

Greek Vases

in the J. Paul Getty Museum Volume 5



Occasional Papers on Antiquities, 7

Greek Vases

in the J. Paul Getty Museum Volume 5

MALIBU, CALIFORNIA 1991

© 1991 The J. Paul Getty Museum
17985 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, California 90265-5799
(213) 459-7611

Mailing address:
P.O. Box 2112
Santa Monica, California 90406

Christopher Hudson, Head of Publications
Cynthia Newman Helms, Managing Editor
Karen Schmidt, Production Manager
Leslee Holderness, Sales and Distribution Manager

Project staff:

Editor: Marion True, Curator of Antiquities
Manuscript Editor: Benedicte Gilman
Assistant Editor: Mary Holtman
Designer: Patricia Inglis
Production Coordinator: Elizabeth Burke Kahn
Production Artist: Thea Piegdon

All photographs by the Department of Photographic Services,
J. Paul Getty Museum, unless otherwise noted.

Typography by TypeLink, San Diego
Printed by Alan Lithograph Inc., Los Angeles

Cover: A dinoid volute-krater by the Meleager Painter. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum
87.AE.93. Side A. See article page 107.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
(Revised for vol. 5)

Greek vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum.

(Occasional papers on antiquities; 1.)

English and German.

Includes bibliographical references.

1. Vases, Greek—Addresses, essays, lectures.
 2. Vase-paintings, Greek—Themes, motives. 3. Vases, Etruscan. 4. Vase-painting, Etruscan—Themes, motives.
 5. Vases—California—Malibu. 6. J. Paul Getty Museum. I. J. Paul Getty Museum. II. Series.
- NK4623.M37J24 1983 738.3'82'093807479493 82-49024
ISBN 0-89236-058-5 (pbk. : v. 1)

ISBN 0-89236-184-0

Contents

Bellerophon and the Chimaira on a Lakonian Cup by the Boreads Painter <i>Conrad M. Stibbe</i>	5
Six's Technique at the Getty <i>Janet Burnett Grossman</i>	13
A New Representation of a City on an Attic Red-figured Kylix <i>William A. P. Childs</i>	27
Onesimos and the Getty Iliupersis <i>Dyfri Williams</i>	41
A Cup for a Hero <i>Diana Buitron-Oliver</i>	65
A Fragmentary Phiale by Douris <i>Martin Robertson</i>	75
The Greek Pentathlon <i>Gene Waddell</i>	99
A Dinoid Volute-Krater by the Meleager Painter: An Attic Vase in the South Italian Manner <i>Lucilla Burn</i>	107
Satyr- und Mänadennamen auf Vasenbildern des Getty-Museums mit Addenda zu Ch. Fränkel, <i>Satyr- und Bakchennamen auf Vasenbildern</i> (1912) <i>Anneliese Kossatz-Deißmann</i>	131

This page intentionally left blank

Bellerophon and the Chimaira on a Lakonian Cup by the Boreads Painter

Conrad M. Stibbe

Some years ago I was kindly invited by the curator of the Department of Antiquities of the J. Paul Getty Museum to publish a Lakonian cup of high quality, showing in the interior of the bowl Bellerophon with Pegasus fighting the Chimaira. I accepted, but hesitated for a long time to write the article because publishing a vase that I had not seen with my own eyes seemed (and still seems) comparable to setting out on a wild-goose chase. But as the distance between Malibu and Leiden remained practically unbridgeable, I decided to risk commenting on the cup, though with the caveat that I had not examined it firsthand.

The vase (85.AE.121) is of average size for a Lakonian drinking cup, measuring 12.5 cm in height and 18.4–5 cm in diameter across the rim.¹ Its fabric is very light beige; the black glaze is thin, though evenly applied, and has a metallic luster. Unglazed surfaces are covered with a creamy slip that has darkened to tan. Added purple is flat, tending toward blue.

The cup has been reassembled from many fragments and partially restored.² Except for the restoration of some important parts of the figure of Pegasus—upper section of the head, central areas of the wing and hind leg, and the tail—the interior scene is intact.

The circular scene of the bowl is surrounded by a black-glazed band on the inside of the lip, with thin reserved stripes at the rim and at half its height (fig. 1a). Inside the band and facing inward is a ring of pomegranates with double petals, which is interrupted by the figures where they extend to the very edge of the field.

In the center a young but bearded Bellerophon runs in *Knielauf* to the right as he attacks the Chimaira, who is seen rearing up before him. Bellerophon wears a simple, sleeveless tunic reaching to his knees and purple-colored boots. An incised pattern of diamonds decorates the tunic; the belt and hem are black bands delineated by double transverse incisions. With his right hand he thrusts a spear into the belly of the Chimaira; in his left hand he holds the reins of Pegasus, who rears up behind him forming a heraldic counter-

part to the Chimaira. Bellerophon's massive legs are somewhat out of proportion to the more slender build of his chest and arms, and even the exergue line on which he kneels seems to bend under their weight. Both ends of this line are interrupted by the legs of the two fantastic beasts that fill the remaining space around the hero.

Pegasus, who carried Bellerophon to the spot, is assisting his master by attacking fiercely with his forehooves the Chimaira opposite him. In order to do so, Pegasus stands on his hind legs and arches his body high over the head of Bellerophon; his extended wings seem to support him in his breathtaking maneuver. The splendid appearance of the horse is made more vivid by the colorful effect of purple on the upper section of the wing and, alternating with black, on the spreading feathers. In addition, the tail is purple (painted on the slip), and simple purple lines mark neck, belly, and hindquarters.

Opposite Pegasus the triple-headed Chimaira is clearly on the defensive. Standing on her hind legs she turns back her lion's head to avoid the smashing blows of Pegasus's hooves, which now strike her neck. Her raised forepaws reach out behind Pegasus's chest, evidently missing their mark. The averted lion's head, with open mouth and a long drooping purple tongue, looks straight into the face of the Chimaira's second head, that of a goat emerging from her back. Only the goat's neck and head are depicted; it is long-horned, bearded, and fire-breathing, as revealed by the three lines emerging from her nostrils. The Chimaira's third head, at the end of the tail that has been transformed into a snake, reaches forward to the tips of the goat's horns. The snake's head is seen in profile, and details of the body, for instance the scales, are carefully incised.

The body shared by these three heads is also of awe-inspiring appearance. The meticulously incised hair on the belly, like that of the lion's mane, and the wavy markings on the trunk (nine incised lines alternating with seven purple ones) and hind legs (two incised and two purple ones) contribute to the Chimaira's fero-



Figure 1a. Lakonian cup decorated by the Boreads Painter. Interior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 85.AE.121.

cious, forbidding aspect. Two intertwining, purple jets of blood spurt from the point in the belly where Bellerophon's spear has entered the creature.

The eyes of Pegasus, Bellerophon, and the lion's head of the Chimaira are similarly incised: curving upper and lower lines that meet at the corners, thereby leaving a central area open for a pupil, which has, however, been added only in the case of Pegasus. Simple circles are used to indicate the eyes of the goat and the snake. Other notable incisions are those of the knees, elbows, and ear of Bellerophon: these lines betray beyond any doubt the hand of the Boreads Painter to whom the scene was correctly attributed by Marion True, as will be demonstrated below in more detail.

The exterior decoration is dominated by the standard combination of three ornamental friezes encircling the underside of the bowl (fig. 1b). Lowermost is a row of pomegranates with double petals, followed by upright tongues painted alternately black and purple, and an uppermost frieze of rather broad upright rays. Four

concentric black bands separate the pomegranates from the foot attachment. The three friezes are each separated by a wide band of purple (painted on the black glaze) between three brownish lines. Above the rays a third group of bands marks the lower boundary of the handle-zone. The only ornaments in the handle-zone are four handle-palmettes. A thin line delineates the lip jog, and the lip itself is plain, except for a pair of thin lines below a thick band at the rim.

The entire decorative system on the exterior of the cup is painted over a thick creamy slip. The foot has a black-glazed interior and exterior and a plain resting surface. Slip covers the foot fillet at the join with the bowl. Most of the stem and small parts of the fillet have been reconstructed in modern times.

As no profile drawing of the cup is available, the shape must be studied from photographs (fig. 1c). The proportions of the various parts are well balanced in relation to each other. A straight-slanting rim is combined with a rather deep bowl, and the handles are not



Figure 1b. Underside of cup, figure 1a.



Figure 1c. Profile view of cup, figure 1a.



Figure 2. Lakonian cup decorated by the Boreads Painter. Interior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 85.AE.461.

too long or heavy, nor do they curve too far upward. The foot is of almost equal height to the cup (6.15 cm) and sturdily but elegantly fashioned, with a foot-plate that turns slightly upward at the toe. Like a column capital, a plastic fillet crowns the top of the stem where it is joined to the bowl.

No particular problems are encountered in the evaluation of the shape. The Getty cup clearly belongs with the early cups of Group VIIb that is discussed on page 26 of *Lakonische Vasenmaler* and can therefore be dated around 565 B.C. I shall return below to the significance of this connection.

There can be no doubt about the attribution of the painting: The figure style as a whole as well as every detail point clearly to the hand of the Boreads Painter, whose work we know from a series of well-preserved and fragmentary pieces.³ This painter specialized in the decoration of cups and is to be considered the founder of one of the two most important Lakonian workshops

from the third decade of the sixth century B.C.⁴

The Getty kylix enriches our knowledge of the subjects that were treated by the Boreads Painter as it shows the first example of the Bellerophon myth in his work.⁵ The composition is in itself a notable achievement, the figures being well spaced in the circular field, with Bellerophon standing on a low exergue line. This is made all the clearer by a comparison with three other preserved scenes of circular composition by the same painter: Achilles and Troilos stand above each other, as if on different stages⁶; the Boreads are impeded in their pursuit of the Harpies by the presence of a reclining sphinx of outsize proportions in a field lacking an exergue line (fig. 2)⁷; and Herakles, while being introduced on Mount Olympos, is hampered in his movements by the small space allotted him, as a result of the space occupied by the inordinately large boar on the exergue.⁸ Thus, the scene in the Getty cup may be considered successful, though it seems very improbable

that the Boreads Painter was himself the inventor of the compositional scheme. The single known parallel for this scheme occurs on the attachment plate of the hand grip of a bronze shield from Olympia, which dates from the third quarter of the sixth century.⁹ On the grip the two creatures are positioned at the reverse of the Getty cup and are not in physical contact. Moreover, Bellerophon, while holding the reins of Pegasus, attacks the Chimaira from the right with a sword. The Chimaira is of the protome type.¹⁰

Despite these differences, it would seem probable that both representations go back to a common but unknown prototype, which in its turn could be derived from the more common kind of heraldic scheme, the *potnios hippon*.¹¹ Such a scene, where a small male figure is placed between a pair of large, winged horses in rearing position, is seen on a well-known Lakonian cup in the British Museum.¹² Here, the characteristic detail of the man holding the reins of one of the two Pegasoi should be noted. As this cup was decorated by a follower of the Naukratis Painter and is of course later than the Getty cup, it could not have served as the Boreads Painter's source.

A characteristic feature of the Boreads Painter's ornaments, recurring throughout his career, is the pomegranate fringe around the inside of the bowl. Perhaps he wished to soften the contrast between the black of the lip and the light-colored background of the central scene by means of this rather fossilized motif, which he used also to decorate the exteriors of cups. The long petals of the Getty pomegranates indicate a later period in his production.¹³

We move now from the overall composition to the single figures. The fact that Bellerophon attacks the Chimaira from a kneeling position on the ground and is not mounted on Pegasus in accordance with the myth and the more usual iconography¹⁴ may be due to the artist's adaptation of the myth to a basically different and alien scheme, as we noticed above. Thus, the scene in the Getty cup is yet one more example of the many variant representations of the Bellerophon saga in ancient art. It may even be proper to regard some of these variants as errors on the part of the craftsmen, as suggested by Konrad Schauenburg ("erstaunlich viele Irrtümer"), who devoted a number of studies to the theme.¹⁵ Such variants or mistakes, depending on our point of view, can often be explained as the result of the limitations and demands imposed on the artist by the available space. This holds good both for compositions in a circular field, as in our case, and for narrow friezes. Examples of the latter are found on a Proto-corinthian aryballos¹⁶ and on the exterior of a Lakonian

cup from Lavinium¹⁷: in both cases Bellerophon is armed as a hoplite and fights the Chimaira from a position on the ground.¹⁸

The painting in the Getty cup shows a number of notable details that find parallels in Lakonian. Bellerophon's ear is rendered like the ear of Athena on a cup in New York¹⁹; the cross-hatching of Bellerophon's tunic recurs several times elsewhere²⁰; and his formidable legs and high boots are repeated in nearly the same way on a second cup (fig. 2) by the Boreads Painter in the Getty Museum.²¹

The hand of the Boreads Painter can further be recognized by the lavish use of added purple on the body and sickle-shaped wings of the much restored figure of Pegasus. Alternately black and purple feathers are known from many of the winged creatures on his later cups.²² This painter was fond of horses, and the few examples that are well enough preserved for comparison show heads, manes, and bodies rendered in the same way as on the Getty Pegasus.²³

Finally, the Chimaira itself. The type as such, with only the head and neck of the goat being depicted on the beast's back, is Peloponnesian. In contrast, the Attic type has a complete goat protome that includes the animal's forelegs, with the head always turned back, even when Bellerophon is in front of the monster.²⁴ Perhaps the Boreads Painter himself struck on the idea of turning the lion's head away from Pegasus; a less likely possibility is that he was influenced by Attic Chimairas or Attic scenes of Herakles and the Lion.²⁵ At any rate, the Boreads Painter illustrates clearly by means of this device the Chimaira's attempt to avoid the fierce onslaught of Pegasus.

An essential detail of the myth is the fire-breathing character of the Chimaira,²⁶ which is here depicted by lines in diluted glaze emerging from the goat's nostrils, while its mouth remains closed. Evidently the painter misunderstood the meaning of these lines in his prototype, for if he realized that they represented fire, he would surely have spared the monster the indignity of having flames blown directly into the open mouth of its lion's head.

In the work of the Boreads Painter, as known at present, there are only a few lions or felinelike creatures (sphinxes) that can supply comparisons for the treatment of the incisions on the Getty Chimaira. Most incised details of the lion's head and mane are rendered like those on a fragmentary cup in the British Museum.²⁷ Three other examples have comparable belly hair.²⁸ The incisions of body and hind legs approach very closely the painter's standard treatment of similar details on felines, as distinct from his horses (cf. Peg-



Figure 3. Lakonian cup decorated by the Boreads Painter. Interior. London, The British Museum B 5. Photo courtesy Trustees of The British Museum.

asos), though the incisions on the Getty cup are more numerous than usual.²⁹

Also the Chimaira's other two heads deserve comment. This is the first example of a goat's head from the hand of the Boreads Painter. Snakes, in contrast, appear very often in his painting, always in a mythological context.³⁰ However, only one example with the head in profile view is well enough preserved to allow for comparison with the Getty snake (fig. 3). The closeness of the two provides further proof of the correctness of our attribution.

A last point concerning the interior is the presence of the two reserved lines on the lip, which relieve the dull uniformity of the black band. The placement of a reserved line at the rim was common practice among Lakonian painters, but the addition of a reserved line through the middle of the band seems to have been a personal whim of the Boreads Painter.³¹

The handle-palmettes are the most notable feature of the outside of the cup. They are of a type that was commonly used by the Boreads Painter in the later stage of his career,³² which can be dated circa 570–565.³³ The ornamental friezes on the underside of the bowl—rays, tongues, and pomegranates—are in keeping with the decorative system that was usually combined with these characteristic handle-palmettes.³⁴

Earlier I remarked, on page 90 of *Lakonische Vasenmaler*, that the dating of the Boreads Painter was entirely dependent on a comparative study of shapes and decorations. Since then a number of drinking cups by his hand have become known, but these have done very little to change the situation in this respect.³⁵

The single exception is a very interesting cup from a grave at Porto Cheli (Halieis) in the Argolid. The complete contents of this grave have not yet been published. However, W. Rudolph reports in his publication

of the cup by the Boreads Painter that the grave contained, among other things, a Corinthian aryballos with a spout in the shape of a woman's head.³⁶ According to Rudolph, this aryballos confirms a date around 575 for both the cup from Porto Cheli and a related cup by the Boreads Painter in New York, which marks the beginning of his career.³⁷ The grave at Porto Cheli is of great importance because it supplies a secure starting point for the dating of the painter's production.

For our purposes, however, a fixed date for the *last* period of the Boreads Painter's career would be of more interest, as the Getty cup should be from that

time. As long as no archaeological context proves otherwise, there is no reason to alter the stylistic and chronological framework of the Boreads Painter's late production as presented on page 90 of *Lakonische Vasenmaler*.³⁸

In light of the aforementioned arguments regarding shape and exterior decoration, a date around 565 B.C. for the Bellerophon and Chimaira cup in the Getty Museum seems acceptable. And this appears all the more so when we consider that the rather high stem of the foot, which is exceptional, points to a late date in the career of the Boreads Painter, who, most probably, also potted the cups he painted.

Rijksmuseum van Oudheden
Leiden

NOTES

Abbreviations:

LV C. M. Stibbe, *Lakonische Vasenmaler des sechsten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Amsterdam and London, 1972).

Pipili M. Pipili, *Lakonian Iconography of the Sixth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1987).

I would like to thank Marion True for inviting me to publish the Getty Bellerophon and Chimaira cup, Karen Manchester for helping me to overcome most obstacles by sending me all the necessary information about the cup, and Vincent Tosto for correcting my English.

1. The provenance of the cup is unknown.

2. Large parts of the rim, the foot, and the footplate are modern, but enough of each part is preserved to ensure the trustworthiness of the restorations.

3. For this painter, see LV, pp. 87–106. For the cups and fragments by the Boreads Painter, which became known after the publication of LV, see below (note 35). This cup was attributed to the Boreads Painter by M. True; see "Acquisitions in 1985," *GettyMusJ* 14 (1986), pp. 188–189, no. 28.

4. These two workshops have recently been treated in a not altogether satisfactory manner in F. Pompili, ed., *La Ceramica Laconica*, Atti del Seminario Perugia, 23–24 Febbraio, 1981 (Archaeologia Perugina, vol. 3) (Rome, 1986), pp. 65–74.

5. The cup was previously mentioned and the interior illustrated by Pipili, p. 19, fig. 29.

6. LV, p. 102, no. 156; Pipili, p. 27, fig. 41.

7. LV, no. 122, pl. 41.1; Pipili, p. 21, fig. 31. On another cup by the Boreads Painter in the Getty Museum (86.AE.461, C. Hoyt-Grimes, "A Kylix and Fragments by the Boread Painter," *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, vol. 3, Occasional Papers on Antiquities, vol. 2 [Malibu, 1986], fig. 1a; here fig. 2), the sphinx is substituted by a lion.

8. LV, no. 140, pl. 44.1; Pipili, p. 21, fig. 16.

9. E. Kunze and H. Schleif, *Olympiabericht*, vol. 2, *JdI* 53 (1938), p. 80, fig. 52, pl. 27; E. Kunze, *Archaische Schildbänder*, Olforsch, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1950), pp. 63–64.

10. See below (note 24).

11. Kunze, *Schildbänder* (note 9), pp. 60–62, 204; P. Demargne, *BCH* 53 (1929), p. 423, fig. 35; L. Giuliani, *Die archaischen Metopen von Selinunt* (Mainz, 1979), pp. 38–39; K. Schauenburg, "Herakles und Bellerophon auf einer Randschale in Kiel," *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome*, 41, n.s. 6 (1979), p. 13.

12. LV, p. 82, no. 96; Pipili, p. 37, no. 96, fig. 52.

13. The petals are shorter in his earlier cups: for example LV, pls.

36.5, 38.1, 41.1; cf. the longer petals on later cups, LV, pls. 44.1, 44.3, 45.2.

14. Cf. *Heldensage*³, p. 292; Pipili, pp. 18–21. The origin of the myth has been treated most recently by S. Karouzou, *RA*, 1985, p. 75.

15. K. Schauenburg, "Baltimoremaler und Bellerophon," *Jahrbuch des Museums für Kunst und Gewerbe* 3 (1984), p. 27.

16. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts AR 25.386. The Chimaira has a human instead of a goat's head. H. Payne, *Protokorinthische Vasenmalerei* (Oxford, 1933), pl. 20.1; K. Fittschen, *Untersuchungen zum Beginn der Sagen Darstellungen bei den Griechen* (Berlin, 1969), p. 160; M. Schmitt, *AJA* 70 (1966), p. 342.

17. Pratica di Mare (Lavinium) inv. E 1986; LV, pp. 7–8, no. 19; E. Paribeni, *Le Tredici Are*, Lavinium, vol. 2 (Rome, 1975), p. 363, mentions only a lion hunt. During restoration the scene with the Chimaira was damaged; see LV, p. 72 n. 4.

18. For other examples, see Schauenburg (note 15), p. 12.

19. LV, no. 140, pl. 44.1.

20. On the tails of boars: LV, no. 140, pl. 44.1; no. 160, pl. 49.3; and on an unclear object: LV, no. 166, pl. 50.6.

21. See above (note 8). Cf. also LV, no. 122, pl. 41.1.

22. LV, no. 122, pl. 41.1; no. 152, pl. 48.2; no. 161, pl. 49.11; and the Getty cup (note 7).

23. LV, no. 152, pl. 48.1, and an unpublished sherd from Sardis (inv. P 62.233/4571).

24. Pipili, p. 19 with nn. 178 and 179.

25. Thus Pipili, p. 21.

26. Cf. K. Schauenburg, *JdI* 71 (1956), p. 66; idem (note 11).

27. Inv. B6; LV, p. 154; E. A. Lane, "Lakonian Vase-Painting," *BSA* 34 (1933/1934), pp. 99–189, pl. 36c. Cf. the different renderings on the other Getty cup (fig. 2), where the manes are treated as a single purple-colored mass. This lion, though, shows a lower jaw and tongue like the lion on our cup.

28. On the other Getty cup (fig. 2), on the cup in Rome (LV, no. 122, pl. 41.1), and on fragments from Amathous (Cyprus), published by J. P. Thalmann, in E. Gjerstad et al., *Greek Geometric and Archaic Pottery Found in Cyprus*, Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, vol. 26 (Lund, 1977), p. 81, pl. XVIII.9–10 ("autour du Peintre des Boreades").

29. Cf. the running dogs on the cup Louvre E 663 (LV, pl. 40.3). The same type of body incisions occur on the lion on the other Getty cup (fig. 2). This type, consisting of two groups of wavy lines, one on the middle part of the body and one on the hindquarters, seems to be standard for his felines.

30. LV, pp. 157, 158, 162 (Hydra); p. 161 (Typhon?); pp. 151, 165

(Gorgoneion and Gorgo).

31. Cf. *LV*, p. 151: British Museum B5 (Lane [note 27], pl. 37a).

32. Cf. *LV*, p. 99 (Group C, b).

33. Cf. *LV*, p. 94.

34. *Ibid.* Mostly there is a broad, black band around the foot attachment, followed by two or three thick lines. Cf. *LV*, pls. 50.4, 50.16, 50.18.

35. Since the appearance of *LV* (1972), the following pieces by the Boreads Painter have been published: one complete cup from Haliëis (*Hesperia* 45 [1976], pp. 240–252, pl. 59); several fragments of at least two cups from Cyrene (G. P. Schaus, *The East Greek, Island, and Laconian Pottery: The Extramural Sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone at Cyrene, Libya*, vol. 2 [Philadelphia, 1985], nos. 155, 156, 193, 194); one fragment from Samos (H. P. Isler, *Samos*, vol. 4 [Bonn, 1978], p. 102, no. 183, pl. 52); six fragments of one cup from Amathous (note 28); one fragmentary cup of unknown provenance in the J. Paul Getty Museum (Hoyt-Grimes [note 7], *passim*; here fig. 2). Unpublished are a cup from the Artemision in Samos, with a rosette in the medallion (I owe this information to Maria Pipili); one fragment

from Gordion, with the same decoration; and one fragment from Sardis, with the hindquarters of a horse (I owe knowledge of the last two to the excavators).

36. W. Rudolph, *Hesperia* 45 (1976), p. 252, where he refers for comparison to H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia* (Oxford, 1931), pl. 47.14 (no. 884).

37. Cf. *LV*, p. 90 (no. 117); also p. 95 and pl. 35.

38. Some confusion seems to have been caused by Isler (note 35), who in his publication of the “Nordtor” complex at the Heraion on Samos dates the sherd by the Boreads Painter extremely late (550–540) on the basis of the archaeological context. One should note, however, that this is no more than a *terminus ante quem*, for Isler writes: “nach der Fundlage um 550–540 v. Chr. oder älter.” These last words, “oder älter,” should not be overlooked. Therefore the later dating by Hoyt-Grimes (note 7), p. 29, of the second Getty cup by the Boreads Painter (fig. 2), precisely from the years 550–540, for which she offers no arguments, cannot be accepted. I shall return on another occasion to Isler’s criticism of my dating of Lakonian vase-painters in general.

Six's Technique at the Getty

Janet Burnett Grossman

A little more than one hundred years ago, the Dutch scholar Jan Six gathered together and wrote the seminal article on a group of fifty-eight vases and twenty-seven fragments decorated during the Archaic period with figures painted in added white, red, or brown on the black-glazed surface.¹ Subsequently, in recognition of Six's contribution, J. D. Beazley coined the sobriquet "Six's technique" to refer to this early polychrome technique on Attic vases.² Development of the technique progressed from its earliest version of figures in added color of plain white with incision used sparingly for inner anatomical details to a later type that has parts of the composition incised alone and other parts depicted using a larger assortment of added colors with more detailed interior incision work.³

Six's technique is one of the triumvirate of experimental vase-painting methods initiated about 530 B.C., a date that heralded an exciting period of transition in the change from black-figure to red-figure vase-painting.⁴ On the basis of surviving examples, the technique was used primarily to decorate lekythoi, since out of 169 vases and fragments painted in Six's technique known to this author, 107 are lekythoi. Additional shapes decorated in the technique include amphora (1), neck-amphorae (3), stamnoi (11), hydria (1), oinochoai (3), alabastra (2), oon (1), phialai (24), kyathoi (2), rhyton with kyathos (1), skyphoi (5), and cups (6).⁵ A small group of artists accounts for the eighty-three vases that have been attributed. They include Nikosthenes; the Antimenes Painter or the Leagros Group; Psiax; Sosimos, potter; Phanyllis Group, C, the Chariot Painter; the Cock Group; the Class of Athens 581; the Sappho Painter; the Diosphos Painter; the Painter of Vatican 480; and Class P: the Chairete Class.⁶

The invention of Six's technique has been attributed to the workshop of Nikosthenes, that ancient entrepreneur and innovator in the pottery industry.⁷ For, in addition to Six's technique, Nikosthenes has been credited with the creation of white-ground technique as well as the introduction of new vase-shapes based on Corinthian, Etruscan, and Eastern prototypes, including the kyathos and the head vase.⁸ The Getty

Museum is fortunate to have in its collection three varied pieces painted in Six's technique: a stamnos, a fragmentary skyphos, and a small fragment from a phiale.

The first vase to be considered in the Getty collection is a handleless stamnos with an overall floral decoration of thick matte-red pigment painted over the black glaze.⁹ The mouth is lipped above and below an incised groove that encircles its outer aspect (figs. 1a–g). The top of the mouth is chipped above side A. The neck curves inward slightly to join the body; a red ring (darker than the body decoration) marks this juncture. The interior of the mouth and neck is glazed black down to the junction of the neck and body. There is a zone of rays done in standard black-figure technique at the base of the body, separated from the upper portion by a line of added dark-red pigment. A fillet of dark-red marks the junction of the body and black torus foot. There is a graffito on the underside of the vase (figs. 1e, f).

The designs on both sides A and B consist of three palmettes enclosed by an encircling tendril attached to the hearts of the three palmettes. The tendril chain originates from the bottom of a calyx from which springs yet another palmette. The palmette within a calyx creates the effect of a crest and serves as a focal point for the design. The tendril chain links the other three palmettes to the "crest" by attachment to each palmette heart. The effect of the design is one of botanical vibrancy. B. Philippaki states that the designs on both sides are identical, but, in fact, there are slight differences between them.¹⁰ The two compositions are distinguished, one from the other, by the number of leaves in the two central palmettes. Side A (fig. 1a) contains seven leaves in the upper palmette and ten in the lower, as compared to five and nine, respectively, on side B (fig. 1b). Also, the enclosing tendril on side B has a more sinuous quality than the one on side A. The lateral palmettes are virtually identical on both sides, each having the same number leaves (12). The design on sides A–B (fig. 1c) and B–A (fig. 1d) are formed by two tendrils spiraling off the enclosing tendrils. Side A–B is distinguished by the tendrils spiral-



Figure 1a. Handleless stamnos in Six's technique. Side A. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 83.AE.324.



Figure 1b. Side B of stamnos, figure 1a.



Figure 1c. Side A-B of stamnos, figure 1a.

ing in the same direction, one above the other; on side B-A they spiral in opposite directions. Four single leaves mark the joins of the enclosing and off-shooting tendrils on each side.

Of the five known Attic examples of handleless stamnoi, three are decorated in Six's technique.¹¹ However, other than the fact that these three lack handles, no affinities between them in either proportion or style of decoration can be seen.¹² In its decorative scheme, the Malibu vase is related to stamnoi in Edinburgh and Leiden.¹³ These three are the only vases in Six's technique on which a palmette-scroll pattern covers the entire vase. While the Edinburgh and Leiden vases do seem to have been painted by the same person, as Philippaki declares (p. 26), I do not think we can place the Malibu vase with them. Whereas the palmettes, nearly circumscribed by the tendrils, range freely over the surfaces of the Edinburgh and Leiden vases in a balanced manner, the palmettes on the Malibu vase are clearly dominant, forming the focus of the design. By comparison to the aforementioned vases, the palmettes on our vase are large, few in number, and deliberately placed on the vase in a symmetrical fashion.

In addition, the profiles of the vases have significant differences. Philippaki states (p. 28) that the Malibu



Figure 1d. Side B-A of stamnos, figure 1a.



Figure 1e. Underside of foot of stamnos, figure 1a.




Figure 1f. Graffito on underside of foot of stamnos, figure 1a. Scale 1:2. Drawing: Timothy Seymour.

vase is connected in shape and proportions with the Edinburgh stamnos and its companions. I confess I do not see this from a comparison of their profiles. The Edinburgh and Leiden vases have mouths of a convex design; high-set, steep shoulders; and globular, bloated bodies. Further, the necks are shorter in proportion to the rest of the vase than the neck on the Malibu vase. The profile of our vase is more nearly like the earliest example (type 1) in M. G. Kanowski's handbook of shapes, while the profiles of the Edinburgh and Leiden vases approximate more closely his type 2.¹⁴

The Malibu vase is thrice unusual; it is a handleless stamnos, it is a vase covered with floral decoration, and it is a vase painted in Six's technique. Clearly, it had to have come from an innovative workshop. It is tempting to place our vase near the workshop of the Sappho and Diosphos painters. These two painters and their workshop account for the greatest number of attributed vases painted in Six's technique.¹⁵ While, admittedly, they seem to have specialized in producing rather pedestrian lekythoi, there are some notable, inventive exceptions. The Sappho Painter's name vase is a particularly fine hydria, and he also painted a column-krater using white-ground technique.¹⁶ The Diosphos Painter produced an even larger oeuvre of white-ground pieces and, in addition, worked in outline.¹⁷

But, more important than the fact that the Sappho Painter and the Diosphos Painter were working in experimental techniques is the similarity between some of their pattern-work and that on our vase. For example, consider the design under the handles on the column-krater by the Sappho Painter in Karlsruhe (B 32, see note 16). There is an elaborate palmette and tendril network on the Karlsruhe vase with the palmettes broad and each leaf full, as are the palmettes on our vase. In addition, the hearts are particularly denoted, and some of the palmettes have twelve petals, the same number we find on the side palmettes of the Malibu vase. Also, we find that the Diosphos Painter painted both lekythoi and alabstra with rows of interlocking palmettes replacing figures.¹⁸

While a high proportion of vases in Six's technique are lekythoi, there are few skyphoi in the technique. Only five are known to this author.¹⁹ The fragmentary remains of one of these is the second vase in the Getty collection painted in Six's technique (figs. 2a-c). An acrobatic drinker adorns the side. The surviving fragments of the vase indicate that the piece was from a large skyphos.²⁰ It is finely potted with a good-quality glaze. An ivy band, black on a reserved background, adorns the indented rim. A thin dark-red line marks the rim-body transition. A reserved area marks the




Figure 1g. Profile drawing of stamnos, figure 1a. Elevation, cross-section. Scale 1:2. Drawing: Timothy Seymour.

lower body filled with alternating red and black tongues between triple dilute-glaze thin lines above and double dilute-glaze thin lines below. A red-glaze fillet marks the body-foot junction. The foot is glazed black to the resting surface, which is reserved. The underside of the foot is glazed on its inner edge up to the body of the vase. The underside of the vase body set into the foot is reserved with a black-glazed circle ringing the center. The interior of the skyphos is black-glazed with a reserved circle, 5.1 cm in diameter, denoting the bottom (fig. 2b).

The acrobat gingerly balances himself in a precarious position on his left arm and right leg on the top-most line of the dark-red double exergue. He raises his left leg in a doglike gesture, while in his right hand he holds a kylix by the stem. His chin is in the bowl as the white of the kylix is painted over the red of his flesh. The red is thickly applied and reveals a blistered surface under magnification (10X). Incisions demarcate anatomical features, with several muscle groups delineated. The facial features are more lightly incised, notably the jawline and a rather wild-looking eye. The



Figure 2a. Fragmentary skyphos in Six's technique. Exterior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 76.AE.127.



Figure 2b. Interior of skyphos, figure 2a.






Figure 2c. Profile drawing of skyphos, figure 2a. Elevation, cross-section. Scale 1:2. Drawing: Timothy Seymour.



Figures 3a–b. Phiale fragment in polychrome technique. Above: interior; below: exterior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 82.AE.40.73.

wildness is emphasized by the scribbled way in which it is drawn. The black hair (glazed) is demarcated by a deep, regular incision line creating a pompadour hairstyle. An inscription, ΟΣΔΣΚΑ, in dilute dark-red glaze is placed just above the figure in such a way so as to create a top frame. A painted dilute-red fillet adorns the symposiast's head, for surely this is a participant in a symposium. Recall that in the *Odyssey* acrobats amused the guests of Menelaos at the wedding feast held for his son and daughter.²¹ Acrobatics and balancing tricks were common entertainment, but, on vases it is usually drinking cups that are balanced, not the symposiast himself.²² To my knowledge, the only vase in Six's technique with a comparable subject is a kyathos in Leningrad.²³ A satyr leans back, tentatively

balancing himself on his left elbow, buttock, and left heel, while he holds a drinking cup in his right hand. As on our man, his naked flesh is painted in red.

In overall style, proportions, and technique we might consider placing our skyphos close to the workshop of the Theseus Painter, the last master of Attic black-figure. He painted large skyphoi and began his career as a painter of White Heron skyphoi. These are so named from the practice of painting a heron of superposed white by the handles. His skyphoi have the same kind of profile as our vase, with a similarly painted ivy band at the mouth, tongues on a reserved area at the base, and a comparable fillet and foot shape.²⁴

The last item in the Getty collection to be considered

is a phiale fragment decorated on the inside with dolphins.²⁵ Strictly speaking, it should not be included as an example of Six's technique, since the design is made with overpainting only and does not contain any incision work (figs. 3a–b). We place it here, however, as it is related to the group of phiale fragments, mostly from the Akropolis, which Six included in the second part of his article.²⁶ The phiale is made of medium-coarse clay glazed black and ringed with dolphins applied in thick white paint, which is well preserved. The dolphins are evenly spaced around the rim with their noses pointing inward. A circle of thickly applied red paint is placed in the spaces between the tails. A thin band of dilute-red glaze marks the rim on both the interior and exterior surfaces (4 mm from the outermost edge in both cases). The outermost edge is reserved, as is the underside of the vessel except for a glazed black band 2.1 cm wide about the perimeter just beneath the thin red line.

This fragment belongs to a rather large group of phiale fragments that have designs executed in overpainting with no incision.²⁷ The phiale seems to be a

popular shape for polychromy. Perhaps this reflects an effort on the part of the artist to replicate the metal prototype for the shape, or it may show an East Greek influence on design. There is a fragment in the Akropolis group of phiale fragments with similarly configured white dolphins.²⁸ Of the several examples of dolphins on vases painted in Six's technique, that one most closely matches the dolphins on our vase.²⁹ There the dolphins are similarly arranged in a centripetal fashion with their tails pointing toward the rim.

The three vases in the Getty Museum painted in Six's technique happily take their place in the small group of surviving specimens executed in this experimental medium during a brief period at the turn of the fifth century B.C. Many of the designs on these vases are action oriented, with the figures shown in exaggerated postures. As we have seen, it was a technique carried out by a select group of artists—experimenters and innovators. Two of our vases in particular are proud exemplars of the best of the technique, possessing a certain naive charm and cunning appeal.

The J. Paul Getty Museum
Malibu

ADDENDUM

There are various additions to the corpus of vases decorated in Six's technique. I have divided the material into two parts. The first part gives museum inventory numbers, attributions, changes in location, and further references for the vases included in the 1888 article by Jan Six. I have not listed the vases in Six's article for which there is no new information. The second part of the addendum offers those vases to be added to Six's original group.

1. Additions to Vases in Jan Six's 1888 Article

- I. Paris, Louvre F 114, *ABV* 226; *Beazley Addenda*, p. 27; *CVA France* 5, pls. 37.9, 12, 13, 16 and 38.1.
- II. Athens 2246, Chariot Painter, Nicole, p. 192, no. 960 ter; *ABL*, p. 203, no. 1.
- III. Athens 2226, Chariot Painter(?), Nicole, p. 192, no. 961; *ABL*, p. 66, no. 1.
- IV. London GR 1838.6–8.133, Walters, B 686.
- V. London GR 1837.7–17.181, *ABV* 672; *JdI* 43 (1928), p. 339; Jacobsthal, p. 70, pl. 87b–c; Walters, B 691; *JHS* 78 (1958), p. 21; Philippaki, p. 25, no. 3; Isler-Kerényi, p. 29.
- VI. Berlin 4029, *ABV* 672; *JdI* 43 (1928), p. 339; Jacobsthal, pp. 69–70, 134, pls. 14d, 87a; A. Rumpf, *Malerei und Zeichnung der klassischen Antike* (Munich, 1953), p. 76, pl. 21.9; Philippaki, p. 25, no. 4; Isler-Kerényi, p. 29.
- VI bis. Leiden RSx 1, *CVA Netherlands* 5, pls. 113–115; Philippaki, p. 25, no. 2.
- VII. Warsaw 142333, Sappho Painter, *ARV*² 300; *Beazley*

(see note 2), pp. 8–10; *CVA Poland* 1, pl. 16; *ABL*, p. 228, no. 56; *ABFV*, fig. 311.

- VIII. Naples RC 185, Sappho Painter, *ABL*, p. 227, no. 41.
- IX. Naples 2463, Sappho Painter, *ABL*, p. 228, no. 46.
- X. Athens, National Museum 2262, Sappho Painter, Nicole, p. 193, no. 962; *ABL*, p. 228, no. 47.
- XI. London GR 1837.6–9.72, Diosphos Painter, Walters, B 687; *ABL*, p. 236, no. 91; *AJA* 17 (1913), p. 9, no. 8; D. Feytmans, *Vases Grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Brussels, 1948), p. 38; Brommer, p. 438, no. 22.
- XII. Once Brussels, van Branteghem collection, probably Sappho Painter, *ABV* 675; *ABL*, p. 228, no. 50 bis.
- XIII. London GR 1842.4–7.16, the Painter of Vatican 480, *ABV* 609.1; Walters, B 693; *BSR* 11 (1929), p. 6, no. 7; Williams, fig. 40a.
- XIV. Paris, Louvre CA 2494, Diosphos Painter, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 95.
- XV. London GR 1842.7–28.989, Diosphos Painter, Walters, B 690; *ABL*, p. 236, no. 94; *DVB*, p. 103, no. 151.
- XV bis. Syracuse 6312, Diosphos Painter, *ABV* 702; *ABL*, p. 235, no. 73; *DVB*, p. 99, no. 99.
- XV ter. Paris, Cabinet des Médailles 493, Diosphos Painter, *CVA France* 10, pl. 95.1, 3, 4; *ABL*, p. 236, no. 93.
- XV quater. Taranto (old museum no. 31), Diosphos Painter, *ABL*, p. 235, no. 72.
- XVII. London GR 1887.7–25.2, Diosphos Painter, Walters, B 688; *ABL*, p. 235, no. 74; *Paralipomena*, p. 248.
- XVII bis. Paris, Louvre MNB 912, Diosphos Painter, *ABL*, p. 235, no. 76; *AWL*, p. 158, fig. 2d.

- XVII ter. Paris, Louvre MNB 2861, Diosphos Painter, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 86.
- XVIII. Berlin 2240, Diosphos Painter, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 89; Neugebauer, p. 57.
- XVIII bis. Paris, Louvre S 1683, Diosphos Painter, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 97.
- XIX. Berlin 2241, Diosphos Painter, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 90; Neugebauer, p. 56.
- XX. Berlin 2239, Sappho Painter, *ABL*, p. 228, no. 44; Neugebauer, p. 56.
- XXI. Athens, National Museum 2317, Sappho Painter, Nicole, p. 192, no. 960 bis; *ABL*, p. 228, no. 45.
- XXI bis. Paris, Cabinet des Médailles 492, Diosphos Painter, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 96; *CVA* France 10, pl. 95.1, 3–4.
- XXII. Berlin 2242, Neugebauer, p. 56.
- XXIII. Berlin 2243, Neugebauer, p. 56.
- XXV. Berlin 2244, Sappho/Diosphos workshop, *ABL*, p. 107 n. 3.
- XXVI. Bonn 85, Sappho/Diosphos workshop, *CVA* Germany 39, pl. 39.5.
- XXVIII. Berlin 4038, Neugebauer, p. 57.
- XXIX. Naples RC 172, Sappho Painter, *ABL*, p. 228, no. 49.
- XXXI. Athens, National Museum 2506, Nicole, p. 963.
- XXXI bis. Agrigento C.732, manner of the Diosphos Painter, *CVA* Italy 61, pl. 72.1–2.
- XXXII. London GR 1865.1-3.32, Walters, B 689.
- XXXII bis. Paris, Louvre F 197 (Coll. Campana, Cp 3481), *ABL*, p. 129; Pottier, pl. 77.
- XXXII ter. Paris, Louvre F 196 (Durand E, N 2592; ED 909), Pottier, pl. 77.
- XXXIII. London GR 1873.8-20.279, Class P: The Chairete Class, *ARV*² 1546.2; *CVA* Great Britain 5, pls. 36.5, 39.3.
- XXXIV. Athens, Akropolis 1236, Graef and Langlotz, pl. 89.
- XXXV. Berlin 2311, Pfuhl, vol. 3, p. 85, fig. 310; Neugebauer, p. 57.
- XXXVI. Athens, Akropolis 1224, Graef and Langlotz, pl. 88.
- XXXVII. Berlin 2312, Neugebauer, p. 56.
- XXXVIII. Athens, Akropolis 1227, Graef and Langlotz, pl. 88.
- XXXIX. London GR 1864.10-7.269, Walters, B 682; *CIRh*, vol. 4 (1929–1930), fig. 326; *JdI* 43 (1928), p. 341; *BSA* 70 (1975), p. 158, no. 81.
- XL. Athens, Akropolis 1209, Graef and Langlotz, pl. 87.
- XLI. Athens, Akropolis 1172, Graef and Langlotz, p. 106.
- XLII. Athens, Akropolis 1218, Graef and Langlotz, p. 109.
- XLIII. Athens, Akropolis 1216, Graef and Langlotz, p. 109.
- XLIV. London GR 1877.9-30.21, Walters, B 685.
- XLVI. Athens, Akropolis 1191, Graef and Langlotz, p. 108.
- L bis. Paris, Louvre MNB 624, O. Rayet and M. Collignon, *Histoire de la céramique grecque* (Paris, 1888), p. 331, fig. 124.
- LI. London GR 1867.5-6.36.
- LII. London GR 1867.5-6.37.
- LIII. Athens, Akropolis 1126, Graef and Langlotz, p. 103.
- LIV. Athens, Akropolis 1120, Graef and Langlotz, p. 102, pl. 85.
- LV. Athens, Akropolis 1114 or 1115, Graef and Langlotz, p. 102, pl. 85.
- LVIII. Athens, Akropolis 1136, Graef and Langlotz, p. 103.
- LIX. Athens, Akropolis 1168, Graef and Langlotz, p. 106, pl. 86.
- LX. Athens, Akropolis 1204, Graef and Langlotz, p. 109.
- LXI. Athens, Akropolis 1181 and 1182, Graef and Langlotz, p. 107, pl. 87.
- LXII. Athens, Akropolis 1184, Graef and Langlotz, p. 107.
- LXIII. Athens, Akropolis 1177, Graef and Langlotz, p. 107, pl. 87.
- LXVII. Athens, Akropolis 1220, Graef and Langlotz, p. 109, pl. 89.

Six also included vases to which he did not assign formal numbers. I assign numbers now, bracketed, along with the page number of the article on which the vases appear.

- [LXVIII] p. 209, no. 2. Paris, Louvre F 195, Pottier, p. 758.
- [LXIX] p. 281, no. 1 (I bis). Bologna PU 229, Sappho Painter, *ABL*, p. 227, no. 42; G. Pellegrini, *Catalogo dei vasi antichi dipinti delle collezioni Palagi ed Universitaria* (Bologna, 1900), p. 32, fig. 25, and p. 33, fig. 26; Pfuhl, fig. 312; DVB, p. 71, no. 13.
- [LXX] p. 289, A. London GR 1864.10-7.206, Walters, B 697; J. D. Beazley, *Campana Fragments in Florence* (Oxford, 1933), pl. 20, no. 79; A. B. Cook, *Zeus* 1 (Cambridge, 1914), p. 735; *BSA* 70 (1975), p. 158, no. 80.
- [LXXI] p. 289, B. London GR 1864.10-7.106, Walters, B 698; *BSA* 70 (1975), p. 158, no. 73.
- [LXXII] p. 289, no. 1. Athens, Akropolis 1075, Graef and Langlotz, p. 99.
- [LXXIII] p. 290, pl. 29.9. Athens, Akropolis ii, 1078, Sosimos, potter, Graef and Langlotz, p. 99; *ABV* 350.

2. Additional Vases in Six's Technique

Antimenes Painter Workshop or the Leagros Group

The following vases are all connected in one way or another by various scholars. Some are linked on the basis of figure style, some on potting technique, while others have similar floral ornament. There has been an attempt to make an attribution for these vases, primarily to either the Antimenes Painter workshop or to the Leagros Group. Philippaki, speaking mainly of Berlin 4029 and London GR 1837.7-17.181, places them in the Leagros Group in the tradition of the Acheloos Painter and the Group of Louvre F 314. Isler-Kerényi adds the Swiss market handleless stamnos (listed by her as private collection, Lugano), but places the group in the workshop of the Antimenes Painter. Beazley, however, while he agrees that the amphorae in Capesthorpe Hall and Florence, and the stamnoi, London GR 1837.7-17.181 (B 691) (Six number V) and Berlin 4029 (Six number VI), go together, does not make an attribution.

Neck-amphorae

1. Capesthorpe Hall, Bromley-Davenport, *ABV* 672; *Paralipomena*, p. 318; *Beazley Addenda*, p. 70; *JHS* 78 (1958), p. 21, pl. Xb-c (reminiscent of the Acheloos Painter); *ABFV*, fig. 312.
2. Florence, from Saturnia, *ABV* 672 (same style as no. 1); *Paralipomena*, p. 318; *Mon.Ant.* 30 (1925), pp. 646-647, 652-653, figs. 32, 34.

Stamnoi

3. Basel, Münzen und Medaillen, sale 18 (November 29, 1958), no. 109; Philippaki, p. 25, no. 5.
4. Reading University, fr., Philippaki, p. 28, no. 1.
5. Swiss market (formerly private collection, Lugano), Isler-Kerényi, pp. 29-34; *Stamnoi: An Exhibition in the J. Paul Getty Museum* (Malibu, 1980), no. 7.

Psiax

Alabastron

6. London 1900.6-11.1, from Eretria, *ABV* 294.25, 669, 674; *ARV²* 8.13; *Paralipomena*, p. 321, no. 13; *Beazley Addenda*, p. 38; *AWL*, pp. 117-118, pl. 1.3a-c; A. S. Murray, in *Mélanges Perrot* (Paris, 1903), p. 252; *JHS* 85 (1965), p. 24, pl. 14; Mertens, p. 35, no. 4. Youths with horses.

Sosimos, Potter

Phiale

7. Eleusis 1458, fr., from Eleusis, *ABV* 350; H. Lushey, *Die Phiale* (Bleicherode am Herz, 1939), pp. 108-109, 151. Floral pattern.

The Cock Group

Lekythos

8. Boston 10.556, *ABV* 471.122; *ABL*, p. 68; Mertens, p. 214 n. 22. Man seated between two nude spear-carrying youths.

The Class of Athens 581

Lekythoi

9. Athens 12848, *ABV* 503; Mertens, p. 214 n. 23. Two nude dancing women.
10. Paris, Mikas collection, *Paralipomena*, p. 245; Mertens, p. 214 n. 23. Dionysos in his chariot.

The Sappho Painter

Lekythoi

11. Alpine, New Jersey, Tray collection. Unpublished. Draped figure riding a bullock.
12. Basel market, L.L. shape, Münzen und Medaillen, sale 51 (1975), pl. 32.145. Bearded kitharode.
13. New York market, L.L. shape, H. A. Cahn, *Art of the Ancients* (New York, 1968), no. 25; *Muse* 3 (1969), p. 28 n. 10. Seated woman and youth in conversation.
14. New York 23.160.87, *BMMA* 25 (1930), p. 136, fig. 4; *ABL*, p. 228, no. 43; G. M. A. Richter, *Handbook of the Greek Collection* (Cambridge, 1953), p. 75 n. 82. Ithyphallic dancing satyr.

15. Syracuse 26822, from Agrigento, *ABL*, p. 228, no. 48. Peleus and Atalanta.

Near the Sappho Painter

Lekythos

16. Zurich, Sternberg collection, L.L. shape, *Paralipomena*, p. 247; Basel, Münzen und Medaillen, sale 14 (1954), pl. 17, no. 73. Woman dancing with krotala.

Stamnos

17. Heidelberg E 51, fr., *Gnomon* 10 (1934), p. 326 n. 1; *ABL*, p. 106. Women washing.

The Diosphos Painter

Lekythoi

18. Athens 14654, L.L. shape, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 101; *DVB*, p. 83, no. 131. Combat between horseman and Amazon.
19. Athens Painter, from Perachora, L.L. shape, *ABV* 510.19. Horseman and warrior.
20. Athens, Kerameikos 30.V.10, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 99. Satyr with goat.
21. Basel BS 423, *CVA* Switzerland 4, pl. 56.8, 10. Woman and satyr.
22. Basel, Delz collection, *ABV* 510.20; Basel, Monnaies et médailles, sale 11 (January 23-24, 1953), pl. 17, no. 332. Horseman.
23. Boston 98.885, from Gela, *Paralipomena*, p. 248, no. 81; *ABL*, p. 236, no. 81, pl. 38.6; J. V. Noble, *Techniques of Painted Attic Pottery* (New York, 1988), p. 142, fig. 221; L. D. Caskey, *Geometry of Greek Vases* (Boston, 1922), p. 218, no. 174.
24. Karlsruhe B 34 (231), from Girgenti, *Paralipomena*, p. 248, no. 78; *ABL*, p. 235, no. 78; *CVA* Germany 7, pl. 31.1. Galloping horseman and dog.
25. London 1910.4-15.1, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 79. Maenad with thyrsos and dog.
26. London 1910.4-15.2, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 80. Eos and Memnon.
27. London 1914.5-12.2, *ABL*, p. 235, no. 75. Athena holding helmet.
28. New York market (Hirsch), L.L. shape, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 100. Youth leading horse.
29. New York 24.97.29, from Gela, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 92; *BMMA* 20 (1925), p. 131, fig. 1; J.-M. Moret, *Oedipe, la Sphinx et les Thébains* (Geneva, 1984), p. 23 n. 7. Eos and Memnon.
30. Oxford 1942.1, *ABV* 510.17; *Paralipomena*, p. 249; *DVB*, p. 99, no. 98; Ashmolean Museum, *Select Exhibition . . .* (Oxford, 1967), pl. 14.125. Amazon leading horse.
31. Palermo 28, *CVA* Italy 40, III, I, pl. 1.1-2. Amazonomachy.
32. Palermo 2187, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 84. Young hero leading off a woman.
33. Paris, Louvre CA 1982, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 98. Satyr carrying a maenad.

34. Paris, Villard collection, *ABV* 510.18. Dancing satyr with kithara.
35. Salerno 1126, from Fratte, *ABV* 510.16. Seated youth with dog.
36. Syracuse 43.053, from Vittoria, *ABL*, p. 235, no. 77. Man with two dogs.
37. Syracuse 23784, from Camarina, *ABL*, p. 236, no. 85. Eos and Memnon.
38. Tübingen S./10 1293 (missing neck and mouth), *CVA* Germany 47, pl. 42.1–3. Horseman each side.
39. University of Missouri-Columbia 58.12, *Muse* 3 (1969), pp. 24–28; *RA* 23 (1972), p. 109; W. G. Moon, *Greek Vase-Painting in Midwestern Collections* (Chicago, 1979), p. 146, no. 83, pl. V; *AWL*, pp. 119, 199, pl. 6.4. Warrior striding past fallen, naked man.
40. Once Vienna, Trau collection, *ABV* 703.20 bis; Lucerne, *Antikensammlung Nachlass Franz Trau, Wien: Auktion*, sale 1 (November 16, 1954), pl. 4.193. Horseman.
41. Zurich, Ikle collection, *ABV* 716, 510.20 ter; *Paralipomena*, p. 249; Basel, Münzen und Medaillen, sale 16 (1956), pl. 26.117. Youth leading horse.

Near the Diosphos Painter

Lekythoi

42. Basel market, Münzen und Medaillen, *Paralipomena*, p. 250, no. 7 bis. Woman with kithara, preceded by a dog.
43. Bonn 464.22, from Cerveteri, fr., *ABV* 511.7; *Paralipomena*, p. 250; *CVA* Germany 39, pl. 39.4. Youth leading horse.

Workshop of the Sappho and Diosphos Painters

Lekythoi

44. Athens, Akropolis ii, 1081, from Athens, fr., *ABV* 673; Graef and Langlotz, p. 99, pl. 84. Athena.
45. Athens, Agora P 24548, L.L. Class, *Paralipomena*, p. 252. Warrior.
46. Athens, Kerameikos E 44, 1, L.L. shape, U. Knigge, *Kerameikos: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen*, vol. 9 (Berlin, 1976), pl. 90.1.
47. Copenhagen 4707, from Boeotia, "Hound and hare group," *ABL*, p. 231, no. 16; *CVA* Denmark 4, pl. 175.1. Man pursuing woman.
48. Jerusalem, Hebrew University 683, L.L. Class, *Paralipomena*, p. 252. Two naked women dancing.
49. Palermo, from Selinus, *ABL*, p. 107 n. 3. Hoplite.
50. Syracuse 26795, from Agrigento, *ABL*, p. 107 n. 3. Amazon running.
51. Taranto 2606, from Locri, *ABL*, p. 107 n. 3. Satyr with drinking horn.

Unattributed Vases

Amphora

52. Brussels R 280, *CVA* Belgium 3, III J a, pl. 2.7a–c; Pfuhl, pp. 335, 352. Running satyrs.

Stamnoi

53. Athens, Agora P 24017, fr., Philippaki, p. 28, no. 2. Diskobolos.
54. Edinburgh 81.44.28, Philippaki, p. 25, no. 1, pl. 15.4, fig. I. Floral decoration.
55. Italian market, handleless, Philippaki, p. 25, no. 7. Two running goats and ithyphallic satyr.

Oinochoai

56. Boston 01.8071. Figure standing on rearing horse, bird following.
57. Oxford 1929.354 (BB 330.2), shape 8. Horse between palmettes.

Lekythoi

58. Amsterdam 992, *ABL*, p. 88, no. 3; *CVA* Netherlands Pays-bas I, III I a, pl. 6.6. Frontal chariot.
59. Amsterdam 1357, from Greece, *CVA* Netherlands Pays-bas I, III I a, pl. 6.7. Two dancing nude men.
60. Athens, Kanellopoulos Museum 447. Horseman.
61. Athens, Kerameikos HTR 17 (1932). Herakles and Kerberos.
62. Basel Z-342, *CVA* Switzerland 4, pl. 56.9, 11. Dancing warrior.
63. Berlin 2238, Langlotz, no. 547.
64. Boston 00.333. Scythian archer flanked by women, all running.
65. Boston 97.374, *ABL*, p. 186; *AJA* 15 (1911), p. 379, fig. 1; Brommer 481.A3; *Jahrbuch der staatlichen Kunstsammlungen in Baden-Württemberg* 9 (1972), p. 7, fig. 1; I. Krauskopf, *Der thebanische Sagenkreis und andere griechische Sagen in der etruskischen Kunst* (Mainz, 1974), p. 89 n. 334. Oedipus and the Sphinx. Genuine? D. von Bothmer, *AJA* 60 (1956), p. 303, states that the design was modern and had been removed. It was still in place in March 1987 when I examined the vase.
66. Brussels A 1390, from Athens, *CVA* Belgium 3, III I a, pl. 2.4. Figure leading horse.
67. Caltagirone, Museo Regionale della Ceramiche, Coll. Russo-Perez. Male dancer, female flute player.
68. Karlsruhe B 985, *CVA* Germany 7, pl. 31.2, fig. 2. Two dancers.
69. Catania 2109, fr., G. Libertini, *Il Museo Biscari*, vol. 1 (Milan, 1930), pl. 82.693. Galloping horse and dog.
70. London GR 1920.7-12.1. Centaur and warrior.
71. London GR 1931.7-15.2. Youth taming horse.
72. London 1905.11-2.3, *JHS* 31 (1911), p. 15, no. VIII, fig. 13; *AJA* 87 (1983), pp. 87–88, pl. 15.4; *AJA* 89 (1985), p. 416, no. 1. Woman weaving.
73. New Haven 1913.128, P. V. C. Baur, *Catalogue of the Rebecca Darlington Stoddard Collection of Greek and Italian Vases in Yale University* (New Haven, 1922), p. 85, no. 128, fig. 20, pl. II; *DVB*, p. 4, no. 62. Herakles and Amazon.
74. New York 41.162.96 (ex-Gallatin), *CVA* USA 8, III I a, pl. 60.11; B. Fehr, *Orientalische und griechische Gelage* (Bonn, 1971), p. 156, no. 229. Seated naked komast.

75. New York 63.11.5, handle missing. Theseus and Minotaur.
 76. New York 67.11.22, *Festschrift F. Brommer* (see note 3), p. 61, no. 170, pl. 19.4. Herakles and the Delphic tripod.
 77. Oxford 1927.4429, from Athens. Standing draped figure with staff.
 78. Oxford 1938.732. Standing draped figure.
 79. Palermo 30, *CVA Italy 50*, III I a, pl. 1.3. Satyr.
 80. Paris, Louvre CA 3326. Standing woman holding torch.
 81. Würzburg 547, from Athens, Langlotz, no. 547, pl. 205.547. Dancing figure holding kantharos and staff.

Oon

82. Königsberg, University F 198, *ABFV*, fig. 310. Crane and rooster.

Phialai

83. Athens, Akropolis 1957.Aa.90, from south slope. Five horsemen.
 84. Basel market, Münzen und Medaillen, sale 24 (October 5, 1963), pl. 41.122. Symposium.
 85. Eleusis 444, from Eleusis, fr., *AM 31* (1906), p. 196, pl. 17.2. Athena.
 86. Eleusis, from Eleusis. Two sirens playing lyres, two palmettes with spirals.
 87. Eleusis, from Eleusis, fr. Dolphins.
 88. Munich 8991. E. Keuls, *The Reign of the Phallus* (New York, 1985), fig. 147. Four nude women.
 89. Rhodes 13209, from Kamiros, *ABFV*, fig. 313; *CIRh*, vol. 4 (1929–1930), pl. 3, fig. 199. Heads of two women, two cranes, two pomegranates.
 90. Rhodes 13393, from Kamiros. *CIRh*, vol. 4 (1929–1930), figs. 323, 325. Two sirens with lyres, two palmettes with spirals.
 91. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1923, *ABFV*, fig. 314. Dolphins.
 92. Würzburg 430, Langlotz, no. 430, pl. 218.430. Eight

seated women.

Kyathos

93. Leningrad, Hermitage Museum, K. S. Gorbunova, *Chernofigurnye atticheskie vazy v Ermitazhe* (Leningrad, 1983), p. 198, no. 173. Reclining satyr holding kylix.

Skyphoi

94. Arezzo. Seated male figure.
 95. Berlin 4905, from Greece, Neugebauer, p. 56. Satyr with snake, maenad with thyrsos.
 96. Tampa, Florida, ex-Noble. Rooster between palmettes.
 97. Paris, Louvre CA 1630, Paris, Hôtel Drouot, sale (1904), no. 23, pl. 1. Two male figures.

Cups

98. Eleusis 2534, from Eleusis, fr., *AM 31* (1906), p. 196, pl. 17.2; K. Kanta, *Eleusis* (Athens, 1979), p. 130. Demeter, Kore, and Pluton, all seated.
 99. Gela 31290, from Bitalemi, fr. Lion.

Fragments

100. Reggio di Calabria, fr. Horse, lotus.
 101. Reggio di Calabria, fr. Octopus.

Current Whereabouts Unknown

Lekythoi

102. Body only. Ithyphallic figure following another figure (only arm and foot visible). (Seen in D. von Bothmer's archive, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.)
 103. Little Lion shape. Bird between two dolphins. (Seen in D. von Bothmer's archive, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.)

Olpe

104. Satyr carrying large amphora. Genuine? (Seen in D. von Bothmer's archive, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.)

Cup

105. Running Youth. Genuine? (Learned of from J. Robert Guy.)

NOTES

Abbreviations:

- ABFV* J. Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases* (London, 1974).
ABL C. H. E. Haspels, *Attic Black-Figured Lekythoi* (Paris, 1936).
AWL D. C. Kurtz, *Athenian White Lekythoi: Patterns and Painters* (Oxford, 1975).
 Brommer F. Brommer, *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage*, vol. 3 (Marburg, 1973).
 DVB D. von Bothmer, *Amazons in Greek Art* (Oxford, 1957).
 Graef and Langlotz B. Graef and E. Langlotz, *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen* (Berlin, 1933).
 Isler-Kerényi C. Isler-Kerényi, *Stamnoi* (Lugano, 1976–1977).
 Jacobsthal P. Jacobsthal, *Ornamente griechischer Vasen* (Berlin, 1927).
 Langlotz E. Langlotz, *Griechische Vasen* (Munich, 1932).
 Mertens J. R. Mertens, *Attic White-Ground: Its Development on Shapes Other than Lekythoi* (New York, 1977).

- Neugebauer K. A. Neugebauer, *Führer durch das Antiquarium* (Berlin, 1932).
 Nicole G. Nicole, *Catalogue des vases peints du Musée National d'Athènes*, Supplement (Paris, 1911).
 Pfuhl E. Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen* (Munich, 1923).
 Philippaki B. Philippaki, *The Attic Stamnos* (Oxford, 1967).
 Pottier E. Pottier, *Vases antiques du Louvre*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1901).
 Walters H. B. Walters, *Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum*, vol. 2 (London, 1893).
 Williams D. Williams, *Greek Vases* (London, 1985).

I wish to thank Marion True, Curator of Antiquities of the J. Paul Getty Museum, for the opportunity to study and publish this group of vases, for her patient assistance with the endeavor, and for being an exemplary mentor. I began this project while a Student Assistant at the Museum September–December 1985, and wish to thank the members of the antiquities department for their support and encouragement. I wish to express my appreciation to Dietrich von Both-

mer, who generously provided me access to his archive and to the group of Six's-technique vases in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. I wish to thank Joan Mertens for an important conversation that helped guide my thinking about experimental techniques in vase-painting. Thanks are due Cornelius Vermeule and David Gordon Mitten for allowing me to study vases in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and Harvard University Art Museums, respectively. Dyfri Williams of the British Museum and Angelika Waiblinger of the Louvre kindly sent me information on the Six's vases in their museums. And, finally, I wish to thank Robert Guy of the Art Museum, Princeton University, for telling me of three Six's vases on the market.

1. J. Six, "Vases Polychromes sur Fond Noir de la Période Archaique," *GazArch* 13 (1888), pp. 193–210, 281–294. Six was concerned, first of all, with what he termed ". . . une question purement systématique . . ." i.e., determining whether this group of vases belonged to black-figure or to red-figure vase-painting (p. 193). He concluded that they formed a distinct group, which, in the earliest examples, resembled a type of black-figure, but then soon became an imitation of the new red-figure technique. The polychrome style could not compete with the liveliness of the new technique, thus enjoying only a short-lived and limited vogue in the workshops of Athens.

2. J. D. Beazley, *Greek Vases in Poland* (Oxford, 1928), p. 8.

3. C. H. E. Haspels, "A Lekythos in Six's Technique," *Muse* 3 (1969), pp. 24–25; *AWL*, pp. 116–117. P. E. Corbett, "Preliminary Sketch in Greek Vase-Painting," *JHS* 85 (1965), p. 24, observes that in addition to the common usage of preliminary sketch in Attic red-figure, preliminary incisions were used in Six's technique as both guidelines for the added colors and, in the later version, as preliminary sketch with evidence for a change of plan where the drawing is directly incised on the black glaze. A good example of preliminary sketch on a Six's vase is found on a lekythos in New York (The Metropolitan Museum of Art 67.11.22). D. von Bothmer, "The Struggle for the Tripod," in U. Höckmann and A. Krug, eds., *Festschrift für Frank Brommer* (Mainz, 1977), pl. 19.4.

4. The other two experimental techniques are coral-red and white-ground. A recent article lists five experiments in vase-painting technique: outline, white-figure, Six's technique, white-ground, and coral-red glaze. See B. Cohen, "Oddities of Very Early Red-figure and a New Fragment at the Getty," *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum* 4, Occasional Papers on Antiquities 5 (1989), p. 73 n. 1.

5. These numbers include some fragments, but the majority are complete vases. In addition, there are two fragments of an unidentified vase-shape. Attic vases painted in superposed colors, which I chose to include, fall within the definition of Six's technique as superposed colors with incision (see below, note 26). For example, these numbers do not include the group of plain, black-body lekythoi Haspels (*ABL*, p. 107) counted. Nor did I include choes of the type described by J. R. Green, "A Series of Added Red-Figure Choes," *AA*, 1970, pp. 475–487, nor the majority of phiale fragments with superposed colors found on the Akropolis, Graef and Langlotz, nos. 1074–1249, pls. 84–89.

6. The number of vase-shapes painted by each artist is: Nikosthenes—Nikosthenic neck-amphora (1); Antimenes Painter workshop or the Leagros Group—neck-amphorae (2), stamnoi (3); Psiax—alabastron (1); Sosimos, potter—phiale (fragments) (1), cup (fragment) (1); Phanyllis Group, C, the Chariot Painter—lekythoi (2); Cock Group—lekythos (1); Class of Athens 581—lekythoi (2); Sappho Painter—hydria (1), lekythoi (13); near the Sappho Painter—lekythos (1), stamnos fragment (1); Diosphos Painter—lekythoi (37); near the Diosphos Painter—lekythoi (3); Sappho/Diosphos workshop—lekythoi (10); Painter of Vatican 480—kyathos (1); Class P: the Chairete Class—rhyton with kalathos (1).

7. Six (note 1), p. 194, while not crediting Nikosthenes directly with the invention of the polychrome technique he is describing, implies as much by beginning his catalogue with the Nikosthenic

amphora in the Louvre (F 114). Six also sees the technique as less one of innovation than one of elaboration of the common and familiar use of added colors for highlighting anatomical and decorative details: ". . . n'avait qu'à transférer un procédé connu sur une plus grande composition pour créer ce nouveau genre" (p. 194). He also connects its use for the nude female figure on F 114 with its use for the scene on Andokides' baigneuse amphora, also in the Louvre (F 203). (Incidentally, I am informed by Angelika Waiblinger that this vase, along with those in Six's technique, will be included in a volume of the *CVA Louvre* on superposed colored vases, which she is assembling.) Pfuhl, pp. 333–334, reminds us that the use of added colors on a dark ground has a long history, extending from Neolithic examples to late Roman provincial ware. However, he also cites Nikosthenes' Louvre amphora (F 114) as the beginning of the Attic development of "die schwarzbunte Technik." Boardman (*ABFV*, pp. 64, 178) tentatively suggests Nikosthenes as the innovator of Six's technique; Kurtz (*AWL*, p. 12) credits Nikosthenes with giving us the earliest example of Six's technique in the Louvre amphora (F 114). For a discussion of the intricacies of the Nikosthenic workshop and the marketplace as progenitor of innovation, see M. M. Eisman, "Nikosthenic Amphorai: The J. Paul Getty Museum Amphora," *GettyMusJ* 1 (1975), pp. 48–54.

