁷ ~~39~~ below. Surviving East Greek gorgoneia sometimes have a single row of curls: e.g. E.3, E.4, but the only one with a double row is the gorgon of the Pantikapaion gem, H.xiv. Prominent rows of snail-curly across the brow are not uncommon in late archaic sculpture, however: e.g. Lullies/Hirmer pl.63, Payne/Young 102,103.1-2, (Attica); Lullies/Hirmer pl.68 (Eretria); pls.75,83 (Aegina). The fashion clearly emerged in the late 6th century, but where?

161. (a) Arch.Reps. 1960-61,48, from the Acropolis (note the beard, recalling the early 6th century gorgoneia from Gela and Selinus);
 (b) AJA 74, 1970,377, pl.95.25, dated to the third quarter of the 6th century (must be right at the end of that period). Cf. the Larisa gorgoneion C.5. Better photographs, AJA 62, 1958, 156, pl.28.4.
162. C.Laviosa, Arch.Class. 6, 1954, 226 n.7, gives some examples.
163. See previous note. See also D.M. Robinson, AJA 27,1923,1-12.
164. op.cit.229.
165. Richter, Archaic Greek Art 128, and Handbook of the Greek Collections, Met.Mus. of Art,(1953) 30,fig. 19 d-g.
166. This naturally brings to mind Laconian examples (see pp.138), though cf. 'Chalcidian' eye-cups, e.g. Kumpf, Ch.V. pls.177-182. The narrow 'scallops' across the brow recall the hair-style of the Tenea Kouros (Richter, Kouroi³ figs.245-250), but wider scallops were common for both Corinthian and Attic tondo-gorgoneia, continuing in Attic to the end of Bf.
167. Laviosa pl.69.2. See p.146 and n.¹⁵⁹22.
168. Richter, Handbook, Met.Mus. 1953, fig.19f, (too early). See note to C.8.
169. Laviosa pl.70; cf.also Christies' Cat., Mar.23,1971, 30,no.85; K.Schefold, Meisterwerke Griechische Kunst no.275.
170. AA 1966, 304 fig.62.
171. See n.¹⁶⁵28.
172. Koch. DK pls. V-VII.

173. Hesperia 39,1970,pl.38.
174. R.Hampe and H.Gropengiesser, Werke der Kunst in Heidelberg II,
38, 98,pl,13. Laviosa 234.
175. The truly pear-shaped face does not appear in surviving East
Greek art before the end of the 6th century.
176. AntK. 4, 1961, pl.25; Lullies/Hirmer, Gr.Vasen pl.56; AJA 62,
1958, pl.9.
177. BSA 11, 1904-05, 303ff, fig.20.
178. AD III pl.29.

Campania

179. H.Koch, Dachterrakotten aus Kampanien 29-38; Andrén, p.clxvii ff.
180. Koch, DK pl.7.1,2.
181. Koch,DK pl.33.2. (colour); pl.5.
182. Koch, DK pl.6.3; (Type VII), cf. pl.28.5.
183. Koch, DK pl.5.5; pl.6.2-4.
184. Koch, DK pl.VI-I (Type IV).
185. See n.184.
186. Andrén p.clxviii; pl.10.32 (Caere), pl.144.502 (Satricum,
Latium).
187. Koch, DK pl.20. Eye-lashes: popular in Laconia; see p.138
and n.111 . One Laconian example comes from Taranto. Stud
ear-rings: See Appendix 6
188. e.g. Andrén pl.1, pl.2 (Veii); cf. also pl.155.
189. Andrén p.clxix; here pl.27. Incidentally, the tufa shield-
gorgoneion from Chiusi has a frame of small tongues.

190. Schumacher, Bronzen in Karlsruhe 151, no.782, pl.22, 'unteritalisch-griechisch des VI-V Jahrh'; modern photograph Ol.Ber.VIII 193, Abb.73.
191. Other examples: Corfu, Mon Repos, Van Buren, GFR 136.3, fig.64; Tegea, Adelt. 19.1, 1964, pl.68g; Sparta, AO fig.147.
192. 'Mixed Ionic-Attic' type: BCH 77, 1953, 293ff.
193. cf. BSA 14, 1907-08, pl.X (Boeotian).
194. Similar snakes, similarly held: this cat. B.iv, J.i. Other examples of gorgons holding snakes which do not encircle their waists occur in Attic, Chalcidian and on a Sicilian arula, as well as on East Greek gems. See note 3 for refs.
195. Koch, DK pl.35 (colour), Giglioli pl.174.
196. Mon.Ant. 37, 1938, pl.VII.
197. G.Schneider-Herrmann, BABesch. 45, 1970, 38-46, figs.12-13, said to be from Capua. For the snakes bordering the jaw cf. this cat. C.5. Furtwängler, with his all-embracing pan-Ionism, included the Capuan antefixes ('Chalcidian monuments') in his list of examples of 'the regular, broad, full Ionic type without snakes' (Roscher's Lexikon, Gorgo, cols.1713-4, cf. Meisterwerke der gr. Plastik, 253). Mrs. Schneider-Herrmann accepts this uncritically (op.cit. 46, with n.28, a list of almost completely irrelevant references), and appears to apply it to most of the other western gorgoneion antefixes also. It should be stressed that the Capuan antefix gorgoneia are about as far removed from the 'East Greek' type as is possible.

Etruria

198. Besig 105-108.
199. e.g. Giglioli pl.53, mid-6th cent.
200. Mon.Ant. VII, 249 fig.24; probably also the Medusa of the Caere plaques, though the fragments are difficult to decipher: Arch.Class. 9,1957, pls.III-V.
201. Walters, Select Bronzes from the BM, pl.V (if Etruscan -listed by Besig, but perhaps more likely Campanian or S.Italian).
202. L.Mühlestein, Kunst der Etrusker 167.
203. Giglioli pl.53.
204. ADelt.XIX.1, 1964, pl.70b.
205. Aukt.Luzern I, 1959.98.
206. CVA Reading 1, pls, 36,37. Note also Achilles' East Greek helmet.
207. Mon.Ant. VII,249 fig.24.
208. Giglioli pl.87.3. B.Goldman, Berytus 14-15, 1961-64, 1ff, sees the pouched overfall of her tunic as a reminiscence of the hanging breasts of Lamashtu, from whom he derives the Greek gorgon. Innumerable examples of this arrangement of the tunic exist in archaic Greek art, on men as well as women (e.g., A/H/S pl.37, Perseus, pl.125, the Palladion), so that Goldman's theory is hard to credit, to say the least. In this case also, the gorgon's breasts may be seen in their normal position.
209. M.Moretti, Arch.Class. 9,1957, 18ff, pls.III-V; a more detailed treatment, F.Roncalli, Le Lastre Dipinte da Cerveteri, 44-46,

- 64ff; EAA 520, sub Cerveteri.
210. cf., e.g., the Attic Gorgoneia of Kleitias, (Beazley, Development of Attic Bf pl.11.3), and Lydos (Humpf, Sakonides pl.23). Also Kleitias' gorgons from the François Vase (FR pls. 1-2 (drawings), Riccioni figs, 58,59); At the same time, there seems a distinct resemblance to the Vignanello antefix (see n.218). Roncalli's date of c.560 (op.cit. 65,69) for the plaques seems to fit the type and spirit of the gorgon-heads.
211. Baltimore plate, AM 62,1937,pl.65.
212. Albizzati pls.34,36, Vatican 335.
213. e.g. CVA BM 6, pl.III He 76.4, 79.3, and many others. Cf. also the very odd gorgoneion on the spout of a feeder by Nikosthenes, n.255.
214. ADelt.22,1967,pl.272a. See p.126.
215. Canino: Schumacher, Bronzen in Karlsruhe pl.VI.I; Kuvo: see n.201.
216. Several antefixes with bearded gorgoneia, found in Etruria, are of Campanian type: e.g. Andrén pl.10.32.
217. Giglioli pl.52.
218. Andrén pl.57 (Vignanello), pl.105.374,(Rome); AJA 73,1969, pl.82.13 (Poggio Civitate). A very similar example to the Vignanello gorgoneion is in the Greek Museum, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
219. e.g. Thermon metope, AD ii pl.52; EC examples, Payne,NC 82, fig.24 B,C.
220. Giglioli Pl.75.1.

221. Giglioli pls.89,90.
222. Andrén pl.1. Note the very strong general resemblance to e.g., the winged gorgoneion shield-device from Olympia, J.1. (Pl. 26).
223. Andrén pl. 10.36.
224. St.Etr. 37,1969,pl.27; L.von Matt, Kunst und Land der Strusker pl.104. See also pp. 334 ff.

Cyclades

225. See pp. 125, 134, 136, 160.
226. Though not unknown; especially in early examples: e.g. BOH 93,1969, 862ff.; AO pl.106. Marangou fig.55.
227. e.g. Beazley, Devel. of Attic Ef pl.11.3 (Kleitias), Hoppin, BFV 172 (Nearchos).
228. cf. the much later antefix C.14; Nr. Eastern examples are frequent, e.g. among 9th-8th century ivories from Nimrud, and, 7th century, Akungal, BGA pl.36e. Cf. also the magnificent East Greek ivory of c.600 B.C., A.Grønføhagen, Ant.Kunstwerke² pl.1.
229. On eye-cups, for instance. (Incidentally Melos was a Laconian colony!).
230. cf. C.12, and, e.g. Guide de Thasos 1967,101.
231. See, e.g. Hdt.I.168, and Boardman, The Greeks Overseas 237

Attica

232. G.E.Mylonas, Ho Protoattikos amphoreus tes Eleusinos (1957).

233. Schefold, ML pl.15b.
234. A/H/S pls.18,19.
235. Payne, NC 82, fig.²/~~7~~4c. 2/
236. S.Karouzou, Aggeia tou Anagyrountos pl.31.
237. JHS⁵ 7, 1937, pl.6. 5/
238. e.g. Gorgon Painter: A/H/S pl.36 (Louvre E 874).
239. e.g. C Painter: CVA Met.Mus.2, pl.II (NY Ol.8.6); Boll.d'Arte 1959,11-12, figs.6,8 (Taranto 110338); many other exx. Circle of C Painter: ASAtene N.S. 21-22,1960,201, (Taranto 20781).
Tyrrhenian: CVA Louvre 1, pl.III Hd 8, (Louvre E 857).
See also p.128 + n.⁴⁹ 17.
240. e.g. Nessos Painter, n234, Gorgon Painter, n.238; C Painter, Albizzati pls.34, 36 (Vatican 335). Cf. CVA BM 4, pl.III He 69.4 (BM B 281, Manner of Redline Painter): in this late Bf example, the skirt is well above the knees over the legs, but touches the ground between the legs, so it is perhaps intended to be the long Ionic chiton.
241. e.g. Amasis-Painter cup, Vatican 369a), JHS 51,1931, 266ff, fig.12; eye-cup, Berlin F 2049, F.von Lübben, Gr.Vasenbilder pl.66. Many exx. in Hoppin, BFV, and, e.g., Graef I pl.89; Hesperia Art Bull.XVI no.96, 'c.500'.
242. e.g. Amasis-Painter cup, see n.²⁴¹ 10; Hoppin, BFV 256, 258 (Nikosthenes), 168, Athens CC 669 (Mnesikleides), and see n.²⁴³ 12.
An unusual gorgon with a 'tondo-gorgoneion' face, complete with beauty-spots, Vagn Poulsen, Opus Nobile (Festschrift Jantzen) 125ff,pl.19, a Segment Class cup, Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg I.N. 3385.

243. Beazley, Devel. pl.11.3 (Kleitias); Hoppin, BFV 172 (Nearchos); Boardman, Greek Art fig.77, Rumpf, Sakonides pl.23 (Lydos).
For white ears, cf. also the Amasis-Painter's cup, n.241.
244. e.g. the gorgons of nn.234, 237.
245. e.g. C.Painter, Oxford 1965.120 (Spencer-Churchill Exhib.Cat. pl.VI.51); later CVA Louvre 4, pl.III He 43 (Louvre F 229 - Antimenes Painter?).
246. e.g. (a) CVA Villa Giulia 3, pl.III He 53-54 (Antimenes Painter);
(b) CVA Louvre 4, pl.III He 41.2,4 (Swing Painter).
247. A few exceptions, e.g. Nessos Painter (n.²³⁴~~3~~); some of C Painter's gorgons, such as NY 01.8.6 (n.²³⁹~~8~~), Oxford 1965.120 (n.²⁴⁵~~14~~);
Swing Painter (n.^{246b.}~~156~~).
248. See Yalouris, BCH 77, 1953, 293ff.
249. At least eleven examples of gorgons on pottery, of which five are late Bf, one Rf, and eight are after c.540 B.C. See also BCH 82, 1958, 660, 663, gorgons on a painted pinax from the south side of the Acropolis. Other characters: e.g. maenads: Antiken in Deutschen Privatbesitz (ed. K. Neugebauer) pl.64.154; warrior: C Painter, CVA BM 2, pl.III He 8; Perseus and Hermes: C Painter, A.Greifenhagen, Antike Kunstwerke pl.25 (the gorgons have no skins here!); winged figures: Lydos, CVA Baltimore 1, pl.19.1; Graef I, pl.86.1757 (Boreads?); Haspels, ABL pl.7.5.
250. See cat. B.ii. and note 2.
251. The marble gorgon, Payne/Young pl.1, also had a snake-belt.
Pottery exx. with snake-girdle: (i) François Vase, FR pls.1-2;

- (ii) C Painter, CVA BM 2, pl. III He 8, BM B380 (also grasping them); (iii) ASAtene N.S.21-22, 19-0,201, Taranto 20781; (iv) CVA Bibl.Nat. 1, pl.46, inv.277; (v) Amasis Painter, Hoppin, BFV 33. Incidentally, (iv) is used by Boardman, AGG 38,43 n.54, as a good example of 'snakes rising at either side of the neck'; I am not disputing the possible origin of such snakes, but in this case, I think the snakes do not actually rise from the shoulders, but rear up from the belt. For snakes held free in the hands, see cat. B.iv and note.
252. Ear-level also: (i) Louvre E 857 (see n.²³⁹~~8~~); (ii) Rhodes, Heidelberg Painter, Cl.Rh. VIII, fig.63; (iii) London B471, Amasis Painter (see n.²⁵¹~~20~~.v.). Neck also: London, BM B 281, Manner of the Red-line Painter (see n.²⁴⁰~~9~~); (also the Eleusis amphora, A/H/S pl.12).
253. S.Karouzou, The Amasis Painter, pl.35 (Boston Ol.8026).
254. See n.²⁵³~~23~~; also Schefold, ML pl.71a (Camtar Painter).
255. Gorgons: C Painter, Vatican 335 (see n.²⁴⁰~~9~~); 'Circle of the C Painter', Taranto 20781 (see n.²⁵¹~~20~~.iii). Gorgoneia: Gorgon Painter, AM 62, 1937 pl.65; Camtar Painter (see n.²⁵⁴~~24~~); Nikosthenes, Berlin F 2324, WV 1890/91, pl.VII.lb(nf). Other schools: Corinthian, Mon Repos antefix, p.126 pl.29b . Laconian (?) bronze relief from Cyrene, p.140 pl.39b . Etruscan, Caere plaques, p.153 pl.46a .
256. Rhodes, ABV 64.14; Cl.Rh. VIII 71ff, fig.63. The tomb also contained a Merrythought cup by the C Painter, a lip-cup, and

- a hydria by the Hunt Painter, which is probably the latest pot. The looped snakes are not exactly like the East Greek ones, in that the loop is very tight - one cannot see through it. Both the looped and the coiled snakes are extremely like those of Athena's aegis on the pinax from the Acropolis, attributed to the Amasis Painter: Karouzou, Amasis Painter 22, 37, no.77, pl.38.
257. See cat. B.iv.
258. (i) Munich 1555, ABV 271.79, Gerhard AV pl.88 (looped); (ii) Villa Giulia 3556, ABV 269.35, CVA Villa Giulia 3, pl.III He 137-138 (coiled); (iii) Louvre F 229, CVA Louvre 4, pl.III He 43; not in ABV; (coiled). At least close to the Antimenes Painter.
259. Munich 2312; CVA Munich 4, pls.194,195. There are a few gorgons in post-archaic Rf.
260. e.g. Graef II pl.81, 1038; A/H/S pl.¹³⁴~~147~~ (Panaitios Painter).
261. Andokides Painter, A/H/S pl.84. This point noted by Beazley, AntK. 4, 1961,59.
262. Epiktetos, JHS 51,1931,43; Brygos Painter, CVA Vienna, Kunsth. Mus. 1,pl.36.
263. e.g. Graef II pl.73; FR pls.22,61; see also n.264 (Berlin Painter).
264. AntK. 4, 1961,pl.25, (Berlin P.); AJA 62,1958,pl.9 (BM E180); BABesch. 29, 1954, 12-15, fig.4 (Makron) -cited Beazley, op.cit. 59.

265. BCH 93,1969, 862ff.
266. op.cit. 875.
267. Marangou fig.56; cf. ibid. figs.1,19,22a) etc.
268. Payne/Young pl.1.
269. GMA Richter, The Archaic Gravestones of Attica, pl.84.
270. C.Seltman, Athens, its History and Coinage, pl.4.
271. A.de Ridder, Cat. des Bronzes de l'Acropole nos. 456-459.
272. Payne/Young pl.121.1,4.
273. i) Buschor, Tondächer II,41,pl.5; ii) Hesperia 39,1970,131,pl.38.
274. n.273.ii. ~~See also p.~~
275. Acrop.458 (n.271); antefix n.273i; Payne/Young pl.121.1;
AD III 29.
276. I exclude the curious mask on a fragment of the foot of a conical stand (?), with relief-decoration: Ist.Mitt. 9-10, 1959-60,56,pl.56 (P.Hommel). The mask has huge eyes, thick, straight lips but no teeth or tongue, and a square beard. On the brow are vertical 'wrinkles', and from each side of the head two long, looped tendrils spread horizontally. No snake-heads are visible. The mask bears a certain resemblance to that of the Kabirion bronze plaque (Riccioni fig.27, here pl.34b). Hommel compares bearded deities from Tell Halaf, and Luristan bronzes, but believes the fragment to be Greek (though probably not a gorgoneion). From the context, however, the date cannot be later than the 8th century, and I cannot believe that the sphinxes on the fragment at least can be Greek

work, at such a date: they look thoroughly oriental.

277. See Cat. and Appendix 1.
278. Naked gorgons in other schools: Canino disc, (lower half), bucchero oenochoe, (upper half); see p.152, nn.22,23. Relief-pithos, Schefold, ML pl.15b, (upper half), Cycladic, h.i.
279. 7th century examples usually have long skirt: Boeotia: horse-Medusa, Schefold, ML pl.15b; Sparta: Perseus ivory, Marangou fig.55; tripod-leg, Karagiorga; GK pl.10; Argos: ivory seal, Riccioni fig.35; Attica: Eleusis amphora, A/H/Spl.12; bronze cut-out, BCH 93, 1969, 862ff. Early 6th century, ?Corinth: relief-vase fragment, Hesperia 21, 1952, pl.72. For late 6th cent. examples, probably influenced by the East Greek type, see the sections on Chalcidian, Etruria and Attica.
280. Two wings: B.i,iii,iv; H.i, vii-xiii,xvii.
Four wings: D.i; E.iii,iv; H.ii,iv-vi,xiv; I.i.
281. Boots: D.i; I.i.
282. B.iv; H.iii-v,vii,xi,xiv, and the antefix C.15.
283. See n.3.
284. Non-East Greek examples: Ol.Ber. III,pl.33, Inv.B 960, bronze arm-grip; Canino disc (see n.278 above); Perugia squatting gorgon, Giglioli pl.87.3.
285. See cat., and Appendix 3.
286. e.g. R.Joffroy, Le Trésor de Vix, pls.VIII,XXI,XXII,XXIII.I.
287. Schefold, ML pl.32c.
288. See p.146 and n.155 ; also p.——— and n.159.

289. cf. the Acropolis antefix, Buschor, Tondächer II pl.5, here p. 187, pl. 50e.
290. e.g. the Ptoion antefix, p. 166 and n. 88, here pl. 50 fig. b; also some of the Magna Graecian ones.
291. Åkerström, ATK pls. 19, 22, 26, 33.
292. AGG 28-37 passim.
293. See N. Bookidis, AJA 72, 1968, 81, who notes Åkerström's preference for lower dates where a choice is possible, and believes that he 'does not make adequate use of one of the few pieces of comparative stratified evidence, the fragmentary relief with a man's head, from Sardis, found in the destruction fill of 547/6 B.C.' (ATK 95, fig. 29.2).
294. Exceptions, B. 1, 2; G. 1-3.
295. Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie col. 1701ff.
296. Riccioni 159.
297. Karagiorga GK 50, and especially 39 with n. 4.
298. The only recent writers known to me who dissent even slightly from Payne's views are: Ducat, a very mild criticism of Payne as doing less than justice to the gorgoneion-aryballoi, op. cit. 54; and Walter-Karydi, who says in 'Äolische Kunst', Studien zur Griechischen Vasenmalerei, p. 16 '... Die frühesten Beispiele (of gorgoneia) Ostgriechenlands zeigen eigene Züge; die Bildtradition entsteht gleichzeitig in der Peloponnes und in Attika wie auch auf der Inseln und in Ostgriechenland in siebten Jahrhundert.'

299. See p. 126.
300. See p. 126.
301. See p. 126.
302. G.E.Mylonas, Ho Protoattikos amphoreus tes Eleusinos (1957); photograph; A/H/S pl.12.
303. Earliest Attic Bf examples: Gorgon Painter, c.590, A/H/S pl.36, and here pl.48c.
304. In fact, the two central snakes on top of this gorgon's head, reconstructed as of type A in the drawing, Cl.Rh.VIII, pl.II, may be of type B, like the other two looped pairs; only their heads are visible in fig.63.
305. See pp. 187 ff.
306. S.Karouzou, The Amasis Painter pl.31.
307. See p. 126.
308. See p. 126.
309. See p. 131.
310. A/H/S pl.36. An example also occurs on a fragmentary terracotta relief of about the same date, D.von Bothmer, Amazons in Greek Art 3, no.3, pl.I.2, NY 42.11.33. This was found in Attica, and is presumably Attic; there is nothing, however, particularly distinctive about the gorgoneion.
311. Friis Johansen, VS pl.34.2, a PC shield-device with just one pair of large fangs.
312. See p. 165.
313. See Hemelrijk, BABesch. 38,1963,46, where the characteristics of nose and mouth, and also of fangs, are noted.

314. CVA Vienna, Kunsth.Mus.1, pl.III I 36, (Bryges Painter).
315. Gerhard, AV II pl.88 (Antimenes Painter); Gerhard, AV III, pl.195-6 (Epiktetos).
316. JHS ⁵¹ 5, 1931, 266ff., fig.12.
317. e.g. François Vase, FR pls.1-2; Amasis Painter, Hoppin, BFV 33; Camtar Painter, Schefold, ML pl.71a.
318. See p.165.
319. Eretria gorgoneion: AD III 29; I see nothing in the gorgoneion to suggest a non-Attic (e.g. Cycladic) origin. Acropolis bronze: A.de Ridder, Cat.des Bronzes de l'Acropole no.458.
320. Payne/Young pl.121.1; H.Schrader, Marmorbildwerke der Acropolis, 335,no.457,fig.394; BABesch.38.1963,46,fig.30 (where Hemelrijk dates it to the third quarter of the century, and seems to think it Attic).
321. Th.Wiegand, Poros-Architektur fig.202a,b; Buschor, Tondächer II 41,pl.5; Van Buren, GFR 137.7; BABesch.38,1963,46,fig.28.
322. Hemelrijk, BABesch. 38,1963,28ff., and 46, where an East Greek origin is claimed for the antefix.
323. See pp.146,147,155.

APPENDIX IThe origin of the sandalled-foot plastic vases

The class of sandalled-foot plastic vases, which consists of two sub-groups with different type of sandal, is generally considered East Greek. R.A.Higgins, in the British Museum catalogue (see under A.11 for bibliography) accepts that the vases are East Greek, but excludes Rhodes on three grounds: (i) the form of the mouth, with handle-plate, is unknown among 'Rhodian' plastic vases; (ii) the glaze is too good a black; (iii) of the sixteen or so examples whose provenance is known, only one is recorded as from Rhodes. Ducat recognizes the last fact as striking, but decides for Rhodes all the same; he believes that the other types of plastic vase with glazed colours had ceased to be produced by c.560-550 (his date for the sandalled-feet), and points out that the faience aryballoi, which were certainly still in production, have the same type of mouth as the sandalled-feet.

Recently, however, it has been suggested by Professor C.M. Robertson (to me, in conversation), and by Mr.J. Boardman (Tocra 153) that the distribution of the vases with known provenance does not exclude an Attic origin for the group, (the clay and general appearance of the fabric excluding a Corinthian one), and that this possibility should not be ruled out.

It should be noted at the beginning of any discussion that the British Museum vase, my A.lla, is something of an oddity within the group in some ways. It is superior to the rest in quality, and also differs from them in details of mouth-shape: the mouth itself is larger and deeper than in other examples, and more concave on top; the handle-plate too is much thicker, and rises higher above the mouth, and, in short, the whole design of the mouth is finer and more artistic. The decoration too is more elaborate and careful. The other sandalled-feet whose photographs I have seen, including the others of Type A, have altogether smaller and thinner mouths and handle-plates, with some variation in the extent to which the handle-plate rises above the mouth. Ducat (op.cit. 182) describes the usual decoration of the mouth and handle-plate, which is very simple (for a good photograph, see Higgins II pl.23). A.lla has lines decorating the sides of the sole instead of dots as in the other examples; it lacks the usual tongues fringing the edge of the leg, and the white toe-nails.

The rest of the sandalled-feet, however, though less distinguished than A.lla, are of good quality, and their fabric and technique appears to be the same, so that there seems no good reason for separating them from it.

The following comparisons, and remarks on the question of origin, are based chiefly on A.lla.

For East Greek origin:

1. The colour of the clay of A.lla (and of BM 1928. 1-17.49, Ducat B.1) is matched in some of the 'Rhodian' plastic vases

(e.g. Higgins II pl.7.1612, pl.9.1619), though others are paler.

According to Higgins, the clay of three of the four BM sandalled-feet (including the two just mentioned) contains mica. (I have found no reference to this in the other published examples).

2. Although the mouth of A.11a cannot be at all closely paralleled in East Greece, and even though other East Greek plastic vases do not have handle-plates, vase-mouths as similar as any others to those of the remaining sandalled-feet are not uncommon in East Greece. Besides the faience aryballoi, some of which are quite close (cf; e.g., CVA Munich 3 pl.152.4 and pl.152.7), there is the class of unglazed/globular aryballoi, dated around the second and third quarters of the 6th century: cf. Pocra 46, pl.39.766; H.Metzger, Foilles de Xanthos IV, 39, pl.V.37,38. ^{max. base: Perichore II p. 383, 41 ed. CVA} There are also a number of East Greek plastic vases, most admittedly considerably earlier, with 'untypical' mouth forms, possibly influenced by other schools: Higgins II pl.1.1601; pl.3.1605; pl.4.1607; pl.14.1633 (all excavated at Camirus, and dated between the middle and the end of the 7th century), and A.6 above.

3. On present evidence, this type of vase seems more 'at home' among the East Greek plastic vases than in any other Greek school. Clearly such an argument cannot be given great weight, but it is perhaps not without value.

For Attic origin:

1. The colour of the clay of A.11a (and of BM 1928. 1-17.49, Ducat B.1, Higgins II pl.23) would certainly suit an Attic

origin. Where the colour of clay of other published examples is given, the descriptions range from 'pale orange' and 'orange' (Higgins, of Ducat B.1-4), 'yellowish clay, orange-brown surface' (CVA Brussels 3, pl.II D 5. 13, Ducat A.4), 'red-brown' (CVA Munich 3 pl.152.5-8, Ducat B.5-7); CVA Heidelberg 1, pl. 6.4, Ducat B.8), 'reddish orange' and 'leather-brown' by different people of the same vase, Ducat B.21 (see A.11b.). Presumably all these descriptions could fit Attic clay, and presumably the mica mentioned by Higgins would not completely exclude an Attic origin.

2. The only really close parallels known to me for the mouth of A.11a are to be found on the mainland, in a comparatively small number of Corinthian globular aryballoi and in one Attic globular aryballos, all of the highest quality. The Corinthian examples include: Payne, NC pl.31.1.5-6, nos.482,803, one EC and one MC, and considered by Payne to be probably from the same workshop; NC no.812, MC, Délos X, pl.21. 152; the 'Pyrias' prize aryballos from Corinth; ASAtene N.S. 21-22, 1960, two superb examples from Taranto, EC, pp.98-99, figs.74,75, Inv.20587, and MC, pp.100-101, (with further references), figs.77,78, Inv.4864 (cf. also figs. 132b, 133a); see pl.53b. The Attic example, probably the closest of all, is the splendid 'Pygmies-and-cranes' aryballos by Nearchos (AJA 36,1932,pl.X), here Pl.53c. Cf. also the curious aryballos by Mnesikleides, Hoppin BFV 168. The mouths of the other sandalled-feet cannot be exactly paralleled on the mainland any more than in East Greece; presumably, though, they are just simplified versions of the mouth-type of A.11a.

Ducat's comments (op.cit. 185 and n.1, sentence 1) are reasonably correct as regards the handles of the general run of Corinthian aryballoi; however, he misses the group mentioned above, with its refined design. His second remark, p.185 n.1, is simply wrong.

3. The patterns on the mouth of A.lia find close parallels in Attic Bf. The rosette on top of the mouth is, of course, almost standard for this type of mouth (Corinthian aryballoi passim, and the Nearchos example); the alternating red and black tongues are superior for an aryballos (East Greek plastic vases, with narrower rim, favour dots where they are not plain: Higgins II pls. 1-19 passim).

The 'ribbon' or 'string of sausages' pattern on the side of the mouth is much rarer. A form of it occurs, however, on the MC globular aryballos just mentioned under 2., Taranto Inv.20587, and also in the topmost zone on the MC flask by Timonidas (AntK.6, 1963, pl.19.2). It is to be found in Attic from at least the second quarter of the 6th century: e.g. C Painter (the earliest example known to me), A/H/S pl.48(c.570); lekythos, CVA Bibl.Nat.1, pl.46, no.277 (c.550); 'Droop' cups, on which it is rather popular, e.g. Langlotz, Würzburg pl.114; lid, AntK.7, 1964, pl.28.1 (c.540). Later in the century it appears on vases by Nikosthenes, e.g. Hoppin, BFV 179, 217, 221, and in a few other examples, but the early form is closer to that of A.lia. I know of only one example from East Greece itself, on a Fikellura oenochoe of c.550 (CVA BM 8, pl.II D 1, 6.5; see BSA 34, 1933-34, 75, where Cook states his belief that it was borrowed from the mainland). The pattern also appears, in a rather bulging form, in the group of the Campana dinoi, made in Etruria either by East Greeks or under strong East Greek influence: see JbBerlMus. 5, 1963, 107ff.,

figs.1,2, and the list, p.114. Simple Vs and zig-zags such as decorate the sides of the mouths of the other aryballoi, are quite common on Corinthian aryballoi.

The 'lozenges in quincunx formation' (Lucat) on the side of the handle-plate are also unusual, and I have found no Attic examples; see, however, the EC and MC aryballoi, Taranto 20587 and 4864, mentioned in 2, above, another EC example, J.Benson, Geschichte der korinthischen Vasen pl.2, and the famous 'Komast' plastic vase in the Louvre (a good photograph, F.Chamoux, Greek Art, pl.12)!

4. The gorgoneion on the handle-plate is the strongest argument in favour of Attica. It fits technically: added purple paint over alternate strands of black hair is common for both Attic and Corinthian gorgoneia; for white paint laid direct on the ground for nose, eyeballs and ears, c.f., e.g. Lydos' plate in Munich, Antk. 5, 1962, pl.30, here pl.48d and see p. (not noses). Payne (NC 88, n.3) noted its resemblance in type to MC gorgoneia such as NC fig.27C, and it is completely mainland in character, with no East Greek features whatsoever. If it was drawn by an East Greek, it is an exceedingly faithful copy. For shape of nose and eyes, cf. the fine tondo-gorgoneion, JHS 49, 1929, pl.16.18. An odd feature is the gap between hair and beard, as if the face 'sprouted' at the sides; the only close parallel I have found for this is the MC tondo-gorgoneion, Kultura Antichnogo Mira (Festschrift Blavatsky, 1966), 230, fig.2. here pl.5a, though a gap at ear level is common (cf. Kumpf, Sakonides pl.23, and here pl.48d).

The Attic aryballos by Mnesikleides, mentioned under no.2. (Hoppin BFV 168) also has a gorgoneion on the handle-plate.

Unfortunately I have been unable to obtain any information about the gorgoneion on the handle-plate of A.11b. The aryballos itself, of Type B, has a rather misshapen mouth, and is clearly much inferior to A.11a.

In conclusion, as far as A.11a is concerned, the very close parallels in Attic (and Corinthian) work of the first half of the 6th century for the shape of the vase-mouth and above all for the gorgoneion, point to an Attic origin. There is, however, nothing in clay or decoration which actually excludes an East Greek origin, provided that one assumes an East Greek artist who was both willing and able to put an exact copy, quite indistinguishable, of a Corinthian/Attic gorgoneion on his handle-plate. A close connection of some kind with Attica is undeniable.

Dating. The gorgoneion-type and the ribbon-pattern confirm a dating in the second quarter of the 6th century for A.11a. There seems to me, despite Higgins, no good reason for dating the vases of Type B later than those of Type A, and therefore I follow Ducat (op.cit. 185). Sandals of Type B appear on a Chiot sherd from Naukratis, which is certainly no later than 550 (Price pl.V.28), and both types may be seen on the dinos by Sophilos recently acquired by the British Museum.

APPENDIX 2'EYE-CUPS'

C.M. Robertson, in his publication of the early pottery from Al Mina (JHS 60, 1940, 1ff), remarks of the 'part-face' of the 'Rhodian' dish-fragment, this catalogue B.7, that the presence of fangs indicates that a gorgon is meant here; he follows K.F. Kinch's attractive suggestion (Fouilles de Vroulia 251ff). that the rays, reversed in many examples and not quite touching the upper border, were originally stylized plants, perhaps derived from Egyptian or Egyptianizing Near Eastern models, and sees the gorgon as 'peering among the reeds'. The rendering of the nose and the fierce expression strongly resemble those of the earliest 'Rhodian' gorgoneion-aryballos, A.1.

This 'part-face' is the only one known with fangs, but a considerable number of East Greek dishes and cups in the later 7th and the 6th centuries bear similar, or apparently related, representations: i) standed dishes: e.g. Fairbanks pl.28.294; Kinch, Vroulia col.256, fig.128 (BM - this example very animal-like); ii) oenochoai: e.g. JHS 60, 1940, pl.I.g; BSA 29, 1927-28, 265, pl.X.7; iii) cups: e.g. Délos X, pl.20 (here pl.54_a); Naukratis II 41, pl.7.1. All these have stylized noses with wrinkles or other markings, and some kind of 'beauty-spot' on the brow. Incidentally, this last detail is extremely rare in full gorgoneia from East Greece

(none, however, survive from these workshops). The plates and oenochoai have abundant filling-ornament, while the cups, certainly a different fabric, are much more restrained. Later examples include one with a lotus 'beauty-spot' (see below) on the neck of a Fikellura amphora in the BM (CVA BM 8, pl.II D1 5,7). (A briefer and more curious example, the eyes and 'nose' on the Euphorbos plate, A/H/S pl.27; cf. also a large eyes-and-nose engraved on the city wall of Thasos near the east gate, A. Conze, Reise auf den Inseln des thrakischen Meeres 12, pl.V, JHS 29, 1909, 219, pl.18e).

Furtwängler, who mentioned 'part-faces' briefly in his discussion of gorgoneia in Roscher's Lexikon, (col. 1706), believed that, though taken over from the same Near Eastern model as the gorgon-mask, they never had a mythological significance, but were purely an apotropaic symbol ('Diese Abkürzung...bekam niemals eine mythologische Bedeutung, und blieb rein apotropäisches Symbol.'). In this he is followed by Riccioni, 136. I am willing to concede that eyes may be 'purely (or at any rate, without mythological significance) apotropaic, as they appear, for instance, alone on shields or shield-aprons (e.g. Chiot, Price pl.V 10, or Attic, CVA Oxford 1, pl.III I 23.4) or perhaps in pairs on either side of the 'beaks' of oenochoai (e.g. EAA VII, pls. 18a, 19c). It seems to me, however, that the similarities between the 'part-faces' and gorgoneia makes such a distinction as Furtwängler supposes extremely improbable, if not incomprehensible. I find no difficulty in accepting the East Greek 'part-faces' as forms of gorgoneia, even without the tusked example (which Furtwängler did not know).

This acceptance, however, raises the question of the 6th century 'Chalcidian' and Attic eye-cups.

The 'Chalcidian' eye-cups (see pl. 54b) almost all belong to the group of vases by the Phineus Painter, of the later 6th century; those which do not are apparently the work of followers of this painter (Rumpf, Ch.V. 111ff; 125-126 discusses the cups and the problems of dating). Almost all have ears, and though several have a figure between the eyes like the majority of Attic eye-cups, so that the impression of a face is weakened, most have noses. Most of the ears are human, and the majority of these have a stud ear-ring; the rest of the ears are equine. This led Rumpf to suggest (op.cit. 111) that, while the part-faces with animal-ears belonged to silens, those with human ears were probably female and belonged to nymphs. This is possible, but it is significant that the noses are extremely similar in all examples, with bulbous bridge which seems ill-suited to a nymph or maenad, but is well-known in gorgoneia and satyrs or silens. The lines running from nostrils to ears are also familiar from mainland gorgoneia of the 'Corinthian' type. Stud ear-rings, though not unknown on 'nymph'-heads, are much more common on gorgoneia. Finally, very many examples (including some of the 'silens') - see, e.g., Ch.V. pls. 177-182 - have a lotus 'beauty-spot' on the brow, recalling one of the early types of Tarentine gorgoneion-antefix, Arch.Class. 6, 1954, pl. 68.5; on the whole, this seems unlikely to be pure coincidence. (Cf. also the

Etruscan bf amphora, Munich, Jahn 1008, in AM 25, 1900, 96, figs. 32, 33; this has a part-face with nose and brows formed by a goat's head and horns, an upward-pointing lotus between the brows, and, along the upper border of the panel, a fringe of large curls).

The general appearance of the Chalcidian cups, and the relation of the face-zone to the bowl, is certainly reminiscent of the Ionian cups.

The Attic eye-cups (see pl. 54c), the earliest dating from c. 540 B.C., are almost all less like the East Greek cups in the distribution of decoration, the eye-zone usually taking up a greater area of the bowl, and also in the general appearance of the 'face'. Noses are few, and, where they occur, very small and unobtrusive, squashed between the large eyes. However, their existence, combined with a beauty-spot above the brows, indicates that the same type is involved; (see e.g. H. Bloesch, Formen attischer Schalen pls. 1 (Exekias)), 8.2a, 11.2a, and pp. 5 nos. 2, 3; 7; 9 nos. 8, 9; 10; 13 (Nikosthenes)). The most common sort of beauty-spot seems to be a drop or stroke between two dots; this occurs on Attic full gorgoneia, e.g. Hoppin, BFV 217, 303.

At least two Nikosthenic amphorae have a part-face on the shoulder-zone: Hoppin, BFV 266, CVA Petit Palais pl. 10.1, with a stroke between the brows, and Hoppin, BFV 195, which has a nose and just one eye on each side, between palmettes.

Ears are unknown in the main series of Attic eye-cups. A small group of cups with 'Ionian' foot (i.e. like the Chalcidian' cups), listed by Bloesch, op.cit. 28, provide the exception: no. 10 (CVA

Villa Giulia 3, pl.III He 41.5,6) has a drop between the eyes, and what Bloesch describes as 'gesträusste, behaarte Ohren', actually looking more like feathers or even wings; no.9 (AM 25, 1900, 56, fig.15), has silen's ears, and a female head with flower on the brow like Athena on some Chalcidian cups, appears between the eyes; these are cleverly adapted to double as wings, thus making a sphinx or siren. No.1, (AM 25, 1900, 57 fig.17), reconstructed from sherds, is very like the 'Chalcidian' cups in the distribution of the decoration, i.e., the face-zone is narrow for Attic, and its face has a nose.

The treatment of the examples with nose is generally so similar to that of the tondo-gorgoneia and of, for example, the gorgoneion-skyphoi (JdI 85, 1970, 1ff), that their gorgoneion-meaning seems undeniable: at least, I cannot imagine how they could have been separated in the minds of the Athenians (though Mrs. Freyer-Schauenburg, JdI 85, 26, seems to follow Furtwängler in considering them distinct). Incidentally, an example of a part-face which must be a gorgoneion appears on a pelta on a late cup by Douris: W.Kraiker, Die rotfigurigen attischen Vasen, Heidelberg, 24, pl.13, no78. And one final intriguing example: CVA Cambridge 1, pl.III H 18.2, an eye-cup with gorgoneia in the irises of the eyes (perhaps rather an ambivalent piece of evidence!)

In the case of each of the schools discussed, there seems to me good reason to think that the part-faces (except those with equine ears) were all originally meant as gorgoneia. No doubt they continued to be thought of as such even in Attic, where usually only

the eyes remain; in this last case, however, it is perhaps just possible that, as with many mythological scenes, the eyes became part of the stock decorative repertoire, and were used without thought of their original gorgon-significance (though presumably their apotropaic significance remained).

That there is a connection between the Attic and 'Chalcidian' eye-cups is certain: the hybrid examples prove this. That there is a connection between these two classes and the East Greek cups also seems certain to me: the East Greek examples continue into the 6th century, and it is at least interesting that eye-cups appear in both Attic and 'Chalcidian' at a time in that century when East Greek influence was beginning to affect both schools in other respects (the Phineus Group, in contrast with earlier 'Chalcidian', shows slight but unmistakable evidence of this). The exact nature of the connection remains obscure. However, without wishing to enter the controversy as to the relationship between the Attic and 'Chalcidian' cups, I believe that the latter group generally shows a stronger likeness than the former to the East Greek cups.

APPENDIX 3The Didyma architrave-gorgons (Cat. D.i).1. Position

The attribution of the gorgons to diagonally-opposite corners (Knackfuss and Gruben) is apparently made on the assumption that the short sides of the corner blocks of an architrave would always be on the long sides of the temple, and not on the front or back. (Knackfuss, Didyma I. 126, 'Die entgegengesetzte Bewegungsrichtung der Gorgo bei gleicher Lage der Stossfugen beweist, dass die Blöcke nicht den Ecken der gleichen Front angehören, sondern diagonal gegenüberstehende Ecken bildeten.' And, Gruben, JdI 78, 1963, 144, 'Die Stossfuge des erhaltenen Stückes muss zur Langseite hin gerichtet gewesen sein...'). As the Berlin gorgon was found on the north side, (presumably) nearer the west end (Didyma I 125, '... kam auf der Nordseite des Tempels ausserhalb des Stufenbaues zu Tage'), it is presumed to belong to the NW corner, and therefore the Istanbul gorgon has to go to the SE corner.

According to Pontremoli and Hausoullier, however, the Istanbul gorgon was found, in the second of their two campaigns, 'dans le voisinage des Deux Colonnes'. The Two Columns are the fourth and fifth from the east front in the inner north colonnade of the later temple, and their position corresponds almost exactly with the NE

corner of the archaic temple (Gruben, op.cit., abbs.2,3). This cannot, of course, be conclusive: Pontremoli and Hausoullier in their second campaign opened a trench across the entire east front of the temple, and one does not know how accurate their provenances are. (The rest of their archaic marbles were found in the first campaign, when their trench was on the north side only, beside the two Columns). Further, there is no certainty that the blocks of the archaic temple were re-used in foundations very near to their original positions (this would apply to the Berlin gorgon too), especially as there was a gap of a hundred and fifty years before the rebuilding.

Despite these uncertainties, it is perhaps worth considering whether the 'rule' about the corner blocks of architraves is invariable. There are no surviving archaic Ionic architraves. Among surviving temples with architraves, however, there are a few which have one, or at the most two, corner blocks with the short side to the front.

- (1) Paestum, 'Basilica' (Temple of Hera I), c.530 B.C. Certainly the NE corner, possibly also the SE (H.Berve, G.Gruben, M.Hirmer, Greek Temples, Theatres and Shrines pl.108).
- (2) Athens, Parthenon, c.447-438 B.C. NE corner (A.W.Lawrence, Greek Architecture pl.47, Berve, op.cit., pl.9).
- (3) Athens, Erechtheum, c.421-406 B.C. North porch, both ends of the north front (Lawrence, op.cit., pl.70).

Curiously, Knackfuss' own front elevation of the later Didymaion (Didyma I, Zeichnungen, pl.15) shows a short block at the NE end,

contradicted, however, by his drawing of the north side (op.cit, pls, 11-12). For what it is worth, the 'restored elevation' of the east front of Assos shows the blank ends of the side-frieze blocks (Lawrence pl.38a; more details in J.P.Clarke, Investigations at Assos, 250ff, fig.62 - the restoration clearly based on the most painstaking calculations).

Of the surviving temples, only the ~~Bretheum~~ is Ionic, and one might say that a projecting porch is not an exact parallel. The coincidence of the east front and the NE corner in the other two examples is interesting.

At least these examples may show that it is not absolutely certain that the Didyma gorgons adorned diagonally-opposite corners, or specifically the NW and SE corners.

Supposing the Istanbul gorgon to belong to the NE corner instead of the SE, she would then be running away from the east centre-front, as the Berlin gorgon, if correctly placed at the NW corner, runs from the west front. In the absence of further evidence, this is not notably less credible than Gruben's hypothesis that all the corner-gorgons were running towards the centre of the east front (i.e. those of the west front running outwards, those of the east inwards).

2. The objects carried by the gorgons.

The problem of the objects carried by the gorgons has not yet been solved. Mendel's suggestion of a stone (as a weapon) is unlikely in view of the way the objects are held and their smooth, regular shape.

His alternative suggestion of a thunderbolt is no more plausible.

Two Etruscan examples offer possible parallels without providing an interpretation:

(a) 'Pontic' amphora, CVA Reading 1, pls, 36, 37, pp.56,57.

on either side of the neck is a gorgon from the waist up, brandishing in raised hands objects which, according to the commentary, 'look for all the world like dumb-bells'. The paint is so worn that it is impossible to tell from the photograph whether the objects may really have a depression in the middle, like dumb-bells, or whether they are simply oblong like the Didyma ones.

(b) Bronze tripod from Vulci, second half of 5th century, Giglioli pl.103 (tripod), L.Savignoni, Mon.Ant.VII, 249, fig.24

(figures). The gorgon is at the top of one of the tripod-legs, Perseus and Hermes on the other two. The gorgon moves to her left, her arms in almost ~~the~~ same position as those of the Didyma gorgons. In each hand she holds an 'oggetto oblungo'. Savignoni suggests that these are perhaps the remains of snakes, or even of one long snake. The latter is impossible - the object in the right hand touches the body at its left end, so that the 'snake' would have had to curve back on itself in a most unlikely way to reach the left hand. Two snakes would just be possible (cf. the antefix from Capua, Giglioli pl. 174); Savignoni says 'sembra che la figura abbia sofferta guasti' - but the lower end of the left-hand object does not look broken, and it is perhaps curious that the broken 'snakes' should have rounded ends, and

be broken off at the same distance on each side of the hands. It is more likely that these are the same type of 'mystery objects' as the Didyma and Reading ones.

Mr. J. Boardman has also recalled to me the objects held by the pairs of men 'boxing', or, at any rate, indulging in some violent physical contest, for a trophy, on some of the bronze situlae from the areas around the head of the Adriatic (w.Lucke, Die Situla in Providence, (1962), pls.7,13,42,49). These certainly show signs of the influence of Greek art, among others. See now Boardman's article, 'A Southern View of Situla Art', in Studies in Honour of C.F.O.Hawkes (1971), ed. Boardman, Brown and Powell, p.134. He believes that the Pontic gorgon's 'dumb-bells' may be a sign of influence from situla art, and gives examples of Etruscan centaurs carrying similarly-shaped rocks. However, there are definite East Greek elements on the Pontic vase (e.g. the helmet with vertical projection on the brow).

The only actual object of approximately this shape known to me, is a single stone 'jumping weight', with slightly swollen ends, and grooves for the fingers, in the British Museum, from Rhodes, (Inv. 67.5-6.48).

APPENDIX 4The Carchemish and Olympia shields, (Cat. E.1 and 2).

The problem of the origin of the two shields must be approached through an examination of style and iconography. There is no doubt that the shields are closely related in form: as Kunze remarks, the Carchemish shield is the sole real parallel for the Olympia fragment.

Kunze is the only scholar to have discussed the two shields in any detail (in his publication of the Olympia shield, Ol.Ber.V, 46-50). He believes that the more careful design and workmanship of the Olympia piece indicates priority in date over the Carchemish shield, which is a hastier, more summary version: 'Der Schild aus Olympia wirkt im Ganzen wie im Einzelnen ursprünglicher, der andere abgeleitet: und dieser Eindruck dürfte kaum trügen' (op.cit. p.48). Considering possible origins, he thinks the animals nearer to Protocorinthian than to 'Rhodian' ('Wild Goat'), while acknowledging that the shield does not much resemble other supposedly Protocorinthian metal-work (op.cit. p.50). He wonders whether a city near Corinth might answer this problem, but dismisses Argos: there is little on which to base such an attribution, and indeed, the difference between the decoration of these shields and that of early 'Argive' shields is against it. In conclusion he says that neither shield can be assigned with certainty to a definite area or school, but that the Gorgoneion, as well as the animals,

perhaps suggests one of the Cyclades, a meeting-ground of mainland Greek and Eastern influences.

Kunze dates the Olympia shield to the 3rd quarter of the 7th century at the latest; the terminus ante quem of the Carchemish shield is 605/4 B.C. (see Cat.).

In my view, the gorgoneion-type makes the East Greek origin of the Carchemish shield almost certain. Kunze (p. 949) remarks that the two gorgoneia are the earliest known examples of the type with snakes encircling the head, '...wie wir sonst erst aus der ersten hälfte des 6 Jahrhunderts von lakonischen und ionischen Schalenmedaillons kennen.' The Laconian examples cited are only superficially similar: the snakes are of a different type (not even S-shaped, let alone looped), and on the better-preserved fragment (BSA 34, 1933-34, pl. 37a) the gorgoneion has long hair in unbroken waves, a beard, and fangs well-removed from the tongue. The snakes appear only round the top of the head, with a longer trailing one at ear-level (cf. also AO pl. XVII). The only certainly Laconian gorgoneion known to me with snakes all round the head is that in the tondo of a mid-6th century cup in Paris (A. de Ridder, Vases de la Bibl. Nat. pl. V, no. 191: 'beaucoup de repeints'). The snakes are hook-shaped and uniform all round; the wavy hair and beard remain, and the face resembles the Corinthian type, with curving cheek-bones strongly marking off the top half from the bottom. The bronze-relief from Cyrene (p. 139) has pairs of intertwined snakes all round the head, but again, the general type of the mask is very different from that of the shields.

When one turns to the Ionian example cited by Kunze, the Fikellura cup-fragment from Samos (B.3), the resemblance is obvious and striking. Moreover, there are many other East Greek parallels in various materials, the earliest being the bronze votive-shields from Samos (E.3 and 4, second quarter of the 6th century). The gorgoneion A.2, on the brow of a helmeted-head aryballos dated to the late 7th century, is also clearly related: it has no snakes over the top of the head, but a combination of curved and fully-looped snakes frames the rest of the face from temple to temple, and the fangs touch the tongue.

There is no parallel whatsoever for this type of gorgoneion in certainly Corinthian or Cycladic art.

As for the animals, those of the Carchemish shield are so cramped, and sketchily done, and so badly preserved, that it is impossible to reach any indisputable conclusions about their style. The most one can say is that the running dogs bear a general resemblance to those of Protocorinthian and 'Rhodian'. Rows of riderless horses are unknown in surviving 'Rhodian' (in fact, horses are very rare altogether: see Schiering, Werkstätten, index); they appear occasionally in Protocorinthian, e.g., Perachora II 77, no.673, pl.30, a cup of the 2nd quarter of the 7th century, whose shape 'must be derived from the East Greek bird bowls', and CVA Louvre 13, pl.III c 43.9, a piriform aryballos, c.630 B.C., with hare and hounds in another zone. These are just like ridden PC horses, full of angles and spring, and completely different in style from those of the shield. Rows of horses

also occur in Near Eastern art, e.g., Giglioli pl.xxix, a 7th century Phoenician gilded-silver bowl from the Bernardini tomb at Praeneste.

The animals of the Olympia shield are thought by Kunze to be more like Protocorinthian than 'Rhodian' examples. The dogs are possibly slightly closer to Protocorinthian, but I do not think that this can be claimed for the rest. Ostriches are almost unknown to both schools. A possible Corinthian example appears on a Transitional PC sherd from Rhodes, (J.Brants, Description of the Ancient Pottery of the Mus. of Arch. of Leiden, Pt.II, pl.12.9, Inv. I 1905/1 31). Two examples from S.Russia are either Greek work, or heavily influenced by Greek work of an East Greek flavour: (i) Boardman, The Greeks Overseas 269, fig.73b, 270 (end of 7th century.); (ii) M.I. Maximova, Griechische Städte... (ed. Irscher and Schelow, 1961), pls. 23,24, the silver rhyton from Kelermes, early 6th century. (A fair number of examples exist in Near Eastern art of the 9th-7th centuries). The goats are of 'East Greek' type (though some examples do occur in Protocorinthian and Corinthian: Payne, NC 70, n.6), but are much more solidly built than most 'Wild Goat' style goats, with shorter, less pointed faces, and thick legs (there are some closer-than-average parallels on unpublished pots in Izmir Museum). Protocorinthian and Transitional goats (not to mention Corinthian ones) almost all have quite a different character from those of the shield, and from the majority of 'Rhodian' ones, even when they are of 'Rhodian' type: they are very solid and earth-bound, practically never run (one example, the light-on-dark frieze of the Chigi Vase, Friis Johansen, VS pl.XL) and hardly ever lift their heads from grazing; they

all seem to have beards.

Dot-rosettes without 'spokes', which appear on both shields, are, of course, the most common filling-ornament on LBC and transitional pots, but they are also quite common, among a great variety of filling-ornaments, on 'rhodian' pottery (see Kardara, RA 170,269). They also occur on the East Greek Herakles/Potnia Theron bronze relief from Olympia (Olympia IV pl.38, here pp.367ff. pls. 75b, 77a).

The dividing-bands of simple rows of dots, punched from behind and incised in front, which also appear on both shields, are extremely rare in extant Greek metal-work. The shield-bands, for instance, admittedly different in character, usually have cable or forms of 'bead and reel' or tongues between scenes (dots, Schefold, ML pl.41a). Dots, incised only, appear as zone-dividers on the bronze dish from Struxia in the Louvre, which is thought Rhodian by F.Villard, and probably Struccean by some other scholars (Mon.Piot.48, 1954, pls.II-V; F.Hiller, MarbWPr. 1963 (publ. 1964) 27ff.). The use of dots in this way was probably adopted from the Near East (see below). Borders of three rows of dots are to be found on a group of bronze votive-shields from Samos (see pl.15). Some of the Cretan shields, extremely oriental in character, have zones of large dots, often between heavy lines (e.g. Kunze, Kretische Bronzereliefs pls. 1-3,5), sometimes alone, but usually surrounded by other pattern-zones (op.cit. pls.4,6,7,10, etc.).

Kunze comments briefly (Ol.Forsch II, 47) on the resemblance to Phoenician bowls, mentioning the dot-rows, and the ostriches on one of

the bronze bowls from Nimrud. It is clearly from Nr. Eastern art such as this that the concentric zones of animals on the two shields are derived, and the comparison is intriguing. (The references which follow are all to A.H.Layard, Monuments of Nineveh II). Generally the dividing-zones are single cables or bands of oblique strokes, but dots (points) appear on pls. 57 E and 63, and circles, as on our shields, as decorative zones round the central rosette in pls. 60 and 61A. They are incised only, not punched from behind.

The bowls with many zones have a plain band between each animal-zone (pls. 59A, 59C, 61A). The animals include deer (59A, 60, 61A), dogs (61A), hares (61A), and dogs chasing hares (64), as well as very eastern-looking bulls, lions and griffins.

Dot-rosettes, consisting of points, not circles, appear on pls. 57B,E, 58E, 59C,D, 61B.

The animal-style of the Olympia shield is unmistakably Greek. That of the Carchemish shield, more careless and crowded, bears a superficial resemblance in the published photograph to that of the most similar of the Nimrud bowls, pl. 61A. Even in photographs, however, it is clear that the animals of the bowls are dry and angular, stiffly walking, as opposed to the shield animals, who rush along, supple and rounded. In the originals, the fundamental difference in style (not to mention technique) is most striking, and must dispel any doubts about the Greek workmanship of the shield. The similarity of the dogs on the two shields is also much greater than appears from the photograph of the Carchemish shield.

To sum up: The Carchemish shield is certainly Greek. The

gorgoneion is, moreover, of East Greek type, and, in the complete absence of parallels in mainland Greek art, there is no reason to doubt that it was made east of the Aegean. The looped snake of the Olympia shield belonged, beyond reasonable doubt, to a gorgoneion of the same type. The style of the Olympia animals does not exclude an East Greek attribution, and their type on the whole favours it. Therefore the Olympia shield is almost certainly East Greek also. There is nothing to connect it with the Cyclades.

The difference in quality of workmanship between the two shields could be caused, as Kunze suggests, by a difference in date, but this seems to me a risky conclusion even when dealing with objects known to be products of the same city. Here we have to deal, not with one city, but with a whole large region, and, quite apart from the price the buyer could give, the workshops available to him, and the degree of Near Eastern influence on them, would also have relevance. Therefore, it seems to me that Kunze is mistaken in dating the Olympia shield before the Carchemish one for the reasons he gives. In any event, a date before 650 B.C. seems highly unlikely on stylistic grounds, and neither the style of the animals, I believe, nor the dot-rosettes, would preclude a dating as late as the last quarter of the 7th century.

Finally, some circumstantial evidence for East Greek ownership of the Carchemish shield. (It is, of course, possible that the shield reached that city in some other way than on the arm of a Greek soldier, but the finding of a Greek greave at the West Gate, even if, as Woolley thinks (op.cit.81), it was lost sometime before the final sack, shows

that Greek mercenaries were present near that date). We know from Herodotus (II 159) that after his victory at Gaza on his march north to Carchemish, the Pharaoh Necho dedicated the clothes he had worn to Apollo of Branchidae: this certainly implies Greek, and very probably East Greek, influence (cf. Hdt. I 157 - importance of Branchidae to the Ionians and Aeolians). Further, the account given by Herodotus (II 152 ff) of Greek relations, military and mercantile, with Egypt from the mid-7th century on (filled out by J. Boardman, The Greeks Overseas 131-134), shows that the Greeks concerned were almost exclusively East Greeks. On the Babylonian side, a fragment of Alcaeus (D.L. Page, Sappho and Alcaeus 223, Z 27) describes the poet's brother as returning from the ends of the earth after performing great feats in the service of the Babylonians; this could even have been at Carchemish, but perhaps more likely are Nebuchadnezzar's campaigns in Palestine in the early 6th century (I owe this reference to Prof. C.M. Robertson).

These pieces of information are not, of course, proof, but they may fairly be thought to show that there is a good chance that the Carchemish shield was owned, as well as made, by an East Greek.

APPENDIX 5OTHER EAST GREEK BRONZE SHIELD-DEVICES FROM OLYMPIA

After attributing the bronze gorgoneion shield-device J.1, to East Greece, it is tempting to look among the other bronze shield-devices from Olympia, to see whether any of them may be assigned to the same area. A candidate immediately presents itself in the shape of the horse-head found in the same sector (NW corner of the stadium) at the same time: Ol.Ber. I, 56, pl.11; II, 76-77, pl.26. No precise details of find-spots are given. pl.55a.

The greatest length of the head is 25 cm. Like the gorgoneion, it is in higher relief than most of the other shield-devices; it is incised, and, also like J.1, had inlaid ivory eye-balls.

Kunze and Schleif in Ol.Ber. II date it to the end of the 6th century, saying that horses on red-figure vases of the turn of the century show the same characteristics.

The straps of the harness recall many East Greek painted representations: see, e.g., pl. 65 (Chiot); pls. 61, 70 (Clazomenian); GVA BM8, pl. II Dq 5. See also Beazley, LHG 23.

The most interesting feature, however, is the cheek-piece, the curved piece of metal attached to the end of the bit. It is very large, and curves forward, protruding beyond the horse's muzzle, apparently with a small knob at each end. The two cheek-straps are attached near the centre of the curve. (The end of the bit, or the rein-ring, can be seen between them, and the hook which hangs down behind the cheek-piece

is also for the reins; these last features occur with other types of cheek-piece). I have been unable to find any mention of this type of cheek-piece as specifically East Greek, though I would not claim to have made an exhaustive survey of the literature on Greek harness. This particular example is mentioned briefly, without attribution, by Åkerström in his discussion of Larisa Frieze VIII, (see below). The only other reference known to me is that of Yalouris.

N. Yalouris, in his article 'Athena als Herrin der Pferde', Mus. Helv. 7, 1950, discusses 'Corinthian' bits (pp.30-47). These are the type most commonly seen in Greek art from the second half of the 7th century, with semi-circular cheek-pieces whose ends point backwards, the reins normally being attached to these ends. Yalouris believes that these were brought from Assyria to Corinth about the mid-7th century, and from there spread throughout Greece. In the course of his discussion, he three times refers to the type of bit whose semi-circular cheek-pieces point forwards, but clearly regards it simply as a variant of the Corinthian type, with no special significance. He refers thus to our shield-device (op.cit. 42), calling it a 'Flugelpferd [!] argivischer Herkunft', and dating it to the first half of the 5th century. His other references are: p.42, n.125, to a late Proto-Attic amphora (AA 50, 1935, 294, Abb.19), and n.129, to 'Chalcidian examples' (Rumpf, Ch.V. pls. 215, 216). The latter actually occur solely in the Group of the Polyphemus Amphora, dated by Rumpf (p.169) to c.530, and described as 'related to Chalcidian'; on Chalcidian vases proper there appear to be no similar examples. In both these cases, the

cheek-piece is fairly small, not protruding beyond the horse's muzzle, and the cheek-straps are attached to the ends (the Polyphemus Group examples are very sketchy, with no clear details, the Proto-Attic one is a mirror-image of the usual Corinthian type). These examples do not seem sufficiently similar to our cheek-piece to be comparable, and Yalouris is probably right in his interpretation of them (rather similar, sketchy examples may be seen from time to time in Attic Bf). (Yalouris has one more reference, p.43, n.132, to one of the horses from the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus. This example appears in the old reconstruction to be of the type of the Olympia shield-device, but its position has recently been changed: it is actually the ordinary 'Corinthian' type).

There are, however, several instances of this type of cheek-piece in East Greek art of the late 7th and 6th centuries, and these show that it is certainly an independent form, rather than just a variant of the 'Corinthian' cheek-piece:

(As strict chronological order is difficult to decide, the examples are grouped according to the type of object on which they appear: first pottery, second coins, and lastly stone and terracotta reliefs).

1. 'Rhodian' plastic vases in the form of horses' heads. With modelled harness: Ducat 107ff., A.1, B.1 (Higgins II, 25, pl.15, 1636, 1637); A.2 (CVA Scheurleer 1, pl.II D, III C 1.6); A'.1 (CVA Cracow pl.3.8). With painted harness: Ducat G.5 (Vienna, Kunsth. Mus. V.1411, Ant.K. 7, 1964, pl.17.4);
Beginning late 7th century. (c.610). Pl.56 a, b.

2. 'Rhodian' plate, with horse and rider. Berlin, Inv.3724.
 Neugebauer, Führer pl.17; H. Prinz, Funde aus Naukratis pl.3a;
 Rumpf, JdI 48, 1933, 77,d.57, 'Euphorbos Group, developed phase';
 Schiering, Werkstätten 67.
 Late 7th or early 6th century. Pl. 56c.
3. Fragmentary column-krater from Nisiros, with galloping horsemen.
Cl.Rh. VI-VII, 524, fig. 54 ff, Tomb 38, Inv. 14324. Mentioned
 by Schiering, op-cit., as dating from the end of the 'Euphorbos
 period'. Unusual style, but clearly East Greek. The figure-
 zone uses incision, and blotchy (Corinthian-inspired?) rosettes as
 filling.
 Early 6th century.
4. Plate-fragment from Naukratis, BM 86.4-1.1272.
JHS 44, 1924, pl.VII.9; Schiering, Werkstätten,33, 'Vlastos Gp';
 Considered 'Aeolic' by E. Walter-Karydi, 'Aeolische Kunst' in Studien
zur griechische Vasenmalerei (1970), 6,9, pl.3.5.
 Early 6th century. Pl. 57b.
5. Unpublished dish in Izmir Museum, with a top-heavy, engaging little
 horse. The muzzle is very worn, but harness is visible, and an odd
 spike appearing above the end of the nose may plausibly be explained
 as the end of a cheek-piece of our type.
 First quarter of the 6th century? Pl. 57a.

6. EL 1/12 stater, wt. 1.20gm., and 1/24 stater, wt. 0.6gm., from the Central Basis at Ephesus, now in Istanbul. Horse-head.
D.G. Hogarth, Ephesus, pl.II.77,78; E.S.G. Robinson, JHS 71, 1951, 163, pl.38,24,25. Cf. BMC Ionia pl.II.11; Samml. von Aulock Ionia 1780-1782?
Dated c.600 by Robinson, and cannot be later than c.590.
7. EL 1/6 stater, wt. c.2.4gm. Forepart of winged horse.
BMC Ionia 3, pl.1.10 'possibly of Lampsacus'.
First half of 6th century. Pl. 57 d.
8. EL 1/24 stater, wt. c.0.5gm. Horse-head.
In the British Museum, not illustrated in BMC.
First half of the 6th century. Pl. 57 c.
9. EL stater, wt. 14.23gm., Cabinet des Medailles, Paris. The forepart of a horse, possibly winged, the harness very clear.
E. Babelon, Inventaire Sommaire de la Collection Waddington (1898), 78, no.1406, pl.III.9 (apparently = Babelon, Traite vol.2,67, Plates 1, pl.II.24). Babelon attributes this coin to southern Ionia because of its weight, appearance, and incuse (a rectangle between two squares, filled with crossing lines), and suggests that our no.7 may belong to the same issue.
First half of the 6th century. Pl. 57 e

All these coins are of the same standard, the 'Lydian' or 'Milesian'.

10. Marble relief from a tomb at Bin Tepe, near Sardis. BM B 269, 89.10-21.1. The sculptured frieze, 8.5 cm. high, has three men carrying spears, trotting along on squat little horses. F.N. Pryce, Cat. of Sculpture in BM, vol.I, pt.1, 99-100, fig.164; Akurgal, KA 156, Abb.107, 'the only remains of 6th century Lydian sculpture'.

Later 6th century (Akurgal,; 'first half', but this is surely too early). Pl. 58 a.

11. Marble relief fragments from Myus. Chariot race.

There are 35 fragments, from at least 10 slabs; on 4, the race goes from left to right, on the rest, from right to left. Two-horse chariots of East Greek type (closest to Larisa Friezes II, III, and IV), with four-, six-, and eight-spoked wheels. Ht. of slab, 70 cm. C. Blümel, Die archaisch griechischen Skulpturen der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin (1963), 61, no.65, figs. 193-210.

Earlier third quarter 6th century? Pl. 58 b.

12. Fragment of terracotta sima, from Sardis. Chariot-scene.

T.L. Shear, Sardis X (1926) 27ff., pl.11; Åkerström, ATK 95, pl.39.1 (Now destroyed). The fragment is worn, but Shear describes the harness, comparing it with that of no.1³~~2~~ below: 'The bit ends in a wide outcurving iron outside the mouth. From the bit the rein passes back to the collar, which is a heavy band with a semicircular cutting resting on the shoulder of the horse...Attached to the collar is a moulded guiding-ring...'.

Third quarter of 6th century? (Åkerström, last quarter).

13. Terracotta relief of a chariot with armed charioteer and warrior. Of unknown provenance, but securely attributable to East Greece on several grounds. In Paris, Bibl.Nat.

Gaz.Arch. 8, 1883, 305, the best photograph for the harness;

Åkerström, ATK 43, pl.16.2.

Third quarter of 6th century.

Pl. 58 c, 52 c.

Åkerström, Terrakottaplatten 65, ATK 63, believes that the horses of the chariot-frieze Larisa VIII (Larisa II pl.39) may wear the same type of cheek-piece: '...wie an der Friesplatte im Louvre [no.13] oder an einem getriebenen Schildblech aus Olympia' (ours). He assigns this frieze to his 'Peloponnesian Group', and dates c.550-530. It is impossible to be certain either way about the cheek-piece.

A curious example to be considered is the painted horse-head on the base of the stag-head plastic vase, JHS 58, 1938, pl.V.3, ^{(Pl. 58 d).} Is this simply an outsize 'Corinthian' cheek-piece dangling loose? Our East Greek type, as may be seen clearly on the shield-device and no.1³~~2~~, has attachments for the cheek-straps near the centre of the curve, not at the ends.

As may be seen from the examples given above, this cheek-piece is worn by both chariot- and riding-horses. The size varies (in the case of the aryballoi, the cheek-piece could not be made to protrude beyond the muzzle), and the knobs or spikes at the ends are not identical, but clearly the cheek-pieces are of the same type.

There are, it should be noted, a considerable number of archaic East Greek horses without this type of cheek-piece, among the horse-head aryballoi, on coins and pottery, marble and terracotta reliefs (the 'Corinthian' cheek-piece is not in evidence, however).

Our examples are distributed over almost the whole 6th century, though the majority are of the first half. The connection with Lydia is intriguing. Two examples are from Lydia itself; (though the Sardis plaque at least copies a Greek motif and is very Greek in appearance). The coins are all almost certainly from Ionia (some may even be^e Lydian, though a Greek origin is perhaps more likely). None of the pottery need be Rhodian, no.4 has been thought Aeolic in fabric, no.5 is probably local, and no.3 has parallels in technique and filling ornament from the north (some among unpublished material from Pitane). The chariot of No. 13. is close to some of the Larisa ones in type, and also to the Myus chariots (no.11) - note especially the wheel. The horse-head aryballoi alone seem not to fit into an 'Aeolian-Ionian' framework. In any event, it seems quite certain that this type of cheek-piece is at home in Asia Minor; it may just possibly be^e Lydian, taken over by the Greeks of S.Aeolis and Ionia, or it may be an East Greek invention. I have found no parallels elsewhere in Asia Minor.

The closest parallels for the cheek-piece of the Olympia bronze are nos. 11 and 13, two extremely clear and detailed examples (on many of the others the precise details cannot be distinguished). No. 13 has the same arrangement of hook beneath the chin for the reins (absent on No. 11, where the reins go straight back from the bit). The ends of the cheek-piece on the bronze are not so prominent and pointed as those of the other two (and of, e.g., the coins). In general style the shield-device is closest to no. 13, though again, no. 11 is extremely close; the shape

of the head and eyes is very similar in all three. Some Clazomenian horses' heads are also quite similar in shape: cf. CVA BM 8, pl. II Dn 4.1, 10.2.

The date of the bronze must be the later 6th century, perhaps c.525.

LION-HEAD, pl. 55 b .

Another shield-device, fragmentary this time, which I believe may belong to the same school as the gorgoneion and horse-head, is the Lion-head, Ol.Ber. III, 85, pl.28, Inv. B 849. This is thought to have been part of a protome, or possibly a half-lion, and is dated to the late 6th century. It was found in the stadium area, though not in the same place as the other two. It shows a similar spirited quality, and is, like them, in higher relief than the rest. The eye, originally inlaid with ivory, is extremely similar in shape to that of the horse. The treatment of such details as the mane, the ear, and the 'jaw-flap' is found among East Greek Lions of the later 6th century (cf. the lion on a bronze votive-shield from Samos, Brown, EL pl.27b).

There is no reason to think that any of the other Olympia shield-devices are East Greek. They are very much flatter in appearance, and, in fact, it is difficult to detect any definite stylistic similarities between them; however, the solitary wing, Ol.Ber. V pl.33, is very close to that of the rearing winged horse, Ol.Ber. II pl.24, and must belong to the same workshop.

APPENDIX 6Some Observations on Disc and Stud Ear-Rings

It was noted of the East Greek gorgons and gorgoneia, that from the second quarter of the 6th century at least, a significant proportion wear disc ear-rings (see pp.183f). These are not to be found on Attic gorgons or gorgoneia until the late 6th century (in vase-painting, until early Rf); and then only on examples of East Greek type. In the West also, the only examples with disc ear-rings are the later 6th century ones of East Greek type, and a few others of the late archaic period (see p.150 and pl.45c, Campanian).

Few, if any, would be likely to deny that the disc ear-ring is not native to Attica: quite apart from the evidence of the gorgoneia, disc ear-rings first appear on women in vase-painting only with early Rf, when they are suddenly plentiful (e.g. A/H/S pls. 99-104, 106, 116, 134 - Oltos, Smikros, Euthymides, Panaitios Painter). (The gold spiral ear-rings with a disc at one end, found in Attica, Higgins, Jewellery 99, pl.13E, dated to the first half of the 8th century, seem to me unlikely to have been passed through the ear-lobe, but were perhaps suspended in some way). If women on Attic Bf vases wear ear-rings (and this is fairly rare), they consist of a ring piercing the lobe, with pendants attached to it - a type which goes back at least to Assyria (e.g. CVA Munich 1, pl.1, c.590; FR pl.13; A/H/S pl.57, and

Karouzou, Amasis Painter passim; Hoppin, BFV 133,322. Continuing in Rf: A/H/S pls.85,141; Cf. Hrouda, Kulturgeschichte des Assyrischen Flachbildes pl.8).

This type is also seen on Attic female statues of the earlier 6th century (Berlin goddess, Blümel, AGS fig.7, Lyons kore, Payne/Young pl.24), whereas the new-style 'Ionian' korai who begin to appear in great numbers around 530 usually wear the disc ear-ring. In these statues the ear-ring is sculpted, and very clearly distinguished from the ear in the modelling, as well as by painted decoration; occasionally the ear-lobe has a very large, circular hole, presumably for some metal or glass inlay (Payne/Young pls.36ff.; large hole, pl.69, no.659). For the last feature, cf. the Siphnian caryatid, Richter, Korai fig.318.

Interestingly, a few of the 'chiton-korai' which have been thought most 'Attic' in character seem to keep the old type of Attic pendant ear-ring, despite their new dress; although the actual ear-ring, originally added in metal, has gone, it is virtually certain that the small holes in the lobe were for this type, and not for a plug holding a disc, as the rest of the ear-lobe is modelled normally, so clearly meant to be seen (Payne/Young pl.28, no.669; pl.42, no.671; pl.53, no.681, 'Antenor's'; cf. pl.33, Peplos kore, and pl.35, no.678). In the very late archaic nos.686, 688, where a new ideal has come in, the disc ear-ring has vanished (Payne/Young pl.85,89; cf. also the very Attic-looking 'midget', pl.59, no.683).

The disc ear-ring also makes its appearance on Attic coins and terracottas in the late 6th century.

In East Greece, the earliest example of a disc ear-ring known to me appears on a terracotta statuette from Samos, dated before 650 B.C. (pl. 59a; also the first example with cross-wise himation? AM 66, 1941, 29-30, pl. 25, T 387; AM 76, 1961, 44, 48, Beil. 20), and this type is also worn by the 'Rhodian' female-bust aryballois, of the late 7th and early 6th centuries. In the 6th century there are many examples on terracottas, on marble statues and in vase-painting (as well as the disc-and-cap variety ably discussed by Hemelrijk), and in fact, this type seems to have a virtual monopoly in East Greek art until the end of the archaic period, when pyramid-pendants appear. (Examples: Higgins I pls. 10 no. 49; 12 no. 62; 25-28; Higgins II pls. 5-8, contrast pl. 2.1502; Richter, Korai figs. 232-234; 244-247; 291-292; BMC Sculpture vol. 1, pt. 1, pl. 5, p. 50 fig. 40; Naukratis II pl. 12; CVA Cambridge 2, pl. II D 17.40; Price, pl. 6.1, 12.16).

Though this type of large disc ear-ring seems to have been overwhelmingly popular in East Greece from an early date, it was not confined entirely to this region before its appearance in Attica after the mid-6th century. Earliest of all, a terracotta head from Amyclae, probably of c. 700, has a painted circle with a central dot on the ear-lobes (Higgins, Greek Terracottas 24, pl. 9a, with refs.).

A class of Argive terracottas, dated to the late 7th century and around 600 by Payne and Jenkins respectively, has them. These are followed by a group without ear-rings, then by a class of vaguely Cypriot appearance, with a slightly different type. I believe that outside influence is involved at least in the last-mentioned group

(Perachora I, 242, pl.109, nos.238,239; BDA 32, 1931-32, 35ff., pl.12, Class B, c.600; pl.14.2-5, Class E, and pl.15, Class F, second half of 6th century: Class F noted by Jenkins as under East Greek influence).

Some Boeotian figurines, dated c.550 and later by Higgins, also wear them (BM 1966.3-28.21, and; e.g., Higgins I pl.103,106). There is also a curious 'sphinx', dated c.600 (Higgins I pl.31).

In addition, a fine beaten bronze head from Olympia, probably of the late 7th century, has large circular holes in the ear-lobes, which must have had inlay (ADelt. 17, 1961-62, Chron. 121-122, pl.140; this may be East Greek - see p.376).

A kore-head of very poor workmanship, found at Sikyon and dated by Richter to the mid-6th century, wears disc ear-rings; the date must be uncertain (Korai figs. 301-303).

Schrader (Marmorbildwerke 320, pl.184), and Beazley (AntK. 4, 1961, 59) believed that the fine marble gorgon from the Acropolis (Pl. 50a) wore disc ear-rings, because her lobes are flat and almost circular. In my opinion, this is extremely unlikely. Not only does it seem to me out of keeping with the detail of the rest of the figure that such an ear-ring should not be more clearly modelled, but there are several close parallels for this shape of ear-lobe in contemporary sculpture (e.g. Richter, Kouroi³ figs. 30, 70, 81, 183; cf. the sherd by the Gorgon Painter, Hesperia 13, 1944, pl.1.3).

All in all, the disc ear-ring seems very rare on the mainland before the late archaic period.

Of possible Cycladic works, the Nike of Delos wore disc ear-rings (Richter, Korai pl.XIV a), and the Siphnian caryatid has already been mentioned. On the Siphnian frieze, there are two or three types of ear-ring; on the East frieze, Aphrodite and Artemis look as though they had pendants (Attic sculptor? - though the stooping goddess on the North frieze perhaps had a disc); on the West and South friezes, the eastern disc-and-cap appeared, as Hemelrijk noted (Lullies, Greek Sculpture pls.49,54; Hemelrijk, BABesch, 28, 1963,40).

The ex-Cnidian caryatid, whether Cycladic or East Greek, wears large disc ear-rings, apparently fixed very low on the lobe, (Richter, Korai figs.271-274).

In Etruria, disc ear-rings appear on numerous female ears from the third quarter of the 6th century on, sometimes painted with the same cross-and-dots pattern as on Greek examples. Here certainly, it seems reasonable to assume influence from the eastern Aegean, probably from East Greece itself, considering the general character of most of the heads. (See, e.g. Andr en pls.2.4, 6.15,18 - heads not of 'Ionian' type, and dated to before 550, but possibly too early; pl.9; above all pl.140.491. Pallattino, Etruscan Painting 45,47 (T. of Lionesses), 57 (T. of Baron)).

Although there are no Attic gorgons or gorgoneia with disc ear-rings before the Rf period, Beazley recognized as ear-rings the spots on the lobes of gorgoneia of the second quarter of the 6th century by Kleitias (pl. 48 b) and Nearchos (Graef I pl.36; Beazley, AntK. 4,

1961, 58ff). There are other examples on Attic gorgoneia, though they remain exceptional (e.g. Nessos Painter, Karouzou, Aggeia tou Anagyrountos pl.31, and, later, Hoppin, BFV 168, Mnesikleides; CVA Louvre 10, pl.III He 103.6). Of these, Kleitias' and the Louvre tondo have real dots, the others circles. These Attic examples are not alone: the Syracuse gorgon (pl.42a) has red dots on her ear-lobes; compare also the EC gorgoneion, NC fig.24B, which has a large dot half-way up the ear - and a small one on one nostril! I believe that Beazley is right, and that these are ear-rings of stud type. I know of no examples on 'normal' women on either Attic or Corinthian vases (though I am not quite sure about Chelidon on the Thermon metope: Robertson, Greek Painting 50). However, the female protomes on an MC pyxis have them, as do the terracotta sphinxes from Thermon and Kalydon, in red (NC 239 n.4, pls.48.1-4, 49).

Later, 'Chalcidian' eye-cups of the Phineus group usually have dots on their human ears, in the form of a dark disc with a light spot in the centre; on the Phineus cup itself, and on one other example, the dots are larger, and have an incised rosette on them - a vital piece of proof that these are intended as ear-rings (Rumpf, CH.V. pls. 43 (Phineus cup), 44, 158ff.).

From Etruria, there is a terracotta female head from Caere, dated by Andr n to the first half of the 6th century, and certainly early in appearance (Andr n pl.6.13- could well be Corinthian-influenced). Also, on one of the Campana slabs, dating to the third quarter of the century, and very 'Ionian' in appearance, a woman being carried off by

two men has a ~~dark~~ dot on her ear-lobe - another useful piece of evidence (Pallottino, Etruscan Painting p.34).

There are no gorgoneia with stud ear-rings from East Greece, but there are in East Greek vase-painting, especially in Chiot, a great number of ears with painted circles and/or dots on the lobe, which it might be worth examining in the light of the mainland and Etruscan examples just mentioned.

It has already been noted that there are definite examples of disc ear-rings in Chiot, and other East Greek, vase-painting. These are distinguished by their size, their position (and this includes some of circle-and-dot type), or their decoration of cross and dots, and there can be no mistake. Disc ear-rings, both large and small, with a central stud which would be represented in painting as a dot, are common in sculpture. It seems likely, therefore that despite the obvious extreme stylization of Chiot ears both with and without 'ear-rings', the circle-and-dot Chiot ear-lobes would have been accepted without question as this type, and the simple dots as the stud type, but for the fact that both types of 'ear-ring' appear on men as well as on women and sphinxes.

T.B.L. Webster, mentioning two instances on Caeretan hydriae of men with small circles on their ear-lobes (JHS 48, 1928, 198), refuses to countenance the idea of Greek men with ear-rings; he quotes Xenophon (Anab. III 1-31) and Anacreon (fr.54) as evidence of the contempt in which Greeks held men who wore ear-rings, and declares of the Chiot examples '... here too...I prefer to believe until an absolutely certain

instance of a Greek man wearing ear-rings has been found, that the dot in the middle of the lobe represents a dimple'. Beazley, discussing Rf representations of Anacreon in a komos (Boston Vases II 56), does not mention Chiot, but accepts the apparent evidence of the quotations.

Webster seems to me right in seeing the pattern on the ear-lobes of certain early Attic kouroi (Richter, Kouroi³ fig.38, Sounion, fig.51, Dipylon head) as simply stylization, rather than as an ear-ring; it fits with the general treatment of details in these statues. The Xenophon quotation, however, is considerably later than our period, and I am not entirely convinced that Anacreon is criticizing ear-rings for men as such.

A brief review of the evidence from the eastern side of the Aegean may be helpful. Clearly ear-rings were by no means considered effeminate in Assyria: the king seems to wear them for all occasions (e.g. Barnett, Assyrische Palastreliefs pls.13, a Phoenician, and pl.84, Assurbanipal). Hemelrijk notes (op.cit.32 n.12) that 'Cypriot men often seem to have worn a single ring through the upper rim'. On a 6th century relief from Xanthos in Lycia (Akurgal, KA 135, Abb.86), not only the lyre-player, (who might perhaps be considered rather 'aesthetic'!), but also the beefy wrestlers, have large holes in their lobes, clearly for studs. A terracotta plaque from the destruction-fill of 547/6 at Sardis has a charming man, in Greek style if not Greek work, with what is certainly a disc ear-ring with central dot, (Åkerström, ATK 95, fig.29.2).

A Naukratis sherd, apparently from a plate, has a man wearing a large disc ear-ring with cross-pattern; he seems, however, to have some

kind of red head-covering, so he is possibly a barbarian.

So far, it is clear that ear-rings for men were quite normal in the archaic period among the non-Greek inhabitants of western Asia Minor, and, although the disc and stud types are not known from Assyria, they were clearly in use in Lycia and Lydia at least. (Cf. Archiv für Orientforsch. 4, 1927, 203, pl. 8.7).

In East Greek art, apart from the sherd just mentioned, two interesting examples are known to me: (i) the ivory kneeling boy from Samos, of the last quarter of the 7th century (Altsam.St. IV, Abb. 244, 245), has large holes for inlay in his ear-lobes; (ii) there is a 'Rhodian' male-bust plastic vase type, corresponding to the female-bust one, but not nearly so common, in which the man wears a large disc ear-ring (pl. 59b; Higgins II pl. 7.1513, cf. CVA Munich 6, pl. 279.2-4).

Though we cannot be sure that Greeks are represented here, it seems likely, particularly in the second case; and on the whole, it seems not improbably, that ear-rings were sometimes worn by quite ordinary male East Greeks (as opposed to luxurious decadents!). Relations with Lydia were close at this time; we know also from inscriptions and literary evidence that there was some, possibly considerable, mixed blood in the inhabitants of the East Greek cities.

(There is a much later example of a Greek youth with an ear-ring on a marble stele of c. 375 B.C., from Delos, in the British Museum: Description of the Marbles XI, pl. 50, inv. 1812-61. The holes, all that remain, are very high on the lobe, like those of the Pèplos kore, so perhaps they were for a ring rather than a stud.)

Returning to the chalices, it seems quite possible on the evidence discussed that some of the men could have ear-rings. Some ears look more ambiguous than others, and examples such as no.4 on the page of drawings almost cause one to despair. Others, however, notably nos. 1-3, and 8,9 ('Priam' and 'Achilles' on the Troilos/Ransom of Hector chalice, pl. 63) look very much like ear-rings, resembling the Sardis terracotta closely, though not quite closely enough for certainty.

The later 'boxers' amphora, assigned to the Campana group but apparently found in Egypt (BSA 47, 1952, pl.32) adds to the confusion: both men and woman have white dots on their ear-lobes - and we have seen the Lycian wrestlers with ear-rings - but why should these dots be any more realistic than those marking the boxers' leg-muscles?

Can some of these examples be accepted while others are discarded? It seems that all one can say in the end is that East Greek men seem sometimes to have worn ear-rings, and that therefore, some of the men on Chiot pottery may be intended to have them. In the case of Webster's Caeretan hydriae, it is interesting that the only examples of possible ear-rings worn by men outside East Greece should occur on vases by an East Greek painter; and, in the case of Anacreon, may he not have been shown with ear-rings on some vases because he actually wore them? At the very least, it seems wrong to say categorically that Greek men did not wear ear-rings.

One other puzzle remains: granted that the spots on the lobes of the mainland gorgoneia and sphinxes discussed above are intended as stud ear-rings, why should they be confined to creatures in some way monstrous

(this could apply also to the pyxis-protomes)? This may be chance, but on the whole it seems unlikely. The only explanation which occurs to me is that they were considered 'outlandish', and added a touch of strangeness or horror. This would fit with an importation from east of the Aegean; but the question seems as confused and confusing as that of the Chiot men's ears, and no very definite conclusions seem possible.

What we may claim is that East Greece is probably responsible, not only for the disc ear-rings of later 6th century statues and terracottas, but also for the isolated earlier mainland examples. The Etruscan examples, seem certainly to derive from the same source.

Archaeological evidence for actual disc and stud ear-rings is exceedingly meagre. C.Blinkenberg discusses possible studs in Lindos I, 115; on both types, Higgins, Jewellery 125-6, 137-9. A few examples of discs requiring a hole of c.0.5 cm. in the lobe are known (from Cyprus and Etruria). The proposed studs are very problematical in my opinion. The most likely is Hogarth, Ephesus pl.42.7, ivory, diam. 1.6 cm. (stalk narrower); just possible also is the rock-crystal object, diam. c.1.0cm., Boehlau, Nekropolen pl.15. 14. The shape of Lindos I pl.12, no.277 GA, seems fairly improbable, though not quite as unlikely as the gold objects from Cyprus, Ohnefalsch-Richter, Kypros: the Bible and Homer, pl.33.10,11, with a diam. of 2.4 cm., thickness of 1.4 cm., and concentric circles on both ends (quite apart from their size, why should they be symmetrical?).

^ Egyptian parallels.

A Selection of Chiot Ears.

1. Without ear-ring.



sphinx



sphinx



f



f



f



m & f



f



m



m



m

2. With ear-ring .



f



f



f



sphinxes



man



f

3. Others. All men except 5 (sphinx), 10 (woman).

1.



2.



3.



4.



5.



6.



Kavalla krater

Riders chalice

7.



8.



9.



10.



'Priam'

'Achilles'

Polyxena

Troilos chalice

11.



Boxers amphora, m & f.

PART TWOCHAPTER IIISCENES FROM THE TROJAN WAR AND THE ODYSSEYA. Aphrodite and Aeneas

London, Brit.Mus., Inv. 88.6-1. 482b. A. Chiot chalice sherd. from
Naukratis. Pl. 60 a.

Ht. c. 8cm., wth. c.4 cm.

E.R. Price, JHS 44, 1924, 218-219, pl.VI.6. Also mentioned by:
Friis Johansen, Iliad, 200, 271 (original, Danish, ed., 1934, 165); J.D.
Beazley in Caskey and Beazley, Attic Vase-paintings in Boston II, 20;
J. Boardman, BSA 51, 1956, 60 n.4.

Date: probably c.575 B.C.

The sherd has a cream slip; the paint is golden brown for outlines of
flesh and clothes, for the pleats of the woman's chiton and for the
spear, dark brown for the man's hair, eye and beard, and for part of his
tunic. The woman's cloak is dark red.

In the lower half of the sherd appears the upper part of a kneeling,
bending or crouching man, wearing a garment which is probably a tunic.¹
He has long hair bound with a fillet, and also possibly wears an ear-
ring.² Beside him was a standing (or sitting?) female figure: all
that remains is part of the right side of her chiton³ above the waist,
and her right arm holding out her cloak or veil behind the man's head.
Above, and at the left edge of the sherd, is part of a bent arm and
part of the shaft of a spear which the owner of the arm must have held.
He must have been standing in front of the couple and facing outwards

(i.e. to the left): a fine golden-brown line at the elbow (not visible on Price's photograph) must mark the outside of the joint. An examination of the sherd showed that the line which I assume to be a spear certainly could not be the upper border-line of the scene, as the angle is wrong. This arm with spear is not mentioned by Price, or by the other scholars who have referred to this sherd.

E.R. Price suggested that the sherd might be part of a representation of the fight between Diomedes and Aeneas (II.V 239ff), showing the moment when Aphrodite covers the wounded and helpless Aeneas with a fold of her dress to protect him from the weapons of the Achaeans (II.314-317). Miss Price believed (op.cit. 218-219) that a second sherd, with a shield (pl.VI.5?), certainly belonged to the same chalice.

Friis Johansen and Beazley note her interpretation without offering an alternative: Friis Johansen compared the Etruscan Bf amphora in Würzburg (see below); Beazley observes that 'the man does not look like a warrior'.

The only other suggestion in print is Boardman's, op.cit. Discussing possible Egyptian inspiration for some of the scenes on Greek pottery from Naukratis, he says of this sherd 'It might be the Greek way of depicting the Egyptian and oriental "embrace" of a king by his tutelary deity.' Interesting though this is, it seems to be quite ruled out by the arm holding the spear.

For the same reason, the suggestion, made to me in conversation, that the sherd might show Hera about to suckle Herakles, seems impossible. At first sight the position of the couple does recall the certain

representations of this rare subject, all very much later in date.⁴ However, in each of these cases Hera's breast is bare, and Herakles is identified by the lion-skin.

Is Price's identification any more plausible? In the Iliad (V.290ff) Diomedes kills Pandarus, who has driven with Aeneas to attack him, and Aeneas prepares to defend his friend's body. Diomedes hurls a huge boulder at Aeneas, crushing his hip and rendering him helpless. Aphrodite then tries to save her son, flinging her arms round him and screening him with 'a fold of her shining robe' as she removes him from the field. Wounded in the hand by Diomedes, she drops Aeneas; Apollo picks him up in a blue mist, but Diomedes still pursues, 'ever eager to kill Aeneas and strip off his fine armour', until finally warned off by Apollo.

It is immediately clear that there are two major discrepancies between this version and the sherd. On the latter, first, there is apparently a warrior, lacking in Homer, defending the couple; second, and more serious, 'Aeneas' has no armour. However, these discrepancies are not sufficient in themselves to rule out the interpretation. Greek vase-painters were not book-illustrators, bound to stick to the Iliad in every detail (they were probably unable to check details even if they had wanted, and even supposing the Iliad to be the only version circulating). They knew the general outline of the story, and that was usually enough for them. A glance at the certain representations of this scene (as of most other mythological scenes) is

enough to show that divergences from the Iliad version which we should consider serious, had no significance for the artists.⁵

Friis Johansen discusses the few known illustrations of the Diomedes-Aeneas fight, op.cit. 57-63, 200-207. Beazley also lists them with brief comment, op.cit. The two earliest, the fragmentary Corinthian pinax from Penteskouphia,⁶ roughly contemporary with the Chiot sherd, and the Bf. column-krater fragment from the Acropolis,⁷ dated by Johansen c.540 B.C., are not directly relevant, since they choose a different moment of the fight (they contain several 'inaccuracies', though). There are three fairly complete versions, all Rf., showing Aphrodite's intervention. The earliest is an Oltes cup⁸ of c.510 B.C., on which Diomedes wounds the goddess in the hand. She has let Aeneas fall, and Apollo rushes to help him. Diomedes is fully armed and wears a tunic, while Aeneas has only helmet and shield - not the situation implied in the Iliad, but in vase-painting it is not uncommon for warriors in the same scene to wear differing amounts of armour.⁹ The ^{other} two versions, on a cup by the Kleophrades Painter¹⁰ (c.500-490 B.C.) and a calyx-krater by the Tyszkiewicz Painter¹¹ (c.490-480 B.C.), both show the moment of Aeneas' collapse and his mother's intervention. In each case the characters are named, both men are fully armed, and Aeneas is wounded by a spear (in the abdomen on the former, the thigh on the latter) Aphrodite catches him as he falls, but in neither case does she actually draw a fold of her garments around him. Athena is present behind Diomedes to balance Aphrodite, though she is not directly involved at this point in the Iliad. In none of the scenes, either, is

Diomedes wielding his boulder; spear and sword are his weapons. The object between Diomedes' shield and Aeneas on the Kleophrades Painter's cup is puzzling, and might just possibly be meant for a large rock, like that which appears in a similar position on the cup by Douris with Ajax and Hector.¹² (Pl. 60c). Friis Johansen, however, takes it for Aphrodite's veil, and this is probably the most likely explanation; the strange spreading of the material being the artist's solution to the problem of showing, without actually obscuring Aeneas, how the goddess screened her son - a very different solution from that of the Etruscan artist whose amphora is next discussed. The object is cut off straight at the upper edge, and bears no inner markings. This last fact is probably conclusive against the boulder theory (contrast the rock carried by the centaur on a Nolan amphora by this painter).¹³

A more interesting, because less conventional, illustration is that on the shoulder of an Etruscan Bf. amphora now in Würzburg, (pl. 60d). This vase is of unusually good quality for Etruscan work, and, though in the Bf. technique, is quite late in date (it is dated by R. Bronson, the most recent writer on it, to 460-450 B.C.).¹⁴ In the centre, surrounded by hoplites and archers, a winged woman holds her cloak or veil, which she has removed completely, around the head of a warrior who is on his knees, wounded by a spear in the left side, while a second warrior tries to attack him with a sword. Both warriors have corslets, greaves and helmets, the fallen man has lost sword and shield. Bronson disputes the identification of the scene,

made in the original publication of 1843 by J. de Witte and generally accepted since. He maintains that 'there are not sufficient characteristics in the picture to verify this interpretation'; he prefers Eos, Memnon and Achilles, adding, however, 'but it might just as well be a winged Nike shielding the fallen Hector from Ajax Telamonius, as is shown on a Rf. kylix by the Penthesilea Painter in Spina.' The last suggestion is too implausible to be considered for either vase.¹⁵ Eos Memnon would just be possible for the amphora: though it is unusual for one of the mothers to be absent from this scene, it is not unknown, and the wings would suit Eos.¹⁶ However, the fallen warrior is clearly not dead (as Bronson assumes), and above all, the woman's action here seems so specific as to make the identification of the scene almost certain. A winged Aphrodite is no problem in Etruscan art.¹⁷ More difficult is the question of whether the artist actually knew the story, or whether he simply copied, with minor additions such as wings, a Greek original.¹⁸ The grotesqueness of the rendering of 'Aeneas' and the cloak does not seem very Greek.

It is curious that Aphrodite's use of her cloak on this vase should be closer than either of the Greek examples just mentioned to the Chiot sherd (and to Homer). Returning to the sherd, the woman's attitude is, in fact, the chief factor in favour of the Aeneas-Aphrodite interpretation of the scene. One or two other points may be made about the sherd: A) The presence of the arm with spear proves that fighting is involved (Miss Price's attribution of the sherd with a shield (op.cit. pl.VI.5? to the same chalice pointed that way, but was

but was no decisive proof on its own). B)'..the man does not look like a warrior' (Beazley). This is true, yet his appearance is not impossible for a warrior. Warriors on Greek vases not infrequently wear tunic without corslet;¹⁹ living warriors (as opposed to dead ones, who often appear stripped) occasionally have no helmet;²⁰ long hair is no bar.²¹ The ear-ring is slightly disconcerting at first sight, but men wearing ear-rings are fairly common in some areas of East Greek art.²² If we assume the ear-rings to have been for pierced ears (as extant examples are), then they were probably kept in most of the time.

There is one other scene from the Iliad, also involving Aphrodite, which perhaps deserves a mention. This is the duel between Menelaus and Paris (II. III, 324ff.).²³ Here there is a description of Paris arming: he wears a tunic, and has corslet, greaves, helmet, shield, sword and spear. Unpromising though this sounds for our purposes, he does lose his helmet in the fight.(1.375). Menelaus drags him by the crest towards the Achaean ranks, and he is saved by Aphrodite, who makes the chin-strap break, snatches him up, hides him in a mist (1.380), and removes him to his perfumed bed-chamber.

The intervention of Aphrodite is similar in both episodes, and those troubled by the unwarlike appearance of the man on the Chiot sherd might find Paris more acceptable than Aeneas.

Incidentally, both these episodes have been suggested for the scene engraved on the lid of a Praenestine cista in the Villa Giulia, which is mentioned by Beazley, op.cit. 20, n.1. Savignoni who published the cista, favoured Diomedes and Aeneas, while Matthies and

Bulas preferred Paris and Menelaus.²³ Aeneas/Paris is naked and unarmed²⁴ ('which suits neither episode' - Beazley), and is being carried off by a winged woman as his victorious opponent, naked but for cloak draped over the left shoulder, and with helmet, shield and sword, rushes after him, backed up by a winged Athena (and preceded by a dog!). Lack of helmet would suit Paris (as a matter of fact, a helmet and shield lie on the ground on either side of Athena, though they may well simply be filling, as on the Würzburg amphora). Lack of body-
 armour is irrelevant. However, the fact that 'Aphrodite' has wrapped a fold of her robe under the arms and across the chest of the wounded man, and, possibly, the presence of Athena, makes the Aeneas story slightly more likely, (cf. the cup by the Kleophrades Painter, mentioned above).