8. G. Loeschcke, "Dreifussvase aus Tanagra," *AZ* 39 (1881), pp. 36–37, argues that Nikosthenes introduced white-ground into Attica in order to revive an already worn-out black-figured style; the earliest Attic example of white-ground is found on the fragments of a large kantharos by Nearchos (Athens, Akropolis 611, *ABV* 82.1), where it is used for the pattern-bands above and below the figure scene: see J. D. Beazley, *The Development of Attic Black-Figure* (Berkeley, 1951), pp. 40–41. Boardman (*ABFV*, p. 64) finds Nikosthenes among the first to use white-ground for black-figure decoration; Kurtz (*AWL*, p. 12) suggests that white-ground originates with the Antimenes Painter and members of the Nikosthenic circle; D. von Bothmer, "Andokides the Potter and the Andokides Painter," *BMMA*, February 1966, p. 207, states that Andokides "should perhaps be credited not only with the invention of red-figure, but also the introduction of the white-ground technique"; Mertens, pp. 32–33, finding that Nikosthenes handled white-ground in an accomplished manner while "creating no impression of particular achievement," concludes that he does not seem to have developed the technique. In her opinion, "Nikosthenes, Andokides and their painter collaborators worked contemporaneously, and on the basis of existing evidence, the matter of priority cannot be conclusively resolved" (p. 35). But she deems the Andokidean workshop more decisively innovative, concluding that "Andokides produced the innovation [white-ground] and that Psiax and his 'brother' [Antimenes] demonstrated its possibilities" (p. 43). For Nikosthenes as the inventor of the kyathos, see M. M. Eisman, "Attic Kyathos Painters," Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1971, p. 46. For the association of Nikosthenes with the introduction of the head vase to the Attic market of the late sixth century B.C., see W. R. Biers, "Some Thoughts on the Origins of the Attic Head Vase," in W. G. Moon, ed., *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (Madison, 1983), p. 125. Nikosthenes as the inventor of the kyathos, Six's technique, and white-ground is presented matter-of-factly by D. Williams, *Greek Vases* (London, 1985), p. 35.

9. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 83.AE.324. H: 20.7 cm, max. diam of body: 17.9 cm, diam of mouth: 13.7 cm, diam of foot: 10.4 cm. The vase has been broken and repaired. First published by Philippaki, pp. 25–28, no. 6 (listed as Geneva market). See also *Stamnoi: An Exhibition at the J. Paul Getty Museum* (Malibu, 1980), no. 8, and "Acquisitions in 1983," *GettyMusJ* 12 (1984), p. 242, no. 53.

10. Philippaki, p. 28.

11. In addition to our vase, one in a collection in Geneva (ex-Lugano, Bolla collection), attributed to the workshop of the Antimenes Painter, is published by Isler-Kerényi, pp. 29–34; the other, on

the Italian market, Philippaki, pp. 27–28. Isler-Kerényi (p. 34) suggests Etruscan stamnoid kraters without handles as a prototype for this shape. See also her article, “Stamnoi e Stamnoidi,” *NumAntCl* 5 (1976), pp. 33–52.

12. Isler-Kerényi, p. 29, does suggest that the Geneva and Italian market vases could resemble one another in their “continuous figured decoration devoid of decorative elements.”

13. Edinburgh 81.44.28, Philippaki, pp. 25–26, pl. 15.4, fig. 1.A; Leiden RSx 1, Philippaki, pp. 25–26, *CVA* Leiden 3, pls. 113.1–2, 114.1–2, 115.1–2, fig. 3.

14. M. G. Kanowski, *Containers of Classical Greece* (St. Lucia, 1984), p. 140.

15. On the Diosphos workshop, the Diosphos potter, the Sappho Painter, and the Diosphos Painter, see *ABV*, pp. 507–511; *ARV²*, pp. 300–306; *Paralipomena*, pp. 246–251; *Beazley Addenda*, pp. 60–61; *ABL*, pp. 94–130, 225–241, 368–369, and eadem, “Le Peintre de Diosphos,” *RA*, 1972, pp. 103–109; *ABFV*, pp. 148–149; *AWL*, pp. 116–117.

16. Hydria, Warsaw 142333 (ex-Goluchow 32), *ARV²* 300, *CVA* Poland 1, pl. 16.3; column-krater, Karlsruhe B 32 (167), *ABV* 507.57, *Beazley Addenda*, p. 60, Mertens, pl. XI.1.

17. White-ground, esp. alabastra, see Mertens, pp. 95–98; and side-palmette lekythoi, see *AWL*, pp. 96–99. Semi-outline on white-ground, e.g., New York 06.1070, *ARV²* 301.3; *AWL*, pl. 59.2.

18. Palmette alabastra, e.g., Gerona 9, *ABV* 509.117; Mertens, p. 95, no. 10, pl. 14.2. Palmette lekythoi, e.g., Athens 12271, *ABL*, p. 235, no. 66; *AWL*, pl. 69.1. In addition, the Diosphos workshop was the first to produce white-ground side-palmette lekythoi in quantity.

19. In addition to the Malibu vase: Berlin 4905; Paris, Musée du Louvre CA 1630; Tampa, Florida, ex-Noble; and one in Arezzo. Knowledge of these latter two examples is due to the kind assistance of Dietrich von Bothmer.

20. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 76.AE.127. H: 16 cm, reconstructed diam of mouth (based on a projection from the arc of the surviving fragment): 23.2 cm, reconstructed diam of foot: 13.2 cm.

21. *Od.*, IV.15–20.

22. For example, a cup with symposiasts by Epiktetos in Oberlin (Allen Art Museum 67.61, *Paralipomena*, p. 329, no. 14 bis; J. Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period* [London, 1975], fig. 68) shows a squatting figure balancing a kylix on his outstretched arm. A figure in the tondo of a cup with Epilykos kalos (Louvre F 129, Pottier, pl. 73) balances a pointed amphora on his outstretched foot, while another cup, also in the Louvre (G 73, *ibid.*,

pl. 97) depicts a youth in an acrobatic position (a reverse hand-spring), balancing a large skyphos on his lower abdomen. In black-figure, a warrior acrobat, standing on his helmeted head, adorns one side of a cup belonging to the Class of Topband Stemlesses (Würzburg 428, *ABFV*, fig. 184).

23. Leningrad B 4474, K. S. Gorbunova, *Chernofigurnye Atticheskie vazy v Ermitazhe* (Leningrad, 1983), p. 198, no. 173. A small fragment among the Akropolis superposed color phiale fragments depicts a white-wreathed, bearded, red-fleshed man raising a kylix to his lips: Graef and Langlotz, pl. 89.1226.

24. On the Theseus Painter, see *ABL*, pp. 141–151, 249–254, and *ABFV*, p. 147. For examples of his skyphoi comparable to ours, see Toledo, Ohio, 63.27, *ibid.*, pl. 245.1–2; and a vase that was on the New York market, in *Masterpieces of Greek Vase Painting, 7th to 5th C. B.C.*, New York, Andre Emmerich Gallery, April–May 1964, no. 20.

25. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 82.AE.40.73. The fragment measures approximately 5.4 x 9.8 cm. The reconstructed diameter of the phiale, projected from the arc of the existing rim, is 23 cm.

26. Even though Six (note 1), pp. 281–287, presents the hoard of phiale fragments with added color with the other vases, few of them contain incision, which has been defined as the distinguishing characteristic in Six’s technique. See Green (note 5), p. 481, who distinguishes his group of choes from Six’s because, “The technique as a whole differs from that properly called Six’s which readily admits secondary colours, for the hair for instance, and regularly has incision.” Kurtz (*AWL*, p. 116) issues a caveat on discriminating between applied color and applied color with incision, which she defines as Six’s technique. Note that Beazley (*ABV*, p. 350) described a group of fragments from a phiale potted by Sosimos as being decorated in “Six-like technique,” presumably because the applied color had no incision.

27. See *AWL*, p. 117 n. 6. These fragments from Eleusis, as well as the Akropolis group presented by Six, are related by J. Boardman, “A Chian Phiale Mesomphalos from Marion,” *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*, 1968, pp. 14–15, to polychrome phialai from Chios.

28. See Graef and Langlotz, pl. 86.1202. Boardman (note 27), p. 15, reports a closely matching dolphin pattern on a Chian vase.

29. Most dolphins on Six’s vases known to me are part of a larger pattern scheme, e.g., on a lekythos in the Louvre (F 197) they supply narrative interest and legibility for the figure above them, who is seen to be swimming in the sea.

A New Representation of a City on an Attic Red-figured Kylix

William A. P. Childs

In the tondo of a much-broken but fully restored Attic red-figured kylix purchased by the J. Paul Getty Museum in 1984 is represented a city siege (fig. 1a).¹ The motif of the city is rare in Greek art, and this new example is unusual because it has no readily apparent mythological context.² The Museum attributes the kylix to the Kleomelos Painter, a logical conclusion from the style and the inscription KLEME . . . KALOS distributed along the two vertical exergues. Beazley attributed four vases to the Kleomelos Painter and grouped him with Apollodoros and two close associates as a workshop or as different phases of the same hand working around 500 B.C.³ The shape of the kylix (fig. 1b) is Bloesch's type "C," and the cup belongs in a group associated with Apollodoros.⁴

The scene depicted on the Getty kylix is a simplified city siege: a freestanding city wall topped by three merlons almost fills the tondo. The two end merlons, to the right and left, are cut by the circular frame of the scene. In each of the two embrasures is a warrior. On the left, completely preserved, the soldier wears a crested Corinthian helmet with a long tail (the end of it is painted over but is partly visible next to his proper right upper arm), a cuirass of scales with a skirt of tassels and with epaulets from under which projects a chiton. He holds a spear very near its butt end—however, the underpainting for the spear shaft extends much further up, crossing the reserved band defining the tondo, into the field beyond. The reserve band is incised through the relief lines of the painted-over spear shaft. On his left arm the soldier holds a large round shield that is seen in three-quarter view from the inside; the emblem on its front is not distinguishable except as a black mass.⁵ In the right embrasure the only traces of the missing soldier are the butt end of a spear and the tip of an elbow along the top edge of the large lacuna extending from the middle of the center merlon to the border of the tondo; below the lacuna are a large portion of the spear and the bottom part of a shield with traces of an unrecognizable emblem.

Two warriors stand before the wall. The one on the

left wears a crested Corinthian helmet with a long tail and a belted himation; he carries a round shield seen in three-quarter view from the inside, with an emblem on the outside of three dotted circles; he holds a spear almost vertically, apparently aimed at the warrior in the embrasure above him. The spear has a smaller, second blade clearly indicated at its butt end. The second warrior leans over to the right to throw a stone, which he holds in his right hand. He, too, wears a crested Corinthian helmet, cuirass with tassels and epaulets, and a chiton, which projects at the shoulders and from beneath the tassels. In addition, he holds a shield seen in profile that covers his left arm entirely and part of his face; the emblem on the shield is an octopus. Neither soldier wears greaves, and neither has a clearly distinguished left or right foot.

The kylix was broken and repaired in antiquity: five holes 2 mm in diameter surround the left handle and clearly served to hold lead clamps (they are only partially visible on the photographs, figs. 1a, c). The vase is now broken into some forty fragments; the right handle and half of the foot-plate are restored, as are several parts of both the scene and the sides of the bowl. The former are not all easily distinguished on the photograph. Missing in the scene are the upper right part of the city wall, including the right part of the center merlon, the warrior in the right embrasure, and most of the right merlon; a triangular piece on the left side of the left merlon that continues across the whole merlon in a narrow band from its apex; much of the wall of the city on the right, including part of the head of the lower right warrior, part of his upper arm, the upper part of his thigh, and part of his torso up to the proper right shoulder. Most of the restorations of the scene are merely connections across breaks, all done in dull black ink; exceptions to this practice are the warrior in the right embrasure, the surrounding architecture, and the missing parts of the warrior's shield and spear, all of which are worked in a green-white, self-adhering vinyl that distinguishes these extensive restorations clearly from the minor ones and



Figure 1a. Attic red-figured kylix. Interior, without restored warrior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 84.AE.38.

from the original drawing (fig. 1d).⁶

The material of the missing sections of the kylix has a color hardly distinguishable from that of the original clay; it is used also to fill cracks. The surface color of the largest single fragment, which holds the greater part of the lower left warrior and the hip of the lower right warrior, is lighter than that of the other fragments, probably due to a difference in the circumstances of preservation in the ground.

There are traces of black lines that represent preliminary drawing later not used and largely erased: two parallel vertical lines on the right edge of the left merlon (to the left of the still clearly visible but unexplainable dot); across the helmet of the warrior in the left embrasure; in the rim of the shield of the lower right warrior, where the two spears cross. A dilute glaze is used for the shield emblems, and a brown dilute glaze is used on the belt of the lower left warrior, in the scale armor of the warrior in the left embrasure, in the scale pattern of the helmet of the lower right warrior, and on

the crest of the helmet of the two warriors on the left. Although I noticed no use of dilute brown for interior modeling of the figures, Dr. Robert Guy assures me that it is there, though very faint⁷; the effect is to give the figures a very sketchy appearance.

The date of the kylix may be determined largely on the basis of the elegant tail of the himation of the warrior on the lower left and the swallow-tailed folds of the chiton of his companion on the right. The patterns are close to those of the Pasiades Painter.⁸ The elegant arcs of the drapery swaying under the influence of the motion of the bodies, however, reflect the interest of later painters such as the early Kleophrades⁹ and Berlin painters.¹⁰ Indeed, a vase that probably belongs to the Kleomelos Painter has been attributed to the Kleophrades Painter by V. Tusa.¹¹ This suggests, as does the simple yet fine linear pattern of the drapery, a date after 500 B.C. rather than before.

The Getty kylix shares several characteristics of style with vases of the Apollodoros Group, most partic-



Figure 1b. Profile view of kylix, figure 1a.




Figure 1c. Exterior of kylix, figure 1a.



Figure 1d. Interior of kylix, figure 1a, with restored warrior.

ularly with the works attributed to the Epidromos Painter.¹² Already mentioned above is the use of very faint dilute glaze for the definition of muscles¹³; particularly characteristic of the Getty kylix and works by the Epidromos Painter (as well as of other vases attributed to the Kleomelos Painter) are: the lack of articulation of the ankle bones¹⁴; serifs at the ends of quick, tight arcs¹⁵; and the tight arcs themselves,¹⁶ used on the Getty kylix for the eye- and ear-slots of the helmets and the folds of the chiton of the warrior on the lower right. These observations do no more than confirm in part Beazley's original grouping of the vases around Apollodoros and suggest a particularly close tie between the Epidromos Painter and the Kleomelos Painter within the group.¹⁷ Although Dyfri Williams, in his study of the Apollodoros Group of some ten years ago, affirmed the identity of the painters in the group, he noted that the conclusion was "tentative and temporary."¹⁸ Indeed, there are now many unpublished

vases by painters of the Apollodoros Group in various collections, and a new study is necessary to assess their relationships, which would go far beyond the competence of this writer and the scope of this essay.¹⁹

The technique of the Getty kylix is singular. The two figures in the foreground are painted in outline, set against the clear ground of the city wall. Even the well-preserved figure in the left embrasure is largely presented against the central merlon and is cut off by the wall below, with the result that he is more than half depicted in outline. His companion in the right embrasure was probably set against the right side of the central merlon with similar results. The manner of representing the wall as a reserved surface is the same as that of several black-figured vases that depict cities, such as a hydria in Munich of the Leagros Group (figs. 2a–c), but on these the black figures stand out.²⁰ The only example of a city on a red-figured vase with figures in front of the wall is on a kylix by the Foundry

Painter in Boston.²¹ There the city wall is rendered in black glaze, and the gates are reserved. Figures in front of the wall are in red-figure, and those in front of the gates are in black-figure technique.

There are a few examples of outline technique in early red-figure painting,²² but it is in the development of white-ground painting that the technique is exploited to the full and forms the closest parallel to the rendering of the figures before the city wall on the Getty kylix.²³ Already mentioned was a vase by the Pasiades Painter; the Diosphos workshop also produced works close to the figures of the Kleomelos Painter.²⁴ The Kleomelos Painter is clearly a minor cup-painter of the period just after 500 B.C. with ties to other minor painters of small vases. I cannot see that he should be considered old-fashioned; his style is mannered and as such belongs fully in the late Archaic group of painters of the first quarter of the fifth century B.C.

The depiction of a city is, as already mentioned, very rare on Greek pottery. Some ten years ago I proposed that the eight examples then known to me in the Archaic and Classical periods derived ultimately from a Near Eastern tradition most fully represented by the great Assyrian palace reliefs.²⁵ This appeared to me also to be the case for the city reliefs of Lycia in southwest Asia Minor of the first half of the fourth century B.C. Since then several scholars have raised objections to this, essentially taking issue with the proposal of the diffusion of the city motif from the Near East and proposing instead more or less explicitly the autonomous invention of the city as a motif in each area and period.²⁶ The Getty kylix gives an ideal opportunity to review the evidence.

All eight of the previously known Greek scenes with cities depict clearly identifiable myths: Amazonomachy, Death of Troilos, Death of Hektor.²⁷ Two Etruscan examples either depict the Trojan War or are derived from Greek prototypes that were intended to do so.²⁸ Among the Greek examples, the Getty kylix is distinguished by the lack of mythological specificity. If there is an intended myth, I suspect the Seven against Thebes is a likely candidate, but some event in the Trojan War cannot be excluded. The lack of a readily identifiable myth for the subject is completely in keeping with the oeuvre of the Apollodoros Group, as is the choice of an unusual and spatially ambitious composition.²⁹

The most prominent element in every Greek representation of a city is the gate: either directly depicted³⁰ or implied by figures shown partially overlapped by the wall, thereby suggesting that they are moving through a gate that is perpendicular to the picture plane.³¹ In other cases an architectural element suggests

the gate in which figures stand or through which they pass.³² In two cases figures stand in or exit through a directly depicted gate.³³ The city wall is almost always crenelated³⁴; the embrasures can be stacked with stones³⁵; filled with profile heads³⁶; filled with figures represented as busts (to the shoulder or waist) with an arm raised in a gesture of defense³⁷ or a variety of gestures³⁸; or simply left blank.³⁹ The Getty kylix alone lacks a gate depicted or implied. Because of the prominence and activity of the two figures in the embrasures the kylix belongs with a Tyrrhenian amphora in Florence depicting an Amazonomachy (fig. 3) and the Leagros Group hydria in Munich (figs. 2a–c) with a complex and confusing iconography that appears to have at its core the Death of Troilos.

The strictly simplified rendition of the city on Greek pottery is uniform through all the examples known, including the Getty kylix. Of course, it might be argued that the size and format of the pots precluded any other manner of representing the city, but the even smaller Cypro-Phoenician silver bowls experienced no such constraint.⁴⁰ Equally, the often minimalist notation of a gate to stand for the city⁴¹ has no necessary relation to the format or the technique but is part of the normal Greek disinterest in rendering full and integrated contexts. The relative frequency of the city motif in the late sixth century coincides with the occurrence of numerous vases that do illustrate contexts.⁴² Whether such scenes occurred also in monumental art, that is, wall-painting, is unknown; there is no reason to doubt such a parallel.

The Greek ceramic tradition of the city motif is formally related in many points to the representation on Cypro-Phoenician silver bowls. The kind of city on the Praeneste Bowl⁴³—a pair of towers with a wall between, the whole crenelated—is also that of the François Vase, the Tyrrhenian amphora in Florence (fig. 3), and the kylix of the Euergides Painter in London.⁴⁴ The depiction of the defenders as mere heads in the embrasures occurs on two silver bowls in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York,⁴⁵ and on the hydria of Dr. Vinhas in Portugal.⁴⁶ The depiction of archers who actually repel assault on a silver bowl in Delphi and another in London⁴⁷ can be related to the Amazons of the Tyrrhenian amphora (fig. 3), to the Leagros Group hydria in Munich (fig. 2),⁴⁸ and to the warriors on the Getty kylix.

It may be argued that the Cypro-Phoenician silver bowls that depict cities are far earlier than the Greek vases here under discussion. Equally, the city is such a standard form, when reduced to its most basic elements, that it may be argued that no prototype is



Figure 2a. Attic black-figured hydria of the Leagros Group. Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek 1700. Photos courtesy Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek.

necessary to produce very similar forms in noncontiguous areas, periods, or cultures. These arguments can be countered by the numerous points of contact between the Cypro-Phoenician silver bowls and the Greek vases that depict cities, on the one hand, and on the other by the fact that the Greek tradition quickly evolves its own distinctive vocabulary. The principal characteristic of the Greek monuments is the reduction of the motif to a very simplified notation, no matter how complex the scene, above all the use of synecdoche. The Greek use of the city as a concept is totally different from that in the Near East, for it is no more than a context, a stage prop, for specific mythological narration; it does not function on its own as an element in the iconography of hegemony, that is, the depiction

of the siege and capture of a city, which is the essential use of the motif in the eastern Mediterranean. The practice of siege by actually attacking the walls of the enemy city was uncommon or even unknown in historical Greece before the fourth century, but it was a highly developed military craft in the ancient Near East.⁴⁹

The early Greek uses of the city—on the François Vase and on the Tyrrhenian amphora in Florence (fig. 3)⁵⁰—do present the city as an entity and as a place, much as in the Near Eastern tradition. By the end of the sixth century the form has evolved to that of the stage prop that supports some principal activity that takes place next to it. The Euergides Painter's kylix in London alone reverts to the earlier manner of depicting the city as a complete, freestanding unit⁵¹; the Getty



Figure 2c. Belly panel of hydria, figure 2a.



Figure 3. Detail of Tyrrhenian amphora. Side A. Florence, Museo Archeologico 3773. Photo courtesy Soprintendenza alle antichità d'Etruria.

kylix occupies an intermediate position, for it represents the city as a freestanding entity but alters the composition in a manner that conforms with the other later Greek representations by placing the city behind the principal activity.⁵² At the same time the Getty kylix depicts a subject that is pervasive in the Near Eastern examples: conflict between figures inside and outside the city. This is implicit on the Tyrrhenian amphora, but only the Leagros Group hydria in Munich approximates the type of conflict depicted on the Getty kylix. On the Munich hydria the composition and the iconography are so confusing that the scene needs detailed examination.

The scene covers the belly panel and the shoulder frieze (figs. 2a–c). On the belly are depicted, from left to right: four horses in harness running from left to right, their rumps partially cut by the left frame of the panel; behind them, within a rectangular frame, which surely is meant to represent a gate, a hoplite with Corinthian helmet and a figure wearing an Oriental cap; both wear greaves (the bodies are covered by the horses); a spindly tree, whose branches fill the ground of the scene on the shoulder; Athena in paladionesque rigidity facing the horses to the left, the upper part of her head and her helmet projecting into the shoulder frieze; a crouching white-haired man facing to the right; a hoplite facing to the right holding over his shoulder a boy by the ankle; and a three-stepped construction on which stands a tripod set against the right frame of the panel. The shoulder frieze is separated from the body panel by a thin black line. Above this is drawn in outline only a simple pattern of rectangular crenellations. Set in the embrasures from left to right

are: an archer in Oriental garb, aiming his bow downward and to the right; a hoplite with Corinthian helmet looking down and to the right; a hoplite with double-crested Corinthian helmet facing to the left; an old man with white hair gesturing with his left arm through the embrasure downward and to the left; behind the old man a hoplite with Corinthian helmet drinking from a rhyton; two women facing left, one gesturing like the preceding old man through the embrasure downward and to the left, the other raising her right hand to her head; finally, cut by the right edge of the frieze, a third woman with arm raised looking to the left.

Charlette Motta has suggested that on the shoulder is depicted the rejoicing of the Trojans at the departure of the Greek fleet, while on the belly is the Sack of Troy with the Death of Astyanax.⁵³ This interpretation assumes no physical connection between the two scenes, yet the penetration of both the tree and the figure of Athena from the belly panel into the shoulder zone and the gesture of the woman on the right of the shoulder frieze down into the belly panel suggest that the zones belong together. Even if one accepts that the two zones are not to be taken together as a single scene, the explanation of the shoulder frieze given by Motta does not concord with the activities of the figures, to wit, the archer taking aim on the left and the old man and the women in distress on the right.

An alternate interpretation is that the scene on the belly represents the Death of Troilos.⁵⁴ This is suggested primarily by the chariot and warriors coming out of the gate of the city on the left, which have general parallels on the hydria of Dr. Vinhas in Portugal and on the François Vase, both of which depict warriors (on the François Vase explicitly Hektor and Polites) marching through the gate of Troy to the unsuccessful rescue of the young boy.⁵⁵ The three-stepped construction on the right with tripod would then represent the sanctuary of Apollo Thymbraios in which Troilos was killed, though, as Motta points out, on a cup by Brygos in the Louvre the altar on which Priam is killed also has a tripod on it.⁵⁶

The real problem of the identification of the scene is the warrior on the right who holds a youth by the ankle; he clearly represents the type of Neoptolemos created for the Death of Astyanax. The fact that Achilles holds Troilos (name inscribed) by the foot on a Corinthian krater⁵⁷ and is probably depicted holding Troilos by the arm in front of him on a shield strap from Olympia⁵⁸ cannot beguile us into believing that the long and consistent tradition in the sixth century of a striding hoplite wielding a small child over his shoulder is not intended to represent Neoptolemos with

Astyanax.⁵⁹ It is true that on the Mykonos relief-pithos of the seventh century, children are three times held by the Greek warriors about to dispatch them, each in a slightly different way.⁶⁰ The gesture of holding up a child that is to be killed appears to be integral to the early illustrations, possibly going back to the Geometric period,⁶¹ but the very graphic pose of wielding the child by the foot over the shoulder is a later, probably sixth-century, invention and appears to have a very specific application to the *hurling* of Astyanax from the walls of Troy.⁶² Troilos's death is usually depicted differently: he is held out in front of Achilles, who will stab him and cut off his head, essentially the pattern established on the Mykonos pithos. Accordingly, it is impossible to deny that, if the Munich hydria is interpreted to represent the Death of Troilos, we must posit the migration of a somewhat inappropriate type from one story (Death of Astyanax) to another (Death of Troilos). The same reflections hold for the old, crouching man in the center of the belly panel. He must be Priam mourning the death of the child. Priam is seated next to the city of Troy on the François Vase, receiving the news of Achilles' ambush from his herald, Antenor.⁶³ But, despite Charles Dugas's objections, it is probably Priam who appears as a suppliant in the Death of Astyanax on a lid by the C-Painter.⁶⁴ In either case the figure of Priam on the Munich hydria fits no earlier pattern; if the scene depicts the Death of Troilos, then Priam has apparently been transposed from Troy to the sanctuary of Apollo some distance from Troy. Athena fits best with this interpretation: she is inserted behind the back of Achilles as his defender.⁶⁵

The tree that grows up into the shoulder frieze and the head of Athena that projects well into the upper scene suggest, as I have already observed, that the panel and frieze belong together. The arm of the woman that projects down into the belly panel on the right of the shoulder frieze supports this conclusion. If the scene on the belly represents the Death of Troilos, then the figures on the shoulder could have some coherent role in the scene. The archer could be responding to the attack of Achilles, and the old man (Priam again?) and the women could be bewailing Troilos's death or simply the danger he is in. The same scene on the hydria of Dr. Vinhas in Portugal has figures, albeit mere heads of soldiers, in the embrasures of the city wall.⁶⁶ Yet what is the role of the soldier on the wall who is drinking from a rhyton? The painter is clearly very interested in putting into the scene as much detail as possible, and an explanation for most of it is not impossible but this figure evades clarification in the myth of Troilos and suggests that more may be going

on in the complex scene than just amassing descriptive, and to us, confusing detail.⁶⁷

Although there are no other Greek examples of figures on the wall of a city similar to those on the Munich hydria, there are on Roman monuments, and these suggest a possible source for the Munich figures other than originally in a representation of the Death of Troilos. On a silver oinochoe from Berthouville, now in Paris, a man and a woman bewail the fate of a man before the walls of Troy, while two soldiers prepare to throw spears against the enemy: the scene is the dragging of Hektor's body around Troy.⁶⁸ The man and the woman are certainly Priam and Hekabe. As on the Munich hydria, the figures are placed so that they look down from either side to a central event before the wall. Since the Death of Troilos does not take place close to the walls of Troy but the dragging of Hektor's body does, it perhaps makes sense that the painter of the Munich hydria has borrowed the figures of the shoulder frieze from a scene of the Death of Hektor or the dragging of his body around Troy. On the kylix by the Foundry Painter in Boston the appearance of Priam and Hekabe *outside* the wall, agitated at the fate of Hektor, clearly indicates the existence of the pictorial tradition by the early fifth century B.C.⁶⁹ On the kylix there was no room for the figures on the wall, for the crenellations touch the lip of the vessel. If indeed the figures and their source are correctly identified on the Munich hydria, then the painter may also have borrowed the soldier drinking from a rhyton from another scene, probably some military celebration, possibly, as Motta suggested, the celebrations of the Trojans upon the apparent departure of the Greeks, or a Sack of Troy.⁷⁰ For neither suggestion is there any other evidence.⁷¹ If either or both of the above suggestions is correct, the Oriental figure on the left of the shoulder frieze could be borrowed from yet another source and be Paris aiming the fatal arrow that killed Achilles,⁷² making the scene a complex amalgam of events that led up to the destruction of Troy.

Whatever the truth is about the origin and meaning of the figures on the shoulder of the Munich hydria, the admixture of elements from the deaths of Astyanax and Troilos on the belly panel are, I submit, not unconscious confusions of figure types but a perfectly understandable statement of the inner link between the two stories. On a much simpler level, the conflation of the deaths of Astyanax and Priam represents the same process. Even if the scene appears to us macabre, apparently depicting Neoptolemos swinging Astyanax over his shoulder, about to bludgeon Priam to death with the child, the painter achieves a powerful statement

with the juxtaposition of the deaths of the oldest and youngest members of the royal house of Troy, the annihilation of the family.⁷³ It is impossible to know whether there was a literary source for the sentiment, or whether a vase-painter thought it up. Equally, it is not knowable whether the deaths of Troilos and Astyanax were paired in some tale of Troy. In fact, the issue of a literary origin is irrelevant. The images we have illustrate the connection between events that are highly sensitive statements about the stories.⁷⁴

The very obvious popularity of the scenes of the Death of Troilos, whether represented by the ambush, the chase, or the actual killing, from the beginning of the sixth century in all areas and media marks the subject as significant far beyond the otherwise incidental nature of the event.⁷⁵ From the evidence of the monuments, I believe it is necessary to posit that the later tradition, which connected the fate of Troilos with that of Troy,⁷⁶ was known in the sixth century and is the reason for the popularity of the Troilos story and for the amalgamation of illustrations of his death with that of Astyanax. These illustrations, just as those of the deaths of Astyanax and Priam, follow the principles laid out by the famous Boston Polyphemos Painter's kylix depicting Kirke and Odysseus.⁷⁷ Through a conglomeration of elements, animate and inanimate, not only is a story told but it is given structure, meaning, and depth that go far beyond the valuation and interpretation of the individual elements depicted and thus contrast with the somewhat flat, additive structure of earlier scenes.⁷⁸ This is a parallel development to the dramatic concentration of narrative tension in the isolated figures of Exekias.

We may not always have the evidence to sort out scenes on pottery that appear confusing. It appears reasonable to suggest that we may be confused, but that the Attic painter normally was not. I am not willing to go so far as to believe that all the minor references I alluded to above are indeed present or conscious in the scene on the Munich hydria, though there appears at least a possibility that they were. At the very least the painter was a free and inventive artist, who sought to produce a full and unusually descriptive illustration of the Death of Troilos using elements of the Death of Astyanax to give range and depth to the event and its meaning.⁷⁹

Just as the complex iconography gives expressive depth to the illustration of the Munich hydria, the development of a complex setting indicates a new and fruitful perception of space in art. The rectangular element on the left, which is surely meant as the jamb and lintel of a city gate through which the chariot team

rushes; the simple pattern of crenellations along the shoulder of the hydria; and the partial view of the three-stepped altar on the right of the body panel create by allusion a full and complex sense of space and setting. The field of the body panel is transformed into a convincing image of the city wall, much as on the Getty kylix or the later kylix of the Foundry Painter in Boston. The relative locations of the city gate and the altar of Apollo are easily understood, and the scene almost takes on a full, three-dimensional character.

To the modern critic the somewhat loose assemblage of partial images and the consequent allusion to spatial relationships without a firm and measurable delineation of them is viewed as problematic. Yet it is certainly no coincidence that just at this time—the last quarter of the sixth century—artists are also experimenting with foreshortening, i.e., a rudimentary perspective, most especially in the representation of wheeling chariots.⁸⁰ The fluid attitude to spatial relationships maintained by Greek artists, especially unsettling to the modern eye in the application of geometric perspective in the later fifth and fourth centuries, is to be set against the convincing allusion to space by assemblages of partial images, the hallmark of late sixth-century vase-painting, and particularly evident in the work of the Apollodoros Group. In contrast to the elaborate Assyrian settings of continuous landscape, the Greek sense of the partial image is the necessary prerequisite to discovering perspective, which is, after all, nothing but a system for arranging partial and frequently distorted images of objects in which space is alluded to by the relative position of the objects and the distortions of their form.⁸¹ Although there is a marvelous and rich sense of space in the Troilos band of the François Vase, it is strictly two-dimensional. On the Munich hydria the idea of space as three-dimensional is palpable.

The Munich hydria suggests that late Archaic vase-painters (and probably painters in all fields) depicted the city more frequently than the preserved monuments attest, though the range of mythological subjects is not altered by the above arguments. At the same time the Munich hydria demonstrates the attitude of the Greek artist to the inherited motif of the city: it is rearranged and interpreted into a narrative vocabulary that has nothing to do with the original Near Eastern source. Finally, the city is portrayed with an extreme economy of means. The Getty kylix is far less radical in its adaptation, that is, simplification of the imported Near Eastern motif, and yet it is distinctly Greek. Action takes place only back to front; the focus is on individual conflict and not on mass engagements⁸²; and the mechanics of siege (ladders, etc.) are omitted in

favor of the human, individual element.⁸³ At the same time the Getty kylix confirms and extends the evidence of the Munich hydria in suggesting a wider use of the city than heretofore known. Here the city and the siege are the primary themes, and the city looms large: it is neither a stage prop to elucidate the story, whatever that is, nor is it a mere backdrop to action, but it is a necessary element to the story. Yet, just as the much later depiction of Kapanos storming the wall of Thebes by ladder on the southeast wall of the heroön at Trysa presents all the necessary elements but does not elaborate on the idea of siege, keeping the image tightly focused on the particular, individual event,⁸⁴ just so no more of the city is represented on the Getty kylix than absolutely necessary.

The city representation of the Getty kylix's tondo lends greater verisimilitude to Evelyn Harrison's reconstruction of the shield of the Athena Parthenos.⁸⁵ It is exactly the theme of the siege of the Akropolis⁸⁶ that points to the inclusion of some type of architectural setting on the shield and that is indicated by two of the Piraeus reliefs.⁸⁷ Although my first reaction to Professor Harrison's reconstruction was to feel that it attempted too much detail, photographs of the plastic reconstruction of the shield for the statue of Athena in the Nashville Parthenon reveal that the forms of the city as proposed by Professor Harrison serve well as a framework for the figures, much as the rough ground functions in the reconstruction of the shield carried out by Neda Leipen.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, as P. E. Arias has suggested, even in monumental painting the dominance of architectural settings was probably not attempted in Greece in the fifth century B.C.⁸⁹ Certainly we have no evidence for it on painted pottery or in relief sculpture. It seems to me likely that of the three ladders on which Professor Harrison places figures in her reconstruction, only the one from which an Amazon falls is necessary or likely, because the other two exceed the sense of the minimal necessary setting.

A further iconographic question remains to be investigated on the basis of the new evidence of the Getty kylix: Could the city representations of the Lycian tomb reliefs of the first half of the fourth century B.C. be local, autonomous creations or are they derived from the Greek tradition of the city motif? According to Bruno Jacobs the Lycian city representations arise "aus dem Repräsentationswillen der lykischen Dynasten und griechischem Darstellungsvermögen," and form "eine autochthone Tradition des Historienbildes."⁹⁰ Others have pointed out that my earlier hypothesis of a strong Near Eastern background for the Lycian city reliefs is doubtful in view of the fact that

there is no demonstrable continuation of the narrative and highly detailed tradition of historical city sieges in the Near East after the Assyrian palace reliefs and their minor imitators, the Cypro-Phoenician silver bowls.⁹¹ It is certainly indisputable that the illustrations of cities on coins and other minor objects are, as Nancy Ramage has said, "a parallel" tradition and not in themselves part of the historical-narrative tradition of Assyria.⁹² Yet the very existence of the city motif in the Near East as a symbol of hegemony is more to the point, and the coins attest this unequivocally. Indeed, because the Lycian reliefs have so little other than formal links with the Greek tradition of the city motif and fit so fully within the Near Eastern iconographic tradition, one must be suspicious of a primarily Greek role in the formation of the Lycian tradition or of an autonomous invention.

The smaller podium frieze of the Nereid Monument of Xanthos depicts a number of standard siege scenes: storming of the wall by ladder and earthworks; leading away of prisoners; negotiations before the walls.⁹³ Bruno Jacobs has observed that this is not a very extensive repertory in comparison with the Assyrian palace reliefs,⁹⁴ but it is inconceivable to imagine the continuation of the extensive, historical Assyrian representations beyond their unique function in the Assyrian palaces, and one should look only for the basic elements, much as they occur on the Cypro-Phoenician silver bowls.⁹⁵ It is exactly the abbreviated, simplified, stock siege and battle motif that is used on the Nereid Monument. The historical details there are really only the local Lycian architectural forms.⁹⁶ Two arguments, however, clearly favor the existence of non-Greek prototypes. In all four of the examples of cities on the Nereid Monument frieze the action is lateral, not back to front as on several of the later Greek vases. Secondly, on the great west wall of the heroön at Trysa, where the action is back to front in the Greek manner, there are sets of warriors on the wall to right and left who are portrayed in a rigidly repetitive, Oriental manner that contrasts with the very free and Greek rendering of the figures of the central part of the city.⁹⁷ J. M. Cook's remark that the style of all the figures seems to be the same, including that of the individual and very Greek combats of the battle friezes to the left of the city, is most apt: because the style is the same, the iconographic prototype cannot be the same, indicating an altered model.⁹⁸

There is one last point to be made concerning the iconography of the city motif in Lycia: only the reliefs of the smaller podium frieze of the Nereid Monument give the impression of quite specific, even accurate

historical narrative. The reliefs of the heroön at Trysa are far more generalized, and the city reliefs of the other monuments function explicitly outside of a narrative context.⁹⁹ It is precisely this evolution, or, more properly, the rapid transformation of the city motif in Lycia from a narrative, quasi-historical motif to a symbolic one, that cannot be explained by the theory of a local invention of the motif tradition or the borrowing from the Greek tradition. Elements of the narrative tradition persist but are strictly subordinated, a phenomenon that both demonstrates the existence of a narrative tradition and shows that it was not one that had a very national Lycian flavor. It is precisely the contemporary appearance of complex city representations on the coins of Phoenicia and Palestine and on other works of the minor arts in the Near East that documents a widespread resurgence of the popularity of the city motif as a symbol of suzerainty, of which the Lycian reliefs are the most elaborate example. The very complexity of the representations on the coins suggests that there was a monumental tradition behind them, for otherwise quite simple, even symbolic manifestations of the city could and, indeed, did suffice.¹⁰⁰ Consequently, though the evidence is scanty, I cannot help but see it as pointing quite unequivocally to a continuous use in the Near East of the city motif with adjunct elements of descriptive nature, such as siege by ladder and earthworks, the taking of prisoners, and the dynast seated before envoys of a besieged city, to name but the simplest and those represented in the reliefs of the Nereid Monument. Finally, it seems very likely that the direct models for the reliefs of the Nereid Monument and the heroön at Trysa were in the form of drawings, to judge by the incomplete understanding or rendition of perspective in several of the reliefs.¹⁰¹

These drawings could have been simply the sketches provided to the sculptors for the monuments themselves, but it still does not seem outré to suggest that there was a tradition of seminarrative representations of city sieges in the dynastic courts of Phoenicia, Palestine, Syria, and southeast Asia Minor.

The subject of the city representation on the Getty kylix eludes identification, but, as already observed, in this respect it fits well into the Apollodoros Group of vases, which often display unidentifiable, even idiosyncratic themes. There is no difficulty in believing that the city motif was more widely used in Greek art than in the previously known examples, though the very lack of specificity does suggest in the context of the vases of the Apollodoros Group a free creation, probably derived from one of the already known subjects such as the Seven against Thebes or the Trojan War. In any case, the depiction of direct conflict between warriors inside and outside the city, only alluded to in the Munich hydria, really presents a new theme, that of siege. Most important of all, however, is the view that the Getty kylix provides of the developed late Archaic composition of the scene, with the city behind the action with which it is associated. This strengthens the impression given by the Munich hydria and the kylix of the Foundry Painter in Boston of a Greek formulation of the motif. On the one hand, it is this formulation of the city motif that Harrison uses for her reconstruction of the shield of the Parthenos; on the other hand, it is precisely the old Near Eastern formulation of the city that is used on the Nereid Monument frieze and most of the Lycian reliefs. In short, the Getty kylix broadens our view of a formal and iconographic theme in Greek art and strengthens our understanding of its context in the late Archaic period.

Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

NOTES

Abbreviations:

- Childs W. A. P. Childs, *The City-Reliefs of Lycia* (Princeton, 1978).
- Recueil Dugas* Ch. Dugas, "Tradition littéraire et tradition graphique dans l'antiquité," in H. Metzger, ed., *Recueil Charles Dugas* (Paris, 1960), pp. 59–74 (reprinted from *AntCl* 6 [1937], pp. 5–26).
- Wiencke M. I. Wiencke, "An Epic Theme in Greek Art," *AJA* 58 (1954), pp. 285–306.
1. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 84.AE.38; Diam of bowl: 18.8 cm, H: 7.3 cm. See "Acquisitions in 1984," *GettyMusJ* 13 (1985), p. 168, no. 18.
 2. Cf. Childs, pp. 58–65.
 3. Cup: Louvre G 111; oinochoe: Athens, Akropolis 703; and two round aryballo: Naples RC 177 and Adria B 616, *ARV*² 118–

119.1598; see also *Paralipomena*, p. 332, *Beazley Addenda*², pp. 174–175, and further below.

4. H. Bloesch, *Formen attischer Schalen* (Bern, 1940), pp. 127–128, pl. 34.6 (London E 57). Note the single incised line around the top of the molding at the base of the stem on the Getty kylix. Some of the cups in the group have no incision, and some have two, one above and one below the molding.

5. Dr. Robert Guy has suggested to me that the emblem is a boukranion.

6. For a full description of the restoration of this vase, see M. Elston, "Technical and Aesthetic Considerations in the Conservation of Ancient Ceramic and Terracotta Objects in the J. Paul Getty Museum: Five Case Studies," *Studies in Conservation* 35 (1990), pp. 69–80, esp. p. 74.

7. See the similar observations of M. Dumm (Ohly) on a kylix in the Apollodoros Group by the Elpinikos Painter: "Schale mit

Theseus und Sinis," *MitJb* 22 (1971), p. 10.

8. J. Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period* (London, 1975), fig. 107.

9. *Ibid.*, fig. 135, bottom.

10. *Ibid.*, fig. 143, right.

11. V. Tusa et al., *Odeon ed altri "monumenti" archeologici* (Palermo, 1971), pp. 188–189, no. 13, pl. 46. This reference was kindly provided by Dr. Robert Guy.

12. Dumm (note 7), pp. 19–20, disagrees with this conclusion, preferring to link the Elpinikos Painter with the Kleomelos Painter and the Epidromos Painter with Apollodoros and considering each pair a separate painter. K. Schefold, "Pammachos," *AntK* 17 (1974), pp. 137–142, esp. p. 140 with n. 35, wishes, however, to separate the Epidromos Painter from Apollodoros, while he accepts the link between the Elpinikos and Kleomelos painters.

13. Above, note 7 (cup by the Elpinikos Painter).

14. D. J. R. Williams, "Apollodoros and a New Amazon Cup in a Private Collection," *JHS* 97 (1977), pp. 163–164.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 164. An unpublished kylix in the Getty Museum, inv. 85.AE.377, shares this stylistic idiom, bears the inscription KLE[O]MELOS KALOS, and thus very likely belongs to the Kleomelos Painter.

16. *Ibid.*, pp. 164–165.

17. *ARV*² 117.

18. Williams (note 14), p. 168. R. Blatter, "Eine neue Schale des Epidromos-Malers," *Hefte des archäologischen Seminars der Universität Bern* 2 (1976), pp. 5–9, also ends with a tentative affirmation of the identity of the Epidromos Painter and Apollodoros (reference kindly supplied by Robert Guy).

19. The Getty Museum owns four more kylikes that belong in the group. One seems clearly by the Kleomelos Painter (see above, note 15); two have been attributed to Apollodoros, and one to the Elpinikos Painter. The last three do not share the particularly characteristic traits I have listed for the Kleomelos kylix. See below (note 29) on composition and subject matter.

20. Childs, pl. 30.1–3. Additional bibl. is cited below, where these vases are discussed at length.

21. *Ibid.*, pl. 31.1–3; *ARV*² 402.23.

22. Boardman (note 8), p. 18, fig. 19.

23. J. R. Mertens, *Attic White-Ground: Its Development on Shapes Other than Lekythoi* (New York, 1977), pp. 14, 28–29, 118.

24. D. C. Kurtz, *Athenian White Lekythoi: Patterns and Painters* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 149–150, pls. 58–59.

25. Childs, *passim*.

26. N. Ramage, *AJA* 84 (1980), pp. 108–109; J. M. Cook, *JHS* 100 (1980), p. 279; B. Jacobs, *Griechische und persische Elemente in der Grabkunst Lykiens zur Zeit der Achämenidenherrschaft*, *Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology*, vol. 78 (Jonsred, 1987), pp. 63–64.

27. Childs, pls. 29.1–3, 30, 31.1–2.

28. *Ibid.*, pls. 28.3–4, 29.4.

29. Williams (note 14), p. 163. This is particularly evident in the four other new vases of the Apollodoros Group owned by the Getty (see above, note 19). All share a slightly unusual subject matter and manner of representation: sphinx carrying youth over the sea; man next to an altar that is only partially depicted; old man pulling a goat whose body is outside the scene; eagle carrying off a hare. In the case of the first of these (inv. 85.AE.377) there is an interestingly similar composition by Douris on the interior of a cup in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (inv. 95.31, *ARV*² 443.225; *Beazley Addenda*², p. 240; CB, vol. 3, pl. 71, no. 127; A. Shapiro, *AJA* 85 [1981], pl. 28, fig. 13). Eros(?) carries a youth through the air. Depending on how the cup is oriented (see CB and Shapiro, this note), a palmette motif occupies the area behind or below the youth. If the latter orientation is chosen, the palmettes replace a sketchy seascape on the Getty kylix, a characteristic element of setting for the period around 500 B.C. and typical of the Apollodoros Group.

30. Childs, pls. 29.1, 2–3 (here fig. 3), 31.1–4.

31. *Ibid.*, pl. 30.2.

32. *Ibid.*, pls. 30.1, 30.3.

33. *Ibid.*, pls. 29.1, 31.1–3.

34. Exceptions are *ibid.*, pls. 30.3, 32.1–2, in which no wall is actually depicted but just a gate with the wall implied.

35. *Ibid.*, pl. 29.1.

36. *Ibid.*, pl. 30.2; cf. the Etruscan vase, pl. 28.4.

37. *Ibid.*, pl. 29.2–3, pp. 58–59; *ABV* 95.8; Florence 3773 (here fig. 3).

38. Childs, pl. 30.1; here figs. 2a–c.

39. *Ibid.*, pls. 31.1–3, 31.4; cf. the Etruscan vase, pl. 29.4.

40. *Ibid.*, figs. 26–29, pl. 28.2.

41. *Ibid.*, fig. 30, pls. 30.3, 32.1–2.

42. J. Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases* (London, 1974), figs. 134, 186, 224; *idem* (note 8), fig. 119. Particularly impressive are the Priam Painter's scene of bathing women and the name piece of the Antimenes Painter in Leiden: *Paralipomena*, p. 146, no. 8 ter; *ABV* 266.1; J. Charbonneaux, R. Martin, and F. Villard, *Archaic Greek Art* (New York, 1971), figs. 350–351, 348.

43. Childs, fig. 29.

44. *Ibid.*, pls. 29.1–3, 31.4.

45. *Ibid.*, figs. 26–27.

46. *Ibid.*, pl. 30.2; add to the bibl. given on p. 62: M. Heidenreich, *MdI* 4 (1951), p. 105; C. Zindel, "Drei vorhomerische Sagenversionen in der griechischen Kunst," Ph.D. diss., Basel, 1974, pp. 72–73; K. Schefold, *Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Kunst* (Munich, 1978), pp. 207–208; *LIMC* 1 (1981), p. 87, no. 362. Cf. the Etruscan vase, Childs, pl. 28.3–4.

47. *Ibid.*, fig. 28, pl. 28.2.

48. *Ibid.*, pp. 59–60, 61, with earlier literature; see also *Paralipomena*, p. 36 (Florence 3773), p. 161 (Munich 1700), and *Beazley Addenda*², p. 25 (Florence 3773), p. 96 (Munich 1700).

49. A. W. Lawrence, *Greek Aims in Fortifications* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 41–43; P. Demargne and W. A. P. Childs, *Le monument des Néréides: Le décor sculpté*, *Fouilles de Xanthos*, vol. 8 (Paris, 1989), p. 269.

50. The two Etruscan examples should be included with the earliest Greek examples: Childs, pls. 28.3–4, 29.4.

51. *Ibid.*, pl. 31.4.

52. On the Leagros Group hydria in Boston with the dragging of Hector's body around Troy only the column and architrave on the left suggest the presence of the city, which can be thought of as existing in the background of the scene. Indeed, it is worth stressing the extraordinary economy of means in the representation of all the cities on the Leagros Group hydria and the early fifth-century red-figured kylikes: Childs, pls. 30–31.

53. C. Motta, "Sur les représentations figurées de la mort de Troilos et de la mort d'Astyanax," *RA* 50 (1957), pp. 28–29; see also A. Kossatz-Deißmann, *LIMC* 1 (1981), p. 90, no. 382; cf. *LIMC* 2 (1984), p. 934, no. 29 (O. Touchefeu).

54. For very much the same basic reading of the scene as given here, see: *Recueil Dugas*, p. 73; J. D. Beazley, *The Development of Attic Black-Figure*, rev. ed. (Berkeley, 1986), p. 77; Schefold (note 46), p. 207.

55. Childs, pls. 29.1, 30.2. The horses present in scenes of the deaths of Astyanax and Priam are usually at rest, not running. See Wiencke, p. 298 (pl. 59, fig. 18). This distinction is also made by Dugas with reference to his interpretation of the C-Painter's lid as representing the Death of Troilos: *Recueil Dugas*, p. 71.

56. Motta (note 53), p. 29, fig. 2 (p. 28); Wiencke, pl. 60, fig. 22a; *ARV*² 369.1. The tripod here, in fact, is probably intended to draw attention to the relationship of the deaths of Troilos and Astyanax, as elaborated below (note 76).

57. *Recueil Dugas*, p. 71, pl. XV.1–2; Wiencke, p. 293, pl. 56, fig. 5; Motta (note 53), p. 32, fig. 6; H. von Steuben, *Frühe Sagen-darstellungen in Korinth und Athen* (Berlin, 1968), pp. 62, 121 (K 5); *LIMC* 1 (1981), p. 88, no. 365. See also an Attic band-cup with a

similar representation: Schefold (note 46), p. 204, fig. 278; *LIMC* 1 (1981), p. 87, no. 359a.

58. E. Kunze, *Archaische Schildbänder*, Olympische Forschungen, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1950), pp. 140–142, pls. 5 (1b), 42 (XVb), 29 (IXc); von Steuben (note 57), pp. 62, 70, 121 (K 7); *LIMC* 1 (1981), pp. 89–90, nos. 376–377.

59. *Recueil Dugas*, p. 71; Wiencke, p. 299, who seems to me to misconstrue Beazley, *Development* (note 54), n. 44 on p. 105; Motta (note 53), p. 28.

60. M. Ervin, "A Relief Pithos from Mykonos," *Archaiologikon Deltion* 18 (1963), pls. 23b, 26a, 27b; cf. pl. 24a; Zindel (note 46), pp. 87–98; J. Schäfer, "Bemerkungen zum Verhältnis von Malerei und Dichtung in der früharchaischen Epoche," in K. Krinzing er et al., eds., *Forschungen und Funde: Festschrift Bernhard Neutsch* (Innsbruck, 1980), p. 422, pl. 77.4.

61. Athens, Agora 310: E. T. H. Brann, *Late Geometric and Protoattic Pottery*, The Athenian Agora, vol. 8 (Princeton, 1962), p. 66, pl. 18; idem, "A Figured Geometric Fragment from the Athenian Agora," *AntK* 2 (1959), pp. 35–37; K. Schefold, *Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art* (New York, n.d. [1966]), p. 27, fig. 2; von Steuben (note 57), p. 70; J. Carter, "The Beginning of Narrative Art in the Greek Geometric Period," *BSA* 67 (1972), p. 53.

62. Wiencke, pp. 286–289, reviews the early literary evidence and the variations. It should be noted that in *Il.* XXIV.734–735, Andromache foresees that Astyanax may be grabbed by the arm and hurled from a tower to his death (rather than by the leg). The seizing of the arm of a child is represented on the Mykonos pithos, Ervin (note 60), pl. 23b, and is depicted on the Olympian shield reliefs (see above, note 58); the latter are generally taken to depict the Death of Troilos. In my opinion, the pictorial tradition of the sixth century is too explicit and different to be confused with this other tradition of simply grabbing a child by the arm, which has no specific connotation of a particular event in the seventh century.

63. Childs, pl. 29.1. See a comparable scene on a Klazomenian hydria (Athens, National Museum 5610): Schefold (note 46), p. 207, fig. 284.

64. *Recueil Dugas*, pp. 71–73, pl. XVI.2; Wiencke, pp. 293–294, pl. 56, fig. 6.

65. The interpretation given also by Beazley, *Development* (note 54), p. 77; Schefold (note 46), p. 207.

66. Childs, pl. 30.2.

67. Cf. Wiencke, p. 299.

68. Childs, pl. 33.4, pp. 66–67, with n. 74 (p. 67) for other, related monuments.

69. *Ibid.*, pl. 31.2.

70. Motta (note 53), pp. 28–29.

71. The celebration of the Trojans is mentioned by Proklos as part of the *Little Iliad*: A. Severyns, *La Vita Homeri et les sommaires du cycle*, Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proklos, vol. 4 (Paris, 1963), p. 90, ll. 235–236. *Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and Homerica*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), pp. 510–511.

72. The identification of the Oriental archer in the west pediment of the Temple of Aphaia on Aigina as Paris is most reasonable and is almost contemporary with our vase: D. Ohly, *Glyptothek München: Griechische und römische Skulpturen, Ein kurzer Führer* (Munich, 1972), p. 63, pl. 29.

73. *Recueil Dugas*, pp. 66, 69, 74; Heidenreich (note 46), p. 108 and n. 27; N. Himmelman-Wildschütz, "Erzählung und Figur in der archaischen Kunst," *AbhMainz*, 1967, no. 2, pp. 76–77. J. M. Hemelrijk, review of proceeding in *Gnomon* 42 (1970), p. 169 (reference kindly given by Professor J. P. Small).

74. *Recueil Dugas*, p. 72; C. Hofkes-Brukker, "Die Umformung des homerischen Bildstoffes in den archaischen Darstellungen," *BABesch* 15 (1940), pp. 2–31, esp. pp. 19–29; Wiencke, p. 291. See also A. M. Snodgrass's general yet illuminating observations, *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment* (Berkeley, 1980), pp. 189–194; idem, *Narration and Allusion in Archaic Greek Art*, The Eleventh J. L. Myers

Memorial Lecture (London, 1982), passim.

75. Zindel (note 46), pp. 107–128, gives a catalogue of 183 examples of the Troilos legend. A. Kossatz-Deißmann, *LIMC* 1 (1981), pp. 79–90, nos. 206–377, eliminates a few cited by Zindel. As H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Mythology*, 6th ed. (London, 1972), p. 235, remarks, Troilos "fell in combat with Achilles early in the war. For some reason, he became rather prominent in later legend. No really important story, however, is connected with him." One imagines that *Il.* XXIV.253–260 must have been the source for Dares Phrygius and his later, mediaeval followers, who make Troilos a hero who wounded Achilles and was second only to Hektor among the Trojan warriors. See Zindel, p. 30; Kossatz-Deißmann, pp. 73, 95.

76. Plautus, *Bacch.*, 953–954; First Vatican Mythographer 207 (Mai 210); see also Tzetztes, *On Lycophron*, 307–313, where Apollo is said to have decided on vengeance for the bloodying of his altar and to prepare the death of Achilles. See Zindel (note 46), p. 64. The cup by Brygos mentioned above (note 56) is perhaps to be understood in this context. The placement of a tripod on the altar on which Priam is killed, universally said to be the altar of Zeus Herkeios, can only mean that the painter is referring back to the death of Troilos as a necessary event before Troy can fall. The connection might also be made through the sacrilege of Achilles, which seals his fate and, by concatenation, the fate of Troy.

77. *ABV* 198; Hofkes-Brukker (note 74), pp. 15–16, fig. 4; Himmelman-Wildschütz (note 73), no. 2, pp. 74–77, pl. 4.

78. Schäfer (note 60), pp. 417–438, esp. pp. 422–423, 428–429, 432–433.

79. It is always possible that a wall-painting was the source for the scene on the Munich hydria, but such a hypothesis does not help clarify the iconography.

80. Boardman (note 42), fig. 154.

81. E. Panofsky, "Die Perspektive als 'symbolische Form,'" in F. Saxl, ed., *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg, Vorträge 1924–1925* (Berlin, 1927), pp. 258–330, esp. pp. 260–261, 268–274.

82. O. Bie, *Kampfgruppe und Kämpfertypen in der Antike* (Berlin, 1891), p. 39 and passim.

83. Above (note 49).

84. Childs, pl. 5.1.

85. E. Harrison, *AJA* 85 (1981), ill. 5, p. 297.

86. *Ibid.*, pp. 294–296; P. E. Arias, "Nuovo contributo alla tradizione figurata dell'Amazzonomachia del V. sec. a. C.," in F. Krinzing er et al., eds., *Forschungen und Funde: Festschrift Bernhard Neutsch* (Innsbruck, 1980), p. 53.

87. T. Stephanidou-Tiveriou, Νεοαττικά, Οἱ Ἀνάγλυφοὶ Πίνακες ἀπὸ τὸ Λιμάνι τοῦ Πειραιᾶ (Athens, 1979), pp. 7–8, no. 2, pl. 2, and pp. 16–17, no. 21, pl. 17. Cf. Childs, p. 65.

88. N. Leipen, *Athena Parthenos: A Reconstruction* (Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, 1971).

89. Arias (note 86), p. 54.

90. Jacobs (note 26), p. 64.

91. Ramage (note 26), pp. 108–109; Cook (note 26), p. 279.

92. Ramage (note 26), p. 109; cf. Childs, p. 83.

93. *Ibid.*, pp. 22–31. The placement of block 878 on the north side of the frieze, proposed on pp. 24–26 and illustrated in fig. 11, is not possible, as is demonstrated by Demargne and Childs (note 49), pp. 154–157, 340–342.

94. Jacobs (note 26), p. 63.

95. Childs, fig. 28, pl. 28.2.

96. *Ibid.*, pl. 12.1–2 (blocks 876, 877).

97. *Ibid.*, pls. 14–17.

98. Cook (note 26), p. 279. See also the observations of Bie (note 82), pp. 26–27, who makes very much the same distinctions as I have done.

99. Childs, pp. 36–47, pls. 18–25 (Pinara and Tlos).

100. *Ibid.*, fig. 39, pl. 34.7, among numerous other examples of all periods.

101. *Ibid.*, pp. 28–29, 32.

Onesimos and the Getty Iliupersis

Dyfri Williams

The centenary of the birth of Sir John Davidson Beazley was marked in 1985 in both Oxford and London with international colloquia, and in America not only was there a symposium in Malibu but also a “one-man-show” that toured New York, Toledo (Ohio), and Los Angeles.¹ These American celebrations centered on the black-figured artist known as the Amasis Painter and on his world. Beazley’s interest in Greek vases had, in fact, first been drawn by a red-figured vase, for in a letter written to Professor Martin Robertson’s mother in Cambridge he confessed that his “first vase love,” at the age of only twelve years, was the beautiful cup in Brussels by Onesimos.² Thanks to the front cover of Professor Martin Robertson’s book *Greek Painting* this cup has become the first vase love of many other students and scholars.³ It is perhaps fitting, therefore, that the J. Paul Getty Museum, which sponsored some of the American celebrations, should possess one of Onesimos’s grandest works.⁴

Onesimos was perhaps the greatest of a group of vase-painters who specialized in decorating cups in the first quarter of the fifth century B.C.⁵ We have, it would seem, none of Onesimos’s prentice works, as is all too often the case with vase-painters; instead, a series of polished, sophisticated works has come down to us. The style owes much to Euphronios, his teacher, but the spirit is different. There is occasional stiffness, although this is quickly lost. Among the finest of these very early cups is a group of white-ground pieces with divine themes. Two were offered in the sanctuary at Eleusis.⁶ On one Athena fights a giant; on the other only the fine bearded head and torso of the fish-bodied Triton is preserved. A third white-ground cup, perhaps slightly later than the two Eleusis pieces, formerly in the Bareiss collection, is now in the Getty Museum in Malibu (fig. 1).⁷ It showed Dionysos holding a large kantharos and a satyr playing the pipes. Here Onesimos has combined the black-figure technique of black silhouette and incision with the usual outline technique used on a white ground.⁸

There were, however, a number of simpler cups in the regular red-figure technique. Such is a cup also in the Getty Museum with a satyr attacking a sleeping

maenad (fig. 2a).⁹ There is real vitality and power in both the composition and the drawing. This cup deserves particular mention not only because of its fantastically arranged tondo but also for the use of abbreviated scenes on the exterior (fig. 2b), what Beazley called “shorts,” single figures on a short ground-line.¹⁰ This piece is now the earliest example of “shorts,” and, in the light of it, it is tempting to associate their origin with the similar and roughly contemporary idea of single figures on line bases on neck-amphorae decorated by the Pioneers.¹¹

The climax of this very early group of works by Onesimos, however, is perhaps the fragmentary cup divided between Berlin and the Vatican, although all but a handle fragment of the Berlin part was lost during World War II.¹² Inside, within a frame of palmettes is the terrible climax of the Sack of Troy, Neoptolemos killing King Priam. Outside, the carnage continues in the form of warriors chasing women. This piece seems to have been signed by Euphronios as potter.

Most of the very early cups of Onesimos bore the praises of the young Leagros, as do the mature works of Euphronios, so that it is possible to confirm the stylistic impression that the very early works of Onesimos are roughly contemporary with the mature and late works of Euphronios.¹³ There seems, however, to be a further connection between Onesimos and Euphronios, for the Berlin and Vatican cup probably carried the potter signature of Euphronios, *Euphronios epoiesen*, as, in fact, do a number of later cups by our painter.¹⁴ Whether we are dealing with the same Euphronios and whether *epoiesen* here meant “potted with his own hands” or “owned the workshop” is extremely difficult to determine, for in the case of Euphronios there is a clear division between those vases that are signed with *Euphronios egraphsen* and those signed *Euphronios epoiesen*: all the vases with the painter signature are clearly only by one painter, none of the vases with the *epoiesen* signature were painted by that artist, and no vase bears a double signature.¹⁵ We are probably saved, however, from concluding that there might have been two people in the Athenian Kerameikos with the name Euphronios by the clear styl-





Figure 1. White-ground cup by Onesimos. Interior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.313.

istic connections between the painters who decorated cups potted by Euphronios and the works of the painter Euphronios: indeed all seem to have been pupils of the painter Euphronios or associates and followers of those pupils.¹⁶

All of Euphronios's potter signatures, which begin in the decade 510–500 B.C. and continue down to about 470 B.C., are on cups, except for a covered skyphoid vessel in the Getty Museum.¹⁷ This means that the *epoiesen* signatures of Euphronios coincide in date with the time when some of his painter pupils began to specialize in decorating the same shape. This is too much of a coincidence, and we are surely looking at two aspects of one and the same development. Moreover, this development is not special to Euphronios and may, therefore, reflect more than failing eyesight,¹⁸ for at about the same time some painter pupils of the other Pioneers, such as the young Kleophrades and Berlin painters, began to specialize in decorating closed

shapes. Here we are unfortunately lacking the name or names of the potters involved, although the unattributed oinochoe in New York with the incised signature of Euthymides as potter might point the way.¹⁹

The next chronological group of Onesimos's cups records the beauty of a youth named Athenodotos. The earliest, the Boston cup with its splendidly bold tondo composition of a satyr seated on a pointed amphora like some excited creature on its precarious perch, still praises Leagros, as well as Athenodotos.²⁰ There follow not only a group of elaborate cups, such as the lively symposium cup in Dr. Herbert A. Cahn's collection,²¹ but also simpler pieces, among which one might count a fragment with an archer stringing a bow, found at Gela, but now in Syracuse.²² The outside of the Syracuse cup, however, has been given a special slip of coral red. This suggests that it may once have been decorated with figures, possibly in the black-figure technique, as on a fragment in Heidelberg



Figures 2a-b. Red-figured cup by Onesimos. Above: interior; below: exterior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.607.



Figure 3a. Cup fragment by Onesimos. Interior. Heidelberg, University Museum 52. Photos courtesy Heidelberg University.



Figure 3b. Exterior of fragment, Figure 3a, with coral-red slip.

which Beazley placed in the Manner of Onesimos, but which, thanks to the new satyr and maenad cup in the Getty, we can now see as an early work of Onesimos himself (figs. 3a–b).²³ This application of a very rare, and no doubt relatively expensive, coral-red slip reflects both Euphronios's use of it during his own career and his continued presence.

Onesimos's early cups, which, as we saw, praised Athenodotos, merge into those of the middle period, characterized by the kalos name Panaitios. This is his mature or "Panaetian" phase. Here belong many scenes of revel, symposium, and athletics, some simple works, others grander in scale. From among the cups showing scenes from the revel a typical example is the tondo of a piece signed by Euphronios as potter and now in the Getty Museum (fig. 4).²⁴ A youth stoops to hold the head of his elder, who is feeling the effects of too much wine and reveling. This piece is important not only because it gives such a good idea of the painter's style at this moment and of his tender humor but also because it may be compared with a previously unattributed fragment which I believe is also a work of Onesimos (fig. 5).²⁵ Little is preserved but a stretch of border pattern, a foot wearing a shoe, the end of a stick, an elbow, and some drapery. Nevertheless, a comparison between the shoes, the drapery, and similar sections of the Getty tondo border, together with the sheer quality of the line, not easily appreciated in the published drawing, reveal the clear connection between the two pieces.

The particular interest of this fragment lies in the fact that it was found in the offerings trench at the center of the burial mound in the plain of Marathon, the burial place of the 192 Athenians who fell in the almost

miraculous victory over the Persians in 490 B.C.²⁶ The significance of the context of this fragment, and its associated finds, is much debated,²⁷ but this fragment still serves as a fairly secure peg on which to hang Onesimos's and Euphronios's careers; it should also help to check anxiety caused by recent reconsiderations of the absolute chronology of Greek art in the fifth century B.C.

Later in this middle phase a new border pattern emerges, the interlocking meander. It is so loved by Onesimos that one might well call it the "Onesiman meander." On the inside of a fragmentary cup divided between the Louvre and the Getty Museum we see, within the "Onesiman" meander, a reveler, alone after his night's debauchery (fig. 6).²⁸ In his agony of retching he grips his stick with both hands. Outside, the theme is lovemaking. With these later middle cups there is a slight lessening in the weight and massiveness of the figures, a tendency which increases as the painter's career proceeds.

There are many cups with mythological themes that belong to this period. Many of them are novel in whole or in part. Indeed it seems that Onesimos in some way set the pace for other painters, such as the Brygos Painter, for Onesimos's is the first Herakles and Ops,²⁹ his the first representation of Theseus under the sea,³⁰ his the first Prokne and Philomela,³¹ his the first killing of the suitors by Odysseus,³² his the first Tekmessa covering the body of Ajax,³³ and his the only slaughtered herds of the Greeks.³⁴ To these we may add not only the fragmentary and ruined scene of Medea rejuvenating the ram on a piece in the Getty Museum, for this is the first occurrence of the magic box in Medea's hand,³⁵ but also some of the episodes



Figure 4. Cup by Onesimos, signed by Euphronios as potter. Interior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.285.



Figure 5. Fragmentary cup by Onesimos. Interior. Marathon Museum, no inv. number (from *AM* 18 [1893], pl. 5.2).



Figure 6. Photo montage of fragmentary cup by Onesimos. Interior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.284, and Paris, Musée du Louvre C 11337. Photo courtesy Musée du Louvre (fragment).



Figure 7a. Cup fragment by Onesimos, signed by Euphronios as potter. Interior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.311.




Figure 7b. Exterior of cup fragment, figure 7a.

described below on the Getty Iliupersis cup.

A particularly interesting fragment of this period, also in the Getty Museum and signed by Euphronios as potter, should also be mentioned here (figs. 7a–b). On the exterior is an unusually vivid Centauromachy that may well have had some influence on the Foundry Painter's version on his Munich cup.³⁶ But most extraordinary of all is the scene on the interior, which preserves the head and shoulders of a lone warrior with a scalp on top of his helmet. This is the only known example of a scalp worn as a trophy by a Greek warrior. The custom of taking scalps was known to the Greeks through their contact with the Scythians, indeed the Greek word for to take a scalp was *apokythiazain*.³⁷ This contact goes back to the late seventh century B.C., as is indicated by the discovery of Greek objects, while the representations of Scythian archers on Athenian vases, which begin in the second quarter of the sixth century, but become particularly common after circa 530 B.C., suggest the presence of Scythians in Athens itself.³⁸ The return of Miltiades the Younger to Athens in about 493 B.C., however, must have intensified Athenian information about the Scythians.³⁹ Indeed, it is possible that not only did Miltiades and his followers bring with them detailed knowledge of the Scythian custom of scalping but that they may also have adopted it themselves on certain occasions, much as we hear of Europeans who learned the technique from the Indians of North America.⁴⁰ This unique occurrence of a warrior sporting a scalp on his helmet

on a cup that one would normally date in the later 490s has all the hallmarks of a contemporary observation, and it is tempting to think that Onesimos intended the warrior to be Miltiades or one of his companions.