A Roman terracotta stamp in Rheims, with figures named in Latin, (pl. 60b), affords a curious parallel for the positions of the man and woman on our sherd;²⁵ but with such a difference in date it seems much too dangerous to draw any conclusions from it!

Returning finally to our sherd, it seems that no decisive argument can be brought against the Diomedes-Aeneas theory, while very convincing ones are available against the other suggestions made, with the exception of Menelaus-Paris. The crucial features of the sherd are, first, the arm holding the spear, indicative of a violent setting, and, second, the gesture of the woman, which suits Miss Price's interpretation better than any other so far proposed. Unfortunately the interpretation cannot be certain, but, if it is correct, the Chiot version is clearly no

mere imitation of the only surviving contemporary mainland representation, that on the Penteskouphia plaque.

B. Achilles dragging the body of Hector

Brussels, Musée du Cinquantenaire, Inv. M 831. A black-figure
sherd, apparently from the shoulder of a hydria. Pl. 61 a.

Said to be from 'the area' of Clazomenae.

lgth. 8;0 cm., ht. 6.5 cm.

R. Zahn, AM 23, 1898, 38ff., pl.VI.2. CVA Mus. du Cinquantenaire 3,
pl.II D 4.5 R.M. Cook, BSA 47, 1952, 139. K. Friis Johansen,
Iliad, 138ff., esp.151-153, 279 (bibl.).

Date: c.540 B.C. (Cook).

The sherd is described in CVA as of brick-red clay, with a creamy,
dirty-looking micaceous slip. The black paint is only slightly
lustrous. Many details are picked out in red over the glaze, and white
is used sometimes over the glaze, sometimes direct on the slip.

(Compare Boehlau's rather different-sounding description, AM 23, p.42).

On the sherd appears a chariot with six-spoke wheels, drawn from
right to left by a pair of galloping horses (nearer black, the farther
white), and driven by a warrior with spear and shield (and possibly
originally with helmet). The warrior's flesh is white. The feet
and lower legs of a man may be seen beneath the chariot: he is
strapped by the ankles to the axle, face down.

The sherd was first published by R. Zahn, when it was still in a
private collection in Smyrna, along with a larger fragment believed to
be from the belly of the same hydria (see Section F below). In a good
and full discussion, he compares the representation with Attic ones,

and, without giving full details of the latter, notes the most important differences between them and the Clazomenian sherd: on the sherd, i) the chariot has two, not four, horses; ii) Achilles drives himself instead of having a charioteer; iii) Hector is face-down instead of face-up (he suggests as the reason for this, that the artist found it too difficult to draw the feet fastened with toes upwards!). Zahn also notes something which he interprets as a spear beneath the horses, and, observing that the companion sherd has what seems to be a fallen warrior near its upper right-hand edge, on the shoulder-zone, he postulates that the scene showed Achilles dragging Hector back from the battle. The chariot would have occupied the centre of the field, with fighting groups on either side. He believes that Patroklos' grave mound, shown on several Attic scenes, would have been behind the chariot, and therefore visible on the sherd, if it had been present at all.

The archaic representations of this subject are fully treated by Friis Johansen in his book 'The Iliad in Early Greek Art' (1967; Danish ed. 1934). He gives a detailed and interesting analysis of the Attic scenes, all of which are on vases, and most of which belong to the Leagros Group (c.510-500). Hardly any can be earlier than this, and a few are a little later (Friis Johansen nos.m-p, p.265). There are no red-figure versions known, and none from any other school, apart from our sherd.

Briefly, Friis Johansen points out that there is no very clear distinction in the Attic representations between the two settings in

which Achilles drags Hector's body in the Iliad: i) from the battlefield to the Greek camp (II. XXII. 395ff.), and ii) round Patroklos' tomb on twelve successive mornings (II. XXIV. 12ff.). He shows besides how regular motifs for other scenes on Attic vases are incorporated and adapted: those of the warrior running to battle from the chariot driven by his charioteer, and of standard 'Departure' scenes.

Turning to the Clazomenian sherd, he observes, à propos of this being the only representation in which Hector is dragged face-down, that Homer refers to the body as left lying in this position. (Of the actual dragging, Homer says merely that Hector was dragged by the feet, with head trailing in the dust, but he twice describes him as left lying on his face between draggings: II.XXIII.25, not mentioned by Friis Johansen, and II.XXIV.17).

Eager to prove that the Iliad XXII episode is intended, Friis Johansen follows Zahn's suggestion for the setting of the scene, and also accepts his argument about the tomb of Patroklos, saying that it 'does not seem to have been represented': this despite the fact that one of his illustrations²⁶ is of an Attic example which, if broken like the Clazomenian sherd, would not show the tomb. All that can be said is, that the tomb does not appear on the sherd. This, however, is a relatively minor point.

His concluding remarks on the question of artistic connections between Athens and East Greece are most seriously influenced by pre-conceived ideas. Rightly rejecting the old 'Pan-Ionism'; which, because the Clazomenian sherd is earlier than the earliest known Attic representa-

tion of Achilles in a moving chariot, would have seen it as indisputable evidence of East Greek influence on Attic black-figure, he at once rushes to the other extreme. Remarking that extensive Attic influence on Ionian black-figure has long been acknowledged, he continues, surprisingly, 'Hence it seems most reasonable to assume also in the present case that the Clazomenian picture presupposes an Attic proto-type, and that in Attic vase-painting Achilles was portrayed dragging Hector already about the middle of the sixth century, in the form which shows Achilles' chariot moving at full speed over the battlefield.' He then thinks to increase the credibility of this (admitted) hypothesis by pointing out that representations of the Ransom of Hector, 'a theme closely related in content', occur in Attic bf about the mid-century.

It seems to me most unreasonable to make such an assumption on such evidence. Quite simply, the Clazomenian sherd is certainly older than the oldest known Attic example. Further, the resemblance between it and the Attic versions is not (in my opinion) so great that there must be a direct connection, rather than just a common use of a story. In short, no influence can be demonstrated, or even inferred, in either direction.

The Chiot scenes discussed in this chapter, and the many Chiot sherds,²⁷ show that there existed an East Greek narrative school in the first half of the century which was parallel with, not obviously dependent on, the mainland bf schools, and there seems no reason why even bf schools in East Greece should not retain some independence.

Specifically East Greek details in the scene:

1. Shield-device: the East Greek nature of the gorgoneion has been demonstrated in Chapter II (this example, B.4.).
2. Shield-apron: R.M. Cook has noted this as the earliest known example. As Cook points out, not all East Greek warriors after this date have shield-aprons, but they do occur frequently on Clazomenian sarcophagi (he gives further details: they are de rigueur in the work of the Borelli and Hanover painters, a little later than our sherd, and optional in that of the Albertinum Painter)²⁸ There is one example in Fikellura, c.525, on an amphoriskos with Ares.²⁹ Cook adds that they 'appear irregularly in Attic about the end of the 6th century'³⁰ and concludes that they must have been introduced in the Athenian army then, as 'at that time Attic artists would hardly have borrowed from East Greek'. He may be correct in assuming that East Greek vases were not the carriers of this detail to Athens, but it seems to me very likely that East Greek vase-painters (or other artists) were. Certainly Attic vase-painters were happily borrowing East Greek gorgoneia,³¹ to name one definite example, at precisely this time.
3. Decorative peytrel: The decorative girdle, or peytrel, hanging below the chest-strap of the horses, is common on East Greek horses,³² and is presumably a humble descendant of the very elaborate type of trappings seen on Assyrian horses.³³ Decorated (functional) chest-straps appear on Attic chariot-horses as early as the second quarter of the 6th century,³⁴ but purely decorative girdles are very rare.³⁵ They become slightly more common at the end of the century,³⁶ no doubt

through East Greek influence.

4. Two-horse team. No definitely East Greek archaic four-horse teams are known to me.^x The bf sherds from Old Smyrna with Achilles and Memnon,³⁷ published by J.M. Cook, are almost certainly not East Greek, or, if East Greek, are direct copies of a Corinthian model (see p. 354). Kjellberg believed that there was a quadriga in the centre of each pediment of the temple at Larisa (fragments of terracotta sculptures found included 7 horse-heads, four in the round and three in relief). It would also be possible to have had four bigae, one at each corner.³⁸

Two-horse teams occur on bronze-work, Chiot and Clazomenian pottery, Claz. sarcophagi, terracottas and marble-reliefs, and in the tomb at Kizilbel in Lycia.³⁹

On the mainland, above all at Athens and Corinth, and especially in the 6th century, two-horse teams are almost unknown, (see below).

In the Nr. East, two-horse teams are probably the most common, though three- and four-horse teams appear in some areas.⁴⁰

5. Chariot-type. There is no exact parallel among other East Greek chariots for the shape of the body of ours, with its slightly convex wall and apparently circular handgrip at the front, but quite clearly the type is the same. Only one type of chariot appears in E. Greek art of the 7th and 6th centuries, with closed body, usually rising at the front, and with handgrip at the back and often at the front also. The wheel almost always has six or eight spokes, (occasionally more on later Clazomenian sarcophagi), sometimes with rings or prominent sockets near the hub, and the axle is normally at or very close to the back

corner. (See list for details).

This clearly derives from Near Eastern chariots,⁴¹ seeming closer to the Neo-Hittite 9th-8th cent. examples than to the Assyrian (the former must certainly be a separate type, and not just sculptors' poor imitations of Assyrian models, as Akurgal believes).⁴² Six- and eight-spoke wheels are almost invariable in both Assyrian and Neo-Hittite representations (the eight-spoke kind apparently appearing later (c. mid-8th cent.) in Assyria).⁴³ Assyrian chariots always have the axle at the back corner, but the wheels of the later ones are extremely large in proportion to the body of the vehicle, with very thick rims, while the body is high and square, often with a raised upper edge at the back, and with no visible handgrip, (many of these, of course, on reliefs from the royal palaces, are massive and imposing specimens, the wheels alone often almost man-high). The Neo-Hittite chariots, less ponderous and pretentious, have wheels which are smaller proportionately, and bodies which are less square, and whose upper edge may have a slight concave curve.⁴⁴ The axle is set in the centre, or towards the back. The closest of all Near Eastern chariots known to me to the East Greek type, is the hunting-chariot from Sakçegözü⁴⁵ (second half 8th cent.), with its two handgrips and curving upper edge.

However, although the origin of the East Greek chariot clearly lies in this general area, either the East Greeks adapted the body-shape considerably to the typical graceful design with sides curving up to the front, or there is some later (or other) Near Eastern influence on them. (One or two of the East Greek war-chariots seem rather

squarer in shape, and have proportionately rather larger wheels⁴⁶ but this does not apply to all).

The contrast with the typical 7th and 6th century mainland Greek chariots is very striking.⁴⁷ Here the four-spoke wheel is almost unchallenged, and the body is much more open, usually with low, straight, horizontal rails at the sides, and a high, vertical one (in an inverted U-shape) at the front. The axle is in the centre, or very slightly closer to the back.

A number of interesting 'in-between' examples come from the Islands (including Crete). (See end of section).

6. Griffin protome. In Greek art, such a protome appears behind the horses' heads on almost all the East Greek chariots, and almost exclusively on them. Its exact position is disputed. Kjellberg, publishing the Larisa terracottas,⁴⁸ argued that it was either on the pole-end, or attached to the horses' collars (as there is apparently no trace of a yoke in the East Greek representations). The protome usually faces back, very occasionally forward.

This again is derived from Near Eastern prototypes, and seems once more to be closer to Neo-Hittite than to Assyrian examples. On the yokes of Assyrian chariots we see snake-, bird-, and bull-heads⁴⁹ (as well as more elaborate fan-shaped ornaments with figure-decoration of winged discs, demons, etc.). Actual griffin-protomes, however, appear in some Neo-Hittite examples from, e.g., Carchemish, Tell Halaf and Zincirli⁵⁰ (forward-facing).

No other types of protome appear on East Greek examples.

In the rest of Greece (and occasionally in Etruria), protomes sometimes appear with some of the 'in-between' chariot-types (see below), but the normal mainland chariot has only a vertical bar,⁵¹ presumably in the centre of the yoke, from which usually a single 'rein' runs to the front rail of the chariot, where it is attached by a loop.

EXCURSUS

A List of East Greek Chariots.

Unless specifically mentioned, all are drawn by two horses, and have griffin protomes facing back. The three Olympia bronzes are included, because their East Greek origin is indicated by other features besides the chariots.

1. ? (found Olympia). Bronze relief. Warrior's dep.
Horses lost. 8-spoke wheel. Axle slightly behind centre.
Handgrip rear.
Ol.Ber. I, pl.31; III, pl.69. Late 7th century. Pl. 78b.
2. ? (found Olympia). Bronze relief. Warrior's dep.
Protome lost. 6-spoke wheel. Axle towards back. Handgrip rear.
Leather? cover at front; palmette (cf.4).
Ol.Ber. III, pl.68, Inv.B.1529. Early 6th century. Pl. 77b.
3. ? (found Olympia). Bronze relief. Warrior's dep.
Horses, protome, lost. 8-spoke wheel, rings on spokes. Axle

central. Handgrips rear, front. Leather? cover.

AJA 75, 1971, pl.64. c.570-60? Pl. 78a.

4. SAMOS. Bronze relief. Departure? Left to right.
Protome (griffin?) faces forward. 4-spoke wheel. Axle towards rear. Palmette at front (cf.2) Long-robed driver.
AM 83, 1968, 287, pl.119, 120. Not later than c.570.
5. MYUS Marble relief slabs. Chariot race, both directions.
Protomes lost. 4-, 6-, 8-spoke wheels, rings or sockets on 6- and 8-spokes. Axle slightly behind centre. Handgrips rear, front.
Blümel, AGS 61, Abbs. 193-211. c.550.
6. LARISA. Terracotta revetment plaques, (Frieze VIII). Race, both directions (standing warrior behind some chariots; cf. Murray, Terracotta Sarcophagi in the BM, pl.6.
4-spoke wheel. Axle slightly behind centre. Handgrips rear, or rear and front. Straightish top. Panther-head on side.
Larisa II, 81-91, pls. 34-43; ATK pl.19. c.550.
PHOCAEA, same mould, ATK 34, 200, Abb. 1,3.
7. LARISA. Terracotta plaques (Frieze II). Race.
8-spoke wheels, rings on spokes. Axle at rear. Handgrips rear, ?front. Straight top.
Larisa II, 32-41, pls.2-6; ATK pl.22. Third quarter 6th cent.

8. LARISA. Terracotta plaques (Friezes III, IV). Race.
 Protomes face forward. 6-spoke wheels (Frieze III, 8-spoke also, and rings on spokes). Axle at rear. Handgrips rear, front; once also side (Frieze III).
Larisa II 41-49, pls. 7-11; 50-53, pls. 12-14. Third quarter.
9. LARISA. Terracotta plaques (black-ground). Race, left-right.
 8-spoke wheels. Axle central. Handgrip rear. Naked driver.
Åkerström, Terrakottaplatten. Last quarter 6th cent.
10. ? . Terracotta plaque. Warrior.
 8-spoke wheel, rings on spokes. Axle at rear. Handgrips rear, front. Straight top (cf.7). Woven? cover.
ATK 43, pl.16.1. c.550. Pl. 62c.
11. KIZILBEL. (Lycia). Tomb-paintings. a) Warrior's dep., left-right; b) Procession? right-left.
 Protomes lost. a) 8-spoke wheel; b) 4-spoke. Axle rear.
 Handgrips rear, front. Shape, cf.7, 10.
AJA 74, 1970, 252, pl.60; 75, 1971, pl.50. c.525.
12. CYZICUS. Marble reliefs (2). Race, both directions.
 a) 8-spoke wheel with sockets on spokes. Axle just behind centre. Lion on side (cf.4, and Nuoffer, Der Rennwagen I, pl.2).
 b) 6-spoke wheel, Axle central. Long-robed driver. Both, handgrip rear (a) more angular).
BCH 33, 1909, 249, pl.7; a), EAA II, 702; b) Akurgal, KA .
 c.525.

13. DATSCHA (nr.Cnidus), probably Rhodian. Relief-pithos.
 Hunt? Fight?
 No protome. 8-spoke wheel. Axle central. No handgrip.
 Åkerström, Terrakottaplatten fig. 15.2; BCH 72, 1950, 161 fig.
 14, 166 no.18, 177; Schäfer, Reliefpithoi, 55; Third quarter?
14. CLAZOMENIAN VASES.
- a) Achilles. pl.61a . See p.284ff.
 b) Warrior. 4-spoke wheel. Axle central. Handgrip rear.
 c) Goddess? 8-spoke wheel. Axle central.
 d) ? Protome lost. " "
- b: AD II pl.55. 2a. c,d: CVA BM 8, pl.II Dn 13, 1,2. c.525.
15. CLAZOMENIAN SARCOPHAGI. Fight-scenes, races.
- a) Dennis P. 8-spoke wheel. Axle central. Shape, cf.13,
 14c,d. Acta Arch. 13, 1942, 42, fig.27. c.525.
 b) Erast Gp. Very damaged. Griffin protome, but odd.
 c) " 'Protome', but not griffin. 10-spoke wheel,
 rings on spokes. Axle central. Handgrip rear, low.
AD I. pl.45; II pl.26. c.525.
 d) Hanover P. 'Palmette' protome. 8-spoke wheel, rings on
 spokes. Axle central. Handgrip rear. AD II pl.27.3
 (Pfuhl, MuZ III, fig.141) Last quarter.
 e) Albertinum P. 8- or 10-spoke wheel. Axle central.
 Handgrip (closed) rear. Often knobs round profile. Many
 exx., e.g. AD I pl.44; II pl.27.2; Åkerström; Terrakotta-

platten Abb.38. Last quarter.

16. CAERETAN HYDRIA. No protome. 8-spoke wheel. Axle rear.
Handgrip rear. Leather? cover at front. Knobs on top.
Pfohl, MUZ III. Abb.151. c.525.

Besides, there are fragments of chariot-scenes from several parts of East Greece. With the possible exception of Akalan, all seem to have two horses.

- i) Chiot: CVA Cambridge 2, pl.II D 17.53,55,56. (Reins). c.575.
- ii) Rhodian: Åkerström, ATK 213, Abb.69.1 (part of horses and pole).
- iii) Sardis: Terracotta-plaque frags; (two friezes). Both, griffin protomes; one, 4-spoke wheel. Sardis X, figs.11, 16; ATK 70, pl.39.1,2; 73, pl.43.2. c.525?
- iv) Akalan: Reins (because of relief, hard to tell if 2 or 4).
ATK 125, pl.66; c.525?

Also a terracotta plaque, very crude, from Gordion: 8-spoke wheels; shape, cf. 13 above; ATK 141, pl.70.

A brief summary of the most general characteristics distinguishing East Greek chariots from mainland ones appears on p. 289. Within the East Greek group there seem to be two main types: The first has sides which are rather low at the back, and rise with a curving top edge up to the front; the sides are considerably wider at the top than at the bottom. This type is represented from the late 7th century

to the end of the archaic period. It seems to undergo a slight modification of design towards the end of the 6th century. The early examples (1-5) and some later ones (e.g. 8,12) have a simple concave curve up to the front, but in the latest ones the top of the sides rises in an S-shaped curve (first concave, then convex), or sometimes simply in a convex curve from the rear handgrip (nos. 9, 14b, 15d,e, 16).

The second type has a squarer body, higher at the back, perhaps with a slight curve up to the front, or with a straight top from which a breasting or hand-rail rises vertically at the front (nos. 6,7,10,11,13,14c,d,15a).

(Within these broad divisions, however, there is considerable variation in shape and details).

The squarer group is more directly comparable with Nr. Eastern chariots. The Sakçegözü chariot remains the closest known to me, but some of the chariots on the reliefs from the Apadana at Persepolis also show square chariots with slightly curving top edges.⁵² Most similar is the chariot assigned by Schmidt to the 'Syrians', and by Porada to the 'Lydians'. This chariot has wheels with 12 spokes with a bulge in the centre; the king's chariots have wheels with 12 spokes with rings. (and the 'Libyans' have straight-spoked wheels). Unfortunately, even supposing these to be genuine national types, (which seems dubious), the date is uncertain: it could be as late as the second quarter of the 5th century, and must be later than most of the East Greek examples, so that the comparison cannot be very fruitful.

The spokes of the East Greek wheels are very often 'trumpet-shaped'⁵³ in the earlier examples (this a contrast with Nr. Eastern spokes, which seem usually to be either straight or tapering to the rim); in later examples (especially in the Clazomenian vases and sarcophagi), the spokes swell out in the centre, or are almost diamond-shaped.⁵⁴

The chariots on the late Clazomenian sarcophagi (particularly by the Hanover and Albertinum Painters), tend to be rather exotic, with knobs, extravagant curves, and highly decorated solid rear handgrips (cf. the Caeretan example, 16). The protomes too become very airy and fantastical, and one wonders how much the painters embroidered reality.

A Note on 'hybrid' chariots.

These chariots, of which there are several, ranging in date from the mid-7th to the mid-6th century, or later, are usually drawn by two-horse teams, but also have one or more of the features which characterize the East Greek chariots. Most are from the Islands (including Crete), and all are from areas whose art generally shows connections with East Greece and the Nr. East.

The following are the chief examples:

1. Cyclades.

a) Relief pithos from Tinos.⁵⁵ perhaps of the mid-7th century.

In one of the minor zones beneath the panel with the Birth of Athena appears a row of chariots with four-spoke wheel, but with squarish,

covered body which, though not very close to East Greek examples, is even further from mainland types.

b) 'Naxian'.⁵⁶ Two examples of the second half of the 7th century appear on the 'Ares and Aphrodite' amphora, and on a fine chariot-race sherd recently found in Naxos. The chariots are very close to the mainland type, with open rails (4-spoke wheels also surviving in the former). However, as well as their two-horse teams, they have a definite protome (though it is rather vegetable-looking (cf. Thasos), and certainly no griffin!).

c) 'Melian'.⁵⁷ The earliest of the four examples is the 'Apollo' amphora, of c.640. The others, going down to the early 6th cent., are: ii) 'Herakles' amphora; iii) Kavalla 'Peleus and Thetis' amphora; iv) Berlin 'Paris and Helen' amphora. Only the first two are well-preserved. They have four horses, while iii) has two, and iv) appears to have 6 reins. The body of the 'Apollo' chariot is more covered-in than mainland examples, and has 6-spoke wheels, with the axle just behind centre; that of iii) also seems to be covered-in, while ii) is close to a mainland type (and cf. the Spartan relief-pithoi, below). All seem to have protomes, though that of iii) cannot be interpreted from a photograph; i) has a griffin protome with floating tendril and, as if growing from the tendril, a volute on which is perched a bird, looking back (cf. Thasos).

2. Thasos.⁵⁸ From the island come two terracotta-relief fragments, one from a tripod, the other perhaps from a pithos, and both very

'East Greek' in appearance. i) On the tripod, which is perhaps c.550, is a chariot-race, from right to left. The charioteers wear short tunics and carry whips. The two-horse chariots have low, covered sides rising to a high front, with a rear handgrip. The 8-spoked wheels are set close to the rear. There is also a protome, though in the form of a 'volute-bud' of the kind which appears as filling on, e.g., the 'Herakles' amphora. The drivers' tunics billow, rather like those of Larisa Friezes III and IV; their hair-style also is not dissimilar. If found in East Greece, this would, I think have passed without query as local. ii) The second example (pl. 62b) shows the Departure of Amphiaraus. A charioteer, possibly in a short tunic (or naked?), stands in a chariot of completely East Greek appearance, with 8-spoke wheels with rings on the spokes. He holds a whip, and controls a 4-horse team. On a volute springing up behind the horses' heads is a bird, looking back (cf. 'Melian'). A warrior, wearing only a corslet and helmet, steps into the chariot, looking back at a woman with two children; behind them is a second woman, holding a large necklace. The first woman's chiton has long sleeves (or she wears a shawl), and a skirt with fine vertical folds. A man stands in front of the horses. The chariot and team are a most intriguing mixture of East Greek and 'Melian'; the scene also provides an interesting comparison with the East Greek bronze-reliefs (nos.1-3, and see pp. 381 ff.). Date c.600?

3. Crete.⁵⁹ Two 6th cent. relief pithoi have 2-horse chariots racing from left to right. In one, the chariot is unlike the East Greek ones,

but there is a forward-facing ?snake protome. In the second, the chariot has a closed body of rather East Greek appearance, but with 4-spoke wheels; there is a large, backward-facing griffin protome. The well-known relief from Palaikastro also has two horses, and a covered chariot-body which could almost pass as East Greek, but again, the wheel has 4 spokes, and there is no protome.

4. Sparta.⁶⁰ There are five slightly differing examples on Laconian relief-vases of fine quality, dated to the late 7th and earlier 6th centuries. Warriors step into heavy chariots of mainland type (cf. the Chigi Vase), with open rails and 4-spoke wheels, moving right-left. The way in which cloth or leather is attached to the rails to cover-in the sides may be seen very clearly here. The 2-horse chariots almost all have a protome. In one case, this is very like that on the 'Apollo' amphora (see 'Melian'); in another, the reins all seem to pass through the mouths of splendid large griffin (and panther?) heads. The charioteers wear short tunics, and carry whips.

5. The West.⁶¹ i) On fragments of a polychrome oenochoe from Megara Hyblaea are parts of two 2-horse chariots. Only one has wheels, which are 4-spoke. The bodies are covered, the sides rising to the front, where there is a handgrip; they resemble the East Greek or Cretan examples. These are dated c.650-40, but could be later.

ii) The Chalcidian 'Phineus' cup has an otherwise mainland-looking chariot with 8-spoke wheels. Two other Chalcidian vases have chariots with 4-spoke wheels, but with covered sides and a large rear handgrip (cf. Ricci hydria). This seems to be a genuine Magna Graecian type,

as it appears again, in slightly less exaggerated form, on one of the Locrian clay reliefs; dated c.470-60. ii) Etruria: Chariots of native (Monteleone) type on a red-ware pithos have griffin-protomes (after 550). There are many examples with the same body-type, on pottery, architectural terracottas, tomb-paintings and finger-rings, which have 6- or 8-spoke wheels (some with 4 also). The Ricci hydria, probably the work of an East Greek in Etruria, has a covered body, but of a rather unusual shape (not dissimilar to the two Chalcidian examples just mentioned); the covering looks as if it is laced. The wheel, with its 8 spokes swelling in the centre, and the pole, bear a close resemblance to Clazomenian examples; the protome, a snake looking back, is a curious throw-back to Assyria. There are four horses. The Caeretan chariot appears in the East Greek list (no.16).

Occasional two-horse teams draw mainland chariots in Corinthian and Attic 7th cent. vase-paintings⁶² (this need not, of course, indicate any outside influence; two-horse chariots are common on Geometric pots, and a few survivors in later art would not be unusual).

From this brief survey it seems to emerge that, at least as far as artistic traditions were concerned, Corinth/Attica on the one hand, and East Greece on the other, had their own definite and widely-differing chariot (and chariot-trappings) types, that of the latter showing strong links with the Near East, while in the areas between, and in 'fringe' areas like the West, elements from both traditions mingled to quite a surprising extent. The earliest 'Melian' chariot

is earlier than the earliest surviving East Greek examples, (though the East Greek tradition is certainly independent of 'Melian'). For the Spartan chariots, Christou has pointed out,⁶³ probably correctly, that the closest connections seem to be with 'Melian'. However, some East Greek, or even direct Near Eastern, influence for the protomes; should perhaps not be ruled out. The Thasian examples certainly show strong East Greek influence, mingled with Cycladic elements (in the tradition of much of the archaic art of that island).

C. The Ransom of Hector.

Istanbul, Arch.Mus.; museum no. 8904, Inv. no. 19 CND 63 N VII-L-2.

A Chiot chalice excavated in the archaic cemetery at Pitane

(Çandarlı), (pl.).

Pl. 63, 64 a.

Ht. 29.5 cm., diam. c.30.5 cm. Ht of figs. c.12 cm.

Unpublished. Briefly mentioned:

ITKR 1963, 38; 1964, 36-37 (Akurgal); AJA 69, 1965, 148; 70, 1966, 157

(Mellink). K. Schauenburg, JdI 85, 1970, 48-50, Abb.14, 15 (Schauenburg,

who has not seen the chalice, seems to think that the figures discussed

below all belong to the Troilos scene). (Colour photo of part of

interior, Akurgal, BGA 203, pl.63). For the subject, K. Friis Johansen

Iliad, 49-51, 245; 127-138, 267.

Date: early second quarter of 6th cent. (Akurgal, c.560). With

the chalice were found an Attic komast cup, no.9333, a 'lydion',

no.9334, and a lekythos, no.8971.

The chalice has a white slip, peeling very badly (probably because the soil in the Pitane cemetery is very salty). The paint used is black, often diluted to a reddish-brown, and red. The figure-zone of the chalice is divided equally between this scene and the 'Ambush of Troilos' (see section D), but a slightly 'off-centre' look is caused by the fact that the scenes run, not from mid-handle to mid-handle, but from the right-hand edge of one handle to the right-hand edge of the other. Thus it seems as if the most important part of each scene is 'pushed round' to the side, close to or over the handle.

From the left of the scene, three men walk to the right. The hindmost has lost his head, but the other two are bearded, and have on their heads bonnets with curled-under pokes: one bonnet is red, the other striped in black and red. All three men wear long, pleated white robes with black-and-red cloaks over them; a short horizontal reserved strip on the breast does not look like a pin or brooch holding the cloak, but I can think of no other explanation. Each of the last two men carries a spear point-upwards in his right hand, and a red sack over his left shoulder, held at the mouth by his left hand. Two lines curving down and left apparently from the right hand of the second man, could possibly be leads for a pair of smallish animals. The third man from the left has neither spear nor sack, but carries a branching, leafy twig in his right hand, held out a little in front of him.

The rest of the scene is extremely fragmentary. After a gap of about 10 cm., there are traces in the middle of the field, probably of another standing figure, more richly dressed (scraps of black with red decoration). Then, without further gap, come the heads of two men who face each other. These two men have no head-covering; their hair is long and black, and bound with a fillet. They are both bearded, and both apparently wear ear-rings. Traces of red and black, presumably part of the dress of the right-hand man, appear below his hair. There is a gap of about 6 mm. between the top of his head and the upper border of the scene, as opposed to about 1 mm. in the case of the man facing him, and nothing at all in the case of the bonneted men (the pokes of

whose bonnets actually overlap the border).

Clearly, the scene shows an embassy or mission of some kind, and, though fragmentary, it bears enough resemblance to Attic representations of the Ransom of Hector for this to spring immediately to mind.

The story of Priam's visit to Achilles to recover his son's body is told in Iliad XXIV (I mention only such details as are relevant to the pictorial representations): Priam is ordered by Zeus to go to Achilles, alone except for one herald, taking gifts to soften his heart (II. 175-180). After selecting suitable gifts, Priam sets out in his chariot, accompanied by the herald Idaios, who drives a mule-cart containing the presents. They are met by Hermes, who, in the guise of a young Myrmidon, guides them to Achilles' hut, but leaves without entering (II.349ff.). Idaios remains outside with the cart, while Priam goes in alone to Achilles, whom he finds sitting in a chair (I.515, cf.597) after dinner, with the food still before him. He clasps his knees and kisses his hands. Automedon and Alkimos alone are with Achilles, and they later go out with him to remove the gifts from the cart, unyoke the horses and mules, and take Idaios inside. Hector's body is outside the hut, and is never brought into the main room; it shows no sign of decay or ill-use (II.18-21).

The gifts which Priam brings are enumerated in II.228-235: twelve lovely robes, twelve single cloaks, twelve rugs, twelve white sheets, twelve tunics; ten talents of gold, two gleaming tripods, four cauldrons, and a cup of marvellous beauty.

Two widely differing pictorial versions of the story are known from the archaic period. (Friis Johansen discusses most of the representations, but a few, including the chalice, came to light after he wrote). Both versions stick to the general outline of Homer's account, but depart considerably from it in details - partly, at least, in order to make the story intelligible in one picture. The earliest surviving examples of each date from the second quarter of the 6th century.

The one which concerns us less here is perhaps the earlier by a few years. It occurs on a bronze mirror-handle and shield-bands of the 'Argive-Corinthian' school (details given by Kunze and Friis Johansen).⁶⁴ Here the episode has to be concentrated into a small, almost square field (c.5 x 5.5 cm.). Hector, naked and with no visible wounds, lies on his back with knees up, head to the right.

Priam, old and bowed, Achilles, young, naked, bearded and with spear point-upwards in his left hand, and Hermes, naked, bearded and with kerykeion, stand around the body. Priam raises his right hand to Achilles' chin; Achilles gestures towards the body with his free hand, and Hermes gesticulates hopefully (or admonishingly, according to Friis Johansen). A fragmentary Siana cup by the Heidelberg Painter,⁶⁵ if indeed it shows this scene, is the only known Attic representative of the type.

Almost all the other known representations of the story (which are not many), are Attic (for two late Etruscan versions, see below.) and are of a second, much more detailed type, whose main outlines are as follows: Achilles reclines on a couch at the right of the scene, a

table with food before him. In black-figure, with one exception,⁶⁶ and on the red-figure cup by Oltos, he is bearded. In the bf examples he looks to the left, straight at Priam, in the rf ones he looks back over his shoulder at a male or female attendant. Priam approaches his couch from the left, usually at a dignified pace, but on two late bf lekythoi at a desperate run.⁶⁷ Hector's body lies with feet at the left, usually under the couch,⁶⁸ but in several cases in front of it.⁶⁹ His position varies slightly. His wounds are sometimes shown⁷⁰ (despite Homer); in one early rf version, his feet are tied,⁷¹ on the Brygos Painter's skyphos his wrists are bound.⁷² He is naked and bearded in every case, except on the lekythos by the Edinburgh Painter,⁷³ where he is beardless, and seems to wear a tunic.

In several cases the setting is indicated by armour hanging on the wall.⁷⁴

In two late bf examples, and in several of the rf ones, there appear behind Priam attendants bearing gifts.⁷⁵ Most of the other scenes have at least one extra figure. Hermes appears twice, once seated (perhaps as if outside the hut), on the hydria by the Painter of London B 76, and again, leaving Priam with a gesture of farewell, on Oltos' cup.⁷⁶

The Oltos cup is one of two Attic examples in which Priam actually touches Achilles: he touches his shin with his left hand; the other instance is the Pioneer Gp stamnos,⁷⁷ where he clasps Achilles' leg below the knee with both hands. Usually he simply gestures towards Hector and/or towards Achilles' chin.

Most of these Attic vases are of the late 6th century. Three, however, two long known and one published in 1961, belong to the second quarter of the century: an amphora sherd from Naukratis, a Tyrrhenian amphora (miraculously transformed by cleaning since Friis Johansen wrote), and a hydria by the Painter of London B 76.⁷⁸ These differ from the later representations in having a second table to the right of Achilles' couch, on which stands some of Hector's armour, and in front of which his body lies, instead of being beneath or in front of Achilles' couch. (The Group E amphora in Kassel⁷⁹ seems to be in a transitional stage: the body is in the later position, but a stool at the right holds a helmet, and a shield leans against the wall beside it). In these early scenes, contemporary with the Pitane chalice, though there are extra characters besides the protagonists, they are (with the exception of Hermes) simply stock 'onlookers', and there is no sign of the gifts brought by Priam.

The two early red cups are the most nearly comparable with the chalice in this respect (recent finds of new sherds of the Kleophrades Painter's vase,⁸⁰ to add to those illustrated by Friis Johansen, show that here also, young attendants carried gifts - a hydria, and ?boxes - but the scene is still extremely fragmentary). On the cup by Oltos,⁸¹ (pl. 64b), at the left-hand end of side A, behind the group of Priam (a bent, balding greybeard clad only in himation), Hector and Achilles, appears Hermes, just leaving the hut, and behind him is a youth carrying a metal hydria and three phialae. The procession of Trojan attendants continues on Side B, with a naked boy leading a horse, a girl with a

flat box on her head, presumably containing linen or clothing, and finally two more young men with horses. One of these youths wears a Persian bonnet and trousers,⁸² but is unarmed.

The scene occupies only one side of the skyphos by the Brygos Painter,⁸³ (pl.64c). Here too, Priam is white-haired and balding (slightly), but his dress (pleated chiton, voluminous himation, and pointed slippers) and manner are far more dignified than those of Oltos' Priam. Behind him come two himation-clad men-servants: a youth with a large hydria upright on his left shoulder, and a pile of three elaborate metal phialae in his right hand, and a bearded man, also with a hydria on his left shoulder, and carrying a large metal 'foot-bath' with three lion's feet in his right hand. Following them are two maid-servants in chiton and himation, balancing large, rectangular, decorated boxes on their heads, supporting them with both hands.

It is possible to relate the surviving figures on the Chiot chalice to those of the Attic versions with very little difficulty, even though the differences in detail are considerable. As in the Attic scenes, the movement is from left to right. The three men at the extreme left are Trojans, helping to bring the ransom. Since they carry sacks, we cannot speculate on how closely the Chiot artist adhered to Homer's list of gifts! If I am right about the 'leashes' held by the second man, a pair of hounds must have been included,⁸⁴ but this is no further from Homer than the Attic horses. The oriental bonnets⁸⁵ seem to put it beyond doubt that non-Greek inhabitants of Asia Minor are portrayed (and cf. the horse-leading youth on the Oltos

cup). The two men with sacks use their spears as staves, in the manner of dignified, otherwise unarmed envoys such as those accompanying Menelaus on the Proto-Attic stand by the Pan Jug Painter⁸⁶ (cf. also 'Odysseus' and 'Ajax' on the Olympia tripod-leg discussed below).⁸⁷

The third man carries an olive or myrtle branch, and this must be either as a sign of supplication, or as a gesture of homage to a victor (see below).

The climax of the scene clearly comes at the right-hand end, where the two men confront each other. Their high rank seems to be indicated by their uncovered heads with long, splendid hair bound with a fillet. Their relative positions are interesting: 'Priam' is closer to 'Achilles' than in almost all the Attic pictures (the exception being the late lekythos on which Priam and two girls rush frantically right up to him),⁸⁸ and his head is slightly higher (see the description). It does not seem possible from the relation between Achilles' head and the surviving fragments of his body that he is reclining (cf. the Attic examples, where his left shoulder juts out as he supports himself on his left elbow); also, a small point but, I believe, significant, in all the Attic versions except the lekythos just mentioned, the fact that he is on a couch raises his head slightly higher than Priam's.

The remaining alternatives are a standing or a sitting position. If he is standing (as on the Argive-Corinthian bronze-reliefs), there seems absolutely no reason for making him smaller than Priam - and the uniform height of the other surviving figures makes it seem unlikely that this could be merely accidental. If he is sitting, the anomaly

is explained (cf. the seated pair on the Clazomenian sherd, pl. 70a).
 If this interpretation is correct, we find the Chiot artist following
 Homer in this detail (the only other known versions to do so are two
 5th century Etruscan ones).⁸⁹ - Seikoum p. index (5) !

The erect bearing and plentiful black hair of 'Priam' are in
 contrast with most of the other versions, where he frequently appears
 bent, and with receding, often white hair (as, indeed, in the majority
 of his appearances on vases, in other scenes such as the Death of
 Astyanax).⁹⁰ A parallel is afforded, however, by Priam on the Lekythos
 by the Edinburgh Painter (pl. —); in these two scenes he is shown as
 a proud, still vigorous ruler, not as a broken old man.

The damaged condition of the scene, combined with its unique
 detail, naturally means that the interpretation must remain open to
 question. Two other possibilities should be mentioned briefly:

First, the branch carried by one of the men is unparalleled in
 the other representations of this scene, but similar branches or twigs
 are carried in religious processions in both Attic and Corinthian art.
 On an amphora by the Amasis Painter,⁹¹ for instance, a woman with an
 offering-basket on her head, and holding a branch, leads four men,
 three of whom also carry branches. The first man carries a piglet,
 the last a wineskin and a wickerwork object over his left shoulder,
 and an oenochoe in his right hand. All wear sprigs of the same tree
 (myrtle, or olive?) in their hair. (On the other side is a scene
 with flute-player, drinkers, and dancing, naked men). There are
 several similar scenes in Attic art, including fine fragments by Lydos

from the Acropolis, and an interesting large band-cup on the Swiss market in 1958.⁹² On the latter, a long procession of men with twigs, accompanied by a lyre-player and two flautists, leads a cow, (or bull?) a sow and a sheep towards an altar; the girl with the basket is again present. Behind the altar stands the priestess, and behind her is the statue of Athena. One of the Corinthian plaques from Pitsa⁹³ also shows women with twigs, and children with a sheep, before an altar, though there is no statue.

In the Chiot scene, the hypothetical animals led by the third man could then be (small) sacrificial victims.

This interpretation, however, is not very satisfactory. The sacks (which are not wine-skins) would presumably have to be explained as containing the sacrificial implements. There seems to be rather a shortage of twigs as compared with the certain sacrifice scenes (though the leaders of the procession could have had them). Oddest of all for this interpretation is the meeting of the two men: in the cult scenes where priestess or statue appears, there is an altar between them and the worshippers, and there is certainly no room for that here.

A more subjective argument against the sacrifice theory is that a definite mythological scene seems more likely as the companion to the Ambush of Troilos on the other side, particularly as the scene is very prominent, more so than, for instance, the indeterminate 'filling' compositions often used on 'Side B' of Attic bf amphorae (on the other hand, however, apparently unmythological horsemen appear on one side of the other Pitane chalice with Achilles and Memnon).

A possible alternative mythological interpretation might be as the embassy of the Greek leaders to Achilles (Iliad IX, 162ff). The late 7th cent. tripod-leg relief from Olympia may be compared for the marching men. This is usually taken as showing Phoenix, Odysseus and Ajax, the other two, less important, heralds being omitted.⁹⁴

'Phoenix' seems to carry a bundle of some kind over his left shoulder; 'Odysseus' and 'Ajax' carry spears over their shoulders.

However, on this occasion no gifts were actually taken to Achilles, so that the sacks and ?animals would be difficult to explain. Further, there is space in the scene for more than five people approaching 'Achilles' (extra figures standing around, as 'onlookers', would be possible in a different composition, but in this simple marching composition they would be less explicable, especially as 'Achilles' has no supporters).

It seems to me, in any event, that the oriental bonnets are vital in showing that non-Greeks are involved; and at this date and in this context, these non-Greeks must be Trojans. The general resemblance in composition to the Attic versions of the Ransom of Hector, the fact that one important-looking man is confronted by another who brings with him Trojans carrying mysterious sacks, seem to me to make the interpretation of the scene virtually certain, despite its fragmentary condition.

The branch should perhaps be taken, not as a 'suppliant bough', as these seem to have been reserved for the gods,⁹⁵ but as a compliment to the victor (athletic victors, for instance, are sometimes shown being

offered myrtle twigs, and on a silver cup a twig is given to a successful schoolboy).⁹⁶

If my interpretation of the scene is correct, this means that there is an East Greek version of the subject which is as early as the earliest mainland representations, and is in no way inferior to them in conception. Nor can it by any stretch of the imagination be assumed to be copied from some earlier mainland version. Like its companion-piece, the Ambush of Troilos, it has originality. If, as seems likely, it shows Achilles seated, it follows Homer where the Attic scenes keep to contemporary custom. Where Homer is set aside, as in the introduction of servants to carry the gifts, the choice of companions for Priam is strikingly different from that of the Attic versions, but in many ways more impressive (and more realistic!).

D. The Ambush of Troilos.

As the two East Greek representations of this subject differ widely in character and date, they will be discussed separately.

1. Istanbul, Arch.Mus., museum no. 8904, Inv.19 CND 63 N VII-L-2.

A Chiot chalice excavated in the archaic cemetery at Pitane (Çandarlı).

Pl. 65, 66 a,c.

For a general description of the Chalice, which has on the other side the Ransom of Hector, see p. 304 . Additional bibliography: EAA VII, 1007 (E. Paribeni). G. Camporeale, St.Etr. 37, 1969,68. For the subject generally: Brommer, Vasenlisten², 264-266. Kunze, Ol.Forsch.II, 140-142.

N. Heidenreich, MDAI 4, 1951, 103ff. Steuben 58-61.

At the left of the scene are Troilos' two horses, facing right. The far one is white (that is, reserved on the slip), with dot-harness, dark mane with occasional red locks, and red hooves. The near horse is black, with red markings on the rump. A man, preserved from the chest down, wearing a red and black chiton, is seated on the black horse, and holds the reins of the white (probably of both, but this detail has disappeared from the black, whose head and neck are poorly preserved). The black horse bends its head to drink from a basin on a pedestal. There is a tree to the left of the basin. A man in a red-brown tunic, with small beard and short, red-brown hair, stands to the right of the basin, pouring in water from a tiny oenochoe. Immediately to his right

is the fountain-house, shown in profile, with chequered wall and architrave, and a red-brown column with Aeolic capital. The roof has large palmettes at corners and apex, and there are traces of red decoration. Behind the back wall of the building is the large, kneeling figure of Achilles, his body almost completely hidden by his round shield, which has a large bud-motif in the centre; all available colours are used in the shield - red, black, red-brown and white. Achilles' head appears above the shield; he is bearded, and wears a dark brown helmet with projection on the brow, and also with cheek-pieces and a large, red neck-guard. The high stemmed crest is gaily painted, and has a flowing tail. The point of a spear also projects above the shield. A trace of brown on the ground behind the shield is probably part of Achilles' greaved leg. Behind Achilles stands Polyxena, balancing a large oenochoe on its side on her head, and carrying a small one in her left hand. She has black hair, a red and black dress, and a stud ear-ring.

The story, told in the *Kypria* and probably in other archaic poems,⁹⁷ was well-known to archaic Greek artists of most schools, the earliest surviving representation being on a PC aryballos from Hephaestia on Lemnos.⁹⁸ Here a crouching warrior, with round shield which covers him from neck to knees, faces an unarmed youth on a horse which he seems to be trying to pull up short, while a second youth runs off. Though this lacks many of the characteristic features of the later scenes, the attitude and appearance of the

figures seems to make the interpretation certain. An even earlier example is seen by Fittschen on a relief-pithos sherd from Tinos, and one of c.600 by Freyer-Schauenburg in an ivory-fragment from Samos.⁹⁹ Two shield-band reliefs¹⁰⁰ of the early 6th century show a later moment of the story, where Achilles lays hands on Troilos at the altar of Apollo; one of the painted metopes from Kalydon,¹⁰¹ of c.630, may have had a similar representation. Our concern here, however, is with the later scenes.

In the 6th century Ambush scenes, apart from the shield-bands, the moment chosen is that just before the actual attack (the moment after is shown by the many Pursuit scenes). The greatest number of surviving examples is, as usual, in Attic, but the subject was clearly popular with Laconian vase-painters also. There is a close basic similarity in the versions of the different schools, and none has a clear priority in date. The earliest surviving examples from Corinthian, (pl. 67c) Attic, (pl. 67a) Laconian and Chiot (our chalice) must be approximately contemporary around the early second quarter of the century, and there are also Chalcidian and Boeotian examples before 550.¹⁰²

In addition to the vase-paintings, there exists one certain, and one possible, representation in architectural relief-sculpture of just before or around the mid-century. The first is a metope from the Heraion at Foce del Sele,¹⁰³ showing a kneeling warrior facing right, behind a palm-tree; unfortunately the companion

metope, with Troilos, has not been found. The second is the 'Olive-Tree' Pediment from the Athenian Acropolis.¹⁰⁴ The interpretation of this as the Ambush is not beyond dispute, as the chief remains, the central building, the olive-branches engraved on the background, and the frontal figure of a woman with a pad on her head, are by no means unambiguous. Wiegand thought a representation of the Erechtheum more likely than that of a myth with no direct connection with Athens. Buschor was the first to make out a strong case for Troilos, and many scholars have followed him, with hot dispute about the composition of the scene.¹⁰⁵ Unfortunately, with all its ambiguities, this representation is important because of the 'fountain-house' (see below).

The basic elements appearing in the scene are: the fountain or fountain-house; a tree or spreading creepers behind it; Achilles, behind the tree, usually crouching, but occasionally poised as if on the point of rushing out; in front of the fountain Polyxena, with a hydria which she often stoops to fill, and behind her Troilos, usually with two horses, and almost always mounted on one of them. (Of the Laconian examples,¹⁰⁶ the dinos Brommer C6, (pl.66d) fits this pattern. The cup-tonsos, however, are unique in having a 'two-tier' design, with Achilles and the fountain-house in the upper, larger segment, gradually squeezing out Troilos and Polyxena, who at first appear in the smaller, lower segment. This decreases in size as the series progresses until in the latest example, (pl.66b)

it is large enough only for a hare).

Sometimes, as with the majority of mythological scenes on vases, extra characters are introduced. Both Corinthian examples¹⁰⁷ have spare women with water-jars; Priam and another elderly Trojan also appear at the extreme left on the MC flask by Timonidas, (pl.67c) whose version, though on a miniature scale, is one of the finest and most detailed, recalling the style of the great MC and LC kraters. Several of the earlier Attic examples add supporters for Achilles (Athena, or Thetis with victory-wreath, and Hermes), and for Troilos¹⁰⁸ (male companions, or hoplites coming to the rescue). (pl67a,b).

'Birds of omen' perched on the fountain are very popular in Attic, appearing on the majority of examples, both early and late.¹⁰⁹ There is one, flying, on the Boeotian kantharos,¹¹⁰ and the fountain-houses of the Laconian cup-tondos have one or more on their roofs. The Laconian dinos, like the chalice, has none, nor have the Corinthian and Chalcidian vases.

In the choice of the direction of the scene, the non-Attic examples are fairly evenly divided: The MC flask has Achilles at the right, the LC oenochoe in Tunis has him at the left; on the Boeotian kantharos and the Laconian dinos he is at the right, on the pseudo-Chalcidian amphora, at the left. It is rather difficult to decide in the case of the Laconian cups because of the two-tier system and because, though at the right, he faces the front of the fountain house!

In the surviving Attic examples up to the late 6th cent., he is almost always at the left (I know of one instance, on a Tyrrhenian amphora,¹¹¹ where he is at the right). In late bf the right becomes the favoured position for him, while in several of the latest examples there is also an intriguing change of emphasis: Troilos disappears, and Achilles lies in wait for Polyxena alone.¹¹² This change of direction and emphasis appears in the one known rf example, on an early kalpis by the Berlin Painter.¹¹³

There are interesting similarities in the case of the other main Troilos-scene, Achilles' pursuit of Troilos and Polyxena. In the great majority of bf examples, the movement is from left to right; in the majority of rf, the direction again changes, and though there is not quite the same change of emphasis, certain motifs become more prominent, notably that of Achilles actually dragging Troilos from his horse, extremely rare in surviving bf scenes.¹¹⁴ In both these cases may be seen the fresh attitude of the early rf painters to the old subjects, and also, incidentally, their influence on their bf contemporaries.

When the Pitane chalice is compared in detail with the examples from the other Greek schools, some interesting or unusual points arise.

First, there are two strange 'misplacements': the tree, and Polyxena. Most (though not quite all) of the representations have a tree or shrub, and in all except ours it is behind the fountain, directly in front of Achilles, or at least with branches trailing

both to rear and front of the fountain. Why, then, should the Chiot tree be in such an unsuitable position for concealing Achilles? An obvious explanation, without going into fruitless arguments about the painter's literary knowledge, is that this is purely artistic licence. Achilles does not need a tree to hide him behind this fountain-house, and the tree where it stands is a most satisfying element in the composition, while still suggesting the rich vegetation around the fountain.

What then of Polyxena, taking Achilles in the rear? It seems rather as if the painter knew that, according to the story, she must be present, but, considering the men the chief protagonists, and not finding a place for her in his conception of the scene (which differs markedly in this respect from that of the mainland painters), was forced to relegate her to a rather inappropriate corner. Achilles is clearly not intended to be visible to her. (Or perhaps the artist felt that a definite vertical accent was needed to close the scene, as there is no break or border between it and the next?)

A third problem is posed by the male figure who stands in the centre of the scene, pouring water into the trough. Is he Troilos? Or is the small figure on the black horse Troilos, and the standing man a squire? Unfortunately only the lower part of the mounted figure remains. That the standing figure is meant to be young may be shown by his height (compare the figures on the other side of the chalice), and possibly also by his short hair. His beard is

slightly disconcerting, but Troilos does appear bearded (with name inscribed) on the Timonidas flask, as well as on the Boeotian kantharos, and, later, on a hydria of the Leagros Group.¹¹⁵ From a dramatic point of view, his figure is much more prominent than the figure on the horse, and his innocently-turned back more poignant - to a modern eye.

It must be admitted, however, that the arguments against such an interpretation are strong. Though in other schools Troilos is occasionally shown dismounted,¹¹⁶ on the two examples where one other youth is present, Troilos is clearly the mounted one. On the later vase (a Leagros Group hydria),¹¹⁷ this is made clear by position: the other youth is at the edge of the scene, following Troilos and his two horses. The earlier example, a Tyrrhenian hydria,¹¹⁸ is a closer analogy, as the dismounted youth is actually serving Troilos (grasping the bridle of his restive horse), as the young man pouring water on the chalice might be thought to be serving the mounted one. (See below for the Etruscan bronze with three young men at the fountain). A further minor point is that, if the dismounted figure is Troilos, when the pursuit begins there will be two men on horseback, whereas in the surviving Pursuit scenes Troilos is always shown alone with his spare horse.

This brings us to the fountain-house and the water-trough or basin. The basin appears in various shapes and sizes on the majority of the other Ambush scenes on vases. In every case except one, however, it is beneath the spout of a fountain, with the water falling directly into it. The fountains seem to consist of a

simple rectangular, or occasionally cylindrical, brick or stone pedestal (the component blocks often painted in a chequer-board pattern), from which a spout protrudes, either plain tubular, or in the form of a lion's head.

Fountain-houses are rare. The Laconian group is unique in having only fountain-houses; the Chalcidian *dinos*-fragment (pl. 67d)¹¹⁹ seems to suggest a building, but shows no roof. The two Corinthian examples¹²⁰ have only fountains. None occurs in certain Attic representations of the Ambush before the late 6th century (at this time, when fountain-house scenes generally were popular, especially on *hydriae*, a number of Leagros Group vases with the Ambush suggest the fountain-house by placing a column, sometimes supporting an architrave, beside the lion-head spout).¹²¹ A possible early (second quarter of the 6th cent.) Ambush scene with fountain-house occurs on fragments of a large lid from the Acropolis:¹²² remaining are the bottoms of two walls, with what is probably a basin on a pedestal between them, the legs of two horses, a black and a white, side by side, and a row of at least three walking warriors. Clearly the fountain-house is frontal, and the basin presumably inside, under the spout. There is no means of knowing whether a roof was shown. This is the place for the 'Olive Tree' pediment; its importance lies in the fact that it has a complete building, roof and all, while without it there is no such surviving example in Attic art for this scene.

Among the Attic representations of the Pursuit of Troilos, two of the earliest, a cup by the C Painter and the François Vase,¹²³ have fountain-houses, but the latter, though complete, is shown frontal and without basin, while the former, though in profile, is shown to the architrave only, and has a basin inside, under the spout.

The only example besides the chalice which has a fountain-house with basin outside and not under a spout, is the Laconian dinos, (pl.66d) of c.550. In these two cases, unless this is just another piece of artistic licence, one has to assume that the basin is specifically for animals to drink from.

The apparent back-view of the building on the dinos is unique. However, the series of Laconian cup-tondos also has fountain-houses, and it is here that the closest parallel for the Chiot example is to be found, in the latest cup (where only Achilles and the fountain-house remain). Both have a back wall of brick or stone painted in a chequer-board pattern, and their architraves are similarly rendered. The Laconian example has a Doric column with a rather strange capital, and a roof crowned by a disc-akroterion (seen as if from the front). The Chiot house has a splendid Aeolic column (probably wooden?), and gaily-painted palmette akroteria on the roof.

Finally, the horses. Though it is not uncommon for horsemen on vases to lead a spare horse, it seems possible that the literary

tradition also gave Troilos two horses, as two appear in almost all the examples of both the Ambush and the Pursuit.

There are two motifs combined in the rendering of the horses on the chalice: that of a pair of horses of contrasting colours, and that of a pair of horses, one of which holds its head erect while the other stoops to drink.

The nearer Chiot horse is black, the farther white. Pairs of riding-horses of which one is black, the other white, and chariot-teams with one or two white horses, are common in several different schools. The earliest examples known to me are two-horse and three-horse chariot-teams on 'Naxian' and Proto-Attic vases of the mid-7th century.¹²⁴ (On the 'Melian' Apollo amphora, of c.540, in a four-horse team, the nearest horse has a black body, the other three are shown in outline behind him, and all have white (outline) faces; cf. also the Proto-Attic Nessos amphora in New York.¹²⁵ This however, is perhaps simply an easy way of showing a four-horse team in a predominantly outline style). I mention these 7th century examples to show that the idea of contrasting colours, black and white, for two or more horses side by side was known in other areas of Greece well before the Corinthian 6th century light-ground and red-ground styles.¹²⁶

In the 6th century, the earliest surviving examples of the motif at Athens and Corinth are so close in date that neither can definitely be given priority. There are a few instances in

later MC, c.580, one of which is the Timonidas flask (nearer horse white). In these, of course, as in the chalice, the 'white' horses are actually reserved, not painted with added white paint. The motif did not become really popular at Corinth, however, especially for riding-horses, until the advent of the LC 'red-ground' style. In this, every chariot has at least one white horse, as does almost every horseman with two mounts, and where a row of one-horse riders appears, white horses usually alternate with black.¹²⁷

Sophilos, considered a contemporary of Timonidas,¹²⁸ is the first known Attic bf vase-painter to use the motif: on the sherd with the funeral games for Patroklos, the nearest horse of the chariot-team is in white paint, laid directly on the ground in the LC fashion. He is generally believed to have been under strong Corinthian influence; he could have taken the motif from MC, but it is perhaps more likely that early 'red-ground' vases were being made at Corinth alongside the later MC ones.

Many examples occur in Attic after Sophilos, mostly in the second quarter of the century, but continuing here and there even down to the late 6th century for chariot-teams¹²⁹ (it was never very popular for riding-horses at Athens).

In Chiot, one example is known for riding-horses, (pl. 71c)¹³⁰ In the third quarter of the century Clazomenian vase-painters took it up to a certain extent, and it appears in East Greek architectural terracottas.¹³¹ There are also Etruscan examples.¹³²

To return to the Troilos-scene, three of the earliest Attic examples (two admittedly by the same painter) have contrasting horses;¹³³ this is about one-third of the surviving pre-550 scenes. In each case, the far horse is the white one, and Troilos rides the nearer, black one, as with the rider on the chalice. The fact that five surviving representations of c.580-560, from three schools, have the motif (which is generally rarer for riding-horses) perhaps indicates a recognized tradition for the scene.

The same would seem to apply to the second motif involved in the rendering of the horses on the Pitane chalice - that of one horse keeping its head erect while the other stoops to drink. Two of the three Attic examples with contrasting horses (All, by the Painter of London B76, (pl.67a) and the Eleusis lid A31), (pl. 67b) share this second motif also with the chalice. In both cases the farther, white horse, the spare, is the one which leans forward to drink. A fourth example occurs on the Laconian dinos, (pl.66d) Here both horses are black, and Troilos is mounted on the farther one, but it is still the spare, in this case the nearer one, which lowers its head. (Is it just careless drawing which puts the trough behind the horse's head, or a misunderstanding of the motif?) The Chiot chalice has the nearer, black horse leaning to drink, but, uniquely, this is the horse with rider, not the spare.

The closeness in date of the examples discussed is striking. One feels that there must have been a common prototype at least for the horses, but its place of origin cannot be deduced. It is also

impossible to say whether it was in vase-or free-painting, but it must certainly have been pictorial rather than literary.

In particular, there seems no reason to assume the influence of the Corinthian figure-style on the Chiot chalice (the closest connection is 'Troilos' beard!) There was a continuous Island tradition of polychromy from the mid-7th century; as for the composition, though the figures on the chalice and on Corinthian column-kraters are approximately the same height, a very different impression is given: the Chiot open and spacious, the Corinthian congested. The figures on the chalice are anatomically rather feeble, but the whole scene is both charming and impressive, and with its simplicity and spaciousness gives a more monumental feeling than any of the other examples.

The links between the Chiot and Laconian versions are intriguing:¹³⁴ the fountain-house, and, in the case of the dinos, much of the iconography of the scene (though not its execution!)

Specifically East Greek features in the Chiot picture are:

- a). Aeolic column-capital of the fountain-house.
- b). Helmet with vertical projection on the brow.¹³⁵
- c). Dotted harness for the horses.¹³⁶
- d). Polyxena's ear-ring: this type of ear-stud seems to be unknown in mainland art, except for a few gorgoneia and sphinxes, but is common in East Greek art.¹³⁷
- e). The dress worn by the Trojan youths¹³⁸ (Troilos appears naked in many of the other versions, while in some he wears a

'normal' tunic). This type of garment, which looks as if it consists of a shirt under a pair of shorts with a sort of pinafore-top fitting over one shoulder only, is common for men on Chiot chalices.

2. Smyrna, Old Arch. Mus. (no invoice number visible).

A Clazomenian sarcophagus, unpublished, (possibly one of those mentioned by RM Cook, CVA BM 8, 46, as 'found recently at Old Smyrna'?)

Pl. 69 a.

Date: late 6th cent. (Albertinum Painter).

The scene occupies the head-end of the top surface of the sarcophagus. As may be seen from the photograph,¹³⁹ the sarcophagus has been wrongly 'restored', so that it is much narrower across the end than it should be; the gap ought to be slightly wider than the surviving right-hand fragment. (The piece visible at the bottom left is alien).

On the left-hand fragment are four girls, chatting as they walk slowly right. The first and third from the left carry empty water-jars. Details in white paint of the folds of the himatia of the first two from the left may be seen on the actual object, but almost all other inner detail has vanished. On the right-hand fragment (which is better preserved, especially at the right), is, first, a very curious fountain, with a ?lion-head spout, supported on a very thin column with a foot, and surrounded by spindly plants

which possibly originally ended in flower-buds. Behind the fountain, encircled by long, trailing branches, crouches a warrior in greaves, short tunic (?), corslet and helmet, and armed with a spear. His helmet has horns and ears; there is a large palmette on his corslet, and his shield bears a fine, prancing winged horse (one wing under the belly) within a dot border. Behind him is a twisted tree, presumably the source of the branches. In its forked top perches a small bird.

There can be no doubt as to the identification of the scene, and there is plenty of room for Troilos and his horses in the gap. The scene is of great interest for two reasons. First, a recognizable mythological scene such as this is extremely rare, if not unique, for the Clazomenian sarcophagi, which are normally decorated with stock general themes such as chariot-racing, hunting, and fighting.¹⁴⁰ Second, it bears a strong resemblance to the Ambush scene on a Leagros Group hydria, on the Swiss market in 1961, (pl. 69b).¹⁴¹ On the vase, from the left there appear a hoplite, and a girl carrying a hydria on its side on her head; Troilos, mounted and leading a spare horse; two more girls, one with a hydria upright on her head, the other as the first girl; the fountain-house, indicated by a single column with architrave, and trailing branches in the background; and finally, only half visible at the right-hand edge, the crouching figure of Achilles.

As we have seen, extra characters such as hoplites marching to

the rescue, girls walking away with hydriae, or a goddess standing 'in the wings', are not unknown on earlier representations, especially where the field is long and narrow. This communal expedition to the fountain, however, appears only in two Leagros Group examples among surviving vases (the second being a hydria in Munich,¹⁴² where five youths armed with spears join two girls and Troilos, and where Achilles has been squeezed out completely). The two girls gossiping as they walk to the fountain, though they do not appear on the Leagros Group hydriae just mentioned, are familiar from other works of the group and their contemporaries.¹⁴³

The connection of the Albertinum Painter with Attic vase-painting of the Leagros period has long been noted,¹⁴⁴ but this picture seems to be a particularly good illustration of the point.

The most puzzling feature of the sarcophagus picture, for which I know no parallel, is the fountain. It looks as though the water must flow in through the projecting piece at the top, the slim shaft being only a support; the whole thing may be of metal. The plants too are strange, and recall Etruscan flora more than anything in East Greek art.¹⁴⁵ The palmette on Achilles' corslet occurs elsewhere in East Greece,¹⁴⁶ as does the horse with a wing under the belly,¹⁴⁷ a type deriving from Near Eastern models.

There can be no question of the identity of the painter. The 'pony-tail' hairstyle is not exclusive to him, and the band of chequer below the merman seems more common in the work of other

painters,¹⁴⁸ but the figure of Achilles is unmistakable. Besides the general attitude,¹⁴⁹ details such as the horned helmet and dotted shield-rim are easily paralleled.¹⁵⁰ The winged horseman occurs elsewhere in his work;¹⁵¹ also very similar rows of sphinxes¹⁵² (squatting, however). The broken meander bordering the scene is a favourite of his. The 'bead and reel' appears on one of his red-figure sarcophagi.¹⁵³ There is no trace of plants like those round the fountain in the rest of his work (or on the other sarcophagi), but neither is there any remotely similar scene to give scope for such touches of landscape (and he is generally fond of scattering large flowers and buds, and even trees, in his scenes).¹⁵⁴

A note on the Etruscan representations.

The scene seems to have caught the fancy of Etruscan artists, whether or not they knew the literary version. The vase-representations, including the two mysterious scenes on amphorae of the La Tolfa Group, where Troilos, preceded, as if to a religious ceremony, by a boy with branches, rides to an altar-like fountain on which stands a strange deity, have recently been fully discussed by K. Schauenburg.¹⁵⁵

He also notes briefly the two gold finger-rings of the last quarter of the century, on which a procession (no horseman) approaches a fountain with large lion-head spout on top.¹⁵⁶ Behind the fountain on one of the scenes is a crouching figure: not, however, Achilles, but a civilian apparently communing with the

strange being squatting behind the spout on top of the fountain. Rich vegetation fills the scene. The similarity of composition seems to show influence from Troilos-scenes; the monstrous lion-head spout appears in another Etruscan Troilos-scene¹⁵⁷ (perhaps even, the spout on the Clazomenian fountain should be thought of as a whole lion-head, though more restrained than these?).

Roughly contemporary with the vases (third quarter of the 6th century), are two more representations, each of which has minor points of resemblance with the East Greek versions (though these may have no special significance). The painting from the Tomba dei Tori¹⁵⁸ has a fountain surrounded by rich vegetation. Fondness for such plant-life is a well-known Etruscan trait; however, some of these plants are very like those on the Clazomenian sarcophagus, and this along with the very 'Etruscan-looking' plant on the East Greek revetments¹⁵⁹ mentioned above, leads one to think that perhaps this fondness owed more to East Greek artists than has hitherto appeared.

On the fine twin bronze-reliefs from Vulci, (pl.68). from the central arm-grip of a shield, we see no Polyxena, but three young men at the fountain: one drawing water, one armed with a spear, holding the horses, and one (Troilos?) mounted on the far horse. G. Camporeale, who has recently discussed the scene,¹⁶⁰ thinks this an Etruscan aberration, but it may be compared with the Chiot version. (He also, quite unnecessarily in my opinion, takes the same view of the position of Achilles, at the side of the fountain, instead of behind it).

It has been noted that the whole-lion spouts, common to both the wall-painting and the bronzes, though very rare, are paralleled in Greece, and in the 6th century in East Greece.¹⁶¹

That there is some connection, however indirect, between the bronze-reliefs and East Greek art, is shown by the gorgoneion which appears at the base of the palmette (cf. *Ch. II* p. 155). I should not like to claim the reliefs as East Greek work solely on the strength of this; however, it is certainly true to say that it not only has the East Greek characteristics, but is unusually East Greek in appearance also, for a non-East Greek work.

E. The Pursuit of Troilos?

Athens, Nat.Mus. Inv. 5610. A black-figure sherd from a hydria.

Said to be from 'the area' of Clazomenae.

Pl. 70 a.

R. Zahn, AM 23, 1898, 38ff., pl.VI.1. R.M.Cook, BSA 47, 1952,

139 no.19.¹⁶² Charbonneaux, Martin, Villard, Archaic Greek Art,

93, fig.102. (colour photograph).

Date: c.540 B.C.

The sherd is certainly from a hydria: its shape, turning back at a sharp angle at the upper edge of the figure-scene, shows that it is part of the main body-scene, with a little of the shoulder-zone remaining at the top. It was published by Zahn along with the sherd showing the dragging of Hector's body (Section B), and was thought by him, probably correctly, to belong to the same pot. He gives no measurements (from the Achilles-Hector sherd, he estimated the hydria to have a diameter of 20.5 cm. at the junction of shoulder and body). The descriptions of the clay of the two differ slightly, but this is probably simply because the observations were made by different people.¹⁶³

At the right-hand end of the scene, facing left, are a man and a woman in embroidered robes, seated on high-backed thrones (only the nearer one is visible). The man has a moustache and beard, and long hair combed straight back from his brow. The woman has a fillet in her hair, and wears disc-and-cap ear-rings. Both have ribbons or circlets round their necks. They raise their right hands, while slightly extending their left. In front of them, with head

reverted, stands a man in a sleeved tunic and long himation, with a round hat on his head. He also has moustache and beard, and a band round his neck. In his left hand he holds up a kerykeion, in his right he has a thymiaterion.

Immediately behind him, at the left-hand edge of the sherd, appear the foreparts (chest, head and foreleg only), of two horses, the nearer black, the other white. The black has a decorative girdle with tassels, and below this appear three straight lines (the outer two incised, the inner in white paint), converging slightly towards the front of the horse's chest.

Discussing the interpretation of the scene, Zahn rejected the idea that the seated couple might be gods, on the grounds that the man had receding hair, and must therefore be an elderly mortal (see also Cook). Many examples of receding hair are known from archaic vase-paintings,¹⁶⁴ but I am not quite sure that the man on this sherd should be included. His hairstyle is different from the herald's, it is true, but is well-known from East Greek sculpture.¹⁶⁵

That the standing man is a herald seems sure: his hat can be closely paralleled,¹⁶⁶ and though his kerykeion is unorthodox, with its thick ribbed or twisted shaft, variants on the 'standard' archaic kerykeion are by no means rare. Clazomenian sherds provide two rather similar knobby sticks, and there are at least two kerykeia on vases (one Attic, one Chalcidian), with what may be the same type of head.¹⁶⁷

The object in his right hand is certainly a thymiaterion, an object associated with religious rites.¹⁶⁸ If we consider the seated couple to be gods, the herald must presumably be Hermes, but the presence of the thymiaterion, not to mention the horses, is mysterious.

Zahn, however, turns again to the Trojan War, and suggests Achilles' pursuit of Troilos, comparing the representation of this subject on the François Vase.¹⁶⁹ For him, the couple seated on the throne are Priam and Hecuba, and the horses approaching them are Troilos' fleeing from Achilles, with Troilos mounted on the black horse (Zahn believed the ~~three~~ converging lines below the horse's decorative girdle to be the head of Troilos' spear). The herald is simply attending the royal pair, perfuming the air for them with incense. The panel would have been completed by Achilles pursuing the horses, and perhaps by Polyxena. Zahn claimed, interestingly, that this scene shows authentic Homeric features - the queen seated at the king's side, and the herald as the servant who attended them.¹⁷⁰ For the thymiaterion, he cited some Near Eastern reliefs such as the one from Kūyūnjik (Nineveh), on which Assurbanipal (668-626 B.C.) sits with his wife in an arbour, with two thymiateria standing on the ground behind them, and suggested that the vase-painter must have known something of the ceremonial of Near Eastern barbarian courts.¹⁷¹

Zahn's interpretation has not, however, been universally accepted. E.R. Price accepted Priam and Hecuba, but thought they were receiving the herald (occasion unspecified). Both J.M. and R.M. Cook believe the horses to be a chariot-pair; this would, of course, rule out

the Troilos scene.¹⁷²

Clearly, too much speculation would be pointless, but there are a few items which may be discussed briefly.

First, the problem of the horses and their harness. R.M. Cook (*op.cit.*) took the three mysterious lines below the decorative girdle for the chest-strap which chariot-horses normally wear as part of their harness, connecting them to the yoke. Generally speaking, however, whenever a horse in a vase-painting or terracotta relief has a decorative girdle as well as the chest-strap, the former seems to be, or to fall, below the latter (as indeed is the case on the companion sherd to this one).¹⁷³ But this is, perhaps, a minor point. Turning to the lines themselves, it is extremely difficult to see from the photographs exactly what happens to them, especially as some kind of blotch obscures the point where they would meet (Zahn mentions this, p.41, 'Der rote Fleck an dem Schnittpunkt der Linien ist wol nur zufällig.'). Despite this, and no matter whether or not they actually meet, they clearly converge, and this would be most improbable for a chest-strap, which normally grows broader towards the centre, where the strain is greatest. Also, they do not appear to reach the edge of the horse's chest, as the decorative girdle above them does. So, for Cook's assumption to be possible, the painter must have been very careless. Yet, though he is not a brilliant artist, and though he makes mistakes (for instance, the herald's left arm ends in a right hand, and vice versa), he is not generally slapdash. Therefore it is perhaps unlikely that the three incised lines are a chest-strap.

Before the chariot-theory is discarded, however, it should be mentioned that there is one East Greek example of a two-horse chariot-team apparently without chest-straps on a fragmentary Clazomenian 'broad amphora' dated by R.M. Cook 'perhaps about 530 B.C.', from Tell Defenneh.¹⁷⁴ (As on our sherd, the nearer, black horse wears a decorative girdle, but the white horse behind it has none; presumably the artists thought it unnecessary to add the tiny scrap of decoration when they painted-in the narrow outline.) From this it appears that our horses could still be a chariot-pair, even if we reject the incised lines as a chest-strap.

To return to Zahn's interpretation, a spear-head as the explanation of the three lines is certainly possible, and it is difficult to think of a more convincing alternative. Troilos carries a spear or spears in several vase-representations of the Ambush and Pursuit (in all these, as it happens, he holds the spear upright, but obviously the horizontal position is perfectly possible).¹⁷⁵

It might seem slightly odd that Troilos should be so much on top of the domestic scene (at least on the François Vase, the only other known example where Priam appears, he is set firmly outside the walls of Troy, and a greater feeling of distance is given by the long field, the desperately galloping horses and the running figure of Polyxena), but this could be put down to the exigencies of composition in a panel. The weakest point for the Troilos interpretation is, for me, the position of the herald. He appears rather too prominent for a mere domestic attendant carrying out his

normal duties, and one wonders whether he is actually introducing some embassy to the seated couple, and perhaps presenting them with the censer.

In short, there is nothing definitely against Zahn's theory, which is attractive and ingenious; nevertheless, it cannot be rated higher than a possibility.

A possible alternative, (involving the acceptance of the horses as a chariot-team) might be the Introduction of Herakles to Olympus. Representations of Athena escorting Herakles by chariot to the home of the gods become popular in Attic bf after the mid-6th century.¹⁷⁶ Hermes very often walks in front of the chariot, and frequently turns back his head, as on our sherd, to see that all is well.¹⁷⁷

Even more interesting for us is the Ricci hydria¹⁷⁸ (almost certainly made by an East Greek, possibly even a Clazomenian, in Etruria). On this vase the scene occupies the main zone of the belly; here too Hermes looks back from his position at the head of the procession, holding up a kerykeion (head unfortunately not visible in the photographs) in his left hand. Between him and the horses, however, is a winged goddess with spear (Athena?). Herakles is about to step into the chariot, which is driven by a second goddess. These versions do not show the actual arrival in the palace of the gods, with Zeus and Hera greeting the travellers, but parallels for the positions and gestures of the figures on the sherd can be found in other scenes. For instance, a bf hydria with the Judgment of Paris¹⁷⁹ shows Hermes and Paris greeting each other, with attitude

(Pl. 70b).

and gestures very similar to those of the sherd. A late 6th century red cup by Epiktetos¹⁸⁰ shows Zeus and Hera seated side by side; Eos and Thetis rush up to intercede for their sons, at the same time looking back to where the duel is in progress. This attitude of approaching someone while looking back to the main action of the central characters is common on vases.

This interpretation, though it leaves the thymiaterion still unexplained (ceremonies of admission to be carried out for Herakles?), seems better suited to the position of the herald and the gestures of the couple, which look more like motions of greeting (possibly slightly surprised), than of grief or fear. It also avoids the awkwardness in the Troilos interpretation, of having the actual Pursuit so close to 'Priam and Hecuba'.

As the size of the hydria is not known,¹⁸¹ it is difficult to guess at the size of the panel (which, however, was at the front only: no trace of the side handle). In the Attic representations of the Introduction, the panel is almost entirely filled by the chariot; but the composition is complex, there are four horses, usually also characters standing between chariot and horses, and often Herakles or Athena is just stepping up into the chariot. The Ricci hydria probably gives a better idea of how the Clazomenian version might have looked, though the scene must be considerably longer than that on the Clazomenian vase.¹⁸² At any rate, it seems not too improbable that there would have been room on the Clazomenian hydria for a simple two-horse chariot with passengers aboard, despite the additional figures of Zeus and Hera.

There are a number of East Greek features, mostly very familiar, in the scene:

- a) The horses' trappings;¹⁸³
- b) The white dots along the edge of the horse's leg-muscle are very common in Clazomenian.¹⁸⁴
- c) The seated man's hair-style (see above, p.337).
- d) The woman's ear-ring is of a type familiar in Asia Minor and Cyprus, but very rare in mainland Greek art.¹⁸⁵
- e) The throne seems to differ from most examples in mainland Greek art in being more square-set and upright, with higher seat and arm. In general shape it closely resembles some of the thrones of the seated figures from Didyma, though they have no stretchers; it also seems close to some of the thrones on the Harpy Tomb, and, like the horse-trappings, shows Near Eastern influence.¹⁸⁶

F. Achilles and Memnon.

Istanbul, Arch.Mus. Inv.8582.

Chiot chalice.

Excavated in the archaic cemetery at Pitane (Çandarlı). Pl.71.

Ht. c.31.5 cm.; ht. of foot, c.7.8cm.; diam. of bowl,

c.38.3cm.; diam. of foot, c.14cm. Ht. of figure-zone,

c.13.6cm. Unpublished. See under Section C for brief refs.

to discovery. On the subject: J.D. Beazley, in Caskey-Beazley,

Boston Vases ii, 14-19. Brommer, Vasenlisten², 259ff. Steuben

64-65, 122. Fittschen 178.

Date: second quarter of the 6th century. The shape seems

slightly later than that of the Troilos chalice, (the two

cones of the bowl and foot more exaggerated).

The chalice has a rather dirty cream slip, peeling. The added colours are red, black (thinned to various shades of brown), and white. Incision is used for the pattern round the rim of the right-hand warrior's shield. The figures are more ponderous than those of the Troilos chalice, and certainly by a different artist.

The larger part of the figure-zone is taken up by a horse-race with seven horses - it covers the whole of one side plus the space over both handles. On the other side is the clear scene of two hoplites fighting, watched by two women. This does not, however, fill the whole side: a very badly damaged area at the right, behind the second woman, contains traces of two figures. Since the first of these almost certainly has his back to the woman (the tops of his legs seem to be distinguishable), the two groups are most

likely unconnected. It is the group of warriors and women with which we are concerned here.

From the left, the scene is composed as follows: facing right is a bare-headed woman wearing a red ribbon or fillet in her black hair, and a red and black dress with bands of a dotted pattern at the waist and hem, joined by a vertical stripe down the middle of the skirt. (The curious distribution of colour in this dress, black above the arm, red below, red to the left of the central stripe, black to the right, probably owes more to the painter's desire for pictorial interest and vividness than to the actual facts of East Greek dress-making. There are parallels in Chiot vase-painting.¹⁸⁷ It is not impossible that skirts should have been made in pieces of different colours, as shown, but the parti-colouring of bodices as shown is distinctly more dubious, as is that of, e.g., the cloak of the right-hand woman in this scene, which is red as far as the arm, then black below!) Next comes the very fragmentary figure of a hoplite: perhaps a trace of red greaves, and a red helmet with the typical East Greek projection from the brow - vertical, then turned back at right-angles.¹⁸⁸ He has a shield whose interior is red, edged with a band of black dots, and his spear-point meets and passes in front of that of the second warrior above their shields. The second man has a black helmet with nose - and cheek - pieces, and a ledge at the back to protect the neck, but no projection on the brow. Faint traces of a crest

can be made out. He wears a black tunic (visible only below the waist) with a patterned edge, and red greaves. His shield almost certainly has a sphinx¹⁸⁹ as its device - red hair and the tip of the nose, and to the right of the hair traces of white with brown lines which look like part of a wing. The pattern round the edge of the shield is incised, with blobs of red and white in the small squares. He seems to lean forward slightly. Between the two warriors, sniffing unconcernedly at the ground, is a black, curly-tailed dog. Behind the second warrior stands a woman with curls over her brow, wearing a red and black cloak over her head, and holding it out with her right hand (as well as the changes in colour, note the change in the border-pattern of the cloak). Under the cloak she wears a white chiton, on which very faint but quite definite fine vertical folds can be seen, (compare the dress of contemporary East Greek and Cycladic female statues).¹⁹⁰

The identification of this scene as the combat between Achilles and Memnon¹⁹¹ rests on the description by Pausanias (V.19.1) of the representation on the chest of Cypselus at Olympia: *Ἀχιλλεὺς δὲ καὶ Μήμνωνι μάχόμενος παρεστῆκασιν αἱ μητέρες*, and on parallels in other schools of archaic vase-painting.

Beazley's account of the theme, with lists, cannot be bettered, and the following discussion draws heavily upon it.

There are in archaic Greek vase-painting a number of inscribed scenes which fit Pausanias' description and correspond with the iconography of the chalice scene, (in some the fallen

Antilochos appears between the two). There are also a great many similar scenes, without added names. Two questions arise here: i) are definite examples known of a different hoplite duel in the presence of two women? and ii) how likely is it that the Pitane scene represents a definite mythological episode?

i) On the neck of the 'Melian' Apollo amphora of c.640, appear two warriors fighting over a set of armour, watched from the adjoining panels by two women.¹⁹² This seems, on the face of it, unlikely to be Achilles and Memnon, though the interest of the women favours that interpretation (and the fact that one woman is bareheaded while the other covers her head with her himation, may also indicate it; see below). The alternative suggestions of the dispute of Odysseus and Ajax over Achilles' armour, or the contest of Ajax and Diomedes for Sarpedon's,¹⁹³ leaves the women quite unexplained. Apart from this enigmatic early example, there are fragments of an Attic krater of c.550-40, which show a duel between Aeneas (named) and another warrior who must be Diomedes, with two women watching.¹⁹⁴ The woman behind Aeneas, however, is securely identifiable as Aphrodite by the flower which she holds in her right hand - an attribute which appears on none of the unnamed 'Achilles and Memnon' scenes. Both Beazley and Friis Johansen note these two examples; both incline to accept the 'Melian' scene as Achilles and Memnon, and Friis Johansen¹⁹⁵ states strongly his belief that, in the case of the second example, the composition is

a borrowing from the Achilles-Memnon iconography.

An amphora by the Swing Painter¹⁹⁶ has Poseidon fighting a giant watched by two women (indeed, various other mythological contests, such as Theseus and the Minotaur, have women looking on),¹⁹⁷ but there seems to be no other hoplite duel.

The Chiot scene fits Pausanias' description, and also the iconography of several named scenes from the second quarter of the 6th century on.¹⁹⁸ There seems, therefore, every likelihood that, if it has a definite mythological content, it represents Achilles and Memnon watched by Thetis and Eos.

ii) Fight-scenes, i.e. duels or groups of four warriors, as opposed to bigger groups, which of course are common, do occur frequently as early as this without any label in the form of an inscription or an identifying attribute. The C-Painter, for instance, was fond of putting a fight on one side of his cups;¹⁹⁹ his other subjects were very often general too - symposion, komos, horsemen, standing men and women, boxers and wrestlers. Some painters used a vague scene such as a fight between two or more warriors as filling on the subordinate side of a large pot whose main side carried a definite mythological scene.²⁰⁰ While this does not necessarily mean that a specific fight was not intended (after all, it is more difficult to identify a mythological fight than, e.g., a Judgment of Paris), there is a strong probability that fighting warriors were a stock scene, like facing sirens or cocks.

(This probability is even stronger later, when compositions deriving ultimately from specific mythological scenes were sometimes certainly used to illustrate general themes.²⁰¹ Although many of the 'hoplite duel with two women' scenes must be intended for Achilles and Memnon (and the named scenes show that the subject was still quite popular), there can be no proof; and when, for instance, the motif occurs in a larger scene with many fighting groups, sometimes on both sides of a cup,²⁰² the suspicion that it is being used simply as a stock scene becomes a virtual certainty).

However, on a rather grand vase of the date of our chalice, such a scene seems very likely to have a mythological significance. Mythological scenes, including Trojan Cycle episodes, appear on one comparable large chalice (Troilos/Ransom of Hector, Sections C,D) and on a number of contemporary Chiot sherds.²⁰³ Even more to the point, if the horse-race on the other side of our chalice need not be mythological, it is difficult to see the fragmentary scene on the same side (a large man in brown tunic, with white-painted flesh and red hair, kneeling with outstretched hands before another man) as anything other than a specific mythological scene, however mysterious.

It is most probable, then, that the Pitane scene represents Achilles and Memnon.

There is no indication in the scene as to who will be the victor. The right-hand warrior seems to lean forward slightly, but

the damaged state of the surface makes it impossible to say much about the stance of the left-hand warrior. Both are erect and uninjured, and their shields and spear-points are symmetrically placed. Can anything be deduced from the other scenes about the likely relative positions of the characters?

It has often been maintained that there was a convention that the victor in a duel should be at the left. This is certainly the case in the majority of archaic vase-pictures, but the number of exceptions stretching right down to red-figure shows that there was no hard and fast rule.²⁰⁴

There are about eight certain 'Achilles and Memnon' scenes dating to before and around 550, six of them listed or mentioned by Beazley and Brommer, (besides the inscribed examples, I have included the Vienna dinos with Psychostasia).²⁰⁵ In one of the two Corinthian examples, and two of the three Attic,²⁰⁶ Memnon is at the right; in the remaining five, he is at the left, (in two of these,²⁰⁷ the presence of Antilochos' body may effect Memnon's position: see below). Among the uninscribed scenes in Tyrrhenian alone, the loser appears in both positions.²⁰⁸ So, on the chalice, and in similar early scenes, it seems that either warrior could be Memnon.

In the later named scenes, both bf and rf, (all Attic), Memnon is at the right,²⁰⁹ and in later uninscribed duel scenes of this composition, the winner is usually at the left (a rf exception is

the Penthesilea Painter's cup from Spina, (pl. 73c);²¹⁰ cf. also the Etruscan mirror mentioned below). It seems, therefore, that it was in Attic vase-painting of the later 6th century that the 'victor at the left' position became overwhelmingly popular.

In some of the scenes, Antilochos also appears, fallen, between the two heroes. On the inscribed examples, his head is towards Achilles,²¹¹ and this is also the case in those uninscribed scenes where 'Memnon' can be identified because he is still directing his spear at the wounded man.²¹² (Interestingly, Memnon is on the left, in the so-called 'victor's position', in all these scenes, including the Attic).

As Beazley notes,²¹³ another 'rule', that in such a fight the fallen man's head always points towards his friends, is by no means hard and fast; therefore it cannot safely be assumed in the 'Achilles-Memnon' scenes where the characters cannot be distinguished on other grounds, that 'Memnon' is always at the foot end.

For the identification of Eos and Thetis on the chalice, there is the following evidence: In most examples, both mothers are bareheaded. There are, however, a few cases in both bf and rf, where some kind of head-covering is worn by one or both women. In almost all the bf examples, both certain and uninscribed, both women are veiled (on the 'Aeolic' sherds from Old Smyrna, Eos is veiled, but Thetis' head is lost).²¹⁴ In rf, (accepting as certain the examples with winged mothers), there are two early classical

examples where Thetis is bareheaded, while Eos wears a coif (as she does in some other early scenes).²¹⁵ On two other likely (but un-inscribed) late archaic 'Achilles and Memnon' scenes, on a Chalcidian skyphos and the Gorgos cup, 'Eos' alone is veiled,²¹⁶ (though, to be strict, these should not be counted). There are no definite instances where Thetis is veiled, and Eos bareheaded, (though there is a sherd with Thetis' head alone, in a coif).²¹⁷

This evidence is admittedly precarious, and cannot be given much weight, but it perhaps makes it slightly more likely that the right-hand, veiled woman on the chalice is Eos (in which case the right-hand warrior would be Memnon). Incidentally, on the 'Melian' amphora mentioned above, one woman is bareheaded, the other veiled.

The handsome dog, who looks so incongruous between the combatants on the chalice, is presumably simply filling, like the swan on the Chalcidian skyphos in Naples, mentioned above (pl.72c).

Specifically East Greek touches in the Pitane scene are confined to the dress of the two women, and to one of the helmets (the projection being apparently of a more developed type than that on Achilles' helmet on the Troilos chalices: see p. 329).

The position of the chalice in relation to the other early scenes.

If the 'Melian' scene were Achilles and Memnon, it would be by far the earliest known example.²¹⁸ The date of the Chest of Cypselus is unknown, but it cannot have been the one in which Cypselus was hidden from the Bacchiadae (as Pausanias believed); this would have

to date from the second quarter of the 7th century at the latest, and so early a date is incompatible with the wealth of mythological scenes with inscriptions, described by Pausanias. The last third of the century seems the earliest possible date - the shield-bands started about then, and there are the Thermon and Kalydon metopes - but it is dated as late as the second quarter of the 6th century by some scholars.²¹⁹

Another suggested early example (first quarter of the 6th cent.), is a marble relief-fragment from the temple of Artemis on Corfu.²²⁰ This shows part of a hoplite, helmeted and with shoulder-length hair, facing left and aiming a spear; a hand (very battered) touches his right upper-arm from behind. There is no means of telling whether the hand is male or female, but, assuming it to be female, there is no particular reason to suppose that the scene showed Achilles and Memnon. Of the certain representations of the subject, there are only two, both 5th century, in which one of the mothers touches her son, and in both²²¹ it is Eos who supports a collapsing Memnon - a situation definitely not shown in the Corfu fragment. There are, however, representations of another duel in which a goddess touches a hero's arm in the gesture which Beckel calls the *'μενος - Übertragung'*. Both the cases known to me show the fight between Diomedes and Aeneas, and it is Athena who touches Diomedes' right upper-arm.²²² So the Corfu fragment is at least as likely to be from this scene as from the Achilles-Memnon one.

That there must have been 7th century examples seems likely, and,

if an early 6th cent. dating for the Montecalvario strip (see below) is correct, even certain. However, the earliest certain surviving example is a Middle Corinthian krater²²³ of c.580; this, though, uses a stock fight-motif, which only the inscriptions make specific.

Our chalice falls in the earliest group with mothers present, in the second quarter of the century. This includes representatives of several different schools: Corinthian, (~~pl. —~~), Attic, (pl. 72a), Chalcidian, (pl. 72b), (and 'pseudo-Chalcidian'), Chiot, and ?Aeolic. As well as differences in detail, there are two distinct variants: i) the 'basic' composition, as on the chalice, and ii) a version with chariots drawn up behind the combatants, occurring on the Old Smyrna sherds (see below), the Baltimore LC hydria, and an Attic 'kothon' in Munich; (possibly connected, the Inscription Painter's version, where Automedon seems to have a horse - n. 205, vii).

The 'Aeolic' sherds from Old Smyrna.²²⁴

The fragments of a second Achilles-Memnon scene from East Greece have already been mentioned briefly. ^{p 289} They are two sherds from a black-figure krater, excavated at Old Smyrna with other sherds apparently 'of a relatively early 6th century date', and at first thought to be Aeolic. JM Cook's final dating is 'c.575-570'. The two sherds, a) with Eos, the charioteer Aithiops, and part of Memnon, b) with the legs of a four-horse chariot-team (two white and two black horses) and a woman's skirt, were found 25 yards apart,

but seem certainly to belong to the same pot.

Despite the heading 'East Greek (Aeolic) Black Figure' under which the sherds appear, the question of their attribution to a particular school is a vexed one. Although no certain LC fragments were found at Old Smyrna, Cook says that these have the appearance of red-ground LC; the painted names $\Lambda\alpha\sigma\kappa$ and $\Upsilon\theta\iota\alpha$ on sherd a), however, contain two non-Corinthian letters, λ and ξ instead of λ and μ . Miss Jeffery in her discussion of these states that the dialect could be either Doric or Aeolic. Cook concludes that the sherds belong to a small group of kraters whose painter(s) were Corinthian-trained but apparently not actually Corinthian, because of the inscriptions and the slightly unorthodox shapes of the pots. He thinks them 'in all probability...by the same hand' as the Vatican krater, Albizzati pls. 10-11, (NC 1452), attributed by Benson to the Cavalcade Painter of his 'Three Maidens Group'.²²⁵

There is no doubt that there is nothing specifically East Greek, with the possible exception of the inscriptions, about the sherds, and one feature in particular, the four-horse chariot on b), is definitely un-East Greek. The white dots on the border of Eos' veil are a very common feature on later East Greek Bf, and very rare in the figure-scenes on Corinthian large pots, but they are common for decoration on animals and occasionally daemons, on EC, MC, and LC small pots. In short, there seems no reason to dispute

Cook's conclusion: 'I should now doubt whether it is in any way East Greek'.

The LC hydria in Baltimore, (~~pl.~~),²²⁶ not mentioned by Cook, has a closely comparable composition (and, in fact, the horses of the Old Smyrna sherds look to me closer to those of the hydria than to those of the krater by the Cavalcade Painter, and cannot, I think, be by this painter, as Cook thinks). At any rate, there seems no doubt that the Old Smyrna sherds are Corinthian work.

The chief difference between these two Corinthian versions and that of the interesting Attic 'exaleiptron' of c.570, in Munich;²²⁷ is that the chariots here face inwards, and the mothers are on the nearside of the horses. There are no known examples of this type after 550.

As far as the surviving Achilles and Memnon scenes are concerned, it is impossible to decide which school had priority. On present evidence, Corinth may possibly be responsible for the second variant (perhaps it fell from favour along with Corinthian pottery). Certainly the simpler composition was much the more popular, and, apparently, long-lived.

There is no evidence for mainland influence on the Chiot version (and it was certainly not influenced by the 'Corinthian' version evidently known at Old Smyrna).

Influence in the West.

With such a simple composition, it is clearly almost impossible

to distinguish the influence of different homeland schools on western versions, unless very specific details of style or iconography appear.

A relief on a terracotta arula from Locri²²⁸ is described by Beazley (op.cit. 17, n.2) as 'East Greek style from the later part of the 6th century', (pl. 73a). Both women wear their cloaks over their heads, holding them out with one hand. Both warriors are in strong movement; the left-hand man strides forward slightly more, while the right-hand man's knee is slightly more bent. Also, the right-hand woman seems to lean forward a little (anxiety?), so just possibly the right-hand warrior is Memnon. There are no distinctively East Greek features in the dress. Perhaps Beazley based his attribution on the heavy muscularity of the combatants, which does not look Attic, certainly, and recalls figures on, e.g., Caeretan hydriae, or such 'Ionico-Etruscan' paintings as the Campana Slabs.²²⁹ It is, however, also to be seen in such western Greek works as the Perseus metope from Temple C at Selinus (and Langlotz compares figures on Chalcidian vases).²³⁰ Certainly a second terracotta arula, from Gela,²³¹ is different in style, with slenderer, more alert-looking figures, but I am not sure that this is a difference between Eastern and Western Greek.

A poor-quality bf hydria²³² and a fine bronze mirror,²³³ both Etruscan of the early 5th century, seem to show Attic influence in style. The mirror, the only inscribed western example, shows

Memnon (Memnun) on the left, falling backwards, being caught by a winged woman, presumably Eos, whose right leg is bared at least to the knee as she leaps to the left. There seems no sign of Thetis behind Achilles (Achle). The mirror may follow early classical Attic of iconographic development as well as style (winged mothers occur in two Attic examples of the second quarter of the century) - though wings were generally popular in Etruria.

The subject of western examples cannot be left without a reference to the earliest, which is also the most intriguing because of the problems of dating and subject surrounding it. This is the bronze strip, possibly from a chariot, from a large chamber-tomb at Montecalvario, near Castellina in Chianti.²³⁴ Our scene is one of three recurring on the strip. The women seem to wear cloaks, though not over their heads; the victor is not indicated. (The warriors are left-handed, presumably because the craftsman became confused when making the matrix).

The opinions of Milani, who published the strip, on dating (mid-7th cent.) and subject (a Pyrrhic dance) were rightly ignored by Curtius in his detailed discussion in Festschrift Arndt.²³⁵ He himself, however, produced a red herring in the theory that the three scenes are connected, and show episodes from the story of Amphiaraus, the duel being between Amphiaraus and Adrastus in the presence of their mothers. This idea, which starts from the departure-scene, is based on a scholion to Odyssey XI.326. He dates

the strip to the early 6th century ('the period between the Dodwell Painter and Timonidas') chiefly by the guilloche border and the filling-ornament, but also remarking on the greater flexibility of the warriors' stance compared with Protocorinthian.

A.von Salis²³⁶ produced good reasons against Amphiaraus and Adrastus, but, keeping to the Theban cycle, suggested Eteokles and Polyneikes watched by their sisters. Payne²³⁷ accepted the broad lines of Curtius' interpretation (following von Salis in querying the characters of the duel scene), and also his date, comparing Early Corinthian for the figures and filling, and the Argive-Corinthian bronze-reliefs, 'in which the elaborate cable border is a regular motive', for the guilloche. I find the remark about the cable-border puzzling, as the shield-bands seem to have only a single cable. Double cables on the handles of PC aryballoi go back well into the 7th century, but the closest parallel known to me for that on the strip is the border of the East Greek 'Kaineus' plaque from Olympia (c.600 or a little before).²³⁸

The figures on the strip are so crude that close dating is almost impossible on style, but the position of the warriors' legs does seem to indicate a 6th rather than a 7th century date, and the early 6th century seems reasonable, at least as a terminus ante quem non, for the types of the figures, though the strip itself may be later.

As for the interpretation of the scene, Curtius cannot be right, since the scenes are in the wrong order for his hypothesis; unless

we are to assume either that the Etruscan artist took over the Greek scenes haphazardly, without knowing their meaning, or that, with a set of three episodes going from right to left, he started at the left-hand end of the strip, and ended with an incomplete set at the right. Admittedly, either of these is possible (perhaps only too probable), but, since it is quite uncertain whether all three scenes belong to the same legend, Achilles and Memnon, the obvious choice, must remain strong favourites for the combat-scene.

G. The Blinding of Polyphemus

1. Samos, Inv. B 1680.

Bronze relief.

From the Heraion.

Pl. 74 a.

Ht. 12 cm. (almost complete); remaining width 19.8 cm.

E. Homann-Wedeking, AA 1966, 160, fig.5 (brief excavation report);G. Kopcke, AM 83, 1968, 289, pl.118. (publication). Fittschen192-193 and n.913, SB 114. B. Fellmann,²⁴⁰ Die Antiken Darstellungen des Polyphemabenteuers (1972), 15-19, pl.4.Date: late 7th century. (Homann-Wedeking, third quarter;

Kopcke, c.620). Found in the 'pre-Rhoikos alluvial deposit',

and therefore not later than c.570.