This is not the place, however, to go any further in a consideration of Onesimos's career, for we have come far enough to set the Getty Iliupersis cup in its place as the masterpiece of the painter's early middle phase and date it to the period 500–490 B.C. The Getty cup, which was repaired in antiquity, is of type C, with offset lip and a fillet between the stem and the foot (fig. 8a). Its diameter is 46.5 cm, its height as restored is 20.5 cm. This makes it the largest cup of type C so far known and a worthy cousin to the colossal black-figured cup of type A in the British Museum by the Lysippides Painter (diam. 53.0 cm) and the even larger red-figured cup of type B in Ferrara, the work of the Penthesilea Painter (diam. 56.6 cm).⁴¹ On the reserved edge of the foot of the Getty cup are the remains of a painted inscription, which Dr. Marion True has convincingly read as the potter signature of Euphronios: E]VΦ[RONIOΣ ΕΠΟΙΕ]ΣΕ[Ν (figs. 8b–c). This is, in fact, the potter Euphronios's largest surviving work.

When we turn to the painted decoration, we are not disappointed, despite the cup's fragmentary condition. Inside we see a large tondo surrounded by a zone (fig. 8d). Such zone cups are rare and always spectacular, just like the two other "jumbo cups" just mentioned, which also have zones around their tondi. The only other type-C cup with a zone around the tondo is the




Figure 8a. Profile drawing of cup by Onesimos. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 83.AE.362. Scale 1:2. Drawing by Timothy Seymour.




Figure 8b. Signature on foot of cup, figure 8a.




Figure 8c. Signature on foot of cup, figure 8a.




Figure 8d. Interior of cup, figure 8a. Tondo and zone.

smaller, fragmentary piece by the Kleophrades Painter in London, an heirloom in a mid-fifth-century tomb at Kameiros.⁴² This piece is placed by Bloesch in his Eleusis Group, a group of special cups of fine make with offset lips inside, which also contains works painted by the young Onesimos, the young Douris, the Foundry Painter, and one of the Pan Painter's rare essays on a cup, a group which may represent the work of more than one potter.⁴³ Indeed, the earlier pieces of the group, the Eleusis and London white-ground cups, to which we may add the white-ground Bareiss cup and the other white-ground fragment from Eleusis—both no doubt early works of Onesimos as noted above—could well be associated with the potter Euphronios.⁴⁴ The other three pieces are later, larger, and all decorated only in red-figure, by the Foundry

Painter, the Kleophrades Painter, and the Pan Painter.⁴⁵ I cannot help wondering if these later pieces might not be connected with the potter Brygos, although to support this I could do no more than point to the fact that the Foundry Painter is a Brygan, that the Kleophrades Painter's only pupil, the Boot Painter, belongs to the Brygan world, and that the potter of the Pan Painter's white-ground lekythos seems to be the same as that of the Brygos Painter's white-ground lekythoi.⁴⁶

The Getty Onesimos's closest relative in shape is the Brygos Painter's cup from the so-called Brygos Tomb at Capua, which bears the signature of Brygos on the edge of the foot, the same placement as the signature on the Getty piece.⁴⁷ This type-C cup by Brygos takes with it a number of other pieces, including, I believe, the cup in the Brygos Painter's manner also in London,



Figure 8e. Tondo of cup, figure 8a. Death of Priam.

so that here we have, rather more clearly, the potter Brygos following in the footsteps of Euphronios.⁴⁸

The tondo of the Getty Onesimos is densely packed with figures (fig. 8e). It shows the Death of Priam. He sits on an altar on the left. Neoptolemos (NEOPTOLEMOΣ), armed with a shield bearing the device of a lion pulling down a deer, comes at him from the right, wielding the young Astyanax (ΑΣΤΥΑΝΑ+Σ retrograde). A woman stands between them. Collapsed on the ground, partly obscured by the altar and mostly missing is the figure of a fallen warrior. The tips of three of his fingers can be seen between Astyanax's dangling arms, his trunk is just visible on the right of the altar, and his left foot juts out beyond the bottom left corner of the altar. Below the groundline, we can also see a curved slashing sword, a *machaira*, which must have been his.

This remarkable composition is almost exactly par-

alleled on the fragmentary and very early cup by Onesimos divided between Berlin and the Vatican, which was mentioned earlier.⁴⁹ In writing of that ruined but splendid piece I named the woman attempting to intercede for both boy and old man Hekabe, Priam's wife, but the Getty cup shows that Onesimos was rather more imaginative, for he has labeled her Polyxene (ΠΟΛΥ+ΣΕΝΕ), Priam's daughter.⁵⁰ All I can do in my defense is to point out that I did at least draw the woman as young—though quite why I do not know!⁵¹

As for the fallen warrior, I fortunately only referred to him as the ποιμήν λαῶν.⁵² The Getty cup now adds part of his name .|ΑΙΦΟΝΟΣ. One's first restoration would naturally be Daïphonos, but no Daïphonos is mentioned by Homer or listed among the sons of Priam in our various literary sources. To have such an anonymous Trojan, however bitterly ironic his name



Figure 8f. Detail of tondo of cup, figure 8a. Heads of Priam, Polyxene, and Neoptolemos.

(*Daïphonos* would mean “slayer of the enemy”), seems unlikely, and I wonder if Onesimos might perhaps have made a slight slip and written *Daïphonos* instead of *Daïphobos*.⁵³ *Daïphobos* was one of Priam’s sons and was described by Hektor as his dearest brother—indeed it was his form that Athena took when she tricked Hektor outside the walls of Troy. *Daïphobos* also married Helen after the death of Paris. It is usually imagined that he was killed by Menelaos,⁵⁴ who, together with Odysseus, headed straight for his house, but perhaps the vase-painters preserve a different tradition, one in which *Daïphobos* had taken a stand before Priam, only to be cut down by Neoptolemos. This makes the vase-painter’s version of the Death of Priam, a version which seems to combine the deaths of Astyanax and Priam into one horrible act and which is not, as such, preserved in our literary sources, even more powerful, for Neoptolemos is now

seen destroying the three generations of Priam’s Troy: Priam himself, *Daïphobos*, and Astyanax—father, son, and grandson—a terrifying glorification of this young Greek’s savagery, only equaled by his later sacrifice of Polyxena on the tomb of Achilles.

Written on the altar that serves as Priam’s refuge is *HEPKËIQ*, thus identifying it as that of Zeus Herkeios, the altar that stood in the court of every household. An omega used for the genitival diphthong *ov* is very rare, but we do find it at the end of the sixth century and early in the fifth, for example on the tomb of Patroklos on a black-figured hydria in Boston from the Leagros Group and in the inscription written by Douris on an aryballos for Asopodoros.⁵⁵

To the right of the altar are Priam’s sandaled feet, one above the other, jutting out below his long chiton, the greaved left leg of Neoptolemos, and part of the torso of the fallen *Daïphobos*. But amid this jungle



Figure 8g. Interior zone of cup, figure 8a. Rescue of Aithra (left); Sthenelos and a woman (right).

there is also a strange object. It crosses in front of the fallen Trojan's body and projects down to the right below the groundline. It narrows in the center and seems to swell at the ends. It can only be a pestle for grinding corn.

Pestle-wielders are quite rare—we find them in only three other representations of the Sack of Troy,⁵⁶ and also, perhaps under their influence, in the hands of one of the daughters of Nereus, as Herakles breaks up her father's house on a pelike in Munich by the vase-painter Myson.⁵⁷ The pestle on the ground in the Getty tondo no doubt belonged to Polyxena—it was a woman's weapon.⁵⁸ If this is so, it sets Polyxena alongside Andromache as a pestle-wielder of some distinction. Andromache is named on the Brygos Painter's cup in the Louvre, and, by extension, the woman warrior on the Kleophrades Painter's famous Vivenzio hydria in Naples is usually called Andromache, as is the figure on the back of the column-krater by the Tyskiewicz Painter in the Villa Giulia.⁵⁹ In the case of the Louvre cup, the Andromache scene seems to precede the Death of Priam episode on the other side, for behind Andromache runs young Astyanax, who reappears on the other side at the mercy of Neoptolemos,

but this cannot be so on the Kleophrades Painter's vase. I wonder, therefore, if the pestle-wielder there, and on the Villa Giulia vase, might not really be Polyxena, still attempting to defend her father and her city.

With all the figures and their actions identified, we can now appreciate some of the details of Onesimos's drawing. In the case of the white-haired old Priam, note the lines in dilute glaze marking the furrows on his brow, at the corner of his eye, and around his nostril; his open mouth with teeth bared in terror; his outstretched hands, one, it would seem, in fear, the other in appeal (fig. 8f). We see little more of the beautiful young Polyxena than her head, her hands, and the contour of her right breast as it shows through her chiton, but all her action is concentrated on her head as she tears at her loosened hair in mourning at the fall of Troy and the imminent deaths of her loved ones. The drawing of her right hand is interesting: the ball of her hand is just visible through her hair, while the ends of her fingers are clearly shown, having gone right through the strands of hair to protrude at the front. The stony-faced, thin-lipped Neoptolemos, resplendent in his black helmet and scaly armor with its panther's head back-flap and his symbolically decorated



Figure 8h. Interior zone of cup, figure 8a. Rape of Cassandra.

shield, dominates the center of the tondo, a predator among the grazing herd. His living club, the young Astyanax, drawn by Onesimos as a long-haired, fine-limbed boy, his pubic hair still not grown, his eyes wide open in his tiny face, brackets the tondo on the right. The fallen figure, sprawled across the bottom of the tondo, is too damaged to appreciate fully, but we might perhaps imagine his head lolling back, chin jutting upward, his eye closed in death, unless his face was turned toward the viewer, as seems to have been the case on the Berlin and Vatican cup.

This wonderful tondo is separated from its surrounding zone by a very careful continuous meander pattern. In the zone the other events of that savage night at Troy unfold. Beginning from the left handle are parts of two warriors to the right—they wear short chitons and greaves, and they both carry shields (fig. 8g). The leading warrior also has a sword at his left hip and a spear in his left hand. To the right of this pair is an old woman with white hair, who wears a long chiton and a cloak. She stands before an altar with a volute terminal, perhaps having sought sanctuary there, and reaches out her hands to the two warriors. Part of a name is preserved . . .]ΜΟΦΟΝ, surely from

Demophon. The scene is the rescue of Aithra by her grandsons Akamas and Demophon.⁶⁰

One of the finest representations of this scene is on the Vivenzio hydria by the Kleophrades Painter mentioned earlier. There the episode is found on the right-hand end of the frieze: Akamas and Demophon reach out to their grandmother, who sits on a block, and begin to help her to her feet—there are no names on this vase but the actions are clear enough. In both versions Aithra's hair is cut short, since she was a slave in Troy, but on Onesimos's cup she has also been given the white hair of the aged. Both artists have chosen to interrupt the lower contour of her chin in order to represent a double chin, but Onesimos has also given her a low-hanging, rounded breast. Such characteristics of age are rare until the Hellenistic period, so that they are even more evocative when they do occur.

Moving on to the next group, or vignette, we see a violent fight. A woman in a long chiton is down on one knee as she wields a large pestle over her head to ward off the attack of a Greek warrior armed with a *machaira*.⁶¹ He is named Sthenelos (ΣΘΕΛΕΛΟ[Σ] retrograde), and he seems just to have delivered an overhead slashing blow with his *machaira*, which she



Figure 8i. Interior zone of cup, figure 8a. Combat scene; Antenor and Theano.

has successfully parried. There are traces of this valiant woman's name: it began with H and ended with E—there is room for about four or five letters between. The woman is probably too young for Hekabe, and Helene appears elsewhere in the zone. If the *H* was in fact a *K*, which does not, however, seem very likely, the woman might be Klymene, who, like Aithra, was a servant of Helen.⁶² Sthenelos is, of course, rather easier: we know him from the *Iliad* and attending to the wounded Diomedes on a lost Chalcidian neck-amphora.⁶³

The next group is much more complex and much more familiar: it is the Rape of Cassandra (fig. 8h).⁶⁴ Ajax, the son of Oileus, attacks from the left. He is equipped with cuirass, greaves, and a black helmet, echoing Neoptolemos in the tondo. His left hand holds the ill-fated prophetess's head as his right arm is pulled back for a feint with his sword (not preserved). Cassandra (KATTANΔARA retrograde) is naked but for a cloak, which seems to be slipping slowly off her shoulders. The bareness of the drawing of her body (there is only a very light wash of dilute glaze for her pubic hair) seems to emphasize her youth and vulnerability. Her right arm reaches out to Ajax in appeal, as her left arm clings to the statue of Athena, which we know will topple over in the ensuing struggle.

The figure of Athena is shown as striding forward,

shield out in front and spear raised in the right hand beside her face. Little is preserved of her helmet, but the shield is clear. It bears the device of a black Gorgoneion surrounded by snakes, set so that it follows the line of the arm, as with devices on shields of Boeotian shape. This black Gorgoneion appears rather strange, and it is possible that further decoration on top of the black was intended; no trace, however, remains. Over her shoulders she wears her scaly aegis, which is remarkable for the snakes that appear amid the scales as well as ringing its edge. Over a long chiton she wears an elaborately decorated peplos with friezes of running figures, Pegasoi, palmettes with lotuses, lotus buds and, finally, squared esses. The decoration of this peplos closely recalls that of the statue of Athena on some unattributed cup fragments from the Akropolis.⁶⁵ It also recalls that of the peploi worn by a number of goddesses on the much earlier Sophilos dinos in London,⁶⁶ and the cloaks worn by Demeter on Makron's rather later skyphos in London, and the cult statue of Dionysos on the same artist's cup in Berlin.⁶⁷ All, no doubt, reflect the sort of elaborately decorated garments offered to deities on their festal days.

Behind this statue of Athena with its simple block base are two large tripods. Tripods are quite often to be seen in representations of sanctuaries, as here in the sanctuary of Athena, but the placing of a tripod behind



Figure 8j. Interior zone of cup, figure 8a. Menelaos and Helen.

the altar of Zeus Herkeios on the Brygos Painter's version of the Sack of Troy on his cup in the Louvre seems to make less sense.⁶⁸ It makes one wonder if it is the last vestige of the Cassandra scene, which does not otherwise appear on the Louvre cup.

The next group in the zone of the Getty cup shows a fight (fig. 8i). A Greek in a scaly cuirass with a cloak tied around it and a short chiton presses forward to the right, shield and spear in hand, against two Trojans, one of whom has already fallen. This naked fallen figure has his mouth open and eye closed in the very moment of dying, it would seem. His wounded but still standing comrade bleeds from his stomach, as he desperately wields a curved *machaira* over his head, his teeth bared, berserk, as the Greek's spear is about to go home once again in his undefended side. This Trojan's name, written retrograde, begins with ΟΦΡV[...], then there is part of another letter, then space for another and then finally a Σ. At first I took this for Ophruios, meaning, perhaps, "supercilious," a previously unknown form, but now I wonder if the damaged letter after the V may not be part of an N, giving us Ophrynos—a man from Ophryneion, a city in the Troad, which later boasted the grave of Hektor. We can only guess at the Greek's name, but perhaps it was Diomedes, balancing Sthenelos to the left of the Cassandra scene.

Running toward this group, but looking back right, comes a youthful figure in a short chiton decorated with circles and a cloak that is fastened at his neck. In his right hand he holds a spear; up in his left another straight, short stick of some sort with a loop at the end. He probably wore a *petasos* on the back of his head, for there is a red tie under his chin to the right, as well as a thicker one from his fillet at the back of his head. His function is not immediately clear, and it is perhaps best to suspend judgment until the next group has been examined.

This group consists of a bearded Greek warrior wearing an animal skin, helmet, and greaves and carrying a shield and a spear, who meets two draped figures—the first, a woman with white hair who wears a long chiton, the second, an old man in long chiton, himation, and shoes who held a staff or scepter. The Greek warrior's name ends in ...]EVΣ and one immediately thinks of Odysseus. The old woman's name ends with an ...]O—it would have been written retrograde away from her. There seems only one solution to these clues. The old couple are the Trojans Antenor and Theano, appealing to Odysseus—Theano's hand actually grips Odysseus's bearded chin in the ritual gesture of supplication.⁶⁹ Antenor and Theano had shown hospitality to Odysseus and Menelaos when, before the war, the latter came in an em-

bassy to Troy to request the return of Helen and the possessions stolen by Paris. The couple even saved the lives of the Greek ambassadors from treachery, according to some versions. After the inconclusive duel between Paris and Menelaos, Antenor urged the Trojans to give back Helen, but to no avail. In return for all these good offices, the Greeks determined to save Antenor and his family when they finally captured Troy. They advised him to hang a panther's skin outside his house, and Odysseus and Diomedes headed directly for it.⁷⁰ This group on the Getty cup is the only certain representation of the scene so far known, apart from the version reported by Pausanias in Polygnotos's painting "Troy Taken" in the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi.

In the light of this identification, the action of the figure to the left of the group, moving away from it, but clearly connected with the event taking place there, may be reconsidered. We hear of many sons of Antenor, some fell before Troy, others were saved with their parents, and this might be one of them, although it would be strange for him to be running away. We might, therefore, consider another possible identification. In Pausanias's description of Polygnotos's later painting we hear that Akamas and Demophon had to send a herald, Eurybates, to ask for permission of Helen, before taking their mother, Aithra, home.⁷¹ No herald is mentioned in the Antenor scene, and heralds do not usually carry spears, but, by analogy and in the context of the Sack of Troy, I wonder if this figure might be a herald, despatched posthaste by Odysseus to ask Menelaos or Agamemnon if Antenor and Theano might be spared and allowed to leave the city. Onesimos would, thus, be following a version of the story of Antenor and Theano not preserved in the literary sources, in which Odysseus came upon the old couple by chance, rather than intention, and therefore had to seek permission to spare them.

There is now a section missing from the zone: it was probably filled by a fight scene. The next group to be preserved is that at the bottom of the cup (fig. 8j). Here the protagonists are Menelaos and Helen. Menelaos (MENELEOΣ retrograde) has advanced on Helen with drawn sword, but Eros, hovering above—part of his legs and part of one wing are preserved—has intervened, and Menelaos's sword drops from his grasp. Helen (HELENE) is clothed in a fine chiton and patterned hairnet and has an earstud in her ear—care over one's appearance clearly pays. Behind Helen another woman clutches at Helen's chiton. She is probably Aphrodite, as on Makron's skyphos,⁷² but the gesture unexpectedly seems to be one of fear at Menelaos's

violent advance, an emotion closely followed no doubt by wondering relief as Menelaos's anger suddenly evaporates. This is the earliest occurrence on vases of the motif of Menelaos dropping his sword: it is first known in literature from Euripides' *Andromache*.⁷³ There is no trace of a sanctuary of Apollo, to which Helen is said and seen to have retreated, although it is perhaps just possible that an altar or even a cult statue overlapped with the probable figure of Aphrodite behind Helen.

The last group is extremely fragmentary. On the left was a fight group—we see a jungle of feet. These legs seem to come from two men, both without greaves, closely locked in struggle—one of their names ended with the letter . . .]Σ. On the right was a woman in long chiton and head cloth, wielding a double axe—we see her head, part of her name (AN[. . . written retrograde), the end of her double axe, and part of her long chiton, as well as one foot. This woman is presumably Andromache, unless she is Antiope, the wife of Laokoon,⁷⁴ and she is probably to be thought of as attempting to come to the aid of the man on the right, who would thus be a Trojan. If this Trojan's opponent is a Greek, then he is the only Greek warrior not to wear greaves on this cup.

We might well expect to see somewhere in this zone the figure of Agamemnon, and it is tempting to wonder if Onesimos might have provided Andromache with an axe because of the artistic tradition of giving Klytaimnestra an axe when she is shown coming to the aid of Aigisthos,⁷⁵ but Agamemnon could as easily have been part of the fight group on the other side of Menelaos's reconciliation with Helen.

So much for the tondo and its zone. There remain the scenes on the exterior of the cup, which are bounded below by a neat border of stopped meanders and a frieze of enclosed and linked palmettes—a palmette-lotus marks the place where the artist began and ended his floral border (fig. 8k).

On the extreme left of the better-preserved side, a male in a himation leans nonchalantly on a thick knotty stick that has been given a wash of dilute glaze (fig. 8l). Beyond him a bearded man in a corslet and himation faces to the right. His right arm is outstretched, his left bent at the elbow. Toward these two figures comes a complex procession of figures. The first is a male in a himation decorated with crosses and with a dilute wash. He leads a woman dressed in a chiton and a cloak, holding her by the right wrist in a gesture of possession, control, and, in other circumstances, of marriage. His right hand was out in front of him, bent at the elbow to hold a spear: only the tip of his elbow



Figure 8k. Exterior of cup, figure 8a. Side A. Patroklos leading Briseis from Achilles to Agamemnon.

is preserved and part of the spear, which extends behind the figure in front of him. Between the two men is written retrograde and downward $\dots\text{ΠΤΡΟΚΛΟΣ}$, from Patroklos. The woman holds a red flower between the fingertips of her left hand.

Behind the woman comes a youth in a chlamys, buttoned at the neck (fig. 8m). He has a red tie at his chin and so no doubt wore a *petasos*, as well as a head fillet. He holds a *kerykeion* in his left hand. Behind him comes a bearded man similarly dressed, except that he wears a sword at his left hip. The *petasos* is clear at his right shoulder, and the tip of his *kerykeion* butt projects on the right, beyond the face of the woman to the right of him. His right arm seems to reach out to this woman, or beyond her, as he twists around sharply. The woman, who wears a chiton and cloak, moves quickly to the right. Both seem attracted by the violent action of the figure on the far right, a youth whose beard is still rather thin and whose long hair is tied up

in a *krobylos*. He wears only a cloak and is beginning to draw his sword from its scabbard. Only one letter of his name is preserved, A[...], but he is surely Achilles. And the scene must be the leading away of Briseis from Achilles' tent. There are also traces of the name of the woman immediately in front of Achilles, $\Theta\text{E}[\dots]\text{I}[\Sigma]$, for Thetis, Achilles' divine mother.

The story is well known from the first book of the *Iliad*. Agamemnon sends his two heralds, Talthybios and Eurybates, to fetch Briseis from Achilles' tent. They arrive, nervous and silent, and Achilles takes charge, ordering Patroklos to lead Briseis out for them. He then bursts into tears and withdraws from his comrades to sit alone by the shore of the gray sea, praying to his mother Thetis, who quickly appears to hear his plaint. That is the Homeric version, and it helps us to understand the scene on the Getty cup. Patroklos leads Briseis away, followed by the two nervous heralds. Achilles' rage begins to get the better of him, and he



Figure 81. Exterior of cup, figure 8a. Side A, detail left.

goes for his sword. The elder herald turns in alarm, and Thetis appears to quiet her son. Over to the left two men await the procession and the arrival of Briseis. Unfortunately, their names are not preserved. One might imagine that the bearded man who reaches forward is Agamemnon, but this would make the powerful but relaxed figure on the far left little more than a bystander. I wonder, therefore, if we should not see this relaxed figure as an arrogantly nonchalant Agamemnon, and the warrior acting as his second in this drama, his brother Menelaos. This would mean that Agamemnon and Achilles balance each other in position and contrast each other strongly in mood, much as the figures of Odysseus and Ajax do in representations of the vote for the arms of Achilles.⁷⁶ Patroklos's spear is not perhaps in the usual "at ease" position, for it is virtually horizontal.⁷⁷ It is almost as if Briseis, as a spoil of war, is handed over to Agamem-

non by making her walk out from under Patroklos's spear. The goose under the handle behind Agamemnon no doubt symbolizes Aphrodite, the instigator of so much suffering and death at Troy. The stool under the other handle is probably the stool in Achilles' tent from which he has just risen.

Onesimos's depiction of the Briseis episode is not an illustration of Homer. Indeed, he diverges significantly, for Achilles' anger has no place there, and Thetis should appear to a grieving, solitary hero. Achilles' anger, in fact, belongs earlier in the drama, during the quarrel between him and Agamemnon, and, then, as he reaches for his sword, it is Athena who appears and tugs him by the hair, not Thetis. But whatever Onesimos's source, whether it be literary, folktale, or visual, the results are extremely effective, for action and mood combine to achieve a totally understandable and particularly evocative whole.




Figure 8m. Exterior of cup, figure 8a. Side A, detail right.

It is perhaps interesting to pause for a moment here and look at the only two other representations of the Briseis episode to be preserved. On a skyphos in the Louvre by Makron, Agamemnon leads an unnamed woman by the wrist, followed by Talthybios, the herald, and a watchful Diomedes.⁷⁸ This corresponds with neither Homer nor Onesimos, but the other side shows the embassy to Achilles—Ajax, Odysseus, and Phoinix come to treat with the sulking Achilles—true to the Homeric description. The second piece is the cup in the British Museum by the Briseis Painter, the name piece of this follower of the Brygos Painter.⁷⁹ Here two heralds lead a woman away from Achilles' tent, which appears as a picturesque, stripy marquee. Achilles is seated, sulking inside, his helmet, sword, and spear put aside, two comrades in attendance. The painter has thus combined the Briseis episode with the setting for the embassy to Achilles. This is an artifice of a visual

tradition which deals in schemata that can be adapted at will—as is Onesimos's inclusion of the anger motif. On the other side of the London cup three men observe as two heralds lead a woman away. Beazley described this as “Briseis brought to Agamemnon,” but I find such an interpretation hard to follow. The direction of motion is both away from the three men and counter to the direction on the other side of the cup. A more logical interpretation would seem to be that we see here Briseis being led back to Achilles after Patroklos's death: the sequel, not a redundant amplification.⁸⁰ In this way Achilles' tent and his pose serve double duty.

The other side of the Getty cup is sadly extremely fragmentary (fig. 8n). We have part of Athena ([AΘE]NAIA retrograde) from the extreme left of the scene—the back of her helmet, part of her scaly aegis, some of her himation, and the end of her spear are



Figure 8n. Exterior of cup, figure 8a. Side B.

preserved. Alongside Athena's feet are the remains of two right feet of different figures, whose left feet appear further on to the right. One of these figures was a warrior, as his greaves indicate. To this figure must belong the fine shield of Boeotian shape decorated with a silhouette boar and snake seen near the middle of this side of the cup. Above the shield is the tip of this warrior's spear and over his thigh the pommel and hilt of his sword. In the center of the side is a man in long chiton and himation with a bow—this can only be Apollo. A spear crosses the figure of Apollo from the right, and this must belong to the warrior, the toes of whose right foot are just visible next to Apollo's heel. Beyond this there was probably enough room for another figure before the archer in Oriental garb whose calf and foot in a soft shoe are preserved on the extreme right—he was surely a Trojan.

If we presume that the subject continues the Trojan theme of the rest of this complex cup, a duel between a

Greek and a Trojan separated by Apollo suggests that between Ajax and Hektor as told in the *Iliad*.⁸¹ Ajax would be the warrior on the left, supported by Athena. The foot of the warrior on the right seems to be just off the ground and so he would be Hektor, sinking back, wounded. There is no sign of the rock, mentioned in Homer, which knocked Hektor over, and which is seen in some versions of the scene—as on the outside of Douris's cup in the Louvre.⁸² Homer tells us that Apollo picked Hektor up, and the fighting continued until a herald from either side, Talthybios and Idoiios, succeeded in separating them. The two figures on either side of the warriors—only parts of the one on the left are preserved, but these are so close to the warrior that they suggest he was trying to restrain him—are very probably the heralds, hence the lack of greaves on the preserved legs. The two heroes stopped fighting and then exchanged gifts—Hektor gave Ajax a silver-studded sword in its scabbard, Ajax gave Hektor

his bright scarlet belt. This exchange is, of course, shown on an amphora by the Kleophrades Painter in Würzburg, where the two heroes are restrained by, it would seem, Priam and Phoinix.⁸³

This then is the Getty cup, one of Onesimos's greatest works. The outside shows two scenes from the *Iliad*. Although the Briseis episode is treated with a remarkable range of moods, the other side is, for the moment, little more than a skeleton, and sadly we cannot judge its real power. It is, perhaps, the Sack of Troy on the tondo with its unremitting violence and brutality that now has the most lasting impact. Neoptolemos is the center of the storm. His shield device—a lion attacking a deer—seems to act out the events at Troy like a savage simile. His weapon is the still-living, young body of Astyanax, Priam's grandson. His prey is the terrified Priam, and his victory offering will be Polyxena, slaughtered over Achilles' tomb, to be a bride for him in the Underworld. Beyond this spotlight circle whirl the other events of that dark night. At the top—and now we can see how Onesimos has decorated the cup, deliberately and exceptionally following the axis of the handles—at the top, the violence of the tondo is echoed by the deeds of Ajax, who drags Cassandra from the protection of the statue of Athena. Sacrilege following sacrilege. As our eyes pass around the circle in either direction, we en-

counter more violence, but then next to the handles, rescue on one side, deliverance on the other. At the bottom, however, the whole series of episodes, the entire drama, has come full circle and Menelaos melts before Helen's beauty.

It is a very Greek tale, and in Onesimos's hands there is no room for a Trojan future, no escape for Aeneas, only the relatives and friends of the Greeks are saved. The Getty cup is a Greek celebration of the Greek defeat of Troy, as indeed is the Brygos Painter's. It was for the Kleophrades Painter, between the Persian Wars, to show the other side of the story, the effect on the defeated, in the form of the mourning women, and, by including Aeneas, the hope for the future.⁸⁴

NOTE ON CONDITION

The foot was broken off and mended in antiquity with a bronze pin that passed right through to the interior of the cup and with a bronze tube with the top end closed set up under the hollow of the foot to cover the bottom end of the pin and perhaps to add further support. There are also traces of burning on the face of Polyxena and on the drapery over her left arm, as well as on Briseis's drapery on the exterior.

The graffito under the foot has been published by Jacques Heurgon.⁸⁵

The British Museum
London

ADDENDUM

In November 1990, long after the text of this article was written and submitted, I was kindly shown photographs of a further joining fragment of the Getty Onesimos cup. It is a rim fragment, made up of three pieces.

The fragment gives us more of the less well-preserved side of the cup. The exterior adds, on the left, the head and shoulders of a herald who moves to the right while turning his head back to the left. He holds a kerykeion forward in his right hand and wears a chlamys tied at his neck and a *petasos* that is perched on the back of his fair hair. In the center is the head and chest of Ajax (ΑΙΑΣ) and the rest of his Boeotian shield. He is bearded and has prominent eyelashes. On the right is the head of Apollo (ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ retrograde). He looks

to the left and holds up an arrow in his right hand. This fragment thus confirms the interpretation of the scene suggested above.

The inside of the fragment gives more of the Menelaos scene from the zone around the tondo. It completes the tiny figures of Eros (ΕΡΟΣ), adds the beseeching hands of Helen, and provides the head of Menelaos, who wears a black helmet, together with most of his shield (device: an eagle holding a snake in its beak). On the right is the head and shoulders of a young warrior moving to the right. He wears a cuirass and a cloak over his shoulders. He thrusts down to the right with a spear. The photograph stops short of the edge of the fragment, so that I cannot tell if there is a new clue to the identity of the protagonists in this fight.

NOTES

1. See esp. D. C. Kurtz, ed., *Beazley and Oxford* (Oxford, 1985); *The Amasis Painter and His World: Vase-Painting in Sixth-Century B.C. Athens*, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and other institutions, September 1985–April 1986 (catalogue by D. von Bothmer, 1985); M. True, ed., *Papers on the Amasis Painter and His World* (Malibu, 1987). The papers at the colloquium at London will not be published.

2. M. Robertson, *MűJb* 27 (1976), pp. 37–38. Brussels A 889, ARV² 329.130.

3. M. Robertson, *Greek Painting* (Geneva, 1959). It is unfortunate that in reprinting this book the publishers changed the front cover, preferring an Etruscan vase to a Greek one!

4. Malibu 83.AE.362, 84.AE.80, and 85.AE.385, *GettyMusJ* 12 (1984), p. 286. I am very grateful to Dr. Jiří Frel for inviting me to publish this cup and to Dr. Marion True for her constant support and encouragement.

5. For Onesimos, see J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red-figured Vases in American Museums* (Cambridge, Mass., 1918), pp. 82–89; idem, *Greek Vases in Poland* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 22–23; idem, in *Commemorative*

Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear. Hesperia, Suppl. 8 (1949), pp. 3–5; idem, in L. D. Caskey and J. D. Beazley, *Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* (Oxford, 1954), nos. 71–81; idem, *AJA* 66 (1962), pp. 235–236; G. von Lübben, in *Die Griechische Vase* (Rostock, 1967), pp. 485–490; E. Vermeule, *AJA* 71 (1967), pp. 311–314; J. Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases* (London, 1975), pp. 133–134; D. Williams, *JBerMus* 18 (1976), pp. 9–23; M. Ohly-Dumm, *GettyMusJ* 9 (1981), pp. 5–21; B. A. Sparkes, in C. G. Boulter, ed., *Greek Art: Archaic into Classical* (Leiden, 1985), pp. 18–39.

6. Eleusis 618 (inv. 1798) fr., *ARV²* 314.3; (the main fr.) Robertson (note 3), p. 97. Eleusis 619 (inv. 2124) fr., *ARV²* 314.4; *ArchDelt* 9 (1924–1925), p. 16, fig. 14.

7. Malibu 86.AE.313 (ex-Bareiss): J. Mertens, *HSCP* 76 (1972), pp. 271–281, pls. 1–4; eadem, *MMAJ* 9 (1974), p. 97, fig. 12. For the attribution to Onesimos, see D. Williams, *JBerMus* 24 (1982), p. 37. See also *Greek Vases: Molly and Walter Bareiss Collection*, exh. cat. (Malibu, 1983), p. 50, no. 35, checklist, no. 181.

8. For the technique, cf. also Athens, Akropolis 2165, fr., B. Graef and E. Langlotz, *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1925), pl. 93.

9. Malibu 86.AE.607, *GettyMusJ* 15 (1987), p. 162, no. 11.

10. "Shorts," *ARV²* 320.13, 323.48, 324.64, 1648.75 bis; *Paralipomena*, p. 362 add as 28 ter and 93 quater. Add to these, Basel, Herbert A. Cahn collection 766 (interior, youth playing pipes; side A, foot). Compare also the "shorts" by Douris, *ARV²* 428.10–12.

11. E.g., *ARV²* 18.1–3, 27.6–8.

12. Vatican, no inv. number, and Berlin 2280 and 2281, fr., *ARV²* 19.1 and 2; Williams (note 5), pp. 9–23 with figs. 1–7.

13. For Euphronios, see D. von Bothmer, *AA*, 1976, pp. 485–512.

14. Onesimos cups signed with *Euphronios epoiesen*, *ARV²* 318.1, 319.2, 319.4, 319.5, 319.6, 320.8, 322.27 (see now *CVA Amsterdam* 1, pls. 24.5–6 and 25.5–6), 324.60, 325.76; Malibu 86.AE.286 (ex-Bareiss 229), *Paralipomena*, p. 360, add as 74 ter; Centre Island, New York, private collection, fr., *Paralipomena*, p. 360, add as 93 ter; Malibu 86.AE.311 (ex-Bareiss 408); Malibu 79.AE.19 (see below, note 35). The signature on *ARV²* 319.2 is incised on the handle (the incised signature on the last Getty cup has been recognized as modern by Martha Ohly-Dumm); for the rest the signature is done with red paint on the tondo or on the exterior. Beazley suggested that fragments of a cavalry cup also bore the signature of Euphronios, but all that is left is SE, which could even be from a signature of Onesimos as painter: Louvre C 11346, C 11346 bis, Bryn Mawr P 935, 931, 246, 984; *ARV²* 330.6–8 and 324.71–72; H. Giroux, *RA*, 1975, p. 300; note that the handle fr. of Louvre C 11457 (*ARV²* 800.1) joins Bryn Mawr P 931.

15. On the *epoiesen* problem, see J. D. Beazley, *Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens* (London, 1944), esp. pp. 25ff.; R. M. Cook, *JHS* 91 (1971), pp. 137–138; M. Robertson, *JHS* 92 (1972), pp. 180–183; M. J. Eisman, *JHS* 94 (1974), p. 172; R. Blatter, *AntW* 8 (1977), pp. 57–58; I. Scheibler, *Griechische Töpferkunst: Herstellung, Handel und Gebrauch der antiken Tongefässe* (Munich, 1983), pp. 112–116. The theories of M. J. Vickers concerning *epoiesen* (*JHS* 105 [1985], pp. 108–128, esp. 126–128) are surely misguided.

16. In addition to cups decorated by Onesimos, two pieces by the Colmar Painter bear the remains of the signature *Euphronios epoiesen*: Boston, E. D. B. Vermeule collection, fr. (interior, athlete and trainer; exterior A–B, hoplitodromoi); once market (interior, youth reclining playing kottabos; exterior A and B, wrestlers with trainer—photographs in the Beazley Archive, Oxford). Two other cups also probably bore the signature of Euphronios as potter: the Gotha cup (*ARV²* 20, top), as Martha Ohly-Dumm suggested, *GettyMusJ* 9 (1981), p. 21 (I do not accept her attribution to Onesimos—it remains, for me, much closer to Euphronios himself); Athens, Akropolis 434, fr. (*ARV²* 330.5), which should be attributed to the Antiphon Painter.

17. The latest *Euphronios epoiesen* signature is on the white-ground

cup by the Pistoxenos Painter, Berlin 2282, *ARV²* 859.1; *CVA Berlin* 3, pls. 102–103. This cup is signed both in paint on the interior and with incision on the edge of the foot. It is very likely that two other white-ground cups by the Pistoxenos Painter also bore the signature of Euphronios: Athens, Akropolis 439, fr. (*ARV²* 860.2) and Taranto (*ARV²* 860.3). Covered vessel, Malibu 81.AE.195, J. Frel, in W. G. Moon, *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (Madison, 1983), p. 158, fig. 10.19.

18. For this idea, see Beazley (note 15), p. 34; J. Maxmin, *Greece and Rome* 21 (1974), pp. 178–180; Frel (note 17), p. 157; Scheibler (note 15), pp. 127–128.

19. New York 1981.11.9, *Metropolitan Museum of Art: Notable Acquisitions 1980–1981*, pp. 13f. This interesting oinochoe seems to be by the same hand as the fragmentary cup in the Cabinet des Médailles signed by Brygos as potter, Paris, Cabinet des Médailles 570, 578, 580, and ?722, fr., *ARV²* 399. This piece is, in turn, connected with the pair of small amphorae of Panathenaic shape, probably from the same tomb on Aigina (see A. S. Rhoisopoulos, *AZ* 22 [1864], 361*), Athens, National Museum 1689 and 1688, attributed by Beazley to the Pythokles Painter, *ARV²* 36.1 and 2. (Note that A. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis* [Cambridge, Mass., 1949], has given the wrong number in his caption on page 363; for Beazley's mistaken reference to Cockerell pl. 12.3, see D. Williams, *AA*, 1987, pp. 639–640, no. A 26.) These amphorae are themselves by the same hand as the fine lekythos in Geneva (inv. 211232) with the retrieval of the body of Memnon: J. Chamay, *Genava* 25 (1977), pp. 250ff.; K. Schefold, in F. Krininger, B. Otto, and E. Walde-Psenner, eds., *Forschungen und Funde: Festschrift Bernard Neutsch* (Innsbruck, 1980), p. 446 and pl. 85.7–8. Finally, the fragments of a cup from Elea, already compared by Brinna Otto with the Geneva lekythos, should also be by the same hand: B. Neutsch, *RM* 86 (1979), pl. 42.1; Krininger et al. (this note), p. 316 with pl. 62. All six vases may be the work of one hand, whom we should continue to call the Pythokles Painter, following Beazley, with the New York and Cabinet des Médailles pieces representing a grander, slightly stiffer manner, and the others slightly more fluid works under the influence of Onesimos. For further possible, but not likely, examples of Euthymides as potter, see *ARV²* 28.17 and 29.19.

20. Boston 10.179, *ARV²* 327.110; Sparkes (note 5), pl. 19.

21. Basel, Herbert A. Cahn collection 116, *ARV²* 316.3; Williams (note 5), p. 19, fig. 11, p. 21, figs. 12–14.

22. Syracuse 22479, *ARV²* 328.112; W. Technau, *RM* 46 (1931), p. 191, fig. 1; R. Tölle-Kastenbein, *Pfeil und Bogen im antiken Griechenland* (Bochum, 1980), pl. 6 on p. 71.

23. Heidelberg 52, *ARV²* 330.1; W. Kraiker, *Die rotfigurigen Attischen Vasen* (Berlin, 1931), pl. 9 (interior only); B. Cohen, "Attic Bilingual Vases and Their Painters" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1977), p. 516, no. B 133. For quasi black-figure on coral red, compare also Basel BS 458, *CVA Basel* 2, pl. 3, and Louvre MNB 2042, *ABV* 400; B. Cohen, *Marsyas* 15 (1970–1971), pp. 9–10.

24. Malibu 86.AE.285 (ex-Bareiss 229): Bareiss (note 7), pp. 51, 53, no. 37, checklist no. 151.

25. Marathon Museum, no inv. number (formerly Athens, National Museum 1044), *CVA Athens* 1, pl. 13.5; *AM* 18 (1893), pl. 5.2.

26. For the excavations, see V. Stais, *ArchDelt* 6 (1890), pp. 123–132; and idem, *AM* 18 (1893), pp. 46–63.

27. For discussions, see E. Langlotz, *Zur Zeitbestimmung der strengrotfigurigen Vasenmalerei und der gleichzeitigen Plastik* (Leipzig, 1920), pp. 38–41; C. H. E. Haspels, *Attic Black-figured Lekythoi* (Paris, 1936), p. 91; E. Löwy, *Der Beginn der rotfigurigen Vasenmalerei* (Vienna and Leipzig, 1938), pp. 74–84; P. Mingazzini, *Annuario* 52–53 (1974–1975), pp. 9–13. E. D. Francis and M. J. Vickers, in their numerous forays into chronology, see most recently *BSA* 83 (1988), pp. 143–167, do not seem to address the problem of the Marathon tumulus. See now R. M. Cook, *JHS* 109 (1989), pp. 164–170, esp. p. 168.

28. Malibu 86.AE.284 (ex-Bareiss 327) and Louvre C 11337 part,

ARV² 326.87 (the first of the Louvre fr. only); *Paralipomena*, p. 360, add as 74 bis (the Bareiss fr.); *Bareiss* (note 7), pp. 51, 52, no. 36 (only the interior of the Bareiss fr. is illustrated), checklist no. 150. The second of the Louvre fr. joins part of Louvre S 1328, ARV² 320.11.

29. New York 12.231.2, ARV² 319.6; D. Williams, in F. Lisarague and F. Thelamon, eds., *Image et Céramique grecque* (Rouen, 1983), pp. 138–139.

30. Louvre G 104 and Florence PD 321, ARV² 318.1; K. Schefold and F. Jung, *Die Urkönige, Perseus, Bellerophon, Herakles und Theseus in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst* (Munich, 1988), pp. 238–239, figs. 288–290.

31. Basel, Herbert A. Cahn collection 599; Sparkes (note 5), pl. 36.

32. See M. P. Baglione, in J. Christiansen and T. Melander, *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery* (Copenhagen, 1988), pp. 17–24. The vase is a spectacular but very fragmentary phiale. Baglione compares details with works of the Brygos Painter, but the phiale may, in fact, be attributed to Onesimos.

33. Malibu 86.AE.286 (ex-Bareiss 346); D. Williams, *AntK* 23 (1980), pls. 33.7, 36.1–2; *Bareiss* (note 7), pp. 44–45 (old photos), checklist no. 152.

34. New York 1977.192.3 and Louvre C 11342, C 11335, and unnumbered fr., ARV² 319.4 and 327.97; D. Williams, *JHS* 96 (1976), pl. 4c; idem (note 33), pp. 137–145 with pl. 33.1–6 (Louvre C 11336, illustrated on pl. 33.3, does not belong); Sparkes (note 5), p. 38 n. 72 (notes the addition of the handle fr. in the Louvre which “touch-joins” the New York part).

35. Malibu 79.AE.19 plus fr., H. Meyer, *Medeia und die Peliaden* (Rome, 1980), pl. 8.1 (Dieter Ohly’s montage); M. Ohly-Dumm, *GettyMusJ* 9 (1981), pp. 5–21. Further fragments have been added by Dr. Dietrich von Bothmer.

36. Malibu 86.AE.311 (ex-Bareiss 408), *Bareiss* (note 7), checklist no. 178. For the Foundry Painter’s cups, see J. D. Beazley, *Adunanze per il conferimento dei premi della Fondazione A. Feltrinelli*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1966), pp. 53–60, pls. 13–16.

37. For the Scythian custom of scalping, see Hdt. IV.64. The head of the fallen enemy was first cut off: for an example of decapitation in Scythian art, see E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks* (Cambridge, 1913), p. 223. I know of no Scythian representation of a scalp. For physical evidence of scalping in the Scythian world, see S. I. Rudenko, *Frozen Tombs of Siberia* (Berkeley, 1970), p. 221; R. Rolle, *Totenkult der Skythen* (Berlin, 1979), pp. 55, 86 n. 133. For severed heads, see E. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley, 1979), pp. 107–108. Note also the Chiot fr., London GR 1888.6-1.510, E. R. Price, *JHS* 44 (1924), pl. 6.21 with p. 219. For *aproskythiazoin*, see Ath. XII.524f., and Eur., *Tro.* 1026.

38. For the archaeological record, see J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, 2nd ed. (London, 1980), pp. 256–266. For representations of Scythians, see M. F. Vos, *Scythian Archers in Archaic Attic Vase-painting* (Groningen, 1963).

39. Hdt. VI.39–40. For the chronological problems, see A. R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*, 2nd ed. (London, 1984), p. 133 with n. 14, and pp. 218–220.

40. On American Indian scalping, see G. Friederici, *Scalpien und ähnliche Kriegsbräuche in Amerika* (Braunschweig, 1906); G. Nadeau, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 10 (1943), pp. 178–194. Herodotos’s description of the Scythian technique is not by itself specific enough to allow comparison with those discussed by Nadeau but the Scythian finds and Onesimos’s representation indicate that the custom was to take the whole scalp off by means of a neat incision around the hairline, passing above the ears—this is Nadeau’s class of “Total Simple Scalping.”

41. London B 426, *ABV* 256.20; *MonInst* 9, pls. 10, 11; Williams (note 29), p. 135, figs. 3–5. Ferrara, Spina T 18c VP, ARV² 882.35; E. Simon and M. and A. Hirmer, *Die Griechischen Vasen* (Munich, 1981), pls. 184–188.

42. London E 73, ARV² 192.106; J. Boardman, *GettyMusJ* 1 (1974), pp. 10–11, 14.

43. H. Bloesch, *Formen attischer Schalen* (Bern, 1940), pp. 137–138.

44. The London cup is D 1, ARV² 429.20. For the other works, see above (notes 6, 7).

45. Foundry Painter, Louvre G 290 (ARV² 401.9). Pan Painter, Oxford 1911.617 (ARV² 559.152). For the Kleophrades Painter’s cup, see above (note 42). Cf. also perhaps the lip-cup fragment, Malibu 77.AE.21.18, M. Robertson, *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, vol. 1 (Malibu, 1983), p. 53, fig. 6.

46. For the Foundry Painter, see most recently E. R. Knauer, *A Red-figure Kylix by the Foundry Painter: Observations on a Greek Realist*, Indiana University Art Museum Occasional Papers (Bloomington, Indiana, 1987); for the Boot Painter, ARV² 821–823; for the Pan Painter’s white-ground lekythos, Williams (note 7), p. 39 with n. 83.

47. London E 65, ARV² 370.13; Bloesch (note 43), p. 134, no. 4 (Kalliades-Brygos Group).

48. London E 67, ARV² 386.3; Bloesch (note 43), p. 132, no. 15.

49. See above (note 12).

50. Williams (note 5), p. 10.

51. One might wonder now if the woman behind Priam on the Spina calyx-krater (side A, center) might not be Polyxene rather than Hekabe, F. Laurens, *LIMC* 4 (1988), p. 479, no. 54, s.v. Hekabe.

52. Williams (note 5), p. 12. This figure first appears on Berlin 1685, *ABV* 109.24; Boardman (note 5), fig. 67; *LIMC* 2 (1984), s.v. Astyanax, no. 9, pl. 682. On the Vivenzio hydria he is particularly well depicted.

53. For Deiphobos, see L. Kahil, *LIMC* 3 (1986), pp. 362–367, s.v.

54. This tradition (*Little Iliad*) led to the identification of the kneeling figure to the right of Neoptolemos on the Vivenzio hydria as Menelaos and the fallen figure as Deiphobos, see C. Robert, *Bild und Lied* (Berlin, 1881), pp. 67–68.

55. Boston 63.473, *Paralipomena*, p. 164, no. 31 bis; *CVA* Boston 2, pl. 82. Athens 15375, ARV² 447.274. See further J. D. Beazley, *AJA* 52 (1948), p. 338; H. Immerwahr, in *Festschrift B. L. Ullman* (Rome, 1964), p. 41 n. 1; A. W. Johnston, *Trademarks on Greek Vases* (Warminster, 1979), p. 23 with n. 13 on p. 61.

56. Louvre G 152, ARV² 369.1; Naples 2422, ARV² 189.74; Villa Giulia 3578, ARV² 290.9.

57. Munich 8762, ARV² 1638 add as 2 bis; *AA*, 1962, pp. 615–618.

58. On the use of the pestle, see B. A. Sparkes, *JHS* 82 (1962), pp. 125–126. A satyr, exceptionally, wields a pestle on Athens 1129, Haspels (note 27), pl. 49 (Beldam Painter).

59. Louvre G 152, ARV² 369.1; P. E. Arias, M. Hirmer, and B. B. Shefton, *A History of Greek Vase Painting* (London, 1962), pl. 139; *LIMC* 1 (1981), pl. 621, no. 46. Naples 2422, ARV² 189.74; Boardman (note 5), fig. 135.3. Villa Giulia 3578, ARV² 290.9; *CVA* Villa Giulia 2, pl. 18.1.

60. For the scene, see U. Kron, in *LIMC* 1 (1981), pp. 420–431 (Aithra I) and pp. 435–446 (Akamas and Demophon).

61. The fragment with the woman’s face was found in a Centre Island, New York, private collection and generously donated to the Getty Museum by its owner. It is now Malibu 84.AE.80.

62. For Klymene, see Homer, *Il.* III.144; for Klymene on the Vivenzio hydria, Robert (note 54), p. 73.

63. Homer, *Il.* V.108–109. Chalcidian vase, K. Schefold, *Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Zeit* (Munich, 1978), p. 219, fig. 297.

64. For the rape of Cassandra, see *LIMC* 1 (1981), pp. 336–351 (O. Touchefeu); S. Matheson, “Polygnotos: An Iliupersis Scene at the Getty Museum,” *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, vol. 3 (1986), pp. 101–107 (p. 106, fig. 4 is a detail of the scene on the Getty cup).

65. Athens, Akropolis 212, B. Graef and E. Langlotz, *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1933), pl. 10.

66. London 1971.11-1.1, D. Williams, “Sophilos in the British Museum,” *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, vol. 1 (1983), pp.

9–34, esp. figs. 27–28, 33.

67. London E 140, *ARV*² 459.3; Boardman (note 5), fig. 309. Berlin 2290, *ARV*² 462.48; Boardman (note 5), fig. 311.

68. See above (note 59).

69. For Antenor, see *LIMC* 1 (1981), pp. 811–815 (M. Davies).

70. The skin over Odysseus's shoulder might possibly refer to the signal.

71. Paus. X.25.7–9 and 26.1.

72. Boston 13.186, *ARV*² 458.1; *LIMC* 4 (1988), pl. 321, Helene, no. 166.

73. Eur., *Andr.* 627–631; see L. Kahil, in *LIMC* 4 (1988), pp. 542, 559, pl. 341, Helene no. 277 is a detail from the Getty cup. For a new scene of Menelaos and Helen, see M. Jentoft-Nilsen, in Christiansen and Melander (note 32), p. 280, fig. 5.

74. This Antiope is shown on the Torlonia hydria, L. Ghali-Kahil, *Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène* (Paris, 1955), pl. 57.2.

75. On Klytaimnestra's axe, see A. J. N. W. Prag, *The Oresteia: Iconographic and Narrative Tradition* (Warminster, 1985), pp. 88–90. Prag notes that the axe was primarily a household tool, employed as a weapon only in emergencies.

76. Compare Williams (note 33), pp. 137–145, and *LIMC* 1 (1981), pp. 326–327, nos. 80–86, s.v. Aias I (O. Touchefeu).

77. For the “at ease” position, see D. Williams, *JHS* 97 (1977), pp. 162–163.

78. Louvre G 146, *ARV*² 458.2; *AntK* 26 (1983), pl. 32.1–4.

79. London E 76, *ARV*² 406.1; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Briseis nos. 1 and 14, pls. 133 and 136.

80. Cf. A. Kossatz-Deißmann, *LIMC* 3 (1986), p. 160, Briseis no. 14 (= 1).

81. *Il.* VII.264–272. For representations, see *LIMC* 1 (1981), pp. 319–320, s.v. Aias I (O. Touchefeu).

82. Louvre G 115, *ARV*² 437.74; Simon and Hirmer (note 41), pl. 160b.

83. Würzburg 508, *ARV*² 182.5; *CVA* Würzburg 2, pls. 12–13.

84. For a discussion of Greek attitudes to victory and defeat, see P. Ducrey, in C. Bérard, C. Bron, and A. Pomari, eds., *Images et Société en Grèce ancienne* (Lausanne, 1987), pp. 201–211.

85. J. Heurgon, “Graffites étrusque au J. Paul Getty Museum,” *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, vol. 4 (1989), pp. 181–186.

A Cup for a Hero

Diana Buitron-Oliver

ΔΟΡΙΣ ΕΛΑΦΩΣΕΝ

A fragmentary red-figured cup in the J. Paul Getty Museum, signed by Douris as painter, unites three apparently unrelated scenes in the decoration of interior and exterior surfaces (figs. 1a–f). The tondo picture, complete but for some missing fragments of drapery, depicts a bearded male standing before a seated youth, who holds his head in a gesture of mourning. The kalos inscription in the tondo praises Hermolykos, who may be the individual by that name mentioned by Herodotos and Pausanias. The two outside scenes, though missing large pieces from the upper walls of the cup, preserve enough detail to allow us to identify the subjects: an athletic contest viewed by spectators, and an episode from the story of Herakles and Eurytos. The foot, which was broken off and reattached to the cup in antiquity, bears the signature of Kleophrades, son of Amasis, as potter.¹

The cup belongs to a period of experimentation that occurred early in the career of Douris, characterized as transitional between his first efforts and his settled, mature style. Many of his earliest cups were potted by Euphronios, his teacher, whose influence is still apparent on the Getty cup. During this transitional phase Douris experimented with a “rich” method of decorating cups, and a “bare” method. The Getty cup is an example of his transitional “rich” method.²

The richness manifests itself in the tondo scene in the depiction of elaborate drapery and the lavish use of dilute glaze for rendering details of anatomy. The furniture, too, is showy; note the patterned cushion of the diphros (the stool with perpendicular legs), and the footstool with curved legs ending in lion’s paws. The stools of the exterior are an unusual type with slanting, splayed legs, with the ends of the cross slats carefully depicted.³ Clothing is rendered in great detail; the sons of Eurytos wear colorful spotted animal-skin boots, and their quivers are decorated with a scale pattern. Herakles’ lionskin is colored in with dilute glaze.

During his transitional period Douris decorated cups made by several potters, among them Kleophrades. Besides the Getty cup, Kleophrades and Douris collaborated on two now fragmentary cups acquired by the

Berlin Museum in the early 1880s, one now in East Berlin, the other in West Berlin.⁴ Only one foot is preserved, at present attached to the more complete cup in East Berlin, though to which it originally belonged is not known. Furtwängler recorded the signature in 1883; today it has all but disappeared. Around the edge of the foot is written:

KLE[O]ΦΡ[ΑΔΕΣΣΕΠΟ]ΙΕΣΣΕ[N]

The cups made by Kleophrades are larger than those decorated by Douris for other potters at this time, such as Euphronios and Python.⁵ The tondo of the Getty cup is larger than is normal for Douris, which may help to explain some of the oddities apparent in the style of drawing, such as the long, floppy feet and hands and the extra lines added to the central vertical folds of the himations.

The ornament also connects the cups in the Getty and in East Berlin. The exterior borders consist of circumscribed palmettes, upright on the East Berlin cup, pendant on the Getty cup. Both tondos are framed by labyrinth meanders enclosing saltire squares, dotted on the East Berlin cup, plain on the Getty cup.

The palmette border was introduced by Euphronios and the other Pioneers, who also used it on their larger vases. Besides its appearance on the exterior of the cup in East Berlin (the cup in West Berlin is too fragmentary to determine whether such a border was used there also), Douris employed the border as a tondo frame on two other cups, on a phiale, and on a pyxis lid.⁶ With the exception of the pyxis lid, these all belong to his transitional period.

The labyrinth meander, also introduced by the Pioneers, appears on a number of late Archaic vases and cups, including works by the Kleophrades Painter, the Berlin Painter, Onesimos, and the Magnoncourt Painter.⁷ The labyrinth meander appears on only one other work by Douris, a round aryballos in Athens painted in his early period.⁸ It is not a common border. Beazley put together a small group of cups and cup fragments that share this border and are connected in some way with Douris:



Figure 1a. Cup signed by Douris as painter and Kleophrades as potter. Tondo. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 83.AE.217.




Figure 1b. Exterior of cup, figure 1a.




Figure 1c. Foot of cup, figure 1a, with signature of Kleophrades.



Figure 1d. Foot of cup, figure 1a, with signature of Kleophrades.

1. Cabinet des Médailles 543 and part of 536, plus fr. Tondo, Dionysos seated and maenad; A–B, satyrs and maenads. *ARV*² 448, bottom, “akin to the very earliest works of Douris.” The ornament consists of a labyrinth meander enclosing dotted saltire squares in the tondo, palmettes outside.

2. Louvre G 131, S 1416. Tondo, lyre-player; A, boxers; B, (athlete). *ARV*² 1566, “bears some relation to early Douris.” Labyrinth meander enclosing plain sal-

tire squares in the tondo, reserved line outside.

3. Louvre C 12220. Tondo (exergue); A, arming—youth putting on his greaves, youth lifting his shield. *ARV*² 1565–1566.3. Labyrinth meander enclosing plain saltire squares in the tondo.

4. Oxford 1966.720. Tondo (buttock, thigh?); outside, fight. *ARV*² 1566. Labyrinth meander enclosing plain saltire squares in the tondo.

5. Florence 3910 (part ex-Villa Giulia), and Boston




Figure 1e. Foot of cup, figure 1a, with signature of Kleophrades.




Figure 1f. Profile drawing of foot of cup, figure 1a. Scale 1:2. Drawing by Timothy Seymour.

08.31a. Tondo, athlete (hoplitodromos) and boy; A–B, hoplitodromoi. *ARV*² 1565.3, “vaguely akin to Douris.” The labyrinth meander in the tondo encloses dotted saltire squares and checkerboard squares, alternately.⁹

A sixth cup can be added to this list:

6. Karlsruhe 70/395. Tondo, symposion (man vomiting, helped by a boy); A, symposion; B, return home of symposiasts. The labyrinth meander in the tondo encloses alternately plain and dotted saltire squares.¹⁰

The kalos name Aristagoras appears in the tondo of the Karlsruhe cup, as well as on the cups in the Louvre (no. 2) and Florence (no. 5). This name is known in Douris’s signed oeuvre: he praises Aristagoras on the famous psykter in London.¹¹

The Karlsruhe cup was attributed to Douris by Herbert A. Cahn and, although the attribution has not been universally accepted, it appears to be correct. In comparison with the Getty cup it is somewhat smaller,

the tondo significantly smaller, requiring only twenty-six meander units around the tondo, to the Getty cup's thirty-two.¹² As a result, the proportions of the figures on the Karlsruhe cup are closer to what is usual for Douris. A comparison of the two tondos shows that details of anatomy and drapery are similar: the heavily lashed eyes; the ring of dots suggesting the aureole of the nipples; the sharp line distinguishing the limb in front from the limb behind through the drapery; and the broad, wavy lines used to represent the folds around the torso and head. In light of the Getty cup, it seems likely that the Karlsruhe cup is indeed by Douris and belongs to the same period.

In the sequence of Douris's vases, the Getty cup should come after the Berlin cups and before a lost cup (once Joly de Bammerville), known only from drawings, and before a cup in Vienna showing the Arms of Achilles.¹³ Also in this period belong the Brussels Amazon kantharos; a series of mythological cups in Paris and London with tondos showing Achilles and Penthesilea; Ajax with the body of Achilles; Europa and the bull; and three white lekythoi with Atalante, Iphigenia, and warriors arming.¹⁴ These vases share rich ornamental schemes; the figure scenes are full of details: lashed eyes, showy patterns, coloristic use of dilute glaze, and elaborately pleated drapery. The exterior compositions are generally crowded: eight and ten figures on the Getty cup, at least six on the Berlin cup, and seven on each side of the Vienna cup.

Specific details are close: women's drapery divided into groups of fine pleats (cups: Cabinet des Médailles 538; London D 1; Getty phiale, 81.AE.213); short chitons of the men and Amazons, tightly pleated, falling in uneven hemlines (cups: Cabinet des Médailles 538; Berlin 2283; Getty phiale; Getty lekythos, 84.AE.770; Brussels kantharos, Musées Royaux A 718). The quivers of the Brussels and Paris Amazons are generally similar though differing in detail. The bows on the Getty cup are simple in comparison with the deep double curve of the bows of the Amazons. The slightly mannered poses typical of the period recur on the Vienna cup; compare, for instance, Agamemnon on the quarrel side with the standing man in the tondo of the Getty cup.

HERMOLYKOΣ KALOS

In his division of Douris's work into periods, Beazley used kalos inscriptions as one of his guidelines. Chairestratos, the favorite name on Douris's earliest vases, continued to appear in his transitional period, giving way to Hippodamas in the middle period. In the transitional period other names appeared. In addition

to Aristagoras, who has already been mentioned, there are Diogenes, Kallimachos, Menon, Nikodromos, Panaitios, and now, on the Getty cup, Hermolykos.

The name Hermolykos is not otherwise known on vases,¹⁵ but at least two historical individuals bore the name. A Hermolykos was the dedicator of a statue by Kresilas set up on the Athenian Akropolis, the base of which was found in 1839¹⁶:

HERMOLYKOΣ	Hermolykos
ΔΙΕΙΤΡΕΦΟΣ	the son of Dieitrophos
ΑΠΑΡΧΕΝ	offers (it)
ΚΡΕΣΙΛΑΣ	Kresilas
ΕΠΟΕΣΕΝ	made (it)

But the Hermolykos of this mid-fifth-century B.C. inscription is too young to have been the subject of praise on Douris's cup.¹⁷

A better candidate is Hermolykos, the son of Euthynos. Herodotos (IX.105) says that in the battle of Mykale "the best on the Greek side were the Athenians and, among the Athenians, Hermolykos, son of Euthoenos, a man who practiced the pankration. Later than the date of which I am speaking, in the war between the Athenians and the people of Karystos, this man fell at Kyrnos, in the territory of Karystos, and lies buried on Geraistos."¹⁸

As an Athenian, Hermolykos probably participated in the Panathenaic games held every four years starting in 566/565 B.C. as part of the Great Panathenaia. The pankration was one of the five standard athletic events. The competitors were divided into three classes in Athens, according to their age: boys, beardless youths, and men.¹⁹ Hermolykos could also have won in other contests, such as the Nemean or Isthmian games; Pindar wrote odes for victors in the pankration at both. The pankration had been an Olympic event for men since the 33rd Olympiad (648 B.C.) but was instituted for boys only in the 145th Olympiad (200 B.C.).

The battle of Mykale, during which the Greeks destroyed the Persian fleet that had been at Samos, was fought in 479 B.C., within days of the decisive land battle of Plataea. By this time Hermolykos had distinguished himself in the pankration and had taken part in the great war. He is likely to have been a mature man of perhaps thirty years. Hermolykos would have been kalos at the age of eighteen or so, in the period between 495 and 490. This would correspond well with the chronology established for Douris, whose cup in the Getty should also date to this period. Hermolykos died in 472, at the battle near Kyrnos, in the Athenian attempt to subjugate Karystos and make it a tributary

member of the Delian League. He would have been about thirty-seven. Pausanias reports that his statue stood on the Akropolis and that his history had been told by other writers (I.23,12).

If the cup by Douris names this earlier Hermolykos, it would have been painted before any of these events took place, though probably not before Hermolykos's participation in the pankration. The cup itself provides fairly strong evidence that the man named is the same as this individual and that by 490 he had already distinguished himself as an athlete.

One of the exterior scenes shows a contest, quite possibly a pankration, an event that combined boxing and wrestling. The contest is witnessed by three distinguished persons seated on stools, perhaps the judges, and by five standing spectators, one of them a boy. We cannot be certain of the exact nature of the contest since the athletes, like the spectators, are only partially preserved, but the athlete on the right is kicking his opponent, and kicking was a sign of the pankration, which was an all-out fight resembling full-contact karate, requiring endurance and skill. The manoeuvre could also be interpreted as an attempt to trip his opponent, also allowed in the pankration, as well as in a simple wrestling match.²⁰

EURYTOS

The other side of the cup shows an episode from the story of Herakles and Eurytos. A central theme of this legend was the archery contest between Herakles and the sons of Eurytos, the king of Oichalia. The victor's prize was to be Iole, daughter of the king. According to the story, Herakles won, and when he was denied the prize, he slew Eurytos and his sons.

The Getty cup preserves the lower bodies of eight figures: on the far left is Herakles, recognizable by his lionskin; on the far right, a woman, presumably Iole; between them six archers dressed alike in elaborate animal-skin boots tied around the legs with strings and turned down to show the spotted side at the top. The archers wear short chitons, pleated into groups of fine folds, and carry quivers decorated with scale pattern (preserved on three figures) and bows (preserved on two figures). This arrangement follows the scheme developed by late Archaic vase-painters for showing the archery contest. Similar pictorial schemes appear on five other vases:

1. Red-figure cup by Epiktetos in Palermo²¹
2. Black-figure amphora by the Sappho Painter in Madrid²²
3. Red-figure cup by the Brygos Painter in Athens,

Akropolis²³

4. Red-figure cup by the Brygos Painter in Paris, Cabinet des Médailles²⁴
5. Red-figure stamnos by the Eucharides Painter, Basel market²⁵

On the Epiktetos cup and the stamnos (nos. 1 and 5) the scheme is reversed: Herakles shoots from the right and Iole is on the left, with Eurytos and his sons in between. The Madrid amphora and the stamnos (nos. 2 and 5) seem to combine the contest with the slaughter. On each Iole is shown with a target pierced by arrows. Late Archaic vase-painters also represent another episode in the story: a fight breaking out at a banquet.²⁶

Douris himself treated the story on another vase of the same period, a fragmentary phiale also in Malibu. Because of its fragmentary state, it is, however, hard to reconstruct the composition, but it seems to have been shown in two scenes on the exterior surface.²⁷

The story of Eurytos is known only from brief, contradictory passages in ancient literature. In the *Iliad*, the locale of the story, Oichalia, is situated in Thessaly, but in the post-Homeric tradition it is also located in Messenia and Euboea.²⁸ In book VIII of the *Odyssey* Homer tells us that Eurytos challenged Apollo in archery and was slain by him (224–228). In book XXI (13–41) he relates the story of Odysseus's great bow: that it belonged to Eurytos and was given to Odysseus by Iphitos, one of the sons of Eurytos who was later killed by Herakles. A lost epic by Kreophylos of Samos, called the *Sack of Oichalia*, may have been close in date to the Homeric epics.²⁹

Panyassis, a fifth-century epic poet and kinsman of Herodotos, treated the story in his *Herakleias*. Three long fragments ascribed to this poem describe a feast at the house of Eurytos from which Herakles, drunk with wine, was roughly expelled by his host.³⁰ Sophokles, in the *Trachiniae* (268–269), tells the same story. Perhaps this banquet is the inspiration for the vase-paintings that show the fight breaking out at a banquet. Possibly this quarrel led to the archery contest.³¹

The archery contest itself is mentioned briefly in *Trachiniae* (265–268) and by the scholiast on Euripides's *Hippolytos* (245–551); the scholiast says that when Herakles won and was denied Iole, he slew the sons of Eurytos.³²

The most complete version of the story is told by Apollodoros (II.4,1–2), who says that Eurytos offered his daughter Iole as a prize to the winner of an archery contest against himself and his sons, and that Herakles won but did not get the bride. Iphitos, the eldest son,

favored the match, but Eurytos and his other sons overruled him. Apollodoros omits the subsequent slaying of the sons of Eurytos but mentions, a few lines further on, the murder of Iphitos by Herakles under different circumstances at a later time.

Douris's version of the story includes no fallen figures such as those seen on the Madrid amphora and on the Brygos Painter's Akropolis fragments (nos. 2 and 3). The sons of Eurytos are approaching Herakles, as on the Epiktetos cup and the Eucharides Painter stamnos (nos. 1 and 5). This is perhaps the moment when it is clear that Herakles has won, and Eurytos and his sons have become agitated. On the Madrid amphora, two of Eurytos's sons, Deionos and Iphitos, have fallen and are in distress. This seems also to be the case on the Brygos Painter's fragments in Athens, if indeed the middle fragment belongs to the same side of the cup as the fragments with Herakles and Iole. These two representations, on the Madrid amphora and on the Akropolis fragments, seem to combine the contest with the shooting of Eurytos's sons.³³ These vases, along with the scholiast on Euripides's *Hippolytos*, perhaps reflect the version of the story told in Kreophylos's lost epic.