The technique is repoussé, with incision round the outlines and for inner detail. On the fragmentary bronze sheet, which is complete at the top, and said to be so at the right-hand edge, appear two men, barefoot, clad in short, close-fitting tunics, walking to the left and holding something, which can only be a pole or stake (though it is not visible in the photograph), with both hands on a level with the tops of their heads. The men have wavy hair falling to just below shoulder-level; the first has a large curl at the front of the brow, while the second wears a narrow band across his brow, and has a row of small curls escaping beneath it. Both men are beardless. The first man has a vertical line of lozenges incised on the inside of his right thigh, the second a similar line on the outside of his left thigh. The men's tunics are plain above the waist except for a

fine triple incised line round the edge; below the waist they are divided into four horizontal zones with incised patterns: the first man has two rows of squares alternating with vertical lines, and two rows of 'herring-bone' going in opposite directions; the second man has three rows of the square-and-line pattern with, between the second and third, a zone described by Fellmann as containing five tiny incised circles (I wonder if these could not have been surrounded originally with little dots, making rosettes?). The tunics have a fringed hem. At the lower left-hand edge of the fragment is an engraved line which could be the back outline of the left thigh of a third stake-bearer. Clearly, though, if there were other stake-bearers in front (or behind), they were not so close to the existing pair as these are to each other. The upper border of the relief is complete - a narrow convex band with pairs of vertical incised lines at intervals.

Fellmann believes the right-hand man to be Odysseus, partly because he imagines his hair-style and tunic patterns to be more important-looking than those of his companion, and partly because he is apparently the last in the line.

The relief is an important addition to the list of 7th century representations of the theme (the rest, with one possible exception, all on vases).²⁴¹

The archaic representations of the blinding of Polyphemus have already been fully discussed, notably by B. Schweitzer,²⁴² P. Courbin,²⁴³

and G. Mylonas,²⁴⁴ and, most recently, by O. Touchefeu-Meynier²⁴⁵ and B. Fellmann, so that a detailed analysis here would be superfluous. Mylonas, in his publication of the Eleusis amphora (1957), corrects two mistaken conclusions reached by Courbin. The first, caused primarily by the fact that he knew neither the Eleusis amphora nor the Caeretan hydria, was that the number of the companions of Odysseus decreased steadily from the earliest representations. This is manifestly incorrect: though certainly the latest examples, the Attic oenochoe by the Theseus Painter, and the Campanian bf amphora, have cut down to only two men wielding the stake, in the earlier examples the numbers fluctuate fairly evenly between three and four.

The second conclusion was more serious (Courbin, op.cit.p.49). Courbin believed that the object carried by the Greeks on the Argive sherd was a metal spit, not the wooden stake of the canonical version of *Odyssey IX*. This belief led him to assume the existence in the seventh century of a variant version of the story, which the Argive artist must have followed. This assumption, which Fittschen notes without comment, and Touchefeu-Meynier accepts, seems to me quite unwarranted, and Mylonas, (op.cit.p.50) answers it effectively.

One of the interesting features about the group of surviving representations of this scene is that, though few in number, they begin early (three very close in date just before or around the mid-seventh century), and are exceptionally well spread over the different schools of Greek art.²⁴⁶

Courbin's errors have shown the dangers of jumping to conclusions

from few examples, but one may perhaps venture a few remarks on the relation of the Samos bronze-relief to the other surviving examples. First, it is only the second certain example after the Argive Krater-herd in which the movement is from right to left (the fragmentary bronze-relief mentioned briefly by Yalouris - see note²⁴¹ above - is a possible third). Second, it differs from the other early examples in the fact that its Greeks are clothed. The next certain example of this is the Caeretan hydria, in the third quarter of the sixth century; after this clothing of some kind seems to become the rule, the Campanian amphora being the only exception. Here again, however, Yalouris' bronze-relief should be mentioned: the man on it is described as 'a warrior' (πολεμιστης), though we cannot tell from this whether he is fully-armed, or wearing just a sword. The men on the Chiot chalice of c.600 B.C., discussed below, p.383, are also clothed.

The position of the stake, above the head, seems to be the most frequent early one. The Aristonothos krater is the sole exception among the seventh century versions. Shoulder- and waist-level are the popular positions after 600, the overhead position occurring in two out of seven cases.

Style and workshop of the Samos relief.

Homann-Wedeking simply calls the relief Samian, Fellmann 'Ionian, perhaps Samian'. Fittschen rightly points out that it belongs with a well-known group of bronze-reliefs from Olympia, variously attributed to East Greece, South Italy, and the Cyclades.²⁴⁷

Of this group, those affording the most scope for comparison with the Samos relief are the two reliefs found in the same deposit of discarded votive offerings during excavations on the site of the new museum at Olympia in 1959: a 'Warrior's Departure' scene (Fittschen AF 4, p.195, now published by A.Yalouri),²⁴⁸ and the strip with three mythological scenes arranged vertically, the centre one of which may be the Death of Clytemnestra (Fittschen SB 109, p.188). The borders of the three reliefs are the same. The profile of the Samos men differs from the others', which are slightly more 'beaky', (they are certainly by different artists), but the general shape of body is the same. Compare also the short, close-fitting tunics with horizontal zones of incised decoration on the skirt: the square-and-line pattern occurs on all three; the Polyphemus and 'Clytemnestra' reliefs both have chevrons.

The hair-styles of the men on the three reliefs are close; and such details as the strong incised line for the calf-muscle, and also the rendering of the knee-cap, where visible, look the same on all three. The men are all beardless. There is also a considerable resemblance in the treatment of the bent-back left arms of the men on the Samos relief and the woman with a child on the Departure scene, where the artist was unable to manage the foreshortening.

All in all, these resemblances in detail, plus the similarity in technique which seems to appear in the photographs, are enough to assign the Samos relief to the same workshop as the other bronzes.


There is one detail on the Samos relief which cannot be paralleled

either on the other members of the group or on any other bronze-relief known to me (certainly not on the shield-bands, which form the main body of surviving bronze-reliefs). This is the vertical row of lozenges on the thighs of the men, which may be meant to indicate tattooing. Ch. Karousos, publishing the 'Naxian' amphora fragments with Aphrodite and Ares in a chariot, in JdI 52, 1937, 166ff., gives a list of examples of 'tattooing' on vases (op.cit.184). None is identical with our example. Curiously enough, the example in Karousos' list which is closest in effect, though not in pattern, appears in the 'Blinding of Polyphemus' scene on the Eleusis amphora: the last man has, not lozenges, but a sort of cable-pattern, vertically on his thigh.²⁴⁹

Karousos does not list the only virtually identical example known to me. This appears on a sherd from Lindos:²⁵⁰ a centaur who canters to the right has a vertical row of large lozenges (or crosses) incised on the outer side of his right leg from the buttock to the knee. Blinkenberg, who published the sherd, which is one of three apparently from a vase-stand, believed it to be Rhodian because of the bird between the centaur's legs, and dated it to the subgeometric period, c.700 B.C. However, he also says that an incised line runs around the centaur's outline, and this probably means that the sherd is considerably later than he thought. An early 6th century East Greek leg aryballos has, not lozenges, but a cable, incised and painted on the inside of the thigh.²⁵¹

A solitary lozenge occurs on the inside of the thigh of the second man from the front on the Argos Polyphemus fragment (whose possible Cycladic connections were discussed by Courbin).²⁵²

Lozenges appear several times on the thigh, but in a different arrangement, in 'Cycladic' vase-painting (two examples were noted by Karousos; the pots on which the others appear were discovered after he wrote):

- i) 'Naxian' Aphrodite amphora - four in a diamond shape.²⁵³
- ii) 'Melian' Riders' amphora - a single lozenge.²⁵⁴
- iii) the 'Horseman' plate from Thasos ('Melian' type, called 'Pano-thasian' by the excavators) - four in a diamond-shape.²⁵⁵
- iv) fragmentary relief-pithos from Tenos -  on each thigh.²⁵⁶

(A pattern of eight lozenges also apparently appears on the thigh of a horseman on one of the ivories from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia, and a cable on the lower leg of a man on another. Both are 7th century.)²⁵⁷

The discussion of the origin of the relief is best coupled with a general examination of the group to which it belongs.

Different members of the group have been mentioned, and some of them have been put together, by various people (Fittschen gives the bibliography under the individual examples), but, so far as I know, no detailed discussion has been published. Almost everyone seems to agree at least on East Greek influence, and most lean to East Greece or the Cyclades as the area of origin.

Fittschen names nine reliefs as belonging to the group: (my order, and not chronological) -

- 1) Kaineus and centaurs: Fittschen 118, SB 21; Ol.Ber.I, 85, pl.28. Ht. 22.5 cm. Pl. 75a.
- 2) Herakles/Potnia: Fittschen 119, SB 26; Olympia IV, 100, pl.38 (Athens, NM inv. 644). Ht. 86 cm. Pl. 75b, 77a, 79a.
- 3) 'Clytemnestra': Fittschen 188, SB 109; Adelt.17, 1961/62, Chron. 107, pl.114; (Inv. M 77). Ht. ? Pl. 76 .
- 4) Warrior's departure: Fittschen 195, AF 4; Adelt.17, 1961/62, Chron. 107, pl.113; AJA 75, 1971, 269ff. (Inv. M 73). Ht. 21 cm. pl. 78a .
- 5) Blinding of Polyphemus: Fittschen 192, SB 114; Samos, Inv. B 1680. Ht. 12 cm.
- 6) Departure: Fittschen 195, AF 6; Ol.Ber.III, 150, pl.68; (Inv. Olympia B 1529). Remaining ht. 11 cm.
Pl. 77b.
- 7) Warrior's departure: Fittschen 195, AF 5; Ol.Ber.I, 87, pl.30; III, 150, pl.69. Ht. 22 cm.
Pl. 78b.
- 8) Potnia theron: Fittschen 118, n.582; Ol.Ber.I, 88, pls. 32-33. Remaining ht. 53 cm.
- 9) Warrior: Fittschen 185, SB 103; JHS 13, 1892/93, 268, fig.32. (Inv. Athens, NM 69567). Remaining ht. c.16 cm.

Of these, nos. 1, 2, and 8 have been attributed to the same workshop by R. Hampe and U. Jantzen (Ol.Ber.I, 86), and nos. 3 and 4 to 'the Kaineus workshop' by F. Willemsen (Ol.Ber.VII, 190).

If the highest and lowest dates assigned to any of the reliefs were correct, this would give a span of a hundred years to the workshop, from 'mid-7th century' for the Kaineus relief (Hampe/Jantzen), to 'about 550' for nos. 3 and 4 (Willemsen). In fact, judging by the style and development, the time-span cannot be more than fifty years at the most, and is probably less. Fittschen's dates range from 'mid-7th century' for no.9, to 'c.600' for no.2; I should put all except no.9, which certainly looks earlier, in the period c.610 to c.560, with nos. 3 and 4 perhaps the latest.

By general agreement no.1, the Kaineus relief, is put earliest (only Fittschen attributes no.9 to the group - see below). This is because it seems slightly less free and perhaps a little more formal and elaborate than the rest; the awkwardness of the right-hand centaur's right arm may also be a sign of early date. It is set a little apart from the rest too by its guilloche border, by the way the punch has been used to mark the ankle-bones and knee-caps, for instance, and by generally finer detail. It is probably the finest in quality of the more complete examples, though no.2, the Herakles relief, runs it close. However, although the reliefs are apparently by different craftsmen (apart, perhaps, from nos. 3 and 4, which besides being found together, are extremely close in style),

they are interconnected by many motifs and details of treatment.

All have an incised line marking the relief-outline of the figures; this is not unique to this group, as Eilmann notes (Ol.Ber. III, 151) - it appears, for instance, on 7th century Cretan armour - but it is by no means universal (the shield-bands, for example, lack it).²⁵⁸

The centaurs of nos.1 and 2 are an obvious target for comparison; though they are not identical, that of no.2 having a rather squatter and fleshier-looking horse-body and a slightly different hair-style, the general appearance of the heads is similar, and all three have plump, stippled human foreparts. (Incidentally, the rendering of the 'hairs' on no.1 seems to be rather unusual among the metal examples - a scattering of tiny dots, rather than rows of little strokes).²⁵⁹ The rendering of their wounds is the same; the palm-trees which form a background to both scenes are also almost identical in design (though less so in treatment).

The moustaches of the centaurs on no.1 are done in the same way as those of Herakles and the centaur on no.2 and the men on no.4; it is impossible to tell from the photographs whether this applies also to nos. 3,5,6, and 7.

Fringed tunics appear on nos. 2,4, 5 and 6, and the first two at least are also split.

The treatment of the chiton of the woman standing by the chariot on no.6 compares closely with that of the potnia theron's chiton on no.2. The feet and ankles of both women are also very

similar (though perhaps there is not a great deal of scope for difference here). More important, the toes of the potnia theron on no.2 are incised in precisely the same way as those of the warrior on no.6 (visible at the bottom right of the fragment) and those of the centaurs on no.1; Contrast for instance, the toes of the 'Embassy to Achilles' on the late 7th century tripod leg from Olympia (according to the drawing!).²⁶⁰

The technique used for the horses' tails on no.6, with straight guide-lines inside the wavy outline, is also used for the centaur's tail on no.2. Compare also the locks of the potnia theron on no.2 (though here there are no guide-lines).

'Stippling', that is, rows of tiny incised lines, used normally to indicate hair or fur, also appears on the chariot-body of no.4, and on the front of the chariot-body of no.6 (Eilmann, op.cit. 151, suggests that leather may be intended).²⁶¹

The strong incised line marking the calf-muscle, mentioned above, appears on all the reliefs 1-6, even visible through the greave (not on it) in nos.1,4 and 6. It is true that this muscle is marked by an incised line on some, though by no means all, of the shield-bands, and on some Cretan bronzes, but the rendering is not identical.²⁶²

Turning to ornament, the volutes-and-palmettes on stems of nos. 1 and 3 are very similar (and are unique on Greek bronze-relief figure-scenes).²⁶³ The technique of the rosettes of nos.3 and 4 is the same - a double concentric circle at the centre, and double incised

line for each petal, with a 'bump' raised in relief at the tip of each petal; this seems to be the same as that of the rosette found with no.2 (compare also the relief 'bumps' at the tip of each inner wing-feather in no.2).

The tiny rosettes on the tunics of nos.1 and 4 are very like.²⁶⁴

The chevron or 'herring-bone' pattern on garments appears on nos. 3 and 5, as already mentioned, and the square-and-line pattern occurs not only on nos.3,4 and 5, but also on nos.2 and 6, and probably, smaller, on Kaineus' tunic on no.1.

Nos.2 and 3 have the same plain convex band separating the figure-scenes, a strong contrast with the elaborate dividing-patterns of the shield-bands, (though not confined to this workshop).²⁶⁵

No.6 has a more prominent and carefully-done version of the border of nos.3, 4 and 5, with triple instead of double vertical lines. (It is interesting to note how many parallels can be found between no.6 and the other reliefs, despite its very fragmentary state, and its high quality is very obvious).

The other three reliefs assigned by Pittschen to the group (nos. 7, 8 and 9 in my list) seem to me very doubtful members.

7. Warrior's departure

This is the most important of the three. It is difficult to be dogmatic about it, as its condition is extremely poor (see the description in Ol.Ber.I). From the photographs, however, it seems to differ markedly in style from the rest - it appears drier, more precise, and more angular. Eilmann (Ol.Ber. III 150-151) noticed this

when comparing nos.6 and 7, but apparently attributed it simply to a difference in date, no.7, he thought, being older. He does not actually claim that the two belong to the same workshop, but says that they both have a close relationship ('eine innere Verwandtschaft') to the Cassandra relief from the Argive Heraion - which definitely does not belong to the group under discussion.

Hampe and Jantzen, the original publishers of nos.1 and 7 in Ol.Ber.I, do not assign them to the same workshop.

It is true, of course, that no. 7 is very similar to the main group: it has the East Greek chariot-type, split chiton-skirt, the pattern of squares and vertical lines on the garments. There are certain differences too: the shape of the wheel-spokes and the chariot-front, more formal and stylized hair, style of the woman's dress (the sleeve here is very like those of Clytemnestra and Cassandra on the Argive Heraion relief),²⁶⁶ charioteer wearing a corslet. None of these differences, however, are as decisive to my mind as the difference in general character which indicates another workshop, even if an East Greek one.

8. Potnia theon.

This bronze-relief^s is assigned by Hampe and Jantzen to the same workshop as the Kaineus relief and the Herakles relief. They date it earlier than the latter because of its 'stiffer, more heraldic composition...and the greater number of filling-rosettes'. Fittschen includes the relief in his list without query; but it seems to me to

have a hard quality which is quite alien to the central members of the group. Note, for instance, the articulation of the wings, each area sharply defined. As in the previous relief too, the hair is more stylized. The dot-rosettes are simply punched from behind, with no engraving on the front as is the case with all the central members of this group.²⁶⁷

9. Warrior. - from the Acropolis, Athens.

This is an intriguing fragment which looks early (perhaps third quarter of the seventh century). It is clearly rather different in type from the others; according to the drawing, the rosettes are not quite the same, and their large size and formal placing, as well as the apparent framing of the double palmette above, are unique for the group. The warrior's helmet, hair and profile are also rendered differently, and the figure of the archer (Herakles?) is quite unlike anything on the other reliefs in question.

Possible additional members of the group.

Olympia IV, 105, pl.37, no.711, Inv.671. - This is a tiny fragment, which has two features which recall the group: the border, and the man's short, tight, fringed tunic.

There follow three animal-reliefs which, if not from the same workshop, are from the same area; all three have incised outlines. The first is the closest to the group.

1) Griffin-Bird - Ol.Ber.V, 86, pls.46,47, Inv. B 1885. Ht.24.7 cm.

Pl. 79b.

Thought to be Protocorinthian of the mid-7th century by H-V. Herrman, who publishes it. There are no PC, or even Corinthian, griffin-birds among the examples from vase-painting given by Herrman on p.87, n.25, which are at all close to this one, and the only ones with tendrils are Early PC, and of a completely different type.²⁶⁸ Some Corinthian griffins have tendrils.²⁶⁹ The examples from other schools given by Herrman are also very different; one Laconian example has two tendrils.²⁷⁰

Admittedly the two or three East Greek painted griffin-birds known to me are no more like the bronze than are the mainland examples, but the numerous griffins in 'Wild Goat' style almost always have tendrils, and their heads generally resemble this one very closely.²⁷¹

Herrman notes the 'ostrich-like' legs of the griffin-bird, and these, a striking feature of this proud monster, are very like the legs of the 'eagles' on no.2 of our group. Finally, the rosettes are of the same type as those of nos.3 and 4.

ii) Lion and stag - Ol.Ber.III, 148, pls.66,67, Inv. B 850.

Ht. 13.5 cm.

Pl. 80a.

Apart from general 'East Greekness' the rosette is the main link between this and the group - and it is not possible to see whether the characteristic relief-bump at the tip of the petals is present. Obviously one has to be careful here: note the relief Ol.Ber.II, pl.

55, apparently with a similar rosette but very different in style, despite Herrman (Ol.Ber.V, 87, n.27), and some Cretan reliefs.

The stag is definitely East Greek, spotted and displaying both antlers.²⁷² This type is extremely rare in PC and Corinthian.

iii) Lion - Olympia IV, 101, pl.37, no.698, Inv.3567.

This lion, described by Furtwängler as a creature with a head like a dog, wolf or jackal, and a tail like a lion, looks so like the lion of the previous example that I have put them together. (The great difference in type between them and the lions on no.2 of the group probably means that they do not belong).²⁷³

(Rosettes like those of nos.2, 3 and 4 also occur (with raised bump) on the poles of a most impressive hammered bronze female head found at Olympia. Kunze believes her to be Peloponnesian, possibly Laconian, but notes that she has eastern traits. She wore large stud or disc ear-rings, a clear sign of East Greek influence at least).²⁷⁴

Finally, there are a few fragments from decorative bronze strips from Olympia, which bear volute-and-palmette 'trees': Olympia IV, 111, pl.XLIII, nos.744²⁷⁵ (Inv.3737) and 745 (Inv.9787); Ol.Ber.VI (1958), 133, fig.109 (Inv.B 2048).

The origin of the group.

There is no doubt that this group of reliefs is not of mainland origin-and is either Cycladic or East Greek. (Both areas

are considered here, as the Cyclades have influential adherents, notably Kunze).²⁷⁶ Such details as the chariot types and the Ionic chitons of the women are enough to make this certain, quite apart from the general style, with soft, rather flowing outlines and plumper and less articulated figures than in, for example, the shield-bands or Corinthian vase-painting. The figures correspond well in this respect with, for instance, those of Chiot vase-painting.²⁷⁷ The men are all clothed - another typical feature of both Cycladic and East Greek vase-painting; East Greek sculpture too, unlike the mainland schools, had a tradition of clothed standing, sitting and reclining male figures.²⁷⁸

The type of some of the figures, those of the Polyphemus relief, for instance, recalls 'Melian', but only in a very general way; Fittschen, who believes the group to be Cycladic, gives several parallels from Cycladic relief-pithoi,²⁷⁹ but to my mind these are not at all close.

The split and fringed tunic is difficult to parallel exactly. Ares on the 'Aphrodite' amphora wears a normal tunic with a fringe of large bobbles, and a possible example of a fringed and split tunic appears on a Cycladic sherd published in Lélos XVII, pl. L XVIII. (Rh. 68). Examples also appear in Laconian, Attic, and Chalcidian vase-painting of the mid-6th century, but they are of a different cut.²⁸⁰ In any event, the style must be Near Eastern in origin: it is common in Assyrian, Neo-Hittite and Phoenician art.²⁸¹

The Ionic chiton, falling in fine pleats or folds, which the women wear on nos. 2,3 and 6, and which is not seen on them in mainland art, is known from East Greek pottery, ivories and bronze-work, and from many statues. These examples range in date from the late seventh century to about or just after the middle of the sixth century, and come from Chios, Erythrae, Ephesus, Miletus, and above all, Samos. It therefore seems safe to assume that this dress was fashionable at this time at least throughout Ionia and probably in other parts of East Greece too.²⁸² The Cyclades have two possible representatives in the korai of c.570 B.C. from the Athenian Acropolis (nos.619 and 677) who wear this dress and have been claimed as Naxian. They certainly appear different in character from the Samian examples which are nearest to them in date, (Cheramyes' dedications and the Geneleos group) less monumental and with less massive forms (and, in the case of 677, with a very different hair-treatment from Philippe and Ornithe). Nevertheless, some scholars believe them to be Samian, or at least, to be the work of Naxian sculptors under Samian influence.²⁸³

The vase-painting examples, contemporary with the earlier Samos korai, have wavy lines for the folds, as on our reliefs. These do not appear until later in sculpture, but this may well have something to do with the difficulties of the technique - it is much easier to paint a wavy line or to engrave it on bronze than to carve and model it in stone.

The type of chiton which appears on no.4, without folds but

with a band of decoration down the centre of the skirt, is quite common in Chiot vase-painting.²⁸⁴

The patterns on the garments, and the filling-ornaments, fit harmoniously into either an East Greek or a Cycladic context of the late seventh and early sixth century (most, of course, also exist in mainland art).

Rosettes are one of the most common filling ornaments of the orientalizing period. The type of our nos.3 and 4, and of the rosette-attachment found with no.2, where the centre of the petal is emphasized, is rare on the mainland compared with the 'uniform' type such as abounds, for instance, on Corinthian vases. There are some in Proto-Attic, and, for example, on one (only) of the Thermon metopes.²⁸⁵ Examples on East Greek and Cycladic (chiefly Chiot and 'Melian') vases are more numerous - or rather, form a higher proportion of the total; (on the whole too, East Greek and Cycladic painted rosettes even of the plain petal type tend to have more carefully-separated petals than their mainland counterparts, and so to be generally more like those of the bronze-reliefs).²⁸⁶ In other materials, seventh century Rhodian jewellery has some rosettes of this type, though with the centre of the petals recessed instead of raised.²⁸⁷

It should perhaps be noted that occasional examples of rosettes close to those on nos.3 and 4 also occur on Cretan bronzes of c.650: on a helmet from Afrati (but with tiny extra petals), and, extremely

similar, on a helmet from Axos. These Cretan armour-reliefs also have an incised or traced line round the outlines of the figures, but the general character of the relief-work (not to mention the style) differs considerably from that of our group: the outline of the repoussé work is much harder and 'squarer', and there is also more pure incision, both for inner detail, and for extremities such as hands, feet and face.²⁸⁸

As might be expected, rosettes of this kind (usually with the petal-centres recessed, not raised), are numerous in Near Eastern art of most schools.²⁸⁹ The only examples I have found with a bump at the tip of each petal are those in the centres of two Phoenician bronze bowls: one from a tomb of the last quarter of the ninth century in the Kerameikos, the other, dated to the eighth century by E. Gjerstad, from Idalion in Cyprus. In neither, however, is the centre of the petal emphasized.²⁹⁰

The cable-border is another oriental pattern which the Greeks embraced whole-heartedly (it is the commonest border on the shield-bands, for instance). In our area, single cable is popular on Rhodian plates, complex cable on, for example, Chiot chalices.²⁹¹

Forms of the square-and-vertical-line pattern which is so popular as a garment decoration on the bronze-reliefs appear on Chiot and Rhodian vases as decorative bands on the lip or body. It does not seem to be used in this way on mainland vases, though a form of it, with rectangles which often look like tongues, is very common as a dividing-zone on the shield-bands. It also appears occasionally as a garment border on the mainland.²⁹²

Forms of the volute-and-palmette tree occur sometimes on Proto-Attic; it is, however, much more common, and very much part of the standard filling repertoire on 'Melian' and Rhodian. It is, of course, a Near Eastern motif, and in fact, the closest surviving parallels for the 'trees' of the Kaineus plaque, with their triple volutes, are Near Eastern: on orthostats of the 9th/8th century from Tell Halaf, and on a bronze relief found at Olympia, probably late 8th or early 7th century.²⁹³

So far, decision between the Cyclades and East Greece as the home of the reliefs is difficult. However, there is one important ingredient of the reliefs which has no parallel, to my knowledge, in Cycladic art, and which I consider to be of great significance - that is, the chariots of nos. 4 and 6. These are the genuine East Greek type, with solid body, projecting platform and handgrip at the back for the mounting passenger, and 6- or 8-spoked wheel. Not many chariots are known in East Greek art compared with the vase numbers of mainland ones (which are chiefly on vases), but, so far as I know they are all, without exception, of this type, and reasonably close to ours in date. The chariot on no.6 is definitely drawn by two horses, as almost all East Greek ones are; one cannot be sure about no.4 (or no. 7, whose chariot is similar).

The 'rings' on the wheel-spokes are also paralleled on terracotta revetment chariots from Larisa, and on an East Greek terracotta plaque of unknown provenance, on which also the charioteer and warrior have fringed tunics (this last detail is difficult to see in the

photographs, but definitely exists).²⁹⁴ On another bronze chariot-relief from Samos, not of the same workshop but clearly East Greek, there is a palmette on the front of the chariot, as on our no.6, and the chariot-body also has tiny rosettes, as on no.4.²⁹⁵

Several chariots survive on Cycladic vases of the later 7th and early 6th centuries, and almost all are close to the more open type of chariot which appears on mainland vases. Probably the nearest to our chariots is that on the 'Melian' Apollo amphora, which looks like a sort of cart, but it is not very close. Cycladic chariots also often have four-spoke wheels and four horses,²⁹⁶ both mainland characteristics which are almost unknown in East Greek art.²⁹⁷ (See the Excursus on chariots in Section B of this chapter).

A small but important detail which also points unmistakably to East Greece (and specifically to Ionia), is the belt worn by the potnia theron on no.2. Examples of such belts, in bronze, have been found on several Ionian sites, and were identified by Boardman.²⁹⁸

The pleated chitons of the women inclined the scales towards East Greece, but with the complication of the 'Naxian' korai. The evidence of the chariots and the belt is less equivocal, and makes an East Greek origin for this group of reliefs virtually certain. Within East Greece, Ionia is the strongest candidate on present evidence.²⁹⁹

It is impossible to go closer than this; but it is perhaps worth pointing out as a possible connection of the group a bronze kore statuette, height, 18.5 cms. from the Samian Heraion, dated by Buschor

c.545 B.C. (Altsanische Standbilder V, 88, figs.353-356). She wears the Ionic chiton with engraved wavy lines for the folds, and down the centre of her skirt is a band of what looks like the square-and-line pattern (cf. the woman in the top zone of no.3). On the front of her plinth is engraved a form of meander with an edging which also looks very like the borders of garments on our reliefs, again especially nos. 3 and 4.

2. Chiot chalice.

pl. 74 b.

Excavated at Tocra, in a sanctuary of Demeter and Kore.

Est. Diam 27 cm.

J. Boardman and J. Hayes, Tocra I, 58, 60, 62 fig.31, no.775.

Date: c.600 or a little later (the excavators' Chalice Type II).

Only fragments of the figure decoration remain. The main group of sherds shows a row of clothed figures, at least five, walking from left to right. They wear sleeved tunics, and all hold up their arms in an identical position, as if carrying something at shoulder-level. Part of the leading man's head remains, showing that he is bearded. He wears a sword, and carries over his shoulder what could be a stake, pointing slightly downwards.

Very little can be said about this. It could be a scene of the Blinding of Polyphemus, as the excavators note. The fact that the men are clothed fits with Chiot, and East Greek, custom. As only the leader seems to have a sword, he would presumably be Odysseus.

Five men, if there are only five, tallies with Homer (this would be the only example besides the Aristonothos krater to do so). The hand-position on the last two men looks odd for wielding a stake, but it is difficult to think of a more plausible explanation.

H. Odysseus and Circe.

London, Brit.Mus., Inv. 88.2-8.114 and 206e.

Sherds from the body of a Clazomenian broad amphora, found
at Tell Defenneh. Pl. 81 a.

Estimated ht. of figures, c.15 cm.

R.M. Cook, CVA BM 8, 25, pl.II Dn 9.20,21 (with refs. to
earlier bibl.) Brommer, Vasenlisten,² 308ff., C.1. (listing
also five Attic bf and nine Attic rf examples, along with
several late non-Attic representations, almost all Cabiric
skyphoi. O.Touchefeu-Meynier, Thèmes Odyséens dans l'Art
Antique (1968), 81ff., no.172 (a detailed catalogue in
chronological order, including examples in Etruscan and Roman
art, and a discussion of the theme; her nos. 174, 177, Attic bf,
not in Brommer).³⁰⁰

Date: third quarter of the 6th century. (Cook, assigned
to his Urla Gp;).

Details which do not appear in the CVA photograph: Odysseus'
sword-hilt is studded; the foot of the goblet appears below Circe's
hand; the pig-man at the left has a curly tail ending in a neat
little fringe of hairs; the small area of dark glaze behind him, at
the upper left corner of the sherd, is certainly the bent forepaw
of a second animal-man.

There are no surviving examples from archaic schools of vase-
painting other than Attic and Clazomenian. Mention should, however,

be made here of the only other certain archaic representation of the Circe story known, a most important and fascinating example: this appears on one of the side-panels of a painted terracotta arula, probably Sicilian, recently acquired by the Louvre.³⁰¹ Odysseus is not present, but Circe, naked as on the Boston cups,³⁰² holding a small kantharos-like vessel and stirring its contents with her wand, faces a boar-headed man. Devambez in his preliminary publication dates it to the third quarter of the sixth century, that is, roughly contemporary with our scene.

The general scheme of the Clazomenian scene is clearly the same as that of the other black-figure examples, the components being Circe with her cup, the companions of Odysseus partly transformed into animals, and Odysseus with drawn sword. Here Odysseus stands directly in front of Circe, threatening her, and Cook points out that this is the earliest surviving example showing this particular moment of the story. On the two Attic cups which are earlier than the Clazomenian fragment (Boston 99.519 and 99.518, c.550 B.C.),³⁰³ Circe is shown serving more wine to Odysseus' companions, who already have animal-heads, while Odysseus has just arrived and is rushing forward from the back of the crowd. (Pl. 81 b).

The direct confrontation between Odysseus and Circe was the more popular in red-figure, where in several cases Odysseus is shown actually chasing the terrified enchantress.³⁰⁴ The earliest surviving example of it in Attic seems to be the late Bf lekythos in Berlin, F 1960, showing Circe seated and apparently not yet aware of her danger.³⁰⁵

The Clazomenian scene is so fragmentary that few further comparisons with the Attic examples can be made. Odysseus does not appear completely naked, as in our scene, in the Attic versions: on the two Boston cups he wears a chlamys round his shoulders, and in later versions he has tunic and petasos too (on a lekythos by the Athena Painter, Athens 1133, he also wears a corslet).³⁰⁶

From the position of his left arm on our sherd, it seems possible that he was shown grasping Circe's right wrist; in the Attic examples he does not actually lay hands on her. However, he may simply have been making a gesture similar to that on Berlin F1960.³⁰⁷

None of the heads remain on our fragment. The 'half-beast' behind Odysseus is a boar, the one behind him, judging by the forepaw, either a boar, a goat or a ram. Odysseus' companions appear with the heads of many different creatures in the representations of this scene - donkey, bull, ram, goat, boar, lion, ?dog (or wolf?), cock and swan -, though boar-heads are the most constant type (according to Homer, Od. X, 239, all Odysseus' companions who were enchanted became pigs, *σῦες*, though tame 'mountain wolves and lions' bewitched by Circe roamed the woods around her house, 11.212ff.)³⁰⁸ On one of the fragments belonging to this scene there is what appears to be a long, thin tail (though it is difficult to imagine what sort of animal owned it - a lion, perhaps, but certainly not a pig): tails are normally shown in this scene, though they are absent from the two earliest examples. Animal forelimbs, however, are rare:

apart from the Clazomenian amphora, they appear on only one of the two Boston cups, the merrythought cup 99.518 (which is perhaps slightly curious in view of the extremely close resemblance of the scenes on these two cups in other respects), and on the late Bf lekythos by the Daybreak Painter, Taranto 9125.³⁰⁹

Circe's cup on almost all the Attic examples is a normal contemporary type, first (on Boston 99.518 and the Daybreak Painter's lekythos) a cup with high foot and offset lip, and later, a skyphos. (On the second Boston cup, only a rather heavy foot and the base of the bowl remains). In the Clazomenian scene she holds a cup of quite a different shape: it has a deep bowl with a simple curve, one high vertical handle, and a slender stemmed foot. Some Aeolic buccero shapes come closer than surviving painted pottery ones, but even these are not very close.³¹⁰ Probably a metal shape was intended, but in any case, the drawing is rather summary, making the search for a parallel hazardous. Perhaps closest of all (except for the fact that it has two handles!) is the kantharos held by a youth on a late archaic East Greek gem in the Ionides Collection.³¹¹

On the available evidence, this Clazomenian scene appears to fall into line with the other East Greek scenes we have examined; that is to say, while generally similar to contemporary representations in mainland schools (here the only comparison possible is with Attic), it is no mere copy, but has its own distinctive characteristics. As with other surviving examples of Clazomenian vase-painting, the

drawing is inferior to the best contemporary Attic (though better in the original than in the photograph), but this in itself does not prove Attic artistic domination.

A very brief mention should be made here of the single figures of animal-headed men which occur in sixth-century art. Most of these are of East Greek or Island origin, appearing chiefly on gems and coins, and have been interpreted by some as Odysseus' bewitched companions. Some of the examples cannot be Odysseus' men, and none can be proved to be. Touchefeu-Meynier (p.123) pronounces against this interpretation; but the best discussion of these creatures, which says all that can be said, is J. Boardman's in Archaic Greek Gems.³¹² He lists almost all the examples, to my knowledge omitting only the winged dolphin-headed man who appears beneath the throne of Zeus in a Birth of Athena scene on a Bf belly-amphora of the third quarter of the sixth century, in Philadelphia.³¹³ He mentions the probable influence of representations of Egyptian and Near Eastern deities; it seems to me certain in one case at least, that of the lion-headed man on Cyzicene³¹⁴ coins, (pl.82a). The head must surely be derived from a monster such as that on a late Assyrian relief from Niniveh in the British Museum, (pl.82b). This demon wears a skirt and has bird-feet, but the head is extremely similar, with tall pointed ears and a 'comb'.³¹⁵

NOTES TO CHAPTER IIIAphrodite and Aeneas

1. Cf. the Troilos chalice from Pitane, Istanbul Inv. 8904 CND 1963 N VII-L-2 (pl. 65) and the horsemen on side B of the 'Achilles and Memnon' chalice from Pitane, Istanbul Inv.no. 8582 (pl. 71c).
2. Cf. the horsemen, pl. 71c, Priam and Achilles on the Troilos chalice, pl. 63 , and some of the BM Chiot sherds from Naukratis (e.g. BM 88.6-1. 482-a and -c). See also note 22 below.
3. Even this fragment shows that the dress is the Ionic chiton with its fine folds; cf. statues from Samos of about the same date, Buschor, Altsam St. V, figs. 340-352; nearer home a magnificent kore from Erythrae in the Izmir Mus., still unpublished (see AJA 70, 1966, 157). and, on the 'Achilles and Memnon' chalice, the woman on the right ('Eos'). 'Aphrodite' must have been wearing a veil or cloak as in the last example, and as, e.g., Cheramyas' Hera, and Aphrodite, Altsam St.V, figs. 340-344.
4. All 4th or 3rd cent. The only Greek example, a 4th cent. Apulian lekythos, BM F107 (Cook, Zeus III, pl.15.1) differs from the rest in showing Herakles as a child. The others are a Faliscan Kalyx-krater (K.Schauenburg, Gymnasium 70, 1963, 128ff., dated 390/370), and three Etruscan mirrors (E.Gerhard, Etruskische Spiegel pl.126, and Suppl.Vol.pl.59 = Cook, Zeus III 90, 93, both 4th cent., and Gerhard, Suppl. pl.60, earlier 3rd cent.)

- J.D. Beazley discusses and gives refs. to earlier literature in 'The World of the Etruscan Mirror', JHS 69, 1949, 14 (not the Faliscan krater). K. Schauenburg, *op.cit.*, publishes the Faliscan krater. Cf. also A/H/S 389.
5. See Friis Johansen, Iliad 40; Schauenburg, JdI 85, 1970, 45, and especially Robertson, CQ 19.2, 1969, 209-10, n.4, 212.
 6. Friis Johansen, Iliad 57-62, fig.9, cat. p.244.
 7. Friis Johansen, Iliad 200-202, fig.82, cat. p.250
 8. Friis Johansen, Iliad 202, fig.83, cat. p.250.
 9. e.g. (Rumpf, Sakonides pl.32;) A/H/S pl.59 (Exekias); pl.144 (Douris) = Friis Johansen fig.88; pl.168 (Penthesilea P.)
 10. Friis Johansen, Iliad p.206, figs. 84, 85, cat.p.250.
 11. Friis Johansen, Iliad p.206, fig.86, cat.p.250.
 12. A/H/S pl.144.
 13. Lullies/Hirmer, Gr.Vasen pl.85.
 14. R. Bronson, Arch.Class. 18, (1966), 23-40, esp. 28-34; p.23, list of earlier literature. Friis Johansen, Iliad, 200, 272 (dates c.470).
 15. This is the interpretation of the fight-scene on the Spina cup by Arias in Alfieri/Arias, Spina, p.39, pl.31. There are no grounds for it. Curiously, Arias gives the Iliad ref. for the Diomedes-Aeneas fight, but as if it refers to Ajax-Hector, and with no mention of an alternative: 'Auch dieser Zweikampf zwischen Ajax und Hektor hat seine Vorlage in dem homerischen Epos (Ilias VII, V.244ff)...' Beazley's interpretation of the

Spina cup scene as Achilles and Memnon (ARV² 882.35) is infinitely preferable. A fair case could be made for Diomedes-Aeneas, the chief problem being the wings of the goddess. One or other of the mothers is occasionally absent from the certain representations of the Achilles-Memnon fight (Eos in three cases, Thetis in two (once replaced by Athena). Wings for Eos (and for Thetis, if it comes to that) are quite normal in early classical red-figure (see pp. 358). A winged Aphrodite, however, is difficult (only two possible examples are known to me, on late archaic gems: Boardman, AGG pl. XV, no. 238, and no. 594, p. 163, the latter possibly not Greek, but Etruscan). Further, Prof. C.M. Robertson remarked to me that the grieving elderly man behind the fallen warrior indicates a real tragedy rather than a farce, and this seems just. (Incidentally, we know how the Penthesilea Painter (at least sometimes) represented both Aphrodite and Eos: Diepolder, Der Penthesilea-Maler, pls. 22, 29).

Achilles-Memnon seeming virtually certain on the above grounds, the absence of Thetis (when there was plenty of room for her) appears significant of a change of emphasis in the scene: our attention is concentrated by the composition on the fallen Memnon and his mother, rather than on Achilles, - that is, stress is laid, not on the fight itself, or on Achilles' victory, as in earlier renderings, but on the pathos of Memnon's defeat. Perhaps the roughly contemporary Etruscan mirror (Richter, JMA

Handbook to Etruscan Coll., fig.132) may be compared; cf. also Douris' cup-tondo, A/H/S pl.145 (an isolated forerunner, the amphora by the Painter of the Vatican Mourner, Beazley, Devel. pl. 33).

16. See previous note, and pp.358 below.
17. Cf. e.g., JHS 69, 1949, 2, pl.IIb; Giglioli pl.86.6.
18. For a good discussion of the problems involved in the study of Etruscan artists' use of scenes from Greek mythology, and references to the recent series of books and articles on the subject, see now K. Schauenburg, 'Zu Griechischen Mythen in der etruskischen Kunst', JdI 85, 1970, 28-81.
19. e.g. A/H/S pl.48 (C-Painter); Price, op.cit. pl.VI.24 (Chiot); CVA BM8, pl.II Dq.5 (Claz.sarc.).
20. e.g. Griechische Vasen (Badisches Landesmuseum, Karlsruhe) pl.17 (Fight over a living fallen warrior, fully armed except for helmet); CVA Heidelberg 4 pl.157.2, Inv.S 10a, Little-Master cup sherd, (two hoplites fight over a fallen man, watched by two women; the fallen man is naked but alive-he raises himself on his elbow- and also has a fillet in his short hair). These two examples both 3rd quarter of 6th cent. Also CVA BA 5, pl.III Ic 79.1 & 2 (Rf, both by the ^{Leningrad Painter} ~~Painter of the Petrograd~~ amphora; Herakles attacks a helmetless Amazon, and centaurs attack helmetless Kaineus).
21. Countless examples. E.g. CVA Munich I pl.10.4, 39, 43 (all Bf). Claz. sarcs.: AD I pl.44, II pls. 25, 58.
22. All of a simple stud or disc type, nothing elaborate such as

Assyrian sculptures show! Chiot: sherds from Naukratis in B: 88 6-1.482c, 88.6-1.482a; East Greek but possibly not Chiot, 88.6-1.578 (this man may not be Greek); Troilos and Achilles and Meanon chalices from Pitane. Rhodian plastic vases, CVA Munich VI pl.279.2,4; Higgins II pl.7. For fuller discussion see Appendix. G.

23. L. Savignoni, Ausonia 5, 1910, p.83; C. Matthies, Die Praenestinschen Spiegel 37, 139; K. Bulas, Les Illustrations Antiques de l'Illiade, 105; M. Moretti, Il Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia (1957), 314.
24. In the drawing of the scene, a strange object appears by the wounded man's right hand. It does not seem to be part of the woman's drapery. Could it be a bow?
25. JdI IX, 1894, 148, fig.10, mentioned by Bulas, 106. He supposes Diomedes to hold a boulder, but surely it is only his shield? See also O.Jahn, Griechische Bilderchroniken, nos. B & C, for a representation of Venus, Paris and Menelaus on the Tablula Iliaca (Roman, early 1st cent. A.D.?)

Achilles dragging Hector's body.

26. op.cit. p.145, fig.51.
27. The bulk of the material is from Naukratis. E.g. JHS 44, 1924, pls. V-VI; CVA Cambridge 2, pl.II D 17; CVA Oxford 2, pl.II D 5; Also Graef I pl.24, and cf. Villard, La Céramique Grecque de Marseille, pl.19.
28. e.g. AD I pl.46.5 (Borelli); AD I pl.46.2 (Albertinum).

29. CVA Rhodes 1, pl.II D1 4.
30. He gives no examples. I assume his statement to be correct; I have found early 5th cent. exx.: e.g. Tyszkiewicz P., Masterpieces of Gk. Vase Painting, André Emmerich Gall., 1964, no.26; Foundry P., CVA USA 8, Fogg Mus. pl.13; Syriskos P., Leningrad P., CVA BM 5, pl.III Ib 73; (and later painters).
31. See Ch. II. pp. 164 ff., 188.
32. Beazley, LHG 23. Both chariot- and riding-horses; many exx. in CVA BM 8, pls.II Dn and II Dq; see also Cyzicus relief, no.12. Earlier, bronze protome for Chios, Adelt. 2, 1916, 209, fig.29.
33. e.g. Barnett, Assyrische Palastreliefs pls. 59, 87 (Assurbanipal).
34. e.g. BSA 53-54, 1958-59, pl.32; (workshop of Sophilos); Graef I pl.36 (Nearchos), pl.30 (Acrop.606).
35. Riding-horses: A/H/S pl.53 (Lydos); pl. 63 (Exekias); some other exx. in Exekias and Gp.E.
36. e.g. Bf; Leagros Gp., CVA BM 6, pls.III He 82.3, 84.1, 86.2; Madrid P., CVA Munich 1, pl.44; many others RF: CVA USA 8, Gallatin Coll. pl.47.4; CVA Copenhagen 3, pl.III Ic 127.1.
37. BSA 60, 1965, pls.23, 24.3. See pp. 374 ff.
38. Larisa II 117-120, pl.62.
39. See list, p. 292.
40. 2-horse: e.g. Barnett, Falkner, Sculptures of Tiglath Pileser pl.44; Neo-Hittite show only one horse, but sometimes four reins (a trick also seen in Attic Geometric): Orthmann pls.42, 51, 52. Other exx. on ivories, gems, and later on the Persepolis reliefs. Triga: e.g. Barnett, Palastreliefs pls.24,25 (Assyrians and

- enemies). Quadriga: Elamites, Barnett, Palastreliefs pl.121 (early 7th c.); many in Cyprus, but also bigae, see, e.g., V. Karagheorghis, Salamis figs. 16, 18, 22.
41. See Larisa II 148ff, for the Larisa chariots and Near Eastern types.
42. Akurgal, BGA 100. I had formed this opinion before Orthmann appeared (see Orthmann 158).
43. For Assyrian chariots, see B. Hrouda, Die Kulturgeschichte des Assyrischen Flachbildes (1965), 93-100, pls. 26, 27. The 9th cent. chariots are similar in proportions to the Neo-Hittite, and have 6-spoke wheels (for photographs, see, e.g., Budge, Sculptures of Assur-nasir-pal); 8-spoke appear with Tiglath-Pileser, along with the larger, very square body (photographs, Barnett and Falkner, Sculptures of Tiglath-Pileser); on ivories too, e.g. A. Godard, Le Trésor de Ziwiyé, figs. 84,85. Neo-Hittite: conveniently collected on Orthmann, pls.11 (Tell Halaf), 24,37 (Carchemish), 42 (Malatya), 52 (Tell Tainat), 57 (Zincirli), with bibliography.
44. Curved top: Orthmann pls. 24, 52, 57.
45. Orthmann pl.51. Cf. also the chariot on a 'Syrian style' ivory from Nimrud, with handgrip at rear: Barnett, Nimrud Ivories in the BM pls.33, 34.
46. e.g. List nos. 10 (unknown prov.), 11 (Kizilbel). The covering of 10 resembles that of some Assyrian chariots, e.g. Barnett, Falkner, Sculptures of Tiglath-Pileser, pl.71; Parrot, Niniveh and Babylon fig. 345 (Til Barsip, 7th cent.) - both squares;

- cf. also E. Schmidt, Persepolis I pl.52
47. e.g. A/H/S pl.17 (Chigi Vase) - cf. the Spartan relief vases; pls. XI, 37, 49; pl.100; and Payne/Young pl.127.1.
48. Larisa II, 151; also Zahn, AM 23, 1898, 43.
49. e.g. Budge, Sculptures of Assur-nasir-pai, pls. 12 (snake), 14, 15, 17 (bull); Barnett and Falkner, Sculptures of Tiglath-Pileser pl.44 (snake?); Balawat Gates, 9th cent., Barnett, Assyr. Palastreliefs pl.157. These were not in the centre of the yoke. Egyptian chariots often had a disc in the centre of the yoke: O. Nuoffer, Der Rennwagen pls. 1, 2.
50. Oppenheim, Tell Malaf III, 58, pl. 41 'at the joining-point of pole and yoke'; Woolley, Carchemish III, pl.B 60b; Luschan, Sendschirli III 211, pl.39.
51. see n.47.
52. Sakceğözü, Orthmann pl.51. Persepolis: E. Schmidt, Persepolis I, pls. 32 ('Syrians', cf. E. Porada, Ancient Iran, 154), 48 (Libyans), 52 (King's chariots; note the cover); cf. also Porada 176.
53. e.g. nos. 2-4, 5 (4-spoke), 6,9; this very common on the mainland.
54. e.g. 14 c,d, 15, 16 (slightly different). Cf. Ricci hydria.
55. N.Kondoleon, Atti VII Congresso Internaz. Arch.Class. 1958.1 (1961), 267, fig.2.
56. i) JdI 52, 1937, 175 abb.10,11. ii) BCH 85, 1961, Chron. 857.
57. i) A/H/S pl.22. ii) Pfuhl, Muz III, fig.110. iii) D. Lazarides, Kavalla Mus.Guide, pls. 27,28. iv) JdI 52, 1937, 178, Abb.13, 14.