Douris was fond of mythological stories during his transitional period. Those on different parts of a single vase are sometimes related, as in the Vienna cup, which shows three scenes from the Arms of Achilles, or in the Brussels kantharos, but they often seem to have been chosen randomly: Ajax with the body of Achilles inside, Tityos outside; Europa inside, Apollo and Herakles struggling over the Delphic tripod outside. In the case of the Getty cup, I believe that there is a connection between the three apparently disparate scenes.

The tondo composition belongs to the tradition used to represent Odysseus's mission to Achilles when, after Agamemnon took Briseis from Achilles, the latter refused to fight, and the Achaean forces suffered. In the *Iliad* (IX.162ff.) Homer tells how the delegation was chosen: Phoinix, Ajax, and "brilliant Odysseus," on whose persuasive powers they most relied. Makron, Douris's contemporary, who decorated two skyphoi with Trojan subjects, shows the mission on his Louvre skyphos, where the names are inscribed: Odysseus standing before Achilles, his weight on his right leg, his left leg crossed behind, leaning on his spear; Achilles seated on a beautiful inlaid camp stool with an embroidered cushion, muffled in drapery; Ajax and Phoinix on the sides.³⁴ The helmet, sword, and camp stool set the scene in a military camp.

The tondo of the cup by Douris shows two figures:

a man standing before a seated youth, his weight on his right leg, his left leg crossed behind, leaning on his walking stick; the youth seated, muffled in drapery, head bent forward and supported by his right hand. The names of the figures are not provided, and the athletic equipment seems to set the scene in the palaestra rather than an army camp. The usual camp stool is replaced by a stool with rectangular legs and an elegant footstool, which would be somewhat out of place in a camp. Nevertheless, the iconography of the scene was well known.³⁵ The subject was especially popular in the first quarter of the fifth century, and it appears on a number of red-figure vases, including a cup by the Oedipus Painter, a follower of Douris, and two fragments of calyx-kraters by the Kleophrades Painter.³⁶

Subtle Odysseus, cleverest of the Greeks, is the unifying factor for the scenes on the Getty cup. He is not pictured himself, but all three exploits represented here recall his history. The tondo scene recalls his powers as a persuasive speaker. The pankration on the exterior reminds us that Odysseus, too, was a star athlete, surpassing all the Phaiakians at the discus "which, speeding from his hand lightly, overflowed the marks of all others" (*Od.* VIII.192–193).³⁷ Odysseus followed his great discus throw with a challenge to anyone to meet him in boxing or wrestling. The Eurytos story makes a parallel with another great hero, Herakles, who was also an accomplished archer. Like Herakles, Odysseus engaged in an archery contest that was followed by a slaughter, and the great bow with which he slaughtered the suitors was given to him by Eurytos's son Iphitos.³⁸ The epic that may have described the sequence of events in Eurytos's house and that may have been the inspiration for the vase-painters is no longer preserved, whereas the *Odyssey* provides a vivid description of the slaughter of the suitors in Ithaca.

To vase-painters of the first quarter of the fifth century, the Eurytos story would have been preferable to the rarely depicted slaughter of the suitors.³⁹ Eurytos and his sons were perhaps only marginally Greeks. They lived in Thessaly, or Euboea, or Messenia. Vase-painters invariably show them dressed in unusual costumes—barbarian costumes. On the Getty cup the evidence for this is limited at present to the elaborate animal-skin boots.

To the Athenians, the bow was an alien weapon, used by foreign mercenaries and Amazons, though also by gods and heroes.⁴⁰ In the Eurytos story, a Greek hero vanquishes an enemy, who can be equated with barbarians, and this may reflect the political situation of the 490s in Athens.⁴¹

The deeds of heroes provide the subject matter for all three scenes on the cup. As a compliment to the youth Hermolykos, these scenes and the deeds they

recall might have been intended to suggest a future heroic role for him, a role we know from historical sources that he ultimately attained.

Chevy Chase
Maryland

NOTES

1. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 83.AE.217; *GettyMusJ* 12 (1984), p. 245, no. 69. The foot with its inscription was published by D. von Bothmer, *The Amasis Painter and His World: Vase-Painting in Sixth-Century B.C. Athens*, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, and other institutions, September 1985–April 1986 (Malibu, 1985), pp. 230–231.

2. J. D. Beazley divided the work of Douris into four phases in *ARV²*. I have refined this division in a monograph on Douris, which will appear in the series *Kerameus*. I use my own designations in this article.

3. For the splaying legs, compare, for example, the chair and bench on a hydria in Milan, *ARV²* 571.73; G. M. A. Richter, *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* (London, 1966), fig. 276.

4. Berlin, Pergamon Museum 2283, *ARV²* 429.21, and Berlin, Charlottenburg 2284, *ARV²* 429.22; *ArchZeit*, 1883, pls. 1–2; *CVA* Berlin (forthcoming).

5. 83.AE.217: H: 11.5 cm, Diam: 36.2 cm, Diam of foot: 16.2 cm, Diam of tondo: 24 cm. See also below, notes 12 and 13.

6. Cups: Cabinet des Médailles 575 and 648, fr. *ARV²* 430.27, partly illustrated, A. de Ridder, *Catalogue des vases peints de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1902), p. 433; Boston 95.31, *ARV²* 443.225, *AJA* 85 (1981), pl. 28, fig. 13. Phiale: Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.213, see the article by Martin Robertson in this volume, pp. 75–98. Pyxis lid: Mannheim 124, *ARV²* 447.276; *CVA* Mannheim 1, pl. 26.1 and 6–7, pl. 32.5.

7. On the labyrinth meander, see M. Robertson, “Origins of the Berlin Painter,” *JHS* 70 (1950), p. 30; D. C. Kurtz, *Athenian White Lekythoi* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 17–18; and B. Sparkes, “Aspects of Onesimos,” in C. G. Boulter, ed., *Greek Art: Archaic into Classical* (Leiden, 1985), p. 26 n. 62.

8. Athens T.E. 556, *Paralipomena*, p. 376, no. 273 bis; B. Philippaki, *Kernos* (Athens, 1972), pls. 54–55.

9. *CVA* Florence 3, pl. 89.

10. *Jahrbuch der staatlichen Kunstsammlungen in Baden-Württemberg* 8 (1971), pp. 254–257; D. Thimme, *Griechische Vasen* (1975), pp. 37–39; C. Weiss, *CVA* Karlsruhe 3 (forthcoming).

11. London E 768, *ARV²* 446.262; *CVA* British Museum 6, pl. 105.

12. The Karlsruhe cup measurements: H: 11 cm, Diam: 32.6 cm, Diam of tondo (without border): 16 cm. I thank Dr. Michael Maass for the measurements.

13. *ARV²* 429.25–26. For Vienna 3695, see *CVA* Vienna 1, pls. 11–13; measurements: H: 12.8 cm, Diam: 33.8 cm, Diam of tondo: 21.5 cm.

14. Brussels, Musées Royaux A 718, *ARV²* 445.256, *CVA* Brussels 1, pls. 5–6; Cabinet des Médailles 538, *ARV²* 428.16, *LIMC* 1 (1981), pl. 477; Cabinet des Médailles 537 and 598, fr., *ARV²* 429.19, *LIMC* 1 (1981), pl. 143; London D 1, fr., *ARV²* 429.20, I. Wehgartner, *Attisch Weissgründige Keramik* (Mainz, 1983), pl. 16; Palermo NI 1886, *ARV²* 446.266, D. C. Kurtz, *Athenian White Lekythoi* (Oxford, 1975), pl. 10.1; Cleveland 66.114, *Paralipomena*, p. 376, no. 266 bis, *CVA* Cleveland 1, pls. 32–35; J. Paul Getty Museum 84.AE.770, *Art Antique: Collections Privées de la Suisse Romande* (G. Ortiz and J. L. Zimmerman) (Mainz, 1975), no. 205.

15. The HERMO . . . on a cup fragment in Athens might be part of the same name, Athens, Akropolis 223, *ARV²* 1583.

16. A. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis* (Cam-

bridge, Mass., 1949), pp. 141–144.

17. J. Six proposed that the two men named Hermolykos were members of the same family, father and grandson; “Hermolykos und Kresilas,” *JdI* 7 (1892), pp. 185–188.

18. D. Grene, trans., *The History of Herodotus* (Chicago, 1987).

19. H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (London, 1977), pp. 34–36.

20. On the pankration, see M. B. Poliakoff, *Combat Sports in the Ancient World* (New Haven, 1987), pp. 55–57; and W. E. Sweet, *Sport and Recreation in Ancient Greece* (Oxford, 1987), p. 81.

21. Palermo V 653, *ARV²* 73.30; *CVA* Palermo 1, pl. 5.

22. Madrid 10.916, *ABV* 508; R. Olmos Romera, “Die Einnahme von Oichalia” *MM* 18 (1977), pls. 32, 34a; and *LIMC* 1 (1981), pl. 687, Antiphonos I.

23. Akropolis 288, fr.; Olmos Romera (note 22), pl. 35d; and *LIMC* 4 (1988), pl. 62, Eurytos I.5.

24. Cabinet des Médailles L 243, L 46, L 78, 600, fr., *ARV²* 370.8; J. D. Beazley, “Brygan Symposia,” in *Studies Presented to David M. Robinson*, vol. 2 (St. Louis, 1953), pl. 28k and i.

25. C. Isler-Kerényi, *Stamnoi* (Lugano, 1976/1977), pp. 36–42; Basel, Münzen und Medaillen, sale 70, *Kunstwerke der Antike* (November 14, 1986), pp. 70–71, no. 208; and *LIMC* 4 (1988), pl. 62, Eurytos I.7.

26. For example, a cup by Onesimos in New York, 12.231.2, *ARV²* 319.6; *MM* 18 (1977), pl. 35c.

27. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.213; see the article by Martin Robertson in this volume, pp. 75–98.

28. Sophokles, *Trachiniae*, 237, places Oichalia in Euboea; see G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), p. 105.

29. Huxley (note 28), p. 106.

30. Huxley (note 28), pp. 178–180.

31. Cf. R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Sophocles* (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 232–233; D. Williams, “Herakles, Peisistratos and the Alcmeonids,” in F. Lissarague and F. Thelamon, eds., *Image et Céramique Grecque* (Rouen, 1983), p. 139.

32. E. Schwartz, ed., *Scholia in Euripidem*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1891), pp. 70–71.

33. Cf. P. Hartwig, “Herakles and Eurytos,” *JHS* 12 (1891), p. 338; G. M. A. Richter, “A Euphronios Cylix,” *AJA* 20 (1916), p. 128. This is an example of simultaneous narration, on which subject see: P. G. P. Meyboom, “Some Observations on Narration in Greek Art,” *Meded* 40.5 (1978), pp. 55–82; A. M. Snodgrass, “Narration and Allusion in Archaic Greek Art,” J. L. Myres Memorial Lecture, 1982; and M. Davies, “A Convention of Metamorphosis in Greek Art,” *JHS* 106 (1986), pp. 182–183.

34. Louvre G 146, *ARV²* 458.2; *LIMC* 1 (1981), pl. 104, “Achilleus,” p. 447.

35. K. Friis-Johansen, *The Iliad in Early Greek Art* (Copenhagen, 1967), p. 166; G. Neumann, *Gesten und Gebärden in der Griechischen Kunst* (Berlin, 1965), pp. 15–17.

36. *Heldensage*³, pp. 342–343; and A. Kossatz-Deißmann, “Achilleus,” *LIMC* 1 (1981), pp. 106–114.

The Oedipus Painter cup was attributed by Beazley to Douris himself: London E 56, *ARV²* 441.180; *LIMC* 1 (1981), pl. 104, no. 444. The attribution to the Oedipus Painter was first proposed in D. Buitron, *Douris* (Ann Arbor, Mich., University Microfilms, 1976). Robert Guy, in his Ph.D. dissertation, *The Late Manner and Early Classical Followers of Douris* (Oxford, 1982), came independently to

the same conclusion.

The Kleophrades Painter's fragments are: Athens, Kerameikos 4118, *LIMC* 1 (1981), pl. 103, no. 441; and Athens, Agora P 6103, 10509, 18278, 19582, *ARV*² 185.39, *Hesperia* 35 (1966), pl. 9. On the mourning figure, see also J. Boardman, "The Kleophrades Painter at Troy," *AntK* 19 (1976), pp. 13–14.

37. R. Lattimore, trans., *The Odyssey of Homer* (New York, 1967).

38. Cf. K. Schefold, *Götter und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Kunst* (Munich, 1978), p. 150.

39. *Heldensage*³, pp. 427–428; F. Brommer, *Odysseus* (Darmstadt, 1983), pp. 104–108. For the earliest known representation of the subject, see the article by Martin Robertson in this volume, pp. 93–94 and note 53.

40. A. M. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks* (London, 1967), pp. 80–81.

41. Cf. R. Olmos Romera, "Eurytos I," *LIMC* 4 (1988), pp. 117–119.

A Fragmentary Phiale by Douris

Martin Robertson

The fragments here illustrated come from a very unusual vase,¹ a huge red-figured phiale, decorated inside and out with elaborate figure scenes and pattern-work. It also bears painted inscriptions: on the interior names by many figures and a signature of the painter Douris; on the exterior an *epoiesen* inscription with a name ending in ...kros or ...chros. There is further on the exterior part of an Etruscan graffito.²

The shallow bowl, footless, handleless, and with a hollow boss in the center, known to the Greeks as well as us by the name of *phiale mesomphalos* or *phiale omphalotos*, is a shape of strictly limited use and character.³ It was used for pouring libations in ritual; and it was originally, and for the most part remained, a metal not a pottery shape. It was borrowed from the East, probably Assyria, in the seventh century, and its development in Greece is paralleled in Persia. In pouring a libation the user held the vessel with thumb over rim and the ends of the middle fingers within the hollow of the omphalos; so the size is strictly determined by the size of the human hand. Many examples in bronze survive, and a fair number in precious metals, and these are rarely if ever more than about 25 cm in diameter. It is doubtful if clay examples were actually used in ritual, but a good many have been found in graves or dedicated in sanctuaries, and these are normally on the same scale as the metal ones. The piece here published is very much larger, about 42 cm across, and could never have been intended for mortal use. Four other Attic red-figured examples of similar size have appeared in recent years, all of approximately the same date (not far into the fifth century). The character and relationship of the five are discussed below.⁴

DIMENSIONS AND DECORATIVE LAYOUT

Original diam: circa 42 cm; H of bowl: 4.5 cm; H of omphalos: 4.0 cm; diam of omphalos-hollow: 5.2 cm.

Interior: Omphalos, black; around it, two grooves; frieze of upright enclosed palmettes (dots between supporting volutes, small volutes off each alternate frame at the top), H: 2.2 cm; grooved step; frieze of rightward spiral with drops between, H: 1.5 cm; figured frieze, H: 9.9 cm; broad rim-band of hanging palmettes

(mirror-image of band around omphalos), H: 2.2 cm.

Exterior: Hollow of omphalos, black; broad frieze of running palmettes, H: 4.0 cm; narrow frieze of upright enclosed palmettes with drops between, H: 2.5 cm; figured frieze, H: 12.0 cm; narrow rim-band of elaborate ovolo, H: 0.7 cm. The patterns are discussed below.⁵

FIGURE SCENES AND INSCRIPTIONS

In the effort to arrange the fragments convincingly one has to take account of the remains on both sides of each (figs. 1a, b). The figures on the outside vary little in character, though we shall see that there is reason to think that they were separated in two scenes. On the interior there are three distinct representations: (a) seated deities, (b) a combat, and (c) running figures (a pursuit?). The spatial relation of these is certain, though their association (if any) by subject matter is not. The inside, therefore, is more generally useful in determining the relative position of fragments, but the outside has constantly to be used as a check.

EXTERIOR

No trace of a name appears by any of the figures on the outside as they survive. All the remains are of males in short chitons (figs. 1a, c, t). Each was girt with a quiver hanging on the thigh (*gorytos*) and was handling a Scythian bow. (There are fragments of figures on which one or both of these features cannot be demonstrated [figs. 1d, e] but on none are they certainly absent, and it is highly probable that they were universally present.) Two are certainly bearded (figs. 1c, i), and the face of a third was shown in three-quarter view, which at this period would be very unusual in an unbearded face (fig. 1f). None was certainly clean-shaven. Two wear a lionskin over the chiton (figs. 1c, g), and it seems safe to say that both must represent Herakles and to conclude from the repetition that the figures were separated in two related scenes. There are no traces of separating frames, and by analogy with the interior, one would not expect them. There a space separates (a) from (b), while the left-hand figures of (c) actually overlap the right-hand of (b). The relation of (c) to (a) is not preserved.



Figure 1a. Fragmentary phiale signed by Douris. Approximate arrangement of fragments. Exterior. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.213, 85.AE.18, 85.AE.185, and 88.AE.30.




Figure 1b. Interior of phiale, figure 1a. Approximate arrangement of fragments.



Figure 1c. Exterior. Large composite fragment, rim to omphalos. Standing Herakles.




Figure 1d. Exterior. Standing male in short chiton.




Figure 1e. Exterior, rim. Tops of two heads.



Figure 1f. Exterior, rim. Face in three-quarters view.




Figure 1g. Exterior. Squatting Herakles.



Figure 1h. Exterior. Standing legs and squatter.



Figure 1i. Exterior. Two standing and one squatting male figures.




Figure 1j. Exterior, rim. Arms of squatting male drawing bow (Herakles).



Figure 1k. Exterior, rim. *Epoiesen* inscription and end of hanging bow.




Figure 1l. Exterior. Graffito.

One of the lionskinned figures is standing upright (fig. 1c), the other squatting (fig. 1g). Only the lower part of this latter is preserved, as are legs of two other squatters (figs. 1h, i; the remains on the other side make it impossible that these should belong to one figure). Arms and hands held above the head of a figure which must have been in this position are preserved as well (fig. 1j), and almost certainly belong to the one in the lionskin (fig. 1g). They are drawing the bow, and this is probably what the other squatters, too, were doing, whereas many of the upright figures are taking the bow from the wall, stringing it, or just holding it. On the interior of the fragment with the standing figure in lionskin is part of the combat (see fig. 1m); on the interior of all four fragments with parts of squatting figures (figs. 1g, h, i, j) are parts of seated deities (see figs. 1v, w, x, z). This suggests that all figures shown actually drawing the bow were concentrated in one area.

Jiří Frel suggested that there were two pictures illustrating the archery contest of Herakles with Eurytos and his sons: first the preparation, then the contest itself. I think this must be right, though there are problems. I do not think it matters that a figure on the same fragment as one of the squatters is still stringing his bow, but there is an awkwardness in the numbers involved. Eurytos is credited, besides his daughter Iole, with two, three, or four sons, variously named, but often including Iphitos, Klytios, Toxeus, or Deion (alternatively Deioneus). If Herakles, Eurytos, and four sons were shown in each scene, that accounts for twelve figures; and though there may not be absolute evidence for more here, there is certainly room. On the interior there must have been at least sixteen full-size figures, probably eighteen or more. However, this is not the kind of point on which, I think, one can rely

on a vase-painter's accuracy, and I have no doubt that some form of this story is illustrated. I certainly can find no alternative. Herodotos tells a story connecting Herakles with the Scythians and their bowmanship,⁶ but the details offer no help here, and I do not think an Attic vase-painter of this time would show Scythians in Greek chitons. Besides, Herodotos ascribes the story to the Greeks of Pontus, and it does not seem likely that it was current in Athens at the beginning of the fifth century.

The story of Herakles and Eurytos is never clearly told, and allusions seem to be to different versions, but all involve rivalry with the bow. Eurytos, king of Oichalia, was, like his father, Melaneus, an outstanding archer. According to some he had been taught by Apollo, who gave him a bow; and Homer says that this bow was given by his son Iphitos to Odysseus (the bow with which the suitors were killed). Homer also says that Eurytos challenged Apollo to a contest in this art and was killed by him, that he bequeathed his bow to Iphitos, and that Iphitos was murdered by Herakles (a story repeated by others).⁷ The version, however, which seems to connect with illustrations on Archaic vases has Eurytos offer the hand of his daughter, Iole, to anyone who could defeat him and his sons at bowmanship. Herakles did so, but Eurytos reneged on the bargain. Herakles left in anger, returned with an army, sacked Oichalia, killed Eurytos and his sons, and carried off Iole, a course of action which led directly to his own death.⁸ A feast in the house of Eurytos breaking up in a quarrel appears to have been a key moment in one telling of this version. The feast (not the quarrel) is shown on an Early Corinthian (late seventh century) krater,⁹ on which Eurytos is called Eurytios; his four sons Toxos, Klytios, Didaiwon, and Wiphitos; and his daughter Wiola. This scene is also illustrated on Attic



Figure 1m. Interior. Large composite fragment, rim to omphalos. Parts of combat (b) and pursuit scene (c).



Figure 1n. Interior. Toes from combat scene.

Figure 1o. Interior. Large composite fragment. Achilles, Athena, Nike, and Ares.

Figure 1p. Interior. Corinthian helmet from combat scene.

Figure 1q. Interior. Tip of helmet-crest and first letters of Achilles' name.

Figure 1r. Interior, rim. Crest of Athena's(?) helmet.





Figure 1s. Exterior of fragment, figure 1r. Hands taking bow down.

Figure 1t. Exterior of fragment, figure 1o. Parts of four males in short chitons with Scythian bows and quivers.

Figure 1u. Interior, rim. Dionysos.

Figure 1v. Interior. Amphitrite and Poseidon.

Figure 1w. Interior, rim. Plouton and Demeter.








Figure 1x. Interior. Lower parts of Plouton and Demeter.



Figure 1y. Interior. Kore and arms of a child.



Figure 1z. Interior. Lower part of two seated figures (Dionysos and another?)

vases not far in date from ours. Others give the quarrel, notably two fragmentary cups, one by the Brygos Painter, the other a very early piece by Douris himself.¹⁰ In both these Herakles and his opponents are shown accoutred exactly as on the phiale. On Douris's cup there are six opponents, and there seem to have been at least as many on the very fragmentary one by the Brygos Painter.

The only painted inscription on the outside of the phiale is the fragmentary one with part of a name and of *epoiesen* (fig. 1k). This is discussed below.¹¹ It lies high up in the picture on a broad area of black, and one might at a glance think that it occupied one of the

hypothetical gaps separating the two scenes. However, traces of something can be made out at the bottom of the picture, and the remains on the interior (part of the head and name of Dionysos, see fig. 1u) can be associated with other fragments which show that the writing on the exterior came above one of the squatting bowmen.

A very small fragment (fig. 1l), with part of a woman lifting her veil on the interior¹² (see fig. 1aa), has a purely black outside across which runs a vertical graffito, roughly scratched, ... VT... . This is part of an Etruscan word, SUTIL (SUTHIL). It is evidently of a dedicatory nature and in other contexts has been




Figure 1aa. Interior of fragment 11. Arm and breast of goddess lifting himation.



Figure 1bb. Interior. Lion's-foot stool.



Figure 1cc. Interior. Part of figure and two scepters.



Figure 1dd. Interior, rim. Fingers and inscription ...des.

thought to be particularly associated with grave-goods.

INTERIOR

We have seen that there are three scenes: (a) assembly of seated deities, (b) combat, and (c) running figures (pursuit?). The junctions of (a) with (b) and (b) with (c) are preserved, but the center and right of (c) and the left end of (a) are lost. It will be simplest to begin the account to the left of the gap with what remains of (c) (fig. 1m), go on to (b) and (a), and then consider the three together and any possible connections between them. Many, probably almost all, of the figures in (a) and (b) were named, but no name is preserved by any of the three which survive from (c), and the woman whose head is preserved can never have had one.

These three are rushing to the right, overlapping one another. Nearest us is the one at the back, a woman preserved from the waist down. Her right leg is stretched far back, only the toes on the ground, left foot forward and high, left arm stretched forward, hand open with the palm up. She wears a long chiton slightly hitched up to run, himation, and bracelet (red). Overlapping her in front runs another woman, com-

pletely preserved except for: back of hair, right shoulder and upper arm, fingers of left hand, left foot. She is identical in dress to her companion, and almost in movement, only slightly less extreme. Her forward left foot was probably clear of the ground, but much closer to it than the other's. She wears bracelets (red) on both arms and a stéphane on her blond hair. Her right hand is raised and seen from the back, fingers open, her left extends forward in the same attitude as the other's. The black area in front of her face is preserved and bears no inscription. She in turn overlaps the third figure, a man wearing only a himation, in the same movement as the two women, perhaps more like the first than the second in its violence. His right foot, too, is far back. Otherwise he is preserved only from neck to waist. The end of his long fair hair lies on his neck and back. His shoulders are in profile, the right arm (lost from above the elbow) reaching forward, left forearm (also largely lost) issuing forward from the himation.

No other fragment can be certainly attributed to this scene, but two likely candidates will be considered when we look at the subject and its relation, if any, to the subjects of (a) and (b).

The combat (b) is the only relatively unproblematic picture on the vase. The center is lost, but the two ends correspond perfectly and there are loose fragments which find a natural place between them and can go nowhere else.

Overlapped by the rearmost running woman in (c) is the right-hand figure of (b) (fig. 1m). It steps to the left, wearing a long chiton and himation like the women in (c). Head and shoulders are missing, along with most of the left arm, but wrist and hand are preserved, and the hand holds a bow: not the Scythian bow of the exterior but the straight Greek form. The right arm, in the long chiton-sleeve, is reached forward, but forearm and hand are missing. The figure could be either Artemis or Apollo; but, if it were female, a breast would probably be drawn, and as we shall see, the context calls rather for the god. The painter omitted to draw the rear (left) foot. It should appear toe to toe with the rear (right) foot of the well-preserved woman in (c). There is a chip off the surface in this place, but not large enough to account for the foot's disappearance. Right leg and foot are forward, the Achilles tendon overlapped by the right heel of the rearmost woman in (c), the toes by the drawn-back left heel of a collapsing warrior. Of this figure, besides the left foot and much of the lower leg bent sharply forward, part of the thigh is preserved above, with buttock and hip and some of belly and back, left arm and hand back with shield, seen from inside, slipping from it across Apollo's knee. Red blood from a wound is marked on the belly. Above the lower leg and parallel to it is a spear, the point touching Apollo's shin. The right leg of the warrior must have been reached forward, and toes which certainly belong to it appear on a loose fragment (fig. 1n), confronting the forepart of a left foot planted on the ground. Other fragments show that this left foot belongs not to the warrior's victorious opponent but to a figure behind him, corresponding to Apollo: Athena. Much of the goddess and the victor is preserved on a large composite fragment (fig. 1o): of the warrior, lower torso, frontal, lunging forward, thigh of forward left leg, frontal thigh, and knee of right leg reached back, right part of upper body with elbow of right arm raised for downward spear-thrust. Below this the long tail of the helmet-crest flies back, and above it is the inscription $\alpha\theta\eta\epsilon\text{N-}AIA$, Athena. Of Athena (besides the front of the left foot on the loose fragment) is preserved the middle of the body in chiton, himation, and snake-fringed aegis hanging down the back to mid-buttock; right arm (red bracelet) raised forward from the elbow, open hand in back view; left arm (red bracelet) reaching forward

below the hero's crest, hand extended, palm up, across his body. Across the black area behind her, which separates (b) from (a), flies a tiny Nike, horizontally. Traces of her chiton survive, and her arms reached out over Athena's aegis. The right arm (red bracelet) conceals the left, but both hands are drawn, supporting a red wreath for the victor.

Between the hero's thighs an inscription runs downward to the left: $\Delta O\Pi\Sigma$; and on the loose fragment with parts of Athena's and the falling warrior's feet, the end of the verb: $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\sigma\text{]EN}$. Most of the inscribed names on the vase are written more or less horizontally, to be read with the pictures, and the two-line *epoiesen* inscription on the exterior is similarly aligned. Douris's signature is almost upside-down to these: the painter must have reached over the rim of the vessel to write it, as though it were an afterthought. The relative positions of the name and the end of the verb fix the left foot on the loose fragment as Athena's forward one. The victor's left leg must have been crossed by the extended right leg of his opponent, his own right extended back across Athena's skirt.

Parts of both heroes' helmets are preserved on loose sherds. One gives a Corinthian helmet to left (fig. 1p), the eye-hole black, evidently because the helmet is pushed up on the hair, and disappearing behind the front of the crest a spear-shaft sloping slightly down to left. These belong to the falling hero, whose right hand must still have been raised with the spear. Another very small piece (fig. 1q) has the front of a helmet-crest to right and in front of it the letters $AX[\iota\lambda\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, Achilles. This belongs to and identifies the victor. A third scrap has the front of a Chalcidian helmet to right with patterned crest support (fig. 1r). This almost certainly belongs to Athena: the exterior has hands lifted to take a bow from the wall (fig. 1s), and the figure on the outside which most nearly corresponds to the torso of Athena evidently had his hands raised (fig. 1t, central figure). One cannot, however, rule out the possibility that this helmet belongs to one of the seated deities in (a): Ares, who we know was present, or Athena, who may have been. There is, however, no evidence that either Apollo or Athena, the two deities present in (b), were also shown in (a). On the left of the black area behind Athena (fig. 1o) appears the end of a himation, evidently lying over the knees of a seated figure (but see Postscript), and in front of it the name $APE[\varsigma$; but before we go on to the group of seated deities (a), there is a little more to say about the combat.

The composition—Greek hero backed by Athena striking down Trojan hero backed by Apollo—is very

popular in early red-figure and is most regularly used to illustrate one particular episode: the death of Hektor at the hands of Achilles. A classic example is on the Berlin Painter's great volute-krater in London,¹³ where it is paired with another favorite scheme: Achilles killing Memnon, the mothers, Thetis and Eos, each behind her son. The Greek on the phiale was named Achilles, and it is very probable that his victim (the wound in the belly implies a death) is Hektor; but one cannot be quite sure. On his name vase in Boston the Tyskiewicz Painter places Athena behind Achilles as he kills Memnon, who is backed in the normal way by his mother Eos; and on the other side Athena supports Diomedes as he wounds Aeneas, whose mother Aphrodite comes to his aid.¹⁴ On a cup by Douris himself, later than the phiale, in his fully developed middle style,¹⁵ Athena and Apollo support the combatants, and the defeated Trojan is Hektor; but he is not killed, and Athena's protégé is not Achilles but Ajax. On the phiale Douris could have made another variation, keeping Achilles under Athena's protection and allotting a different Trojan to Apollo; but I do not think it likely. On the cup Douris has moved outside the usual repertory to illustrate a story told in book 7 of the *Iliad*.¹⁶ In an abortive attempt to settle the quarrel by single combat, the lots fall on Ajax and Hektor. In the course of the fight Ajax fells Hektor with a cast rock, but Apollo revives the Trojan, and the duel is continued with swords, then stopped by the heralds. Douris draws the rock, and no blood is shown on the collapsing hero, though in Homer he was already wounded in the neck. The omission is surely deliberate on the vase-painter's part to indicate that this is not a death-scene as this type of composition normally is, and as it is shown to be on the phiale. The spear we noticed crossing the space between the hero's legs and the god's must, like the rock on the cup, be something thrown. The spear in Homer is regularly thrown. Vase-painters show heroes using the hoplite gear of their own day, where the spear is a heavy thrusting weapon; but sometimes, in a gesture to the text, they show one cast. In Homer's account of the last fight between Achilles and Hektor,¹⁷ Achilles throws his spear and misses, but it is then returned to him by Athena. Hektor then throws his, but it rebounds from Achilles' shield. The spear on the phiale might be thought of as either of those, though in Homer neither hero has a second. The dying Hektor on the Berlin Painter's krater holds a spear and is very like the figure on the phiale.¹⁸ Accurate adherence to the detail of texts is neither found nor to be expected. On Douris's cup Ajax has a spear in his hand, Hektor a sword, which does not fit any moment

of Homer's account. I think it by far most likely that the fight on the phiale is that of Achilles and Hektor, but a doubt remains.

The third subject (a) is an assembly of seated deities. All surviving remains show feet and knees to the right, and it is safe to suppose that all sat that way, but four heads are preserved turned back to the left. One of these belongs to the only figure preserved from head to feet, and she has her torso frontal and her left hand placed on her right thigh, fingers to the left. Any torso-fragment with the same arrangement can safely be said to belong to a figure looking back. The degree of overlap is widely varied. We have the right-hand end (front) of the group but not the other, and one cannot calculate how many figures there were. We have six names, and two others can almost certainly be identified by propinquity with named figures. It seems likely that all figures in this group originally had their names, with the probable exception of a child seated on a goddess's knees, who is additional to the eight just referred to. All surviving names are written horizontally near the top of the picture, to the right of the head, whichever way it is facing; with one exception. The name of Ares is written by the knees of the foremost figure on the right. By analogy with other assemblies of deities in early red-figure, Ares will have been accompanied by Aphrodite.¹⁹ If, on the phiale, they overlapped one another closely, her name may have occupied the extreme right-hand position at the top, and this would account for the unusual placement of her consort's name. See Postscript.

The other six identifiable deities fall into two groups of three, which perhaps follow on one another, making a series of six; but there is no way of knowing how close this series comes to Ares and Aphrodite on the right, or to the left-hand end of the row. A small fragment gives the forehead of a black-haired deity in an ivy-wreath (fig. 1u). An ivy-branch, evidently held in front, extends over the head to the left, and between head and branch are the letters ΔΙΟ[ΥΣΟΣ, Dionysos. He is looking to the right. Another small piece gives the left-hand end of the ivy-branch and the letters ΑΜΦ[ΙΤΡΙΤΗ, Amphitrite. The remains on the exterior of this scrap suggest that it touch-joins a large composite fragment (fig. 1v) with the only seated figure preserved from head to foot: a dark-haired goddess looking back over her shoulder, left hand on thigh, right lifting the cloak from her shoulder in front of her face. She, then, is Amphitrite, and traces of the stool-seat and sleeve of the figure to her right must belong to Dionysos. Next to her on the left comes a figure whose knees and hands just overlap her. The foreparts

of both feet appear under the goddess's lifted right heel, but the rest of the lower part is lost, together with almost everything above the arms. The left one is laid along the thigh and the hand holds a long staff, the lower part of which slopes across the goddess's skirt, while the top must have been near the holder's head. The right forearm, hand lost, is slightly raised, and the positioning of both suggests that the figure was looking forward. Gods and goddesses alike in this group are dressed in long chiton and himation, but goddesses have a red bracelet on either arm. These arms are bare, so the figure was male. In assemblies like this, Amphitrite accompanies her husband Poseidon.²⁰ The figure on the goddess's right here is Dionysos, so the god she is looking toward, and who was probably looking toward her, must be the sea god. His staff probably ended in a trident-head.²¹ This figure is strongly overlapped on the left by the knees of another, to whom we shall return when we have considered the other three named figures.

A small composite fragment (fig. 1w) gives a head with blond hair and beard looking left, and to the right the name ΠΛΟΥΤΟΝ, Plouton, the last letter appearing on a large composite fragment which has the head of a goddess looking left, and part of her right arm in a patterned garment extended in the same direction. Across it rise grain-ears, evidently held in front of the body in the left hand, and to the right is the name ΔΕΜ[ΗΤΗΡ, Demeter. Her hair, too, is in dilute color, but much darker than the god's. Remains on the exterior make it almost certain that a large loose fragment (fig. 1x) with parts of two seated figures barely overlapping each other gives us more of Plouton and Demeter. The left-hand figure is shown to be a male looking back by the left arm with the hand on the thigh, like Amphitrite's but unbraceleted. The other figure has a fringed and patterned cloth over the stool-seat.

Another composite fragment (fig. 1y) has a light-blond head and part of the torso of a goddess in a transparent chiton, and to the right of the head, which looks to the left, the letters κ]ΟΡΕ, Kore. Her breast is frontal, right forearm vertical, the missing hand perhaps lifting the chiton off the shoulder. Remains behind the other shoulder perhaps belong to the himation, but the arrangement is not clear to me. Across the breast reach two small hands, open, palms up, to the left. It would be possible to restore an Eros flying horizontally, like the tiny Nike in the combat, but it would not be easy to account for his presence here, and a more convincing suggestion is a child seated on Kore's lap. Its probable identity will be discussed in the

next section.

The three Eleusinians must have been together. One might have expected Kore to come between her mother and her spouse, but this is the one position ruled out for her. There is some reason to think that she was placed not on his left but on Demeter's right, and that the knees overlapping Poseidon are hers. The drapery of all these figures is extremely elaborate. Both Amphitrite and Poseidon have a triple division of the himation over thighs and knees, so that they almost look as if they have three legs, the furthest sweep having the stepped folds of the edge, which also appear over the knees of Ares. The figure overlapping Poseidon has a double division without this further edge. The himation seems to be hitched up higher, so that the folds are looser over thighs and knees. At the extreme left edge of the fragment are traces on a smaller scale which cannot be part of the figure's own drapery: a tiny end hanging by the patterned disc at the top of the stool-leg, and above that a sharp corner. These make perfect sense as the back of a himation belonging to a child sitting on the figure's knee.²² Kore need not have been the only figure in the assembly with a child but there seems to me a strong possibility that these knees are hers. The figures on the exterior of the two fragments are compatible with such an arrangement. If that is so, we have a sequence of six figures: Plouton, Demeter, Kore with the child, Poseidon, Amphitrite, and Dionysos. It is worth noting that Poseidon, Amphitrite, and Dionysos, together with Zeus, are figured in a strictly Eleusinian context by Makron on his London skyphos.²³ There is at present no evidence for any other identifiable deity in the assembly on the phiale except for Ares at the front and his probable companion Aphrodite. There is, however, one other fragment (fig. 1z) which certainly belongs to (a) and gives part of two overlapping seated figures. The left-hand one could be Dionysos, and that it is so is suggested by the exterior figures (see fig. 1h). On the back of the piece with two seated figures appears the thigh of a squatting bowman; on the back of the piece with part of Dionysos's head and name (fig. 1u) is the *epoiesen* inscription (fig. 1k), which, as we saw, comes above a squatting figure.²⁴ If the right-hand figure overlapped another to its right, it can only just have done so; but it is not possible to reconcile the remains with the scrap of drapery over Ares' knee and make it the end figure on the right. A vertical staff with a central dividing line appears under the stool, presumably a scepter held in the left hand.

Another small fragment (fig. 1aa) most probably belongs to (a), though we cannot be sure that it does

not come from (c), about which we know so little. It shows the left breast and shoulder of a female figure to right; in front, the vertical forearm (red bracelet), and in between a narrow strip of himation, evidently lifted in the lost hand. This is the scrap on the black outside of which appears the Etruscan graffito (fig. 11). If (a) is the obvious home for this, two more pieces which might possibly be accommodated here present problems and are better provisionally assigned to (c). One, combined from two scraps, has most of the right-hand leg of a cross-legged stool with lion's foot (fig. 1bb). An object which crosses this looks at first glance like the other leg, but this cannot be right: it comes too soon, extends too far, and is too wide. This object in turn is crossed by a vertical staff, rather thick, and an object on the ground beside the lion's foot seems to be the end of this. The stool suggests the seated deities of (a); but a figure seated on it to the right would have left some trace on the sherd. The second fragment (fig. 1cc), from higher up, also has a vertical staff which could be the same one (the remains on the exterior are not incompatible). The volutes supporting the finial of the scepter are preserved, and part of the shaft, held between fore- and middle finger of a left hand in back view. To the left of this the neck of the figure is preserved with a little of the hair (in rather dark diluted color), which shows that it was facing left. Part of the engrailed chiton neck also survives, and peaked himation folds on the left shoulder. Not quite enough of the forearm is preserved to make it certain that there was no bracelet, so the sex remains open. Across breast and neck a second, slenderer, scepter slopes up, again with a volute of the finial preserved. This must have been held by another figure. Whether or not it goes with the stool-fragment, this piece suggests a more *mouvementé* scene than (a).

Two other pieces show letters. One, a tiny scrap, has only the letter O. This might go almost anywhere. The other (fig. 1dd) has on the right three fingers of an open hand, and from the left the end of a name . . . ΔΕΣ, with a trace of the preceding letter. This is certainly not I. It looks more like O than anything else, but that is difficult. There are names which end in . . . odes (e.g., Herodes, which was borne by a sixth-century poet as well as by more celebrated characters in later times), but I can think of none in mythology. It could be a kalos name, though none with this ending is recorded. The only place for the kalos would be in a second line below, which is perfectly possible; but the positioning of the letters seems most natural, on this vase, for a name by a figure's head. It should be considered whether the remains are not those of another letter,

badly written: hardly A, I think, but just possibly E. We shall return to this question.²⁵

SUBJECT MATTER

The setting of these three scenes, around the interior of a bowl without any dividing frame, suggests that there should be some thematic link, but it is not easy to find. Scene (c) is not only not framed off from (b) but heavily overlaps it. Such overlaps occur in pictures of the adventures of Theseus around the exteriors or interiors of cups,²⁶ but they are a special case. I can think of no case of overlaps between unconnected pictures, though occasionally one may be in doubt whether a figure under a handle belongs to the picture on the front or the back of a vase.²⁷ I find it impossible to suppose, however, that the two women and the man in civil dress bolting to the right actually belong to, or are closely connected with, the combat. On the Penthesilea Painter's great cup in Ferrara, painted several decades after our vase, a Trojan combat is flanked by civilian figures.²⁸ They, though, are standing still, facing toward the fight and mourning their fallen hero. They must be thought of as watching from the wall, and the composition really offers no parallel to the one here. On the other side of the fight, behind Athena, there is a gap before the first of the seated gods, Ares; but that in this case there might be a unified theme is suggested by the superficially obvious parallel of the East Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi.²⁹ There a group of deities at the left-hand end is certainly deliberating the fate of heroes in the Trojan War, represented in combat on the right. There is, however, a great difference between the compositions on frieze and phiale. The assembly on the frieze is a debate: all figures are seated toward Zeus in the center, and if one turns, it is to consult or dispute with a neighbor. On the vase all are seated toward the fight, but many of them look the other way. In Amphitrite's case, it seems as though she is turning to her neighbor and spouse, Poseidon; but all three Eleusinians and their child look in one direction, away from the fight. It would be odd, in any case, to find the Eleusinians gathered in such strength in connection with the Trojan War. It seems that if there is any connection between the three scenes, it must be of a less literal and straightforward kind, though the painter can hardly not have had in mind the suitability of placing the war god Ares at the right-hand end of the assembly, directly abutting on the fight.

Demeter and Persephone often appear at this time in pictures of the dispatch of Triptolemos on his mission, and sometimes in other contexts,³⁰ but the "family group" on the phiale is not paralleled until much later,

and the use of the name Kore is extremely unusual. She is so labeled on one piece of red-figure in its earliest phase,³¹ but that was dedicated at Eleusis, where the goddess is especially known by that appellation. She is often named on vases, but elsewhere, so far as I am aware, always as Persephone or some name of related form (on Makron's skyphos,³² Pherephatta). Plouton on the phiale is, I believe, the first attested appearance of the name, though on a black-figure vase by or near Exekias one Ploutodotas appears in an Eleusinian context.³³ Plouton is first named in literature in Attic tragedy of the middle or second half of the fifth century,³⁴ where the name is equivalent to Hades, lord of the Underworld and groom of Kore/Persephone, but in an aspect which stresses the connection of death and the Underworld with the life-restoring riches of earth, Demeter's province. The placing of Plouton next to Demeter on the vase suggests the same ambience here. Plouton and Ploutos are later closely linked; and the use of the first name for the god here makes it likely that the second is what we should think of for the child on Kore's lap. Ploutos was not in fact, in any story, the child of Kore/Persephone but her mother Demeter's, fathered, according to Hesiod in the *Theogony*,³⁵ by Iasios (elsewhere more commonly Iasion). He is closely associated with both goddesses, however, in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter³⁶ and elsewhere. Other children are sometimes associated with Persephone: Iakchos, who is at times identified with Dionysos, at others with Ploutos; and Adonis, whom she was given to rear.³⁷ The presence of Plouton here, however, makes Ploutos the most likely identification for the child, though I do not think it probable that the painter wrote in the name; at least it is hard to see where he would have put it.

The possibility has been mooted that the name ending in . . . des on a loose fragment (fig. 1dd) mentioned above³⁸ should be restored as Hades, and that (c) showed him carrying off Persephone. That would give a relation between the themes of (a) and (c), but I find it awkward to think of Plouton, Demeter, and Kore, who all look away from the combat (b), as watching their own actions under different names. In any case, Hades in Greek is always written Haidēs, and the letter cannot be read as *I* (and I do not really think it could even be *A*). I find it easier to suppose that it is a badly formed *E*, and if one can accept that, there are two obvious mythological candidates: Diomedes and Ganymedes.³⁹ The painter could have intended the victorious Greek in the fight for Diomedes; only the scrap with a helmet-front and AX . . . is incontrovertible proof that he meant him for Achilles, and there is no

other place on the vase for Diomedes. For Ganymedes, on the other hand, there are two possibilities. In two assemblies of seated deities of this time he is shown as a boy standing: with Zeus and Hera on a cup by Douris himself, probably a little later than the phiale⁴⁰; and, his name written beside him, on the great cup in Tarquinia with the names of Oltos and Euxitheos, probably painted a little earlier than the phiale.⁴¹ It is interesting that the Douris cup (which shows on the interior Hermes at an altar) has on one side of the exterior an assembly of seated gods which includes, besides Zeus, Hera, and others not identifiable, Dionysos and Poseidon with Amphitrite; and on the other the combat of Achilles and Hektor. There is no evidence for a standing figure among the seated deities on the phiale, nor for the identification of any of them as Zeus or Hera; but the group could very well have appeared there.

It is worth, though, considering an alternative: that scene (c) showed Zeus pursuing Ganymedes, a popular subject with painters of this phase. The male figure with long blond hair gathered on his neck would be Zeus (he regularly wears a himation in this scene), and the women would, I suppose, be the boy's sisters, or mother and sister, trying to intervene. In pictures of abduction of women, sisters or companions often play such a part, or scatter in flight, or run to tell the father⁴²; and in some pictures of abduction of boys, male companions, sometimes defined as brothers, are similarly shown.⁴³ Women in an abduction of Ganymedes would be, to the best of my knowledge, unparalleled, but I doubt if that rules out the possibility. On a later cup, a beautiful tondo of his middle period, Douris has a unique picture of the story: Zeus carrying in his arms a sleeping youth wrapped in a mantle, who cannot be other than Ganymedes.⁴⁴ If the two small fragments discussed above (figs. 1bb, cc)⁴⁵ belong to this scene (and it is hard to see where else they can go), they are compatible with this interpretation. The sloping scepter on the upper one would be Zeus's (he normally carries one), and the figure with the upright one would be the boy's father, to whom he is fleeing, just risen from his stool. The god would have caught up with Ganymedes, as he is often shown, so that his scepter, in one of his forward-reaching hands, stretches out beyond the boy.

If this were a correct interpretation of scene (c), the assembly in (a) might be thought of as awaiting Ganymedes' arrival among them. One of the most regular occasions for such an assembly in vase-painting is to await the arrival of Herakles.⁴⁶ Zeus would then presumably not have been shown among them. Since

Ganymedes was a member of the Trojan royal house, a tenuous link would also be established with the fight in (b), though Hektor was of a younger generation. According to Homer and others, Ganymedes' father was Tros, but others make Ganymedes Tros's grandson, Ilos's son, and brother of Laomedon, and yet others see him as the son of Laomedon and brother of Priam. The distress of his father Tros is emphasized in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite (assuaged by the gift of swiftest horses).⁴⁷

If convincing connections between the three scenes on the interior are hard to establish, the subject of the exterior is remote from any of them. A wider view, however, may give one something. The events at Oichalia led inexorably to Herakles' death, and that was followed by his acceptance as a god in Olympos. Whatever the occasion of the assembly in (a), it cannot but have brought to mind pictures of Herakles' reception among the gods; and if they are waiting for Ganymedes (though that of course is anything but proven), that is another case of a mortal raised to immortality. The death of Hektor, then, might be a contrast: a hero whom the support of a god could not save from the common fate of man. In Homer the same applies to his slayer, whose own death was so soon to follow, but a later story had Achilles raised to immortality, living with Helen as his bride, divinized heroes in the White Island.⁴⁸ Thus, though connections between the various subjects at a literal level are so very tenuous, it does seem possible to read them all as evoking thoughts of death and possible survival. The unusual prominence given to the Eleusinians in the divine assembly fits well with such thoughts.

THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE OTHER LARGE PHIALAI, AND THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE GROUP

We noticed at the beginning that there are four other outsized clay phialai decorated in red-figure of about the same period as ours. Though they do not form a group in a stylistic sense, they stand apart from anything else, and there are interrelationships between them. Two are without figure work.⁴⁹ They are slightly smaller than the Douris (respectively 33.2 cm and 32.0 cm in diameter against about 42.0 cm). The outsides are black, with a narrow band of ovolo at the rim; the insides, within a narrow black line at the rim, are fired intentional red ("coral red"), encircling two zones of pattern around the omphalos (which in both cases is missing). The patterns are closely related to those around the omphalos on both sides of Douris's phiale. This connection is considered below.

Of the two with figures, one, though totally without pattern-work, is linked to the patterned pair by its use of intentional red.⁵⁰ It seems also to have been about the same size as those, but few of the fragments have been put together, and I am not sure of the diameter. The outside is fired deliberately red, with a black rim and two black lines toward the center (the omphalos with its immediate surround is lost). On the interior the rim is coral red with two black lines, and immediately below that is a figure zone, which seems to have been 8 or 9 cm high, against the all but 10 cm of the interior figure zone of the Douris. Below that is intentional red, with two black lines below the picture and lower down the beginning of a black area, which presumably surrounded the omphalos.

The figures evidently formed a single picture: an Amazonomachy, including Amazons on horseback and—a most unusual feature—a fight over the stripped corpse of a Greek.⁵¹ There is no trace of any figure identifiable as Herakles or Theseus, and it seems likely that this is a Trojan Amazonomachy. Perhaps the key group gives the end of Penthesilea's *aristeia* when, across the body of her last victim, she herself faces death at the hands of Achilles. Among the Greeks she killed, Apollodoros mentions Machaon, son of Asklepios, and Quintus Smyrnaeus Podarkes, brother of Protesilaos and after his death leader of the Thessalian contingent.⁵² This fight brings us a step nearer to Achilles' own death. After Hektor, he fought and killed Penthesilea; after her Memnon; and was then himself shot by Paris from the wall.

The style of this piece is not Dourian, rather Brygan; I think it is by the Foundry Painter. The style of the fifth big phiale is likewise considered Brygan by the excavator, I think rightly. It is certainly not Dourian, but is the nearest thing to the Douris vase in character as well as size. It is of almost precisely the same dimensions, and like Douris's piece has, both outside and in, figure scenes combined with elaborate zones of ornament around the omphalos. The ornaments chosen, however, are totally different. It was found at the great Etrusco-Hellenic sanctuary at Pyrgi and is being published by Dr. Paola Baglione.⁵³ I am deeply grateful to Dr. Baglione for her generosity in sending me pictures of this very exciting piece and for sharing her ideas about it with me. Only fragments of the vase survive, and on some of these the surface is badly preserved, on others in good condition. It seems clear that both inside and out a single picture occupied the whole circle: in both cases a symposium with reclining participants, but very different from one another in character. On the interior it appears to be a normal symposium with

music, and nothing that survives defines it as part of a mythological narrative. The outside is very different: bleeding limbs droop from couches, and on the ground beside one rests a severed head. Dr. Baglione is surely right in interpreting this as the slaughter of the suitors by Odysseus and his helpers, I think the earliest illustration we have of the scene. In these two pictures there seems a very purposed contrast between life and death; or between death and a heroic afterlife, so often envisaged in terms of feast.

Another shape which, when it occurs in pottery, is clearly directly imitated from metal models is the animal-head rhyton; and the metal rhyton, like the metal phiale, is a vessel with Oriental connections, designed purely for ritual use. Rhyta have been studied by Herbert Hoffmann,⁵⁴ and he has noted that while in the metal rhyton the animal-mouth is pierced (and this feature is essential to its ritual employment), the Attic examples in clay are unpierced. He concludes that this is done to mark the fact that they are not for use, or at least not for use by living mortals. Most are found in graves and are perhaps thought of as used by the heroized dead. Hoffmann suggests to me that the great size of the dedicated clay phialai, too large for mortal hand, in the same way indicates that they are for the use of heroes. The preoccupations we seem to detect in the subject matter of the figure-painted pieces can be seen as fitting into this picture.

THE STYLE OF DOURIS'S PHIALE, AND THE RELATION OF ITS PATTERN-WORK TO THAT OF THE PATTERNED PHIALAI

This vase would certainly have been ascribed to Douris without the help of the signature, and it finds a natural place in his development. Beazley divided the artist's long career into four periods: "(1) very early, and early; (2) early middle; (3) middle; (4) late." The closest parallels to our phiale are to be found in period (2), perhaps near its beginning. Very like is the famous cup in Vienna with the Arms of Achilles, which Beazley lists at the start of this period.⁵⁵ That cup, like the phiale, has more elaborate patterning than is usual in this phase of the painter's work; but in the case of the phiale this may be due to imitation of designs traditional in the metal form.⁵⁶ A possible indication of a date early in period (2) is in the lettering. In his early work Douris uses the normal Attic form of delta, a simple triangle, but in the course of period (2) he adopts the form of a dotted lambda. The dotted form is found on the Vienna cup and on most of the signed vases from the period; but on two, which Beazley lists after the Vienna one but still among the first in the

period, he employs the old triangle, as he does on the phiale. However, that this is not a safe chronological guide is shown by the fact that the triangle recurs on the London psykter, which belongs to the middle period (3) when on his cups the artist invariably employs the dotted form.⁵⁷

The dotted net which decorates some stool-seats and covers on the phiale is used by Douris in the same way on a very early signed cup in the Getty Museum.⁵⁸ The distinctive patterning of Demeter's polos is paralleled on that of another Demeter on a fragment from the Akropolis of a kantharos with the reception of Herakles in Olympos.⁵⁹ Beazley ascribed these fragments to the painter of the Sosias cup in Berlin; but Martha Ohly-Dumm, assigning the cup to Euthymides (whom she seeks to identify with the Kleophrades Painter), detaches the Akropolis kantharos and suggests that it is by Douris.⁶⁰ This too, I think, must be right, but if so it surely belongs even earlier in his career than the phiale. The drawing on the phiale is of exceptional and consistent elaboration, often strong and of exceptional beauty. It must take a place among his best works.

Particular interest attaches to the pattern-work around the omphalos, inside and out. As noticed, Douris in this phase of his work makes little use of ornament on his cups; earlier and later it plays much more part. That its wealth here is a function of the shape and its metal origins is suggested by the resemblance of these pattern-zones to those on the two large phialai without figure-work.⁶¹ On one of these the band immediately around the omphalos is of framed palmettes, exactly like that immediately around the omphalos on the interior of Douris's piece. Outside that is a narrow zone of ovolo. Both these patterns are so common in contemporary vase-painting that not much weight can be attached to the resemblance, but there would certainly be no difficulty in supposing the patterned piece also from Douris's hand. The patterns on the other are much more distinctive. Around the omphalos is a running chain of palmette and lotus, unlike anything on the Douris; and outside that a running spiral with drops, exactly like that on the Douris interior. Carol Cardon, publishing these pieces without knowledge of the Douris, noted that the form of lotus used is precisely paralleled in the work of the Berlin Painter; and that the running spiral, a very rare pattern in Attic red-figure, also appears in that painter's work, on his name piece and on fragments of another amphora.⁶² She concluded that the two phialai are his work also. Attribution on pattern-work alone must always have an element of doubt; but the florals on the Berlin Painter's vases are so distinctive and so conso-

nant with his figure style that I am inclined to accept that the lotuses on the more elaborate of the two patterned phialai do justify its attribution to him. However, the general likeness of the pattern-work on these two and on Douris's, and in particular the repetition of an identical spiral, demand further discussion.

The spiral (a curvilinear version of the ubiquitous rectilinear meander) is a very rare pattern in Attic red-figure; and in many of the few cases where it occurs, it is drawn not as a continuous running line but as a series of closed spirals tangential to one another. Examples of the continuous form known to me are those on Douris's and the other phiale, the two on amphorae by the Berlin Painter, one on a small jug with palmettes which belongs to a class of floral vases related to the Berlin Painter and also to the Dutuit Painter; and one on a tiny fragment in the possession of Robert Guy, to whose kindness I owe my knowledge of the piece and a photograph. It is on the inside of a bowl, black on the outside, and I wonder if it does not in fact belong to the patterned phiale in the Getty Museum. Carol Cardon also mentions one in the form of a "ghost" on a vase by the Dutuit Painter.⁶³ Contemporary examples of the tangential version are found on two vases by the Kleophrades Painter: on the handle-flanges of the early volute-krater in the Getty Museum; and above the picture on a later work, the great Iliupersis hydria in Naples.⁶⁴ The volute-krater, like the phiale and the rhyton, is a shape originally developed in metal and only borrowed into clay. Unlike those, however, the volute-krater from about the time of the Pioneers becomes a regular part of the ceramic tradition in Athens and afterward in South Italy, and potters and vase-painters develop it in their own ways. The normal decoration for the handle-flanges in Attic is the stylized black ivy-spray, found also on the handle-flanges of amphorae type A, the rims of column-kraters, and as picture borders on many shapes. On metal volute-kraters the pattern on the handle-flange is often a running spiral⁶⁵; and when the Kleophrades Painter employed it in this position (as the Niobid Painter did a generation or two later⁶⁶), he was surely imitating the metal-workers' practice. It was no doubt a more popular pattern among metal-workers than among vase-painters, and I am sure its appearance on the two phialai is a direct borrowing. I do not conclude from this either that the figure scenes on Douris's phiale owe anything to a hypothetical "gold-figure" original, or that the Kleophrades Painter and the Berlin Painter, when they use the spiral in other contexts, are directly imitating metal models.

Whoever painted the patterned phialai (and they need

not be from the same hand) I find it hard to suppose that they were not produced in the same workshop at the same time as the figured one signed by Douris. There are points of contact between Douris and the Berlin Painter, but nothing suggests that they ever sat regularly in the same workshop. I wonder if the five large phialai may not have formed part of a special order, to meet which painters were recruited from various workshops. There are other cases which suggest such an occasion.⁶⁷

A striking feature on Douris's phiale is the number of golden heads. This coloring is particularly favored by the Berlin Painter, but there are other examples in Douris's work, and I do not think one can point to the Berlin Painter's influence in this matter.⁶⁸

THE EPOIESEN INSCRIPTION

Douris put his own name with *epoiesen* on two vases, neither of them cups: a kantharos from the same early middle period (2) as the phiale, and an aryballos from his middle period (3).⁶⁹ He painted both but signed only the kantharos with *egrapsen*. Two other names appear with *epoiesen* on cups by him: Kleophrades on two from his early period (1),⁷⁰ and Kalliades on one from his middle period (3).⁷¹ The name Python appears without a verb on the foot-rim of three cups signed by Douris as painter, one very early, one early, one middle.⁷² Since the name appears with *epoiesen* on a cup signed by Epiktetos as painter, and since the foot-edge is a frequent location for an *epoiesen* inscription, one need not hesitate to supply the verb on Douris's cups.⁷³ The potter-work of most of Douris's cups aligns them with those that bear the name of Python, though that of one or two early pieces goes with those inscribed *Euphronios epoiesen*. The meaning of *epoiesen* on a vase is still in dispute; but evidently Douris worked regularly in the same workshop as Python (or in Python's workshop) but occasionally with other *poietai* or performing the same office for himself. The *epoiesen* inscription on the phiale gives us another name, unhappily incomplete.

The inscription runs from left to right in two horizontal lines of which only the right-hand ends are preserved:

.....ΚΡΟΣ	orΧΡΟΣ
ἐποι]ΕΣΕΝ		ἐποι]ΕΣΕΝ

No name ending in ...kros or ...chros is found with *epoiesen* on any other vase. One ending in ...kros does, however, occur with *egrapsen* on several: Smikros. The painter Smikros was evidently a member of the Pioneer Group, a close imitator and companion of Eu-

phronios. I say companion as well as imitator, because the name Smikros appears beside a beautiful youth at a feast not only on a vase signed by Smikros himself but on a much finer one, which was clearly the model for Smikros's, and which is certainly the work of Euphronios.⁷⁴ The name also appears with *kalos* on an unattributed kalpis from the same general circle. The name, of course, is in the nature of a nickname ("Tiny"), and one cannot be quite sure that the same person is meant in all cases, but that seems to me more probable than not.⁷⁵

Several names of Pioneer painters appear with *epoiesen*, mainly in the years after they have apparently ceased painting: Euphronios,⁷⁶ Phintias,⁷⁷ and probably Euthymides.⁷⁸ There is no improbability in supposing that Smikros may have followed the same

course, though this fragmentary inscription is no proof that he did. If he did, and if the word *epoiesen* means "made with his hands," then Smikros shows himself a more talented potter than painter: the phiale fragments are of very fine technique indeed. I should add, though, that I believe that even as a painter Smikros was better than some ascriptions to him suggest. The signed pieces show him as a painstaking, serious pupil of Euphronios, and I do not see how he can be the author of two rough psykters in the Getty Museum which have been attributed to him.⁷⁹ These seem to me imitations, even perhaps parodies, of Pioneer style by a painter who can never have been trained by any of the group. If this is so, it must affect one's assessment of the significance of the inscriptions, one of which shows Euphronios and Leagros as lovers.

Cambridge

POSTSCRIPT

A new fragment has appeared on the market. It gives important new information on both interior and exterior pictures. On the interior is much of a figure standing frontal, wearing a scaled corslet and over it a himation. He is overlapped from the left by the knees of a figure in chiton and himation seated on a stool. The standing figure is Ares; and this shows that the himation, which I took to be over his knees, is in fact over his left shoulder and upper arm, and that the row of seated deities begins to the spectator's left of him. The head is missing, and we cannot tell which way he was looking. Ares wears himation over corslet on a

fragmentary amphora by Oltos in Vienna University.⁸⁰ There he wears a helmet; most likely here also, but one cannot be sure. There is nothing to indicate the sex of the deity whose knees overlap him. It might well be Aphrodite, but again there can be no certainty.

On the exterior we find not (like every other figure of which remains survive) a male in a short chiton but part of a quietly standing figure in long chiton and himation. The obvious candidate in the context is Iole, and that is surely who it must be. She was shown on both the fragmentary cups with the quarrel of Herakles and the sons of Eurytos cited above (by Douris and the Brygos Painter).⁸¹

NOTES

1. 81.AE.213. This phiale also includes subsequent acquisitions 85.AE.18, 85.AE.185, 88.AE.30.

I am most grateful to the authorities of the J. Paul Getty Museum for inviting me to publish this vase and, with the Getty Foundation, making me a Guest Scholar at the Museum, which allowed me (among other things) perfect opportunity to work on the fragments. I owe particular thanks to Jiří Frel, who first showed me the fragments, discussed them with me, and invited me to publish them; and to Marion True, who confirmed the invitation and supplied me with pictures, information, and much more. She and her staff made my stay ideal, and it was a great pleasure to work in the department. Important joins among the fragments were made by Karen Manchester and Karol Wight, and Ken Hamma has been unfailingly helpful.

2. For the graffito, see page 86; for the *epoiesen* inscription, see page 95.

3. The phiale in Greece, its Eastern origins and connections and its history: H. Luschey, *Die Phiale* (Bleicherode, 1939); also T. J. Dunbabin, in H. Payne, *Perachora* (Oxford, 1940), and idem, in *Papers presented to A. J. B. Wace, BSA* 46 (1951), pp. 61–71. Clay phialai: B. Freyer-Schauenburg, E. Böhr and W. Martini, eds., *Studien zur Mythologie und Vasenmalerei: Festschrift für Konrad Schauenburg* (Mainz, 1986), pp. 115–120; also M. Robertson, in A. Cambitoglou, ed., *Studies in Honour of Arthur D. Trendall* (Sydney, 1979), p. 131.

4. Pp. 93–95.

5. P. 94.

6. Hdt., IV.8–10.

7. Eurytos: See Roscher, vol. 1, cols. 1435ff. The Homeric references are *Od.* VIII.224–229 and XXI.32–38. This Eurytos is also alluded to in the Catalogue of the Ships in the *Iliad* (II.596 and 730; 621 refers to another man of the same name). See also D. Buitron, this volume, pp. 65–74.

8. This version is the background to Sophokles' *Trachiniae*.

9. Corinthian krater, Louvre E 635, H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia* (Oxford, 1931), p. 302, cat. no. 780; also p. 132 (subject) and p. 168, no. 2 (inscriptions), pl. 27 (detail); fuller illustration in *Encyclopédie photographique de l'art: Le Musée du Louvre*, fasc. 19 (Paris, 1937), pp. 270–273.

10. Brygos Painter: Athens, National Museum, Akropolis 288, B. Graef and E. Langlotz, *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen* (Berlin, 1929–1933), pl. 16; *ARV*² 370.7. Douris: J. Paul Getty Museum 83.AE.217, not in *ARV* (see also p. 94).

11. See p. 95.

12. See pp. 90–91.

13. E 468, *ARV*² 206.132; J. D. Beazley, *Der Berliner Maler* (Berlin, 1930), pls. 29–30.

14. Boston 97.368, *ARV*² 290.1; CB, vol. 2, pls. 35–36 and suppl. pl. 13.1.

15. Louvre G 115, *ARV*² 434.74; *Encyclopédie photographique de l'art: Le Musée du Louvre*, fasc. 21 (Paris, 1938), pp. 14–15. On the other side, Menelaos, Aphrodite at his back, pursues Paris, beyond whom is Artemis; on the interior Eos lifts Memnon's body.
16. *Il.* VII.1–312.
17. *Il.* XXII.273–293.
18. So also on the Gorgos cup: Athens, Agora P 24113, *ARV*² 213.242.
19. So on Tarquinia RC 6848, *ARV*² 60.66 (Oltos); Berlin 2278, *ARV*² 21.1 (Sosias cup); London E 15, *ARV*² 136.1 (Poseidon Painter, the figures not named); and see M. Robertson, in *ÖJh* 47 (1964–1965), p. 110.
20. E.g., on the Sosias cup (note 19), but the artist has muddled the names; and on a cup by Douris himself, like the phiale of his early middle period: Vatican, Astarita 131, *ARV*² 431.43 (see further p. 92).
21. He most often carries a trident, but occasionally instead a normal scepter.
22. A child in arms wearing long chiton and himation: Dionysos carried by Zeus to the nymphs of Nysa, on a cup by Makron: Athens, National Museum, Akropolis 325, Graef and Langlotz (note 10), pls. 20–22; *ARV*² 460.20.
23. London E 140, *ARV*² 459.3; *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, vol. 3, Occasional Papers on Antiquities, vol. 2 (1986), p. 80, fig. 2c (M. Robertson).
24. See pp. 86 and 95.
25. See p. 92.
26. E.g., interior zone of Penthesilea Painter's huge Ferrara cup, T.18 C VP, *ARV*² 882.35; N. Alfieri, *Musei d'Italia: Spina* (Bologna, 1979), pp. 53ff.; exterior of cup by Aison, Madrid 11265, *ARV*² 1174.1; exterior and interior zone of cup by the Codrus Painter, London E 84, *ARV*² 1269.4.
27. See I. K. and A. E. Raubitschek, in *Studies . . . presented to H. A. Thompson, Hesperia*, suppl. 20 (1982), pp. 116f.
28. Above (note 26).
29. E.g., de La Coste Messelière, *Delphes* (Paris, 1943), figs. 76–81.
30. Triptolemos's Mission: see the Raubitscheks (note 27); Robertson (note 23). On this and other Eleusinian subjects: G. Schwarz, *AA*, 1971, pp. 177–182; idem, *ÖJh* 50 (1972/1973), pp. 125–133; idem, *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery*, Allard Pierson Series, vol. 5 (Amsterdam, 1984), pp. 309–313.
31. Pot fragment, Eleusis 596 (4213), *ARV*² 12.13. I am grateful to Alan Shapiro for drawing my attention to this piece.
32. Above (note 23).
33. Reggio 4001, *ABV* 147.6. Hesiod, *Op.* 125, speaks of *daimones . . . ploutodotai*, and *Ploutodotes* is later an epithet of Zeus and of *Ploutos*.
34. See Roscher, vol. 1, col. 1786, s.v. Hades.
35. Hesiod, *Theog.* 969–974.
36. Lines 483–489.
37. See Roscher, vol. 2, col. 2, s.v. *Iakchos*; vol. 1, col. 70, s.v. *Adonis*.
38. See p. 91.
39. There are other possibilities, e.g., Palamedes, Lykomedes. Might one seek Achilles on Skyros in (c)?
40. Above (note 20).
41. Above (note 19).
42. E.g., Euthymides' Theseus amphora, Munich 2309, *ARV*² 27.4; Oreithyia Painter's two name vases, Berlin 2165 and Munich 2345, *ARV*² 496.1 and 2; but the motif recurs constantly.
43. On some of these, see Beazley, in CB, vol. 2, p. 37.
44. Louvre G 123, *ARV*² 435.94.
45. See p. 91.
46. E.g., the Sosias cup, above (note 19); the kantharos fragments below (note 59).
47. *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, V.202–217.
48. Story told in the Aethiopsis (Proklos, *Chrestomathia* 38). Interesting recent observations on this legend by G. F. Pinney, in W. Moon, ed., *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (Madison, 1983), pp. 127–146.
49. J. Paul Getty Museum 76.AE.16.1 and 2; not in *ARV*; *GettyMusJ* 6/7 (1978–1979), pp. 131–138 (C. Cardon). See also pp. 94–95.
50. J. Paul Getty Museum 90.AE.38, not in *ARV*.
51. Amazons or Centaurs may be shown dead in their battles with Greeks, Greeks often stricken down, but very rarely dead. There is one in the Amazonomachy from the shield of the Parthenos, one in the Centauromachy of the south metopes on the Parthenon. On these, see E. Harrison, in *AJA* 85 (1981), p. 306; M. Robertson, in E. Berger, ed., *Parthenon-Kongress, Basel*, vol. 1 (Basel and Mainz, 1984), p. 208.
52. Apollodoros, *Epit.* V.1; Quintus Smyrnaeus, I.233–246; eight other victims of Penthesilea are here listed in three lines, but only Podarkes' death, which comes a few lines later, is given full treatment. The Greek grief at his loss is emphasized later, at his burial (811–822). There are many lines between those describing Podarkes' death and those in which Penthesilea confronts Achilles and is herself slain (538–629), but they deal with other combatants.
53. Preliminary publication by Dr. Baglione, in *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery, Copenhagen, 1987* (Copenhagen, 1988).
54. H. Hoffmann, *Attic Red-figure Rhyta* (Mainz, 1962); idem, "Rhyta and Kantharoi in Greek Ritual," *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, vol. 4, Occasional Papers on Antiquities, vol. 5 (1989), pp. 131–166.
55. Vienna 3695, *ARV*² 429.26.
56. See pp. 94–95.
57. Psykter: London E 768, *ARV*² 446.262.
58. See above (note 10).
59. Athens, National Museum, Akropolis 556, Graef and Langlotz (note 10), pl. 42; *ARV*² 21.2.
60. In *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery* (above, note 30), p. 171 n. 54.
61. Above (note 49).
62. Cardon (note 49), pp. 137ff. with figs. 11 and 12.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 135 n. 24.
64. Volute-krater, J. Paul Getty Museum 77.AE.11, *ARV*² 186.51; *Beazley Addenda*, p. 94; J. Frel, in *GettyMusJ* 4 (1977), pp. 63–70, figs. 1–12. He does not illustrate the handles but demonstrates (note 7) that they belong to this vase. They are illustrated by H. Giroux, *RA*, 1972, p. 246, figs. 5, 6 with fragments by the Berlin Painter (*ARV*² 206.130). Kalpis, Naples 2422, *ARV*² 187.74.
65. E.g., the krater from Vix, where the pattern appears also on the rim: R. Joffroy, *Le Trésor de Vix* (Paris, 1954), pls. 4–15 (cf. pl. 22.1, rim of krater in Munich).
66. Palermo G 1288, *ARV*² 599.2.
67. I have thought of this for the big pelikai of the Class of Cabinet des Médailles 390 (*ARV*² 254); see my remarks in *Greek Vases* (note 23), pp. 76–78.
68. On the Vienna cup (note 55) Douris gives blond hair to Neoptolemos in the tondo, and to Ajax and another figure in the quarrel; but it is rare in his work. On the Berlin Painter's liking for this coloring, see M. Robertson, *GettyMusJ* 2 (1975), p. 58 with nn. 16–18 (its possible influence on others); and idem, *MJb* 31 (1980), p. 7. On the Berlin Painter and Douris, see Beazley's remarks in his original article on the Master of the Berlin Amphora, *JHS* 31 (1911), pp. 277, 291.
69. Kantharos: Brussels A 718, *ARV*² 445.256; aryballos: Athens, National Museum 15375, *ARV*² 447.274.
70. Berlin 2283 (or 2284), *ARV*² 429.21 and 22; and the cup, above (note 10).
71. Louvre G 115, *ARV*² 434.74.
72. Vienna 3694, *ARV*² 427.3; Vienna 3695, above (note 55);

Louvre G 121, *ARV*² 434.78.