58. i) BCH 94, 1970, 815 fig.6, 818; for hairstyle cf; also a relief-vase frag. from Chios, Ephem. 1969, pl.58. ii) Unpublished as far as I know. Another unpublished frag. in Thasos mus. (probably later 6th cent.) has a chariot-race with dogs under the horses, and protomes with a triangular head.
59. i), ii), Åkerström, Terrakottaplatten 56, 57 Abb.30.1,2. iii) BSA 11, 1904-05, pl.15. cf. also Terrakottaplatten 42, Abb. 15.1,4. (body) and Schefold, ML pl.26 (wheels).
60. Ch.Christou, Adelt. 19, 1964, 233-148, pls. 78,80,83-85, 94-99, 103.
61. i) Vallet and Villard, Megara Hyblaea II, 166-172, pls.190, 217. ii) Rumpf, Ch.V. pl.41; pls. 35, 36, from Reggio and Leontini, cf. Langlotz, Magna Graecia pl.IX. iii) a. Åkerström, Terrakottaplatten 58, Abb.31; b. pottery: e.g. Lucati, Pontische Vasen pl.19; Hampe and Simon, Griechische Sagen in der frühen etruskischen Kunst, pls. 3,7. cf.25 (Monteleone); terracottas: Van Buren, ETR pls. 28-31; tombs: R. Bartoccini, et al., Tombadelle Olimpiadi 79; rings: Boardman, Antk. 10, 1967, 11, pl.2, B II 3,4,8; 3, B II 14; 4, B III 1, B IV 2. iii) c. Ricci hydria, ASAtene vol.24-26, NS 8-10, 1946-48, pl.V; spokes, cf. list nos. 14c,d,15; pole with knobs, cf. Åkerström, Terrakottaplatten 69, Abb.38.
62. Protocorinthian: Friis Johansen, VS pl.34.1; Proto-Attic: J. Cook, BSA ~~37~~⁵, 193~~7~~⁴-3~~7~~⁵, pl.54a; Kübler, Altatt. Malerei 54.71; cf. also Åkerström, Terrakottaplatten 42, Abb.15.3.
63. Adelt. 19, 1964, 243, 246.

Ransom of Hector

64. Ol.Forsch.II, 145ff., pl.45, Beil 10.2 11. (Frisk Johansen, Iliad 49-51, 246.)
65. F.J., Iliad, 137, 267 no.B.20a.
66. A late bf lekythos by the Sappho Painter; F.J., Iliad, B.20e.
67. F.J., Iliad, B.20e; B.20f, fig.46a.
68. Might the scene on a kyathos, with Dionysos on a couch and a satyr beneath it, be a caricature of the Ransom? I. Raubitschek, Herst Hillborough Vases, no.11.
69. F.J., Iliad, 267, B.20 b, e, f, h; and Tyrrhenian amphora, Antk. 7. 1964, pl.28, 3,4; hydria by Painter of London B 76, Bonn.Jb 161, 1961, pl.47.
70. e.g. F.J., Iliad 267, B.20a (Arch.Zeit. 1854, pl.72); B.20i, fig.46 (Brygos P.)
71. Pioneer Group Hydria, Aukt.Basel 34, 1967, pl.46; Paralipomena 324. Also the late rf Etruscan vase, Beazley, EVP pl.10 (n.25).
72. F.J., Iliad, 267, B.20i; CVA Vienna, Kunsth.Mus. 1, pl.III I 35,36.
73. F.J., Iliad, 267, B.20d, fig.44.
74. e.g. F.J., Iliad, figs.44, 46; Tyrrhenian amphora, hydria by Painter of London B 76 (see no.69); Kassel amphora, see n.79.
75. The bf exx. are F.J., Iliad, 267, B.20d (Edinburgh P.), and B.20e (Sappho P.-.) Neither seem quite certain: on the former, a youth holding out two phialae stands just behind Priam (he might be one of Achilles' servants); on the latter, a youth with two spears

stands beside a horse, also behind Priam 'he may just be an 'extra', especially as there is a second youth behind him, doing nothing in particular, but Furtwängler thought he belonged to the scene - FR II, 117ff.).

76. a) see n.69; b) F.J. Iliad, 267, B.20g, figs.42, 43.
77. see n.71.
78. a) F.J., Iliad, 267, B.20b, fig.47 (Oxford G 131.30); b) F.J., Iliad, 267, B.20c, now cleaned and with repainting removed, Antk. 7, 1964, pl.28.3,4; c.) Bonn.Jb. 161, 1961, pl.47.
79. Antk. 7, 1964, 82ff., pls.26,27 (R. Lullies). Note the similarity of Hector's position on the shield-band, Ol.Forsch.II, pl.45.
80. F.J., Iliad, 267, B.20h, fig.45; plus AJA 75, 1971, 296, pl.73: what Friis Johansen believed to be Achilles' head is now shown to belong to a Trojan servant.
81. F.J., Iliad, 267, B.20g, figs.42-43, Munich 2618.
82. FR ii 119 says that this dress does not designate him as a Trojan, as the other Trojans are dressed just like the Greeks; however, in the context the dress must be intended to give 'local colour'.
83. F.J., Iliad, 267, B.20i, fig.46, Vienna 3710.
84. Hounds on leashes, e.g. Blümel, AGS 34, no.23, fig.64, Cycladic? stele of C.470-60:
85. There are, of course, many representations of similar bonnets on Attic vases, worn by Amazons or archers: e.g. Graef I pl.31

- (Acrop.606); Charbonneaux, Martin, Villard, Archaic Greek Art fig.343; von Bothmer, Amazons, pls.15, 38, 61. Closest of all are the hats hanging on the wall in the Larisa 'Banquet' frieze, Larisa II pl.22,24.
86. Berlin A 42, CVA Berlin I, pls.31-33.
87. F.J., Iliad 52, fig.8.
88. F.J., Iliad, 136, fig.46a.
89. Beazley, Etruscan Vase-Painting, 195, Praxias Group no.1, Gerhard, AV III pl.197; 52, pl.10 'Settecanini P.'. The first Beazley ERP looks a sort of cross between the Ransom of Hector and the Greek Mission to Achilles, as Achilles sits with cloak over his head, as on the Attic rf versions of the Mission, and there is no sign of food (or of Hector); but the men appealing to him are white-haired, and one kneels and kisses his knees. The second is a very late version, showing Achilles surrounded by women, including Athena, and Priam on the edge of the group.
90. A good selection in E.Wiencke, AJA 58, 1954, pls.55-64. Before 550, he sometimes has white hair, but more often seems to have dark hair, sometimes receding; after 550, white hair, often receding, seems more usual.
91. Karouzou, The Amasis Painter, 27, pl.9, Berlin 1690.
92. Dinos by Lydos, Graef I pl.33; no.607e; also, late bf, Graef I pl.96, no. 2298; Hesperia 9, 1940, 183; Beazley-Caskey, Boston Vases I, pl.4. The band-cup: Aukt.Basel 18, 1958, no.85.
93. Charbonneaux, Martin, Villard, Archaic Greek Art, fig.357.

94. F.J., Iliad, 245, A.3, fig.8; see now Fittschen 176, SB 81, offering the attractive alternative of the mission of Talthybios, Odysseus and Menelaus to Troy.
95. See nn.91-93 (though these are probably not precisely 'suppliant boughs', which were normally bound with wool: cf. Sophocles, O.T. 1.3, and Jebb's commentary.)
96. Athletic victors: e.g. Beazley, Devel. pl.37; Richter and Hall, Of Athenian Vases in the MMA, pl.4, no.3, possibly pl.76, no.74. Prizewinners: e.g. Richter and Hall, *op.cit.* pl.106, no.105. The man at the extreme left on the Louvre Tyrrhenian amphora (n.⁷⁸~~14~~-b), seems to hold a wreath, but he is very much on the fringe of the scene, and it is not clear to whom he belongs.

Ambush of Troilos.

97. Kypria: Homer OCT V, 105 l.12. Ibycus?, see C.M. Robertson, BICS 17, 1970, 11ff.
98. D.Mustilli, ASAtene 15-16, 1932-33, 222, pl.19 (Brommer 265, C7). Mustilli's suggestion of a conflation of the Ambush and the Pursuit is unnecessary.
99. Fittschen, 171, SB 72. B. Freyer-Schauenburg, (Elfenbeine aus dem samischen Heraion, 5, 38-39, pl.8a, no.6; cf. Gnomon 39, 1967, 845.
100. Ol. Forsch. II 140-142, pl.5, Ib; pl.42, XVb. Cf. also the late 7th cent. tripod-leg from Olympia, Ol. Ber. VII, 181ff, pls. 79,80; Steuben 121, K6; Fittschen 172, SB73.
101. E. Dyggeve, Das Laphrion, 156, 1D, pls.18, 20a, fig.211; cf. Ol.Forsch. II, 141; Foce del Sele II, 227.
102. Corinthian: Flask by Timonidas, Athens CC 620, Payne, NC no. 1072, pl.34.5, c.580-70 (MC); Brommer 265, C8. A good photograph of the vase, AntK. 6, 1963, pl.19.2.
- Attic: several exx. of c.575-565: i) Painter of London B 76, BM 97.7-21.2, BICS 17, 1970, pl.1a, Brommer 264, A6; ii) Painter of London B 76, NY 45.11.2, Bull.Met.Mus. 3, 1944-45, 167, Brommer All; iii) Tyrrhenian, Vienna 3614, AJA 1907, 432, fig.3, Brommer A10; iv) Painter of Louvre E 876, (this pot), CVA Louvre 2, pl.III Hd 22 (a quite wrong reconstruction of the shape of the dinos), Brommer A16. There are several

- Tyrrhenian examples which could be early in the second quarter.
- Laconian: BM B 7, BSA 34, 1933-34, 164, pl.36g, Boll.d'Arte 39, 1954, 289ff., fig.2 (cf. figs.1,4); Brommer C2. Lac.III.
- Chalcidian: Reggio 1169, Rumpf, Ch.V. 15, no.18, pl.36 (Inscription Painter); Brommer C10.
- Boeotian: Berlin 3178, JHS 78, 1967, 121, pl.16b; Brommer C13.
103. Foce del Sele II, 223-229, pl.78.
104. Th.Wiegand, Die archaische Peros-Architektur der Acropolis zu Athen, 197-204, pl.XIV. R. Heberdey, Altatt. Perosskulptur, 16ff.
105. See Heidenreich, MDAI 4, 1951, 110ff. for refs. to the main reconstructions (Buschor, Kalinka, Zanotti-Bianco). Steuben 59-61. Most recently, Boardman, RA 1972, 70.
106. P. Zancani-Montuoro, Boll.d'Arte 39, 1954, 289ff.
107. i) see n.102. ii) Denochoe in ^{Carthage} ~~Fosie~~, NC no.1404, fig.98, Steuben, frontispiece.
108. Achilles: Eleuŷsis lid, Brommer A31; Troilos: AJA 11, 1907, 432, fig.3; JdI 85, 1970, 47, Abb.11, etc. Both: AMB 1944-45, 167.
109. e.g. CVA Mus.Cap.1, pl.III h 12.5, Brommer A2 (Tyrrhenian); CVA BM 6, pl.III He 84.4 (Leagros Gp.), Brommer A12.
110. See n.102 end.
111. See n.109.
112. e.g. Pottier, Vases Antiques du Louvre 2, pl.86, Brommer A22, (lekythos, Athena Painter); cf. Brommer A15, 20,21, 23-25, 28-30,32, and Karlsruhe 186, CVA Karlsruhe 1, pl.13-1,2; these are almost all late lekythoi.

113. Beazley, Der Berliner Maler pl.24.1.
114. e.g. Schauenburg, Jdl 85, 1970, 53, Abb.19;
cf. Pontic amphora, BICS 17, 1970, pl.IIb.
115. Leagros Gp. hydria: GVA B4 6, pl.III He 84.4 (beard not visible in photograph, nor mentioned in commentary, but noted by Mayer in Roscher's Lexikon under 'Troilos', and by later writers. (There are at least five other Leagros Gp. vases with this subject, all with a beardless Troilos).
116. See, e.g., n.102, Corinthian: Timonidas flask;
Attic (iv)¹⁰²: Louvre E 876; Chalcidian: Reggio 1169.
117. GVA B4 6, pl.III He 86.1, 87.2, Brommer A13.
118. AJA 11, 1907, 432, fig.3, Brommer A10.
119. See n.102, end.
120. See n.107.
121. e.g. Jdl 85, 1970, 48, Abb.12, Munich 1716; Aukt.Luzern 3, 1961, 41, no.96.
122. Graef I, 211, pl.95, no.2115.
123. C Painter: Beazley, Devel. pl. 8.2; François Vase: Schefold, ML pl.48.
124. Åkerström, Terrakottaplatten 62, lists Protocorinthian (Macmillan Painter), and Proto-Attic.
'Naxian': Schefold, ML pl.9; BCH 85, 1961, Chron. p.857.
125. Schefold, ML pls: 10, 23.
126. M. Mayer, in Roscher's Lexikon, under 'Troilos', col: 1221, noting this feature, believed that it indicated Corinth as the

- home of the scene-type.
127. See Åkerström's lists, Terrakottaplatten 62. Add: MC kraters, NY 27.116, (Paynes, MC no.1187), Schefold, ML pl.70a; AntK. 11, 1968, pl.23. LC: Pottier E 642, E 646; Ashmolean, Spencer-Churchill Cat. no.47, pl.V.
- LC riding-horses:
- Schefold, ML pl.71b (Louvre E 638); pl.72 (Naples, Astarita). Alternating: e.g. Louvre E 636, (Pottier pl.49), E 637, 638.
128. C.M. Robertson, Greek Painting 57; Cook, GPP 72.
129. Sophilos: A/H/S pl.39. Also, e.g., A/H/S pl.42 (François Vase; popular with Exekias and Group E: Technau, Exekias pls. 4,7,9,14,16,27,28; late 6th cent: Ashmolean, Spencer-Churchill Cat. nos. 59,66; Albizzati pl.64. Many other exx. (See also Åkerström, op.cit.). Riding-horses: e.g. Schefold, ML pl.78b (C Painter); late, Albizzati pl.63.
130. Chalice from Pitane, Istanbul no.8582, a row of horsemen, alternate horses white (reserved); see Section F.
131. e.g. CVA BM 8, pl.II Dn 7.7, 13; see also pl.61a,70a; of the Ricci hydria.
132. e.g., Hampe/Simon, Gr. Sagen in der frühen etr. Kunst, pls.7,9; JdI 85, 1970, 69 Abb.37.
133. See n.102, Attic i), ii); also BSA 36, 1935-36, pl.22, Eleusis 4211, Brommer A31.
134. Lane, BSA 34, 1933-34, 164, suggested that the vase was painted by an Ionian living in Sparta.

135. See Cook, CVA BM 8, p.15-16. He believes that straight type, as on this pot, to be earlier than the turned-back type. If this is so, the 'Achilles and Memnon' chalice, here Section F, definitely later in shape, has also a helmet of the later fashion. (The turned-back type certainly outlives the other, but they probably co-existed earlier). Most important examples not mentioned by Cook are the two on late 6th cent. marble-relief fragments from Sparta, BSA 30, 1928-30, 253, fig.8, now also ADelt. 24, 1969.2(1), 133, pls.124, 125. The better-preserved, worn by a woman, presumably Athena, can be seen to have no cheek-pieces. These are, to my knowledge, the only examples known outside East Greece and Etruria, and must be East Greek work; a vital bit of evidence for East Greek artistic influence at Sparta. The work, which is of very high quality, recalls, e.g., the stele from Anavysos, Richter, Archaic Gravestones of Attica 42, fig.153.
136. See Beazley, LHG 22-24. This must be the earliest known example in East Greek pottery. ~~An early 6th cent. coin, see pl. . . .~~
cf. also the shield-device, pl.55^a. Many exx. in Claz. pottery and sarcophagi (cf. also the Ricci hydria).
137. See Appendix 6 to Ch.II.
138. See pls.60^a, 71^c ; and, e.g., Price 215 fig.56, 219 fig.63.
139. I am most grateful to Dr.D.C. Kurtz for providing this.
140. Two other examples by the same painter have 'Warrior's Departure'

scenes, one at least with women, children and older men, but these need not be mythological (Friis Johansen, Acta Arch. VI, 1935, 201-203, fig.20, Boston, with ref. to a fragment in Leipzig; Cook, CVA BM 8, 46, nos.27, 28; F.J. believes the Boston composition derived from mainland models, and points out such un-East Greek features as the 4-horse chariot). A third example, in Leiden, has a very fragmentary scene showing a fight by a tumulus (JdI 28, 1913, 59, fig.1, Cook no.34).

141. Aukt. Luzern 3, 1961, 41, no.96, Paralip. 164. 25 bis.
142. Munich 1716, JdI 85, 1970, 48, Abb.12.
143. e.g. CVA BM 6, Pl.III He 92.1 (Leagros Gp.).
144. See CVA BM 8, 47 (ref. to Rumpf).
145. See esp. Troilos scene in Tomba dei Tori, M.Pallottino, Etruscan Painting 31 (on top of the fountain). Another plant, on a terracotta revetment plaque from East Greece, Åkerström, AIK 207, Abb.66.2.
146. Kizilbel tomb: AJA 74, 1970, pl.60; cf. Åkerström, AIK pl.16.1.
147. e.g., Lazarides, Guide to Kavalia Mus., 108, A 1889, on a sherd with white slip, described as the bottom of the bowl of a Chiot chalice. The vase may well be Chiot, but is no ordinary chalice: the 'bottom of the bowl' is too shallow, and there is white slip inside, and poor black glaze outside. The horse is in black glaze, with white-dotted harness, peytrel and wing-edge, and red mane. Lazarides' date (1st quarter 6th cent;) is probably too early. Another Albertinum Painter example:

- AD II pl.27.2. Near Easterns on a Urartan bronze relief (also with dots along wing), Akurgal, BGA 187.
148. Pony-tails: Erast Gp., Acta Arch. 6, 1935, 156; Hanover Painter, AD II pl.27.3. (both men). Chequer: e.g. Borelli P., Acta Arch. 13, 1942, 37, fig.23; Dennis P., *op.cit.* 42, fig.27.
149. cf. AD II pl.27.1; esp. Dresden sarc., JdI 47, 1932, 5, Abb.2; (in Attic, cf. CVA B4 6, pl.III He 89.3, Priam Painter).
150. e.g. CVA B4 8, 51, pl.II Dq 1.1 (helmet); ADI pl.44, 46.2; etc., (shield rim).
151. BCH 37, 1913, pl.10.
152. AD I pl.44.
153. AD II pl.25.
154. Graceful trees: Acta Arch. 6, 1935, pl.1; (esp. Dresden, JdI 47, 1932, 5, Abb.2. Cf. Tomba degli Auguri, Tomba del Triclinio, Pallottino, Etruscan Painting 41, 76-77. Flowers, *passim*, cf. AD II pl.26.
155. JdI 85, 1970, 68-81; other Etruscan exx., pp.60-68.
156. AntK. 10, 1967, 9, 11, 12, pl.2, B II 1, 2 (J. Boardman); Schauenburg, *op.cit.* 74, n.168.
157. Schauenburg, *op.cit.* 64; C.M. Robertson, BICS 17, 1970, 14.
158. M. Pallottino, Etruscan Painting 31.
159. Åkerström, ATK 207, Abb.66.2.
160. G. Camporeale, St. Etr. 37, 1969, 65ff., pl.27 (with bibl.)

161. Camporeale 67 n.23; Gabelmann, Löwenbild, pl.1, no.2 (from Olympia, 7th cent.); from Smyrna, pp.89, 90, pl.23, no.117 (later 6th cent.). Dunkley, BSA 36, 1935-36, 194, mentions two examples from Smyrna.

Pursuit of Troilos.

162. There will be no discussion here of the Clazomenian sherds with young riders, noted by RM Cook, op.cit.142, and CVA BM 8, 17-18, as possibly being from, or derived from, Troilos-scenes; the krater sherd, AD II pl.56.3 (BSA 47, 1952, 139, F.15) is quite convincing.
163. Zahn described this sherd, Böhlau that with Achilles and Hector (Section B). Böhlau's description differs even more from that of the same sherd given in CVA Belgique 3 !
164. A few exx. of Priam with receding hair: AJA 58, 1954, (MJ Wiencke, 'An Epic Theme in Greek Art'), pls. 56, fig.6; 57, fig.9, 10; 58, figs 13, 15, 16; 60, fig.21. In all these the hair recedes very markedly.
165. Relief-sculpture: BMC Sculpture I.1, 51 (Ephesus).
Statues: GMA Richter, Kouroi³, figs. 369-386.
Terracotta plaques: Åkerström, ATK pl.28 (Larisa).
Vases: cf. Caeretan, e.g. A/H/S pl.78; (no other in Claz., however).
166. Zahn cites the early bf bowl from Aegina (Attic): Schefold, ML pl.44a (Perseus, who borrowed Hermes' hat). Usually with small brim, e.g. Karouzou, Amasis Painter pl.8; Pfuhl, Muz III, fig.

- 148 (Northampton Gp.); A/H/S pl.77 (Caeretan). Many ordinary travellers also wear such hats, so they are not in themselves enough to designate a herald.
167. Claz. sticks: CVA BM 8, pl.II Dn 3.1, cf. 6.11. Kerykeia: cf. E. Simon, Die Götter der Griechen fig.201 (Tyrrhenian); Rumpf, Ch.V. pl.167, no.192 (imitator of the Phineus Gp.).
168. Th. Wiegand, Bonn.Jb. 122, 1912, 16ff. traces the development of the thymiaterion from Near Eastern and Greek monuments. He notes that it appears only in cult scenes (involving either the gods or the dead), apart from a very few Assyrian and Persian exx. where kings seem to be receiving incense (see below, n.171). See also his note 3, p.69, literary refs. to use of thymiateria on secular occasions, e.g; at banquets. There are a number of Attic rf pots on which Nike is flying along with a thymiaterion and, e.g., an oenochoe or a phiale: e.g. CVA Oxford 1, pl.III I 23, two lekythoi of c.490 B.C. See also Wiegand 40ff.
169. A/H/S pl.44. A very full version of the scene, the only one known which definitely shows Troy, Priam and Antenor. Most versions show Achilles, Troilos on his horse, leading a spare, and Polyxena; occasionally Polyxena is omitted; sometimes the fountain, and perhaps one or two onlookers, are shown.
170. Arete and Alkinous (Od.VII, 140ff); Helen and Menelaus (Od.IV, 120ff), both mentioned by Zahn. Heralds as attendants upon the king: Pontonous, Alkinous' herald (Od.VII, 178ff; VIII, 62ff);

heralds serve the Greek leaders (Il. IX,174); the herald Idaios accompanies Priam (Il.XXIV, 149ff, 470).

171. Kbytnjik: Barnett, Assyrische Palastreliefs pl.105. See also Wiegand, op.cit. 20-21, 31. Persepolis: censers being used for, or in the presence of, the king: E.Schmidt, Persepolis I, pls. 121,123 (Darius I); 98,99 (Artaxerxes?); also pls. 148b, 150, 183, 184. The first group, appearing in audience-scenes, are very large; the second group, carried along with towel, alabastron and incense-pail by the king's servants, are similar in shape and size to ours.
172. Price quoted in RM Cook, BSA 47, 1952, 139 n.71. JM Cook, Greeks in Ionia, 107-110.
173. e.g. Åkerström, ATK pls.23.1, 25.2 (Larisa); AD 1 pl.45, II pl.26 (Claz. sarcophagi); CVA BM 8, pl.II Dn 7.7 (Claz). Attic: e.g. CVA BM 6, pls.III He 82.3, 84.1, 86.2 (Leagros Gp.); though see W. Technau, Lxekias, pl.9a, above chest-strap.
174. CVA BM 8, pl.II Dn 13.2.
175. Troilos with spear: e.g. Beazley, Devel. pl.8.2 (C Painter); BSA 36, 1935-36, pl.22 (here pl.676); Beazley, Race. Guglielmi pl.9 (late Bf); red-figure: Mon.Piot 16 pl.15 (Brygos Painter). Horseman carrying spears horizontal, A/II/S pl.97 (Epiktetos).
176. For discussion of the Attic scenes, Boardman, RA 1972, 60ff.
177. e.g. Albizzati pl.64; CVA BM 6, pl.III He 82.2,3; cf. Graef I pl.106. Early rf: CVA Copenhagen 3, pl.127.2.

178. ASAtene NS 8-10, 1946-48, pl.III.
179. R. Hampe, E. Simon, Gr. Sagen in der frühen etr. Kunst, pl.26
(Manner of the Antinenes Painter).
180. EAA IV.3.
181. Zahn, AM 23, 1898, 44, estimated the diam. at junction of
shoulder and belly, of the 'Achilles and Hector' sherd, at c.
20.5 cm.
182. Largest diam. of Ricci hydria, 34 cm.
183. See p. 188, and Beazley, LHG 22-24.
184. CVA B1 8, pls. II Dn 4, 7, 10, 12, 13; II Dq 4,5.
185. JM Kemelrijk, BABesch.38, 1963, 28ff.
186. cf. Didyma seated statues: BMC Sculpture 1.1, pls.6-9, 12-14.
Harpy Tomb: *ibid.* pls. 22, 24. Also, the throne on a funerary
relief from Thasos, in Istanbul, GMA Richter, Furniture of the Gks.,
Etruscans and Romans, fig.317. Richter, *op.cit.*18, fig.54, puts
our throne in her class with animal feet, but the form of foot
is very doubtful. It looks more like her thrones with turned
or rectangular legs. For animals under the seat, see Richter,
loc.cit.
- Achilles and Memnon.
187. Cf. also Boardman, Emporio pl.60.785; Price, pl.VI.20 (bodice),
9,18 (skirt).
188. See p. ³²⁹~~188~~ and n.135.
189. Cf. the shield of the leading huntsman on the splendid Chiot
krater in Kavalla, Lazarides, Guide to Kavalla Museum, pl.36.

190. Altsam.St. V, figs.340ff. Payne/Young, pls.18-20.
191. Story from the Aithiopsis, attr. to Arktinos of Miletus,
Homer OCT V, 106.
192. A. Conze, Die Melische Thongefässe pl.3, A/H/S pl.22. Beazley,
op.cit. 17. Lippold, Münch.Arch.Stud. 1909, 432-5, supported
Achilles and Memnon because of the women (he also stated that
Achilles was sometimes distinguished by his 'Boeotian' shield,
while Memnon had a round one, and that this was an 'Ionian'
tradition; the second part of this statement is contradicted by
the only surviving 'Ionian' example).
193. Il. XVI.663; XXIII.798. Suggested by Nierhaus, Jdl 53, 1938,
111-114, who found the armour an insuperable obstacle to Achilles
and Memnon.
194. Graef I, pl.42.
195. Iliad 201, and n.292.
196. CVA Copenhagen 3, pl.105, Inv. 3672.
197. cf., e.g., CVA Louvre 6, pl.III He 59.1,2, 'Achilles and Memnon',
and Louvre F 33, L.A. Stella, Mitologia Greca 530 (Theseus and
Minotaur).
198. i) Tyrrhenian, MMB 1960-61, 152-153, fig.2; ii) late bf, Graef I,
pl.111, Acrop. 2611, Brommer A2; iii) rf, Beazley, Berliner
Maler pl.29, BM E468; iv) rf, Caskey-Beazley, Boston Vases II
pl.35, Boston 97.368; v)rf, Beazley, op.cit. 16, cup frs.,
NY 06.1021.139, etc.
199. See ABV 51-52.

200. e.g. Painter of London B76: ABV 86.10,12; 87.16,21.
201. One of the best-known, the 'Warrior's Departure' scene: e.g. CVA Munich 1, pl.16, no.1381, and MMB 1960-61, 154, fig.4, (both with 'Achilles and Menon' scenes on other side).
202. e.g. band cup, Langlotz, Würzburg pl.117 (inv.419), flanked by youths with spears, and archers; Mingazzini pl.91, (inv.50712), (flanked by chariots, warriors, civilians male and female, and two old men on stools, as if a 'Departure' scene has slipped in!)
203. e.g. Price pl.V.6,19,21; Graef I pl.15.450a; Tocra I, 62.
204. e.g. i) Achilles and Hector (Cor.), Friis Johansen, Iliad fig.15; ii) Hector and Menelaus, ('Rhodian'), ibid. fig 18; iii) Achilles and Hector (rf), ibid. fig.77; iv) Ajax and Hector over Patroklos, (rf), ibid. fig.79.
205. i) MC krater, Berlin 1147, Mon. 2, pl.38b. ii) LC hydria, Baltimore 48.2230, Journ. Walters Art Gall. 1961, 45-48. iii) Bf sherds from Old Smyrna, BSA 60, 1965, pl.24.3. iv) Tyrrhenian amph., NY 59.11.25, MMB 1960-61, 152-153. v) hydria related to Tyrrhenian, Vienna, Masner 220, fig.14 (this slightly dubious, as the inscriptions are nonsense, but the one by the victor could just be an attempt at his name, The inscriptions on the main scene are quite sensible). vi) dinos by Painter of the Vatican Mourner, Vienna 3619, Masner 235; no inscriptions, but a Psychostasia beside the duel. vii) Chalc. neck-amphora sherd by Inscription Painter, Florence 4210, Rumpf, Ch.V. pl.1. viii) 'pseudo-Chalc.' neck-amphora,

Rumpf, Ch.V. 182 fig.12.

206. Corinthian: n.205, i) Attic: n.205, v), vi).
207. n.205, vii), viii).
208. e.g. CVA Louvre 1, pl. III Hd 2.4,10; 4.5,13 (loser at right);
ibid. pl.5.3,11 (loser at left).
209. Beazley, op.cit. 15 (bottom)-16. Cf. also Aukt. Basel 22, 1961,
no.150.
210. Alfieri/Arias, Spina, pl.31. On this cup see also pp. 280
above.
211. n.205, vii), viii); and rf krater, Boston 97.368, Tyszkiewicz
Painter, Boston Vases II pls.35,36.
212. e.g. Copenhagen NYC. 2652, Poulsen, Vases Grecs, fig.6.
213. Beazley, op.cit. 14 and n.2.
214. Exception: cup by Heidelberg Painter, CVA Brussels 1, pl.
III He 1.2, inv.A 1578; no distinction between warriors; woman
at left veiled; other figures behind the 'mothers'. See also
n.216.i. On the Ricci hydria, both mothers are veiled; also
on the Locri arula, n.228.
215. i) Castelgiorgio P; London E 67; ii) Altamura P., Bologna
285, Zannoni, Scavidella Certosa, pl.11.3,4; 12.1. Cf.
A/H/S pl.145; Diepolder, Der Penthesilea-Maler, pl.29.
216. i) Rumpf, Ch.V. pl.173, no.219; ii) AJA 62, 1958, pl.6
217. Palermo, from Selinus, rf cup-fr. AJA 39, 1935, 481.
218. I discount the 'Melian' plate-fr. from Thasos, mentioned by
Fittschen, 178, SB 87, as I think the figure behind the warrior

- must be a man; cf. 'Melian', BSA 22, 1902, pl.5 (Dionysos in pleated chiton).
219. e.g. Payne, NC 125; Schefold, ML 74; Simon, EAA IV, 427ff.
220. Rodenwaldt, Korkyra II, 115ff., pls.33,34; mentioned Beazley, *op.cit.* 17,n.2.
221. Tyszkiewicz Painter, see n.211; Etruscan mirror, n.233.
222. Friis Johansen, Iliad figs.82, 86; G.Beckel, Götterbeistand 22. (I recently noticed that on one of the Louvre Tyrhenian uninscribed 'Achilles and Memnon' scenes, CVA Louvre, 1, pl.III Hd 2.4,10, the woman behind the victor touches his elbow: so perhaps Rodenwaldt's interpretation could stand).
223. n.205. 1).
224. JM Cook, BSA 60, 1965, 115-117, pls.23, 24.3; inscription, L.H. Jeffrey, BSA 59, 1964, 46, no.3.
225. AJA 73, 1969, 119-120.
226. Journ.Walters Art Gall. 1961, 45-48.
227. Munich 8600, Scheibler, JdI.79, 1964, 100 Abb.25; (Steuben Ab).
228. AA 1941, 658, Abb.135.
229. Caeretan: e.g. Pfuhl, MuZ III, Abbs. 152, 153; Campana slabs: N. Pallottino, Etruscan Painting 34.
230. Langlotz, Magna Graecia pls.14,15 (Temple C); p.258, pl.24 below, the arula.
231. P. Griffo, L.von Matt, Gela, fig.58; cf. AA 1964, 734, Abb.48.
232. Arch.Class. 18, 1966, pls.14-16.

233. Richter, Handbook to the Etruscan Coll., MMA, fig.132. Beazley, op.cit. 17, seems to become confused between the two mothers!
234. L.A. Milani, NSc. 1905, 232, fig.25. The contents of the tomb, a mixed bag of bronze and iron fragments, are no help in giving a close date.
235. 36ff. The scholion says that Amphiaraus and Adrastus quarrelled, but then swore on oath to let Eriphyle decide their disputes.
236. Gnomon 1928, 245.
237. NC 141; Schefold, ML 189 n.26, appears to follow Curtius.
238. PC aryballois: Johansen, VS pls. 22, 23.
Kaineus plaques: Ol.Ber.I, pl.28, here pl.75a.
239. Steuben 40, and Fittschen 179 n.851, return to Achilles-Memnon.
Blinding of Polyphemos.
240. Fellman's book appeared after this section was completed; the most useful part of his discussion of the bronze-relief is his detailed description. He accepts the shield-band relief, Ol. Forsch.II, 173, pl.51.40 (XXVw), regarded as doubtful by Kunze (Fellmann 22); he also adds an interesting new 6th cent. example, on a Chalcidian skyphos (Fellmann 20).
241. N. Yalouris, ADelt. 19, 1964, Chron.176, no.1 (noted by Fittschen) records the finding on the site of the new museum at Olympia of a fragmentary bronze-relief with 'a warrior facing left, holding in both hands horizontally above his head a fairly thick shaft' (στειλεον, ἱκανου παχους). He suggests that this may be Odysseus blinding Polyphemos, but gives no details of size,

style or date.

242. B. Schweitzer, RM LXII, 1955, 78ff. (Aristonothos krater).
243. P. Courbin, BCH LXXIX, 1955, 1ff. (Argos krater-fragment).
244. G. Mylonas, *Ho protoattikos amphoreus tes Eleusinos*, , 42-52.
245. O. Touchefeu-Meynier, Thèmes Odyséens dans l'Art antique, 10-78.
246. Fittschen also notes this, *op.cit.* 194.
247. Fittschen gives the bibliography under the individual items, and especially in n.582, p.118.
248. AJA 75, 1971, 269ff., pl.64. This section was completed before the article appeared, so overlapping in our comparisons and parallels is coincidental. Yalouri does not discuss the other reliefs, apart from brief references to the other chariot-scenes (which she does not specifically assign to the same workshop).
249. Mylonas, *op.cit.*, pl.6.
250. Ch. Blinkenberg, Lindos I 263, pl.43, no.943a. He mistook the centaur for an archer, and thought the lozenges to be decoration on long oriental trousers. Mentioned by W. Schiering, Werkstätten 129 n.456, who noted the unusual style of the sherd, and by Fittschen, *op.cit.* 101, R53, dated to the first quarter of the seventh century.
251. Ducat 135, pl.XXI.1.
252. Courbin, *op.cit.* 5, fig.4.
253. Karousos, *op.cit.* 175, fig.10. Fellmann, *op.cit.* 16, produces only this and the next.

254. A. Conze, Die Melischen Thongefässe pls.1,2.
255. 'Guide de Thasos' (Ecole Francaise d'Athenes) 9. fig.2.
256. N. Kontoleon, AE 1969, pl.49, p.227 -dated c.700 (too early?).
257. AO pls. 104,95.
258. It is a characteristic of Near Eastern metal-work. See, e.g., E. Akurgal, BGA pls. 39,42,47.
259. Centaurs with 'stippled' human foreparts (presumably one just assumed the horse-part to be hairy!) occur quite early in several schools of vase-painting: Protocorinthian (2nd quarter 7th cent.) is the earliest: Schefold, ML pl.24; Perachora II pl.16, no.285, pl.30,924; then Corinthian (early 6th cent.) -Schefold, op.cit.pl.62; AD I pl.7.7b -pinax from Penteskouphia; Chiot (2nd quarter 6th cent.) -JHS 44,1924,pl.6.29.
- (Devambez, in his preliminary report on the Sicilian arula, Rev. du Louvre 1971, 181ff., mistakenly calls its stippled centaur unique). Satyrs too: Chiot (early 6th cent) - JHS 44,1924, pl.6.17; and many examples from several schools later in the 6th cent. For other animals (with the exception of Herakles' lion-skin, which is perhaps a special case!) this treatment seems confined to the Cyclades and East Greece: pl.VIII;
Cycladic - e.g. Delos XVII; Buschor Griechische Vasen fig.70 (griffin-jug); A/H/S pl.25; AE 1969. pl.44 ('Euboeo-cycladic' relief pithos from Thebes, NM 5898); 'Rhodian' - Pfuhl, MUZ fig.111 (3rd quarter 7th cent.); a 'Rhodian' bronze bowl, Pfuhl, MUZ. fig.134. The tradition continues down to the

- Clazemenian sarcophagi. For dots rather than strokes, cf. the 'pseudo-Clazomenian' amphora, Berlin 5344, BSA 47, 1952, pl.32.
260. Ol.Ber.VII, pl.31.
261. Hilmann compares the chariot on the Caeretan hydria, Pfuhl, MuZ fig.151, for what he thinks some kind of covering on the front part of the body.
262. e.g., Ol.Forsch. II pls.10,11 (II -first quarter 6th cent.), pl.24 (VIII) and pl.23 (VII) -both second quarter 6th cent.; Beil.11.3. 'Art and Technology'. 133.
263. Not dissimilar examples on Etruscan bronze-reliefs, Fleanning Johansen, Reliefs en Bronze d'Étrurie (1971), pl.13.
- See n. 293 .
264. Incidentally, Karousos in his list of 'tattis' (JdI 52, 1937,184) includes the dot-rosette on Herakles' shoulder in no.2!
265. See Adelt. 17, 1961-62, Chron., 116, pl.128b, Olympia Inv. B 4348: a very fine relief with much incision. Cretan?
266. Schefold, JL. pl.32c.
267. H-V. Herrman in Ol.Ber.V, 89, pl.48, attributed another fragmentary Potnia theron (Inv.B 3001, from the stadium south wall) to the same piece of furniture as this one (from the stadium north wall), claiming them to be by different craftsmen from the same work-shop. There seems to be little similarity apart from subject and size. In any event, this second potnia is even less like the works of our group than the first one.

268. Payne, FV pl.6.3.
269. Payne, NC pls. 3(MPC) 16 (Transitional).
270. CVA Louvre I, pl.III Dc 5 (E 667).
271. Griffin-birds of later 7th and 6th cents: two unpublished exx.,
 i) on a standed dish in Galerie Ulla Lindner, Munich, said
 to be from near Smyrna; ii) bf, a coarse sherd in the BM, inv.
 1924. 12-1.1030; no tendril. Cf. also CVA BM 8, pl.II D1 2.3,4;
 7.1, a Fikellura amphora of c.550, on which the last bird seems
 to be turning into a griffin-bird, with tendril and curved
 wings. Griffins: see Kardara, RA 155.
272. Kardara, op.cit. 144.
273. There is another fragmentary animal-relief from Olympia which is
 almost certainly East Greek - Ol.Ber. I, 89, pl.29, dated to the
 late seventh cent. by Hampe and Jantzen. On it is a goat,
 being attacked by a huge snake, and their outline is engraved.
 Above them are three rosettes, arranged rather like those of the
 griffin-bird relief; from the photograph, however, they do not
 seem to be engraved - though this may be misleading.
274. Adelt. 17, 1961-62, Chron. 121-122, pl.140, '3rd quarter 7th cent'.
275. 744 (Inv.3737) was found in the 3rd Treasury - most unfortunately
 not mentioned by Pausanias, presumably because it was already
 destroyed.
276. Kunze, Neue Meisterwerke aus Olympia, 18, says of the Kaineus
 plaque: 'Man hat das Relief mit einigen verwandten, aber jüngeren,
 Bronze reliefs in Olympia überzeugend einer kykladischen

'Werkstatt zugeschrieben'; In Ol.Forsch. II, 67 n.2, he says of nos 8 and 2, that they are 'Ionian, perhaps Cycladic'. Fittschen calls the group Cycladic.

277. cf. Price, *op.cit.* pls.5,6; and here pls.63,65,66,71 (the Pitane chalices).
278. e.g. Buscher, Altsam.St. I-III, fig.160 (standing), fig.141 (seated), and fig.99 (reclining).
279. Fittschen, 118, n.582. His suggestion here that the Crowe corslet from Olympia may belong to the same workshop is impossible.
280. Laconian: BSA 34, 1933/34, pl.41a. - the Gunt Painter's name-cup, Lac.III (fringed but not split); pl.41c - small male figure between winged horses (Lac.IV); pl.46b -Hermes (Lac.IV).
Attic: S. Karouzou, The Anasis Painter, pl.15a (not split); 15b, fringed and split.
Chalcidian: Kumpf, Ch.V. pl.47. no.24.
- The negroes on the Caeretan Busiris hydria also seem to have fringed garments: Pfuhl, MUZ fig. cf. Yalouri 267 n.9.
281. Assyrian: a dress going back a very long way - see, e.g., A. Parrot, Nineveh and Babylon, fig.89, a stele of the late 2nd to early 1st mill. From Tell Barsip. Late Assyrian, e.g. A.H. Layard, The Monuments of Niniveh I, pls.13, 14, from Nimrud. Neo-Hittite: e.g. Tell Halaf III, pl.114; Akurgal, BGA pl. 34a (Karatepe, dated c.700). 'Phoenician': e.g. R.D. Barnett, The Nimrud Ivories in the British Museum, pl.III;

Akurgal, BGA pl.36. The Assyrian examples are most like ours, straight-edged and fairly short; the Neo-Hittite ones have a curved edge (as do the Laconian examples just mentioned). The Assyrian ones have borders, but apparently not fringes; fringes were, however, extremely common in Assyrian noble dress at least - see Layard, *op.cit.*, *passim*. In Neo-Hittite art, there are many instances where it is not clear whether a fringe is intended, or just a border - some are almost certainly fringes: see, e.g., Akurgal, *op.cit.* pls. 24, 26, 28, 29.

Note also the deity on the bronze tympanon from the Idaean Cave, (Matz, *Geschichte* pl.264), who has a straight-edged, knee-length split skirt.

Finally, the horsemen of the terracotta revetments from Dover, which may be Greek and are certainly Graecizing, wear knee-length tunics (or shorts) with a fringe (Akurgal, BGA pl.68, dated late 6th cent.).

282. Samos: Buschor, Altsam St.V. figs. 353-388; G.M.A. Hanfmann, Classical Sculpture fig.63. Dated by Buschor between the late seventh century and the late 530s. The earliest, and the only terracotta example, is the bottom half of a statuette found in a very late 7th cent. context (Buschor, 81, fig.353 - 'imitating Eastern predecessors' in the rendering of the folds). By far the most important find-place, with at least a dozen examples including several masterpieces. Miletus: Buschor, *op.cit.* fig.352-'c.550-540'. Lphesus: Akurgal, Die Kunst Anatoliens

figs.176-177 - a bronze statuette of rather poor quality, dressed in the simple style of Philippe and Ornithe, with straight folds cast, not simply engraved; c.560.

Chios: (vase-paintings): Price, JHS 44, 1924, pl.V.6; here pl. 71 (Pitane chalice with Achilles and Aeneas).

Lrythrae: a very fine unpublished, over-lifesize statue in the Izmir Museum, from Akurgal's excavations; dressed in the style of Philippe and Ornithe.

Also (on grounds of dress and style): Altsam St. I-III fig.118, dated c.560-50, a bronze statuette from Olympia, (Olympia IV no.74). (See GJA Richter, Korai figs.183-262 for good photographs of many of these.

283. Payne/Young, pl.18 (no.677) and pl.20 (no.619). Buschor, Altsam St.V 83, believed that the sculptor of Cheramyes' Hera (with his earlier works) influenced 'the Naxian masters' who made the Acropolis korai.
284. e.g., Price, op.cit. pl.VI.9; Boardman, Corinthia pl.59.
285. Protoattic: e.g. Scheffold, Myth and Legend pls.36a, 23;
Theraon netope: Scheffold, op.cit. pl.21.
Late Cor: Scheffold, op.cit. pl.71b -a shield device.
286. Chios: e.g. A/E/S pl.28 (Würzburg chalice)
'Melian': e.g., Altit.17, 1961/2, Chron.pl.280 (Neapolis amphora);
Guide de Theses 9, fig 2.
287. e.g. Jatz, Geschichte pl.275A.

288. Afrati: Daedalische Kunst (Hamburg, Mus. für Kunst, u. Gewerbe, 1971), pls.1-11 (helmet, colour plate 1). Axes: 'Art and Technology, Symposium on Classical Bronzes', ed. Doeringer, (1970), 137, (cf.pp.104-105). Cf. also BCH 73, 1949, 421-436.
289. e.g. Assyrians: Layard, op.cit. especially pls.47-52; vol.II pl.32 (Khorsabad, late 8th cent.); Parrot, op.cit., fig.343 (Till Barsip, 8th cent.)
- Neo-Hittite: Akurgal, BGA pl.23b. (Sakceğüz, 8th cent.).
- Ivories of all styles: cf. Barnett, op.cit. pl.CIX, S386.
- Bronze bowl: Layard. op.cit. vol.II. pl.60.
290. Akurgal, BGA pls.39,40, p.148, and n.588. Cf. BSA 37,1936-37. 94, fig.1.
291. Single: e.g., A/H/S pl.27; and Kardara, EA 160, cf.Lane, Greek Pottery² pl.18.
- Complex: e.g. A/H/S pl.28; Price, op.cit.pl.V.28.
292. Chiot: Price, op.cit. pl.X,3,9; ADelt.17, 1961/62, Chron. pl.281;
- Rhodian: Kardara, op.cit.161;
- (cf. also e.g., Kraay, Greek Coins pl.178.591 (Miletus); ADelt. 2,1916, 209 fig.29 (Chios).)
- A similar pattern occurs in Near Eastern art, e.g. Layard, op.cit. pls, 59,65; Barnett, op.cit. pl.LXXI, 'Syrian style', but it does not seem necessary to assume that the Greeks imitated eastern art in every such case, especially with very simple patterns.

293. Tell Halaf III, pls.71-78 (small orthostats); and Akurgal, BGA Pl.25, p.118. ADelt 17, 1961-62, Chron. pl.130.1.
 'Melian' and Cycladic generally: e.g. Conze, Die Melischen Thongefässe; Delos XVII, pl.XVIII; Delos X, pl.VI.12; Rhodian: Kardara, RA 164,171; Lane, Greek Pottery² pl.16a.
Protoattic: e.g. Schefold, op.cit. pls.29,16.
294. See list of East Greek chariots, p.292, nos.5, 7, 8, 10, and cf. n.58 ii) (Thasos).
295. AM 83, 1968, 286-289, pls.119-120, Inv. B 1865 (Incidentally, Kopcke's 'Artemis', in front of the horses, has a moustache!)
296. 'Aphrodite' amphora: 4-spoke wheels; 2 horses.
 'Apollo' amphora: 6-spoke wheels; 4 horses.
 'Herakles' amphora: 4-spoke wheels; 4 horses.
Delos 17 pl.70: 2 horses?; Delos 10, pl.6: 4 horses.
 See also n.57.
297. 4-spoke wheels: see List. Four horses: Acta Arch.VI, 1935, 201-203, fig.20 (omitted from List).
298. Anatolia 6, 1961, 179ff.; Emporia 214. pl.87.
299. Yalouri, p.274, decides on 'Northern Ionia' for no. 4.
Odysseus and Circe.
300. Taranto 9887, lekythos attributed to the Phanyllis Painter, Haspels, ABL 199, no.13; Rhodes 12.390. white-ground oenochoe, Class of Painter of Vatican G 49, CVA Rhodes 2, pl.III Ia 2.4.
301. La Revue du Louvre et des Musées de France, 1971, 181ff,

(P.Devambez).

A full publication to appear in Mon.Piot 1972

302. These three are the only surviving archaic examples with this detail, which does not occur in the Odyssey. It is presumably an indication of the inducements which the enchantress held out to her admirers.
303. 99.519: ABV 69.1, Painter of the Boston C.A. (this cup), AJA 27, 1923, 426,428; 99.518: ABV 198, Painter of the Boston Polyphemus (this cup), op.cit.427; AJA 17, 1913, 2.
304. e.g. Erlangen 261, Nikon Painter, H. Grünhagen, Antike Originalarbeiten der Kunstsammlung des Instituts, pl.20; New York 41.83, Persephone Painter, MMB 36, 1941, 203.
305. Arch.Zeit. 34, 1876, pl.15.
306. ABL 256.49; JHS 13,1893, pl.2; Touchefeu-Meynier pl.14.3.
307. See n.305.
308. It is not actually stated in the Odyssey that these wolves and lions are bewitched men: the Greek is (1.212)
 ἀμφὶ δέ μιν λύκοι ἦσαν ὀρέστεροι ἢ δὲ λέοντες,
 τοὺς αὐτὴ κατέθειλξεν, ἔπειτα κακὰ φάρμακ' ἔδωκεν.
309. Touchefeu-Meynier pl.13.1,2.
310. cf. BSA 31, 1930-31, pl.25.3; BSA 32, 1931-32, pl.21.10 (Antissa).
311. Boardman, Ionides Coll. pl.1; AGG pl.VII.97.
312. AGG 105, 154.
313. Univ.Mus., Philadelphia, 3449; E.H. Hall, Univ.of Penn. Mus.

Journ. 1912, 72, figs.36,37; G.M.A. Richter, Furniture² p.17 (drawings). The only other dolphin-man with wings seems to be the one on the coins of Cyzicus, Kraay/Hirmer pl.198.699, c.500 B.C. Clearly of a different kind are the wingless and armless dolphin-men in the interior of an 'Ionian' cup published by E.Rohde, AA 70, 1955, 102ff., dated c.540-30: like those on the Lysikrates monument in Athens, they must be from the story of Dionysos and the Etruscan pirates. (Rohde compares a shield-device on a bf sherd, Graef I, 119, pl.58, no.1033).

314. Kraay/Hirmer pl.198.699; AGG 157; Nomisma 7, 1912 , pl.IV.9.
315. BM 118918, reign of Assurbanipal, 668-626; Schaefer/Andrae, Die Kunst des Alten Orients pl.536. See also Orithmann 312ff.

CHAPTER IV

SOME HERAKLES SCENES

Comparatively few of Herakles' exploits appear in surviving East Greek art. The four most important adventures portrayed are treated here. I have left out, for instance, the Fikellura sherd with the head of Busiris, and the mysterious banquet with the 'Girdle of Hippolyta' ('Apotheosis of Herakles'?) from the architrave of the temple at Assos; also the possible 'Labour of Herakles' from one of the pediments of the temple at Larisa. Also omitted are the appearances of Herakles (or his head!) alone, on coins, in plastic vases and relief-sculpture. Cypriot representations, which are very numerous, are excluded except for occasional comparison.

A. HERAKLES AND PHOLOS

1. Istanbul, Arch.Mus.; Paris, Louvre; Boston, MFA.

From Assos.

Pl. 83 a.

Ht. of frieze-blocks, c.81 cms.; ht. of figures, c.56 cms.;
length of centaurs, c.50 cms.; relief of figures, c.4-5 cms.

J.T. Clarke, Report on the Investigations at Assos 1882, 1883;

J.T. Clarke, F.H. Bacon, R. Koldewey, Investigations at Assos,

Drawings and Photographs, (1902), esp. p.147. F. Sartiaux,

RA 22, 1913, 1-46, 359-389; 23, 1914, 191-222, 381-412.

G. Mendel, Cat. des Sculptures, Musees Imperiaux Ottomans (1914), vol. II, 1ff. (EAA I, 743 with recent bibliography). L. Caskey, Cat. of Greek & Roman Sculpture in MFA, Boston, no. 7.

These relief-sculptures are from the frieze which occupies the architrave of the Doric temple at Assos in the Troad, and constitutes its main Ionic element. They are in the local stone, an andesite. Parts of four blocks survive, and one, with centaurs, is assumed to be missing. The principal block has, at its broken left edge, the upper body to the thigh of a long-haired, bearded man holding a wine-cup, of kantharos-type to judge from the handles, in his right hand, and raising his left in a gesture of surprise or shock. The estimated length of the block allows a space behind this figure sufficient for him to have a centaur-body, and he is certainly to be restored as Pholos. To his right is Herakles, standing, and shooting with a 'Scythian' bow at three centaurs with human foreparts, who gallop away. There are remains of three other blocks with centaurs; all have equine fore-legs. On one block they are clearly in flight; on a second they appear to be galloping in an orderly fashion to the attack, with clubs or branches over their shoulders; on the third, either interpretation is possible, but they are generally taken to be advancing also. In all, ten centaurs survive, apart from Pholos.

Sartiaux's proposal for their position, filling the east

front of the temple, with the largest block, that with Herakles, in the centre, seems more satisfactory from the point of view of design than the reconstruction of Clarke, who has the story running round the SE corner of the frieze, from the side to the front, with Pholos and Herakles at the left end of the facade. Sartiaux supposes a fifth, missing block with retreating centaurs, to the right of the central one.

The slim-barrelled centaurs gallop along with front and back legs together, forelegs off the ground. Despite the uniformity of their leg-movements, some care has been taken to achieve variety in the position of the upper part of their bodies; only on the slab Sartiaux no.5, where they advance to the attack, is there virtually no difference in their attitudes, and this, in fact, serves to emphasize the confusion of their flight.

The figures are slim, and graceful rather than vigorous. Leg- and sometimes chest-muscles are shown, and most of the upper torsos, the most ambitious being that of Herakles, are in three-quarter view, but generally speaking the modelling is superficial, though competent. Herakles' head may perhaps be thought to have an 'East Greek' look, but there seems on the whole no trace in these figures of the heavy, fleshy style which characterizes much East Greek art. The centaurs have very normal-looking heads, with no coarse or bestial features.

In addition to the frieze, there are two metopes, each with a galloping centaur holding a branch in the manner of the frieze-centaurs; one at least has a frontal head.

Date: third quarter of the 6th century, perhaps c.540.

(Clarke dated to the 5th century; Sartiaux corrected this to the now generally accepted date. (For another view, D.S. Robertson, Greek Architecture 85, 325).

2. Istanbul, Arch.Mus., and Stockholm.

From 'Larisa' on the Hermos, southern Aeolis. Pl. 83 b.

Ht. of plaques (estimated), 41-42 cms.; ht. of figure-zone, 29-30 cms.; length. probably between 45 and 65 cms.

Larisa I, 136-137 (K. Schefold); II, 57-63, 156-160, pls.18-21, Frieze VI, (L.Kjellberg). Åkerström, ATK 48-49, 54, 55-56, 64, 65, pls. 26.2, 27.2, Group III, 'true Ionic'; p.45 n.1 for details of fragments in Stockholm.

There are fragments of at least four terracotta plaques from the same mould, probably from the temple. At the bottom the border is a simple painted black line. At the top is a moulded zone of inverted tongues (reconstructed with a row of dentils above, as in the Riders Frieze from the same group, ATK pl.26.1). There is a white slip, and the glaze used for most of the painting varies from a dark brown to red; white is added

for details over the glaze, and there is a little added dark red. On most fragments, the nearer centaur is white, the further one dark, but this may have alternated (Larisa II 58, n.3).

At the right-hand end of the plaque stands a man with beard and small moustache, and layered hair reaching to the nape of the neck. He wears a chiton (pattern visible in one fragment). His left hand is outstretched, and perhaps seizes the near centaur by the hair (see Foce del Sele II, 125 n.1, for the interpretation of the hand which is visible as the centaur's). In his raised right hand he holds an object with a swelling, rounded upper end in relief, and a painted part below the hand: Kjellberg took this for a sandal, but, though held unusually close to its head, it must surely be a club. Two centaurs, both in a defeated condition, appear on the slab. One is close to, and facing, the man, head bowed; the other, his horse-body masked by that of his companion, retreats with hand to head. Both centaurs have coarse features, long hair and beard, and animal-ears, and both carry large branches. Their forelegs are human, but end in horses' hooves. Beneath the legs of the centaurs on one fragment (Kjellberg 62, fig. 15), is a wine-vessel of some kind, painted in dark red. The centaurs are heavy, pot-bellied, self-indulgent-looking creatures, of a very different breed from the Assos ones, (of the earlier East Greek centaurs of the Kaineus plaque and the 'Herakles/Potnia Theron' bronze relief, pl. 75).

Kjellberg (who gives a detailed description of each fragment), identified this as the Pholos story, but Åkerström (op.cit. 56), worried quite needlessly by the fact that 'Herakles' uses a club rather than a bow, refused to commit himself to this interpretation, which is certainly the correct one, and suggested a possible contamination of the Pholos theme with that of the Lapiths and centaurs.

The composition, with the overlapping bodies of the centaurs, is effective (as well as being relatively complex for this theme), and solves in a satisfactory way the problem of creating an identifiable rendering of the story within the rather small space of the plaque (one centaur only, and the scene becomes ambiguous).

Date: earlier third quarter of 6th century? (Kjellberg dates c.560-540, Åkerström c.530-520; both compare the Caeretan hydriae).

3. Istanbul, Arch.Mus., Inv.4592-4595, 4597.

From Akalan, c.18 km. SW of Samsun.

Pl. 84 a,b.

Ht. of plaque, 24 cm. Total length of frgs. 80 cm.

Åkerström, ATK 123-124, 125 fig.37, 130, 132, pls. 64, 65,

(with previous bibliography, and detailed description of each fragment).

The clay is coarse and brown, with a cream slip. The added colours, which are matt, are shades of brown from dark-brown to red-brown, with some red, and some white for details over the brown. The scene is so fragmentary that it is not certain that all the pieces belong to the same plaque, though it seems likely. The left end of the plaque remains, with the pithos, poised rather perilously on its tiny foot, and Herakles, kneeling in front of it and shooting. He wears the lion-skin over his head, with the forepaws crossed on his chest, and the tail (presumably, though it has no tuft) dangling down to the ground. He also wears a quiver. The remaining fragments show parts of at least three centaurs, two galloping away, the third collapsed beneath their hooves; two at least of the three have equine forelegs. They have long hair, and very long beards, in contrast with Herakles, who is either beardless or has only a small beard. Traces of colour on the fragment with fallen centaur show that the centaurs were 'stippled'- dark-brown on brown, and white on brown. One centaur looks back, raising one arm and probably stretching out the other in a plea for mercy. Part of a branch carried by one of the centaurs remains, and two arrows may be seen, one in flight, the other in the body of the fallen centaur, who rolls his eyes upwards. Apparently Pholos was not shown.

Herakles is on a slightly larger scale than the centaurs, (see ATK 124). The work is not of the first quality, but the

head of the dying centaur has some power.

Date: second half of the 6th century. (Åkerström dates to the later 6th century, saying that the frieze is influenced by North Ionic work of the second half of the century. This is to assume that the Assos and Larisa friezes were the only East Greek examples, and there is no stylistic reason precluding a date earlier than the late 6th century for Akalan.)

4. Bucharest, Nat.Mus. of Antiquities Inv. V.9310A.

From Istros.

Pl. 83 c.

Dacia N.S.II, 1958, 16-17, fig.4/2,3. Histria II (1966), 92, 456, pl.24, no.389.

The two sherds, from a Fikellura amphora, show the remains of three centaurs who were galloping along from right to left, with branches in their raised hands. The second centaur may be about to collapse. They all have equine forelegs. The heads are bestial, with animal-ears, long hair and beards, and moustaches. Care has been taken to make each head slightly different, and there is variety in the attitudes also. Added red may be seen here and there on hair and bodies. Beneath each centaur's belly is a small, thin water-bird, presumably for filling. S. Dimitriu and M. Coja in Dacia II describe the scene simply as 'a hunt', or 'centaurs galloping with branches', but the key to the scene is the arrow-shaft protruding from the

first centaur's hind-quarters. A second arrow sticks into the ground by the second centaur's forehoof. The fragments must, therefore, be from a representation of Herakles' fight on Mt. Pholoe. (Lapiths and centaurs is unlikely, partly because of the arrows, but chiefly because with this story the centaurs are normally interspersed with the Lapiths in small fighting groups of two or three, not galloping along in a row, whereas the latter arrangement is common in the Herakles-and-centaur scenes). From the direction of the arrows, it seems that the centaurs are advancing towards Herakles, something rather unusual in scenes where Herakles uses a bow (see Foce del Sele II, 128, bottom).

Date: third quarter of the 6th century. (Dacia II, c.540)

The story also appeared on the Amyclae throne, the work of an East Greek, Bathykles of Magnesia. Pausanias (III.18.II) says only 'the battle of the centaurs at Pholos' dwelling', but at least this probably means that Pholos himself was present. A number of fragmentary representations have been attributed to the Mr. Pholoe adventure:

A. Herakles.

1. 1st.Mitt. 21, 1971, 109-119, pls. 33-37 (V.von Graeve, 'Eine Sagedarstellung der frühen milesischen Vasenmalerei').

The sherds were excavated at Miletus; the principal one measures 13 x 7.7 cm.

Surviving is the upper part of a bearded, short-haired man to the left, drawing a bow. Behind him, at some distance, are traces of painted curves, whose interpretation is unknown. Graeve suggests Apollo or Herakles as the archer, and favours the latter. There is absolutely no means of knowing.

Date: Graeve suggests the second quarter of the 7th century (op.cit. 116-117).

2. Istanbul, Arch.Mus., Inv. 1472

From Mytilene, Lesbos.

Pl. 84 c.

Åkerström, ATK, 25, 26, pl.12.1; cf.p.12.

A pentagonal, mould-made antefix, ht. 14.5 cm., wdth. 18 cm.

The surface has a pinkish slip; and black glaze for details.

In the centre of the antefix an archer kneels, shooting to the left. No details of his dress can be distinguished, but he is not wearing the lion-skin. He wears a quiver of oriental type. Behind him is a small, bending tree. Åkerström interprets as a second tree a relief fragment near the left edge; if this is correct, it must have been smaller than the other, and upright.

Åkerström believes this to be certainly a representation of Herakles fighting the centaurs, and compares Bellerophon and the chimaera on separate antefixes from Thasos. Clearly he is right about the breaking-up of the story, and Herakles is perhaps the most likely candidate.

Date: later 6th century (Åkerström).

3. Istanbul, Arch.Mus. Inv.2699, 2700.

From Neandria.

Preserved ht. 17 cm.; L. 15 cm.

Åkerström, ATK 11, 13, pl.4.4. Drawing by R. Koldewey,
Neandria 20, fig. 48.

The two relief-terracotta fragments are believed by Åkerström to be from a decorative frieze from the temple. Surviving is the upper part of the body of a man who moves rapidly to the right. He has a beard and long hair. The hilt of a sword is visible beneath his left arm.

Åkerström believes the man to be Herakles, '...mit Kenntnis des sonstigen Fundbestandes von Kleinasiens' - a cryptic remark, and a quite arbitrary interpretation.

Date: second half of the 6th century (Åkerström).

4. From Sardis.

Åkerström, ATK 88, pl.38.1.

On a terracotta frieze-plaque with figures in panels, is a fragment of a man walking left with a bow. In the next panel is a Potnia theton.

Åkerström compares the Olympia bronze-relief, (pl. 77a) and a silver strip in New York, from Italy (Bull.Met.Mus. 24, 1929,201).

Again, a very hypothetical interpretation.

Date: later 6th century.

B. Centaurs.

1. British Museum.

From Naukratis.

Price 219, pl.VI.29.

A fragment of a Chiot ring-vase, in Bf technique. Surviving is the upper part of the body of a centaur. He is bearded, with long red hair, but his features are not coarse. His body is stippled (incision), apparently at the front only. The markings across his shoulders almost look like some kind of garment. He holds a very large branch over his shoulder, and raises his other arm in front of him, as he moves from left to right.

He seems a likely candidate for a Pholos-scene, and a ring-vase would offer a suitable field. He is at the end of the scene, if scene it is: the back part of a sphinx is visible behind him.

Date: second quarter of the 6th century.

2. Cairo Museum, Inv. 32.377

From Saqqara.

C.C. Edgar, Cat. du Musée de Caire: Greek Vases, 82ff., pls.V, VI.R.M. Cook, JHS 57, 1937, 237 no.11; BSA 47, 1952, 130; CVA BM 8,31 n.9. (C. Clairmont, Berytus 11, 1955, 109 no. 98). P. Amandry,AM 77, 1962, 52.

A strange, baggy amphora, ht. 39.5 cm. Light coloured clay with smooth brown surface; paint dark brown deepening to black; incision round most of the figure-outlines. There are four zones of figure-decoration. In the third zone down, two complete centaurs and remains of three others; they have full human foreparts, long hair and beards. They hurry to the right, waving branches or trees (twisted roots are visible). Two look behind them. We have the end of the scene: behind the last centaur is a reclining lion with its back to him. There is a big gap in front of the first centaur, plenty of room therefore for Herakles.

The drawing on this vase shows several details of definite East Greek origin: saddle-cloth on the horses; stag with both antlers displayed; lion with back-mane; boar with broken bristles. Cook, (JHS 57) calls it 'Egyptian Greek in the 'Rhodian' tradition'; it is surely the work of an East Greek.

Date: second half of the 6th century. (Cook, JHS 57, dates the vase to the first half of the century; in BSA 47 and CVA BM 8, he changes his mind, surely rightly. Details such as the horses' saddle-cloths and the lion's back-mane can be paralleled in the second half of the century, and there seems no good reason to date earlier).

3. Smyrna Museum.

From Amyzon, Nr. Labranda, Caria.

Pl. 86 a.

Ht. 11.5 cm ; 1.10 cm.

Åkerström, ATK 117, pl.59.2.

This fragment of a terracotta relief has a bestial-looking head with 'forelock' and layered hair, beard and moustache, facing right. At the right-hand edge is a left hand, apparently belonging to the same person, holding what looks like a stick or club. Åkerström suggests that this is the bottom of a tree-trunk, with swelling roots.

Date: early 5th century? (Åkerström).

4. Thasos, private collection (in 1944).

From Thasos, precise findspot unknown.

M. Launey, Études Thasiennes I (1944), 150-151, fig. 86.

Ht. of fragment, 22 cm., lgth. 12.5 cm.

Another very fragmentary terracotta plaque, described as part of a sima. On it appears the forepart of a centaur with long hair and beard and, apparently, open mouth. His left arm is raised; he seems to bend forward, and in his right hand, which is held low, he carries a small tree or a branch. If the orientation of the fragment shown in the photograph is correct, he must be kicking out with his back legs. Launey implies that his forepart is entirely human, 'C'est un Centaure, sous son aspect habituel dans l'art très archaïque, d'un homme muni

d'un appendice équin;' It appears to me, however, that he certainly has horse's hooves, like the Larisa centaurs.

Clearly a fight is in progress, and the connections of Herakles with Thasos make it a distinct possibility that he is involved.

Date: c.550 (The material is coarser than that of the antefixes from the polygonal building, dated c.540-20, and Launey believes the style is earlier).

There is little to be said in discussion of these scenes. None of the four certain examples is earlier than c.550, and all follow a scheme well-known in Greek art from before the mid-7th century.

The earliest surviving examples occur on PC pottery of the second quarter of the 7th century, a pointed aryballos and a fragmentary pyxis-lid.¹ In one of these two, the lid from Perachora, the exact composition of the Assos version is already in use: Pholos with wine-cup, Herakles standing shooting, and centaurs with branches running off. (There are several examples, some even earlier, which I count as uncertain because only one centaur is present.² This applies also to the early 7th century vase-fragment from Camirus, with a centaur uprooting a tree, and a man holding sticks.)³

Several Corinthian examples follow the first two; in all,

Herakles wears no lion-skin, and in almost all he uses the bow; in two examples with only one centaur, he has a sword.⁴ Dunbabin⁵ rejected the MPC example on this ground, but a sword is attested from the early 6th century (Sophilos), and there seems no reason why it should not have appeared earlier.

In all the Corinthian examples the composition is simple, with very little overlapping of figures: in fact, there are hardly any versions of the scene with a more complex composition before late black-figure.

Pholos appears twice,⁶ and the pithos only once. They appear together on the MC kotyle (pl. 85a),⁷ which shows the cave of Pholos (and also the earliest certain surviving representation of the version of the story recorded by Apollodorus, in which Herakles first drives off the centaurs with fire-brands).⁸

It seems also that Pholos was represented on one of the Theron metopes, of about 630 B.C.⁹

Turning to other schools, almost the first¹⁰ certain example in Attic is a fragment by Sophilos¹¹ with one of the most complicated compositions known for the scene: wounded centaurs collapse, and Herakles, having abandoned his bow, seizes a centaur by the back hair, as he often does for Nessos, and prepares to despatch him with his sword. Approximately contemporary is an olpe¹² with Herakles and one centaur; the Mt. Pholoe episode seems likely, as the centaur attacks Herakles. This is the earliest example known to me in which Herakles wears the lion-skin - not, however, over his head.¹³

There are several other scenes with more than one centaur from the second quarter of the 6th century; in at least two, Herakles wields the club,¹⁴ in at least one, the sword.¹⁵ Neither Pholos nor the pithos is in evidence - the fight is the important thing. The centaurs sometimes, but by no means always, carry branches. From the mid-6th century, Herakles begins to wear the lion-skin regularly,¹⁶ and the centaurs often carry stones;¹⁷ the club is, and remains into Rf, the most popular weapon. Centaurs with human foreparts appear to be retained in 6th century Attic only for more 'human' and civilized characters such as Pholos and Chiron.

In late Bf there is a change of emphasis in this, as in many other subjects: the majority of representations, of which there are many, show Herakles and Pholos drinking peaceably outside the cave, with the pithos sunk into the ground between them.¹⁸ Often Herakles is lifting the cover of the pithos.¹⁹ Athena and Hermes appear frequently²⁰ for the first time (their earliest appearance being on the MC kotyle mentioned above). Herakles almost invariably wears the lion-skin,²¹ and both club and bow are usually present. Pholos quite often has a fully-clothed forepart.²² This peaceful type of scene seems peculiar to Attic. Occasionally a fight over the pithos is shown.²³

There are a few representations in other schools of Greek vase-painting in the second half of the century, all following the usual pattern. Herakles normally wears the lion-skin:²⁴ the exception is

the interesting Laconian dinos of c.550, already discussed in connection with the Ambush of Troilos (pl. 85b).²⁵ Here Herakles, club in hand, seizes a centaur by the wrist,²⁶ while others, with enormous branches, collapse or gallop away; the artist also adheres to the non-Attic tradition of having centaurs other than Pholos with full human foreparts. On the 'pseudo-Chalcidian' version,²⁷ Athena stands behind Herakles as he shoots. No certain Pholos, and no pithos, appears in these few examples.

One of the few 6th century versions of the story in a medium other than vase-painting is that from Foce del Sele²⁸ (about the mid-6th cent.). It apparently occupies six metopes, placed by the excavators across the east front of the temple. Here Pholos appears with full human forepart, while the other centaurs, (who approach Herakles as he shoots, rather than fleeing as at Assos),²⁹ have equine forelegs. The work is more vigorous than Assos, but has a true 'provincial' flavour which is absent there.

Right at the end of the century there are a number of undistinguished terracotta arulae from Caulonia and Croton whose four sides are occupied by a beardless Herakles with bow and club, two centaurs, and, unusually, Athena actually fighting.³⁰

I have left until last a small number of 6th century representations, Cretan, Etruscan, and ?South Italian, which in some ways come close to the East Greek ones. In three of them, the pithos is poised above ground, in the manner of Akalan: i) relief-plaque fragments from Praisos,³¹ possibly of the early 6th century; ii) fragments of

'red-ware' stamped pithoi from the zone of Sybaris³² (indeterminate style, 6th century); iii) 'Pontic' oenochoe by the Tityos Painter³³ third quarter of the century. In Attic and Corinthian versions where the pithos appears, it is always sunk into the ground. Pholos is present on iii), sitting uncomfortably with his human forepart on a log. On the Praisos plaques, at least the centaur dipping into the pithos has a human forepart (this, however, is not unusual before the mid-century). On ii) also, although the centaur is said to have equine forelegs, they look very odd (cf. the hind legs), and I think that they are probably human legs awkwardly done. On two other examples,³⁴ both 'Pontic', both pithos and Pholos are lacking, but the centaurs have full human foreparts. The only definite conclusion which can be drawn from these examples is that, on surviving evidence, they follow a non-mainland tradition for the pithos, and a non-Attic one for the centaurs. In the case of the 'Pontic' vases at least, however, the resemblances to the East Greek versions may not be accidental: signs of East Greek influence on this class have long been noted.

Finally, a few specific points about the East Greek examples, beginning with the two just mentioned:

- i) The position of the pithos above ground, (Akalan), is unparalleled on the mainland, paralleled in Italy and Crete.
- ii) Centaurs other than Pholos or Chiron with full human foreparts (Assos, Saqqara amphora, cf. the Nessos cup, p.471) are very rare after the mid-century on the mainland (Laconian dinos),

paralleled on 'Pontic' vases and other Etruscan art, as well as on the 'Campana dinoi' (Painter of Louvre E 736).³⁵

- iii) Centaurs with human forelegs ending in hooves (Larisa, Thasos) are clearly an East Greek type, (like satyrs with horses' hooves on human legs). As well as in East Greece, they appear in Etruria on works which show definite East Greek influence in other respects, or are actually by East Greek artists (Caeretan hydriae, vases by the 'Ribbon Painter' of the Campana dinoi).³⁶
- iv) Herakles without the lion-skin, (Assos, Larisa; cf. the Nessos cup, p. 471), seems to be fairly unusual elsewhere after the mid-century.
- v) The form of the flight of the arrows is the same on both the Akalan plaques and the Fikellura sherds; I have found one similar mainland example,³⁷ and another instance occurs on the 'Polyphemus Group' amphora.³⁸ It would be foolish to claim that this is an East Greek form, or even the most popular form in East Greece, but the point might be worth bearing in mind.

B. HERAKLES AND NESSOS.

1. Athens, National Museum, Inv. 644.

From Olympia.

Pl. 75 b.

In one of four panels of a large, rectangular (repoussé) bronze sheet, incised on the front.

Olympia IV pl.38, no.696. Fittschen 119, SB 26. Boardman, Anatolia 6, 1961, 179ff. See pp.367ff.

Herakles kneels at the left, in short, split tunic with fringe, drawing the bow. His quiver and scabbard are strapped to his back. He has long hair bound with a fillet, a neat beard, and incised moustache. The centaur moves away from him already pierced by two arrows, and looking back with a gesture of entreaty. No bestial traits are visible in his head, which is very like Herakles', with similar hair-style, beard and moustache. His forepart is fully human, and 'stippled' (except for the hands and feet) with neat rows of incised lines. Behind him is a ?palm-tree.

Date: early 6th century.

2. Ionian 'Little Master' cup.

Diam. of bowl, 20.2 cm.

Pl. 86 b.

Aukt.Basel 40, 1969, 29, pls. 14,15, no. 53.

In the tondo of the cup appears Herakles in short chiton with folds, and without the lion-skin, attacking the centaur from behind. Herakles has long hair (according to the description), and a short, pointed beard. Nessos has a full human forepart, long hair and beard, horse-ears and a turned-up nose. He twists his upper torso round and stretches out his hands imploringly to Herakles, while his human legs climb the curve of the tondo. Herakles seizes his front hair with his left hand, and raises his sword in his right. According to the description, the object hanging down between Herakles' legs is his scabbard.

Date: c.530 B.C. (Aukt.Basel, presumably so late because of the folds in Herakles' chiton?).

An East Greek onyx scarab of the second half of the 6th century has a fine representation of a centaur carrying a woman in his arms (Boardman, AGG 54, 58, pls. VII, XL, no.108). This may be intended as Nessos with Deianeira, but, as Boardman remarks, the wreath in the centaur's hair must be a sign of festivity, so that a centaur abducting a Lapith woman is more likely, if indeed the artist had a specific story in mind. (See p.470+n.36). An agate scaraboid from Cyprus, of the end of the archaic or the beginning of the classical period, also has a centaur with human forelegs ending in hooves, carrying a woman (AGG 106, 108, pl.XXI, no.307).

The early scenes have been thoroughly discussed by the indefatigable Steuben and Fittschen.³⁹ There are several examples among the many representations of the late 8th and the 7th centuries in which a man fights a centaur, which may be Herakles and Nessos, but about which there can be no proof⁴⁰ (any example in which the centaur does not attack the man is a possibility).

As Steuben notes, the earliest certain representations, of the second half of the 7th century (attested by inscription or, beyond reasonable doubt, by the presence of a woman), show two schemes: one in which Herakles and Nessos face each other, and one in which Herakles attacks Nessos from behind. The former appears in two Protoattic examples,⁴¹ but it is the latter, considered Corinthian by Steuben, which takes over at the end of the 7th century with black-figure⁴² and remains almost unchallenged throughout the archaic period. Unlike the Pholos episode, however, it enjoys no new lease of life in late archaic times; it is most popular in the first three-quarters of the 6th century.

Once again the majority of the surviving examples are Attic, and their chief characteristics are as follows: Deianeira is present in most, often either seated on Nessos' back⁴³ or, especially in early examples, carried in his arms,⁴⁴ but sometimes just standing by.⁴⁵ In the earliest examples, Herakles wears a tunic without the lion-skin,⁴⁶ but the latter appears as early as 'Tyrrhenian' worn over the head⁴⁷ (contrast Herakles and Pholos, p.466 above: the difference probably simply an accident of survival). In one or

two instances, Herakles is naked.⁴⁸ As Fittschen notes,⁴⁹ his usual weapon is the sword or the club; a few certain examples with bow are known from other schools (see below). Herakles rushes on Nessos from behind; occasionally he has not quite caught up,⁵⁰ but most commonly he grabs his arm,⁵¹ sometimes his tail or rump,⁵² or, very occasionally, his hair.⁵³ Nessos usually trots to the right, looking back at Herakles, and sometimes extends an arm in entreaty. Occasionally he crumples to the ground as if already wounded.⁵⁴ Quite often he holds a stone in one or both hands, like the Mt. Pholoe centaurs.⁵⁵ He has equine forelegs.

The composition of the 'Little Master' cup described above is therefore close to the standard 6th century mainland version, with some variations. Herakles grasping Nessos' forelock is rare in Attic;⁵⁶ a long-haired Herakles is unusual in Attic, particularly at this date, and the tunic without lion-skin is also fairly rare after the first half of the century. Centaurs with full human foreparts are almost unknown after the 7th century, the exceptions being Chiron and Pholos.

The scheme is extremely similar to that of an early 7th century bone stepped seal from Perachora,⁵⁷ considered, no doubt rightly, to show Herakles and Nessos. The grasping of the forelock is also to be found on a bronze-relief from Perachora,⁵⁸ probably of early 6th century date; the centaur here also has human forelegs - Corinthian centaurs keep this feature in the early 6th century, after Attic ones have changed. In East Greece we have met the centaur

with human forepart at Assos after the mid-century, and Herakles without the lion-skin at Assos and Larisa (see pls. 83).⁵⁹

There is nothing noticeably East Greek about the style of our scene, except perhaps the head of the centaur, which seems closer to, e.g., Clazomenian or Caeretan than to mainland examples.⁶⁰

The Herakles and centaur of No. 1 above, on the other hand, are thoroughly East Greek in appearance, with fleshy features and portly figures (cf. the Larisa centaurs for a similar well-fed look). Herakles again has long hair and no lion-skin. The centaur is unarmed, and the scheme resembles the Nessos one, but Herakles uses the bow.

In the Protoattic fragments from the Argive Heraion⁶¹ the bow is Herakles' weapon, but it does not certainly appear again in this scene until the Caeretan hydriae; on two of these he carries both bow and club, on one he is actually shooting.⁶² A late archaic Cypriote seal⁶³ also shows him using the bow. (There is a possible example at Foce del Sele,⁶⁴ c.550, but the centaur rushes towards the Bowman and his woman, and is thought by the excavators to be Eurystion. Another very damaged metope seems to have a man alongside a centaur, and this, it seems, should be the Nessos story).

As we have seen, in the Pholos episode the centaurs almost always flee from Herakles' bow, often turning round with gestures of appeal, so that the bronze-relief may be an abbreviation of this theme. Indeed, if the relief covered a three- or four-sided object, the representation may have continued on another panel.⁶⁵ However,

the distribution of the other instances with bow could indicate an East Greek tradition for the Nessos scene, and, if this panel contains the whole scene, then Nessos seems a more likely candidate than just any centaur.

C. HERAKLES AND NEREUS OR TRITON.

Paris, Louvre MA 2828.

From Assos.

Pl. 87 a.

Ht. of frieze-block, c.81 cm.; ht. of the Nereids, c.60 cm.;
lgth. of block, 2.94 m.; lgth. of Triton, c.1.60 m; depth of
relief, c.5.5 - 3.0 cm.

For bibliography, see p.451 no.1. Adding: Enc. World Art VII,
pl.35, a good photograph.

This frieze-block from the temple at Assos was assigned by Clarke to the right-hand end of the east front, and by Sartiaux, more plausibly, to the centre of the west front. (In the following description the merman will be referred to as 'Triton', in accordance with the usual interpretation. See below, p.484).

The group of Herakles and Triton occupies more than half the block, at the right-hand end, and facing right. Triton's tail has four very shallow curves, never rising more than halfway up the field. His upper torso is completely smooth, leaving no indication of where his fish-part started (navel or breast), or whether he was clothed. His upper torso is not fully upright, and there is a space between the top of his head and the upper border. He has fine features (nose, lips, and part of cheek remain), long hair, and a large beard. He looks straight ahead, raising his left hand, in which he holds something curved.

Herakles, naked but for this quiver, with short hair and a small

beard, leans forward almost at full stretch beside Triton, his right knee close to the ground, his left sharply bent. He reaches with his left arm behind Triton's shoulders to grasp his left wrist, and with his right hand seizes the merman's right wrist: a grip unique among surviving representations. The figures of Herakles and Triton are on a comparable scale, with Herakles just a little smaller. Six women on a very much smaller scale occupy the rest of the block, hurrying off to the left, the last two partly masked by Triton's tail. They wear long, belted robes with an overfall at the waist. Three of the women (alternating) look back at the struggle; the positions and gestures vary very slightly, except for that of the first, who raises both arms in the air. The gestures certainly indicate anxiety or distress, and the attitude of the first woman must surely mark the end of the scene.

Date: third quarter of the 6th century.

Herakles was obliged to wrestle with Nereus, the omniscient Old Man of the Sea (who, like his daughter Thetis, had the power to transform himself into different shapes), to induce him to reveal the way to the Garden of the Hesperides. There seems no mythological explanation for his fight with Triton, a son of Poseidon. Both are attested by inscriptions on some vases. The iconography of the two scenes,

and the development of the second out of the first, were ably described and discussed by Buschor more than thirty years ago.⁶⁶ The account which follows will, therefore, be as brief as possible.

The earliest certain⁶⁷ representation, probably of the late 7th or early 6th century, occurs on an Island gem.⁶⁸ There is no means of identifying the merman, who is armless and has a short, slightly wavy tail. He seems to wear a belt, but to be otherwise naked. Herakles, possibly also wearing just a belt, or in a short chiton, and with quiver on his back, strides out alongside him, gripping him in a stranglehold; he passes his left arm around his neck, and holds it firm at the wrist with his right hand. Both figures are bearded; the merman's hair looks longer. Both face the same way.

The great majority of the other representations are on Attic vases. A small group in the first half of the 6th century clearly show Herakles and Nereus (e.g. pl. 87c)⁶⁹ Nereus' tail has three fairly deep curves. Herakles, dwarfed by the merman, sits astride the first curve, usually gripping Nereus as on the seal. Both figures wear chitons, and Herakles has a quiver, but no lion-skin. He looks back in fear at Nereus' mutations, which spring up in the form of a snake or flames from his tail. Nereus, a dignified, often balding, old man, looks straight ahead, raising his hands in shock. There are sometimes onlookers.

On vases of the second half of the century, Triton has taken Nereus' place in this scene, which is extremely popular in later Bf.

(Pl.88c). Nereus himself in his few appearances on vases is now fully human.⁷⁰ Triton shows no signs of age, and no mutations. The curves of his tail are very close together, the central one reaching the height of his head. He is almost invariably naked.⁷¹ Herakles, much more evenly matched in size than in the early scenes, is almost always astride, clothed usually with the lion-skin, and often wearing the quiver. His hold changes, being now usually around Triton's left shoulder and under his right arm-pit, and he often locks his fingers tightly together. Triton normally turns his head back, so that Herakles' head appears in front of the merman's, with a 'double-herm' effect; in a few examples, curiously, Herakles' face is completely hidden.⁷² There are often one or two onlookers, to whom Triton extends a hand in entreaty; they frequently include an old man ('Nereus'), and frightened women ('Nereids')⁷³.

The precise moment of change is difficult to determine, and, as might be expected, a number of hybrids occur between the two clear types, around 550 B.C. and a little later. Boardman⁷⁴ has drawn attention to the fact that Nereus turns back like Triton on the only surviving shield-band representation,⁷⁵ dated c.555-540. Another 'conflation' occurs in the tondo of a lip-cup by the Xenokles Painter,⁷⁶ of c.550: the scheme is exactly that of Herakles and Triton, but what look like flames spring from the merman's tail. More puzzling, and more interesting for us, is the picture on the shoulder of a hydria,⁷⁷ datable perhaps c.540, (pl.88a). Here Herakles, naked, appears astride the merman, holding him in the older manner, as seen on the

early Nereus vases and the Island gem. Both combatants look straight ahead, and the merman gestures like Nereus. His tail has various thin lines, done in dilute glaze, springing from it; it may be that all these are meant as fins (and it is true that properly drawn fins appear in these positions, even by the tail, on many of the later scenes), but they are certainly reminiscent of Nereus' flames. The face of the merman is closer to the 'old man' heads of Nereus on the early vases, than to the robust, 'prime of life' Triton-heads on the later ones, and I incline to think that this is Nereus still, despite the fact that Herakles does not turn back his head.

There are at least four other examples of c.550-540 where both combatants look straight ahead;⁷⁸ in three of them Herakles is naked, and is not astride the merman (for these, see below,).

The most important Attic representations, however, are the two poros pedimental groups from the Acropolis. The 'Smaller Herakles pediment',⁷⁹ dated to c.580, resembles the early group of vase-pictures in that the merman faces forward with arm raised in front of him, while Herakles grips him in the stranglehold; Herakles' head is missing, and so is most of the merman's tail, so that it is not known whether mutations were shown. In the 'Larger Herakles pediment',⁸⁰ of c.560-50, thought to be from the Hekatompedon, the way in which Herakles grapples is not absolutely clear, but the merman's head was either frontal, or turned slightly towards his adversary. The first pediment is therefore usually interpreted as the struggle with Nereus,⁸¹ the second, as that with Triton. Both show significant differences from the majority

of the vase-paintings: i) the curves of the tail are shallower (chiefly because of the shape of the field). ii) Herakles, and apparently the merman also, is naked in both cases. iii) Instead of bestriding the merman, Herakles is alongside him, in the earlier example kneeling on one knee, in the later also on one knee, but in a much more extended position, almost as he appears in some of the Herakles-and-Lion scenes where the combatants wrestle on the ground⁸² (these begin in the third quarter of the century).

A handful of Attic vase-paintings show a similar composition,⁸³ with a naked Herakles, (though the merman is in a more upright posture, and has a deeply-curving tail as in the other painted examples). Pl. 88b shows the scene from a hydria in the Louvre.

The composition of the group in the later pediment particularly, is very close to that on the Assos relief, and, not surprisingly, Attic influence on Assos has been suggested, for this and other reasons.⁸⁴ I wonder, however, whether the schema with Herakles astride the merman, which survives only on Attic vases, may not be a vase-painter's invention, the other schema, with Herakles alongside, being more widely current in Greece as a whole. It may be argued that in the case of the pediments it is more effective to have Herakles nearer the spectator, and that it is also essential because of the shape of the pediment to give the merman a less deeply-curving tail. This is probably true, and yet these features occur on the Island gem and the shield-band relief, where there is no such constraint.

Two other objects whose photographs have been published in the last few years perhaps add weight to my argument. The first, certainly non-Attic, is a terracotta arula of Sicilian type,⁸⁵ dated by Devambez in his preliminary publication to the third quarter of the 6th century. On the front in relief appears a large and splendid merman, with four shallow curves in his tail, as at Assos, and clad in a tunic to his waist. What looks like a fillet binds his luxuriant hair. He looks straight ahead. Above his tail, stretched out as if swimming, appears the small figure of Herakles, clad in a chiton. He grasps the merman's back hair with one hand, one of his fins with the other, and presses one foot against the tail.

The second, which there is no reason to think Attic, is a very fragmentary bronze relief (pl. 89a),⁸⁶ found at Cyrene with marble sculptures dated around 550 B.C. The subject is described by Goodchild, Pedley and White as 'two wrestlers', but the curving tail of the merman is clearly visible on the left-hand fragment (which is wrongly positioned). Herakles' legs may be seen on the near-side of the merman's body, his right knee almost touching the ground. He wears a tunic, but it is impossible to tell whether the merman is clothed. The latter leans forward, so that his head is lower than that of Herakles, who grips him around the neck, locking his fingers to maintain the hold. One of the merman's hands is visible, grasping Herakles' left arm.

There is no means of deciding whether Nereus or Triton is involved in these two cases. Both mermen face forward, and the Sicilian is clothed - both unusual for Triton on Attic vases, but no sure criterion

either there or here.

Returning to Assos, the scene is generally accepted as the struggle with Triton rather than Nereus. It certainly seems that the mutations, the particular hallmark of Nereus, are lacking (there seems little room for painted mutations); there are no mutations, however, on the early Bf Boeotian amphoriskos⁸⁷ with, presumably, Nereus. The damaged object in the merman's hand is intriguing: the 'tail' does not look quite right for a fish, though its worn state defies certainty; one thinks of the snake held by Nereus on the Sophilos krater, (pl.87c). It must be admitted, however, that it is more likely a fish, as on several 'Triton' scenes including the Louvre hydria mentioned above (pl.88b). This would not exclude Nereus, who appears in human form holding a fish,⁸⁸ like his overlord, Poseidon. A third possibility is a wreath or garland: seemingly an odd thing for a merman to hold, but several lone mermen in East Greek art carry one with apparent enthusiasm.⁸⁹

The women in the scene must be the Nereids, running away as they run from the encounter between Peleus and Thetis;⁹⁰ they certainly appear on later Triton scenes,⁹¹ but there seems no reason why the merman here should not be their father Nereus,⁹² as I believe him to be on the Attic hydria discussed above (p;480 , pl.88a).

Incidentally, the nakedness of male figures on the Assos reliefs has been regarded as alien to East Greek art, and a sign of influence from mainland Greece. The servant-boy on the 'Banquet' block (pl.87b), wears a short chiton (visible between his legs), and the reclining men

are certainly clothed also, as in other East Greek banquet scenes (look, for instance at the outline of their hips, and compare the legs of the first man with those of the Nereids: clearly these fine details were accentuated in paint).

This leaves Herakles in the two combat scenes. It is possibly unusual to see him naked in the Pholos episode. The Nereus/Triton scene, however, is a wrestling-match, and wrestlers appear naked in East Greek art,⁹³ so that it is not essential to explain this detail by postulating outside influence.

Clearly, the Doric style of the temple at Assos is strange for East Greece, and mainland influence must have been at work in some way on the architecture, but, as far as the sculptures are concerned, I can see no feature of composition or detail of iconography (with the possible exception of the attitudes of Herakles and Pholos, which appear so early in Protocorinthian), which can convincingly be shown to derive from outside East Greece.⁹⁴

D. Herakles and the Nemean Lion.

Rhodes, Museum, Inv. 13.339.

From Makri Langoni (Camirus), Tomb 211.

Pl. 90 a.

Ht. of amphora, 33 cm.

Cl.Rh. IV, 141, fig. 138, pl.II (side B, fig.139). CVA Rhodes 1, pls. III F 1, 3. R.M. Cook, BSA 47, 1952, 140.e.

On an amphora of special shape, with plump body, cylindrical neck without offset lip, and double handles. The figures are in a dull red glaze, with details in creamy-white paint (no incision).

The lion is at the left, with one back foot only on the ground, presumably to be thought of as springing forward; he has spotted face and paws, a very curly tail, a wavy, floppy lower lip, and a nose-wart, possibly with hairs (Cl.Rh. IV, pl.II, but not visible in the photograph, and absent in the CVA drawing). His mane is shown by white hairs around the outline only, and he has wild-looking back- and belly-manes also. Herakles strides forward from the right and seizes the lion by a forepaw, grasping the club in his other hand. He has a beard, short hair bound with a fillet, and wears a short spotted chiton.

The technique is that of the Clazomenian sarcophagi (cf. the Cyme krater, another Clazomenian-influenced pot, CVA BM 8 pl.II Dn 14); The lion is extremely close to those of the sarcophagi; for the particular curl of the tail, cf. CVA BM 8, pl.II Dq 2.

Date: last quarter of the 6th century. With the amphora was a plain black glaze Attic cup of the late 6th century.

Herakles' struggle with the Nemean lion is, to judge by the surviving material, the most popular mythological scene in 6th century Greek art. It seems likely that some of the many man-and-lion encounters in 8th and 7th century art of various schools must represent this myth,⁹⁵ though the earliest certain example is as late as c.630 B.C., and there are very few more before the end of the century.⁹⁶

In some of these early scenes Herakles wields the sword, in others he wrestles with the lion.⁹⁷ Both these methods of dealing with the animal were current throughout the 6th century (though wrestling was much the most popular), and part of the importance of the few certain 7th century examples lies in the fact that they show both versions of the story to have been current at an early date.

Attic vases and the 'Argive-Corinthian' shield-bands provide the vast majority of the surviving archaic examples, in a very few basic compositions. (From the third quarter of the 6th century, the favourite composition in Attic black-figure (and red-figure) was that in which Herakles wrestled with the lion on the ground, head to head.⁹⁸ This scheme, however, is not relevant to the discussion of the Rhodes amphora.)

The early schemes, which continued to be used throughout the century, though with diminishing popularity, were versions of a standing fight. A representative selection of them appears on pls. 90-92, and they will be summarized here:

1. Pl. 91a . Herakles and lion side by side, facing right. Lion standing, lifting one forepaw, or occasionally with both forepaws off

the ground as if Herakles were hauling him up. Herakles almost kneeling, holding lion in stranglehold with one arm round its neck, the wrist gripped by the other hand.

Examples: the earliest shield-bands, of the late 7th century, and other shield-bands over the first half of the 6th century;⁹⁹ some Attic Bf examples of the first half of the century;¹⁰⁰ a few early 6th century instances in other schools.¹⁰¹ Very rare after the mid-century.¹⁰²

2. a. Pl.91b,e. Herakles and lion facing each other, Herakles usually at left. Lion stands on hind legs, pawing at Herakles, and sometimes lifts a back leg to claw his thigh. In Attic, it very often turns back its head, as if trying to break free. Herakles grasps it round neck, sometimes with both arms, as in 1), sometimes with left arm, while seizing its paw with right hand; sometimes grasps its mouth with left hand, as if to pull head back, or prevent jaws from closing.

- b. Pl.91d . As 2a), but Herakles holds a sword in right hand, plunging it into lion's chest.

Examples: shield-bands, from the first quarter of the 6th century;¹⁰³ many Attic Bf vases (the most popular position around the middle and third quarter of the century);¹⁰⁴ a few examples from elsewhere.¹⁰⁵

3. a. A variant of 2), or, according to Kunze, of 1). Herakles and lion both to right, side by side; lion usually behind Herakles. Lion stands on hind legs, sometimes with back paw clawing at Herakles' leg, and usually with head turned back. Herakles grasps it as before.

b. As 3a), but Herakles wields sword as in 2b.

Examples: Attic Bf, almost entirely of Group E.¹⁰⁶

In these first three types, the combatants are at very close quarters; in the next, Herakles holds the lion at arm's length:

4. a. Pl. 90c,i. Herakles and lion stand facing, lion on hind legs.

Herakles takes lion by throat with left hand, occasionally apparently by mane, and grasps its forepaw with his right hand.

b. Pl. 90c,ii. As 4a), but Herakles wields sword in right hand, sometimes plunging it into lion's chest.

Examples: shield-bands: from second quarter of 6th century;¹⁰⁷

a few Attic vase pictures of the second half of the century, which may be simply a loose form of 2).¹⁰⁸

The club as Herakles' weapon against the lion does not appear long before the mid-6th century,¹⁰⁹ and is never very popular. In many of the scenes in which it appears (almost entirely late black-figure), Herakles is at some distance from the lion, running towards it as it crouches to spring,¹¹⁰ (cf. pl. 92a). Only occasionally has he got to close quarters to use it. (Pl. 92b).¹¹¹ The shield-bands, a comparatively rich source for the other types, provide only one very late example where Herakles brandishes the club.¹¹²

There is no very close parallel for the composition on the Rhodes amphora, but no. 4) above most resembles it, not fortuitously. Kunze has already pointed out¹¹³ the connection of 4b) with a version of the 'Hero killing Lion' which was current in Near Eastern art from very

early times. (It seems to me that 4a) too could well derive from a Near Eastern type, though Kunze sees it simply as the beginning of the wrestling-match). The schema of the Rhodes amphora is clearly a variant of 4b), the club being substituted for the sword. The 'Cypro-Phoenician' silver-gilt bowl from Idalion,¹¹⁴ probably of late 7th century date, may be used to illustrate both forms (Pl. 90b .)

Kunze refers to A. Moortgat, Tammuz 9ff., where some Near Eastern examples down to the late 7th century are given.¹¹⁵ The type of the hero with sword is found on 8th century Cretan bronzes of very oriental character.¹¹⁶ Examples exist in 6th century Cypriot relief-sculpture, including one of Herakles himself.¹¹⁷ East Greek gems, perhaps made in Cyprus, offer many examples where the lion is being grasped by the paw (most of these variants of the Master or Mistress of Animals pose, where the lion is dominated rather than killed: cf. Pl. 20).¹¹⁸ All these Near Eastern or East Greek/Cypriot examples have the lion in a more upright position, and, where a weapon is involved, use the sickle or sword; nevertheless, the composition of the Rhodes amphora must belong with them.¹¹⁹

An unusual feature of the fight, shared by the otherwise more orthodox Caeretan hydria version,¹²⁰ is that Herakles is at the right.

The lion has a number of East Greek characteristics:

1. Back- and belly-manes. The best discussion of these features is that of W.L. Brown in 'The Etruscan Lion', dealing also with the question of influence on Etruscan art.¹²¹ P. Amandry in the preliminary publication of the Delphi gold plaques gives Near Eastern examples for the two

types of mane.¹²² H. Gabelmann deals with the East Greek and the late archaic Attic examples.¹²³

Both types of mane appear in isolated instances in Greece before the mid-6th century,¹²⁴ but it is East Greece which really adopts them around 550, and exports them to Attica before the end of the century. In surviving East Greek art, the full back-mane appears on the gold reliefs from Delphi,¹²⁵ of c.550, on several marble lions,¹²⁶ on the 'Egyptian-Greek' vase from Saqqara,¹²⁷ on a set of terracotta revetment plaques,¹²⁸ and on some late archaic gems¹²⁹ and coins.¹³⁰ The back-mane above the tail only is found on one stone lion,¹³¹ on Clazomenian sarcophagi¹³² and some related vases¹³³ (including our amphora), on situlae,¹³⁴ and on a coin of Colchis¹³⁵ of c.480, as well as on the Caeretan hydriae, (e.g. Pl.91c.)¹³⁶

In the case of the Delphi plaques, two at least of the lions just mentioned,¹³⁷ the Clazomenian examples, our vase, some gems¹³⁸ and the Caeretan hydriae, the back-mane is combined with a belly-mane, complete in the case of most of the gems and of the Caeretan hydriae, behind the front legs only in the other examples. A fine early example of a complete belly-mane occurs on an Ionian 'Little Master' lion,¹³⁹ whose back is unfortunately missing. This lion, possibly the earliest of the pottery examples, also shows the large, shaggy head-mane going back straight from the face, which is a feature of the lions mentioned above, in all materials.