73. Epiktetos-Python cup: London E 38, *ARV*² 72.16. Cup-feet with *epoiesen* inscriptions: e.g., the two Kleophrades cups (note 70) and one by the Kleophrades Painter, Cabinet des Médailles 535, 699, *ARV*² 191.203; Kachrylion, Munich 2620, *ARV*² 16.17; Brygos, London E 65, *ARV*² 370.13.

74. Smikros: stamnos, Brussels A 717, *ARV*² 20.1; Euphronios, fragmentary calyx-krater, Munich 8935, *ARV*² 1619.3 bis and 1705, *Paralipomena*, p. 322.

75. Kalpis with *Smikros kalos*, Berlin 1966.20; *Paralipomena*, p. 508; A. Greifenhagen, *JBerlMus*, 1967, pp. 5f., figs. 1–3; he does not think the *kalos* refers to the painter (serious arguments against the identification, pp. 23–24).

76. *ARV*² 13.

77. *ARV*² 25.

78. There is an *epoiesen* inscription of Euthymides incised on the black foot of a fragmentary oinochoe in New York. The elaborate, heavy drawing is certainly not by Euthymides but must be of about the time of his later work or a little after. The inscription is probably genuine, but a doubt has to remain over an incised inscription on a vase not found in an excavation.

79. J. Frel, in Moon (note 48), pp. 147–158, fig. 10.1–6.

80. Vienna, University 631a, *ARV*² 34.3; *Paralipomena*, p. 326; see Robertson (note 19) (on the costume, p. 114 with n. 46).

81. Above (note 10). The Douris cup is published by Diana Buitron in this volume, pp. 65–74. I am most grateful to her for letting me see her article before it went to press.

The Greek Pentathlon

Gene Waddell

The Greek pentathlon combined five different athletic events: a run, a discus throw, a jump, a javelin throw, and wrestling. To win in most of these events required a balanced physical development that nearly precluded success in the separate competitions held for running and wrestling. Runners had to have well-developed lower bodies, and any unnecessary development of their upper bodies slowed them down in a race. Wrestlers, by contrast, needed especially well-developed upper bodies.¹ Having to compete in most or all of five events, pentathletes had to have the speed of runners and the strength of wrestlers, together with the coordination needed for the discus throw, the jump, and the javelin throw. Although pentathletes were nearly always less good at wrestling than the best wrestlers and less good at running than the best runners, they could win in more different events than athletes who specialized in any single event.

Despite their versatility, pentathletes were often not as highly regarded as runners and wrestlers. In the Panathenaia, for example, the winners in running were awarded prizes worth about one-and-a-half times more than the prizes awarded to pentathletes.² Why, then, would any athlete have trained to become the best all around, rather than the best at a particular event?

Greek philosophy suggests an answer. Aristotle wrote that “pentathletes are the most beautiful,” and he added that “he who excels in everything is fit for the pentathlon.” To “be temperate,” the injunction of the priests of Apollo at Delphi, was to avoid unreasonable extremes, both of underdevelopment and overdevelopment, and of all types of athletes, the pentathlete strove most to achieve this middle course. The mean, though, was between different types of athletes rather than between athletes and nonathletes, and this accounts for physiques very far above average.³

Sculptors had the same high regard for pentathletes as philosophers. Since the discus throw was not a separate event during the Classical period, some of the most celebrated statues of antiquity, which depict athletes with discuses, are of pentathletes, rather than, as they are usually regarded, simply statues of discus throwers.⁴ A statue that is usually attributed to Nauky-

des is a straightforward depiction of a pentathlete's proportions (fig. 1). The subject of Myron's still more famous *Diskobolos* is as much a study of the physique of a pentathlete as a study of action. The embodiment of Polykleitos's canon of proportions is likely also to have been based on the proportions of pentathletes (fig. 2).⁵ What seems to have begun as a competition to determine the best all-around athlete may have owed its long survival to the recognition that it was the best way to achieve a physical development consonant with a balanced mental development.⁶

HOW VICTORY WAS DETERMINED

There is little information in surviving Greek literature about the pentathlon, and there has been much disagreement about how to interpret the information that is available.⁷ It is certain that first-place wins in any three out of five events was sufficient for an overall victory.⁸ There has been much debate, though, on whether fewer than three first-place wins might be sufficient and on whether any second-place wins might count toward a victory in the competition as a whole.⁹

The strongest evidence that second-place wins did count is the story Philostratos tells to explain the origin of the pentathlon. He records a legend about five athletes said to have lived a generation before the Trojan War. Four of the five were each best in a different event, and one of the five, Peleus, the father of Achilles, was best at wrestling and second-best in each of the other four events. The Argonaut Jason proposed a competition including all five events and counting second-place wins. By winning this competition, Peleus secured the distinction of best all-around athlete.¹⁰

Pliny recorded a similar story about five sculptors who voted on one another's works to determine which was best. During the second half of the fifth century, each of the sculptors had made a statue of an Amazon for the Temple of Artemis at Ephesos. The result of the vote was a tie with five separate first places. The largest number of second-place votes went to Polykleitos, and he—with one first-place vote and with more second-place votes than anyone else—was considered the winner. Here again, the use of second places was necessary



Figure 1. Pentathlete holding a discus. Statue attributed to Naukydes. Paris, Musée du Louvre MA 89. Photo courtesy Musées Nationaux, Paris.

to break a tie; otherwise, second places need not have been taken into consideration.¹¹

Philostratos told his story about the origin of the pentathlon without explanation, and he clearly expected it to make sense to his readers. It may be reasonably assumed, then, that the story reflected the rules for the pentathlon, at least during his own time, the third century A.D. The rules may have varied at different places and times, but there is no evidence that they did. From the earliest to the latest recorded victories in the pentathlon at Olympia, from 708 B.C. until A.D. 241, the available evidence suggests that semi-religious sanctions caused the pentathlon to remain essentially unchanged, and in most respects Olympia was the model for athletic competitions elsewhere.¹²

Norman Gardiner recognized that “the pentathlon of Peleus is fatal to the . . . assumption that victory in three events was necessary.” Although convinced that three first-place wins were not required, he was unable to determine how the supposedly initial competition would have worked.¹³ He knew that only winners from previous events were allowed to compete in the final wrestling and did not see how Peleus, who was best of the five competitors only at wrestling, could have survived the process of elimination. Considering, though, that Peleus gained a second place during each of the first four events, that no one else had any seconds, and that no one had more than one first, Peleus continually had a chance to win the competition as a whole. It would thus have been unfair for him not to have been able to continue, and Philostratos’s story would have been pointless. If the story is accepted, the inevitable conclusion is that no pentathlete was eliminated while he stood a chance for an overall victory.

Allowing anyone with a chance to win to continue competing eliminates another potential unfairness that could have arisen, and it explains another seeming inconsistency in the Peleus story. At the end of the third event, three different athletes would have had the three first places, and Peleus would have had all three second places, thus leaving no first or second place for the remaining athlete, who was best in the fourth event. He would still have been eligible to compete in the fourth event, though, because he could still have won the entire competition if he had managed to place first in both the remaining events.

If after three events in any pentathlon, one athlete had won all three, no one else would have a chance to win overall. Once victory was determined, it would then have been pointless to continue. As long, though, as more than one contestant had a chance to win, the competition continued. This method of determining

victory would give every contestant an equal chance, regardless of the order in which the events were held, and it could be extended to cover all cases. For example, if at the end of four events, one athlete had won two events and two other athletes had each won one event, those three athletes alone had a chance for victory, and only they needed to compete further to determine who was best all around. If yet another athlete had been allowed to continue competing with those three, he might have won the wrestling, but he could not have won the competition, and so it would have been unfair to the others to have to wrestle him.¹⁴

Gardiner assumed that every pentathlon included all five events, and consequently he concluded that some kind of scoring system would have been needed to determine a victor.¹⁵ As H. A. Harris noted, to assume that all five events had to be held is contrary to Pindar's statement about a "bronze-shod javelin that released from the sweat of wrestling the strength of your shoulders." Pindar's meaning is fairly certain to have been that when the wrestling event could not affect the outcome of a competition, it was not held.¹⁶

ORDER OF THE EVENTS

Although the events did not need to be held in the same order, they generally seem to have been.¹⁷ There is no doubt that wrestling was usually the final event at Olympia and at Nemea. Xenophon gave a partial description of the competition at Olympia, stating that the organizers "had already held the horse-race and the first four events of the pentathlon. The competitors who had got as far as the wrestling event had left the racecourse and were now wrestling in the space between it and the altar."¹⁸ Bacchylides described a pentathlete at Nemea throwing a discus, casting a javelin, and receiving cheers from the audience "as he flashed through the final wrestling."¹⁹

Attempts by scholars to determine the order of events have produced at least eight different sequences that are alike only in placing wrestling last.²⁰ The best ancient evidence seems to be an account that implies a usual order. Artemidoros gives this account to interpret dreams, and he asserts that any dream about

taking part in the pentathlon *invariably indicates firstly* a trip abroad or movement from place to place, because of the race; *next* it signifies loss . . . because of the discus. . . . Often it portends suffering . . . because of the leaps in the long jump. . . . Again, the pentathlon foretells riots and arguments because of the javelins. . . . Because of the wrestling, the pentathlon indicates for wealthy men a dispute about land, while to the poor it foretells sickness. [emphasis added]²¹



Figure 2. Pentathlete holding a javelin. Doryphoros by Polykleitos (reconstruction with a spear added). Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek. Photo courtesy Fachlabor Zingel.




Figure 3. Pentathlete throwing javelin. Exterior of kylix. Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek 2667. Photo courtesy Fachlabor Zingel.




Figure 4. Pentathlete throwing javelin. Exterior of kylix. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 85.AE.25.

Artemidoros mentions the pentathlon three times in this passage, indicating that he is interpreting a dream about any aspect of it as a reference to the competition as a whole. Since the running and wrestling events were also separate competitions, a dream about the pentathlon would probably have been about the discus, the jump, or the javelin, but the specific event dreamed about was not necessarily the one that should be used as the basis for interpreting the dream. Instead, a dream about any event unique to the pentathlon was to be interpreted “firstly” as a reference to something associated with the run, “next” with the discus, and failing that, with the jump, but if not, then with a javelin, and finally (and perhaps especially if a person were exceptionally rich or poor) with wrestling. Since wrestling was usually, if not always, the final event, and since Artemidoros places special emphasis on a sequence for determining the correct interpretation of all dreams relating to the pentathlon, his order for the events could reflect the one used for most competitions. Other ancient sources make this assumption likely.

Two additional passages about pentathlons imply relationships between two pairs of events. A fragmentary inscription from Rhodes dating around the first century B.C. includes a phrase that translates as “. . . shall jump[,] the one who threw the diskos farthest.” As Stephen Miller has pointed out, this implies that the discus immediately preceded the jump.²² Pindar’s statement already quoted about the javelin making wrestling unnecessary implies that the javelin immediately preceded the wrestling event. Both of these passages are consistent with Artemidoros’s sequence.

Two descriptions of pentathlons provide similar evidence. The account already quoted by Bacchylides described a pentathlete’s success in the discus throw, javelin throw, and wrestling.²³ In another account Pausanias relates how Tisamenos lost a pentathlon in the wrestling event after having won in the run and the jump.²⁴ The order of the events in these two accounts is consistent with the order in the other three accounts and, when all five of these sequences are considered together, they appear to confirm one another (Table 1).

TABLE 1.

Summary of evidence for the order of the events of the pentathlon. Brackets indicate implicit sequences.

<i>Artemidoros</i>	<i>Inscription</i>	<i>Pindar</i>	<i>Bacchylides</i>	<i>Pausanias</i>
run				run
discus	[discus]		discus	
jump	[jump]			jump
javelin		[javelin]	javelin	
wrestling	wrestling	[wrestling]	wrestling	wrestling

HOW THE EVENTS WERE PERFORMED

The ways in which events of the pentathlon were performed seem to have been left largely to the individual athlete. Although there were definitely some rules, such as staying behind a starting line, the rules about what equipment to use or how to perform a throw or a jump must have been minimal. Each athlete was evidently allowed to provide his own equipment. In the case of the discus throw, there is evidence that the largest discus provided had to be used by all contestants.²⁵

With the emphasis in modern athletics on establishing comparable records and on record breaking, it is easy to assume that the Greeks were likewise concerned with measurable extensions of human potential, but lacking stopwatches and wind gauges, they could not establish comparable times for races, nor distances for throws or jumps. Their units of measure varied substantially, and they did not even bother to ensure that their racecourses were the same length.²⁶

There is no evidence that throws or jumps were regularly measured, recorded, or compared. Records do exist for the lengths of two specific jumps, but the distances are about twice the present long-jump records, and these much-disputed jumps are unlikely to be correct.²⁷ The practice of leaving marks in place after jumps and throws further suggests that distances were not recorded; it is unnecessary to mark a distance that has been measured.²⁸

The specific events that were won in pentathlons and the number of first-place wins were not recorded in Olympic victor lists. The winner in any pentathlon was simply the best contestant at that particular place and time. As numerous inscriptions indicate, to win a competition at the most important festival or festivals was the honor sought, and to have won repeatedly was the usual basis for an athlete’s fame.²⁹

All ways in which the individual events of the pentathlon were conducted are not likely ever to be known, but a broader consensus of opinion can probably be reached if the fullest source of evidence, vase-painting, is studied more systematically. This source has often been discounted after insufficient consideration, even by the scholars who have relied most heavily on it, and in one instance by the scholar who has contributed the most to an understanding of all aspects of Greek athletics. When a vase-painting of a javelin thrower did not conform to commonly used modern sequences or to the prevailing opinion about what an ancient sequence was, Gardiner initially rejected it outright. In 1910 he published the sequence shown in figure 3 and commented that the artist had fallen “into

hopeless confusion.” He criticized the position of the hand of the second figure and thought that with such a grip the javelin could only have been thrown backward.³⁰ In 1930, Gardiner illustrated this sequence again and stated more tentatively that unless the hand position was “a mistake in drawing,” the athlete “must reverse the javelin completely before throwing.”³¹

There are reasons for believing that the artist in this case was not hopelessly confused and that the javelin was indeed reversed in throwing: The first and third figures in this sequence are unquestionably accurate. Both positions occur often on vases by other artists, and both are similar to positions in modern sequences for the javelin throw.³² This argues in favor of the artist’s concern for accuracy. The second figure, like the third one, represents a momentary pause that could have been readily observed. The accuracy of the second figure appears to be confirmed by a more recently discovered vase with a nearly identical sequence (fig. 4).³³ Experimentation using a reversal such as the one that would be necessary indicates that it works well with an ankyle (throwing thong).³⁴

In addition to this ancient evidence, a technique not unlike the one shown on these vases has been used successfully in modern competition. Russ Hodge, world-record holder in the decathlon in 1966, examined these two sequences and recalled a similar throw, one that had been witnessed by Bob Paul, Archivist of the United States Olympic Committee. Paul identified the athlete who made the throw as Cuadra Salcedo, who at the time, in 1957, was a student from Spain at the University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez. Salcedo threw the javelin much as if it were a discus, and his distance of 310 feet would have been a world record if it had not

been disallowed by a track-and-field representative of the Amateur Athletic Union because the javelin could not be safely controlled. Nonetheless, Salcedo’s throw demonstrated that a javelin could be thrown record-breaking distances in more than one way.

When a sequence is depicted on a vase, it is more likely to have been one that was unusual, rather than one that was typical, inasmuch as there was little reason to show a sequence everyone knew. This is presumably why so few sequences occur.³⁵ The main evidence—various categories of individual figures—needs to be taken more fully into account to ascertain the range of sequences for each event.

Vase-paintings vary so substantially in their apparent reliability that many scholars have largely rejected them as evidence for the interpretation of Greek athletics.³⁶ Paintings deserve, though, much more consideration than they have received. Undoubtedly, many Greek artists were athletes themselves or had athletic training. Their paintings were probably based on an understanding of how the events were performed, rather than on casual observation, even though their artistic ability was sometimes not equal to their knowledge, and even though they were sometimes mistaken. The artists who were not athletes almost certainly had a first-hand acquaintance with the pentathlon, and their observations, like those of Philostratos and Artemidoros, should not be dismissed without better evidence. For the individual events of the pentathlon to be better understood, the limitations of vase-painting need to be ascertained better. Information that goes beyond other sources could then be used with allowances, rather than rejected as less than completely reliable.

The Getty Center
Santa Monica, California

NOTES

Abbreviation:

Sport: W. E. Sweet, *Sport and Recreation in Ancient Greece: A Sourcebook with Translations* (New York and Oxford, 1987).

Marion True suggested the scope of this article and provided numerous constructive criticisms. Dale Kent gave useful advice on clarity. Stephen G. Miller pointed out a number of problems that I have attempted to resolve.

1. Xenophon had an aging Socrates say he planned to take up dancing, “not wanting to develop my legs at the expense of my arms like a long-distance runner, nor my arms at the expense of my legs like a boxer, but by working hard with my whole body to make it evenly proportioned all over” (*Symposium*, 2.17; Xenophon, “*Memoirs of Socrates*” and “*The Symposium*” [the Dinner Party], trans. by H. Tredennick [Harmondsworth, 1970], pp. 238–239).

Rather than a long-distance race the length of the run in the pentathlon was probably a stade (roughly two hundred meters). Although Lucilius gives this distance in a satirical epigram, there seems to be no reason why he would have distorted the length (*Greek*

Anthology, 11.84).

2. Fragmentary inscription for prizes awarded in a Panathenaia of circa 400–350 (*IG*, vols. 2–3, part 2, no. 2311, trans. in S. G. Miller, *Arete: Ancient Writers, Papyri, and Inscriptions on the History and Ideals of Greek Athletics and Games* [Chicago, 1979], pp. 44–47). At Aphrodisias, the disparity was still greater. The winner in the shortest race received two-and-a-half times as much as the winner of the pentathlon, the winner in wrestling four times as much, and the winner in the pankration (the essentially no-holds-barred fighting) six times as much (*CIG*, vol. 2, no. 2758, an inscription of the second century A.D., *Sport*, p. 120).

3. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1361^b.7–11, trans. in Miller (note 2), pp. 31–32. Plato, *Charmides*, 164d–165b.

Philostratos discusses the major body types of athletes and the advantages of different proportions for different sports (*On Gymnastics*, 25–40). J. M. Tanner’s highly specific somatypes for modern Olympians conform closely with what is known about the proportions of ancient athletes who specialized (*Physique of the Olympic Athlete: A Study of 137 Track and Field Athletes at the XVIIth Olympic*

Games, Rome 1960; and a Comparison with Weight-Lifters and Wrestlers [London, 1964]).

4. The discus throw, javelin throw, and jump were not separate competitions at Olympia and consequently are not mentioned in Olympic victor lists surviving for the period from 776 B.C.–A.D. 369 (N. Yalouris, ed., *The Eternal Olympics: The Art and History of Sport* [New Rochelle, N.Y., 1979], pp. 289–296). That these events were also not separate elsewhere is clearly implied in *Isthmian Odes* 1, where Pindar states that in heroic times, the javelin throw and the discus throw were separate events and adds that “there was no pentathlon then, but for each event the end lay in itself” (*Odes of Pindar*, trans. by R. Lattimore [Chicago, 1959], p. 131).

5. In the surviving literature, the earliest mention of Polykleitos’s statue is by Cicero. Writing about four centuries after the statue was created, Cicero called it the “Doryphoros” or “spear thrower,” rather than javelin thrower. Pliny the Elder and Quintilian also refer to the statue as the “Doryphoros,” but Galen and Lucian refer to it as the “Canon” (G. Leftwich, “Canon of Polykleitos: Tradition and Content,” *Canon, the Princeton Journal: Thematic Studies in Architecture* 3 [1988], pp. 37–78). Polykleitos is more likely to have represented a pentathlete than a warrior for several reasons: His goal was to depict “perfect” proportions, which a javelin thrower (a pentathlete) was more likely to embody than a spear thrower (a warrior). The statue is nude, suggesting an athlete. Pliny indicated that Polykleitos depicted a youth, and the most renowned warriors were generally older. Aristotle wrote that “each age has its own beauty. In youth, it lies in the possession of a body capable of enduring all kinds of contests [he specifies the pentathlon]. . . . In the prime of life, beauty lies in being naturally adapted for the toil of war, in being both a pleasure to look at and yet awe-inspiring” (*Rhetoric*, 1361b, trans. in Miller [note 2], pp. 31–32).

Hyde gives additional arguments to support the conclusion that “Polykleitos . . . made a statue of a javelin-thrower (the *Doryphoros*) as the best example of an all-around man” (W. W. Hyde, *Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art* [Washington, 1921], pp. 211, 226–227; cf. pp. 69–70).

6. Plato, *Republic*, 7.535d.

7. “The order in which these [events] were contested is not entirely clear, and the method of determining the victor is still much debated” (Miller [note 2], p. 112). “How the pentathlon was scored has been perhaps the most puzzling problem in all Greek athletics” (*Sport*, p. 56). Comprehensive overviews of the literature on the pentathlon are given in N. B. Crowther, “Studies in Greek Athletics,” *CW* 79.2 (1985), pp. 77–86, and in T. F. Scanlon, *Greek and Roman Athletics: A Bibliography* (Chicago, 1984), pp. 23–25.

8. Pausanias mentions that Tisamenos lost the pentathlon with the wrestling event after having won two events (III.11.6; for an earlier, but less full account, cf. Herodotos 9.33). His opponent, Hieronymos, had only three wins, but was definitely declared victor, for he was allowed to erect a portrait statue (VI.14.13).

9. In 1956 George Bean summarized and presented good reasons for rejecting all prevailing theories about determining victory in the pentathlon. He suggested some alternatives, which he did not consider entirely satisfactory himself. His method was based on an admittedly groundless assumption that two second-place wins might be equivalent to one first-place win. He was aware that even this method would not remove all inequity. If his assumption were correct, two first-place wins with three second-place wins would have secured victory over three first-place wins with no seconds; G. E. Bean, “Victory in the Pentathlon,” *AJA* 60 (1956), pp. 361–368. In 1987 Sweet summarized reasons for rejecting some of the more recent theories (*Sport*, pp. 57–59).

10. Philostratos, *On Gymnastics*, 3, trans. by R. S. Robinson, *Sources for the History of Greek Athletics in English Translation* (1955; Chicago, 1981), p. 213.

Sweet suggested that if the pentathlon had been created so early, the events that were later unique to it would not have been men-

tioned as separate competitions by Homer (*Sport*, p. 58). Philostratos’s story of the origin may well postdate Homer, and since no other author records it, it may even have been fabricated, but as the only ancient description of how victory in the pentathlon was determined, this method deserves to be carefully evaluated.

11. Pliny, *Natural History*, XXXIV.53.

12. Pausanias (V.8.7) stated that the first pentathlon was at the eighteenth Olympics. The last known award for a pentathlon appears in the victor lists summarized in Yalouris (note 4), p. 295.

13. E. Norman Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London, 1910), p. 368.

14. Writing in 1972, Harris considered the Peleus legend unworthy of consideration and he proposed, instead, a scheme needing no second places. Without documentary evidence, he suggested that if after four events one athlete had two wins and two other athletes each had one win, the two with one win each could wrestle one another, and the winner of that match, “who now also had two wins,” would be entitled to wrestle with the athlete who had won two events (H. A. Harris, *Sport in Greece and Rome* [Ithaca, 1972], pp. 33–35). Harris’s method would have been unfair to both of the remaining contestants. It would have been unfair to the athlete with two wins because it would equate a preliminary win in wrestling with an actual win in another event. It would have been unfair to the other athlete with one win because it would require him to wrestle twice. This would be giving, in effect, the advantage of an automatic bye to the athlete with two first-place wins. This was potentially the only situation in which a bye might be necessary, but a bye could be avoided if the athlete with two first-place wins already had more second-place wins than either one of the other two contestants. For example, if he had two firsts and one second, and if the other two pentathletes had one first each and no seconds, he could not have been defeated. If the wrestling event did need to be held, the bye would surely have been fairly awarded.

15. E. Norman Gardiner, *Athletics in the Ancient World* (1930; Chicago, 1980), pp. 179–180.

16. *Odes of Pindar*, Nemean Odes VII, trans. by Lattimore (note 4), p. 116. Harris’s translation of the same passage is “released neck and muscle from the sweat of wrestling” (H. A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics* [London, 1964], p. 204 n. 25). The meaning of this poetic passage is disputed. One translator concluded that the pentathlete actually did wrestle (*Odes of Pindar, Including the Principal Fragments*, trans. by J. Sandys [Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1978], pp. 387–388). Whether or not the wrestling took place, what seems clear is that Pindar knew the javelin throw *could* make wrestling unnecessary. The interpretation of this passage by Lee and others that Pindar’s tongue was unlike a javelin throw which caused a pentathlete to lose a competition would require that Pindar blame an overall failure on the loss of a single event even though at least two events had to be lost for a pentathlete to be defeated (Hugh M. Lee, “The *TEPMA* and the Javelin in Pindar, Nemean vii 70–3, and Greek Athletics,” *JHS* 96 [1976], pp. 70–79).

17. It is possible that the order of the first three or four events may have been altered when there was good reason to do so. Evidence exists for flexibility even in the order of competitions at Olympia: In 216 B.C., Kleitomachos requested that the pankration be held before the boxing so that he might stand a better chance in competing for both. His request was considered reasonable and so was granted (Pausanias VI.15.5).

18. *Hellenica*, VII.4.28, quoted from Xenophon: *History of My Times*, VII.4.28, trans. by R. Warner (Baltimore, 1966), p. 335.

Xenophon’s account establishes that contestants were eliminated as the events progressed (“competitors who had got as far as”). In other words, every contestant did not participate in every event—as each does in a modern decathlon—and consequently, a similarly complicated scoring system was unnecessary.

19. Ode 8 for Automedes of Phlius, trans. Robinson (note 10), p. 104.

20. Gardiner (note 13), p. 364 n. 1, compiled most of the ancient sources. In general, simple listings of events are of less value for determining the sequence of events than descriptions. For example, in a single line of a poem, Simonides listed all five events, but the order he gave (jump, run, discus, javelin, and wrestling) is likely to have been determined primarily by mnemonic considerations (*Greek Anthology*, 16.3). R. S. Robinson (note 10), p. 94, pointed out that the first letters of the five events transliterated were A-P-D-A-P, and she added, "Cicero emphasizes that effective arrangement was the chief feature of Simonides' mnemonic devices." Philostratos listed the five events twice, but the first time he divided them into heavy and light events, and the second time he listed the athletes who were best in each event. In neither case was he actually describing a pentathlon (*On Gymnastics*, 3).

Crowther (note 7), pp. 78–79, listed sequences proposed by seven scholars. See also H. A. Harris, "The Method of Deciding Victory in the Pentathlon," *Greece and Rome* n.s. 19 (1972), p. 64, and idem (note 14), pp. 35–39.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 250.

22. Miller (note 2), p. 35 (translating *RivFil* 84 [n.s. 34] [1956], pp. 55–57).

23. Bacchylides, *Ode* 8 (note 19).

24. Pausanias III.11.6 (note 8).

25. Statius recounted the story of Hippomedon, who in the first Nemean games supplied his own discus, saying, "as for that other [discus], any hand can toss that weight!" When he threw the smaller discus aside and substituted a far larger one, most contestants withdrew immediately. After the first throw, the landing place of his discus was marked with an arrow so the discus could be retrieved and reused (*Thebiad*, 6.646–721; Statius, trans. J. H. Mozley [Cambridge and London, 1969], p. 109, cited by Harris [note 16], pp. 56–57).

Willoughby points out that for the discus and javelin, the distance that is likely to be achieved is inversely proportionate to the square root of weight, all other factors being equal. In other words, dividing the square roots of the weights of any two discuses or javelins will provide the percentage of difference that may be expected when applying the same force, using the same angle, throwing against the same wind resistance, and so forth (D. P. Willoughby, *The Super Athletes* [South Brunswick, N.Y., and London, 1970], pp. 506–524, 602).

At Olympia, three discuses were dedicated in the Sikyon Treasury for use in the pentathlon (Pausanias VI.19.4). There is evidence suggesting that the three did not have the same weight. Discuses excavated at Olympia divide readily into three distinct categories by weight (Gardiner [note 15], p. 156, table). Using Willoughby's formula, the heaviest of these discuses (5.707 kg) could be thrown forty-seven percent as far as the lightest (1.245 kg).

At Nemea an iron discus weighing about 8.5 kg has been found (S. Miller, "Excavations at Nemea, 1982," *Hesperia* 52.1 [1983], pp. 79–80). This discus has been considered too heavy for use in competition, but if the mean for a Greek discus was around 2 kg, as Gardiner's data suggest, this much heavier discus could have been thrown about forty-nine percent as far, and it could thus have been required for use by all contestants.

26. Gardiner (note 15), p. 128, gives four different lengths for the stade, varying from 177.5 to 210 meters, thus differing by as much as 32.5 meters.

27. The evidence for the record jumps by Phayllos and Chionis of Sparta is given and discussed in *Sport*, pp. 48–50.

Although these distances may have been incorrectly recorded, they suggest that some distances were recorded, and why any distance would be measured requires consideration. The reason is presumably that the Greeks were especially interested in extraordinary

feats. Phayllos was said, for example, to have jumped entirely over the *skamma* (jumping pit).

28. On marks, see above (note 25). Also, when Odysseus threw a discus, "past the marks of all it flew" (Homer, *The Odyssey*, trans. A. T. Murray [Cambridge and London, 1919 ed.], VIII.186f.).

29. Pausanias records innumerable athletic records in his books on Elis (V–VI), and Sweet gathers a sample of inscriptions that also indicate what cities and individual athletes thought worthy of recording (*Sport*, pp. 145–150).

30. Gardiner (note 13), p. 351. Gardiner illustrated a warrior using an ankyle with a spear in "a sort of underhand throw," and he compared the throw to methods used effectively by some primitive peoples, but he did not suggest that a javelin might have been thrown in the same manner (*ibid.*, fig. 93).

31. Gardiner (note 15), fig. 142 (opp. p. 173).

32. Ken Doherty traced the history of modern techniques for throwing the javelin and reflected on the wide range of possibilities. He wrote, "experts may analyze this whole movement into parts, then argue endlessly about what emphasis should be placed on this part or that. For example, even today, after about 70 years of experimenting, expert coaches and expert throwers do not agree as to the relative values that should be placed on power in the final throwing action as compared with momentum in the preparatory run" (K. Doherty, *Track and Field Omnibook* [Los Altos, 1976], p. 252). Photographic sequences of two common variants of javelin throws are reproduced in T. Ecker and F. Wilt, *Illustrated Guide to Olympic Track and Field Techniques* (West Nyack, N.Y., 1966), pp. 149–164.

33. Malibu 85.AE.25, discussed in D. von Bothmer, "An Archaic Red-Figured Kylix," *GettyMusJ* 14 (1986), pp. 5–20.

34. Gardiner (note 13), pp. 339–347, figs. 92, 95, discusses the use of the ankyle and illustrates a variety of depictions of it.

The sequence in figure 4 is as follows: (A) tightening the ankyle (which has been wrapped clockwise around the shaft with its looped end adjusted to the center of gravity of the shaft; the two longer fingers hold the loop and the two shorter ones the shaft); (B) balancing the shaft on or near the shoulder while advancing; (C) twisting the torso and reversing the javelin (similar to the action of bringing a sling overhead and then twisting the torso to maximize torque); and (D) slinging the shaft in a wide arc in preparation for the release (and in the process, turning the point of the javelin back around).

In javelin throwing, an ankyle functions both to spin the shaft and to increase leverage. Analogous functions are performed separately by a rifled cannon and by an atlatl (throwing stick).

35. Gardiner (note 13), p. 351, was convinced that the vase-painting reproduced here as figure 3 represented a sequence, but he noted the rarity of such sequences. Julius Jüthner illustrates what is likely to be a sequence, a frieze showing eleven runners in a torch relay race. Apparently, the first runner hands a torch to the second, then the second hands it to the third, and so forth until the last runner reaches an altar. Thus, instead of eleven different runners being shown, there must be only six, five of which are shown twice—both receiving and handing on the torch (J. Jüthner, *Die Athletischen Leibesübungen der Griechen* [Vienna, 1968], p. 2, pl. 40a).

36. Harris's use of Greek vases was, for example, less consistent than his use of other types of evidence. One vase caused him to comment that "the only safe conclusion is that we must observe great caution in using vase-paintings as evidence for any detail of Greek athletic technique," but another vase he called "among our best pieces of evidence for the field events" (Harris [note 14], figs. 20, 36). Pausanias's attempt at interpreting the iconography of an Archaic wooden chest at Olympia (the Chest of Kypselos, which, incidentally, included an early depiction of Peleus) is an example of the difficulty that interpretation could pose even for an ancient authority expert in myths (V.17.5–11).

A Dinoid Volute-Krater by the Meleager Painter: An Attic Vase in the South Italian Manner

Lucilla Burn

In 1987 the J. Paul Getty Museum acquired a monumental red-figured vase remarkable for its shape, its size, and the wealth and complexity of its figure and pattern decoration (figs. 1a–c). The vase is a unique form of volute-krater, with a separate stand. Much of its body is ribbed, but there are red-figured scenes on both sides of the neck and on the upper surface and vertical sides of the surviving part of the stand (the original stem is missing). The vase was made in Athens around 390–380 B.C., and its figured scenes may be attributed to the Meleager Painter. Style and iconography will be considered shortly, but since the most remarkable aspect of this pot is its shape, this will be discussed first.¹

What must be emphasized about this vase is the fact that it is such a masterpiece of the potter's craft; although the potting is enhanced and complemented by the painting, without the potting the painting would in itself be insignificant. Quite apart from the size—76.9 cm high as currently displayed—and the innovatively daring shape, there is the high quality of the black glaze, and the plastic elements to take into account—not merely the heads in the roundels of the volutes and on the shoulders but also the raised and gilded wreath, the “rope” and other moldings that articulate the divisions of the shape and, of course, the magnificent ribbing, with its regular grooves and arches. It is hard to decide where to start with the analysis of the shape of such a vase as this: rather arbitrarily, we will proceed from top to bottom, looking at each element in turn.

From the rim to the shoulder, there is nothing especially peculiar about this vase, although it is perhaps unusually finely potted and decorated. Monumental volute-kraters are not common in early fourth-century Attic pottery, but those that do survive are often extremely fine, such as the Talos Painter's name vase in Ruvo (see below, fig. 4), or that of the Pronomos Painter in Naples.² The profile of the neck of the Getty vase is very similar to that of the Talos krater, and the decorative schemes too, though different in detail, are

broadly alike, with palmette and other floral friezes above the figured scene occupying the main area of the neck. There are, however, important differences between the exact shape and decoration of the Getty vase and that of the Talos krater. On the Getty vase, for example, the upper terminals of the volute handles are masked with concave discs of elaborate design (fig. 1d). The center of each is a frontal female head in raised and gilded terracotta; around this are five circumscribed palmettes, each with a raised and gilded heart; the whole roundel is then ringed by a chain of narrow pointed leaves, perhaps olive rather than laurel, with berries interspersed. The same leaf chain decorates the vertical shafts of the handles too, in place of the ivy chain most commonly seen on volutes. It may be noted that on the only other volute-krater attributed to the Meleager Painter³ the upper terminals of the volutes are also masked with discs, this time bearing a simple central roundel bordered by a wave pattern; and the olive-leaf pattern replaces the traditional ivy for the shafts of the handles on the Pronomos vase.⁴ However, the richness and complexity of the system employed on the handles of the Getty vase are so far without parallel in Attic vase-painting: the small gilded heads are a restrained and refined forerunner of the “mascaroons” of Apulian kraters.

Because the shoulder of the vase is wider than average, for reasons to be discussed below, the volutes are relatively far distant from the wall of the neck: and perhaps it is partly with the idea of strengthening this potentially vulnerable area that the intervening spaces at each side are decoratively bridged with curling, budding scrolls. The delicacy of these scrolls resembles less the heavier versions found on many Apulian volute-kraters than the elegant handles of barrel-amphorae (type II loutrophoroi).⁵ The volute handles rise from four Negro heads set on the shoulder, vividly realized with black faces, white eyes, open mouths, and gilded hair (fig. 1d). The use of plastic elements in this position recalls the swan's heads found on the shoulders of many Apulian volute-kraters, but in Apulia Negro



Figure 1a. Dinoid volute-krater by the Meleager Painter. Side A. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 87.AE.93.



Figure 1b. Side B of volute-krater, figure 1a.



Figure 1c. Side B-A of volute-krater, figure 1a.

heads are not found in this position: Negroes in fact, though they do put in an occasional appearance, are not popular in South Italian art. The heads also recall those on the shoulders of the more elaborate Paestan *lebetes gamikoi*, but here again, these are generally Phrygian, not Negro.⁶ It is, perhaps, in contemporary Attic pottery that closer parallels can be found in the Negro heads that form the interior bosses of some of the black-glazed "calyx-cups" excavated in the Athenian Agora and elsewhere.⁷

From the rim to the shoulders, then, this vase has presented several strange features, but it is from the shoulders down that its greatest eccentricities appear. From the lower border of the figure scene to within a few inches of the base of the pot, the surface is decorated with beautifully executed, perfectly regular vertical ribbing, with even arches at the top. Around the widest circumference of the pot a plain, smooth band has been left unribbed, and around this is tied, as it were, a wreath of olive leaves, the two ends twisted together in the center below the principal figure scenes (see figs. 1a–b). The leaves of the wreath were all gilded, while the berries, many of which are now missing, were apparently simply shown in relief. It is in the period when this vase was made, the early fourth century B.C., that wreaths cease to be merely a stylized, formulaic border pattern and start to reproduce the living plants: the realism and fineness of this wreath is typical of the period. Similar wreaths are found on the great black-glazed amphorae, hydriai, and kraters of the period, and very occasionally on high-quality red-figured pieces such as the Baksy bell-krater in Leningrad.⁸

Before continuing the downward analysis of the shape of this vase, we may pause briefly to comment on the unusual combination of red-figure and ribbing it displays, a combination so attractive that it is, perhaps, surprising that it should not have proved more popular in either Athens or South Italy.⁹ In Athens, it is not really until the fourth century that ribbing becomes at all common for the decoration of large areas of large vases, such as the monumental kraters, hydriai, and amphorae, many with gilded garlands, that are found in large numbers at Capua and elsewhere¹⁰: these have no real affinities with contemporary red-figure, which they greatly surpass in quality of potting, and certainly no red-figured areas relieve their sober blackness. Perhaps they were made in different workshops from their red-figured contemporaries, workshops influenced as much by the products of metalworkers as by those of other potters. The technique of ribbing does appear much earlier, from the second quarter of the fifth cen-



Figure 1d. Handle A–B of volute-krater, figure 1a.

ture onward, but by the time that its use becomes well established in the second half of the fifth century, it generally appears on small vessels such as mugs and cups, and it is only rarely mixed with red-figure. Exceptions to this rule are a group of late fifth- and early fourth-century cups with red-figured tondi and bowls ribbed externally,¹¹ and, less well known but equally interesting, a small and unfortunately fragmentary aryballos from the Athenian Agora, on which three groups of carefully formed ribs separate three small figured panels: the figures are too partially preserved for attribution, but the context suggests a date in the



Figure 2. Volute-krater said to be from Gela. Side A. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1924, 24.97.25. Photo courtesy The Metropolitan Museum of Art.



Figure 3. Volute-krater from Spina. Side A. Ferrara, Museo Nazionale di Spina T.136 A VP. Photo courtesy Soprintendenza Archeologica di Bologna.

last thirty or forty years of the century.¹² More fully preserved, however, and more relevant to the present inquiry are two rather more monumental examples of the combination of ribbing and red-figure; by an interesting coincidence, these two vases were also, before the appearance of the Getty krater, the only two examples known of Attic red-figured volute-kraters on stands.

The earlier of the two vases is in New York (fig. 2); it has been attributed to the Group of Polygnotos and must date to the years around 440 B.C.¹³ Like the Getty pot, its body is ribbed, but with fewer, broader ribs of the type known as “gadrooms.” On both sides

of the neck are red-figured scenes of Dionysos with satyrs and maenads. The gadrooms, which cover the body from the shoulder down, end some inches above the foot, and though the vase would have seemed perfectly complete in itself, it is given an air of enhanced elegance by its elevation upon a finely turned and profiled stand. Though much simpler in design than the Getty pot, it is noteworthy as an earlier version of a similar idea. The New York pot is said to come from Gela in Sicily; further north, at Spina in the valley of the Po, was found the second, later example (fig. 3).¹⁴ This too is a self-sufficient volute-krater with the additional refinement of a stand; this time both the

lower body of the vase and the stem of the stand are ribbed, with the same slender ribs as the Getty pot. The Spina vase is lavishly decorated, with figure scenes on both the neck and the upper body of the vase; the stand too is patterned, with an ovolo above and a laurel wreath encircling the base. Another interesting echo of the Getty pot is the unusual manner in which the volute handles are decorated: instead of the canonical ivy leaves they bear chains of circumscribed palmettes, recalling those on the discs of the Getty handles, and (surviving on one side only) a delicate scroll bridges the gap between the volute and the rim. The origins of the Spina vase have been the subject of some debate, and the flamboyance of both its potting and its figure style has led some to wonder if it could be South Italian, perhaps even the work of an Athenian emigrant to Southern Italy.¹⁵ The weight of opinion, however, and its provenance are both against such an interpretation. Though the painting of the Spina vase cannot be attributed to the same hand as the Getty pot, it is not impossible that close personal study of both vases could reveal similarities in their potting. For the present, however, we must be content with recording that the two vases cannot be far separated in date, and that they share to some extent a common inspiration.

When the search for vases that combine ribbing and red-figure moves from Athens to South Italy, they start to become slightly more numerous. A volute-krater in Ruvo, attributed to the Painter of the Birth of Dionysos¹⁶ and dating to about 400–385 B.C., recalls in overall effect the New York krater, with its red-figured scene on the neck and its relatively broad, though carefully produced, ribbing; this vase is, in a very general manner, reminiscent of the Getty vase in the way an additional red-figured scene decorates its lower body. It is, however, not till nearer the middle of the fourth century that ribbing becomes at all usual in Apulia, and then it is generally only for small areas such as the handle-zones of calyx-kraters or the lower body and shoulders of barrel-amphorae (loutrophoroi II).¹⁷ In the mid-fourth century a special fondness for ribbing may be discerned in the works of the Varrese Painter. From his hand come three virtually matching nestorides,¹⁸ their distinctive shape emphasized and enhanced by the decorative scheme, which employs red-figure for the upper half of the vase and beautifully executed ribbing on the lower portion. These three vases are clearly the work of a single, highly skilled potter, and possibly the same craftsman was responsible for the potting of a dinos on a finely ribbed stand, the red-figured scene of which has also been attributed to the Varrese Painter.¹⁹ Credit for the ribbing should,

of course, be given to the potter rather than the painter of these vases, but it is not impossible that in this instance they were one and the same, for the Varrese Painter's enthusiasm for ribbing is carried over into his figured scenes, several of which show large, ribbed, probably metal vases standing in naiskoi²⁰; this fondness is shared by a near contemporary, the Painter of Bari 12061.²¹ The way the Varrese Painter uses ribbing for large areas of his red-figured vases is unusual in Apulian vase-painting. On the whole, the use of ribbing to cover large areas of large vases was the prerogative of the producers of later fourth-century Gnathia vases,²² not those of red-figure.

The striking resemblance in overall design between the Varrese Painter nestorides and the Getty pot provokes the suggestion that either the South Italian or the Attic potter, or both, was very well aware of what the other, or others like him, were producing. We shall return shortly to this question: but for the present, we must continue our analysis of shape, for the peculiarities of the Getty vase do not end with its unusual combination of red-figure and ribbing. When it is set beside the near-contemporary Talos vase (figs. 4, 5a), it is immediately obvious how much wider and plumper the body of the Getty pot is than that of a standard volute-krater: from the shoulders down, it is, in fact, a dinos. The ribbing ends shortly above the base: there is a marked inward indentation, and then the walls of the vase draw tightly in to a small circular projection or "tang" (fig. 5a): this projection must be intended to locate the vase securely in the correct position upon its stand. Although this arrangement seems to be unique, there is one piece of evidence to suggest that other vases were made with a similar tang, and that its function was that just described: this is the late Archaic red-figured stand now in Berlin, attributed to the Antiphon Painter, on the upper surface of which is a depression, which looks exactly designed to accept a circular tang such as this.²³

Turning, finally, to what survives of the stand of the Getty vase (fig. 5b), we may observe that stands were probably a more common accessory of both Attic and South Italian vases than might immediately be imagined, especially in the fourth century B.C.²⁴ They are quite often found in association with both Gnathia and red-figured Apulian vases of many shapes, not merely the dinoi and pointed amphorae that need them in order to stand up at all but also kraters, hydriai, and loutrophoroi. It is possible that stands were originally developed for vases of the plainer Gnathia style and that red-figure potters borrowed the idea from there. At all events, it may be noted that Apulian vases, both



Figure 4. Volute-krater by the Talos Painter. Side A. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1501. Photo courtesy DAI, Rome.



Figure 5a. Body of volute-krater, figure 1a, showing projection at bottom of the body.

red-figure and Gnathia, for which stands are preserved are often those in whose decoration there is at least some area of ribbing, which is perhaps to say that stands can often be associated with vases on which enterprising and skillful potters have lavished considerable care.²⁵ A similar tendency may be observed with Attic vases: red-figure vases with stands are rare, though dinoi and pointed amphorae must have had them, and orphaned stands such as the Antiphon Painter's do exist; but with the exceptions of the New York and Ferrara kraters (figs. 2, 3), discussed above, stands only seem to become numerically significant with the production in the fourth century of the large, possibly metal-inspired, black-glazed vessels already mentioned. Where stands do occur, whether they are Attic or South Italian, it is extremely rare for them to be decorated in the red-figure technique: usually they are simply black glazed, or ribbed, their decoration restricted to an occasional wreath or molding.²⁶ The unusual red-figure decoration on the Getty vase stand recalls, rather, the figured scenes that decorate the feet of some monumental Apulian kraters.²⁷

As it survives, the stand of the Getty vase is clearly incomplete. What it resembles most is the lower element of the stand of an Apulian dinos such as that shown in figure 6, though the Getty stand is larger and unusually elaborate in its decoration.²⁸ Originally there must have been a stem that linked the surviving part of the stand with a concave upper resting surface on which the rounded bottom of the vase would have sat, supported up the sides as far as the start of the ribbing, and secured in place by the "tang," which would have fitted into a matching depression in the stand. The monumental size of the vase and its large and heavy volute handles suggest that the stem would probably not have been as tall, in proportion, as that of the average dinos. The reconstruction designed and carried out by the Museum's conservators (figs. 1a–c; see Appendix, figs. 18d–e) is sufficiently tall to enable the figure scene on the upper surface of the base to be seen, and yet not so high that the vase above it seems dangerously unstable or top-heavy.

The hybrid shape—volute-dinos? dinoid volute-krater?—as restored would be unique so far in either

Attic or South Italian red-figured vase-painting; hybrids of other sorts, however, are not unknown, especially in South Italian workshops.²⁹ Throughout this discussion, parallels and comparanda have been sought less in contemporary Athenian vase-painting than in that of Apulia. It is surely undeniable that the size, extraordinary shape, and richly flamboyant decorative scheme of the Getty pot produce a strongly South Italian impression: in so many aspects it stands far closer to the outrageous creations of mid-fourth-century Apulia than it does to the rather tired efforts of the contemporary Athenian *Kerameikos*, the endless, poorly potted and scappily painted bell-kraters and pelikai that were the chief products of its fourth-century workshops. Certainly it is altogether possible that the vase was made with export to Italy in mind, and the possibility also has to be faced that its potter had seen comparable South Italian material. Several vases have in fact turned up in the last few years showing clear signs of having been made specifically for the Italian market: the most notable examples of these are the two red-figured “Daunian” vases in the Getty, and the white-ground “Daunian” nestoris in the Guarini collection, all made in Athens but imitating Italic shapes.³⁰ At first sight it is tempting to put our vase in this same category; and yet there are problems with such an attribution. Unlike the others, it does not imitate an Italic shape; in fact it imitates no shape at all, but rather rivals the iconoclastic inventiveness not of native Italic but of South Italian Greek potters; moreover, it seems to antedate the vases it most resembles, those of the Varrese Painter and his associates, by at least ten or twenty years. Perhaps, then, there is a need to change the emphasis of the comparison: we should be comparing South Italian vases to the Getty pot, rather than it to them.

It should, after all, be remembered that other monumental Attic red-figured kraters do survive, if not in great quantities, from the early fourth century. The most famous examples are the Talos and Pronomos kraters, both monumental vases, over 75 cm high; both were found in Southern Italy, and both have in their time been credited with inspiring the potters and vase-painters of Apulia. And in addition to other slightly smaller vases of similar quality to these, there is the magnificent Baksy bell-krater in Leningrad, further proof, were it needed, that early fourth-century Athens was still perfectly capable of producing large, finely decorated vases.³¹ It is true that the Getty vase differs from these examples in its eccentric shape and in its extensive use of ribbing and other plastic elements; but for these too there is no need to look beyond the



Figure 5b. Stand of volute-krater, figure 1a. Side A.



Figure 6. Apulian dinos. Side A. London, The British Museum F 303. Photo courtesy Trustees of The British Museum.



Figure 7a. Detail of neck of volute-krater, figure 1a. Side A.



Figure 7b. Detail of neck of volute-krater, figure 1a. Side A.



Figure 7c. Detail of neck of volute-krater, figure 1a. Side A.

confines of the Athenian Kerameikos for inspiration, in particular to the workshops producing the large black-glazed garland-kraters. Surely it was under their influence and, whether directly or indirectly, that of the producers of bronze, gold, and silver vases, that some of the more remarkable features of the Getty vase were conceived. It may be our historical perspective that makes us think the Getty vase looks South Italian; perhaps South Italian vases look more Attic than our ideas of classical restraint and simplicity encourage us to admit.

We may now turn to the style and subjects of the figure scenes. There are four of these, on the principal and secondary sides of the neck, and on the upper surface and the vertical sides of the base. We shall deal with each of the four scenes in turn. The principal scene occupies the front of the neck (figs. 7a–c). The individuality of its subject and the complexity of its composition combine with its detailed treatment to distinguish it as the chief scene; its primacy is also emphasized by the more elaborate pattern-work above it and by the way in which the ends of the olive wreath are fastened below it. The central figure in the scene is a youth, who reclines to the left, propped up on cushions, on a couch that is covered with fringed and beautifully patterned tapestries. The youth's head is,

unfortunately, missing, but it can be seen that he had long hair, with curls running down his shoulder and over his breast; he is shown raising both hands to tie or untie a fillet around his head. The youth's upper body, which is plump and soft-looking, is naked; around his hips and legs he has a mantle, richly patterned like the one he lies on. Crouching on the left-hand end of the couch and leaning toward the youth is an Eros, who holds in his left hand a dish containing rounded objects, probably fruit; similar objects float above his right hand, which he seems to hold out to the recumbent figure. In front of or below the couch is a low table or footstool on which are two more rounded objects.

On either side of the youth are three female figures: we shall look first at the group on the left (fig. 7a). Seated immediately to the left of the couch, her fingers brushing the wings of the Eros, is a woman dressed in a finely pleated chiton, which slips off her left shoulder, with a richly patterned mantle around her lower legs. Her hair is arranged in a bun, and she wears gilded bracelets and necklace. Seated to the right, she looks back over her right shoulder to the woman behind her and gesticulates with the fingers of her left hand, as though the two are engaged in conversation. It is interesting to observe that she appears to be sitting

not on a chair or stool but rather on a box or casket. The second woman standing behind her raises both hands to the first woman's shoulder. She wears the same sort of chiton as the first, but her himation is plain and pulled up over the back of her head; mostly concealed by the himation is some sort of diadem decorated with leaves. This woman also wears a gilded bracelet and necklace. On the left-hand edge of the scene, also facing right, is the third member of this group. Wearing a chiton with a plain mantle wrapped around her left arm and lower body, she stands with her left leg raised on a chest or casket; in her raised right hand she holds, perhaps, a string of beads, while in her left hand is a mirror; possibly it is into this mirror that the seated woman is looking. The identity of these figures is something to which we shall return: for the moment we may note that the seated woman is clearly the most important of the three, distinguished not merely by her patterned mantle but also by her seated position: she, as it were, is the mistress, the other two her maids. A further interesting feature of this group is the way the second woman has arranged her mantle: to this also we shall return.

The group of women to the right of the couch (fig. 7c) balances that to the left: its composition and arrangement are similar, but not identical. The seated, dominant figure is this time in the center. Although the heads of both seated women are damaged, it would appear that they were more or less identical. They are identically dressed, down to the patterns of their mantles and the way that their chitons slip from the shoulder; they wear the same jewelry, and they sit on identical boxes. The woman in the right-hand group, however, looks straight ahead, and in her raised right hand she holds a mirror (at an angle that suggests she is not looking in it but merely using it as an object with which to gesture). The woman on the far right stands behind the seated figure, leaning her right hand on the seated figure's shoulder. She is dressed like the woman on the far left, whose counterpart she very clearly is. Both the seated and the standing woman look fixedly ahead of them. But they are not looking at the youth on the couch: rather, their attention is fixed on the third of their company, who is placed between the seated figure and the couch. This third is a striking figure, not stationary like the others, but moving in a graceful dance. Her mantle, long and elaborately patterned like those worn by the youth on the couch and the two seated figures, is pulled up over her head and also envelops her arms: and like the middle figure of the left-hand group, she also wears a diadem adorned with leaves. The ends of the mantle fly out behind to

indicate the way she twists and moves her body; her hands are on her waist, and she looks back and down to the seated figure behind her, her face seen in three-quarter view.

Who, then, is the youth on the couch, and who are his attendants? The commonest male figure shown sprawled on couches in later fifth- and early fourth-century vase-painting is assuredly Dionysos, god of wine. But in the absence of any satyrs, maenads, or such diagnostic attributes as a kantharos or thyrsos, this cannot be he. Moreover, the atmosphere is not Dionysiac, but rather erotic, as indicated not merely by the winged youth crouching on the end of the couch but also by either or both of the seated women: the presence of the Eros suggests that the youth is the object of desire on the part of at least one of the female figures in the scene, and either or both of the seated women could well be intended for Aphrodite.³² A further clue as to the identity of the participants in the scene is perhaps offered by the dancing figure on the right; and here it may be added that her counterpart on the left could also be thought of as a potential dancer, for she too has her mantle drawn up over her head, with leaves arranged in her diadem. Such figures, sometimes described because of the way they wear their himatia drawn tightly around them as "mantle dancers" or "muffled dancers," are found in various contexts, mostly of the fourth and third centuries. The best-known example is the bronze "Baker Dancer," but there are also a large number of similar terracotta figurines.³³ These are generally found in graves, in which context it is impossible to determine their significance. But when they appear on vase-paintings, it does become feasible to speculate a little as to the circumstances in which these dancers performed. One early representation is on the Phiale Painter's name vase in Boston,³⁴ where such a figure, seemingly about to start her dance, appears in a setting that is not precisely identifiable but which has been thought suggestive of rites in honor of Aphrodite. Mantle dancers can also appear in Dionysiac contexts, as, for example, on an early fourth-century representation of the *hieros gamos* of Dionysos and Ariadne, where an intriguingly winged muffled figure dances away in the corner.³⁵ And again, mantle dancers appear on scenes that relate to the worship of Adonis, such as a Kerch-style hydria in the British Museum (fig. 8), where two dancers perform while another woman descends one of the ladders that leads up to the roof-tops on which the "Adonis Gardens" were grown.³⁶

If we were to hypothesize that the youth lying on the couch is Adonis, then various elements of the scene fall

nicely into place. Firstly, the youth's pose and general appearance are perfectly suited for an Adonis figure. Adonis was the god of vegetation, a beautiful youth who became the lover of Aphrodite.³⁷ Aphrodite, worried about the effect of his beauty on other women, is said to have shut him up in a casket, which she entrusted to Persephone, goddess of the Underworld, in order that no one else should see him. Persephone, however, opened the casket and fell in love with him herself, and after much wrangling between the two goddesses it was decreed that Adonis should spend one third of his time with each (the remaining third he could spend as he wished, but he chose to devote it to Aphrodite). The worship of Adonis seems to have spread from the eastern Mediterranean to Greece, where it was introduced into Athens around 440 B.C. Worshipers were exclusively female, and the rites seem to have involved some kind of annual resurrection of the god, followed by his premature death. Symbolic of his annual cycle were the short-lived "Adonis Gardens," quick-sprouting plants grown in broken pots on the roof-tops, which sprang up rapidly in the hot sun, and as rapidly withered away. Apart from the gardens, the most important element in the worship seems to have been the excessive mourning and wailing for Adonis's death, and when Adonis appears on vase-paintings, he is generally shown in an enervated and languid pose, suggesting his weakness and imminent decease: on the Meidias Painter's Florence hydria, he leans back wearily against the lap of Aphrodite (fig. 9), and on a pelike in Naples attributed to the Darius Painter, he reclines on a couch exactly as the figure on the Getty vase does, his hands raised above his head, while a solicitous Eros offers a plate of fruit.³⁸ In general appearance and manner the youth on the Getty pot bears a striking resemblance to this representation of the youthful god. And the way he lies on a splendid couch attended by the fruit-bearing Eros, it is also possible to recognize echoes of Theocritus's Adonis dirge—the beautiful youth lying on his silver couch spread with crimson rugs, with erotes flitting overhead.³⁹ Moreover, his weary attitude, like the plate of fruits and the leaves worn in the diadems of the dancers, is eminently suitable for a dying god of vegetation.

The women who attend the youth on the couch are clearly generally appropriate as votaries of Adonis, but we can, perhaps, choose the degree of precision with which we desire to identify them. We may be content to see in them simply worshipers, mortal admirers of the tragic god, like the women who appear in the ladder scenes. Yet the formal division of the women



Figure 8. Kerch-style hydria. London, The British Museum E 241. Photo courtesy Trustees of The British Museum.

into two parties and the dominance of the two seated women over their two companions are not paralleled on other Adonis scenes and suggest that a more precise interpretation may be in order. Perhaps, then, we should identify the two seated women as the immortal rivals for Adonis's love, Persephone and Aphrodite. This interpretation might have the incidental advantage of explaining the chests on which the women are seated as an allusion to the chest in which Aphrodite concealed Adonis when she entrusted him to Persephone. Moreover, although scenes of Adonis with Aphrodite and Persephone are rare in vase-painting, a few examples are known, the best being, perhaps, the Darius Painter pelike mentioned above: Adonis occupies the central register of the picture on this vase; below are Muses, and above Zeus sits enthroned, between Persephone, who stands impassively by, and Aphrodite, who kneels at his feet, one arm around an Eros, the other flung out in impassioned entreaty; possibly Aphrodite and Persephone are shown again to the right of Adonis's couch, but it is possible that these are intended for other mourners, perhaps mortal women,



Figure 9. Hydria by the Meidias Painter. Detail. Florence, Museo Archeologico 91848. Photo courtesy Museo Archeologico.

who watch the youthful god's strength decline, while Hekate stands on the other side of the couch, ready to lead him to the Underworld.⁴⁰

The painting of this scene, and of the others on the vase, has been attributed to the Meleager Painter, an artist working in Athens in the first decades of the fourth century B.C.⁴¹ A slightly younger contemporary of the Talos and Pronomos painters, the Meleager Painter takes his name from the scenes of Meleager and Atalanta that appear on five of the vases attributed to his hand.⁴² The Getty vase is a far more ambitious and carefully executed piece than any of the Meleager Painter's other vases, and yet the style is unmistakably his. The fairly crudely rendered faces of the figures on the Getty vase are easily distinguishable as his work, especially the prominent eyes with large pupils set right up under the upper lid, often spreading to join it with the one below. But even more obviously characteristic of his style are the lavish textiles, both those with which the couch is covered and those worn by the female figures in the scene. The Meleager Painter was fond of representing elaborately patterned garments of all kinds: hence, perhaps, his penchant for scenes involving "Oriental" characters, sometimes not easily identifiable but invariably clad in decorative stripes, chequers, dots, and zigzags.⁴³ There is one very distinctive border pattern of which the Meleager Painter was evidently especially fond, a running line of sea monsters, with the head and front legs of a horse and the tail of a fish or *ketos*. This border appears on the mantles of both the seated women, the muffled dancer, and the youth; it also appears to fine advantage on the border of the hanging with which the couch itself is

draped, and it is readily paralleled in many of the Meleager Painter's works.⁴⁴ The dotted diamond pattern that decorates the main part of the mantles of both seated women, the youth, and the dancer is another favorite design.⁴⁵

The scene on the other side of the neck (fig. 10a) is rather more conventional in subject, showing six banqueters reclining on three couches. They are arranged in three pairs, each consisting of an older, bearded and a younger, beardless man. All six recline with their legs to the left, but in each case the left-hand member of the pair, who is the younger man, turns his head to face his older partner. The couches are spread with gaily patterned bolsters like those on the couch on the principal scene, but without the elaborate hangings. In front of each couch stands a low table, rendered in rough perspective with three of the four legs showing, laden with round and pyramidal objects, presumably fruits and loaves of bread. The banqueters all wear plain mantles draped around their hips and legs; in their hair they wear fillets adorned with leaves. The composition of this scene is interesting, for it achieves an effect of considerable rhythm through the use of repetition and variation; although the central couple is given slightly more space than those to left and right, the six figures lie in basically the same pose, with their legs all facing the same way, each man with his left elbow propped at the same angle on a cushion. Each pair is then separated from the rest by the way the two figures face each other, turning their backs on their other neighbors; but then the potential monotony of the arrangement is alleviated by the varying poses and occupations of the six right hands and arms. From left to right the right arms are

- i) raised, with three small balls of clay above the fingers of the hand, perhaps a flower⁴⁶
- ii) drawn back across the chest, the hand holding a drinking cup
- iii) outstretched, the hand holding a drinking cup in a negligent attitude, one finger hooked through the handle; this is the figure who occupies more room than any of the others, and to fill in the area between his arm and the back of the man to the left a lyre is introduced
- iv) raised, holding a sash between the right hand and the left
- v) outstretched, though not so straight as iii), with three small balls of clay above the fingers, similar to i)
- vi) drawn back across the chest, holding a drinking cup, like ii)



Figure 10a. Neck of volute-krater, figure 1a. Side B.



Figure 10b. Stand of volute-krater, figure 1a. Decoration on upper surface.



Figure 10c. Stand of volute-krater, figure 1a. Side A-B.



Figure 10d. Stand of volute-krater, figure 1a. Side B.

This arrangement is simple yet effective. However, it is also rather a stereotype, both for the early fourth century and for the Meleager Painter, who reproduced the scene, with varying numbers of banqueters, on at least one column- and four bell-kraters; on all these vases the same couches with their striped bolsters reappear, the same low tables, and the same arrangement of older and younger men, reclining in exactly the same attitudes.⁴⁷

The figure decoration on the upper surface of the surviving part of the stand (fig. 10b) is completely different in subject and mood from either of those on the neck or from that on the vertical walls of the stand. It consists of a series of small combats: a youth wearing a chlamys plunges his sword into the neck of an antlered deer, holding it firmly by the muzzle; another similarly attired youth seems to be having the worst of his struggle with a griffin; a third youth, with a petasos behind his head and a slipping mantle (Theseus?) has forced a bull down to its knees; two youths, one armed with a spear and a stone, the other with a club, corner a hare by a tree with the aid of a hunting dog; and a griffin fights a man in Oriental costume. In general, the scenes recall the small figures on the predellae of earlier kraters, and the only combat that has clear parallels in fourth-century art is that between the Arimasps and the griffin.⁴⁸ Generalized scenes of pursuit, such as erotes chasing hares, are, however, quite popular in the fourth century. These scenes also recall the representations of pursuits on late fifth- and early fourth-century askoi.⁴⁹

The last figured zone on the vase (figs. 5b, 10c-e) runs continuously around the vertical side of the base of the stand. In the center of the front (fig. 5b) is a youth lying on a couch; in general appearance, and in the details of the decorative textiles he wears and lies upon, he is strikingly similar to the youth on the couch

in the principal scene on the neck of the vase. The mantle has the same diamond-patterned surface and the same sea-monster border, which recurs on the textile covering the couch. The youth wears a fillet around his long, curly hair and reclines in a very similar position; but unlike the first youth his identity is in no doubt, as he holds a kantharos in his outstretched right hand, and around him is an entourage of five satyrs and four maenads, two factors that indicate he must be the god Dionysos. Two of the maenads pirouette in ecstatic reverie, heads thrown back and drapery swirling; one runs up with a plate of fruits; and the fourth wards off the attack of an overenthusiastic satyr with her thyrsos. The satyrs are mostly equipped with animal skins: while one plays the pipes, another holds a large tambourine; a third brandishes a huge cornucopia; a fourth is attacking a maenad with his thyrsos; and a fifth chases a hare, in a mock-heroic echo of the hunting scenes above. Scenes of Dionysos with the thiasos are very popular in fourth-century vase-painting, as they are with the Meleager Painter, and many elements of this scene can be found elsewhere.⁵⁰ The poses of the dancing maenads, for example, can be found on many vases from the later fifth century onward, and it is possible that the numerous representations of similar figures may derive from some common late fifth-century prototype.⁵¹ Similarly, although it would be unusual in the fifth century to find Eros with torches standing beside the couch of Dionysos, this is perfectly acceptable in the fourth century, where the influence of Aphrodite becomes extremely pervasive.⁵² Of greater interest, perhaps, are the two figures to the left of the Eros, hurrying toward the couch and the god.

These two figures (fig. 5b), who proceed arm in arm in the manner of komasts, make an unusual couple. The leader, who turns back to look at his companion, is youthful and beardless, with the same long curls as



Figure 10e. Stand of volute-krater, figure 1a. Side B–A.

Dionysos and the youth on the couch in the upper scene. He is naked except for a mantle, which slips from his right shoulder and over his left knee; bound around his head is a long fillet, and in his free left hand he carries a lyre. His companion is of more striking appearance. He is older and bearded, and though barefoot, he wears a knee-length tunic elaborately pat-

terned with crosses and chevrons, and with a sketchy version of the favorite sea-monster border around the neck and lower border. In his right hand he carries a torch.

There is no reason to believe that the two figures are satyrs. They may simply be intended for komasts, and certainly their pose and stance are ones that may be found in other komast scenes, as, for example, on a vase in Dublin, already mentioned.⁵³ However, the dress and overall appearance of the second figure suggest that he is more than just a komast. His dress surely suggests an Oriental origin, and it is tempting to suggest that he is the god Sabazios, being introduced by Apollo into the presence of Dionysos; since torch races were held in honor of Sabazios, the torch he holds could be taken for his proper attribute, just as the lyre is that of Apollo. Assemblies or reunions of deities are not uncommon in vase-painting of this period; certainly Apollo and Dionysos are fairly frequently seen together now, and why should Sabazios, a god with whom the Meleager Painter was quite possibly acquainted, not be introduced to their company?⁵⁴

The British Museum
London

APPENDIX:

The Stem Reconstruction

Lisbet Thoresen, Assistant Conservator, Department of Antiquities Conservation, J. Paul Getty Museum

No known vase in Attic pottery is analogous to the monumental fourth-century red-figured vase and stand described by Lucilla Burn, which she notes for its unusual shape, scale, and elaborate plastic treatment. Although the vase is mostly intact, the stem of the stand is entirely broken off and lost and, thus, its originally intended monumental effect is diminished (figs. 1a–c, 5a–b, 11a).⁵⁵ Dr. Burn, however, has suggested a reconstruction of the missing section that would restore some semblance of the object's original appearance.

When, as here, there are no sherds to articulate the contour of a missing part of a vase, objects with a comparable profile are used as the basis for reconstruction. Because conservation ethics dictate that restorative intervention be carried out according to the comparability of available references, the restoration of the Getty vase has posed particularly challenging aesthetic problems, for there are no direct parallels in Attic pottery that suggest how the dinoid volute-krater and stand may have appeared originally. Dr. Burn cites only two other exceptionally fine, monumental, Attic

red-figured vases on stands, one in Ferrara, the other in New York.⁵⁶ Both are volute-kraters with ribbing, but apart from that the three vases and their stands bear only slight resemblance to one another. Dr. Burn, however, has elucidated the South Italian background of the Getty vase. So, while Attic references are scant, the South Italian vases are relevant sources for comparison.

Vases encompassing the Getty krater's broad range of characteristics were selected for comparison,⁵⁷ and several composite profiles were extrapolated from those vases surveyed. Although other vase-shapes and their stands were examined, most of the closest examples for stem height and overall proportion were Apulian dinoi.⁵⁸

The survey revealed no definitive proportional relationships between vases or between vases and their stands.⁵⁹ Generally, stand heights appear to be about 25 cm, give or take 3 cm. This height is fairly consistent, whether the vase is a tall loutrophoros or a squat dinos. It is therefore notable that the New York and Ferrara vase stands are rather short, 13.3 cm and 18.5 cm, respectively. Clearly, both physical and aesthetic balance dictated a modest height.

The same considerations surely influenced the potter who created a stand for the monumental Getty krater. In this case the potential instability of a tall stand



Figure 11a. Red-figured dinoid volute-krater, figure 1a, before restoration of stem.




Figure 11b. Profile drawing of dinoid volute-krater, figure 11a. Drawing: Author.




Figure 12. Profile drawing of krater. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. Drawing: Author.

supporting the large vase was obviated by making the stand massive enough to counterbalance the height. The base, the only remaining part of the stand, affirms this. Its elaborateness and height of 16.2 cm are unprecedented.⁶⁰ In contrast, the New York and Ferrara bases conform to the average heights of bases, which range from 3 to 8 cm.

With these observations providing a general frame of reference, the field of comparative study was narrowed. Detailed consideration was devoted to the Getty vase and to the New York and Ferrara vases; two Apulian dinoi (Ruvo, Jatta 1496 and 1497) were representative examples used for determining stem height and profile.⁶¹ To scale the vases correctly, relative to each other, elevation drawings were made from photographs (figs. 11b, 12, 13, 14, 15) and checked against the dimensions given. (A 2% factor of error in some of these drawings may have resulted from an insufficient number of dimensions against which to check them.) The drawings made the vases easier to compare and led to greater accuracy in interpreting the profiles. In addition, photographic distortions were eliminated, particularly those caused by lighting (compare figs. 11a and 11b).

Two unusual features on the Getty krater invite dis-

cussion concerning their intended use and provide insight into the correct stem placement. The first is a long circular tang or foot rim at the bottom of the vase. While flat bottoms or short foot rims occur on other dinoi, the one on the Getty dinoid krater is unusually long, 2.2 cm (figs. 5a, 16).⁶² Such a long foot rim may reflect only a consistency of scale in the monumental vase. However, Dr. Burn has suggested that it was intended to secure the vase on the stand to prevent it from shifting. The rim may also have served another function by providing a level support upon which to rest the vessel when it was not in its stand. Certainly, the foot rim made the vase more manageable during its manufacture.

The second curious feature may have a similar practical explanation. The ribbing on the body terminates with a marked undercut followed by a smooth contour in the lower portion of the vase (figs. 11a–b, 16). This feature appears to have no parallel in any other vase. More typically, ribbing will fade into the smooth contour of a vase (figs. 17a–b). If the stand was meant to cradle the Getty vase just under the ribbing, the undercut would discourage shifting. Moreover, the impression of the vase and stand as a single continuous form was enhanced with the lip of the stand fitting more




Figure 13. Profile drawing of krater.
Ferrara, Museo Nazionale
Archeologico T.136 A VP.
Drawing: Author.




Figure 14. Profile drawing of dinos.
Ruvo, Jatta collection 1497.
Drawing: Author.




Figure 15. Profile drawing of dinos.
Ruvo, Jatta collection 1496.
Drawing: Author.

closely against the body of the vase.

It seems highly unlikely that the stand originally supported the vase low on the body. The effect is extremely unbalanced and the vase becomes physically unstable, even with a tang. The stem placement immediately adjacent to the ribbing is more satisfying, both practically and aesthetically. The body is better supported, and the illusion of greater height is gained by placing the lip higher on the body without actually adding to the overall dimension.

Reconstruction drawings were made based upon average stem heights, using the Ruvo vases for specific comparison (figs. 14, 15). The result was a stand and vase of precarious tallness (fig. 18a). The stand measures 36.6 cm and together with the vase attains a height of 84.1 cm.

Another reconstruction was drafted using the average height range of stands as a criterion. Although the overall stand height of 28.7 cm falls within the range surveyed, the stem that resulted measures 12.5 cm and is markedly shorter than those typically seen in the references (fig. 18b). However, it is sufficiently substantial to complement the base proportionally, and as Dr. Burn has pointed out, it is just tall enough to make the painted scene on the base's upper surface easier to

read (fig. 11a). Thus, the first proposed reconstruction was taken as an upper limit, the second as a lower limit.

Drawings for intermediary heights were made to fill out the range of possibilities (figs. 18c–d). All the drawings were then enlarged to 60% of actual size, so that proportional incongruities became clearer. The taller examples became top-heavy and unbalanced; the shorter examples balanced the base without compromising overall scale. Moreover, with a shorter stem the Getty vase bears greater affinity to the two monumental Attic red-figured kraters in New York and Ferrara.

The plastic treatment of the stem itself was the next feature to be considered. Clearly, a plain stem treatment was correct, rather than a ribbed or fluted one. In every fluted stand surveyed, the flutes terminate by flaring out broadly over the base (fig. 17a).⁶³ The diameter of the base and stem attachment on the stand of the Getty vase precludes any flaring whatsoever. In fact, its diameter and the diameter of the vase's foot rim severely limit the degree of tapering possible in the stem (fig. 11a). The lost stem may have been quite ornate, or ribbed or fluted, but not in the conventional manner of the known vases.

Determining other specific elements was more conjectural. Features such as the lip contour, the contour




Figure 16. Bottom of volute-krater, figure 1a. Vase body and foot rim; ribbing terminates with undercut.




Figure 17a. Hydria with stand. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 79.AE.144.



Figure 17b. Detail of hydria, figure 17a, showing ribbing fading into the smooth contour of the lower body of the vase.





Figure 18a. Proposed stem reconstruction for volute-krater, figure 1a. Note variations in figures 18a–d in lip, rope, and stem treatments. Drawing: Author.

Figure 18b. Proposed stem reconstruction for volute-krater, figure 1a. Drawing: Author.

Figure 18c. Proposed stem reconstruction for volute-krater, figure 1a. Drawing: Author.

Figure 18d. Proposed stem reconstruction for volute-krater, figure 1a. Drawing: Author.

Figure 18e. Reconstructed dinoid volute-krater, figure 1a. Front.

between the lip and rope, the rope around the stem, and the degree of tapering in the stem had to be managed with particular restraint, because the references suggested so many possibilities without any correlation between corresponding elements on the vases. Each of the drawings reflects some subtle variations in these features (figs. 18a–d). The details incorporated in the final stem solution were the simplest elements, with the contours rounded to complement the profile of the base.

The final reconstruction drawing was translated into a three-dimensional form by turning it on a lathe from laminated blocks of Plexiglas. This work was done by Jim Davies at the Museum shop located at the Getty Conservation Institute. He and Wayne Haak, Conservation Technician/Mountmaker of the Department of Antiquities Conservation, did additional finishing work on the stem profile. Haak also made a protective mount for the vase.

NOTES

Abbreviation:

Metzger, *Représentations* H. Metzger, *Les Représentations dans la céramique attique du 4ème siècle* (Paris, 1951).

1. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 87.AE.93. Lucilla Burn would like to express her sincere thanks to Marion True for inviting her to publish this vase. Since she has not been able to see it for herself, she has relied very heavily on the information given to her by both Marion True and Karen Manchester, who have answered all her queries most promptly and helpfully. She is also grateful to several friends and colleagues, most especially Professor A. D. Trendall, for their help and encouragement.

The following details were supplied by Karen Manchester: H of vase and stand as currently displayed: 76.9 cm; H of krater: 53.5 cm; H of stand: 16.2 cm; max. Diam of krater: 40.0 cm; max. Diam of stand: 34.2 cm.

Raised clay is used for: the heads in the roundels, the berries in the olive-leaf chain of the volutes, most of the hearts of the palmettes in the border friezes (those that are not raised have broken off), the ivy-leaf chain above the figure scene on side A of the neck, and the berries of the olive-leaf chain in the same position on side B, the wings of the Eros and details of jewelry and accoutrements in the figure scene on side A of the neck, and for the fruits on the raised platform below the couch, the fruits on the tables, fillets, leaves, and flowers in the figure scene on side B of the neck.

Gilding, more or less well preserved, was originally used for most of the raised areas, certainly for the berries and dots in the olive-leaf chains of the volute handles; the jewelry and parts of the mirrors worn and held by the women in the scene on side A of the neck; the roots of the feathers of the Eros's wings; two of the fruits on the plate, and the flower above the Eros's hand in the same scene; the flowers, diadems, and some of the leaves that adorn them in the scene on side B of the neck; and for the leaves of the olive chain that encircles the vase.

Added red appears on areas that were probably gilded, and also on the "rope" moldings of the stand.

Added white was used for two objects on the low platform below the couch on the figure scene on side A of the neck; for objects on the tables and for the sash held by one banqueter in the figure scene on side B of the neck; for the mouths and eyes of the Negro heads; for the cornucopia held by a satyr in the lowest scene, and in the

A near-match black acrylic paint, more matte than the vase's glaze, was then airbrushed over the turned piece. A few simple reserve lines, like those typically seen on stands, were painted on the reconstruction to relieve the blackness of the stem. The lines encircle the lip, the stem above and below the rope, and the stem 4 mm above the base to the stem join. The reconstructed vase, measuring 76.9 cm in total height, is illustrated in figure 18e.

Solutions to conservation problems are often as diverse as the individual objects themselves. But to a great extent each problem suggests its own solutions. This, together with even the most modest references, may yield sufficient information to make possible a plausible reconstruction, as was the case with the Getty dinoid volute-krater. Although subject to refinement or changes if additional information comes to light, the reconstruction of this red-figured vase restored a large measure of the object's original integrity.

same scene for the body of the Eros, the hair and beard of the piping satyr, and the animal skin of another satyr.

2. Talos vase: Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1501, *ARV*² 1338.1; H. Sichtermann, *Griechische Vasen in Unteritalien aus der Sammlung Jatta in Ruvo* (Tübingen, 1966), K 14, pls. 1, 24–34. Pronomos vase: Naples 3240, *ARV*² 1336.1; E. Simon, *Die griechischen Vasen* (Munich, 1981), figs. 228–229.

3. Vienna 158, *ARV*² 1408.1; *CVA* Vienna 3, pl. 139.1–7.

4. See above (note 2).

5. A good example of a loutrophoros with this type of handle is J. Paul Getty Museum 82.AE.16, for which see *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, vol. 2 (1985), p. 130, figs. 1–2.

6. For Negroes in Apulian vase-painting, see *RVAp*, p. 614; for Negro head vases and other plastic vases incorporating Negroes, see Sichtermann (note 2), K 127, pls. 166–167; and F. M. Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1970), p. 27, figs. 33, 38.

7. For calyx-cups, dating to the second quarter of the fourth century, see *Agora*, vol. 12 (1970), pp. 121–122, nos. 693–694.

8. For black-glazed vessels of the fourth century B.C., see G. Kopcke, "Schwarzfirniskeramik," *AM* 79 (1964), pp. 22–84, pls. 8–47. For the Baksy krater, see B. B. Shefton, "The Krater from Baksy," in D. C. Kurtz and B. Sparkes, eds., *The Eye of Greece* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 149–181, pls. 41–48.

9. For ribbing, see K. Schauenburg, "Bendis in Unteritalien?" *JdI* 79 (1974), pp. 137–186, esp. p. 162; *Agora*, vol. 12 (1970), pp. 21–22.

10. See above (note 7).

11. For a list of these, see CB, vol. 3, pp. 90–91; the most famous is the Sparte cup, Boston 00.354.

12. *Agora* P 16927, *Hesperia* 16 (1947), pl. 47.3 (right).

13. New York 24.97.25, G. M. A. Richter and L. Hall, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Red-figured Athenian Vases* (Yale, 1936), pp. 161–163, no. 128 ("Leucippid Painter").

14. Ferrara T.136 A VP, inv. 5081, *CVA* Ferrara 1, pl. 13; for full publication and discussion, see P. Arias, *Rivista dell'Istituto nazionale d'archeologia e storia dell'arte* 4 (1955), pp. 93ff.

15. W. Real, *Studien zur Entwicklung der Vasenmalerei im ausgehenden 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Aschendorff, 1973), pp. 97–98.

16. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1494, *RVAp* 2/7; Sichtermann (note 2), pls. 56–59.1.

17. For example, the Lycurgus Painter's London calyx-krater, F

271, *RVAp* 16/5, pl. 147; or the Ioutrophoros on loan to Basel, *RVAp* 18/16, M. Schmidt, A. D. Trendall, and A. Cambitoglou, *Eine Gruppe Apulischer Grabvasen in Basel* (Basel and Mainz, 1976), pl. 19, and color pl. opp. p. 78; see also J. Paul Getty Museum 82.AE.16 (above, note 5).

18. For the Varrese Painter, see *RVAp*, ch. 13, pp. 335–358; Schmidt, Trendall, and Cambitoglou (note 17), pp. 114–123. For the Nestorides, see *RVAp*, Supp. 1, pl. V, 13/34.1 and 2; *JdI* 89 (1974), pp. 138–141, figs. 1–4.

19. Schmidt, Trendall, and Cambitoglou (note 17), pl. 29, S 33, pp. 114–123.

20. For examples, see Bonn 99, *RVAp* 13/3, pl. 108.2; Taranto 8935, *RVAp* 13/4, pl. 109.1; London F 331, *RVAp* 13/5, pl. 109.2.

21. See *RVAp*, p. 376, with such examples as Bari 12061, *RVAp* 14/126.

22. For Gnathia vases, see J. R. Green, in M. E. Mayo and K. Hama, eds., *The Art of South Italy: Vases from Magna Graecia* (Richmond, Virginia, 1982), pp. 252–259; and for a brief discussion with full bibl., J. W. Hayes, *Greek and Italian Black-Gloss Wares and Related Wares in the Royal Ontario Museum* (Toronto, 1984), p. 139.

23. Berlin 2325, *ARV²* 335.1; the shape may be seen in the drawing by Genick, in A. Genick and A. Furtwängler, *Griechische Keramik* (Berlin, 1883), pl. 15.3. I am grateful to Dyfri Williams for telling me about the unusual shape of this stand and for supplying the reference.

24. For an excellent discussion of the question of stands, with full bibl. and references, see W. Hornbostel, *Aus Gräbern und Heiligtümern: Die Antikensammlung Walter Kropatscheck* (Mainz, 1982), pp. 200–202. It is, perhaps, interesting to observe that vases in naiskoi are not infrequently raised on stands: see, for example, the representation on J. Paul Getty Museum 82.AE.16 (above, note 5).

25. An example is the Basel Ioutrophoros, for which see above (note 17): not only is it fluted on the shoulder and the lower body but it is an exceptionally difficult shape to pot, with its elongated body, and extremely fragile-looking scrolling handles.

26. One exception to this is a stand in Bari, inv. 8006, decorated with a red-figure satyr. I am grateful to Professor Trendall for sending me a xerox of a photograph of this.

27. Examples of decorated feet include volute-kraters in Taranto, *RVAp* 23/295, pl. 284.3; Switzerland (private collection), *RVAp* 27/22a, pl. 325.1; Naples (private collection), *RVAp* 28/87, pl. 358; Basel BS 464, *RVAp* 27/23, Schmidt, Trendall, and Cambitoglou (note 17), pls. 14–15.

28. For examples of Apulian dinoi on stands, see Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1496 and 1497, Sichtermann (note 2), K 44–45, pls. 74–75.

29. One interesting example of a hybrid is a vase in a Swiss private collection, a lebes of unusual shape with Italic-looking handles, complete with a stand; see C. Aellen, A. Cambitoglou, and J. Chamay, *Le peintre de Darius et son milieu* (Geneva, 1986), pp. 224–228.

30. For the Getty vases, see M. Jentoft-Nilsen, “Two Vases of Unique Shape,” *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery, Copenhagen 1987* (Copenhagen, 1988), pp. 278–283. For the Guarini Nestorides, see B. Fedele et al., *Antichità della Collezione Guarini* (Pulsano, 1984), p. 58, pls. LXV–LXVI.

31. See above (note 7).

32. Aphrodite often sits in this sort of pose, sometimes looking back over her shoulder, legs stretched out before her, from the later fifth century onward. For standard representations of Aphrodite, see L. Burn, *The Meidias Painter* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 26–29.

33. For the Baker Dancer (New York 72.118.95), see *The Gods Delight: The Human Figure in Classical Bronze*, The Cleveland Museum of Art and other institutions, November 1988–July 1989 (A. P. Kozloff and D. G. Mitten, organizers) (Cleveland, 1988), pp. 102–106, no. 14, with full bibl. For mantle dancers, see also P. Bol and E. Kotera, *Frankfurt, Liebighaus: Bildwerke aus Terrakotta aus Mykenischer bis römische Zeit* (Melsungen, 1986), pp. 111–113.

34. Boston 97.371, *ARV²* 1023.146; CB, vol. 1, pp. 54–56, no. 62, pl. 29; recently discussed by M. Robertson, “A Muffled Dancer and Others,” in A. Cambitoglou, ed., *Studies in Honour of A. D. Trendall* (Sydney, 1979), pp. 129–131, esp. 131; Robertson agrees “it is possible that she . . . is about to begin a dance.”

35. London GR 1856.10-1.15 (E 228), Metzger, *Représentations*, pl. 11.

36. London GR 1856.10-1.16 (E 241). For an alternative explanation of such scenes, i.e., that the ladder represents the staircase to the women’s quarters and that the scenes represent the ceremony of the *epaulia*, see C. M. Edwards, “Aphrodite on a Ladder,” *Hesperia* 53 (1984), pp. 60–72.

37. For Adonis, see W. Atallah, *Adonis dans la littérature et l’art grecs* (Paris, 1966); B. Servais-Soyez, *LIMC* 1 (1981), s.v. Adonis.

38. The Meidias hydria is Florence 81948, *ARV²* 1312.1, Burn (note 32), pl. 22a; the Darius Painter pelike is Naples Stg. 702, *RVAp* 18/24, *LIMC* 1 (1981), pl. 160, Adonis 5.

39. Theokritos, *Idylls*, 15.

40. Credit for the identification of Adonis, Aphrodite, and Persephone should go to Erika Simon, who saw the vase just after it had arrived at the Getty Museum in March 1987. For the Naples pelike, see above (note 38).

41. The original attribution is that of Ian McPhee. For the Meleager Painter, see *ARV²* 1408–1415; *Paralipomena*, p. 490; *Beazley Addenda*, pp. 187–188; for his chronology, see P. Corbett, *JHS* 80 (1960), pp. 59–60, and L. Talcott, B. Philippaki, et al., *Small Objects from the Pnyx, Hesperia*, Suppl. 10 (1956), pp. 59–60.

42. *ARV²* 1408.1, 1410.14, 1411.39, 1411.40, 1412.49.

43. For unexplained Orientals by the Meleager Painter, see among others his Athens calyx-krater, Athens 12489, *ARV²* 1409.10; *AM* 90 (1975), pl. 39.1–2.

44. Garments with sea-monster borders are worn by, among many others, Hermes, Io, and others on the calyx-krater Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1498, *ARV²* 1409.9; Sichtermann (note 2), K 16, pl. 36, or by Poseidon, Amymone, and others on the hydria, New York 56.171.56, *ARV²* 1412.46, *LIMC* 1 (1981), pl. 603, Amymone 60.

45. For the dotted diamond pattern, see the garments worn by Hera and Io on Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1498 (above, note 44), or by various characters on the Athens calyx-krater (above, note 43).

46. Groups of three raised balls of clay appear quite often in the Meleager Painter’s work. At times, where they appear in the field (as on New York 56.171.56, for which see above, note 44), it may be possible to discern faint traces of stalks that indicate that the balls were intended as flowers. When they appear to be floating above someone’s hand, as here or on other banquet scenes (see below, note 47), it is possible that they are still supposed to be flowers.

47. Bell-kraters: Reading 45.viii.1, *ARV²* 1411.37, *CVA* Reading 1, pl. 26.2; Los Angeles County Museum of Art 50.8.39, *ARV²* 1411.34, *CVA* Los Angeles 1, pl. 31.3–4; Brussels A 196, *ARV²* 1411.35 (unpublished); once London market, *ARV²* 1411.33, Sotheby’s London, sale, December 3, 1973, pl. 33, no. 140. Column-krater: Dublin 1880.507, unpublished. I am grateful to Alan Johnston for supplying me with this reference and with his own notes and photographs of the vase.

48. For Arimasps and griffins, see Metzger, *Représentations*, pp. 327–332.

49. For fourth-century pursuit scenes, see *ibid.*, pp. 415–416; esp. relevant here is his view that “L’intérêt ne réside plus dans la figure du tel ou tel protagoniste, mais bien dans la poursuite elle-même” (p. 416). For askoi, see H. Hoffmann, *Sexual and Asexual Pursuit*, Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, Occasional Paper no. 34 (London, 1977).

50. For Dionysos in the fourth century, see Metzger, *Représentations*, pp. 101–154.

51. For the dancing maenads, see B. S. Ridgway, *Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture* (Princeton, 1981), pp. 210–213, 221; K. Schefold, *Göttersage in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst*

(Munich, 1981), pp. 184, 354 n. 366. For a very similar pirouetting figure on another vase by the Meleager Painter, see Madrid 11012, *ARV²* 1409.11; Metzger, *Représentations*, pl. 11.3. For other contemporary examples, see for example the maenads on the lower frieze of the Karlsruhe Paris hydria, Karlsruhe 259, illustrated Burn (note 32), pls. 39–41.

52. For Eros in the company of Dionysos, see Metzger, *Représentations*, pp. 129–133 (“il n’est pas rare de voir eros s’introduire dans ces images”).

53. See above (note 47).

54. For Dionysos in association with Apollo, see Metzger, *Représentations*, pp. 172–190, and for Sabazios, pp. 148, 377. The cult of Sabazios was orgiastic in a similar way to that of Dionysos, and it was introduced to Athens late in the fifth century. Representations of Sabazios are rare; he may be the camel-rider on the squat lekythos, British Museum E 495, and it has been suggested that he may be present on the Meleager Painter’s Vienna krater (see above, note 3), where the *oklasma* is being danced in the presence of various Oriental-looking characters.

55. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 87.AE.93. Lisbet Thoresen would like to thank Dr. Lucilla Burn, Jerry Podany, Dr. Marion True, Dr. Kenneth Hamma, and Dr. Marit Jentoft-Nilsen for their advice and assistance in guiding the course of this project. She is indebted to Professor A. D. Trendall for his generous help in providing additional information on some of the vase references used. And she is especially grateful to Jim Davies and Wayne Haak for carrying out the reconstruction.

The krater has been reassembled from numerous fragments and the restoration has been well integrated. The vase is in good condition and is complete, except for the stem of the base and the scroll handles, which have been heavily restored. The glaze on the vase body is a uniformly deep black throughout. Losses and abrasions have been in-painted, particularly between the ribs on the body. The base of the stand is unbroken. The upper surface has been harshly rasped around the circumference of the central opening, where the stem was broken off from the base. The glaze on the base gradates from black to a very greenish black. Total vase body H: 53.5 cm; H of vase body without handles: 45.5 cm; H between end of ribbing and top of foot rim: 4 cm; vase body diam: 40 cm; lip diam: 32 cm; rim foot diam: 9.6 cm; H of stand’s base: 16.2 cm; diam of stand’s base: 34.2 cm; diam of base opening (at stem join): 12.6 cm; total H of restored vase and stand: 76.9 cm.

56. Ferrara T.136A VP, inv. 5081; P. Arias, “La Tomba 136 di Valle Pega,” *RivIstArch* 4 (1955), pp. 95–178. Total H of vase and stand: 85.5 cm; H of vase with handles: 67 cm; lip diam: 32.5 cm; stand H: 18.5 cm.

New York 24.97.25; G. M. A. Richter, *BMMA* 20 (1925), pp. 261–263, fig. 3; G. M. A. Richter and L. F. Hall, *Red-figured Athenian Vases in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, vols. 1–2 (New Haven, 1936), pp. 161–163. Total H of vase and stand: 66.7 cm; H of vase without handles: 46.5 cm; lip diam: 31 cm; stand H: 13.3 cm; stand diam: 22.7 cm.

57. The following vases were surveyed:

Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 79.AE.144 and L.86.AE.157.

Indiana 80.27.2, M. Mayo, ed., *The Art of South Italy: Vases from Magna Graecia* (Richmond, 1982), pp. 156–158, fig. 63.

Taranto 8925/8926, K. Schauenburg, “Zu einer Situla in Privatbesitz,” *MededRom* 43 (1981), pp. 83–89, pl. 30.26.

Naples 2905 (81878), K. Schauenburg, “Bendis in Unteritalien? Zu einer Nestoris von ungewöhnlicher Form,” *JdI* 89 (1974), pp. 137–186, fig. 31.

Basel S 21, S 33, M. Schmidt, A. D. Trendall, and A. Cambitoglou, *Eine Gruppe Apulischer Grabvasen in Basel* (Basel and Mainz, 1976), (S 21) pp. 78–80, pls. 19–22, (S 33) pp. 114–123, pl. 29.

Pompeii T. 213, B. Svoboda and D. Concev, *Neue Denkmäler antiker Toreutik* (Prague, 1956), p. 82, fig. 25; also illustrated in V. Spinazzola, *Le arti decorative in Pompeii* (Milan, 1928).

Hamburg A 65, A. D. Trendall, *Apulian Vases of the Plain Style* (New York, 1961), pls. 37, 186.

Ruvo 1618, London F 305, and Naples, private collection 353, A. D. Trendall, *RVAp*, vols. 1 and 2 (Oxford, 1978, 1982), (Ruvo) no. 8/67, pl. 64.3; (London) no. 18/72; (Naples) no. 18/233, pl. 191.1–2.

A number of vases were examined that depicted vases on stands in their painted scenes. The nearest example to the Getty vase is a tall ribbed dinos on a stand painted on a vase in Brussels; *CVA Brussels* 2, III Ic, pl. 12f; R. Lullies, “Der Dinos des Berliner Malers,” *AntK* 14 (1971), pp. 44–55, pl. 23.1.

58. See note 57, except Basel S 21, Hamburg A 65, Malibu 79.AE.144, and Naples 2905.

Most of the Apulian dinoi and stands surveyed measured about 64 cm in total height.

The author is most grateful to Professor Trendall for additional information and photocopies of the complete vase and stand for *RVAp*, vol. 2, no. 18/233, a dinos with a ribbed body on a plain stand. It is approximately 64 cm in total height.

59. Sources on vase proportions were considered in the comparison between the references and the Getty vase and stand; however, the following references had little to offer for the current problem: L. D. Caskey, *Geometry of Greek Vases: Attic Vases in the Museum of Fine Arts Analyzed According to the Principles of Proportion Discovered by Jay Hambidge* (Boston, 1922), and I. A. Richter, *A Rhythmic Form in Art: An Investigation of the Principles of Composition in the Works of the Great Masters* (London, 1932), pp. 47–61.

60. An elaborate treatment of stand bases does not appear to be very common. The best examples are quite distant from the Getty vase: a vase in the Museo della Provincia, Bari, M. Borda, *Ceramiche apule* (Bergamo, 1966), pp. 61–62, pl. 23; a vase once on the market, Basel, *MuM*, sale 18, November 29, 1958, pl. 46. (Reference kindly provided by Professor Trendall.)

61. Ruvo, Jatta collection 1496, 1497, H. Sichtermann, *Griechische Vasen in Unteritalien* (Tübingen, 1966), K44 and K45, pp. 38–39, pls. 74–75.

62. A few examples of dinoi with flat bottoms or foot rims are included here: Berlin 2402, R. Folsom, *Attic Red-figured Pottery* (Park Ridge, 1976), p. 153, pl. 55; New York 07.286.71, M. J. Milne, *Shapes and Names of Athenian Vases* (Washington, D.C., 1973), fig. 71; an unpublished vase on loan, Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.86.AE.157.

63. Basel S 21, S 33, Ferrara T.136, Malibu 79.AE.144, Taranto 8925/8926, Naples 2905 (81878); see references in note 57.

Satyr- und Mänadennamen auf Vasenbildern des Getty-Museums und der Sammlung Cahn (Basel), mit Addenda zu Charlotte Fränkel, *Satyr- und Bakchennamen auf Vasenbildern* (Halle, 1912)

Anneliese Kossatz-Deißmann

Im 6. Jh. v. Chr. begannen attische Vasenmaler damit, das Gefolge des Dionysos auf ihren Vasenbildern durch Namensbeischriften zu individualisieren. Als früheste Beischrift treffen wir um 570/565 v. Chr. den Gattungsnamen SILENOI auf der Françoisvase an,¹ kurz danach dann in der Einzahl SILENOS auf einer Vase des Ergotimos in Berlin.² Individualnamen sind zuerst gegen 550 v. Chr. auf einer tyrrhenischen Amphora überliefert (s. AGRIOS 1, AITHON 1, ELASISTRATOS 1, LAMPON 1, LASIOS 1, SPHOLEAS 1) (Abb. 1a–c). Insgesamt sind jedoch nur wenigen Satyrn und Mänaden (Nymphen) auf attisch schwarzfigurigen Vasen Namen beigeschrieben. Die Blütezeit dieser Sitte liegt vielmehr im 5. Jh. v. Chr. Nach den Vorarbeiten von Heinrich Heydemann in den Jahren 1880 und 1887 (5. und 12. Hallisches Winckelmannsprogramm) erschien 1912 die bei Georg Loeschcke entstandene Dissertation von Charlotte Fränkel über Satyr- und Bakchennamen auf Vasenbildern. In diesem heute noch unentbehrlichen Werk sind die durch Beischriften bekannten Namen von Satyrn und Mänaden auf griechischen Vasenbildern nach den damaligen Kategorien stilistisch geordnet und auch etymologisch erklärt. Doch sind seit der Zusammenstellung des Materials durch Fränkel zahlreiche neue Namensbeischriften bekannt geworden, darunter etwa die eingangs genannte tyrrhenische Amphora, so daß eine erneute Vorlage der Namen berechtigt ist.

Unter den bei Fränkel nicht erfaßten Namen sind auch Inschriften auf Vasen im Getty-Museum. Diese seien hier zunächst kurz vorgestellt.³ Dabei ist besonders bemerkenswert, daß zu den wenigen bislang bekannten Namen auf schwarzfigurigen Vasen (außer den oben genannten auf der tyrrhenischen Amphora sind noch DOPHIOS 1, EUPNOUS 1, PHANOS 1, PHSOLAS 1, SILENOI 1, SILENOS 1–2, SIMOS 5,

SPHOLEAS 2, TERPEKELOS 1 zu nennen) nun durch eine im Getty-Museum befindliche Leihgabe weitere Namen hinzugekommen sind. Es handelt sich um einen fragmentierten Kolonnettenkrater (L.87.AE.120), der dem Maler Lydos zugeschrieben wird und um 550/540 v. Chr. entstanden ist, somit nur wenig später als die tyrrhenische Amphora mit den frühesten Individualnamen. Wie auf seinem Kolonnettenkrater in New York⁴ so hat auch hier Lydos die Hephaistosrückführung dargestellt. Während der Krater in New York Hephaistos und den Zug der Thiasoten zeigt, ist auf dem Gefäß in Malibu die Szene durch die Wiedergabe des Symposions bereichert und aufgelockert. Denn außer dem reitenden Hephaistos sind zwei reich mit Figuren und Ornamenten dekorierte Weingefäße (Volutenkrater und Amphora) erhalten, an denen Satyrn hantieren. Bei den Satyrn ist durch Doppelstriche die Fellbehaarung angedeutet. Die Mänaden tragen feinverzierte Gewänder. Nicht zuletzt läßt dieser Detailreichtum die Darstellung so qualitativvoll erscheinen. Reicher als bei dem Krater in New York ist auch der übrige Bildschmuck, denn der Krater in Malibu zeigt zwischen dem Strahlenkranz am Fuß und dem Hauptbild noch einen Tierfries. Weiter ist die Wiedergabe der Hephaistosrückführung in Malibu dadurch bereichert, daß die Satyrn und Mänaden namentlich benannt sind. Auch das Maultier des Hephaistos ist bezeichnet. Lydos hat ihm ONOΣ (Esel) beigeschrieben (Fragment L.87.AE.120.4)(Abb. 2a).⁵ Dieses Fragment zeigt außer dem reitenden Hephaistos unterhalb des Tieres noch einen am Boden liegenden Satyrn mit frontalem Gesicht. Er hält in einer Hand eine Kylix, in der anderen einen Tierhuf, vielleicht von einem Reh. Wahrscheinlich soll damit auf das wilde Treiben der Satyrn und das Zerreißen der Tiere (*sparagmos*) hingewiesen werden. Dies wäre hier bedeutsam, da sonst der Sparagmos



Abb. 1a. Tyrrhenische Amphora (um 550 v. Chr.). Seite B-A. Inschriften ΣΦΟΛΕΑΣ und ΛΑΝ-ΠΟΝ. Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale o. Nr. Photo: DAI Rom, Neg. Nr. 76.1349.




Abb. 1b. Seite A der Amphora Abb. 1a. Inschriften: ΛΑΝΠΟΝ, ΑΙΘΟΝ, ΑΓΡΙΟΣ, ΙΑΣΙΟΣ und ΕΛΑΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ. Photo: DAI Rom, Neg. Nr. 76.1350.




Abb. 1c. Seite A–B der Amphora Abb. 1a. Inschrift: ΕΛΛΕΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ. Photo: DAI Rom, Neg. Nr. 76.1351.

nicht von Satyrn, sondern mehr von den Mänaden ausgeübt wird, und diese Darstellungen dann auch meist erst in späterer Zeit vorkommen. Der Satyr ist ΟΥΚΑΛΕΓΟΝ (“der sich um nichts kümmert”) benannt (Abb. 2a). Dieser Name paßt hier gut zu ihm, denn während die anderen Thiasoten musizieren oder das Symposion bereiten, also “arbeiten”, liegt er nichtstuend am Boden beim Zechen. Ukalegon ist zwar nicht für Satyrn, aber sonst als Name bekannt. Homer (*Il.* III.148) überliefert diesen Namen für einen trojanischen Greis, und in einer Vaseninschrift ist ein Achilleusgefährte so benannt.⁶ Die Unterschenkel des Ukalegon und die Hinterhufe des Maultieres sind auf dem Getty-Fragment L.87.AE.120.5 erhalten.

Auf dem besprochenen Fragment mit Hephaistos und Ukalegon (L.87.AE.120.4) steht zu Füßen des Ukalegon neben dem Maultier—dem Hephaistos den Rücken kehrend—ein Satyr, der den Doppelaulos spielt. Erhalten sind vor allem der Oberkörper und geringe Reste der Beine. Ihm ist linksläufig der Name ΜΟΛΠΑΙΟΣ beigeschrieben (Abb. 2a). Auch dieser Name ist sonst nicht als Satyrname belegt, doch paßt der von μολπή (Gesang und Tanz) abzuleitende Name gut zu einem Musikanten. Für Mänaden kennen wir bereits ähnliche Namen, erinnert sei an EUMELPE und MOLPE.⁷ Wie bei Ukalegon so nimmt also auch der Name Molpaios Bezug auf die Tätigkeit des Dargestellten.

Vor Molpaios ist die Kopfkalotte einer Mänade zu sehen. Sie trägt ein Band im hochgesteckten Haar und ist von Molpaios abgewendet. Von ihrem Namen ist ΦΙΛΟΠΟΣ[erhalten (Abb. 2a). Der Name ließe sich z. B. zu Φιλοποσία ergänzen, was die “Liebe zum Trinken” bedeutet.⁸ Als Mänadename ist dies zwar noch nicht bezeugt, paßt aber hier sehr gut zum Thema, bei dem ein Symposion im Mittelpunkt steht. Der Unterkörper der Mänade ist wohl auf Fragment L.87.AE.120.8 zu sehen, das auch noch einen Teil vom Körper eines Satyrn bewahrt, der im Volutenkrater einen Kantharos füllt. Weiter vor dem Gewand dieser Mänade ist noch ein Schwanz erhalten, der zu dem Maultier gehören muß. Denn es scheint, als ob Lydos—im Gegensatz zur Darstellung auf dem Krater in New York—die Satyrn hier ohne Schweife wiedergegeben hat.⁹

Fragment L.87.AE.120.2 zeigt eine Amphora, in die ein Satyr Wein hineinschüttet. Von seinem Namen ist nur ΕΟΙ[erhalten (Abb. 2b). Es ist schwierig, hier einen bestimmten Namen zu ergänzen. Günter Neumann erwägt einen Personennamen, in dem das Adjektiv ἠοῖος (morgendlich) enthalten sein könnte. In seinem Rücken tanzen von ihm abgewendet eine Mänade und ein Satyr

mit Namen ΗΡΜΟΘΑΛΕΣ. Namen, die sich auf den Gott Hermes beziehen, sind häufiger belegt, ebenso solche mit dem Element -θαλής. Allerdings ist die Verbindung Hermothales (“der durch Hermes blühende”) bislang singulär.

Auf Fragment L.87.AE.120.11 sieht man einen Teil der Beine eines Satyrn, zwischen denen die Inschrift ΚΡΑΤΑΙ[zu lesen ist (Abb. 2c). Vermutlich handelt es sich um eine Namensbeischrift. Zu denken wäre an den Namen Krataios (“der Starke”) oder vielleicht—wie Neumann vorschlägt—an einen zweistämmigen Namen wie etwa Krataimenes.¹⁰

Fragment L.87.AE.120.12 gibt das Bein eines nach links gehenden Satyrn wieder sowie den Rest eines Gegenstandes. Von der Beischrift ist ΠΙΣΙΟΣ erhalten (Abb. 2d). Die Ergänzung ist hier unsicher, da bislang keine Personennamen belegt sind, die auf -πιος ausgehen. Andernfalls dürfte auch kaum ein anderer Buchstabe als Pi gemeint sein, da er in dieser Form auch beim Namen Molpaios vorkommt. Wäre der Buchstabe ein Rho, so wäre nach Neumann etwa an Charisios zu denken. Der Unterkörper der Figur vor dem Satyrn—mit langem Gewand und Schuhen—dürfte zu Dionysos gehören.

Nur selten ist der Thiasos bei der Hephaistosrückführung namentlich benannt. Außer dem beschriebenen Lydoskrater in Malibu sind auf der Françoisvase SILENOI (1) und NYPHAI (1) zugegen. Auf einem Glockenkrater im Louvre von 440 v. Chr. begegnen bei der Rückführung die Mänade KOMODIA (1) und der Satyr MARSYAS (4). Der Satyr SIMOS (11) ist bei der Wiedergabe dieses Themas auf einem Kelchkrater der Polygnot-Gruppe anwesend, und der Satyr KOMOS (12) auf einem Chous des Eretria-Malers in New York.

Auch auf attisch rotfigurigen Vasen des Getty-Museums finden sich Satyr- und Mänadennamen, so ein Satyrname auf einer fragmentierten Schale von 510 v. Chr. (Abb. 3), die Dietrich von Bothmer dem Euergides-Maler zuweist.¹¹ Vom Innenbild sind nur die Füße eines Hahnes erhalten. Die eine Außenseite zeigte Theseus mit dem marathonschen Stier, während auf der Gegenseite wohl ein dionysisches Thema dargestellt war. Denn rechts von der Henkelpalmette sind geringe Reste vom Rücken eines nach rechts gehenden Satyrn erhalten, der einen gefüllten Weinschlauch geschultert hat. Daß hier ein Satyr dargestellt war, läßt sich aus der Inschrift ΒΡΙΑΧΟΣ schließen, die über der Palmette verläuft und oberhalb des Weinschlauches endet. Denn Briakchos ist uns in zwei weiteren Vaseninschriften aus spätarchaischer Zeit belegt, von denen die des Gołuchów-Malers früher als unser Stück (um 530




Abb. 2a. Fragment eines Kolonettenkraters (um 550/540 v. Chr.). Inschriften: ΟΝΟΣ, ΟΥΚΑΛΕΓΟΝ, ΜΟΛΠΑΙΟΣ und ΦΙΛΟΠΟΣΙ. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.4 und L.87.AE.120.5.



Abb. 2b. Fragment des Kolonettenkraters Abb. 2a. Inschriften: EOI[und HPMOΘAΛEΣ. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.2.



Abb. 2c. Fragment des Kolonettenkraters Abb. 2a. Inschrift: KPATAI[. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.11.




Abb. 2d. Fragment des Kolonettenkraters Abb. 2a. Inschrift: ΠΙΣΙΟΣ. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.12.




Abb. 3. Fragment einer Schale des Euergides-Malers (um 510 v. Chr.). Außenseite. Inschrift: ΒΡΙΑΧΟΣ über Palmette und Weinschlauch. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.305.2.

v. Chr.) anzusetzen ist.¹² Zudem paßt dieser Name (vgl. Hesychios und *Etymologicum Magnum* s.v. Βρίαχος. ἡ βριαρῶς ἰακχάζουσα “gewaltig schreiend [in der bakchischen Ekstase]”) gut zum Gefolge des Dionysos. Wie ein Fragment aus einer unbekanntem Tragödie des Sophokles zeigt, war Briakchos gleichermaßen ein Mänadennamen¹³ und ist als solcher vielleicht auch in einer Vaseninschrift zu ergänzen.¹⁴ Bei Satyr- und Mänadennamen, die mehr als einmal in Beischriften vorkommen, zeigt es sich, daß diese meist—bis auf wenige Ausnahmen—nur über einen bestimmten kurzen Zeitraum hin belegt sind, wie hier etwa alle drei bislang bekannten Briakchos-Inschriften zwischen 530 und 510 v. Chr. entstanden sind. Offenbar unterlagen auch diese Namen einer gewissen “Mode”.

Weitere Satyr- und Mänadennamen finden sich auf einem fragmentierten Deckel von 490 v. Chr., auf welchem Jiri Frel die Malerhand des Onesimos erkennt.¹⁵ Dem niedrigen Bildfeld gemäß, das durch das Deckelrund vorgegeben ist, ist das Gefolge des Dionysos sitzend bzw. liegend oder kriechend dargestellt. Daraus und aus den Attributen (Musikinstrumente, Kantharos, Weinschlauch) ergibt sich zugleich das Thema der Darstellung: die Satyrn und Mänaden sitzen beim Symposion. Konrad Schauenburg hat 1973 die relativ wenigen Wiedergaben der Silene beim Symposion zusammengestellt, zu denen nun diese reizvolle Darstellung des Onesimos hinzutritt.¹⁶

Fragment 81.AE.214.A.4 (Abb. 4a) zeigt eine sitzende Mänade. Sie trägt einen feingefältelten Ärmelchiton und hat einen Efeukranz im Haar. In der linken Hand hält sie ihr Barbiton, die rechte liegt locker auf ihrem angewinkelten rechten Knie. In ihrem Rücken ist der Rest eines gemusterten Kissens zu erkennen. Sie saß wohl auf dem Boden, wie auch für die übrigen hier dargestellten Satyrn und Mänaden anzunehmen ist.

Der Rest des stabartigen Gegenstandes neben ihrem rechten Bein dürfte zu einem Thyrsos gehören. Um diesen herum ringelt sich eine gefleckte Schlange. Der Thyrsos deutet darauf hin, daß die Symposiastinnen hier wirkliche Mänaden sind. Entweder war die Barbitonspielerin nicht mit einer Namensbeischrift versehen, oder die Beischrift befand sich in dem nicht erhaltenen Teil über ihrem Kopf.

Der Mänade auf dem weiteren Fragment (81.AE.214.A.5) ist über ihrem Kopf ΚΑΛΕ beigeschrieben (Abb. 4b). Sie ist wie ihre Genossin als sitzende Musikantin dargestellt. Auch sie trägt den gefältelten Chiton und ist efeubekrönt. Mit vollen Backen bläst sie in den Doppelaulos, den sie mit beiden Händen hält. Es läßt sich nicht klären, ob Kale hier nur ein Hinweis auf die schöne Mänade oder wirklich als Namensbeischrift aufzufassen ist. Vielleicht trifft letzteres zu, da auch die anderen Symposiasten hier teils namentlich benannt sind. Als Mänadennamen ist Kale sonst nur noch auf drei Vasenbildern ab dem Reichen Stil belegt.¹⁷ Auch dort scheint es sich wegen der Anwesenheit anderer benannter Satyrn und Mänaden um einen Namen zu handeln. Auf unserem Onesimos-Deckel befand sich hinter Kale ein ihr den Rücken kehrender Satyr, der sitzend oder halb liegend dargestellt war. Erhalten sind sein bärtiger Kopf mit der efeubekröntem Stirnglatze und seine erhobene rechte Hand. Rechts darüber sieht man den Rest einer Thyrsospitze. Eine Namensbeischrift ist nicht erkennbar oder nicht erhalten.

Ein Satyr und eine Mänade liegend bzw. sitzend und dabei einander den Rücken kehrend sind auch auf dem weiteren Fragment 81.AE.214.A.2 dargestellt (Abb. 4c). Von der Mänade sind Kopf und Teil des Oberkörpers erhalten. Sie sitzt im Profil nach links und ist nicht bekrönt, sondern trägt ein Band im hochgesteckten Haar. Um die Schultern hat sie ein Pardelfell gebunden, dessen Fellmuster fast wie Efeublätter aussieht. Ihre Arme sind auf Fragment 88.AE.29.3 erhalten. Die linke Hand ist erhoben, mit der rechten hält sie einer Gefährtin, von der nur noch eine Hand zu sehen ist, eine Flöte hin. Vor ihr steht ein Reh. Der Rest des länglichen Gegenstandes neben ihr gehört wohl zu einem Thyrsos. Ihr ist der Name ΔΟΠΑ beigeschrieben (auf Fragment 81.AE.214.A.2). Es läßt sich nicht mehr ausmachen, ob dies der ganze Name ist, also ein Kurzname vergleichbar dem bekannten Nereidennamen Δωρίς bzw. dem Namen Δωρώ,¹⁸ oder ob es ein Vollname war, der im nicht erhaltenen Teil des Deckels weiterlief. Doch scheint es mir in jedem Fall, daß der Name kein Vorderglied gehabt haben kann, da der Platz zwischen dem Kopf der Mä-

nade und der Bildfeldbegrenzung für weitere Buchstaben zu niedrig ist. Das Vorderglied müßte dann allenfalls vor dem Kopf der Mänade gestanden haben. Zwar wäre auch an einen Namen mit Hinterglied im weggebrochenen Teil zu denken, doch ist Dora ohne weiteres als Kurzform eines Vollnamens möglich.

Von dem Satyrn in ihrem Rücken ist nur der zurückgelehnte Kopf erhalten. Wie sein bereits beschriebener Gefährte ist er bärtig und trägt einen Efeukranz auf seiner Stirnglatze. Vielleicht war er mit einer Namensbeischrift versehen. Vor seiner Nase nach rechts laufend sind die Buchstaben EHE[erhalten. Ein ähnliches Problem stellt sich bei einer fragmentierten Schale in Theben, die ebenfalls von Onesimos bemalt ist. Hier ist vor dem Mund eines heranschleichenden Satyrn noch der Inschriftrest EXΛ[erhalten.¹⁹ Doch wird sich das Rätsel, ob es sich dabei um einen Namen oder nur um einen Ausruf handelt, mangels weiterer Buchstaben weder bei EHE... noch bei ECHL... lösen lassen.

Auf dem größten der Deckelfragmente des Onesimos im Getty-Museum (81.AE.214.A.3) sind noch drei Satyrn zu sehen (Abb. 4d). Der Satyr rechts ist am Boden hockend dargestellt. Zwar ist sein Kopf nicht erhalten, doch sind weitere Teile seines Körpers auf den Fragmenten 85.AE.328 und 81.AE.214.A.12 zu sehen. Hinter seinem Rücken hängt ein Weinschlauch mit der Aufschrift ΚΑΛΟΣ. Am linken Rand sind Schultern und frontal gerichteter Kopf eines liegenden Satyrn (bärtig mit Stirnglatze) erhalten, sowie oberhalb Reste eines Kantharos. Auf diesen Satyrn kriecht der mittlere zu, der als einziger fast ganz erhalten ist. Sein im Profil dargestellter Kopf mit dem geöffneten Mund befindet sich nah am Kopf seines Gefährten, so daß es den Anschein hat, als wolle er ihm etwas ins Ohr flüstern. Der Satyr ist nackt. Seine langen, über den Rücken fallenden Locken stehen in reizvollem Kontrast zu seiner Stirnglatze. Oberhalb der beiden Köpfe ist die Inschrift ΙΑΕΒΟΝ zu lesen, die sicher zu Phlebon ergänzt werden darf und der Name eines Satyrn, vermutlich des Liegenden, ist. Phlebon selbst ist als Satyrname zuvor noch nicht belegt, wohl aber kennen wir andere Satyrnamen aus spätrarchaischer Zeit, in denen φλέψ (das männliche Zeugungsglied) Bestandteil des Namens ist. So verwendete der Vasenmaler Oltos zweimal den Namen PHLEBIPPOS²⁰ und Phintias den Namen PHLEBODOKOS.²¹ Weiter ist auf einer fragmentierten Schale des Oltos nur ΦΛΕ[erhalten.²² Hier wäre nach Ausweis unseres Onesimos-Deckels im Getty-Museum jetzt auch die Ergänzung zu PHLEBON zu erwägen. In jedem Fall ist ein mit φλέψ gebildeter Name charakteristisch für die

spätarchaische Zeit.

Auf einer attisch rotfigurigen fragmentierten Kalpis von 480 v. Chr., die Marion True dem Kleophrades-Maler zuweist,²³ sind im Schulterbild eine schlafende Mänade und ein masturbierender Satyr dargestellt, von dem im wesentlichen der Oberkörper erhalten ist (Abb. 5). Er sitzt mit seitlich angewinkelten Beinen am Boden. Seinen linken Arm hat er erstaunt erhoben und auch sein Blick ist nach oben gerichtet. Zwar hat es sich gezeigt, daß die über seinem Kopf nach oben gehende Inschrift kein Name, sondern ein Ausruf ist, doch ist dieser so reizvoll, daß er hier kurz besprochen sei. Denn ΔΥΕΛΙΟ liefert den Grund der Überraschung des Satyrn. Offenbar hat er zuviel getrunken und sieht jetzt doppelt. So erblickt er nun "zwei Sonnen", δύο ἡλίω, was der Schreiber richtig in der Dualform wiedergegeben hat, wobei zwischen δύο und ἡλίω eine Krasis stattgefunden hat.

Bislang nicht belegte Satyr- und Mänadennamen weisen auch attisch rotfigurige Vasenfragmente der Sammlung Herbert A. Cahn in Basel auf, die hier dank der Liebenswürdigkeit des Besitzers kurz vorgestellt werden dürfen. Zunächst sind Fragmente einer niederen Schale zu nennen (HC 432), die Cahn dem Sotades-Maler zuweist. Erhalten ist auf einer Außenseite (Abb. 6a) ein nach links rennender Satyr, der eine fliehende Frau verfolgt. Die Beischriften nennen den Satyrn ΕΡΠΙΟΝ, die Frau ΝΥΜΦΕ. Der Satyrname ist von ἔρπω "langsam gehen, schleichen, kriechen" (auch von Tieren, vgl. ἔρπειον) gebildet. Er scheint hier nicht ganz passend, da der Satyr nicht hinter der Nymphe her schleicht, sondern sich in schnellem Lauf befindet. Vielleicht ist es hier parodierend gemeint, daß der Satyr "Schleicher" benannt ist. Von der Gegenseite (Abb. 6b–c) sind drei Figuren erhalten. Dargestellt ist ebenfalls eine dionysische Szene. In der Mitte tanzt Dionysos (Beischrift). Er wird von zwei Satyrn flankiert. Der Rechte (Abb. 6c) spielt den Doppelaulos zum Tanz. Eine Namensbeischrift ist nicht erkennbar. Der Satyr links (Abb. 6b) ist in einer Tanzbewegung begriffen, bei der er seinen Oberkörper nach vorn neigt, seine Arme ausbreitet und sein Gesicht in Vorderansicht wendet. Er heißt ΟΙΝΑΡΕΥΣ, ein von οἴναρον "Weinblatt, Weinrebe" abgeleiteter Name. Oinareus ist – wie Erpon – hier erstmals als Satyrname bezeugt und gehört zur Kategorie der Namen, die von οἶνος "Wein" gebildet sind. Diese sind treffend für den dionysischen Thiasos und begegnen auch für Mänaden wie z.B. ΟΙΝΑΝΤΗ (s. ΟΙΝΑΝΤΗ 1 und 2).

Das Fragment eines von Cahn dem Dinos-Maler zugewiesenen Glockenkraters (HC 1623, Abb. 7) zeigt den mit einem Peplos bekleideten Oberkörper einer



Abb. 4a. Deckelfragment vom Maler Onesimos (um 490 v. Chr.). Mänade mit Barbiton. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.214.A.4.



Abb. 4b. Fragment des Deckels Abb. 4a. Mänade mit Inschrift KAAE. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.214.A.5.

frontal stehenden Mänade, die ihren Kopf nach links gewendet hat. Ihre gelockten Haare fallen in langen Strähnen auf ihre Schulter. Über der Stirn trägt sie einen Efeukranz. Die Mänade hielt einen Thyrsosstab, von dem links ein Teil erhalten ist. Das fein gezeichnete Gesicht mit dem nachdenklich-besinnlichen Ausdruck und ihre ruhige Körperhaltung stehen im Gegensatz zu ihrem Namen. Sie heißt ΔΙΝΑ (vgl. δινέω “wild wirbelnd” und δίνη “Wirbelwind”), was eigentlich besser zu einer ekstatischen Tänzerin passen würde. Doch ist der hier erstmals belegte Mänadename allgemein für eine Thiasotin gut geeignet, da er einen Wesenszug der Mänaden treffend charakterisiert.

Weitere, bereits bekannte Satyr- und Mänadennamen der Sammlung Cahn finden sich auf einem Kelchkraterfragment (HC 436) mit Athena und Marsyas, bei dem die Inschrift ΜΑΡΣ[erhalten ist (s. MARSYAS 5), und auf Fragmenten eines Skyphos aus dem Meidiaskreis (HC 541), der auf der Rückseite eine dionysische Szene zeigt. Dionysos ist hier von den beiden Mänaden Opora (ΟΠΟΡΑ) und Oinante (ΙΝΑΝΘΕ) umgeben, welche einen Gast im Thiasos des Gottes willkommen heißen (s. OINANTHE 2; OΠΟΡΑ 2). Die beiden Frauen sind nicht als wilde Mänaden dargestellt, sondern als Personifikationen von Weinblüte (Oinante) und Weinlese (vgl. Opora als Herbststube).

Die Satyr- und Mänadennamen auf den Vasen im Getty-Museum und auf den Fragmenten der Sammlung Cahn, sowie die Zusammenstellung weiterer Namen, die nach dem Erscheinen von Fränkels Buch bekannt wurden, bildeten den Anlaß, hier eine neue Namensliste herauszugeben. Es hat sich gezeigt, daß

Namensbeischriften hauptsächlich auf Vasenbildern verbreitet sind. Nur wenige Darstellungen des dionysischen Gefolges außerhalb der Vasenmalerei sind mit Inschriften versehen. Zu nennen sind hier etwa torentische Denkmäler (ERIOPE 1, KOMODIA 5, OINA 1, OΠΟΡΑ 6, PHALLODIA 1, TRIETERIS 1) oder Reliefs (BAT... 1, ITALOS 1, SATYROI 1, TO... 1; EUROPE 1, PAIDIA 7) und plastische Figuren (DITHYRAMBOS 2, NYKTERINOS 1; KOMODIA 4, TRAGODIA 5, SKIRTOS 5). Auf Mosaiken begegnen die Satyrnamen MARON 1–2, MARSYAS 9, NEKTAR 1 (Satyr?), OINOS 3, SATYROS 2–3, SILENOS 7, SKIRTOS 2–3, TROPHEUS 1–2 und die Mänaden AMBROSIA 1, ANATROPHE 1, BAKCHE 3–4 und OΠΟΡΑ 5. MAI[NOMENOS (?) 1, SATYROI 2 und INO 1 sind auf einer Formschüssel anzutreffen (Abb. 8a–c). Auf Wandbehängen sind LASIOS 3, LENAIOI 1, SATYROS 1, SKIRTOS 4; BOTRYOCHARIS 1, INO 2, LYDE 1, und MEA 1 überliefert. Ein neugefundenes Mosaik in Israel mit zahlreichen Szenen aus der vita des Dionysos hat ebenfalls Namensbeischriften bei Satyrn und Mänaden, doch liegt noch keine Publikation der Inschriften vor.²⁴

Selten sind Satyr- und Mänadennamen auch auf etruskischen und italischen Denkmälern. Dabei sind aus dem Griechischen die Satyrnamen MARSUAS, SILANUS und SIME entlehnt.²⁵ Der Name EBRIOS ist aus lateinisch *ebrius* (betrunken) entstanden.²⁶ Die anderen bislang bekannten Namen sind etruskische Bildungen.

In kaiserzeitlichen Darstellungen mit lateinischen Beischriften sind die (griechischen) Gattungsnamen SILLENUS und SATUR parallel bezeugt.²⁷ Doch sind ins-




Abb. 4c. Fragment des Deckels Abb. 4a. Mänade mit Inschrift ΔΟΡΑ und Satyr mit Inschrift ΕΗΕ[. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.214.A.2 (rechts) und 88.AE.29.3 (links).



Abb. 4d. Fragment des Deckels Abb. 4a. Drei Satyrn. Inschriften: ΚΑΛΟΣ und ΙΑΕΒΟΝ. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.214.A.3 (links) und 81.AE.214.A.12 und 85.AE.328 (rechts).

gesamt lateinische Namensbeischriften für das Gefolge des Dionysos nur selten zu finden. Auf den römischen Stuckreliefs, auf denen die genannten Inschriften SILENUS und SATUR zu lesen sind, ist auch der Frauenname ANTIOPE bezeugt. Doch wird hier die als Mänade dargestellte mythische Heroine gemeint sein.

Doch zurück zu den griechischen Inschriften. Die relativ wenigen Beischriften auf attisch schwarzfigurigen Vasen wurden bereits oben genannt.²⁸ Außerhalb der attischen Vasenmalerei begegnen im 6. Jh. noch Namen auf korinthischen (s. DASON 1, SIMOS 1) und chalkidischen Vasen (ANTIES 1, DASON 2, DORKIS 1–2, HIPPAIOS 1, HIPPOS 1, MEGAS 1, OFATIES 1, PORIS 1, SIMIS 1, SIMOS 2–3; CHORA 1,

FIO 1–2, KLYTO 1, MOLPE 1, MYRO 1, NAIS 1, PHOIBE 1, XANTHO 1–2).

Auf den attisch rotfigurigen Vasen findet sich der größte Teil der Inschriften. Zwar verteilen sich diese über den Zeitraum vom späten 6. Jh. und über das 5. Jh. hindurch, doch lassen sich Schwerpunkte in der spätarchaischen Zeit und im Reichen Stil feststellen. Auf den Vasen des 4. Jhs. kommen Satyr- und Mänadennamen seltener vor. Auch in der unteritalischen Vasenmalerei begegnen nur vereinzelt Namen (EUMAS 1, MARSYAS 8, ONNASEUAS 1, SIMOS 21, SKIRTOS 1, TYBRON 1–2; AMPELIS 1, EUNOMIE 1, EUTHYMIE 1, OPORA 4, THALIA 3).

Zu den Namen selbst läßt sich feststellen, daß diese



Abb. 5. Kalpisfragment des Kleophrades-Malers (um 480 v. Chr.). Satyr mit Inschrift ΔΒΕΛΙΟ. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 85.AE.188.

teils auch als Menschnennamen bezeugt sind. Mit Vorliebe werden jedoch Namen verwendet, die Eigenschaften und Aussehen der Satyrn und Mänaden charakterisieren, so etwa ihre Vorliebe für Musik und Tanz (CHORILLOS 1–4, EUPNOUS 1, MOLPAIOS 1, SIKINNOs 1–4, SKIRTOS 1–5, TERPAULOS 1–2; CHORO 1–4, EUMELPE 1, MOLPE 1 usw.), ihre Trinkfreudigkeit (HEDYOINOS 1, LENAIOs 1, OINAREUS 1, OINOPION 1–2, OINOS 1–2; BOTRYOCHARIS 1, PHILOPOS... 1 usw.) und sexuelle Anspielungen (PHLEBIPPOS 1, PHLEBODOKOS 1, PHLEBON 1; CHOIROs 1 usw.). Auf das Aussehen nehmen Namen wie SIMOS (1–21) und SIME (1) Bezug. Oft hängen die Namen auch mit dem dionysischen Bereich zusammen wie BAKCHE (1–3), BRIAKCHOS (1–4), HIAKCHOS (1), KISSO (1), KISSOS (1–7), KOMOS (1–16). Es begegnen ferner Personifikationen dramatischer Gattungen (DITHYRAMBOS 1–2; KOMODIA 1–4, TRAGODIA 1–5) und von Festfeiern (PANNYCHIS 1, TRIETERIS 1). Daneben gibt es auch Namen, die die jeweilige Tätigkeit in der betreffenden Darstellung ausdrücken (ECHON 1, DROMIS 1, LEPSIS 1, UKALEGON 1). Vereinzelt sind geographische Namen

anzutreffen (EUROPE 1; DELOS 1, ITALOS 1, LEMNOS 1). Selten sind Zusammensetzungen mit Götternamen wie etwa HERMOTHALES (1).

Die Bezeichnung SILENOI als Gattungsname ist zuerst auf der Françoisvase belegt, in der Einzahl SILENOS ebenfalls ab dem 6. Jh. und danach auf rotfigurigen Vasen des 5. Jhs. (s. SILENOS 1–6). Dagegen kommt die Bezeichnung SATYROI (1) zuerst am Pergamonaltar vor, für die Einzahl SATYROS (1–3) lassen sich nur spätantike Belege anführen.²⁹ Allerdings ist in lateinischen Inschriften SATUR bereits im 2. Jh. n. Chr. belegt. Die Bevorzugung von SILENOS auf attischen Vasen hängt wohl damit zusammen, daß dies die in Athen übliche Bezeichnung für das Dionysosgefolge war, während die Benennung SATYROS auf der Peloponnes verbreitet war. Zwar übernahmen die Athener mit der Einführung des Satyrspiels durch Pratinas aus Phlious (auf der Peloponnes) auch die Bezeichnung Σάτυροι und δράμα σατυρικόν, behielten aber, wie die Vaseninschriften zeigen, für die Trabanten des Dionysos ihre althergebrachte Bezeichnung SILENOI bei.³⁰

Die Benennung MAINAS für eine Mänade begegnet




Abb. 6a. Fragment einer Schale des Sotades-Malers (um 470/460 v. Chr.). Seite A. Satyr mit Beischrift ΕΡΠΙΟΝ und Mänade mit Beischrift ΝΥΜΦΕ. Basel, Sammlung Herbert A. Cahn HC 432. Photos: H. A. Cahn.



Abb. 6b. Fragment der Schale Abb. 6a. Seite B. Dionysos mit Inschrift ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ und Satyr mit Inschrift ΟΙΝΑΡΕΥΣ.

gesichert erst um 460/450 v. Chr. und ist auch nur auf attisch rotfigurigen Vasen belegt.³¹ Dagegen finden wir hier schon um 450 v. Chr. den Namen SATYRA (1). Dies bedeutet, daß die weibliche Namensform in Vaseninschriften vor der männlichen Form SATYROS anzutreffen ist, was sicher mit der Bevorzugung von SILENOS für die männlichen Mitglieder des Thiasos zusammenhängt. Ab 420 v. Chr. kommt dann auch als weibliche Form von Bakchos, BAKCHE (1–2) vor.

Die meisten Namen sind nur einmal inschriftlich überliefert. Zu den Namen, die öfter als dreimal vorkommen, gehören bei den Satyrn: BRIAKCHOS (4 mal), CHORILLOS (4 mal), KISSOS (7 mal), KOMOS (16 mal), MARSYAS (9 mal), SIKINOS (4 mal), SILENOS (6 mal), SIMOS (21 mal), SKIRTOS (5 mal), TERPON (4 mal) und bei den Mänaden: BAKCHE (4 mal), CHORO (4 mal), KALE (4 mal), KOMODIA (5 mal), MAINAS (9 mal), OPORA (6 mal), PAIDIA (7 mal) und TRAGODIA (5 mal). Dies bedeutet, daß SIMOS und KOMOS, gefolgt von KISSOS, die beliebtesten Satyrnamen waren und MAINAS und PAIDIA, gefolgt von den Personifikationen, die häufigsten Namen bei den Mänaden.

Bei den Namen, die öfter als einmal vorkommen, zeigt sich, daß diese meist nur innerhalb einer begrenzten Zeit in Mode waren. So sind alle Inschriften mit BRIAKCHOS, TERPAULOS, TERPON und die mit PHLEB... gebildeten Namen nur in spätarchaischer Zeit belegt. KOMOS ist erst nach 450 v. Chr. überliefert, CHORILLOS ab 440 v. Chr. und HEDYOINOS und KISSOS ab dem Reichen Stil. Dabei begegnet KISSOS mit Vorliebe beim Eretria-Maler und seinem Kreis. Einzig der beliebte Name SIMOS läßt sich vom 6. bis 4. Jh. nachweisen. SKIRTOS begegnet erst ab



Abb. 6c. Fragment der Schale Abb. 6a. Seite B. Satyr mit Doppelflöte.



Abb. 7. Glockenkraterfragment des Dinos-Malers (um 430/420 v. Chr.). Mänade mit Inschrift ΔΙΝΑ. Basel, Sammlung Herbert A. Cahn HC 1623. Photo: H. A. Cahn.



Abb. 8a. Formschüssel (2. Jh. v. Chr.). Inschriften: INΩ, MAI[- (= MAINOMENOS?) und CATYPOI. Pella, Archäologisches Museum 81.97. Photos: G. M. Akamatis.



Abb. 8b. Formschüssel Abb. 8a. Inschrift: AIG[- (= AIGIPAN?).




Abb. 8c. Zeichnung der Formschüssel Abb. 8a. Inschriften:]PIAMBOΣ (= ΘPIAMBOΣ), CATYPOI, MAI[, INΩ und AIG[. Die Zeichnung verdanke ich G. M. Akamatis.

dem 4. Jh. v. Chr. und dann auf spätantiken Denkmälern. Bei den Mänaden kommt der Name KISINE nur in spätarchaischer Zeit und nur bei dem Maler Phintias vor; MAINAS-Inschriften gibt es ab 450 v. Chr., METHYSE nur um die Mitte des 5. Jhs.; TRAGODIA ist seit der Polygnot-Gruppe als Mänadennamen bekannt, und ab dem Reichen Stil kommen BAKCHE, CHORO, OPORA und PAIDIA vor.

In der Regel begegnen benannte Satyrn und Mänaden in Darstellungen des Thiasos oder aus dem Mythos des Dionysos wie Kindheit, Rückführung des Hephaistos usw. bis zur Gigantomachie (EU... 1, PAIDIA 4, SATYROI 1). Seltener ist das Dionysosgefolge in anderen Sagenkreisen benannt, so etwa in der Heraklessage (BAT... 1, HYBRIS 1, ITALOS 1, SKOPAS 1; EUROPE 1). Bei der Ausfahrt des Triptolemos ist der Satyr KOMOS (3) anzutreffen, und den Feuerbringer Prometheus umgeben die Satyrn KOMOS (6), SIKINNIS (1) und SIMOS (13). Der Geburt der Helena wohnt der Papposilen TYBRON (1) bei.

Teilweise sind die Namen literarisch bezeugt. Es würde hier zu weit führen, auch die literarisch überlieferten Satyr- und Mänadennamen zusammenzustellen. Doch zeigt es sich, daß die Individualisierung der Satyrn und Mänaden durch Namen in der Bildkunst im 5. Jh. v. Chr. ihre Blütezeit hat,

während in der Literatur der Höhepunkt viel später liegt: Die meisten Namen überliefert in der Spätantike Nonnos in seinen *Dionysiaka* bei der Aufzählung der Satyrn und Mänaden, welche Dionysos auf seinem indischen Feldzug begleiten.