The reclining lion from the Lion Tomb,¹⁴⁰ from Xanthos in Lycia (second half of the 6th century?) has no back mane, but seems to have

belly-tufts behind the front legs.

Two fine examples of full back-mane from areas other than East Greece, Attica or Etruria, come from Paros and Centuripe.¹⁴¹ Both are reliefs with a lion attacking a bull. The Sicilian example, (pl. 89b), has full belly-mane also, (this may apply to the Paros lion too - it is uncertain from the photograph). The date of both must be c. 525 or a little later, and East Greek influence seems very likely.

Instances of the back- and belly-manes begin to appear in Attic art around 525 B.C.¹⁴² As has been mentioned, Gabelmann discusses the marble examples. A lion from the Kerameikos¹⁴³ is apparently the only surviving Attic stone lion to have the back-mane at the bottom of the back only; the other with this feature have the continuous type of mane. According to Gabelmann, also, the belly-mane was completely ousted by the back-mane, and there are no examples of back- and belly-manes together, as in East Greece (judging from his list, however, the surviving complete Attic lions of this date are extremely few).

In vase-painting the position is rather different. It is true that where the back-mane occurs, it seems to be normally of the continuous kind (though, in a far from exhaustive survey, I have found one certain exception, on an amphora by the Painter of Brunswick 218,¹⁴⁴ and one possible one, on a lekythos by the Theseus Painter).¹⁴⁵ The combination of back- and belly-manes, however, is to be found in a number of cases, including a fine Segment Class cup,¹⁴⁶ and an amphora by the Alkmene Painter, (pl. 92b).¹⁴⁷ The back-mane appears without the belly-mane in a number of late Bf examples,¹⁴⁸ and is also to be

seen of Leopard-skins in early Rf.¹⁴⁹

Further, the belly-mane alone, in the form of tufts behind the front legs, enjoys a considerable vogue in early red-figure. It appears, for example, on 'real' lions on an amphora by the Andokides Painter, a cup by Oltos and a hydria of the Pioneer Group, as well as on slightly later lions by Myson, the Berlin, Kleophrades and Syriskos Painters;¹⁵⁰ and on shield-device lions in the swinging, 'rump-in-air' posture (see below), by Oltos (several), Euphronios,^(pl.92c) Douris and the Brygos Painter.¹⁵¹

A feature which appears in no surviving East Greek examples to my knowledge, is sometimes combined with the belly-mane in these late archaic Attic examples: this is the 'tail-mane', a row of tufts on the rump below the tail. The Alkmene Painter favours it (pl.92b), it appears on a lekythos by the Diosphos Painter, and on the Pioneer Group hydria mentioned above.¹⁵² Many late Bf lions have, not actual tufts, but incised lines, under their tails (and some have them under the belly also), and it may be that these are a simplified form of the tufted mane.¹⁵³ This 'tail-mane' is to be found on the Perachora stone lion, of the early 6th century (as are tufts behind the front legs), and on one of the poros lionesses from the Acropolis, (also, earlier, in the form of incised lines on the Chigi Vase lion).¹⁵⁴ Gabelmann in his discussion of the first of these notes that Assyrian lions of the 9th and 8th centuries show such a mane, but that it has disappeared in 7th century examples.¹⁵⁵ It has an earlier history: it appears in Mycenaean art.¹⁵⁶ There seem to be no instances of it among Brown's Etruscan lions until the 4th century (Chimaera of Arezzo).¹⁵⁷ Its

resurgence in late 6th century Attic vase-painting is puzzling; as it is combined with a lion-type of clear East Greek inspiration, one wonders whether it was to be found also on East Greek lions which have not survived.

Gabelmann, remarking¹⁵⁸ on the 'rump-in-air' crouch of the late archaic Attic lions, believes the posture to have been given to stone lions by Attic sculptors. This may be so, but the inspiration may well have come to them from East Greece along with the heavy head-mane and the back- and belly-manes, even though surviving East Greek stone lions do not show it. Gabelmann himself notes that the position was used earlier in vase-painting, though rather seldom for lions (he gives 7th century examples: a Cretan sphinx, and Protocorinthian dogs); A form of it is certainly in use for lions on Fikellura vases,¹⁵⁹ for instance, dated c.560 by R.M. Cook, and the Ionian Little Master lion¹⁶⁰ is in a posture not far removed from it. It appears also on some 6th century East Greek gems, and is noted by Boardman.¹⁶¹

2. Nose-wart, Nose-hairs. The discrepancies in the published drawings of the lion (mentioned in the description of the scene) make it uncertain whether the wart on the bridge of its nose is smooth, or hairy. Both types are known in Near Eastern art, the smooth kind being perhaps the more common (this may be partly due to the nature of the materials in which the lions appear: there are many Near Eastern stone lions, in the round and in relief, and on these it would have been difficult to show nose-hairs satisfactorily?). Late Hittite and Assyrian stone lions

have smooth warts;¹⁶² hairy ones appear on lions on metal-reliefs of the 8th and 7th centuries,¹⁶³ as well as on Lydian coins of the early 6th century.¹⁶⁴ In East Greek art, lions with nose-hairs appear on pottery and bronzework (pl.77a), in the late 7th of early 6th century,¹⁶⁵ and, after 550, on a bronze votive-shield from Samos,¹⁶⁶ on Clazomenian sarcophagi,¹⁶⁷ and occasionally on gems;¹⁶⁸ also on relief terracottas from Akalan.¹⁶⁹ Occasional examples occur in other parts of Greece at this time, one of the best being on the terracotta reclining lion from Praisos¹⁷⁰ (dated by Gabelmann to the third quarter of the century); here the two warts in relief have tiny incised lines, presumably meant to represent hairs.

3. 'Jaw-flaps'. These appear in a simple form on a stone lion from Smyrna, discussed by Llewellyn Brown¹⁷¹ in connection with Etruscan lions, and dated by Gabelmann around 550. Clazomenian lions have them, as well as East Greek bronze-relief lions,¹⁷² and lions on late archaic gems and coins.¹⁷³ The Praisos lion, mentioned above, is an excellent example, from outside East Greece. Lines marking off the lip-area are commonplace on Corinthian and Attic pottery from the 7th century on¹⁷⁴ (as, indeed, on 'Rhodian' and Chiot pottery), but actual flaps do not appear in Attic until the last quarter of the 6th century,¹⁷⁵ along with the 'East Greek' features already discussed. This, and the priority of the characteristic in East Greece, makes it likely that it entered Athens from this source.

Herakles dealing with the lion in an even more markedly oriental manner appears on two late 6th century East Greek seals (probably made

in Cyprus). On one (pl.23),¹⁷⁶ he grasps a subdued little lion by the ear; on the other,¹⁷⁷ he lifts a similarly insignificant beast by the tail. In both cases he is armed in Greek fashion, with the club. Both these schemes are common in Near Eastern art either for killing or for dominating animals (horses, bulls, sphinxes, griffins, not just lions), though the former is perhaps more often used for animal-slaying scenes, the latter for the Master or Mistress of Beasts, with an animal in each hand.¹⁷⁸

Akurgal discusses the former scheme in connection with the lion-slayer of the Lion Tomb from Xanthos,¹⁷⁹ and maintains that there is no instance of it in true Greek art. It was accepted, as we have seen, for Herakles to seize the lion by throat or mane while killing it, but where the gesture of grasping a lion's ear or the top of its head appears in Greek art, it is normally associated with dominating rather than killing, like the tail-holding scheme.¹⁸⁰

NOTES TO CHAPTER IVHerakles and Pholos

1. a) Berlin 2686, Brommer, H. and Centaurs C.1; Fittschen SB9; Schefold, ML pl.24a. b) Athens, NM, from Perachora, Brommer C.6; Fittschen SB 10; Perachora II pl.48 no.1114.
2. K. Fittschen, 'Untersuchungen zu Beginn der Sagendarstellungen bei den Griechen' (1969), 111ff., lists and discusses all the 8th and 7th century examples, with full bibliography. See also H.von Steuben, Frühe Sagendarstellungen in Korinth und Athen (1968), 23-24, 26-28, 114.
3. Rhodian, first quarter of the 7th cent., BM 6410-71237, Fittschen SB 6, Schiering, Werkstätten pl.1.1.
4. MPC oenochoe, NC 129, pl.7; ?LC hydria, Bull.Met.Mus. 34, 1939,99.
5. Perachora II, 115.
6. i) see n.1b ; ii) see n.7 .
7. Brommer, H. and Pholos C.1, Louvre L 173, Schefold, ML pl.62.
8. Apoll. Bibl. II.V.4. For an account of the literary sources, see Foce del Sele II, 139. Some scholars have thought that the weapon carried by the man attacking a centaur on the aryballos by the Ajax Painter, Boston MFA 9512, was a firebrand; see Fittschen 119ff. for bibliography and further discussion. A later example apparently with firebrands is the 'Pontic' amphora, Oxford 1971.911, Sotheby Sale Cat. 1st July 1969, Lot 224, Plate.
9. NC 129; Adelt. 1,1915, Parart.47; 2, 1916, 187. The scene with

- Herakles shooting occurred on the Chest of Gypselos (Paus.V.19.9),
 u) but Pausanias does not mention Pholos. A centaur with human
 forepart, mentioned a little earlier, is apparently Chiron (V.17.7.).
10. Slightly earlier is Athens, NM 16400, from Vari, Fittschen SB 23.
 A considerably earlier possible example (c.650), Athens, Kerameikos
 Inv. 98, Fittschen SB 17, fragments with remains of at least three
 centaurs.
 11. JdI 13, 1898, pl.I.1.
 12. CVA Musée Rodin 1, pl.13.11; connected with the Gorgon Painter;
 Brommer A 21. Though see Steuben, op.cit. 24 - 'Oreios'.
 13. Another pre-550 example, worn in the same way, CVA Mus. Cap. 1,
 pl.III H 9-10.
 14. i) Aukt.Basel 43, 1967, no.123; ii) Aukt.Luzern 3, 1961, no.91.
 15. See n.13
 16. One of the earliest examples with lion-skin over head: Berlin
 F 1737, Greifenhagen, Ant.Kunstwerke (2nd ed.) pl.27, Brommer A.18.
 17. e.g. Florence 3824, Brommer A.46; CVA Florence 5, pl.10. These
 become large boulders by early Rf: e.g. Lullies/Hirmer, Griechische
Vasen pls. 84, 85.(possibly influenced by Lapith-and-Centaur scenes;
 see AA 1962, 745, Abb. 2, 6-8).
 18. e.g. Brommer, H. and Pholos A.47 Baur, Centaurs, pl.3, no.132.
 Could this possibly be connected with Stesichorus' Geryoneis, which
 we know from a fragment to have contained an account of Herakles'
 meeting with Pholos? See Robertson, CQ 19.2, 1969, 207-221.

19. e.g. Brommer A.39, Baur, Centaurs, pl.4, no.268.
20. e.g. Brommer A.36, Gerhard, AV II, pl.119-120.
21. Exception: Brommer A.34, Mingazzini pl.69.5, 72.1, 2 (Antimenes Painter).
22. See n.19.
23. e.g. Brommer A.33, Albizzati pl.55.
24. e.g. Boeotian kantharos, c.550, CVA Munich 3, pl.147
25. CVA Louvre 1, pl.III Dc 7.2; A. Lane, BSA 34, 1933-34, 147, 163; B.B. Shefton, BSA 49, 1954, 302.
26. See Foce del Sele II, 116-117; the authors believe that the artist intended this figure as Pholos. It does not seem likely.
27. Rumpf, Ch.V. pl.211, 'Group of the Polyphemus Amphora', c.530.
28. Foce del Sele II, 111-140, pls.52-60.
29. See Foce del Sele II, 128, and cf. no.4 above, p.458.
30. NSc. 1897, 350ff; 11, 1957, 186; Mon.Ant. 23, 1916, 909.
31. S. Mollard-Besques, Musée du Louvre, Cat. Rais. des Figurines et Reliefs en Terre cuite, Vol.i, 31-32, B 180-182, pls. 22, 23; cf.BSA 11, 1904-05, 256 Fig.20; AJA 5, 1901, 390, fig.20. For the date, see Fittschen 125 n.630a.
32. G. Pesce, Boll. d'Arte 29, 1935-36, 233 ff.
33. Aukt. Luzern 1, 1959, no.129; L. Banti, St.Etr. 34, 1966, 372, fig. 1b, pl.73 (cf. the 'red-ware' brazier thought by Banti to copy the Tityos Painter's composition, op.cit. 371, fig.1a, pl.74a; the position of the pithos is hard to judge here).

34. i) Munich, Jahn 151; Sieveking and Hackl, Die Königliche Vasensammlung zu München, 100, no.838; ii) Oxford 1971.911, see n.8.
35. See Baur, Centaurs, 110 ff. (some pre-550); Campana dinos frag., CVA Villa Giulia 3, pl. Italia 99.4,6, (this painter's satyrs also have human feet). It is, of course, possible that some, if not all, the Etruscan examples are simply a continuation of the early tradition, derived probably from imported Corinthian works, in the late 7th and early 6th centuries. All these types of centaur appear on 'Pontic' vases.
36. East Greek examples of known origin are from S. Aeolis and N. Ionia (most of the satyrs are from this area too). Baur, Centaurs, 130 ff; gives examples, both East Greek and Etruscan (not enough remains of his no.321, the Clazomenian sherds AD II pl.56, to be sure). A late archaic Cypriot limestone group of centaur and woman, T. Spiteris, The Art of Cyprus, 174. Boardman, AGG pls.VII (no.108), XXI (no.307), for gems; see also p.58 with n.29, for Caeretan centaurs. An interesting split between the Campana dinoi painters on this: the 'Ribbon Painter' has two vases with centaurs, Jb.Berl.Mus. V, 1963, 112 figs. 5,6, and 115 fig.10; unfortunately we do not know whether he gave satyrs hooves too. In the Northampton Group, the ^ecentaurs have equine forelegs (CVA Munich 6, pl.299), while on the Northampton vase itself, one satyr has human feet, the other three have hooves, (Gerhard, AV IV pls. 117-118, incorrect for flute-player - see Beazley, BSR II, 1929, pl.II.4).

37. Gerhard, AV II pl.120.1, Berlin F 1670.
38. See n.27.
39. Steuben 24-26, 113; Fittschen 111ff. Brommer, Vasenlisten² for lists.
40. Fittschen believes the late 8th century bronze group, his SB 1, to be the earliest; cf. also Boardman, IGems pl.14, C13B.
41. C. Waldstein, Argive Heraion II, pl.67 (Fittschen SB 8); JHS 32, 1912, pls. 10-12 (Fittschen SB 13).
42. A/H/S pl.20 (the Nessos Painter's amphora).
43. e.g. Gerhard, AV II pl.117-118.
44. e.g. Albizzati pl.30. Cf. the 'Cycladic' polychrome plate, Délos X 27ff, pls. 11, 57,63, R.M. Cook, GPP 115.
45. e.g. CVA Louvre 3, pl.III He 11.5.
46. e.g. A/H/S pl.20; Baur, Centaurs no.163, fig.9.
47. e.g. Baur pl.1.
48. Baur pl.8; J. Roulez, Choix des Vases Peints du Musée des Antiquités de Leide, pl.8.2.
49. Fittschen 126.
50. e.g. Baur no.163, fig.9.
51. e.g. CVA BM 4, pl.III He 70.2.
52. e.g. CVA Louvre 3, pl.III He 11.5.
53. e.g. A/H/S pl.20; Baur pl.8.
54. e.g. Berlin, Charlottenburg, Führer 1968, pl.47. Cf the Sicilian arula, Rev. du Louvre 1971, 181 ff. (Mon.Piot 1972 forthcoming).

55. e.g. CVA Naples 1, pl.III He 1.5.
56. Baur pl.8 - the only example known to me.
57. Perachora II 414, pl.175 no.A 29 (Fittschen SB 14).
58. Perachora I, 145, pl.47, 3, 4; cf. also the ivory-relief, AO pl.101.
59. It should be noted, however, that early examples of Herakles in the lion-skin (worn in an unusual way, with the head showing beneath his arm) do survive from East Greece: Chiot sherds, probably not later than c.575, i) Graef I pl.15 (now in glorious technicolor, Charbonneaux, Martin, Villard, Archaic Greek Art, fig.39); ii) Price pl.VI.19. Cf. 'Melian', Pfuhl, MuZ pl.110.
60. Satyrs: Claz., CVA BM 8, pl.II Dn 11.3; Caer., Mon.Piot 44, 1950, pl.III The Amasis Painter's satyrs are not unlike.
61. See n.41.
62. Mon.Piot 41, 1946, pl.6; 44, 1950, pls. 3.3, 3.1.
63. AGG pl.V.72.
64. Foce del Sele II, 167, pls. 64, 65; 215, pl.76.
65. Cf. Loeb Tripod A, with Pegasus & Bellerophon in one panel, the Chimaera in the next facing them, AJA 12, 1908, pls. IX, X.
- Herakles and Nereus/Triton.
66. E. Buschor, 'Meermänner', Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1941, II.1. Brommer, Vasenlisten² for vases..
67. See Boardman, BICS 5, 1958,9, for the first reference to fragments from Perachora possibly from this scene; also Steuben 29.
68. Boardman, IGems 51, 91, pl.VII, no.181.
69. See n.67.

70. First definitely on the François Vase (FR pl.1-2); see Buschor, op. cit. 20ff.
71. An exception, Brommer A 46, CVA Naples 1, pl.III He 1.3,4: Almost identical scenes, one to the left, one to the right, on both sides, but on one the merman wears a tunic (on the other, as on many Triton scenes, he appears naked with remarkably well-developed, but flabby, pectoral muscles!). The vase looks quite early: c.540?
72. e.g. Brommer A7, A8, Langlotz, Würzburg pl.55, nos.189, 191 (both near the Antimenes Painter).
73. See n.72, and, e.g., Brommer A56, CVA Louvre 6, pl.III He 68; A63, CVA BM 6, pl.III He 78.4.
74. See n.67.
75. Ol.Forsch. II, 108ff, pl.54.
76. A/H/S pl.CIV.
77. Brommer A74, CVA Mus.Cap. 1, pl.III H 26.3, Conservatori 158.
78. i) Brommer A63, CVA BM 6, pl.III He 78.4, BM B 311. Presumably Triton, as he has red hair and an old man watches. For the other three see n.83 below.
79. Th.Wiegand, Die Poros-Architektur der Acropolis zu Athen, 195, Abb. 213; R. Heberdey, Altattische Porosskulptur, 13, pl.V.
80. Wiegand, op.cit. 82, pl.IV. Heberdey, op.cit. 46, pl.III. Modern photograph and bibliography, Lullies, Greek Sculpture, 58, pl.26. The usual date given is c.570; this seems to me too early. See now Boardman, RA 1972, 69.

81. Boardman, RA 1972, 70, rightly asserts that there is no certainty from the remains that this was Nereus.
82. e.g. Langlotz, Würzburg pl.97, no.310; cf. one of the earliest, by the Taleides Painter, WV 1889, pl.4.6 - not so stretched-out.
83. All c.550-40: i) hydria, Brommer A82, CVA Louvre 11, pl.III He 134.3, 5,6, ABV 313.2 below; ii) hydria, Brommer A124, Aukt.Basel 16, 1956, no.97; iii) band-cup (not in Brommer), Boll.d'Arte 47, 1962, 166 fig. 123.
84. e.g. Sartiaux, RA 22, 1913, 1-46, quoted by Caskey, Cat.of... Sculpture in MFAB, 13; P. Romanelli in EAAI 742. Most recently, Boardman, RA 1972, 70 n.3. See p.484.
85. La Revue du Louvre et des Musées de France, 1971, 181ff. (P.Devambe); also Mon.Piot 1972, forthcoming.
86. Libya Antiqua 3-4, 1966-67, 196, pl.72 (R.G. Goodchild, J.C. Pedley, D. White); for date, see also AJA 75, 1971, 41ff.
87. Antiken aus dem Akad. Kunstmus., Bonn, (1969), no.135. The 'horn-like projection' of the catalogue is surely just a fin.
88. e.g. CVA Karlsruhe 1, pl.13. 3,4. Rf: CVA BM 5, pl.III Ic 46.2.
89. i) coins of Cyzicus: Traité pl.VI, 31, 32, c.500? (Nomisma VII, 1912, no.126, Gp.II.b.c.); ii) Claz. oenochoe, AD II, pl.56.2, BSA 47, 1952, 135, dated c.530; iii) Claz. sarcophagus, last quarter 6th century in Smyrna, (pl.69a).
90. e.g. Ambush: 'Melian' amphora, D. Lazarides, Guide to Kavalla Museum, pl.28; LC krater, Schefold, ML pl.70b,c. Fight: e.g. Leagros Group, CVA Louvre 6, pl.III He 72.5.

91. See n.73.
92. They appear on vase-scenes where Herakles wrestles with Nereus in human shape: e.g. Brommer, Nereus A1, CVA BM 4, pl.III He 55.3; A2, Gerhard, AV II pl.LL2
93. e.g. Berlin Inv. 5844, BSA 47, 1952, pl.32. (Admittedly, though, some of the metope-figures may also be naked).
94. The article by J. Boardman, 'Herakles, Peisistratus and Sons', RA 1972 60 ff., appeared after this section was written. I agree with his later dating of the larger Herakles pediment at least (op.cit.69), and with his remarks (op.cit.70) on the interpretation of the smaller pediment. The down-dating of the larger pediment removes the time-gap between it and the early certain Triton scenes, and Boardman's hypothesis about the change from Nereus to Triton is ingenious. He notes, however, that there is no direct evidence to support his theory (that the scene became a symbol of Peisistratus' victory over a naval enemy, and therefore the innocent Nereus was replaced by the wicked, or more monstrous, Triton), and it seems to me that the existence of 'transitional' scenes such as I have described above weighs against it. One might expect, perhaps, if the theory were correct, to have some old-fashioned, or anti-Peisistratan artists continuing with the Nereus scene while the rest adopted Triton, but not to have some scenes, chronologically in the middle, which seem a cross between the two.

Herakles and Lion

95. Discussions: E. Kunze, Ol.Forsch.II 95-102 (early scenes, 100 n.3); Fittschen 76-88; Steuben 17-19, 112; Brommer, Vasenlisten² 85ff.
96. Transitional alabastron, NC no.83, fig.44 bis (Kunze 96, Steuben 112): sword, no actual contact with lion; Shield-band, Ol.Forsch.II pl.39: wrestling; Terracotta-reliefs from Sounion, Eph.Arch.1917, 197 fig.10 (Ol.Forsch.II Beil.8.2): sword.
97. See n.96.
98. A version by the Taleides Painter must be one of the earliest: WV 1889, pl.4.6. Brommer, Vasenlisten² 99 for oddities, mostly late.
99. Ol.Forsch.II 96-98, pls. 39 (XIVd), 21 (V.d), 60 (XXXIIg), 62 (XXXIVa). Kunze believes the scheme to be a 'N.E. Peloponnesian' invention.
100. e.g. ASatene N.S. 21-22, 1960, 218, fig.194 (Heidelberg Painter).
101. e.g. AA 1964, 731, Abb.47 (terracotta relief-strip from Agrigento); Perachora II no.2542, pls. 106,110.
102. e.g. AJA 12, 1908, pl.15 (Ol.Forsch.II, 97 n.2), Loeb tripod.
103. 2.a: Ol.Forsch.II, 98, pl.14 (IIIc), also XVIc.
104. Brommer, Vasenlisten² 92-97.
105. e.g. Foce del Sele II pl. 75; Caeretan, Brown, EL pl. 26b; Kunze notes, as a later example, a group from an Etruscan bronze tripod (good photograph, Brown, EL pl.39c.2); cf. the late archaic Cypriot seal, Boardman, AGG no.299, pl.20.

106. Brommer, Vasenlisten² 98; add Aukt.Basel 26, 1963, no.105. (Cf. Ol.Forsch.II 97, pl.60).
107. 4.a.: Ol.Forsch.II, 99, pl.66 (XLIlg); 4.b.: Ol.Forsch.II, 99-101, pl.19 (IVg), 53 (XXVIIIg); also 74.
108. e.g. BSA 32, 1931-32, pl.10 (Lydos); cf. also Rumpf, Ch.V pl.215.
109. Ol.Forsch.II, 101 (AA 42, 1927, 310, Abb.6-8: MC aryballos).
110. Brommer, Vasenlisten² 101 (e.g. no.7, CVA Louvre 4, pl.III He 34.4,8, a Nikosthenic amphora; the broken amphora beneath the lion seems to have crept in from a 'Pursuit of Troilos' scene!).
111. e.g. Gerhard, AV II pl.94
112. Ol.Forsch.II, 101 (Payne, NC 126, pl.45.8).
113. Ol.Forsch.II, 100.
114. A.de Longpérier, Mus.Napoleon III, pl.XI; E. Gjerstad, Opusc.Arch. 4, 1946, pl.X, (Louvre AO 20134). Gjerstad dates the bowl to 'Cypro-Phoenician III', c.600-550, but Miss V. Wilson informs me that in her opinion it need not be later than 600.
115. There are countless other examples on seals, ivories, metalwork and stone-sculpture; bulls and sphinxes, horses and caprids, also appear on their hind legs, being seized by a foreleg.
116. Fortetsa: Brock, Fortetsa 198, pl.169; Kavousi: AJA 5, 1901, 147f., figs. 10,11. (Fittschen 80, L24, L25, with bibl.).
117. Atlas of Cesnola Coll. (Met.Mus., New York), I, pl.27.90 (Herakles); pl.83.544 (two heroes, back to back). Both c.550-525.
I owe these references to Miss. V. Wilson.

118. e.g. Boardman, AGG 28, and pl.II.31,32; pl.III.52, 53; cf. the Cypriot gold finger-ring, BSA 65, 1970 pl.4, no.26.
119. A close parallel for the position of the lion, though much earlier (first half of first mill.), occurs on a cylinder seal with a 'lion-centaur' attacking a lion, H. Frankfort, Cylinder Seals pl.36a.
120. Mon.Piot 41, 1946, 56 fig.14 (Brown, EL pl.26b.).
121. Brown, EL, index refs. p.209 (esp.28-29, 47, 75-76); cf. AM 77, 1962, 50, n.100.
122. AM 77, 1962, 49-52.
123. Studien zum fruhgriechischen Löwenbild (1965) 34, 91ff. (esp.97-98).
124. Chigi Vase, A/H/S pl.17 (back); Gabelmann pls.5, 8, from Perachora and Loutraki (belly), all mentioned by Amandry; Acropolis poros lions, Heberdey, Porosskulptur Abbs. 54, 77, (belly).
125. AM 77, 1962, Beil 6, 7, 9.
126. Gabelmann 93, n.380 and pl.27.
127. C.C. Edgar, Cat.Mus du Caire, Greek Vases, pl.V.
128. Åkerström, ATK 207, Abb. 66.1, 67.2, (Boardman, AGG 134).
129. Boardman, AGG 129ff., pls. 29-32, passim.
130. e.g. BMC Cyprus pl.18.3 (must be 5th century) cf. Rev.Belg.Num. 95, 1949, pls.V,VI (Acanthus), and Ant.K.1, 1958, pl.21.1 (Stagira), where the mane is not specifically mentioned, but an Ionian die-engraver is suggested.
131. Gabelmann no.127, pl.26.
132. e.g. AD I pl.44; AD II pls. 25,26,27,58; CVA BM 8, pl.II Dq 2.

133. e.g. AD II pl.55.3a; CVA BM 8, pl.II Dn 14; pl.II Dp 1.1;
134. CVA BM 8, pl.II Dn 2.6,7.
135. Kraay, Greek Coins no.692.
136. See Amandry, op.cit. 53, n.112.
137. Blümel, Die Archaisch Griechischen Skulpturen fig. 89,
(Gabelmann no.104), and see n.131.
138. e.g. AGG pl.30. 424; pl.31.427, 428, 433, 436, 442.
139. E. Homann-Wedeking, Archaische Vasenornamentik Abb.4 (Brown,
EL 76).
140. Pryce, BMC Sculpture I.1, pl.18.
141. Paros: marble relief, Arch.Reps.1962-63, 27, fig.30 (Gabelmann
no.138); Centuripe: terracotta arula, Langlotz, Magna Graecia
65, pl.32. Cybele's lion on the Siphnian Treasury (c.525) has
belly-tufts: Lullies, Greek Sculpture pl.52.
142. Earlier Attic belly-mane: See n.124.
143. Gabelmann no.146, AA 1933, 287 Abb.20.
144. CVA Louvre 4, pl.III He 46.3,4, (tufts).
145. Aukt.Basel 14, 1954, no.64 (strokes).
146. JdI 76, 1961, 54, Abb.6 (Boston 60.1172).
147. Gerhard, AV II pl.94.
148. e.g. CVA BM 6, pl.III He 75.2 (Alkmene Painter); pl.76.4
(Leagros Group).
149. e.g. Beazley, Der Kleophrades-Maler pls.12, 23; cf. A/H/S pl.101

150. Andokides P.: JdI 76, 1961, 49, Abb.1; Oltos: CVA Louvre 10, pl.III Ib 3.4,6; Pioneer Gp.: Aukt.Basel 14, 1954, no.74 (ARV² 34.13); Myson: CVA Villa Giulia 2, pl.III I 15; Berlin P.: e.g. CVA Oxford I, pl.III I 20.11, Alfieri/Arias, Spina pls. 2, 3; Kleophrades P.: Univ.Penn.Mus.Bull., May 1935, pl.5. Syriskos P.: CVA BM 5, pl.III Ib 73, 74.
151. Oltos: A. Bruhn, Oltos figs. 6,7,44; Euphronios: A/H/S pl.114 (Amandry 50, n.96); Douris: A/H/S pl.146; Brygos P.: A/H/S pl.139. (A Bf example by the A.D.Painter, CVA BM 6, pl.III He 89.3)
152. Alkmene P.: see nn.147,148; Diosphos P.: ABL pl.39.I (belly-mane too); Pioneer Gp.: see n.150. Tail-tufts only: A.D. Painter, Langlotz, Würzburg, no.317, pl.96 (Bf); on Lion-skins (Rf): Euphronios, A/H/S pl.115; cf. Beazley, Devel. pl.40.1.
153. a) belly and tail: Psiax: A/H/S pls.XIX, XX.
 b) tail only: e.g. Conservatori Painter: CVA Mus.Cap. 1, pl.III H 22.2; other late Bf: Langlotz, Würzburg no.254, pl.82; CVA BM 6, pl.III He 83.3.; (B 318); 83.4 (B 319); 94.3 (B 343).
154. Perachora: Gabelmann 48ff., pl.5 no.29; Acropolis: Gabelmann no.36a; R. Heberday, Altatt. Porosskulptur Abb.54; Chigi Vase: A/H/S pl.17.
155. Gabelmann op.cit. 49, n.228, and p.12. A very clear example also occurs on the lion held by 'Gilgamesh', from Khorsabad, in the Louvre: A. Parrot, Nineveh and Babylon, fig. 38 (8th cent.); also on a bronze bowl (Layard, Monuments of Niniveh II pl.68) and on 'Syrian-style' ivories from the S.E. Palace, Nimrud (R.D. Barnett,

The Nimrud Ivories in the BM, pls. 18, 20, 21); there are also neo-Hittite examples.

156. BCH 71-72, 1947-48, 174, pl.29 (14th-13th cent.), (ivory relief from Delos); also gold plaque, Grave Circle A, Mycenae (16th C.)
157. Brown, EL pl.57.
158. op.cit. 97.
159. e.g.; CVA BM 8, pls. II D1 1-3.
160. See n.139.
161. Boardman, AGG 130, pl.29.417, pls. 31,32, passim.
162. See Brown, EL 103-104, for a discussion a propos of Etruscan examples, with refs. to Near Eastern ones, (104, top, for Hittite and Assyrian).
163. e.g. Brown, EL pl.61d (cf. Boardman, AGG 130); see also E.S.G. Robinson, JHS 71, 1951, 159-161.
164. Robinson, op.cit. pl.38.66. Plain warts, Kraay, Greek Coins no. 611, (Samos, c.600).
165. e.g. Akurgal, KA ; A/H/S pl.28; Naukratis II pl.VI.I. bronze-relief, Olympia IV, pl.38.696.
166. Brown, EL pl.27b.
167. e.g. AD II, pls.25, 44; CVA BM 8, pl.II Dq 2; BSA 47, 1952, 140.
168. Boardman, AGG pl.31.427.
169. Åkerström, ATK pl.61.
170. Gabelmann no.79, pl.15.
171. Brown, EL 71; Gabelmann no. 126, pl.25.1, cf. no.127, pl.26.

172. Brown, EL pl. 27b; cf. Ol.Ber. III, pl.28 (here pl.77a).
173. Gems: e.g. Boardman, AGG pl.31.427, 437, 446; Coins: e.g. BMC Caria pl.13.12 (Cnidus).
174. e.g. Payne, NC pl.17, 2,3,7,12 ; Beazley, Devel. pl.6.1,3, (and cf. the Eleusis amphora, A/H/S pl.13).
175. e.g. A/H/S pl.XIX (Psiax).
176. Boston 95.80. See Chapter II, H.xvi, for bibliography.
177. Boardman, AGG no.297, pp.104, 105, pl.XX.
178. A few Near Eastern examples: 1) Ear or top of head: Nimrud, Layard, Monuments of Niniveh I, pl.49.1 (from sculptured drapery); Karatepe, Akurgal, BGA pl.34c; H. Bossert et al., Die Ausgrabungen auf dem Karatepe (1st Vorbericht), pl.14.71 (W.Orthmann, Untersuchungen zur späthethitischen Kunst, pls. 17, A/26; 15, A/5); Ziwiye treasure, Akurgal, BGA pl.50; seals, Moortgat, Vorderas. Rollsiegel pl.86.732 (8th-7th cent.); AG pl.15.10 (green jasper scarab, Tharros).2) Tail or back leg: Nimrud, Barnett, The Nimrud Ivories in the BM, pl.23, S26; pl.26, S20 (potniae, 'Syrian-style'); Moortgat, op.cit., pl.8573I (bull-slayer, back leg); pl.86.735 (potnios, back leg); Cypriot: Pryce, BMC Sculpture 1.2, 82ff., nos. C.206ff. (limestone statuettes from Dali, mid-6th cent. on. Herakles, with lion-skin over head, holds little lion by tail. Brommer, Denkmälerlisten 102).
179. Akurgal, Griechische Reliefs des VI. Jahrh aus Lykien 19ff.

180. Greek art: 1) Ear or top of head: (mostly with a very strong eastern flavour): ivory 'Apollo' from Delphi (P.Amandry, Syria 24, 1945, 149ff., pl.X - 'Ionian'; cf. Barnett, JHS 68, 1948, 16-17 - 'Rhodian'); Cretan bronze, Kunze, Kretische Bronzereliefs pl.5 (naked potnia); Rhodian gold plaques, F. Marshall, BMC Jewellery pl.II.1128 (potniae with fists clenched above lions' heads); East Greek gems, AGG pl.III.52, 53 (Gorgon 'lion-slayers'). 2) Tail: BMC Jewellery pl.II.1121, 1126 (potnia); Hogarth, Ephesus pl.26.6 (ivory potnia); 'gorgon-potnia' on the Herakles gem, here pl. 23 ; unpublished E. Greek plate from Pitane, in Istanbul, (bearded man holding one lion by tail, possibly there were two).
cf. Cypriot Greek? gem, AGG pl.IV.65, and coin, ZfN 37, 1927, pl.III.142; (back leg); and Greek? statuettes from Camirus and Naukratis, BMC Sculpture I.1, pls. 36,40.

CHAPTER V.CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions reached for each individual subject or scene studied, have been set down in the discussion of that subject in Chapters II to IV, and therefore will not be repeated in detail here, though reference will naturally be made to them in discussing the general conclusions.

The aim of this thesis, as stated in the Introduction, was to select a few suitable themes from East Greek art of the later 7th and the 6th centuries B.C., and to try by careful examination and comparison to establish some indisputable facts about their position in relation to their mainland counterparts, in the hope that this might shed some light on the problem of the place and importance of archaic East Greek art as a whole. Gorgons and gorgoneia yielded precise and positive results. The study of the mythological scenes, though its results were less definite and clear-cut, nevertheless had something to contribute to the over-all picture. The conclusions which can be drawn concerning the subjects studied are as follows:

First, there is no clear evidence of influence from them to mainland art before c.550 B.C.; they do, however, show evidence of independence in East Greek art at this time. The facial type of the gorgoneia is, basically, the same as that which is current throughout

Greece from the later 7th century, which is probably most like a lion-mask, and which seems on present evidence to appear first at Corinth. The treatment, however, is individual, the 'East Greek type' is developed early, and continues to be strongly independent, admitting virtually no mainland influences.

The earlier mythological scenes on vases discussed here, though almost the earliest known in East Greek vase-painting, are late compared with the earliest mythological scenes in Attic and Corinthian vase-painting. Nevertheless, they are approximately contemporary with the earliest surviving mainland representations of the same subject - and in some cases earlier, if the suggested interpretations of fragmentary scenes are correct. Also, however likely it might seem that mainland vase-painting, because of its well-developed figure-scene tradition, should have influenced East Greek vases, there is no definite evidence that this was so. There is certainly no mere imitation of surviving mainland examples (which are all we can judge from), in the early East Greek scenes. Clearly the same or similar models or patterns were circulating in East Greece as in other areas, but it is impossible in the cases studied at least to say where they originated.

The bronze-reliefs, quite apart from their significance as representatives of a branch of East Greek art which has hitherto not been much considered, seem to me of particular importance here. Some of those from the 'Kaineus Group' seem to be no later than c.600; the chariot relief from Samos, briefly mentioned on p.381, is dated by the excavator before 600. This means that, even if there were no East Greek schools of vase-painting before Chiot which regularly

produced mythological scenes, there were already established by the end of the 7th century at least two bronze workshops producing mythological representations of high quality. The mainland has only isolated examples in bronze-work to offer before this time, and extremely little in the repoussé technique. It seems possible, then, that the East Greek figure-scene tradition may go back further, and be stronger in some fields, than has been thought. This means also that there is less reason to expect the early East Greek vase-scenes to be dependent on the mainland.

The situation up to c.550, then, seems to be that good and sometimes excellent work is being produced, with an independent tradition though not in isolation, and without noticeable impact on the rest of Greece.

In the second half of the 6th century, a marked change occurs in the case of the gorgoneia, though the position of the mythological scenes appears very much the same. To take the scenes first, the black-figure technique has been adopted for vase-painting: but it is, I think, a mistake to assume that this must mean general dependence on Attic vase-painting. Kumpf is, of course, right in saying (JdI 48, 1933, 67) that details of style should not be mistaken for originality or independence, but it is not only style which is in question here. As with the earlier scenes, those on the Clazomenian vases studied are similar in composition to their mainland equivalents, but not so similar that they must be direct imitations rather than simply part of a Greek koine. The latest vase-scene, Herakles and the Lion, has a composition closer to Near Eastern lion-killer schemes than

to other Greek Herakles ones.

Only the Clazomenian sarcophagus with the Ambush of Troilos seems to show a direct connection with Attic vase-painting, and, as there do seem to be 'Atticizing' details in the work of the Albertinum Painter generally, this connection is probably in the form of influence from Athens.

Turning to the gorgons, there is clear evidence of the infiltration of the gorgoneion-type into Attica and the West during the second half of the century. The change in types is clearly documented and beyond question. Attic vase-painting is the most interesting case: The looped snake alone seems to have been adopted first (appearing fairly frequently in later Bf on Athena's aegis, as well as in rare cases in the hair of gorgons). Early Rf took over the full East Greek gorgon/gorgoneion type with enthusiasm, and this soon superseded the old Corinthian-Attic type. This raises interesting questions. Undoubtedly there was a general openness to experiment, and search for new forms and formulae in Attic vase-painting once the rigid, independent Bf tradition had been broken, but might not the presence of immigrant East Greek craftsmen have contributed something to the adoption of this motif? I do not wish to argue that the Andokides Painter was an Ionian after all, (in fact, his gorgoneia are close to the old Attic type, though he admits looped aegis-snakes!), but I see nothing improbable in the idea that some craftsmen, like some poets, should have tried their luck in Athens when conditions in East Greece deteriorated, though the West, and particularly Etruria, no doubt offered easier opportunities in some ways.

This, however, is a matter for speculation at the moment. In any event, there is no reason to assume that only vase-painting or vase-painters from East Greece were available as possible sources of influence on Attic vases. We knew already that there were first-rate gem-engravers working in East Greece at this time, and, to take an example from this thesis, the group of bronze shield-devices from Olympia shows that fine work continued to be produced in this field also. For the west, the shared tradition of architectural terracottas was undoubtedly important.

The gorgon- and gorgoneion-type is an important motif whose transmission from East Greek art to Attic art is clearly demonstrated in this study, by statistics as well as by general observation. As Rumpf said of the statistics on East Greek pottery found in Attica (JdI 48, 1933, 68), 'Hier handelt es sich nicht um Ansichten oder Standpunkte, sondern um Tatsachen, die sich mathematisch nachprüfen lassen'. The lion-type, treated in much less detail here, clearly underwent a similar transmission.

Such points as these, limited but firmly established, prove that the claims of 'East Greek elements' in late 6th century Attic art, not excluding vase-painting, are no mere wishful thinking. They also hold out the hope that similar examination of other details or motifs would yield positive results.

Finally, it is worth noting that the general picture obtained of the development of East Greek art in the fields studied, and of its eventual influence over the rest of Greece, is entirely in agreement

with what is already known of sculpture and architecture. Also, all the evidence from the thesis points to Ionia as the artistic centre of the region, at least in the aspects examined: the home of the 'Kaineus Group' and the later shield-devices, as well as of the 'East Greek' gorgoneion-type.

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations used for periodicals and for well-known reference works are the standard ones, and therefore are not listed here.

Åkerström, ATK	Å.Åkerström, Die architektonischen Terrakotten Kleinasiens.
Åkerström, Terrakottaplatten	Å.Åkerström, Architektonische Terrakottaplatten in Stockholm.
AD	Antike Denkmäler.
A/H/S	P.E.Arias, M.Hirmer, B.B.Shefton. A History of Greek Vase-Painting.
Akurgal, BGA	E.Akurgal, The Birth of Greek Art.
Akurgal, KA	E.Akurgal, Die Kunst Anatoliens.
Albizzati	C.Albizzati, Vasi Antichi Dipinti del Vaticano
Altsam.St.	E.Buschor, Altsamische Standbilder.
Andrén	A.Andrén, Architectural Terracottas from Etrusco-Italic Temples.
AO	R.M.Dawkins, The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta.
Arch.Reps.	Archaeological Reports, (Published by the Council of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies and the Managing Committee of the British School of Archaeology at Athens).

- Aukt.Basel. Münzen und Medaillen A.G.Basel
Kunstwerke der Antike.
- Aukt.Luzern. Ars Antiqua A.G., Luzern
Antike Kunstwerke
- Babelon, Traité E.Babelon, Traité des Monnaies Grecques
et Romaines.
- Baur, Centaurs. P.V.C.Baur, Centaurs in Ancient Art.
- Beazley, Devel. J.D.Beazley, The Development of Attic
Black Figure.
- Besig. H.Besig, Gorgo und Gorgoneion in der
archaischen griechischen Kunst.
- Blümel, AGS C.Blümel, Die archaisch griechischen
Skulpturen der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin.
- Boardman, AGG J.Boardman, Archaic Greek Gems (1968)
- Boardman, I Gems. J.Boardman, Island Gems (1963)
- Brett, Boston Cat. A.B.Brett, Catalogue of the Greek Coins in
the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
- Brommer, Denkmälerlisten. F.Brommer, Denkmälerlisten zur griechischen
Heldensage, I Herakles.
- Brommer, Vasenlisten² F.Brommer, Vasenlisten zur Griechischen
Heldensage (2nd ed., 1960)
- Brown, EL W.L. Brown, The Etruscan Lion.
- Buschor, Tondächer II E.Buschor, Die Tondächer der Akropolis II
Stirnziegel.
- Cl.Rh. Clara Rhodos.
- Cook, GPP R.M.Cook, Greek Painted Pottery.
- Ducat. J.Ducat, Les Vases Plastiques Rhodiens
Archaiques en Terre Cuite.
- EAA Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica.
- Emporio. J.Boardman, Greek Emporio.

- Fairbanks. A.Fairbanks, Cat. of Greek and Etruscan Vases in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, I (1928).
- Fittschen. K.Fittschen, Untersuchungen zu Beginn der Sagedarstellungen bei den Griechen.
- Foce del Sele II P.Zancani-Montuoro and U.Zanotti-Bianco, Heraion alla Foce del Sele II.
- FR. A.Furtwängler and K.Reichold, Griechische Vasenmalerei:- Auswahl hervorragender Vasenbilder.
- Friis Johansen, Iliad. K.Friis Johansen, The Iliad in Early Greek Art (1967).
- Friis Johansen, VS. K.Friis Johansen, Les Vases Sicyoniens.
- Furtwängler, AG. A.Furtwängler, Die Antiken Gemmen (1900)
- Gabelmann. H.Gabelmann, Studien zum frühgriechischen Löwenbild.
- Gerhard, AV. E.Gerhard, Auserlesene Vasenbilder.
- Giglioli. G.Q.Giglioli, L'Arte Etrusca.
- Graef I. B.Graef and E.Langlotz, Die Antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen, I.
- Higgins I R.A.Higgins, Catalogue of the Terracottas in the Dept. of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum, I.
- Higgins II R.A.Higgins, Catalogue of the Terracottas in the Dept. of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum, vol.II (Plastic Vases).
- Higgins, Jewellery R.A.Higgins, Greek and Roman Jewellery (1961).
- Hoppin, BFV J.C.Hoppin, A Handbook of Greek Black-figured Vases.
- Karagiorga, GK Th.Karagiorga, Gorgeie Kephale.
- Kardara, RA Ch.Kardara, Rhodiake Aggeiographiea.

- Kraay. C.Kraay and M.Hirmer, Greek Coins.
- Langlotz, Magna Graecia. E.Langlotz, The Art of Magna Graecia.
- Langlotz, Würzburg. E.Langlotz, Martin von Wagner-Museum der Universität Würzburg, I Griechische Vasen (1932).
- Larisa I. J.Boehlau and K.Schefold, Larisa am Hermos I, Die Bauten.
- Larisa II. L.Kjellberg and others, Larisa am Hermos II, Die Architektonischen Terrakotten.
- Lullies/Hirmer, Gr.Vasen. R.Lullies and M.Hirmer, Griechische Vasen der reifarchaischen Zeit.
- Marangou. E.-L.I. Marangou, Lakonische Elfenbein - und Beinschnitzereien.
- Masner. K.Masner, Die Sammlung antiker Vasen und Terrakotten im K.K.Oesterreich.Mus.
- Maximova. M.I. Maximova, Les Vases Plastiques dans l'Antiquité (Epoque Archaïque).
- Mingazzini. P.Mingazzini, Vasi della Collezione Castellana (1930).
- Naukratis II. E.A.Gardner, Naukratis, part II (1888).
- Orthmann. W.Orthmann, Untersuchungen zur späthethitischen Kunst (1971).
- Payne, NC. H.G.G.Payne, Necrocorinthia.
- Payne/Young. H.G.G.Payne and G.M.Young, Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis.
- Perachora I. H.G.G.Payne and others, Perachora, the Sanctuaries of Hera Akraia and Hera Limenia, I Architecture, Bronzes, Terracottas.
- Perachora II. T.J.Dunbabin and others, Perachora, the Sanctuaries of Hera Akraia and Hera Limenia, II Pottery, ivories, scarabs, etc.,
- Pfuhl, MuZ. E.Pfuhl, Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen.

- Price. E.H.Price, 'Pottery of Naukratis' in JHS 44, 1924, 180-222.
- Riccioni. G.Riccioni, Origine e Sviluppo del Gorgoneion e del Mito della Gorgone-Medusa nell'Arte Greca, in Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte, N.S. IX, 1960, 127-206.
- Rumpf, Ch.V. A.Rumpf, Chalkidische Vasen.
- Schefold, ML. K.Schefold, Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art.
- Schiering, Werkstätten. W.Schiering, Werkstätten der orientalisierender Keramik auf Rhodos
- Schumacher, Bronzen. K.Schumacher, Beschreibung der Sammlung Antiker Bronzen, Karlsruhe.
- Spartz. E.Spartz, Das Wappenbild des Herrn und der Herrin der Tiere in der minoisch-mykenischen und frühgriechischen Kunst.
- Steuben. H.von Steuben, Frühe Sagendarstellungen in Korinth und Athen.
- Tanis II. W.M.Flinders Petrie, Tanis, Part II, Nebesheh and Defenneh.
- Tocra. J.Boardman and J.Hayes, Excavations at Tocra 1963-65: The Archaic Deposits I.
- Van Buren, AFR. E.D. Van Buren, Archaic Fictile Revetments in Sicily and Magna Graecia. (1923)
- Van Buren, FTR. E.D. Van Buren, Figurative Terracotta Revetments in Etruria and Latium in the VI and V centuries B.C. (1921).
- Van Buren, GFR. E.D. Van Buren, Greek Fictile Revetments in the Archaic Period (1926).
- WV Wiener Vorlegeblätter.
- ZfN Zeitschrift für Numismatik.