Abschließend sei insgesamt bemerkt, daß Namen, die etwas Negatives bedeuten oder vulgär und obszön sind, sich bei Satyrn wesentlich häufiger finden als bei Mänaden, deren Namen dagegen viel öfter weibliche Anmut ausdrücken. So nimmt es nicht wunder, wenn für einen Satyrn SIMOS (stupnsasig) 21 mal bezeugt ist, während nur eine Mänade SIME heißt, dafür aber häufiger Namen vorkommen, die -ANTHE (Blüte) als Hinterglied haben. Offenbar waren die Vasenmaler bei den Mänadennamen zurückhaltender, was eigentlich damit in Widerspruch steht, daß das grausame Zerreißen der Tiere meist nur bei Mänaden, nicht bei Satyrn dargestellt wird. Selbst bei den von den Vasenmalern mit MAINAS benannten Mänaden passen Tätigkeit und Attribute häufig nicht zum Namen. So beziehen sich also die Namen der Mänaden anders als die der Satyrn nicht auf deren Tätigkeit und Eigenschaften, sondern beschränken sich auf das körperliche Aussehen, das denen der anderen Frauen gleicht. Doch wäre auch zu überlegen, ob es sich bei Mänaden dann vielleicht um euphemistische Namen handelt.

Institut für Archäologie
der Universität Würzburg

ANMERKUNGEN

Abkürzungen:	
Beazley, <i>Add²</i>	T. H. Carpenter, <i>Beazley Addenda: Second Additional References to ABV, ARV² and Paralipomena</i> (Oxford, 1989).
Boardman, <i>ARFV</i>	J. Boardman, <i>Athenian Red Figure Vases: A Handbook</i> (London, 1975).
Bruhn, <i>Oltos</i>	A. Bruhn, <i>Oltos and Early Red-Figure Vase Painting</i> (Kopenhagen, 1943).
Daszewski	W. A. Daszewski, <i>Dionysos der Erlöser</i> (Mainz, 1985).
Fränkel	Ch. Fränkel, <i>Satyr- und Bakchennamen auf Vasenbildern</i> (Halle, 1912).
Froning	H. Froning, <i>Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei in Athen</i> (Würzburg, 1971).
HPN	F. Bechtel, <i>Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit</i> (Halle, 1917).
Immerwahr	H. R. Immerwahr, <i>Attic Script: A Survey</i> (Oxford, 1990).
Lezzi-Hafter, <i>Eretria</i>	A. Lezzi-Hafter, <i>Der Eretria-Maler</i> (Mainz, 1988).
Schefold, <i>Göttersage</i>	K. Schefold, <i>Die Göttersage in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst</i> (München, 1981).

1. s. hier Addenda, s.v. SILENOI 1.

2. s. hier Addenda, s.v. SILENOS 1.

3. Für die Erlaubnis, die Getty-Vasen mit Satyr- und Mänadennamen hier besprechen und teils auch abbilden zu dürfen, danke ich Marion True aufs herzlichste. Kenneth Hamma schulde ich für viele

Auskünfte besonderen Dank, sowie Benedicte Gilman für die redaktionelle Betreuung.

4. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 31.11.11, *ABV* 108.5; *Paralipomena*, S. 43; Beazley, *Add²*, S. 29; M. A. Tiverios, *Ho Lydos kai to ergo tou* (Athen, 1976), Taf. 53ff.; K. Schefold, *Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Kunst* (München, 1978), S. 31–32, Abb. 23–24; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos Nr. 563 mit Abb.; *LIMC* 4 (1988), s.v. Hephaistos Nr. 138a mit Abb.

5. Zum Reittier des Hephaistos (teilweise auch Esel): J. Wiesner, *AA*, 1969, S. 531ff.; H. Hoffmann, in: D. Metzler, B. Otto und C. Müller-Wirth, Hrsg., *Antidoron*. Festschrift Jürgen Thimme (Karlsruhe, 1983), S. 61 mit Anm. 20 und passim. Reiter auf Maultier mit der Beischrift ONOS: korinthische Amphora, Berlin 1652, F. Lorber, *Inschriften auf korinthischen Vasen* (Berlin, 1979), S. 59–60, Nr. 88, Taf. 19.

6. Attisch rotfiguriger Kantharos, Paris, Cabinet des Médailles R 851, *ARV²* 1251.41 (Eretria-Maler); *LIMC* 1 (1981), s.v. Achilleus Nr. 204 mit Abb.; Lezzi-Hafter, *Eretria*, S. 352, Nr. 285, Taf. 184. Achilleus und Ukalegon nehmen Abschied von Agamemnon und Kymothea.

7. s. hier Addenda, s.v. EUMELPE 1 und MOLPE 1.

8. φιλοσοφία ist seit Xenophon (*Mem.*, I.2.22) belegt. Zwar wäre dies als Personennamen vorstellbar, doch scheint es sich bei dem Buchstabenrest hinter dem Sigma eher um ein rundes Zeichen zu handeln, weshalb man auch Φιλοσοφώ erwägen könnte.

9. Attisch schwarzfigurige Darstellungen von Satyrn ohne Schweife: F. Brommer, *Satyroi* (Würzburg, 1937), S. 26, 53–54, Anm. 15.

10. Vgl. *HPN*, S. 256.
11. Malibu 86.AE.305.1–2. Lit. s. hier Addenda, s.v. BRIAKCHOS 3.
12. s. hier Addenda, s.v. BRIAKCHOS 1 und 2.
13. Vgl. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Bd. 4 (Göttingen, 1977), Fr. 779 (Radt).
14. s. hier Addenda, s.v. BRIAKCHOS 4.
15. Malibu 81.AE.214. Die Fragmente sind erwähnt im *GettyMusJ* 14 (1986), S. 191, Nr. 48, mit weiteren zugehörigen Fragmenten.
16. K. Schauenburg, *JdI* 88 (1973), S. 1ff.; A. Lezzi-Hafter, in *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, Bd. 1 (1983), S. 102 (Mänaden beim Gelage); s. weiter jetzt auch A. Schöne, *Der Thiasos* (Göteborg, 1987), S. 129ff.
17. s. hier Addenda, s.v. KALE 2–4.
18. Zwar entfällt der bei Fränkel, S. 14, 82 B aufgeführte Mänadenname DORO als Parallele (s. dazu hier Addenda, s.v. DORO), doch ist der Name selbst bezeugt für eine Göttin der Sykophanten bei Aristophanes, *Eq.*, 529 mit Scholia.
19. s. hier Addenda, s.v. ECHL... 1.
20. s. hier Addenda, s.v. PHLEBIPPOS 1 und 2.
21. s. hier Addenda, s.v. PHLEBODOKOS 1.
22. s. hier Addenda, s.v. PHLE... 1.
23. Malibu 85.AE.188. Erwähnt: *GettyMusJ* 14 (1986), S. 192, Nr. 52, mit weiteren zugehörigen Fragmenten.
24. s. hier Addenda, s.v. BAKCHE 4.
25. MARSUAS: Bronzespiegel, praenestinish, Rom, Villa Giulia 24898, Helbig⁴, Bd. 3, Nr. 2681 (Dohrn). SILANUS: 1) Cistendeckel, praenestinish, New York, Pierpont Morgan Library BL-64, G. Bordenache Battaglia, *Le Ciste prenestine*, Bd. 1, Corpus 1 (Florenz, 1979), S. 146, Nr. 45, Taf. 186, 190, 194; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Ebrios Nr. 1 mit Abb. 2) Ciste, praenestinish, Poughkeepsie, New York, Vassar College Classical Museum 54.1a–b, I. S. Ryberg, *AJA* 47 (1943), S. 217ff., Abb. 1ff.; G. Foerst, *Die Gravierungen der pränestinischen Cisten* (Rom, 1978), S. 166ff., Nr. 63, Taf. 45a–b; *LIMC* 2 (1984), s.v. Artemis/Artumes Nr. 68; ebenda s.v. Artemis/Diana Nr. 297; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dioskuroi/Tinas Cliniar Nr. 21; hier nur SILA[erhalten. SIME: 1) Bronzespiegel, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art G.R. 135, G. M. A. Richter, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Greek, Etruscan and Roman Bronzes* (New York, 1915), S. 274–275, Nr. 798; G. A. Mansuelli, *StEtr* 19 (1946/1947), S. 53; C. de Simone, *Die griechischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen*, Bd. 1 (Wiesbaden, 1968), S. 111. 2) Bronzespiegel, London, British Museum 630, H. B. Walters, *Catalogue of the British Museum: Bronzes* (London, 1899), S. 98–99, Nr. 630; Mansuelli (a.O. diese Anmerkung), S. 24ff., 51; de Simone (a.O. diese Anmerkung), S. 110–111; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos/Fufluns Nr. 73 mit Abb.; ebenda S. 1072, s.v. Ariadne/Ariatha Nr. 15.
26. EBRIOS: Cistendeckel, praenestinish, New York, Pierpont Morgan Library BL-64. s. hier Anm. 25 zu SILANUS 1.
27. Auf einem Stuckrelief in Ostia sind SILENUS und SATUR mehrfach bezeugt: G. Calza, *NSc*, 1928, S. 156ff.; H. Mielsch, *Römische Stuckreliefs* (Heidelberg, 1975), S. 161–162 K 90; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos/Bacchus Nr. 170, 172.
28. s. hier S. 131.
29. Die Beischrift S(I)BYRTAS auf einer attisch rotfigurigen Schale in Würzburg (s. hier Addenda, s.v. S(I)BYRTAS 1) kann aus sprachlichen Gründen nicht—wie teilweise vermutet—linksläufig als SA-

TRUBS gelesen und dann als Verschreibung von SATYROS gedeutet werden, s. dazu auch die Ausführungen von Günter Neumann. Dagegen ist SATYROS als Personenname früher belegt: *HPN*, S. 567. Auch bei dem Terrakottamodell mit der Inschrift SATYROS (s. hier Anm. 40) handelt es sich eher um den Personennamen.

30. Es ist hier nicht der Ort, auf die Unterscheidung zwischen Silenen und Satyrn einzugehen; s. dazu u.a. Brommer (a.O. Anm. 9); M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*², Bd. 1 (München, 1955), S. 232ff.; F. Brommer, *Satyrspele*² (Berlin, 1959), S. 6; T. H. Carpenter, *Dionysian Imagery in Archaic Greek Art* (Oxford, 1986), S. 76ff.; Schöne (a.O. Anm. 16), S. 10. Von den Inschriften auf den Vasenbildern her läßt sich jedenfalls die Theorie bestärken, nach der die unterschiedliche Benennung örtlich begründet ist. SILENOS war auch Personennamen, so vielleicht bereits im 2. Jahrtausend, vgl. die Knossostafel V 466 si-ra-no: O. Landau, *Mykenisch-Griechische Personennamen* (Göteborg, 1958), S. 129; J. Chadwick und L. Baumbach, *Glotta* 41 (1963), S. 244, s.v. Σιλῆνός; J. Chadwick, I. A. L. Godart, J. T. Killen, J. P. Olivier, A. Sacconi, und I. A. Sakellarakis, *Corpus of Mycenaean Inscriptions from Knossos*, Bd. 1 (Rom, 1986), S. 169, Nr. 466. In späterer Zeit: *HPN*, S. 568.

31. Vgl. hier MAINAS 2–7.

32. Für Hinweise und Beschaffung von Photos bin ich weiter zu großem Dank verpflichtet: G. M. Akamatis, L. Balensiefen, K. W. Berger, H. A. Cahn, T. H. Carpenter, F. Gilotta, G. Güntner, I. Krauskopf, A. Lezzi-Hafter, J. H. Oakley, O. Paoletti, M. Steinhart, C. Weiß und D. Williams sowie Mitarbeitern der LIMC-Redaktionen in Basel, Heidelberg und Würzburg, und ganz besonders E. Simon.

33. Jetzt Lorber (a.O. Anm. 5), S. 62–63, Nr. 93, Taf. 23 mit Lit.

34. Zum Problem Dickbauchtänzer-Satyrn zuletzt: T. H. Carpenter (a.O. Anm. 30), S. 86ff.; Schöne (a.O. Anm. 16), S. 12ff.; C. Isler-Kerényi, in *Proceedings of the Third Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery*, Kongreß, Kopenhagen 1987 (Kopenhagen, 1988), S. 269ff.

35. Nationalmuseet 57, *ABV* 102.97, 684; *Paralipomena*, S. 38; *CVA* Kopenhagen 3, Taf. 101.1a.

36. Athen, Nationalmuseum Akropolis 587, G. Bakir, *Sophilos* (Mainz, 1981), S. 64–65, A 2, Taf. 3i.

37. British Museum 1971.11.–1.1, D. Williams, in *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, Bd. 1 (1983), S. 24, Abb. 28. Zum Verhältnis Nymphen-Mänaden, s. auch Carpenter (a.O. Anm. 30), S. 79ff.

38. METHE: Gemälde (Paus. II.27.3). Statuengruppe (Paus. VI.24.8). EBRIETAS: Gruppe des Praxiteles (Plin., *N.H.*, 34.69). Eine Nachwirkung der METHHE des Pausiasgemäldes darf vielleicht auf Gemmenbildern erkannt werden, in denen eine meist nackte Frau (häufig von dionysischen Attributen umgeben) aus einer Schale trinkt: G. Sena Chiesa, *Gemme del Museo Nazionale di Aquileia* (Padua, 1966), S. 201, Nr. 450ff.; E. Zwierlein-Diehl, *Die antiken Gemmen des Kunsthistorischen Museums in Wien*, Bd. 2 (München, 1979), Nr. 653, 1022, 1023, 1595ff. mit Lit. und Verweisen auf weitere Beispiele.

39. L. Burn, *The Meidias Painter* (Oxford, 1987), S. 114, MM 104.

40. *Tarente* (Paris, 1939), S. 394–395, 413.

41. Weitere Namen s. bei B. Neutsch, *RM* 68 (1961), S. 163.

ADDENDA

zu Charlotte Fränkel, *Satyr- und Bakchennamen auf Vasenbildern* (Halle, 1912)

(mit namenkundlichen Bemerkungen von Günter Neumann)

HINWEISE ZUR FOLGENDEN NAMENSLISTE

Zu den bei Fränkel publizierten Namen werden hier

neuere Literaturhinweise und die Malerzuschreibungen nach Beazley nachgetragen. Zudem hat sich auch

manchmal der Aufbewahrungsort geändert. Weiter sind hier noch griechische Namensbeischriften auf un-teritalischen Vasen und auch auf einzelnen Monu-menten außerhalb der Vasenmalerei eingefügt. Die sprachlichen Erklärungen zu den Namen verfaßte Gün-ter Neumann (Würzburg), dem für diese Arbeit hier aufs herzlichste gedankt sei.³²

Nicht aufgenommen sind die von Fränkel S. 82 C aufgeführten Namen auf dem korinthischen Kolonnet-tenkrater, Dresden ZV 1604³³: DION, FARIS, MYRIS, PORIS, PYROS, SIMA, da es sich hier um korinthische Dickbauchtänzer mit Frauen, nicht um Satyrn und Mänaden handelt. Zwar können sich die Bereiche Dickbauchtänzer-Satyrn durchdringen,³⁴ und auch Namen wie MYRIS, PORIS, SIMA sind im dionysischen Thiasos belegt, doch werden hier im Folgenden nur die Namen aufgeführt, die satyrgestaltigen Wesen zugeordnet sind. So werden hier auch nur die KOMOS-Beischriften bei Satyrn genannt, ebenso KOMODIA- und TRAGODIA-Beischriften nur bei Mänaden.

Weiter entfallen die Namen GYRITES und HALIOPE (Fränkel, S. 21–22, 84 L). Auf dieser tyrrhenischen Amphora in Kopenhagen³⁵ sind erotische Gruppen zu sehen, von denen ein Paar die beiden obigen Namen trägt. Die zwei dargestellten Satyrn dagegen sind un-benannt. Bei dem benannten Paar handelt es sich nicht um Satyr und Mänade.

Die Namen HERILLOS und SAON (Fränkel, S. 72–73, 106 γ) entfallen ebenfalls. Das Gefäß ist identisch mit einer Vase in New York, s. hier CHORILLOS 2.

Weggelassen ist die Beischrift NYSAI (Fränkel, S. 20, 84 H) auf dem fragmentierten Sophilos-Dinos in Athen.³⁶ Wie auf dem Sophilos-Dinos in London³⁷ wo die Beischrift NYPHAI lautet, ist ein Dreiverein von Nymphen gemeint. Vom Thema der Darstellung her (Hochzeit Peleus-Thetis) ergibt sich kein Hinweis auf Mänaden. Weibliche Personen mit der Beischrift NYPHAI figurieren hier nur dann, wenn diese in di-

onysischen Szenen dargestellt sind. Das gleiche gilt für Ino. Doch scheinen die Individualnamen der den Pen-theus zerreißen Bakchen (Agave, Ino, Semele) auf keiner Wiedergabe der Sage inschriftlich überliefert zu sein (vgl. nur GALENE 1).

Verschiedene Namen dionysischer Personifikationen sind nur durch literarische Zeugnisse für nicht erhaltene Denkmäler überliefert. Sie sind, da epi-graphisch nicht faßbar, im Gegensatz zu dem Monu-ment von Thasos (= DITHYRAMBOS 1), nicht in die folgende Liste aufgenommen. Als Beispiele seien METHE und EBRIETAS genannt, die auf Bildwerken sicher die Gestalt von Mänaden hatten.³⁸

Die Vase Fränkel, S. 51, 104 σ (jetzt London, British Museum E 702)³⁹ ist weggelassen, da bei der THALIA benannten Frau kein Hinweis darauf gegeben ist, daß es sich um eine Mänade handelt.

Da die Publikation der Inschriften auf Terrakot-tamatrizen noch aussteht, scheint mir die Deutung der Namen auf diesen Modeln noch nicht geklärt. Pierre Wuilleumier deutete hier KISSO und SATYROS als Mänaden- bzw. Satyrnamen.⁴⁰ Doch scheint es sich eher um Besitzernamen zu handeln.⁴¹

Sind auf einem Monument mehrere benannte Satyrn und/oder Mänaden dargestellt, so wird die Biblio-graphie nur bei der ersten Erwähnung des Objektes gegeben und an den anderen Stellen auf das betreffende Stichwort, unter dem die Literatur zu finden ist, ver-wiesen. Häufiger erwähnte Buchtitel werden ebenfalls nur bei ihrer ersten Nennung vollständig aus-geschrieben. An den anderen Stellen erfolgt ein Ver-weis. Die Namen sind nach dem lateinischen Alphabet geordnet. Werden mehrere Monumente unter einem Namen genannt, so sind sie in chronologischer Reihen-folge aufgelistet.

Die Namensinschriften konnten nicht durch Autop-sie überprüft werden, sondern sind aus Publikationen übernommen.

den, gilt meist die Regel, daß der Akzent um eine Position zurückgezogen wird. Da diese Regel aber nicht streng durch-geführt wird, bleibt in mehreren Fällen der Sitz des Akzents unklar.

Abkürzungen:

GN Göttername

PN Personennamen

Wenn griechische Adjektiva als Personennamen verwendet wer-

SATYRNAMEN

AGRIOS

ἄγριος

“der Wilde, Rohe”; auch als PN belegt, z.B. bei Homer, *Ilias*.

ΑΓΡΙΟΣ

1) Nicht bei Fränkel.

Attisch schwarzfigurige (tyrrhenische) Amphora. Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale. Aus Grab 207 von Monte Abatone. M. Moretti, *Cerveteri* (Novara, 1978), S. 13; K. Schauenburg, *Meded* 6 (1979), S. 10, Taf. 4.9–5.12.

AIETOS	Αἴετος ΑΙΕΤΟΣ	<p>“Adler”, auch als Menschen- und Pferdenamen belegt.</p> <p>1) Fränkel, S. 68, 98 z. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142458 (ehem. Gołuchów, Slg. Czartoryski 77). <i>ARV</i>² 1253.58 (Eretria-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i>², S. 354; J. D. Beazley, <i>Greek Vases in Poland</i> (Oxford, 1928), S. 61ff., Taf. 29.2, 30; <i>CVA</i> Gołuchów III I d, Taf. 38a–g; Lezzi-Hafter, <i>Eretria</i>, S. 157–158, 321, Nr. 76, Taf. 57, 58e–f; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Choro II, Nr. 3; Immerwahr, S. 115, Nr. 799.</p>
AITHON oder LITHON	Αἶθων ΛΙΘΟΝ	<p>zu αἶθω “brennen”; entweder nach der Hautfarbe als “Rotbraun” benannt (so <i>HPN</i>, S. 494) oder nach dem Temperament als “Feurig, Hitzig”. Auch als PN belegt. Schon Odysseus (<i>Od.</i> XIX.183) nennt sich so.</p> <p>1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale. Lit. s.v. AGRIOS 1.</p>
ANTIES	Ἀντίης ΑΝΤΙΕΣ	<p>ionische Lautform (Eta). Kurzname zu dem bei Bechtel, <i>HPN</i>, S. 58ff. gebuchten Typus.</p> <p>1) Fränkel, S. 12, 82 A. Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. A. Rumpf, <i>Chalkidische Vasen</i> (Berlin und Leipzig, 1927), S. 7–8, Nr. 2, S. 46, Nr. 2, Taf. 2.</p>
BABAKCHOS	Βάβακχος ΒΑΒΑΚΧΟΣ	<p>wohl mit Reduplikation zum GN Βάκχος. Die Reduplikation findet sich im Verb βαβάζω “schreien” (Hesychios) und im <i>nomen actoris</i> βαβάκτης, das in der Komödie vorkommt.</p> <p>1) Fränkel, S. 31ff., 90 c. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. London, British Museum E 65. <i>ARV</i>² 370.13, 1649 (Brygos-Maler); <i>Paralipomena</i>, S. 365; Beazley, <i>Add</i>², S. 224; Boardman, <i>ARFV</i>, Abb. 252.1–2; Schefold, <i>Göttersage</i>, S. 124, Abb. 155–156; E. Simon, in D. C. Kurtz und B. Sparkes, Hrsg., <i>The Eye of Greece</i> (Festschrift Robertson) (Cambridge, 1982), S. 125ff., Abb. 30a–b; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Babakchos 1 mit Abb.; E. Simon, in B. Seidensticker, Hrsg., <i>Das Satyrspiel. Wege der Forschung</i>, Bd. 579 (Darmstadt, 1989), S. 367ff., Taf. 1; Immerwahr, S. 88–89, Nr. 551.</p>
BAT. . . .	ΒΑΤΙ	<p>1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Marmorrelief nach Art der <i>Tabulae Iliacae</i>. Rom, Villa Albani 957. <i>RE</i> 3 (1899), S. 149, s.v. Battylos (Wagner); A. Sadurska, <i>Les Tables Iliques</i> (Warschau, 1964), S. 83ff., Nr. 19, Taf. 19; Helbig⁴, Bd. 4, Nr. 3278 (Willers); <i>LIMC</i> 1 (1981), s.v. Admete Nr. 1 mit Abb.; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Bat. . . Nr. 1; P. C. Bol, Hrsg., <i>Forschungen zur Villa Albani: Katalog der Bildwerke</i>, Bd. 1 (Berlin, 1989), S. 192ff., Nr. 60, Taf. 110 (H. U. Cain).</p>
BATYLOS	Βατύλλος ΒΑΤΥΛΛΟΣ	<p>vgl. das nur einmal belegte Subst. βατύλη “die Zwergin”? Fränkel, S. 75.</p> <p>1) Fränkel, S. 75, 104 φ. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. Ehem. Paris, Slg. Raoul-Rochette. <i>ARV</i>² 1316.3 (Gruppe von Neapel 3235); O. Jahn, <i>Vasenbilder</i> (Hamburg, 1839), S. 13ff., Taf. 2; Wagner</p>

		(a.O. s.v. BAT... 1), S. 149; H. A. Shapiro, <i>Personification of Abstract Concepts in Greek Art and Literature to the End of the 5th Century B.C.</i> (Ann Arbor und London, 1977), S. 202; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Batyllos Nr. 1. Die Vase ist identisch mit der bei W. H. Roscher, <i>Mythologisches Lexikon</i> , Bd. 1, Teil 1 (Leipzig, 1884–1890), S. 386 genannten, wo der Name fälschlich als Antyllos angegeben wird.
BRIAKCHOS	Βρίακχος	bei Hesychios und im <i>Etymologicum Magnum</i> erklärt als βριαρῶς ἰακχάζουσα “gewaltig schreiend (in der bakchischen Ekstase)”. Das trifft die Bedeutung. Als Vorderglied liegt ein Nomen βρι- vor, vgl. βρήηπους “laut schreiend” usw.
	ΒΡΙΑΚΧΟΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 34–35, 86 Q. Attisch rotfigurige Oinochoe. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 163. <i>ARV</i> ² 10.3 (Gołuchów-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 151; <i>CVA</i> Cambridge 1, Taf. 36.1; <i>EAA</i> , Bd. 3 (1960), S. 976, Abb. 1245; <i>AA</i> , 1972, S. 239, Abb. 2; Boardman, <i>ARFV</i> , Abb. 21; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Briakchos Nr. 1 mit Abb; Immerwahr, S. 60, Nr. 328.
	ΒΡΙΑΚΧΟΣ	2) Fränkel, S. 34–35, 86 P, Taf. II. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. London, British Museum E 253. <i>ARV</i> ² 35.2 (Pioneer Group, sundry); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 157; <i>EAA</i> , Bd. 2 (1959), S. 170, Abb. 259; <i>CVA</i> British Museum 3, III I c Taf. 2.1b; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Briakchos Nr. 2 mit Abb.
	ΒΡΙΑΧΟΣ	3) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.305. <i>Greek Vases: Molly and Walter Bareiss Collection</i> , Malibu, The J. Paul Getty Museum, 1983 (Ausstellungskatalog von J. Frel und M. True), S. 81, Nr. 172 (Bothmer: Euergides-Maler); <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Briakchos Nr. 3. Hier Abb. 3.
	ΒΙΑΚ[4) Fränkel, S. 34 Anm. 6. Attisch rotfigurige Lekythos. Berlin F 2244. Hier ist kein Silen sondern eine am Boden sitzende Flötenbläserin dargestellt, doch dürfte auch hier der Inschriftrest zu Briakchos ergänzt werden, da dieser Name auch für Bakchantinnen belegt ist (<i>Etymologicum Magnum</i> , 213, 26; Hesychios, s.v. Briakchos); <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Briakchos Nr. 4.
BRIKON	Βρικῶν	“der Barbarische,” “der Böartige”; zu den Hesychiosen βρικοί. πονηροί und βρικόν... βάρβαρον. Vgl. schon Fränkel, S. 37.
	ΒΡΙΚΟΝ	1) Fränkel, S. 37, 90 b. Attisch rotfigurige Strickhenkelamphora. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142332. <i>ARV</i> ² 27.8 (Euthymides); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 324; Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 156 mit Lit.; Beazley, <i>Poland</i> (a.O. s.v. AIETOS 1), S. 13ff., Taf. 4ff.; <i>CVA</i> Gołuchów III I c, Taf. 18b und d; Boardman, <i>ARFV</i> , Abb. 37; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Brikon Nr. 1 mit Abb.; Immerwahr, S. 65, Nr. 374.
BYBAX	Βύβαξ	“der Geile”, unklar (vielleicht Verschreibung für Σύβαξ? Dies zum Adj. σύβαξ-λάγνος (Hesychios), also dann “der Geile”).

- BYB[1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch weißgrundige Schale, Fr. Tarent, Museo Nazionale o. Nr. *ARV*² 860.3, 1672 (Pistoxenos-Maler); *Paralipomena*, S. 425; Beazley, *Add*², S. 298; (zur Namenslesung, J. D. Beazley, *AJA* 45 [1941], S. 601, Abb. 6); G. Gullini, *ArchCl* 3 (1951), S. 1ff., Taf. A.I, II; J. D. Beazley, *AJA* 61 (1957), S. 7, Nr. 18; E. Simon und M. Hirmer, *Die griechischen Vasen*² (München, 1981), Taf. XLI; C. M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*, Bd. 2 (Oxford, 1975), Taf. 89a; Schefold, *Göttersage*, S. 125, Abb. 158; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Bybax Nr. 1 mit Abb.
- CHORILLOS Χόριλλος Deminutiv (Suffix -ιλλο-) zu einem Vollnamen mit χορο- "Chor". (Zur Bildung vgl. etwa Ὀρχεσίλλη, den Namen einer Tänzerin auf einer in Essen, Folkwang-Museum befindlichen Vase.)
- ΧΟΡΙΛΛΟΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 70, 96 x.
Attisch rotfiguriger Skyphos. Berlin F 2589. *ARV*² 1301.7 (Penelope-Maler); *Paralipomena*, S. 475; Beazley, *Add*², S. 360; F. Hauser, in *FR*, Bd. 3, S. 29ff.; E. Simon, *AntK* 6 (1963), S. 18–19, Taf. 3.3; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Chorillos Nr. 2 mit Abb.
- ΧΟΡΙΛΛΟΣ 2) Bei Fränkel, S. 72, 106 x, ist die Vase nur mit ihrem früheren Aufbewahrungsort und anderer Namenslesung (Herillos) genannt. Zudem gibt Fränkel von den zahlreichen weiteren Namen nur noch Saon (= SATHON 1) an.
Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. *ARV* 688 (Coghill-Maler, nicht in *ARV*²); G. M. A. Richter und L. F. Hall, *Red-Figured Athenian Vases in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New Haven, 1936), Taf. 127; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Chorillos Nr. 3 mit Abb.
- ΧΟΡΙΛΛΟΣ 3) Fränkel, S. 70, 98 y.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Berlin F 2532, und Rom, Villa Giulia, Slg. Castellani o. Nr. *ARV*² 1253.57 (Eretria-Maler); *Paralipomena*, S. 469; Beazley, *Add*², S. 354; *CVA* Berlin 3, Taf. 112.1–2, 116.1; T. Seki, *AA*, 1981, S. 58–59, Abb. 7; Lezzi-Hafter, *Eretria*, S. 315, Nr. 31, Taf. 26–27; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Chorillos 1.
- ΧΟΡΙΛΛΟΣ 4) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum L 492. *ARV*² 1512.18 (Jenaer Maler); *Paralipomena*, S. 499; Beazley, *Add*², S. 384; E. Langlotz, *Martin von Wagner Museum: Griechische Vasen in Würzburg* (München, 1932), Nr. 492; *Dionysos: Griechische Antiken*, Ausstellung, Ingelheim (1965), Nr. 46; E. Simon u.a., *Führer durch die Antikenabteilung des Martin von Wagner Museums der Universität Würzburg* (Mainz, 1975), S. 147; E. Simon u. a., *Werke der Antike im Martin von Wagner Museum der Universität Würzburg* (Mainz, 1983), Nr. 56; E. Keuls, *Meded* 11 (1985), S. 29, Taf. 4.22; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Chorillos Nr. 4 mit Abb.; Immerwahr, S. 118, Nr. 827.
- DASON Δάσον zu τὸ δάσος "Dickicht" oder zum Adj. δασύς, das auch "haarig" (z.B. von Menschen- oder Tierkörpern) heißt.
-]ON 1) Nicht bei Fränkel.

- Spätkorinthisches Kraterfr. aus Phlious. W. R. Biers, *Hesperia* 40 (1971), S. 410ff., Nr. 36, Abb. 2, Taf. 88. Biers ergänzt aufgrund von DASON 2 hier den gleichen Namen.
- ΔΑΣΩΝ 2) Fränkel, S. 8, 82 A.
Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dason Nr. 1.
- DEMON Δήμων auch Menschenname (*HPN*, S. 130), Kurzform zu Vollnamen mit δῆμος, "Volk".
- ΔΗΜΩΝ 1) Fränkel, S. 55, 72, 98 z.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142458. Lit. s.v. AIETOS 1; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Demon Nr. 1; Immerwahr, S. 115, Nr. 799.
- DION Fränkel, S. 17, 82 C.
Entfällt (kein Satyr).
- DITHYRAMBOS Διθύραμβος aus dem Appellativum, das ein im Kult des Dionysos gesungenes Chorlied bezeichnet.
- ΔΙΘΥΡΑΜΒΟΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 69–70, 94 r.
Attisch rotfiguriges Kelchkraterfr. Kopenhagen, Thorvaldsens Museum H 597. *ARV*² 1055.78 (Polygnot-Gruppe, unbestimmt); Beazley, *Add*², S. 322; J. Boardman, *JHS* 76 (1956), S. 19, Taf. 3.1; B. Papadaki-Angelidou, *Hai prosopoesis eis ten archaian elleniken technen* (Athen, 1960), S. 62; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*² (Oxford, 1962), S. 5–6, Abb. 1; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dithyrambos Nr. 1 mit Abb.
- ΔΙΘΥΡΑΜΒΟΣ 2) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Nicht erhaltene Marmorstatue von einem choregischen Anathem aus dem Dionysosheiligtum von Thasos (1. Hälfte 3. Jh. v. Chr.). Papadaki-Angelidou (a.O. s.v. DITHYRAMBOS 1), S. 62; M. Jacob-Felsch, *Die Entwicklung griechischer Statuenbasen und die Aufstellung der Statuen* (Waldsassen, 1969), S. 85, 148ff., Nr. 51; A. H. Borbein, *JdI* 88 (1973), S. 48ff.; F. Salviat, *BCH*, Suppl. 5 (1979), S. 155ff.; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dithyrambos Nr. 2. Vermutlich war Dithyrambos satyrgestaltig, wie es auch sonst bei männlichen dionysischen Personifikationen üblich ist.
- DOPHIOS Δόφιος Beazley, *BSA* 32 (1931/1932), S. 21: zu δέφομαι "masturbieren". (Der Satyrname setzt ein *nomen actionis* δοφή voraus.)
- ΔΟΦΙΟΣ 1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch schwarzfiguriger Aryballos. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 26.49. *ABV* 83.4 (Nearchos); *Paralipomena*, S. 30; Beazley, *Add*², S. 23; J. Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases: A Handbook* (London, 1974), S. 35, 46, Abb. 50.2; G. M. A. Richter, *AJA* 36 (1932), S. 272ff., Taf. 11c; J. D. Beazley, *BSA* 32 (1931–1932), S. 21; *The Amasis Painter and His World: Vase-Painting in Sixth-Century B.C. Athens*, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art und andere Museen, 1985 (Ausstellungskatalog von D. von Bothmer), S. 39, Abb. 21; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dophios Nr. 1; Immerwahr, S. 27, Nr. 97.

DORKIS	Δορκίς	zu δόρξ fem. "Reh" (und δορκάς) oder zu δέρκομαι. Vgl. auch die PN Δορκίς, Δόρκος, Δόρκων, Δορκεύς (<i>HPN</i> , S. 121 und 589).
	ΔΟΡΚΙΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 11, 82 A. Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dorkis Nr. 1.
	ΔΟΡΚΙΣ	2) Fränkel, S. 11, 82 B. Chalkidischer Kolonnenkrater. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire A 135. Rumpf (a.O. s.v. ANTIES 1), S. 13, Nr. 13, S. 47, Nr. 13, Taf. 27ff.; <i>CVA</i> Brüssel 2, III E, Taf. 1a–d; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dorkis Nr. 2 mit Abb.
	ΙΚΙΣ	3) Fränkel, S. 11, 23, 88 X. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2617 (81330). <i>ARV</i> ² 65.108 (Oltos); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 166; Bruhn, <i>Oltos</i> , S. 41, Nr. 30; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dorkis Nr. 3 mit Abb.
DROMIS	Δρόμις	wohl zu den PN mit Stamm δρομο- "Lauf". <i>HPN</i> , S. 142–143.
	ΔΡΟΜΙΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 23, 90 c. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. London, British Museum E 65. Lit. s.v. BABAKCHOS 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dromis Nr. 1 mit Abb.; Immerwahr, S. 88–89, Nr. 551.
ECHL...	ΕΧΛ[1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Theben, Archäologisches Museum K 400. <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 359.9 ter (Onesimos); G. Bruns, <i>AA</i> , 1964, S. 261–262, Abb. 26; K. Braun und Th. E. Haevernick, <i>Bemalte Keramik und Glas aus dem Kabirenheiligtum bei Theben</i> (Berlin, 1981), S. 79, R 1, Taf. 26.1. Es läßt sich nicht eindeutig klären, ob der Inschriftrest zu einem Satyrnamen oder zu einem Ausruf zu ergänzen ist.
ECHON	Ἐχων	ob ε oder η zu umschreiben ist, hängt von der Datierung ab. Wenn mit ε, dann wohl mit Fränkel, S. 25, "der Haltende".
	ΕΧΟΝ	1) Fränkel, S. 25–26, 90 c. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. London, British Museum E 65. Lit. s.v. BABAKCHOS 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Echon Nr. 1; Immerwahr, S. 88–89, Nr. 551.
EHE...	ΕΗΕ[1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Deckel, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.214.A.2 (Onesimos). Erwähnt: <i>GettyMusJ</i> 14 (1986), S. 191, Nr. 48.
ELASISTRATOS	Ἐλασίστρατος	heroischer PN (<i>HPN</i> , S. 151), "der den Heerhaufen antreibt".
	ΕΛΑΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale. Lit. s.v. AGRIOS 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Elastratos Nr. 1.
EOI...	Ἐοί[Deutung als Personennamen schwierig. Infrage käme allenfalls das Adj. ἠοῖος "morgendlich, zum Morgen gehörig", vgl. <i>Od.</i> IV.447.

	EOI	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfiguriger Kolonnettenkrater, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.2 (Lydos). Hier Abb. 2b.
ERATON	Ἐράτων	vgl. PN fem. Ἐρατώ (<i>HPN</i> , S. 565), auch Name einer Muse und einer Okeanide; Ableitung von ἐρατός "geliebt, liebevoll".
	ERATON	1) Fränkel, S. 25, 92 g. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Compiègne, Musée Vivenel 1093 (ehem. Slg. Magnoncourt). <i>ARV</i> ² 64.105 (Oltos); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 166; Bruhn, <i>Oltos</i> , S. 40–41, Nr. 29; <i>CVA</i> Compiègne III I b, Taf. 14.1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Eraton Nr. 1 mit Abb.
ERPON	Ἐρπῶν	das Verb ἔρπω heißt im Epos und im Attischen "sich langsam bewegen", dagegen in den dorischen Dialekten "gehen". Vgl. <i>HPN</i> , S. 498: Bechtel belegt hier Ἐρπώνδης- < Ἐρπωνίδης- als Menschenname.
	ΕΡΠΙΟΝ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Basel, Slg. Cahn HC 432. Handliste zu <i>Attische Meisterzeichnungen in der Archäologischen Sammlung der Universität Freiburg: Vasenfragmente der Sammlung Cahn, Basel, Freiburg, Oktober 1988–März 1989</i> (Ausstellungskatalog von H. A. Cahn), Nr. 63 (Sotades-Maler). Hier Abb. 6a.
EU...	EY	1) Fränkel, S. 106 ψ. Attisch rotfiguriges Kelchkraterfr. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2883 (2045). <i>ARV</i> ² 1338 (nahe dem Pronomos-Maler); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 481; Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 366 mit Lit.; J. Henle, <i>Greek Myths: A Vase Painter's Note Book</i> (Bloomington, 1973), S. 51, Abb. 30; C. Bérard, <i>Anodoi</i> (Neuchâtel, 1974), Taf. 1.1; Simon und Hirmer (a.O. s.v. BYBAX 1), S. 155–156, Taf. 232; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eu...
EU...OS	EY JOΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 88 S. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire R 253, und Vatikan, Astarita 306. <i>ARV</i> ² 64.104 (Oltos); Bruhn, <i>Oltos</i> , S. 39, Nr. 26; <i>CVA</i> Brüssel 1, III I c, Taf. 2.2a–d; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eu...os.
EUKRATES	Εὐκράτης ΕΥΚΡΑΤΕΣ	auch PN (<i>HPN</i> , S. 172), "der Kraftvolle". 1) Fränkel, S. 24, 90 Z. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum L 474. <i>ARV</i> ² 173.10 (Ambrosios-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 184 mit Lit.; Langlotz (a.O. s.v. CHORILLOS 4), Nr. 474; <i>CVA</i> Würzburg 2, Taf. 3.2; Simon (a.O. s.v. BABAKCHOS 1), Taf. 32a; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eukrates 1 mit Abb.
EUMAS	Εὐμαῶς	vermutlich Kurzform zu Εὐμένης oder Εὐμαχος oder ähnlich (<i>HPN</i> , S. 172). Oder auch mit B. Neutsch, S. 211 zu Εὐμαῖος "Gutes erstrebend" (zu μαίωμα).
	ΕΥΜΑΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Apulischer Chous. Tarent, Museo Nazionale 52444. B. Neutsch, <i>AA</i> , 1956, S. 209ff., Abb. 12; F. Brommer, <i>Satyrspiele</i> ² (Berlin, 1959), S. 84, Nr. 224; A. D. Trendall,

		<i>Phlyax Vases</i> ² , BICS Suppl. 19 (London, 1967), S. 87, Nr. 199; U. Hausmann, <i>Jahrbuch der Staatlichen Kunstsammlungen in Baden-Württemberg</i> 9 (1972), S. 29–30, Abb. 29; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eumas Nr. 1 mit Abb.
EUPNOUS	Εὔπνοος	wohl mit Greifenhagen, s.u.: “der gut (die Flöte) blasen kann”.
	ΕΥΠΝΟΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Frankfurt, Museum für Kunsthandwerk WM 03. <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 140.9 bis (Three Line Group); A. Greifenhagen, <i>AA</i> , 1957, S. 6ff., Abb. 1ff.; <i>CVA</i> Frankfurt 1, Taf. 33.1–3; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eupnous Nr. 1 mit Abb.
EUPOLIS	Εὔπολις	auch Menschenname (<i>HPN</i> , S. 174), aus εὖ (gut) und πόλις (Stadt) zusammengesetzt.
	ΕΥΠΟΛΙΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 72, 94 q. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1772. <i>ARV</i> ² 1072.1 (Eupolis-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 325; <i>CVA</i> Wien 3, Taf. 113.5; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eupolis II, Nr. 1 mit Abb.
EURYTION	Εὐρυτίων	auch Menschenname (<i>HPN</i> , S. 181); wahrscheinlich Kurzform von εὐρύτιμος “dessen Ehre weithin bekannt ist”; Fränkel, S. 68: Name von Kentauren und Giganten.
	ΕΥΡΥΤΙΩΝ	1) Fränkel, S. 68, 104 φ. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. Ehem. Paris, Slg. Raoul-Rochette. <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. EURYTION IV, Nr. 1.
FARIS		Fränkel, S. 18, 82 C. Entfällt (kein Satyr).
GYRITES		Fränkel, S. 22, 84 L. Entfällt (kein Satyr).
HANBOS ?		verschrieben für Ιαμβος oder Ιανβος? Dann wäre die Bezeichnung des Versmaßes gemeint. Zu -vβ- statt -μβ- s. hier zu LAMPON 1.
	Ἰ ΑΝΒΟΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 33. Lit. s.v. PEON 1.
HEDYMELES	Ἡδυμελής Η(Ι)ΔΥΜΕΛΗΣ	“süß singend”, als Adj., aber nicht als PN belegt. 1) Fränkel, S. 70, 104 π. Pelike. Verschollen. J. De Witte, <i>Description d'une collection de vases peints . . . de Etrurie</i> (1837), S. 20, 43; <i>RE</i> 6 A (1936), S. 735–736, s.v. Thyone (Preisendanz); (Dionysos auf einem Felsen sitzend zwischen Hedymeles, Simos, Thyone und zwei Mainas benannten Mänaden); <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Hedymeles Nr. 1.
HEDYOINOS	Ἡδύοινος	“süßen Wein besitzend”. Als Adj. belegt, aber nicht als PN.
	ΗΔΥΟΙΝΟΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 71, 102 v. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1011. <i>ARV</i> ² 1155.6 (Art des Dinos-Malers); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 337; <i>CVA</i> Wien 3, Taf. 117.3–4; <i>LIMC</i> 1 (1981), s.v. Amymone Nr. 12 mit Abb.; Schefold, <i>Götter-</i>

		sage, S. 255, Abb. 364; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Hedyoinos Nr. 2.
	ΗΔΥΟΙΝΟΣ	2) Fränkel, S. 71, 102 μ. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1024. <i>ARV</i> ² 1152.8 (Dinos-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 336; <i>CVA</i> Wien 3, Taf. 105.2–4; I. Scheibler, <i>Antike Welt</i> 15, Heft 1 (1984), S. 44, Abb. 10; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dione Nr. 11 mit Abb.; ebenda s.v. Eirene Nr. 11 mit Abb.; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Hedyoinos Nr. 1 mit Abb.
HERILLOS		Fränkel, S. 72, 106 χ. Entfällt; die Vase ist identisch mit CHORILLOS 2.
HERMOTHALES	Ἑρμοθάλης	sicherlich als Hermothales zu transkribieren, sowohl der Stamm hermo- wie der Stamm thalos/ -ēs sind in Personennamen häufig. Zufällig ist aber die Verbindung Hermothales sonst noch nicht belegt. Schwer zu übersetzen, “der seine Blüte durch Hermes hat/erhält”.
	ΗΡΜΟΘΑΛΕΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfiguriger Kolonnettenkrater. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.2 (Lydos).
ΗΙΑΚΧΟΣ	Ἰακχος ΗΙΑΧΟΣ	sonst Beiname des Dionysos. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch bilingue Amphora, Fr. München, Antikensammlungen 2302. <i>ABV</i> 294.23; <i>ARV</i> ² 6.1 (Psiax); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 128; Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 77, 150; <i>CVA</i> München 4, Taf. 153.1, 154.1–2; <i>RE</i> Suppl. 9 (1962), S. 80, s.v. Hiachos (Brommer); H. Kyrieleis, <i>Throne und Klinen</i> (Berlin, 1969), Taf. 19.3; B. Cohen, <i>Attic Bilingual Vases and Their Painters</i> (New York, 1978), Taf. 40; D. Paquette, <i>L'Instrument de Musique dans la céramique de la Grèce antique</i> (Paris, 1984), S. 208–209, P 2; T. H. Carpenter, <i>Dionysian Imagery in Archaic Greek Art</i> (Oxford, 1986), Taf. 26.
HIPPAIOS	Ἴππαιος	auch als Menschenname belegt (<i>HPN</i> , S. 220). Suffix -αιο- kommt mehrfach in einstämmigen PN vor, wie Αἰχμαῖος, Ἄλκαιοσ, Δάαιοσ, Θεαῖοσ, Λύκαιοσ, Πτολεμαῖοσ und Ὀρθαῖοσ. (Diese sind nicht nur von a-Stämmen, sondern auch von o-Stämmen abgeleitet.) Ableitung von ἵππος “Pferd”.
	ΒΙΠΠΑΙΟΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 7, 82 A. Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1; <i>RE</i> 8 (1912), S. 1918, s.v. Hippaios 8 (Hepding).
HIPPOS	Ἴππος	entweder einstämmiger Name “Pferd” oder Kurzform eines zweiteiligen Vollnamens mit Vorderglied ἵππο-, vgl. <i>HPN</i> , S. 225.
	ἸΠΠΟΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 7, 82 B. Chalkidischer Kolonnettenkrater. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire A 135. Lit. s.v. DORKIS 2.
HYBRIS	Ἵβρις	vgl. den PN Ἵβρίστας, <i>HPN</i> , S. 502. Das Subst. ὕβρις bedeutet auch speziell “sexuelle Lust”. (Abstrakta als Menschennamen bezeugt Bechtel, <i>HPN</i> , S. 610ff.) Weniger überzeugend ist Fränkels Vorschlag, S. 29, es als Adj.

- “übermütig” aufzufassen.
- ΥΒΡΙΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 28–29, 68, 104 τ.
Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. München, Antikensammlungen 2360. *ARV*² 1186.30, 1685 (Kadmos-Maler); Beazley, *Add*², S. 341 mit Lit.; *CVA* München 2, Taf. 81.1; *RE* Suppl. 9 (1962), S. 1898, s.v. Hybris 4 c (v. Geisau); J. Boardman, in: *Studien zur Mythologie und Vasenmalerei* (Festschrift Schauenburg) (Mainz, 1986), S. 128, Taf. 21.3; *LIMC* 2 (1984), s.v. Arethousa Nr. 4 mit Abb.; Immerwahr, S. 113, Nr. 784.
- HYDRIS Ὑδρίς zu ὕδωρ. Aber mit Fränkel, S. 29, vielleicht Fehler für Ὑβρίς.
- HYΔΡΙΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 29, 90 c.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale. London, British Museum E 65. Lit. s.v. BABAKCHOS 1; Immerwahr, S. 88–89, Nr. 551.
- ITALOS Ἴταλος itazistische Schreibweise für Ἱταλός, “der Italische”.
- HTAΛOΣ 1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Kleines Marmorrelief nach Art der *Tabulae Iliacae*. Rom, Villa Albani 957. Lit. s.v. BAT... 1; *RE* 9 (1916), S. 2286, s.v. Italos 2 (Latte).
- KADOLOS ? IOI 1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Korinthisch rotfiguriger Skyphos. Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum 919.5.5 (C. 421). D. M. Robinson, C. G. Harcum und J. H. Iliffe, *A Catalogue of Greek Vases in the Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology, Toronto* (Toronto, 1930), S. 224, Nr. 454, Taf. 83; I. McPhee und A. D. Trendall, in: M. A. del Chiaro und W. R. Biers, Hrsg., *Corinthiaca* (Festschrift Amyx) (Columbia, Missouri, 1986), S. 164ff., Abb. 8ff. Ergänzungsvorschläge: Kadoros oder Kadosos.
- KALLIAS Καλλίας vgl. den Menschnennamen, *HPN*, S. 232. Aber καλλίας heißt auch – in spöttisch-ironischer Verwendung – “Affe”.
- KΑΛΙI 1) Fränkel, S. 23, 88 S.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire R 253, und Vatikan, Astarita 306. Lit. s.v. EU...OS 1; *RE* 10 (1917), S. 1630, s.v. Kallias 25 (Weiker).
- KISSOS Κισσός “Efeu”; vgl. den gleichen Menschnennamen, *HPN*, S. 593.
Allgemein zu den von κισσός abgeleiteten Namen (s. hier auch s.v. KISSO, KISSINE): *RE* 11 (1922), S. 518, s.v. Kisseis 3 und 4; ebenda S. 522, s.v. Kissos 1–5; *RE* Suppl. 9 (1962), S. 383, s.v. Kissos 6 (v. Geisau); *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Bd. 4 (1959), S. 610ff., s.v. Efeu mit Lit. (Simon).
- KISSOΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 71, 98 z.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142458. Lit. s.v. AIETOS 1; Immerwahr, S. 115, Nr. 799.
- KIΣI 2) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Rom, Villa Giulia o. Nr., und Florenz, Museo Archeologico 16 B 8, B 19, B 40. *ARV*² 1253.63 (Eretria-Maler); *CVA* Florenz 1, Taf. 16, Nr. 290; Lezzi-Hafter, *Eretria*, S. 314, Nr. 26, Taf. 21.

- KΙΣΘΣ (dreimal) 3–5) Fränkel, S. 71, 98 y.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Berlin F 2532, und Rom, Villa Giulia, Slg. Castellani o. Nr. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 3. Hier sind drei Satyrn Kissos benannt.
- KΙΣΣΘΣ 6) Nicht bei Fränkel.
(Die Vase wird bei Fränkel, S. 100 ε, nur für TRAGODIA aufgeführt.) Attisch rotfigurige Oinochoe. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum V 534. ARV² 1258.1 (akin to the work of the Eretria Painter); Beazley, *Add²*, S. 355; *CVA* Oxford 1, Taf. 39.3–4, 43.2; G. van Hoorn, *Choes and Anthesteria* (Leiden, 1951), S. 163, Nr. 783; A. Lezzi-Hafter, *Der Schuwalow-Maler* (Mainz, 1976), S. 114, E 9, Taf. 151d; Lezzi-Hafter, *Eretria*, S. 338, Nr. 211, Taf. 195a.
- KΙΣΙ (= Florenz)
]ΘΣ (= Leipzig) 7) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfigurige Oinochoe, Fr. Florenz, Museo Archeologico 22 B 324, und Leipzig, Universitätsammlung T 727. ARV² 1258.2 (akin to the work of the Eretria Painter); *Paralipomena*, S. 471; *CVA* Florenz 1, III 1, Taf. 22.324; *CVA* Oxford 2, S. VII; J. D. Beazley, *Campana Fragments in Florence* (Oxford, 1933), Taf. 22.324; v. Hoorn (a.O. s.v. Kissos 6), S. 128, 530, Abb. 365; Lezzi-Hafter, *Eretria*, S. 342, Nr. 230, Taf. 142c.
- KOMOS κῶμος zu κῶμος "Umzug", vgl. den gleichen Menschnennamen, *HPN*, S. 517, und die zweiteiligen Vollnamen, *HPN*, S. 272, samt ihren Abkürzungen. Dort hat Bechtel auch κῶμος gebucht.
Zu den Vasen mit Komos-Beischrift bei Satyrn s. auch *RE* 11 (1922), S. 1298ff., s.v. Komos (Lamer). s. ebenfalls dort (S. 1299–1300) zu Kamos.
Auszuscheidende Darstellung: Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. London, British Museum E 439. ARV² 298.1643 (Hephaisteion-Maler); *Paralipomena*, S. 356; Beazley, *Add²*, S. 211 mit Lit.; *CVA* British Museum 3, III I c, Taf. 19.3b und c; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos Nr. 151, mit Abb. Die früher als Komos gedeutete Inschrift wurde schon von Fränkel, S. 71 Anm. 1, verworfen.
- KΟΜΘΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 71, 92 m.
Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 430 (CA 303). ARV² 1031.40 (Polygnot); *CVA* Louvre 8, III I d, Taf. 39.5 und 7–9.
- KῶΜΘΣ 2) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 2.
- KῶΙ 3) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater, Fr. Syrakus, Museo Archeologico Regionale 24.114. ARV² 1041.1 (Art des Peleus-Malers); Brommer (a.O. s.v. EUMAS 1), S. 43, Abb. 40 und S. 79, Nr. 126; G. Schwarz, *Triptolemos* (Horn, 1987), S. 49, V 110. Triptolemos im Kreis von Satyrn. Er blickt nach links zu einem Satyrn, von dem noch ein unpubliziertes Fragment erhalten ist. Dort Rest der Beischrift, s. weiter Beazley.
- KΟΜΘΣ 4) Fränkel, S. 71, 96 s.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Compiègne, Musée

- Vivenel 1025 (ehem. Slg. Magnoncourt). *ARV*² 1055.76, 1680 (Polygnot-Gruppe); Beazley, *Add*², S. 322; *CVA* Compiègne, Taf. 18.1, 19.1–2; E. Simon, *Opfernde Götter* (Berlin, 1953), S. 49.
- ΚΩΜΟΣ 5) Fränkel, S. 70, 102 μ.
Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1024. Lit. s.v. HEDYOINOS 2.
- ΚΩΜΟΣ 6) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1937.983. *ARV*² 1153.13 (Dinos-Maler); *Paralipomena*, S. 457; Beazley, *Add*², S. 336 mit Lit.; J. D. Beazley, *AJA* 43 (1939), S. 618ff., Taf. 13; Brommer (a.O. s.v. EUMAS 1), S. 83, Nr. 187; K. Kerényi, *Prometheus* (Zürich, 1963), Taf. 8–9; Schefold, *Göttersage*, S. 88, Abb. 112; J. H. Oakley, in H. Brijder, Hrsg., *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery*, Kongreß Amsterdam, 1984 (Amsterdam, 1985), S. 120, Abb. 2 und S. 126, Nr. 25; Immerwahr, S. 112, Nr. 772.
- ΚΩΜΟΣ 7) Fränkel, S. 64, 100 ζ.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2369. *ARV*² 1154.29 (Dinos-Maler).
- ΚΩΜΟΣ 8) Fränkel, S. 71, 102 v.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1011. Lit. s.v. HEDYOINOS 1.
- ΚΩΜΟΣ 9) Fränkel, S. 71 Anm. 1, 104 ρ.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Providence, Rhode Island School of Design 23.324 (ehem. Slg. Hope 140). *ARV*² 1188.1 (Pothos-Maler); Beazley, *Add*², S. 341; E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Hope Vases* (New York, 1923), S. 83–84, Nr. 140, Taf. 23; *CVA* Providence 1, Taf. 23.1a; W. D. Albert, *Darstellungen des Eros in Unteritalien* (Amsterdam, 1979), Abb. 72a; A. Queyrel, *BCH* 108 (1984), S. 128, Abb. 7b.
- ΚΩΜΟ[10) Fränkel, S. 63, 100 η.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Ehem. Slg. Hope 141. Tillyard (a.O. s.v. KOMOS 9), S. 85, Nr. 141; Sotheby's, Auktion, 3. Dezember, 1946, Nr. 55.
- ΚΟΜΟΣ 11) Fränkel, S. 70, 98 α.
Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, ehem. Berlin F 2471. *ARV*² 1247.1 (Eretria-Maler); *Paralipomena*, S. 469; Beazley, *Add*², S. 353 mit Lit.; A. Furtwängler, *Sammlung Sabouroff*, Bd. 1 (Berlin, 1883–1887), Taf. 55; E. Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen* (München, 1923), Abb. 560; W. Real, *Studien zur Entwicklung der Vasenmalerei im ausgehenden 5. Jh. v. Chr.* (Münster, 1973), Taf. 7a, 9a, 14a; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos Nr. 334; Lezzi-Hafter, *Eretria*, S. 226–227, 342–343, Nr. 234, Taf. 143d, 144d; Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 793.
- ΚΟΜΟΣ 12) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Chous. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 08.258.22. *ARV*² 1249.12 (Eretria-Maler); Beazley, *Add*², S. 354; FR, Taf. 120.1; Richter und Hall (a.O. s.v. CHORILLOS 2), Nr. 140, Taf. 142; F. Brommer,

Hephaistos (Mainz, 1978), Taf. 9.2; Schefold, *Göttersage*, S. 133, Abb. 172; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos Nr. 565 mit Abb.; Lezzi-Hafter, *Eretria*, S. 339, Nr. 213, Taf. 135; Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 796.

	ΚΟΜΟΣ	13+14) Fränkel, S. 70, 98 y.
	ΚΟΜΟΙ	Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Berlin F 2532, und Rom, Villa Giulia, Slg. Castellani o. Nr. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 3. Hier sind zwei Satyrn Komos benannt.
	ΚΩΜΟΣ	15) Fränkel, S. 70, 96 w. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. London, British Museum E 82. <i>ARV</i> ² 1269.3 (Kodros-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 356; R. N. Thönges-Stringaris, <i>AM</i> 80 (1965), S. 17, Abb. 16; R. M. Gais, <i>AJA</i> 82 (1978), S. 366, Abb. 16; E. Simon, <i>Die Götter der Griechen</i> ³ (München, 1985), S. 266, Abb. 257; Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 787.
	ΚΩΜΟΣ	16) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum L 491. <i>ARV</i> ² 1270.17 (Kodros-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 356 mit Lit.; Langlotz (a.O. s.v. CHORILLOS 4), Nr. 491; <i>CVA</i> Würzburg 2, S. 13ff., Taf. 5–6; A. Lezzi-Hafter, <i>AA</i> , 1985, S. 249ff., Abb. 30–31.
KRATAIOS (?)	Κραταιος	aber auch Ergänzung zu einem zweistämmigen Vollnamen (Typ κραται-μένης, <i>HPN</i> , S. 256) wäre möglich, “der Starke”.
	ΚΡΑΤΑΙΙ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfiguriger Kolonnenkrater, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.4 und L.87.AE.120.11 (Lydos). Hier Abb. 2c.
LAMPON	Λάμπων	“der Leuchtende”. Zur Fehlschreibung -vπ-, s. L. Threatte, <i>The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions</i> (Berlin und New York, 1980), S. 592ff., Nr. 48.03.
	ΛΑΝΠΟΝ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale. Lit. s.v. AGRIOS 1.
LASIOS	Λάσιος	“dichtbehaart”, vgl. den Menschnennamen, <i>HPN</i> , S. 494.
	ΛΑΣΙΟΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale. Lit. s.v. AGRIOS 1.
	ΛΑΣΙΟΣ	2) Fränkel, S. 23, 90 y. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. München, Antikensammlungen 2612. <i>ARV</i> ² 88.3 (Euergides-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 170 mit Lit.; <i>JHS</i> 33 (1913), S. 352, Abb. 5; <i>RE</i> 12 (1925), S. 887 s.v. Lasios (Kroll); H. Bloesch, <i>Formen attischer Schalen</i> (Bern und Bümpliz, 1940), Taf. 15.4a.
	ΛΑΣΙΟC	3) Nicht bei Fränkel. Bemalter Stoff aus Antinoë. Paris, Musée du Louvre o. Inv. E. Guimet, <i>Les Portraits d'Antinoë au Musée Guimet</i> (Paris, 1912), S. 19, Taf. 13; C. Boreux, <i>Musée du Louvre: Catalogue-guide des antiquités égyptiennes</i> (Paris, 1932), S. 279, Taf. 40; P. J. Nordhagen, <i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i> 54 (1961), S. 335–336, Taf. 13; K. Wessel, <i>Koptische Kunst</i> (Recklinghausen, 1963), S. 204ff., Abb. 107; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos in peripheria orientali Nr. 95, Nr.

		116. Der Name wurde in der Literatur sonst fälschlich als NAXIOS gelesen.
LEMNOS	Λῆμνος	vom Namen der Insel ohne Ableitungssuffix gebildet. Zur Bildung, vgl. die PN Θάσος, Νάξος, Σάμος usw. <i>HPN</i> , S. 550–551. Dagegen mit Suffix der PN Λῆμνιος, <i>HPN</i> , S. 540.
	ΛΗΜΝΟΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 55, 98 z. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142458. Lit. s.v. AIETOS 1; Immerwahr, S. 115, Nr. 799.
LENAIOS	Ληναίος	auch Beiname des Dionysos, vgl. ληνός (Behältnis zum Keltern der Weintrauben).
	ΛΗΝΕΟC	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Bemalter Stoff aus Antinoë. Paris, Musée du Louvre o. Inv. Lit. s.v. LASIOS 3.
LEPSIS	Λεῖψις	vielleicht als abgekürztes Terpsimbrotos-Kompositum mit dem Vorderglied λῆψι- “fangen, ergreifen” aufzufassen. Dann wären die PN auf λαβε- bzw. ihre Kurzformen λάβης usw. parallel. Semantisch vgl. Ἐχών?
	ΛΕΦΣΙΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 25–26, 90 c. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. London, British Museum E 65. Lit. s.v. BABAKCHOS 1; Immerwahr, S. 88–89, Nr. 551.
LITHON oder AITHON	ΛΙΘΟΝ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale. Lit. s.v. AGRIOS 1.
MAINOMENOS ?	ΜΑΙ[1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Formschüssel, Fr. Pella, Archäologisches Museum 81.97. G. M. Akamatis, <i>Pelinae mitres angion apo tin Pella</i> (Thessaloniki, 1985), S. 444ff., Nr. 316, Abb. 29, Taf. 215b, 216a. Akamatis schlägt für den ekstatisch tanzenden Satyrn die Ergänzung des Namens zu Mainoles vor, doch scheint mir Mainomenos überzeugender. Vielleicht könnte man auch MAINEUES ergänzen, was in einer Vaseninschrift als Kentaurername überliefert ist: CB, Bd. 3, S. 86.
MALEOS	Μάλεος ΜΑΛΕΟC	unklar, mehrdeutig. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 07.286.85. <i>ARV</i> ² 632.3 (Methysemaler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 272; Richter und Hall (a.O. s.v. CHORILLOS 2), S. 140ff., Nr. 109, Taf. 109–110; M. Bieber, <i>The History of Greek and Roman Theater</i> ² (Princeton, 1961), S. 8, Abb. 19; <i>RE</i> 14 (1930), S. 881, s.v. Maleos 1 (Burckhardt); <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Chryseis II, Nr. 1 mit Abb.; ebenda s.v. Dionysos Nr. 320.
MARON	Μάρων ΜΑΡΩΝ	Trabant des Dionysos, der besonders mit der Weinkultivierung verbunden ist. <i>Od.</i> IX.197ff.; Eur., <i>Kyklops</i> , 412; “der (mit der Hand) Geschickte”. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik aus Shahba-Philippopolis. J. Balty, <i>Mosaiques antiques de Syrie</i> (Brüssel, 1977), S. 50ff. mit Abb.; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos in peripheria orientali Nr. 114 mit Abb. und Lit.

- MAPΩN 2) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Mosaik. Privatbesitz. P. Canivet und J. P. Darmon, *Mon Piot* 70 (1989), S. 1ff., Abb. 1.2.
- MARSYAS Μαρσύας aus der Midas-Sage bekannter Satyrname, dessen Etymologie aber unklar ist; vermutlich stammt er aus einer nicht-griechischen Sprache, etwa dem Phrygischen.
- ΜΑΡΣΥΑΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 72, 94 p.
Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B 3. ARV² 618.3 (Villa Giulia-Maler); Beazley, *Add²*, S. 270; CVA Karlsruhe 1, Taf. 19.1; B. Otto, *Jahrbuch der Kunstsammlungen Baden-Württemberg* 12 (1975), S. 21, Abb. 1; J. Thimme, *Bildhefte des Badischen Landesmuseums, Karlsruhe: Griechische Vasen* (Karlsruhe, 1975), Nr. 52 mit Abb.; M. Maaß, *Badisches Landesmuseum: Wege zur Klassik* (Karlsruhe, 1985), Umschlagbild; Scheffold, *Göttersage*, S. 130, Abb. 166; Veder Greco, *Le Necropoli di Agrigento*, Ausstellung, Agrigento, 1988 (Rom, 1988), S. 156, Nr. 37; A. Schöne, *Der Thiasos* (Göteborg, 1987), S. 166, Taf. 28; Immerwahr, S. 103, Nr. 705.
- ΜΑΡΣΥΑΣ 2+3) Nicht bei Fränkel.
ΜΑΡΣΥ[Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery 1913.132. ARV² 1035.4, 1679 (Midas-Maler); Beazley, *Add²*, S. 318; P. V. C. Baur, *Catalogue of the Rebecca Darlington Stoddard Collection of Greek and Italian Vases in Yale University* (New Haven, 1922), S. 88–89, Nr. 132, Abb. 24, Taf. 7; G. M. A. Richter, *Ancient Furniture* (Oxford, 1926), Abb. 131; B. Philippaki, *The Attic Stamnos* (Oxford, 1967), S. 133, Taf. 55.2; Otto (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 1), S. 31, Abb. 10; S. Matheson Burke und J. J. Pollitt, *Greek Vases at Yale* (New Haven, 1975), S. 72ff., Nr. 60 mit Lit. Zwei Satyrn sind Marsyas benannt.
- ΜΑΡΣΥΑΣ 4) Fränkel, S. 72, 94 P.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 421 (N3402). ARV² 1037.1 (near the Peleus Painter as well as the Hector Painter); *Paralipomena*, S. 443; Beazley, *Add²*, S. 319; E. Pottier, *Vases antiques du Louvre*, Bd. 3 (Paris, 1922), Taf. 143.G 421; CVA Louvre 4, III I d, Taf. 21.8, 22.2; Otto (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 1), S. 23, Abb. 2; P. Ghiron-Bistagne, *Recherches sur les Acteurs dans la Grèce antique* (Paris, 1976), S. 236, Abb. 87; Immerwahr, S. 111, Nr. 767.
- ΜΑΡΣ[5) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater, Fr. Basel, Slg. Cahn HC 436 (chem. Athen, Slg. Leatham). ARV² 1144.16 (Kleophon-Maler); Beazley, *Add²*, S. 334; Boardman (a.O. s.v. DITHYRAMBOS 1), S. 18ff., Taf. 1.1 und 3; Froning, S. 33, 37–38, 40 K 1; Otto (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 1), S. 32, Abb. 12; *Attische Meisterzeichnungen* (a.O. s.v. ERPON 1), Nr. 71.
- ΜΑΡΣΥΑΣ 6) Fränkel, S. 72, 98 B.
Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. ARV² 1184.1 (Kadmos-Maler); *Paralipomena*, S. 460; Beazley, *Add²*, S. 340; H. Sichtermann, *Griechische Vasen in Unteritalien aus der Sammlung Jatta in Ruvo* (Tübingen,

- 1966), S. 20–21, K 10, Taf. 12ff.; Froning, S. 40, Nr. 2; Schefold, *Göttersage*, S. 174, Abb. 232.
- ΜΑΡΣΥ[7) Fränkel, S. 102 λ.
Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 3235 (81401). *ARV*² 1316.1 (Gruppe von Neapel H 3235); Beazley, *Add*², S. 362 mit Lit.; S. Papaspyridi-Karouzou, *AJA* 42 (1938), S. 499–500, Abb. 7; Otto (a.O. s.v. ΜΑΡΣΥΑΣ 1), S. 33, Abb. 14.
- ΜΑΡΣ[8) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Lukanischer Skyphos. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 12.235.4. A. D. Trendall, *The Red-figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily* (London, 1967), S. 53, 273, Taf. 23.1 (Palermo-Maler); ebenda, 2. Suppl., S. 153 und 3. Suppl., S. 19; J. Charbonneaux, R. Martin und R. Villard, *Grèce classique* (Paris, 1969), Abb. 342; Schefold, *Göttersage*, S. 175, Abb. 234; Froning, S. 42, K 38, Taf. 12.1.
- ΜΑΡΚΥΑΚ 9) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Mosaik. Zypern, Nea Paphos, Haus des Aion. Daszewski, S. 23, Abb. 3, S. 27ff., Taf. 6.
- ΜΕΓΑΣ auch Menschenname, vgl. *HPN*, S. 300, “der Große”.
- ΜΕΓΑΣ
ΜΕΓ[ΙΑΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 13, 82 B (liest hier ΜΕΛΙΙ).
Chalkidischer Kolonnettenkrater. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire A 135. Lit. s.v. DORKIS 2. Zur Lesung: *CVA* Brüssel 2, zu III E, Taf. 1.1a.
- ΜΙΜΑΣ auch Menschenname, *HPN*, S. 575. Weitere Anknüpfung aber unklar. Vielleicht am ehesten zu der Hesychglosse μίμαρ-ἀναιδές oder allenfalls verkürzt aus Μιμαλλών fem., das die Bakchen bezeichnet. Weniger plausibel ist der Vorschlag Fränkels, S. 68 Anm. 5, es zu μιμημός-τοῦ ἵππου φωνή bei Hesychios, also “das Wiehern”, zu stellen. Wohl zu μιμέομαι “nachahmen”.
- ΜΙΜΑΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 68, 92 l.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142355 (ehem. Gołuchów, Slg. Czartoryski 43). *ARV*² 1045.6 (Lykaon-Maler); Beazley, *Add*², S. 320; Beazley, *Poland* (a.O. s.v. AIETOS 1), S. 54ff., Taf. 24–25; *CVA* Gołuchów III I d, Taf. 24; W. Dobrowolsky, *Wazy Greckie*, Bd. 2 (Warschau, 1982), Taf. 14.
- ΜΙΜΟΣ wohl Variante zu Μίμας. Aber beachte allenfalls auch die Glosse in der Suda μίμω “Affe”, die zu μιμῆσθαι “nachahmen” gehört.
- ΜΙΜΟΣ 1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater, Fr. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum H 5708. *ARV*² 1339.5 (nahe dem Talos-Maler); Beazley, *Add*², S. 367 mit Lit.; E. Simon, *Pantheon* 36 (1978), S. 199ff., Abb. 1, 2, 4; *CVA* Würzburg 2, Taf. 42.1, 44.4.
- ΜΟΛΚΟΣ unklar (dialektale Variante zu μαλακός “weich, zart, schlaff”? Dafür käme z.B. der Dialekt Kretas in Frage.) Dagegen erscheint P. Kretschmers Vorschlag, *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht* (Gütersloh, 1894), S. 145, ihn mit μέλιπομαι zu verknüpfen,

		lautlich unmöglich. Allenfalls müßte man zu Μολπος konjizieren.
	ΜΟΛΚΟΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 70, 96 u. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Hillsborough, Slg. Hearst (chem. Slg. Hamilton). <i>ARV</i> ² 1185.13 (Kadmos-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 341; Tillyard (a.O. s.v. KOMOS 9), S. 82–83, Nr. 139, Taf. 23; <i>RE</i> 16 (1935), S. 7–8, s.v. Molkos (Scherling); I. K. Raubitschek, <i>The Hearst Hillsborough Vases</i> (Mainz, 1969), S. 71ff., Nr. 20; Froning, S. 37 mit Anm. 234, S. 40 K 10.
MOLPAIOS	Μολπαῖος ΜΟΛΠΑΙΟΣ	Ableitung von μολπή. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfiguriger Kolonnettenkrater, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.4 (Lydos). Hier Abb. 2a.
MYRIS	Μύρις ΜΥΡΙΣ	auch Menschenname, <i>HPN</i> , S. 602 (zu μύρον "Salbe"). 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 07.286.85. Lit. s.v. MALEOS 1. 2) Fränkel, S. 16, 82 c. Entfällt (kein Satyr).
NEKTAR	Νέκταρ ΝΕΚΤΑΡ	Satyr? 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Zypern, Nea Paphos, Haus des Aion. Daszewski, Taf. 18. Nektar trägt im Gegensatz zu den übrigen Mitgliedern des Thiasos einen Schilfkranz auf dem Kopf, weshalb auch zu überlegen ist, ob wirklich ein Satyr gemeint ist oder vielleicht eher ein Flußgott. Denn die Tierohren begegnen auf diesem Mosaik auch bei anderen Wassergottheiten. Die ikonographische Erscheinung als Flußgott würde zu Nektar passen, denn der Göttertrank soll Schriftquellen zufolge von den Strömen des Okeanos kommen (Athen. 11.491b).
NYKTERINOS	Νυκτερίνος ΝΥΚΤΕΡΙΝΟΣ	etwa "der nachts unterwegs ist". Vermutlich Personifizierung der nächtlichen Serenade. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Choregisches Monument, Thasos. Lit. s.v. DITHYRAMBOS 2. Figur nicht erhalten. Namensbeischrift auf der Basis. Die Figur hatte wahrscheinlich die Gestalt eines Satyrn. <i>RE</i> 17 (1936), S. 1511, s.v. Nykterinos (Herter).
OFATIES	Ὀφατίης ΟΦΑΤΙΕΣ	"der mit (großen) Ohren"; vgl. F. Bechtel, <i>Die einstämmigen männlichen Personennamen der Griechen</i> (Berlin, 1898), S. 29. Vgl. die PN Ουατίας und Ουαπαίης, L. Zgusta, <i>Kleinasiatische Personennamen</i> (Prag, 1964), § 1146. Das η weist auf ionische Herkunft (wie Ἀντίης). 1) Fränkel, S. 8, 82 A. Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1; <i>RE</i> 18.1 (1942), S. 1890, s.v. Ofaties (v. Geisau).
OINAREUS	Οἰναρεύς ΟΙΝΑΡΕΥΣ	zu οἶναρον "Weinblatt, Weinrebe". 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Basel, Slg. Cahn HC 432.

		Lit. s.v. ERPON 1. Hier Abb. 6b.
OINOBIOS	Οινόβιος OINOBIOS (zweimal)	“der seinen Lebensunterhalt aus dem Wein bezieht”. 1 + 2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 07.286.85. Lit. s.v. MALEOS 1. Hier sind zwei Satyrn Oinobios benannt.
OINOPION	Οἰνοπίων O[I]NOPION	“Weintrinker”, vgl. den Menschnennamen Οἰνοπίδης, HPN, S. 535. 1) Fränkel, S. 72, 92 l. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142355. Lit. s.v. MIMAS 1; RE 17 (1936), S. 2275–2276, s.v. Oinopion 2 (Göber).
	OINOPIΩN	2) Fränkel, S. 72, 98 β. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 6.
OINOS	Οἶνος]IN[vermutlich Kurzform eines zweiteiligen Vollnamens mit dem Vorderglied οἶνο- “Wein”, vgl. HPN, S. 345 und 575. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. München, Antikensammlungen 2606. ARV ² 64.102, 1622 (Oitos); Beazley, <i>Add²</i> , S. 166 mit Lit.; Bruhn, <i>Oitos</i> , S. 46–47, Nr. 37, Abb. 30; RE 17 (1936), S. 2276, s.v. Oinos 4 (Schmidt); LIMC 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos Nr. 384 mit Abb. Da nur so wenig vom Namen erhalten ist, kommen auch noch andere Ergänzungen in Betracht.
	OINOS	2) Fränkel, S. 63, 104 ρ. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Providence, Rhode Island School of Design 23.324. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 9; Schmidt (a.O. s.v. OINOS 1), S. 2276, s.v. Oinos 2.
	OINOS	3) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Baltimore, Museum of Art 37.127 (aus Antiochia). D. Levi, <i>Antioch Mosaic Pavements</i> (Princeton, 1947), S. 186ff., Taf. 42a–b; Schmidt (a.O. s.v. OINOS 1), S. 2276, s.v. Oinos 3; AJA 40 (1936), S. 6, Abb. 7, S. 348ff., Abb. 1; LIMC 1 (1981), s.v. Agros Nr. 1 mit Lit.
OIPHON	ΟΙΦΟΝ	Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142332. Wohl kein eigener Satyrname, sondern nach Fränkel, S. 37, 90 b, zu Brikon gehörig, vielleicht Attribut. Lit. s.v. BRIKON 1; Immerwahr, S. 65, Nr. 374.
ONNASEUAS	Ὀννασεύας ONNASEYAS	Hinterglied Part. Aor. Aktiv zu σεύω “jagen, hasten, eilen, stürmen”? Vorderglied Präverb ἀνα- mit dialektalem Wandel a > o. Vgl. II. XV.681, σεύας. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Lukanischer Skyphos. Palermo, Museo Nazionale 2158. Trendall (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 8), S. 53, 275 (Palermo-Maler); Trendall (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 8), 2. Suppl., S. 153; Fränkel, S. 109, scheidet das Stück zu Unrecht aus. Auf italischen Vasen ist es durchaus üblich, daß der Name der dargestellten Figur auf einer Stele beigeschrieben ist, vgl. den Skyphos vom selben Maler mit der Inschriftenstele Marsyas, hier MARSYAS 8.

OREIMACHOS	Ὀρείμαχος	wörtlich “der in den Bergen Kämpfende”. Unter den zahlreichen Komposita mit ορει- ist dies sonst nicht belegt.
	ΟΡΕΙΜΑΧΧΟΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 24, 90 d. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Berlin F 2160. <i>ARV</i> ² 196.1, 1633 (Berliner Maler); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 342; Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 190; FR, Taf. 159.2; J. D. Beazley, <i>The Berlin Painter</i> (Mainz, 1974), S. 1, Taf. 1ff.; P. E. Arias, B. B. Shefton und M. Hirmer, <i>A History of Greek Vase Painting</i> (London, 1962), Taf. 151; A. Greifenhagen, <i>Antike Kunstwerke</i> ² (Berlin, 1966), Taf. 42, 43, 45; <i>RE</i> 18.1 (1942), S. 941, s.v. Oreimachos (Frank); <i>AJA</i> 83 (1979), Taf. 27.18; Boardman, <i>ARFV</i> , Abb. 144; Simon (a.O. s.v. KOMOS 15), S. 306, Abb. 292; Robertson (a.O. s.v. BYBAX 1), Taf. 83a; <i>GettyMusJ</i> 6–7 (1978–1979), S. 137, Abb. 11; <i>Jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunstsammlungen</i> 24 (1979), S. 48, Abb. 24; D. C. Kurtz, in: <i>Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum</i> 2 (1985), S. 239, Abb. 2–3; Immerwahr, S. 82, Nr. 490.
OROCHARES	Ὀροχάρης	wörtlich etwa “der sich in den Bergen wohlfühlt”; sonst nicht belegt.
	ΟΡΟΧΑΡΕΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 24, 90 d. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Berlin F 2160. Lit. s.v. OREIMACHOS 1; Immerwahr, S. 82, Nr. 490.
OUKALEGON	Οὐκαλέγων	in der <i>Ilias</i> III.148 als Name eines trojanischen Greises belegt, “der sich um nichts kümmert”.
	ΟΥΚΑΛΕΓΟΝ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfiguriger Kolonnettenkrater, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.4 (Lydos). Hier Abb. 2a.
PAIDIKOS	Παιδικός ΠΑΙΚΟΣ	“der sich mit Knaben abgibt”, vermutlich sexuell. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Kunsthandel. Sotheby’s, Auktion, 17.–18. Juli, 1985, Nr. 263; <i>MuM</i> Auktion 70 (1986), S. 56–57, Nr. 184, Taf. 31 (Umkreis des Nikosthenes-Malers). Vielleicht ist dieser Name auch als Töpfersignatur zu verstehen (s. weiter <i>MuM</i> a.O.).
PEON	Πέων ΠΕΟΝ	zu πέος “membrum virile”. 1) Fränkel, S. 25, 88 T. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 33. <i>ARV</i> ² 14.4 (Euphronios); Pottier (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 4), Bd. 2, Taf. 91.G 33; <i>CVA</i> Louvre 1, III I c, Taf. 1.3; <i>Capolavori di Euphronios</i> , Ausstellung, Arezzo 1990, S. 148ff., Nr. 28 mit Abb. (M. Denoyelle).
PHANOS	Φάνος	mehrdeutig; entweder identisch mit dem Subst. φάνος “Fackel” (bzw. dem Adj. φανός “hell”) oder Kurzform zu einem PN mit dem Element φαν-, vgl. <i>HPN</i> , S. 438ff. und 604.
	ΠΑΝΟΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Frankfurt, Museum für Kunsthandwerk WM 03. Lit. s.v. EUPNOUS 1.
PHLE...	Φλε[vgl. <i>HPN</i> , S. 482. Eher Determinativkompositum “der Hengst mit der (großen) φλέψ” als ein umgekehrtes Possessivkompositum; diesem müßte ein *Ἰππό-φλεβος zu-

		grundeliegen “der die φλέψ (hier: das membrum virile) eines Hengstes hat”. Daß Silene als ἵπποι bezeichnet werden, darauf deutet wohl der Name ἵπποι hin.
	ΦΛΕΙ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Vatikan, Astarita 280. <i>ARV</i> ² 1623 (may be by Oltos), vielleicht zu Phlebippos, Phlebodokos oder Phlebon zu ergänzen.
PHLEBIPPOS	Φλέβιππος ΦΛΕΒΙΠΟΣ	s. zu PHLE. . . . 1) Fränkel, S. 24, 88 X. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2617 (81330). Lit. s.v. DORKIS 3; <i>RE</i> 20 (1950), S. 258, s.v. Phlebippos (Eitrem).
	ΙΕΒΙΠΟΣ	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Basel, Slg. Cahn HC 600 (Oltos).
PHLEBODOKOS	Φλεβόδοκος ΦΛΕΒΟΔΟΚΟΣ	vielleicht sexueller Sinn: “der die φλέψ eines anderen in sich aufnimmt”. Vgl. die PN mit Grundglied -δοκο-, <i>HPN</i> , S. 139. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. Paris, Musée du Louvre C 10784. <i>ARV</i> ² 23.3 (Phintias); Immerwahr, S. 67, Nr. 387.
PHLEBON	Φ]λέβων ΙΛΕΒΟΝ	Ergänzung ist recht sicher. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Deckel, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.214.A.3 (Onesimos). Erwähnt: <i>GettyMusJ</i> 14 (1986), S. 191, Nr. 48. Hier Abb. 4d.
PHSOLAS	Φσόλας ΦΣΟΛΑΣ	J. D. Beazley, <i>BSA</i> 32 (1931/1932), S. 21, akzentuiert ψολᾶς; zu ψολῆ “membrum virile praeputio retracto”. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfiguriger Aryballos. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 26.49. Lit. s.v. DOPHIOS 1; Immerwahr, S. 27, Nr. 97.
PHYMOS	Φῦμος ΦΥΜΟΣ	vielleicht zu φῦμα “Gewächs”, auch “Tumor”? Aber Sinn unklar, vielleicht sexuelle Konnotation. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum L 491. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 16.
PORIS	Πόρις ΠΟ[ΙΙΣ	zu πόρις “Kalb, Jungtier”, auch “junges Mädchen”. Nebenform zu πόρις. Vgl. <i>HPN</i> , S. 586, PN πορῖνος. 1) Fränkel, S. 10–11, 82 B. Chalkidischer Kolonnenkrater. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire A 135. Lit. s.v. DORKIS 2; <i>RE</i> 21 (1952), S. 1143, s.v. Podis (Radke). 2) Fränkel, S. 16, 82 C. Entfällt (kein Satyr).
POSTHON	Πόσθων ΠΟΣΘΟΝ	zu πόσθη “membrum virile”, auch als Menschenname belegt, <i>HPN</i> , S. 482. 1) Fränkel, S. 74, 94 p. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B 3. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 1; <i>RE</i> 22 (1954),

		S. 862–863, s.v. Posthon (Herter); Immerwahr, S. 103, Nr. 705.
PYROS		Fränkel, S. 18, 82 C. Entfällt (kein Satyr).
SAMON	Σάμων	unklar. Kaum zum Namen der Insel Samos. Wenn das α dorisch ist, dann vielleicht zu den PN auf HPN, S. 398, ebenda Σήμων.
	ΣΑΜΟΝ	Wohl kein Satyr, sondern ein Dämon. 1) Fränkel, S. 19–20, 82 D. Böotisch schwarzfigurige Dreifußpyxis. Berlin V.I. 3364. J. Marcadé und W. Zschietzschmann, <i>Eros Kalos</i> (Genf, 1962), S. 110; B. Sparkes, <i>JHS</i> 87 (1967), S. 120, Taf. 15d; U. Gehrig, A. Greifenhagen und N. Kunisch, <i>Führer durch die Antikenabteilung der Staatlichen Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin</i> (Berlin, 1968), S. 52.
SAON		Fränkel, S. 72, 106 X. Entfällt; die Vase ist identisch mit SATHON 1.
SATHON	Σάθων	zu σάθη "membrum virile". Als PN belegt, HPN, S. 482, ferner als Kosewort für männliche Babies.
	ΣΑΘ[]Ν	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 2.
SATRUBS s. SIBYRTAS		
SATYROI	ΣΑΤΥΡΟΙ	1) Fränkel, S. 49 Anm. 2. Pergamonaltar. Berlin, Pergamonmuseum. E. Simon, <i>Pergamon und Hesiod</i> (Mainz, 1975), S. 4 Anm. 19, S. 15 Anm. 74, S. 31, 33, 49–50, Taf. 28, mit Lit.
	САΤΥΡΟΙ	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Formschüssel. Pella, Archäologisches Museum 81.97. Lit. s.v. MAINOMENOS (?) 1.
SATYROS	САΤΥΡΟС	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Wandbehang. Cleveland (Ohio) Museum of Art 1975.6 (weitere Frr. in Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, <i>Annual Report</i> [1973], S. 74, und Riggisberg, Abeggstiftung: <i>Führer durch die Sammlung Abegg-Stiftung, Bern</i> [1976], Titelbild). D. G. Shepherd, <i>Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art</i> 63 (1976), S. 307ff., Abb. 1, 3, 9; K. Weitzmann, Hrsg., <i>Age of Spirituality</i> , Ausstellungskatalog, New York 1977/1978 (Princeton, 1979), S. 144–145, Nr. 124 (D. G. Shepherd).
	САΤΥΡΟ[]	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Madaba, Museum. F. R. Scheck, <i>Jordanien DuMont Kunstreiseführer</i> (Köln, 1985), S. 277 mit Abb.
	САΤΥΡΟС	3) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Privatbesitz. Lit. s.v. MARON 2.
S(I)BYRTAS	Σ[ι]βύρτας	gewiß mit W. Schulze, <i>GGA</i> (1896), S. 254 = <i>Kleine Schriften</i> (München, 1975) linksläufig als Σ[ι]βύρτας zu lesen. So auch Fränkel, S. 35. Zu Σιβύρτας vgl. O. Masson, <i>RPhil</i> 53 (1979), S. 244–245, er zieht z.B. Σιβύριος, Aristophanes, <i>Acharner</i> , 118, Σιβύριος usw. heran. Dagegen will F. Hölscher, <i>CVA Würzburg</i> , in anderer Lese-

		richtung einen sonst unbekanntem Namen, Σατυρβς, lesen.
	ΣΒΥΡΤΑΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 35, 90 Z. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum L 474. Lit. s.v. EUKRATES 1. Anderer (verfehlt) Vorschlag: Rückwärtslesung = Satrubs.
SIKINNIS	Σίκιννις	zu σίκιννις = Name eines Tanzes der Satyrn (vgl. Διθύραμβος). Auch Menschenname, <i>HPN</i> , S. 551. Dies Subst., σίκιννις, ist seinerseits angeblich abgeleitet vom Eigennamen Σίκιννος, dem Erfinder dieses Tanzes.
	ΣΙΚ[Ι]ΝΝΙΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1937.983. Lit. s. v. KOMOS 6; Immerwahr, S. 112, Nr. 772.
SIKINNOS	Σίκιννος	s. zu SIKINNIS.
	ΣΙΚΙΝΟΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Basel, Kunsthandel. <i>MuM Sonderliste N</i> (Mai 1971), S. 51ff., Nr. 69 mit Abb. (Oltos).
	ΣΙΚΙ ΪΣ	2) Fränkel, S. 36, 86 R. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Berlin F 4220. <i>ARV</i> ² 61.76, 1700 (Oltos); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 165; Bruhn, <i>Oltos</i> , S. 41–42, Nr. 31, Abb. 25; Gehrig, Greifenhagen und Kunisch (a.O. s.v. SAMON 1), S. 135; <i>RE</i> 2 A (1923), S. 2526–2527, s.v. Sikinos 3 (Leonard).
	ΣΙΚΙΝΝΟΣ	3) Fränkel, S. 69, 98 β. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 6; Leonard (a.O. s.v. SIKINNOS 2), S. 2527.
	ΣΙΚΙΝΝΟΣ	4) Fränkel, S. 60–61, 100 δ. Attisch rotfigurige Oinochoe. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 00.352. <i>ARV</i> ² 1214.1, 1687 (Kraipale-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 348; CB, Bd. 2 (Oxford, 1954), S. 93ff., Nr. 112, Taf. 64; G. M. A. Richter, <i>Attic Red-Figured Vases: A Survey</i> (New Haven, 1946), S. 136, Abb. 105; K. F. Felten, <i>Thanatos- und Kleophonmaler</i> (München, 1971), S. 39ff., 100, Abb. 3, S. 101, Abb. 3, S. 105, Abb. 1; Leonard (a.O. s.v. SIKINNOS 2), S. 2527.
SILENOI	Σίληνοι ΣΙΑΕΝΟΙ	der Gattungsname als Individualname. 1) Fränkel, S. 20, 84 E. Attisch schwarzfiguriger Volutenkrater (Françoisvase). Florenz, Museo Archeologico 4209. <i>ABV</i> 76.1 (Klitias und Ergotimos); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 29–30; Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 21 mit Lit.; Simon und Hirmer (a.O. s.v. BYBAX 1), Taf. 56; M. Cristofani, <i>Il vaso François</i> (Rom, 1981), S. 71, 141, Abb. 92–93; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos Nr. 567 mit Abb.; Carpenter (a.O. s.v. HIAKCHOS 1), Taf. 4A; Immerwahr, S. 24–25, Nr. 83.
SILENOS	Σίληνος ΣΙΑΕΝΟΣ	der Gattungsname als Individualname. 1) Fränkel, S. 20, 84 F. Attisch schwarzfigurige Schale. Berlin V.I. 3151. <i>ABV</i> , S. 79–80 (Ergotimos); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 30; Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 22; F. Brommer, <i>AA</i> , 1941, S. 37, Abb. 1, S. 39ff.; Grei-

- fenhagen (a.O. s.v. OREIMACHOS 1), S. 11, 45, Nr. 24, Abb. 24; Greifenhagen, Gehrig und Kunisch (a.O. s.v. SAMON 1), S. 177, Taf. 48; U. Gehrig u. a., *Kunst der Welt in den Berliner Museen*, Berlin, Antikemuseum, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, 1980 (Stuttgart, 1980), S. 38, Nr. 12; K. Schefold, *Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Kunst* (München, 1978), S. 74, Abb. 90; D. Callipolitis-Feytmans, *BCH* 103 (1979), S. 196, Abb. 2.
- ΣΙΛΕΝΟΣ 2) Fränkel, S. 20, 84 G.
Attisch schwarzfigurige Schale, Fr. Athen, Nationalmuseum Akropolis 1611. B. Graef und E. Langlotz, *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen*, Bd. 1 (Berlin, 1925), S. 171, 1611b, Taf. 82.
- ΣΙΛΑΝΟΣ 3) vgl. hier TERPON 3.
- ΣΙΛΕΝΟΣ 4) Fränkel, S. 20 Anm. 5.
Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. London, British Museum E 447. *ARV*² 1035.3 (Midas-Maler); Beazley, *Add*², S. 318 mit Lit.; *CVA* British Museum 3, III I c, Taf. 22.2a-c; *EAA*, Bd. 4 (1961), S. 1119-1120, Abb. 1329.
- ΣΙΛΗΝΟΣ 5) Fränkel, S. 72, 98 β.
Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 6.
- ΣΙΛΕΝΟΣ 6) Fränkel, S. 72, 98 α.
Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, chem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11; Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 793.
- ΣΕΙΛΗΝΟΣ 7) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Mosaik. Byblos. M. Chehab, in: *La Mosaïque Gréco-Romaine*, Kongreß, Vienne 1971, Bd. 2 (Paris, 1975), S. 371, Taf. 177.1.
- SIMADES Σιμάδης Patronymikon zu Σῆμος = Adj. σιμός "stumpfnäsiger". Σῆμος auch PN, vgl. *HPN*, S. 490-491.
- ΣΙΜΑΔΕΣ oder ΣΙΜΑΘΕΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 23, 86 O.
Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale Archeologico RC 6843. *ARV*² 23.2, 1620 (Phintias); *Paralipomena*, S. 323; Beazley, *Add*², S. 155 mit Lit.; J. Boardman, J. Dörig, W. Fuchs und M. Hirmer, *Die griechische Kunst* (München, 1966), Taf. 114; *CVA* Tarquinia 1, III I, Taf. 1.1; Arias, Shefton und Hirmer (a.O. s.v. OREIMACHOS 1), Taf. 94-95; R. Bianchi Bandinelli und E. Paribeni, *L'Arte dell' Antichità Classica*, Bd. 1 (Turin, 1976), Nr. 326; Boardman, *ARFV*, Abb. 40.2; Paquette (a.O. s.v. HIAKCHOS 1), S. 49, A 30; Schöne (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 1), S. 147-148, 300, Nr. 485; *RE* 3 A (1929), S. 135, s.v. Simades (Zwicker); Immerwahr, S. 67, Nr. 386.
- SIMAIOS Σιμαῖος, Σῆμος, Σῆμος ΣΙΜΑΙΟΣ 1) Fränkel, S. 23, 88 S.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire R 253, und Vatikan, Astarita 306. Lit. s.v. EU...OS 1; *RE* 3 A (1929), S. 135, s.v. Simaios (Storck).

- | | | |
|-------|--------------------|---|
| SIMIS | ΣΜΙΣ | 1) Fränkel, S. 9, 82 B.
Chalkidischer Kolonnettenkrater. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire A 135. Lit. s.v. DORKIS 2. |
| SIMON | ΣΙΜΟΝ | 1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Neapel, Museo Nazionale o. Inv. ARV ² 1029.25 (Polygnot); <i>MonAnt</i> 22 (1913), S. 453, Taf. 88. |
| SIMOS | Σῖμος | zu Simos s. auch RE 3 A (1929), S. 493ff., s.v. Simos 2 (Gunning). |
| | ΣΙΜΟΣ | 1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Spätkorinthisches Kraterfr. aus Phlious. Lit. s.v. DASON 1. |
| | ΙΙΜΟΣ | 2) Fränkel, S. 9, 82 A.
Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1. |
| | Σ(Ι)ΜΟΣ | 3) Fränkel, S. 9, 82 B.
Chalkidischer Kolonnettenkrater. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire A 135. Lit. s.v. DORKIS 2. |
| | ΣΙΜΟΣ | 4) Fränkel, S. 21, 84 I.
Attisch-chalkidische Amphora. 1878 bei Kunsthändler Penelli in Rom. "Sitzender Dionysos, umgeben von Silenen . . . und Mänaden unter Rebzweigen". Beischriften nach Fränkel sind Simos und Antro. A. Greifenhagen, <i>AA</i> , 1957, S. 13 mit Anm. 16, vermutet, daß diese Vase vielleicht mit der attischen Amphora in Frankfurt identisch ist (= hier SIMOS 5). |
| | ΣΙΜΟΣ | 5) Nicht bei Fränkel (s. zu SIMOS 4).
Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Frankfurt, Museum für Kunsthandwerk WM 03. Lit. s.v. EUPNOUS 1. |
| | ΣΙΜΟΣ | 6) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Matera, Museo Nazionale 9974. F. G. Lo Porto, <i>MonAnt</i> 48 (1973), S. 172–173, Nr. 28, Taf. 21.3–5. |
| | ΣΙΜΟΣ
(viermal) | 7–10) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 2. Hier sind vier Satyrn Simos benannt. |
| | Σ.ΜΟΣ | 11) Fränkel, S. 67, 94 σ.
Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. München, Antikensammlungen 2384. ARV ² 1057.98 (Polygnot-Gruppe); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 445; Beazley, <i>Add²</i> , S. 322; FR, Taf. 7; Dionysos (a.O. s.v. CHORILLOS 4), Nr. 3; Brommer (a.O. s.v. KOMOS 12), Taf. 3.2; Henle (a.O. s.v. EU. . . 1), S. 46, Abb. 27; Otto (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 1), S. 24, Abb. 4; D. Ohly, <i>Die Antikensammlungen am Königsplatz in München. Geleitwort für den Besucher²</i> (Waldsassen, o. J.), Taf. 35; Schefold, <i>Göttersage</i> , S. 131, Abb. 167. |
| | ΣΙΜΟΣ | 12) Fränkel, S. 67, 104 π.
Pelike. Verschollen. Lit. s.v. HEDYMELES 1. |
| | ΣΙΜΟΣ | 13) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1937.983. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 6; Immerwahr, S. 112, Nr. 772. |

- ΣΙΜΟΣ 14) Fränkel, S. 67, 100 ζ.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2369. Lit. s.v. Komos 7.
- ΣΙΜΟΣ 15) Fränkel, S. 67, 96 t.
Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Bologna, Museo Civico PU 286. ARV² 1158 (nahe dem Dinos-Maler); Beazley, *Add²*, S. 337; G. Pellegrini, *Catalogo dei Vasi Antichi dipinti* (Bologna, 1900), S. 46ff., Abb. 35; Pfuhl (a.O. s.v. KOMOS 11), Taf. 220, 562; O. Brendel, *RM* 45 (1930), S. 221–222, Abb. 2; U. Hausmann, *Hellenistische Reliefbecher* (Stuttgart, 1959), S. 83; A. H. Borbein, *Campanareliefs* (Heidelberg, 1968), S. 117 mit Anm. 594; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Bakche Nr. 1 mit Abb.
- ΣΙΜΟΣ
(zweimal) 16+17) Fränkel, S. 67, 98 β.
Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 6. Ein Satyr namens Simos begegnet auf jeder Seite.
- ΣΙΜ[18) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum L 491. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 16.
- ΣΙΜΟΣ 19) Fränkel, S. 67, 102 κ.
Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Verschollen. ARV² 1316.2 (Gruppe von Neapel 3235); Jahn (a.O. s.v. BATYLOS 1), Taf. 3.2; F. G. Welcker, *Alte Denkmäler*, Bd. 3 (Göttingen, 1851), S. 136–137, Taf. 13; T. B. L. Webster, *Potter and Patron in Classical Athens* (London, 1972), S. 70; *LIMC* 3 (1986), s.v. Dione 12.
- ΣΙ[20) Fränkel, S. 67, 102 λ.
Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 3235 (81401). Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 7.
- ΣΙΜΟΣ 21) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Sizilisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Lipari, Museo Archeologico Eoliano 9341 D. Trendall (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 8), 3. Suppl., S. 275, Nr. 46f (Adrastos-Gruppe); L. Bernabò Brea und M. Cavalier, *Il castello di Lipari e il Museo Archeologico Eoliano²* (Palermo, 1977), S. 124, Nr. 119, Abb. 120; L. Bernabò Brea, *Menandro e il Teatro greco nelle terrecotte liparesi* (Genua, 1981), Taf. 9.1; N. Stampolidis, *AAA* 15 (1982), S. 143ff., Abb. 1.
- SKIRTOS Σκίρτος wohl zu σκιρτάω “springen”, dem Intensivum zu σκάρω. In Euripides, *Bakch.*, 446, wird σκιρτάω von den Bakchen gesagt. In der *Anthologia Palatina* 1.15 heißt ein Satyr σκιρτοπόδης “der springende Füße hat”; ebendort 7.707 ist Skirtos als Satyrname belegt; s. auch Nonnos, *Dionys.*, 14.11. Als Menschenname meist Sklaven beigelegt. Skirtos als Kentaurenname und Beinamen des Pan: CB, Bd. 3, S. 86.
- ΣΚΡΓΟΣ 1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Sizilisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Lipari, Museo Archeologico Eoliano 9341 D. Lit. s.v. SIMOS 21. Für die Lesung von Skrgos als Skirtos treten Stampolidis (a.O. s.v. SIMOS 21), S. 143ff., und auch E. Simon, *Gnomon* 60 (1988), S. 637, ein.

	ΚΚΙΡΤΟC	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Zypern, Nea Paphos, Haus des Aion. Daszewski, S. 22, Abb. 3, S. 27, Taf. 4.
	ΚΚΙΡΤΟC	3) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik aus Cheikh Zoueide. Ismailia, Museum 2401. M. Clédat, <i>ASAE</i> 15 (1915), S. 26–27, Abb. 5, Taf. 4; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos in periphēria orientali, Nr. 132.
	Ο ΚΚΙΡΤΟC	4) Nicht bei Fränkel. Bemalter Stoff aus Antinoë. Paris, Musée du Louvre o. Inv. Lit. s.v. LASIOS 3.
	ΣΚΙΡΤΟC	5) Nicht bei Fränkel. Statue, nicht erhalten. Die Figur ist überliefert durch ein hellenistisches Weihepigramm aus Pergamon auf einem Block einer Statuenbasis. Der Satyr spricht selbst: “. . . Dionysodoros . . . hat mich, den dem Weine zugetanen Skirtos errichtet . . .” s. H. Müller, <i>Chiron</i> 2 (1989), S. 527ff. Als Statue (Grabdenkmal) wird auch der Satyr Skirtos im Epigramm des Dioskurides auf den Dichter Sositheos angesprochen (<i>Anth. Pal.</i> 7.707).
SKOPAS	Σκόπας	auch Menschennamen enthalten den Stamm σκοπο-, vgl. <i>HPN</i> , S. 402, erinnert an σκοπάς “Klippe” oder σκοπός “Wächter, Kundschafter”.
	ΣΚΟΠΑ[1) Fränkel, S. 67–68, 104 τ. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. München, Antikensammlungen 2360. Lit. s.v. HYBRIS 1; Immerwahr, S. 113, Nr. 784.
SKRGOS s. SKIRTOS 1		
SOTELES	Σωτέλης	auch Menschenname, <i>HPN</i> , S. 414. Die Bestandteile sind ὤς “unversehrt” und τέλος “Ziel”.
	ΣΟΤΕΛΕC	1) Fränkel, S. 72, 94 p. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B 3. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 1; Immerwahr, S. 103, Nr. 705.
SPHOLEAS	Σφολέας	Lesung unsicher? Vielleicht Σφολέας? (Dies dann Metathese zu φσολας??). Zu denken wäre auch an Phsoleas, da die Inversion -σφ- auf attischen Vaseninschriften häufiger belegt ist: dazu Threatte (a.O. s.v. LAMPON 1), S. 21.
	ΣΦΟΛΕΑC	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale. Lit. s.v. AGRIOS 1.
	ΣΦΟ[2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Frankfurt, Museum für Kunsthandwerk WM 03. Lit. s.v. EUPNOUS 1; A. Greifenhagen, <i>AA</i> , 1957, S. 11, ergänzte die Inschrift zu Sphodros, das dann aber nur hier als Satyrname belegt wäre. In Betracht zu ziehen scheint mir auch auf Grund des Namens auf 1 die Ergänzung zu Spholeas.
STYON	Στύων ΣΤΥΟΝ	zum Verb στύω “penem erigere”. 1) Fränkel, S. 125, 90 c. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. London, British Museum E 65. Lit. s.v. BABAKCHOS 1; <i>RE</i> 4 A (1932), S. 453 s.v. Styon (Türk); Immerwahr, S. 88–89, Nr. 551.

STYSIPPOS	Στύσιππος	formal ein Terpsimbrotos-Kompositum. (Ist Sodomie mit Stuten gemeint?)
	ΣΤΥΣΙΠΟΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Berlin 1966.19. <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 323.3 bis (Smikros); Beazley, <i>Add²</i> , S. 154; A. Greifenhagen, <i>JbBerlMus</i> 9 (1967), S. 10, Abb. 7ff.; Ders., in: <i>Die griechische Vase</i> , Kongreß, Rostock 1967, (<i>Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock</i> 16 [1967], Heft 7/8), S. 452, Taf. 27–28; Ders., <i>AA</i> , 1974, S. 238ff., Abb. 1–2; Boardman, <i>ARFV</i> , Abb. 31. Es ist nicht gesichert, ob es sich hier um den Namen des Satyrs handelt. Beazley, <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 323.3 bis: “the gap seems too long for Stysippos”. Greifenhagen ergänzt als Lieblingsnamen <i>Stysippos kalos</i> . Immerwahr, S. 69, Nr. 404.
	ΣΤΥΣΙΠΟΣ	2) Fränkel, S. 24, 88 X. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2617 (81330). Lit. s.v. DORKIS 3; <i>RE</i> 4 A (1932), S. 457, s.v. Stysippos (Türk).
SYBAS	Σύβας ΣΥΒΑΣ	vgl. die Hesychglosse σύβας (s. oben s.v. Βύβαξ). 1) Fränkel, S. 74–75, 104 φ. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. Ehem. Paris, Slg. Raoul-Rochette. Lit. s.v. BATYLLOS 1; <i>RE</i> 4 A (1932), S. 1011, s.v. Sybas (Gebhard).
TERPAULOS	Τέρπαυλος ΤΕΡΠΑΥΛΟΣ	wahrscheinlich “der durch das Lied des Aulos erfreut”. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Berlin 1966.19. Lit. s.v. STYSIPPOS 1; Immerwahr, S. 69, Nr. 404.
	ΤΕΡΠΑΥΛΟΣ	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Oinochoe. Rom, Villa Giulia. <i>ARV²</i> 308.1 (Terpaulos-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add²</i> , S. 212; <i>EAA</i> , Suppl. 1970 (1973), S. 107, Abb. 111; Helbig ⁴ , Bd. 3 (Tübingen, 1969), Nr. 2647 (Greifenhagen).
TERPEKELOS	Τερπέκελος ΤΕΡΠΕΚΕΛΟΣ	formal Terpandros-Kompositum, vgl. <i>HPN</i> , S. 424 (z.B. Τερπελαος), aber Hinterglied κελο- unklar. Vielleicht Kurzform zu τερπε- κέλαδος, “der durch Musik erfreut” oder “der sich an Musik erfreut”. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfiguriger Aryballos. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 26.49. Lit. s.v. DOPHIOS 1; Immerwahr, S. 27, Nr. 97.
TERPES	Τέρπης ΤΕΡΠΕΣ	Kurzform zu Namen wie Euterpes, “der sich an etwas Erfreuende”. 1) Fränkel, S. 30, 88 U. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale Archeologico RC 6848. <i>ARV²</i> 60.66, 1622 (Oltos); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 327; Beazley, <i>Add²</i> , S. 165 mit Lit.; <i>CVA</i> Tarquinia 1, III I, Taf. 3.1–2; <i>AA</i> , 1969, S. 537, Abb. 7; Simon und Hirmer (a.O. s.v. BYBAX 1), S. 94–95, Taf. 94; Schefold (a.O. s.v. SILENOS 1), S. 48, Abb. 49; <i>RE</i> 5 A (1934), S. 786, s.v. Terpes (van der Kolf).
TERPON	Τέρπων	“der sich an etwas erfreut”. Auch Menschenname, <i>HPN</i> , S. 424.

	Τερόπων	dasselbe mit Sproßvokal.
	ΤΕΡΠΟΝ	1) Fränkel, S. 30, 90 c. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. London, British Museum E 65. Lit. s.v. BABAKCHOS 1; <i>RE</i> 5 A (1934), S. 788, s.v. Terpon c (van der Kolf); Immerwahr, S. 88–89, Nr. 551.
	ΤΕΡΠΟΝ	2) Fränkel, S. 30, 88 U. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale Archeologico RC 6848. Lit. s.v. TERPES 1; van der Kolf (a.O. s.v. TERPON 1), S. 787, s.v. Terpon a.
	ΣΙΛΑΝΟΣ ΤΕΡΠΟΝ	3) Fränkel, S. 30, 88 W. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. München, Antikensammlungen 2619 A. <i>ARV</i> ² 146.2, 1628 (Epeleios-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 179; FR, Taf. 155; Boardman, <i>ARFV</i> , Abb. 106; F. W. Hamdorf, <i>Attische Vasenbilder der Antikensammlungen in München</i> , Bd. 2 (1976), S. 29ff., Taf. 11ff.; van der Kolf (a.O. s.v. TERPON 1), S. 788, s.v. Terpon d; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Choro I, Nr. 1 mit Abb.; ebenda s.v. Erato III, Nr. 1 mit Abb.
	ΤΕΡΟΠΟΝ	4) Fränkel, S. 30, 88 V. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 34. <i>ARV</i> ² 456 (certain resemblance to the drawing of the Magnoncourt Painter); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 243: augmented by New York 1976.181.2; P. Hartwig, <i>Griechische Meister-schalen</i> (Berlin, 1893), Taf. 6; <i>Encyclopédie photographique de l'Art: Louvre</i> , Bd. 3 (Paris, 1938), S. 3c; van der Kolf (a.O. s.v. TERPON 1), S. 788, s.v. Terpon b.
TO...	ΤΟ[1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Marmorrelief nach Art der <i>Tabulae Iliacae</i> . Rom, Villa Albani 957. Lit. s.v. BAT... 1.
TROPHEUS	Τροφεύς ΤΡΟΦΕΥΣ	“Ernährer”, auch als Appellativum vorhanden. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Zypern, Nea Paphos, Haus des Aion. Daszewski, S. 22, Abb. 3, S. 37, Taf. 18.
	ΤΡΟΦΕΥ[2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Zypern, Nea Paphos, Haus des Aion. Lit. s.v. SKIRTOS 2.
TYBRON	Τύβρων	vielleicht zum Pflanzennamen θύμβρα, θύμβρον “Bohnenkraut, <i>Satureia thymbra</i> ”.
	ΤΥΒΡΩΝ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Pästanische Amphora. Paestum, Museo Archeologico 21370. A. D. Trendall, <i>The Red-Figured Vases of Paestum</i> (Hertford, 1987), S. 139ff., Nr. 240, Taf. 89, mit Lit. (Python).
	ΥΒΡΟΝ	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Pästanischer Glockenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 1989.11.4. A. D. Trendall, <i>NumAntClass</i> 19 (1990), S. 126 (Python). Der Name Ybron ergibt keinen Sinn. Da die Vase vom selben Maler ist wie TYBRON 1, liegt nahe, daß hier auch derselbe Name gemeint ist.
TYRBAS	Τύρβας	zu τύρβη “Tumult, Durcheinander”, das speziell auch von bakchischen Festen gesagt wird. Zum dionysischen Tanz Tyrba/Tyrbasia s. Ghiron-Bistagne (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS)

4), S. 266–267.

ΤΥΡΒΑΙ

1) Fränkel, S. 69, 102 λ.

Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 3235 (81401). Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 7; *RE* 7 A (1948), S. 1863–1864, s.v. Tyrbas 1 (Radke).

AKEPHALE NAMEN

...PISIOS

Ἰπισιος

Ergänzung unsicher, denkbar wäre PN Χαρίσιος, weniger wahrscheinlich Ακρίσιος; dagegen gibt es keine PN, die auf -πισιος ausgehen.

ἸΠΙΣΙΟΣ

1) Nicht bei Fränkel.

Attisch schwarzfiguriger Kolonnettenkrater, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.12 (Lydos). Hier Abb. 2d.

MÄNADENNAMEN

AMBROSIA

Ἀμβροσία

enthält wohl den Namen der Himmelspeise Ambrosia (deutbar auch als Femininbildung zu Ambrosios, der seinerseits Ableitung vom Adj. ἄμβροτος "unsterblich" ist).

ΑΜΒΡΟCΙΑ

1) Nicht bei Fränkel.

Mosaik. Zypern, Nea Paphos, Haus des Aion. Daszewski, Taf. 18.

AMPELIS

Ἀμπελῖς

zu ἄμπελος "Weinstock".

ΑΜΠΕΛΙC

1) Nicht bei Fränkel.

Sizilisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Lipari, Museo Archeologico Eoliano 2297. Trendall (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 8), 1. Suppl., S. 102, 3. Suppl., S. 275, Nr. 46g; A. D. Trendall und T. B. L. Webster, *Illustrations of Greek Drama* (London, 1971), III 6, 2, mit Abb.; Bernabò Brea (a.O. s.v. SIMOS 21), S. 274, Abb. 451; W. B. Stanford und J. V. Luce, *The Quest for Ulysses* (London, 1974), S. 34, Abb. 20; F. Brommer, *Odysseus* (Darmstadt, 1983), S. 56, Taf. 10.

ANATROPHE

Ἀνατροφή

formal identisch mit dem Subst. ἀνατροφή "Aufzucht, Ernährung". Hier Name der Amme des Dionysos.

ΑΝΑΤΡΟΦΗ

1) Nicht bei Fränkel.

Mosaik. Zypern, Nea Paphos, Haus des Aion. Daszewski, Taf. 18.

ANTHEIA

Ἀνθεία

zu ἄνθος "Blüte" (ἄνθος kommt auch in PN fem. vor).

ΑΝΘΕΙΑ

1) Fränkel, S. 51, 98 α.

Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, ehem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11; Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 793.

ANTRO

Ἀντρό

zu ἄντρον "Grotte".

ΑΝΤΡΟ

1) Fränkel, S. 21, 84 I.

"Attisch-chalkidische Amphora". Ehem. Rom, Kunsthandel Penelli. Identisch mit ANTRO 2?

ΑΝΤΡΟ

2) Nicht bei Fränkel.

Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Frankfurt, Museum für Kunsthandwerk WM 03. Lit. s.v. EUPNOUS 1. Möglicherweise sind ANTRO 1 und 2 identisch, s. dazu A. Greifenhagen, *AA*, 1957, S. 13 mit Anm. 16.

ARIAGNE	Ἀριάγνη	“die sehr Heilige” (vgl. den Heroinnennamen Ἀριάδνη, der einen sekundären Lautwandel gn > dn durchgemacht hat).
	ΑΡΙΑΓΝΕ	1) Fränkel, S. 54, 92 k. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. Palermo, Museo Nazionale 1109. ARV ² 630.24 (Chicago-Maler); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 399; P. E. Arias, “Storia della ceramica di età arcaica, classica ed ellenistica”, in <i>Enciclopedia Classica</i> , sez. III, Bd. XI, tome 5 (Turin, 1963), S. 291–292, Taf. 130.1; P. Zanker, <i>Wandel der Hermesgestalt in der attischen Vasenmalerei</i> (Bonn, 1965), Taf. 4; H. Walter, <i>Griechische Götter</i> (München, 1971), S. 278, Abb. 253.
BAKCHE	Βάκχη	fem. zu Βάκχος.
	BAXXE	1) Fränkel, S. 49, 96 t. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Bologna, Museo Civico PU 286. Lit. s.v. SIMOS 15; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Bakche Nr. 1 mit Abb.
	BAXXH	2) Fränkel, S. 49, 102 t, Taf. III. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. London, British Museum E 503. ARV ² 1159 (may be by the Chrysis Painter himself); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 458; Beazley, <i>Add²</i> , S. 337; G. M. A. Richter, <i>The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans²</i> (London, 1966), Abb. 622; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Bakche Nr. 2 mit Abb.; Queyrel (a.O. s.v. KOMOS 9), S. 152, Abb. 27.
	JANXH	3) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Madaba. Lit. s.v. SATYROS 2.
	BAXXE	4) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Jerusalem, Israel-Museum. Aus Sepphoris. Das Mosaik und die weiteren Inschriften sind noch unpubliziert. Vorbericht in <i>Biblical Archaeologist</i> 50.4 (1987), S. 228ff.
BOTRYOCHARIS	Βοτρυοχάρις	diejenige, die Freude an Weintrauben hat, d.h. die das Trinken liebende, vgl. dazu jetzt den Namen PHILOPOSIA auf dem neuen Lydos-Krater im Getty-Museum (= PHILOPOS... 1).
	ΒΟΤΡΟΙΟΧΑΙ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Bemalter Stoff aus Antinoë. Paris, Musée du Louvre o. Inv. Lit s.v. LASIOS 3.
BRIAKCHOS		s. hier im Abschnitt Satyrnamen s.v. BRIAKCHOS 4.
CHARIS	Χάρις	“Anmut”.
	ΧΑΡΙΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Basel, Kunsthandel. Lit. s.v. SIKINNO 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Charis II, Nr. 1 mit Abb.
CHIONE	Χιώνη	“die Schneeweiße” (auf die Hautfarbe bezogen).
	ΧΙ ΙΟΝΕ	1) Fränkel, S. 45, 92 g. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Compiègne, Musée Vivienel 1093. Lit. s.v. ERATON 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Chione II, Nr. 1 mit Abb.
CHOIROS	Χοῖρος	“Schweinchen” (mit sexuellem Sinn).
	ΧΟΙΡΟΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 64, 100 ζ.

		Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2369. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 7; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Choiros II, Nr. 1.
CHORA	Χορά	wohl Kurzform eines Namens mit dem Element χορο- (Akzent unsicher).
	ΥΟΡΑ	1) Fränkel, S. 15, 82 A. Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Chora Nr. 1 mit Abb.
CHORANTHE	Χοράνθη	beide Elemente für sich auch in Menschnennamen bezeugt; vgl. sub 'Avθεΐα.
	XOPAN[1) Fränkel, S. 45, 90 a. Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 43. <i>ARV</i> ² 20.2, 1619 (Smikros); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 154; Pottier (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 4), Bd. 2, S. 144, G 43, Taf. 92; <i>CVA</i> Louvre 1, III I c, Taf. 1.2 und 5; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Choranthe Nr. 1 mit Abb.; ebenda s.v. Dionysos Nr. 467.
CHOREIA	Χορεΐα	zu χορεΐος "zu einem Chor gehörend".
	XOPEIA	1) Fränkel, S. 50, 100 θ. Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2419. <i>ARV</i> ² 1151.2 (Dinos-Maler); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 457; Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 336; Simon und Hirmer (a.O. s.v. BY-BAX 1), Taf. 212ff. (Simon weist den Namen Choreia versehentlich einer Mänade auf der Vorderseite zu); <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Choreia 1; ebenda s.v. Dionysos Nr. 33.
CHORO	Χορώ	Kurzname mit Element χορο- (Chor).
	XOPΩ	1) Fränkel, S. 50, 98 α. Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, ehem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Choro II, Nr. 1; Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 793.
	XOPO (zweimal)	2+3) Fränkel, S. 50, 98 γ. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Berlin F 2532, und Rom, Villa Giulia, Slg. Castellani o. Nr. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 3; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Choro II, Nr. 2 mit Abb. Hier sind zwei Mänaden Choro benannt.
	XOPΩ	4) Fränkel, S. 55ff., 98 z. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142458. Lit. s.v. AIETOS 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Choro II, Nr. 3 mit Abb.; Immerwahr, S. 115, Nr. 799.
CHRYSEIS	Χρυσείς	"die Goldene," feminine Ableitung zu χρυσεύς.
	ΧΡΥΣΕΙΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 07.286.85. Lit. s.v. MALEOS 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Chryseis II, Nr. 1 mit Abb.
CHRYSIS	Χρύσις	die Goldene.
	ΧΡΥΣΙΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 50, 98 α. Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, ehem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Chrysis III, Nr. 1; Immerwahr, S. 114,

		Nr. 793.
DELOS	Δῆλος	vom Inselnamen abgeleitet (ohne Suffix), vgl. <i>HPN</i> , S. 550–551, und den Satyrnamen Λήμνος.
	ΔΗΛΟΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 55ff., 98 z. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142458. Lit. s.v. AIETOS 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Delos II, Nr. 1; Immerwahr, S. 115, Nr. 799.
DINA...	Δίνα[wohl zu δινέω “sich im Kreis herumdrehend; wild wirbelnd”. Name vielleicht vollständig, identisch mit δίνη “Wirbelwind”.
	ΔΙΝΑ[1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriges Glockenkraterfr. Basel, Slg. Cahn HC 1623. London, Sotheby's, Auktion, Dezember 1981, Nr. 342; <i>Attische Meisterzeichnungen</i> (a.O. s.v. ERPON 1), S. 21, Nr. 72 (Dinos-Maler). Hier Abb. 7.
DIONE	Διώνη	“die zu Zeus gehörende”.
	ΔΙΩΝΗ	1) Fränkel, S. 54, 100 θ. Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2419. Lit. s.v. CHOREIA 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dione Nr. 10.
	ΙΙΩΝ[2) Fränkel, S. 54, 102 μ. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1024. Lit. s.v. HEDYOINOS 2; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dione Nr. 11 mit Abb.
	ΔΙΩΝΗ	3) Fränkel, S. 54, 102 κ. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Verschollen. Lit. s.v. SIMOS 19; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dione Nr. 12.
DORA (vollständiger Name?)	Δώρα	da vorn abgebrochen, ist das, was erhalten ist, vielleicht das Hinterglied eines zweiteiligen Vollnamens (Typ Theodora). Aber es gibt auch Kurznamen: mask. Δῶρος, Δῶρον; fem. Δωρώ, Δωρίς, d.h. Δώρα könnte eventuell auch der <i>ganze</i> Name sein.
	ΔΟΡΑ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Deckel, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.214.A.2 (Onesimos). Erwähnt: <i>GettyMusJ</i> 14 (1986), S. 191, Nr. 48. Hier Abb. 4c.
DORO		Fränkel, S. 14, 82 B. Entfällt. Der Name wird für diesen chalkidischen Krater (= DORKIS 2) nur von Fränkel, nicht aber bei Rumpf und im <i>CVA</i> angeführt.
EIRENE	Εἰρήνη	“Frieden”.
	ΕΙΡΗΝΗ	1) Fränkel, S. 52–53, 63, 102 v. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1024. Lit. s.v. HEDYOINOS 2; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Eirene Nr. 11 mit Abb.
	ΙΙΡΗΝΗ	2) Fränkel, S. 52–53, 63, 104 φ. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. Ehem. Paris, Slg. Raoul-Rochette. Lit. s.v. BATYLLOS 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Eirene Nr. 12.

ERATO	Ἐρατώ ΕΡΑΤΩ	auch Name einer der Musen. 1) Fränkel, S. 50, 104 φ. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. Ehem. Paris, Slg. Raoul-Rochette. Lit. s.v. BATYLLOS 1; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Erato IV, Nr. 1.
ERIOPE	Ἐριώπη ΗΡΙΟΠΗ	vgl. Nonnos, <i>Dionys.</i> , 17.217. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Goldenes Widderkopfrhyton. Plovdiv, Archäologisches Museum 3199. Aus Panagjurische. B. Svoboda und D. Concev, <i>Neue Denkmäler antiker Toreutik</i> (Prag, 1956), S. 133ff., Abb. 4, Taf. 5; E. Simon, <i>AntK</i> 3 (1960), S. 10, 19, Abb. 3; I. Venedikov, <i>Der Schatz von Panagjurische</i> (Sofia, 1961), S. 9–10, Abb. 10–11; <i>Gold der Thraker</i> , Ausstellung, Hildesheim 1980 (Mainz, 1979), S. 188, Nr. 366, Farbtaf. S. 185; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Eriope Nr. 1.
EROPHYLLIS	Ἐροφύλλης ΕΡΟΦΥΛΛΙΣ	Hinterglied zu φύλλον "Blatt, Laub". 1) Fränkel, S. 46–47, 86 P. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. London, British Museum E 253. Lit. s.v. BRIAKCHOS 2; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Erophyllis Nr. 1 mit Abb.
EUBOIA	Εὐβοία ΕΥΒΟΙΑ	"die gute Rinder hat" oder identisch mit dem Namen der Insel. 1) Fränkel, S. 55, 98 z. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142458. Lit. s.v. AIETOS 1; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Euboa II, Nr. 1 mit Abb.; Immerwahr, S. 115, Nr. 799.
EUDAIMONIA	Εὐδαιμονία ΕΥΔΑΙΜΟΝΙ	"Glückseligkeit". 1) Fränkel, S. 63, 98 β. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 6; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eudaimonia II, Nr. 1.
EUDIA	Εὐδία ΕΥΔΙΑ ΕΥΔΙΑ ΕΥΔΙΑ	"die Graziöse, Feine". 1) Fränkel, S. 63–64, 100 η. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Ehem. Slg. Hope 141. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 10; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eudia II, Nr. 1. 2) Fränkel, S. 63–64, 98 β. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 6; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eudia II, Nr. 2. 3) Fränkel, S. 63–64, 104 ρ. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Providence, Rhode Island School of Design 23.324. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 9; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eudia II, Nr. 3 mit Abb.
EUMELPE	Εὐμέλπη ΕΥΜΕΛΠΕΣ	"die gut Singende". 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch bilingue Amphora, Fr. München, Antikensammlungen 2302. Lit. s.v. HIAKCHOS 1; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eumelpe Nr. 1 mit Abb. Beischrift im Genetiv.
EUNOMIE	Εὐνομία	auch Name einer Tochter der Themis in der Theogonie des Hesiod. Etwa "die für gute νόμοι sorgt" (ionische

		Lautform).
	EYNOMIE	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Apulisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Berlin F 3257. FR, Taf. 149; <i>RVAp</i> , Bd. 1, S. 169, Nr. 32 ("associated to the Group of the Moscow Pelike"); <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eunomia Nr. 11 mit Abb. Fränkel führt diese Vase nur für EUTHYMIE an.
EUOPE	Εὐόπη ΕΥΟΠΕ	"die mit dem guten Blick". 1) Fränkel, S. 44, 92 g. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Compiègne, Musée Vivienel 1093. Lit. s.v. ERATON 1; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Euope II, Nr. 1.
EUROPE	Εὐρώπη ΕΥΡΟΠΗ	auch im Mythos (Geliebte des Zeus). Hier Personifikation des Kontinents. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Kleines Marmorrelief nach Art der <i>Tabulae Iliacae</i> . Rom, Villa Albani 957. Lit. s.v. BAT... 1; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Europe II, Nr. 3.
EURYDIKE	Εὐρυδίκη ΕΥΡΥΔΙΚΗ	auch Name im Mythos: "die weithin für Recht sorgt" o.ä. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 2; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eurydike VII, Nr. 1 mit Abb.
EURYPYLE	Εὐρυπόλη ΕΥΡΥΠΥΛΗ	vielleicht "die eine Stadt mit weiten Toren hat", ursprünglich Menschenname. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 2; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Eurypyle Nr. 1.
EUTHALIA s. PAIDIA 7		
EUTHYMIE	Εὐθυμία ἸΥΘΥΜΙΗ	"die gute Stimmung hat". 1) Fränkel, S. 63, 106 ω. Apulisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Berlin F 3257. Lit. s.v. EUNOMIE 1; <i>LIMC</i> 4 (1988), s.v. Euthymia Nr. 1.
FIO	Φίω ΦΙΟ ΦΙΟ	zum Namenelement Fio-. <i>HPN</i> , S. 219, bezeichnet es als unübersetzbar; aber es ist aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach eine Thematisierung von Φίς "Kraft". 1) Fränkel, S. 14, 82 A. Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1. 2) Fränkel, S. 14, 82 B. Chalkidischer Kolonnettenkrater. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire A 135. Lit. s.v. DORKIS 2.
GALENE	Γαλήνη ΓΑΛΕΝΕ	"Meeresstille". 1) Fränkel, S. 44, 86 N. Attisch rotfiguriger Psykter, Fr. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 10.221a-f (ehem. Neapel, Slg. Bourguignon). <i>ARV</i> ² 16.14, 1619 (Euphronios); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 322; Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 153; CB, Bd. 2, Nr. 66, Taf. 31; <i>EAA</i> , Bd. 3 (1960), S. 760, Abb. 931; S. Drougou, <i>Der attische Psykter</i>

- (Würzburg, 1975), S. 16, 41, 60ff., Taf. 6; *RE* 7 (1912), S. 577, s.v. Galene 2b (Waser); Schefold (a.O. s.v. SILENOS 1), S. 80, Abb. 92; *LIMC* 4 (1988), s.v. Galene II, Nr. 1 mit Abb.; *Capolavori di Euphronios*, Ausstellung, Arezzo 1990, Nr. 6 (J. M. Padgett).
- ΓΑΛΗΝΗ 2) Fränkel, S. 63, 100 η.
Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Ehem. Slg. Hope 141. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 10; Waser (a.O. s.v. GALENE 1), S. 577, Nr. 2a; *LIMC* 4 (1988), s.v. Galene II, Nr. 2.
- ΓΑΙ 3) Fränkel, S. 63, 104 υ.
Attisch rotfigurige Pelike, Fr. Barcelona, Museo Arqueológico 33. H. Bulle, in: *Corolla Curtius* (Stuttgart, 1937), S. 157ff., Taf. 57; A. García y Bellido, *Hispania Graeca*, Bd. 2 (Barcelona, 1948), S. 166, Abb. 44, S. 167, Nr. 133, Taf. 107ff.; *CVA Barcelona* 1, Taf. 31ff.; G. Trias de Arribas, *Cerámicas Griegas de la península ibérica* (Valencia, 1967/1968), S. 182ff., Nr. 589, Taf. 100, 102, 103; Froning, S. 5 Anm. 30, S. 10ff., 15, 20, 66 (Umkreis des Pronomos-Malers); Shapiro (a.O. s.v. BATYLLOS 1), S. 275, Nr. 121; *LIMC* 4 (1988), s.v. Galene II, Nr. 3.
- HALIOPE Fränkel, S. 22, 84 L.
Entfällt (keine Mänade).
- HEBE "Ἥβη
HBH 1+2) Fränkel, S. 53, 98 β.
(zweimal) Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 6; *RE* 7 (1912), S. 2582, s.v. Hebe 1 (Eitrem); *LIMC* 4 (1988), s.v. Hebe II, Nr. 1.
- HEGESICHORA 'Ἥγησιχόρα
ΕΓΗΣΙΧΟΡΑ "die den Chor anführt".
1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 2; *LIMC* 4 (1988), s.v. Hegesichora Nr. 1.
- HELIKE 'Ἑλική
ΕΛΙΚΕ wohl zu ἔλιξ, das u.a. "Weinranke" bedeutet.
1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery 1913.132. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 2+3. Die Ergänzung zu Helike wird nahegelegt durch den bei Nonn., *Dionys.*, 17.217 bezeugten Mänadennamen Helike. *LIMC* 4 (1988), s.v. Helike Nr. 1 mit Abb.
- IANTHE 'Ἴάνθη
ΙΑΝΘΕ "Veilchenblüte", vgl. sub 'Ανθεία.
1) Fränkel, S. 45, 86 R.
Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Berlin F 4220. Lit. s.v. SIKINNOS 2; *RE* 9 (1916), S. 695, s.v. Ianthe 2 (Eitrem).
- INO 'Ἴνώ
ΙΝΩ vgl. die mythische Heroine Ino.
1) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Formschüssel. Pella, Archäologisches Museum 81.97. Lit. s.v. MAINOMENOS (?) 1.
- EINΩ 2) Nicht bei Fränkel.
Bemalter Stoff aus Antinoë. Paris, Musée du Louvre o. Nr. Lit. s.v. LASIOS 3 (die Beischrift wurde in der Lit. fälschlich als OINO gelesen).

IOLEIA	Ἴολεία	wohl Kurzform zu Ἴολάφη oder ähnlich; kaum zu ἴον “Veilchen”.
	ΙΟΛΕΙΑ	1) Fränkel, S. 51, 102 o. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Athen, Nationalmuseum 12594 (Nicole 1138). G. Nicole, <i>Catalogue des vases peints du Musée National d’Athènes</i> , Suppl. (Paris, 1911), S. 263–264, Nr. 1138, Taf. 20.
KALE	Καλή	“die Schöne”.
	ΚΑΛΕ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Deckel, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AE.214.A.5 (Onesimos). Erwähnt: <i>GettyMusJ</i> 14 (1986), S. 191, Nr. 48. Hier Abb. 4b.
	ΚΑΛΕ	2) Fränkel, S. 98 α. Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, ehem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11.
	ΚΑΛΗ	3) Fränkel, S. 102 v. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1011. Lit. s.v. HEDYOINOS 1.
KALIS	ΚΑΛΕ	4) Fränkel, S. 98 γ. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Berlin F 2523, und Rom, Villa Giulia, Slg. Castellani o. Nr. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 3.
	Καλίσ	zu καλός.
	ΚΑΛΙΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 21, 84 K. Attisch schwarzfigurige Schale. Neapel, Museo Nazionale SA 172. <i>ABV</i> 203.1 (Kallis-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 55 mit Lit.; <i>CVA</i> Neapel 1, Taf. 21.3; O. v. Vacano, <i>Zur Entstehung und Deutung gemalter seitenansichtiger Kopfbilder auf schwarzfigurigen Vasen des griechischen Festlandes</i> (Bonn, 1973), S. 233, A 164.
	ΚΑΛΙΣ	2) Fränkel, S. 21, 44, 88 U. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale Archeologico RC 6848. Lit. s.v. TERPES 1.
KALYKE	Καλύκη	zu κάλυξ “Blumenkelch, Knospe”.
	ΚΑΛΥΚΕ	1) Fränkel, S. 45, 92 h. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Verschollen. <i>Musée Etrusque</i> , S. 74, Nr. 559, Taf. 12; <i>RE</i> 10 (1917), S. 1767, s.v. Kalyke 2 (Scherling).
KINYRA	Κινύρα	zu κινύρα “ein Saiteninstrument”.
	ΚΙΝΥΡΑ	1) Fränkel, S. 57, 98 z. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142458. Lit. s.v. AIETOS 1; Immerwahr, S. 115, Nr. 799.
KISSINE	Κισσίνη	zu κισσός “Efeu”.
	ΚΙΙΣΙΝΕ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. Paris, Musée du Louvre C 10784. Lit. s.v. PHLEBODOKOS 1.
	ΚΙΣΙΝΕ	2) Fränkel, S. 47, 86 O. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale Archeologico RC 6843. Lit. s.v. SIMADES 1; Immerwahr, S. 67, Nr. 386.
KISSO	Κισσώ	ebenso wie KISSINE von κισσός “Efeu” abzuleiten.

	ΚΙΣΣΟ	1) Fränkel, S. 51, 98 α. Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, ehem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11; Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 793.
KLYTO	Κλυτώ ΚΛΥΤΟ	Kurzform eines PN mit κλυτο- "berühmt". 1) Fränkel, S. 14, 82 A. Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1; RE 11 (1922), S. 896, s.v. Klyto 1 (Weicker).
KOMODIA	Κωμῳδία]ΩΜΩΙΔΙΑ	"Komödie, heiteres Spiel". 1) Fränkel, S. 63, 94 n. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 421 (N 3402). Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 4.
]ΩΜΩΙΔΙΑ	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 2.
	ΚΩΜ[3) Fränkel, S. 62–63, 104 v. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike, Fr. Barcelona, Museo Arqueológico 33. Lit. s.v. GALENE 3.
	ΚΩΜΩΙΔΙΑ	4) Nicht bei Fränkel. Choregisches Monument. Thasos. Lit. s.v. DITHYRAMBOS 2. Figur nicht erhalten, Namensbeischrift auf der Basis.
	ΚΩΜΩΙΔΙΑ	5) Nicht bei Fränkel. Klappspiegel. Fundort: Elis. Komodia mit Opora und der Personifikation Thiasos. Publikation erfolgt durch A. Dusugli und E. Thagalidou.
KRAIPALE	Κραιπάλη ΚΡΑΙΠΑΛΗ	"der Rausch". 1) Fränkel, S. 60, 100 δ. Attisch rotfigurige Oinochoe. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 00.352. Lit. s.v. SIKINNOS 4.
LAMPAS	Λα(μ)πίας ΛΑΠΙΑΣ	"die Fackel". 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriges Kelchkraterfr. Ehem. Neapel, Slg. Dr. Kleinenberg. ARV ² 1144.22 (Kleophon-Maler); J. D. Beazley, AJA 45 (1941), S. 600, Abb. 5; Immerwahr, S. 111, Nr. 769.
LIGEIA	Λιγεῖα ΛΙΓΕΙΑ	"die mit der hellen Stimme". 1) Fränkel, S. 44, 88 S. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire R 253, und Vatikan, Astarita 306. Lit. s.v. EU...OS 1; RE 13 (1927), S. 523, s.v. Ligeia (Kroll).
LYDE	Λύδη ΛΥΔΗ	die Lyderin. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Bemalter Stoff aus Antinoë. Paris, Musée du Louvre o. Nr. Lit. s.v. LASIOS 3.
MAINAS	Μαινάς entfällt?	"die Mänade". Zu den Mainas-Inschriften s. auch M. C. Villanueva Puig, REA 82 (1980), S. 52–59. 1) Fränkel, S. 47, 49, 90 e. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Genf, Kunsthandel, ehem.

		Northampton, Castle Ashby. <i>ARV</i> ² 371.16, 1649 (Brygos-Maler/Dokimasia-Maler); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 365, 372.25 bis; Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 225; <i>CVA</i> Castle Ashby, Taf. 41.1; <i>The Castle Ashby Vases: Greek, Etruscan and South Italian Vases</i> , Christie's, Auktion, 2. Juli, 1980, S. 73, Nr. 41; D. Buitron, <i>AJA</i> 86 (1982), S. 458. Die Beischrift wurde früher als MAI[NAΣ gelesen, ist jedoch sehr unsicher (vgl. Boardman und Robertson, <i>CVA</i> Castle Ashby, S. 25).
	MAINΑΣ	2) Fränkel, S. 49, 94 p. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B 3. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 1; Immerwahr, S. 103, Nr. 705.
	MAINΑΣ	3) Fränkel, S. 49, 92 i. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. London, British Museum E 492. <i>ARV</i> ² 619.16 (Villa Giulia-Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 270; S. Reinach, <i>Peinture de Vases antiques</i> (Paris, 1891), Millin II, Taf. 13; A. Birchall und P. E. Corbett, <i>Greek Gods and Heroes</i> (Oxford, 1974), Abb. 10; Immerwahr, S. 103, Nr. 707.
	MAINΑΣ	4) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 07.286.85. Lit. s.v. MALEOS 1.
	MAINAIΣ	5) Fränkel, S. 47, 49, 92 l. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142355. Lit. s.v. MIMAS 1.
	MAINΑΣ	6) Fränkel, S. 49, 100 θ. Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2419. Lit. s.v. CHOREIA 1.
	MAINΑΣ	7) Fränkel, S. 49, 102 o. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Athen, Nationalmuseum 12594 (Nicole 1138). Lit. s.v. IOLEIA 1; Immerwahr, S. 119, Nr. 835.
	ΙΙΝΑΣ, MAINΑΣ	8+9) Fränkel, S. 49, 104 π. Pelike. Verschollen. Lit. s.v. HEDYMELES 1.
MAKARIA	Μακαρία ΜΑΚΑΡΙΑ	“die selige, glückliche”. 1) Fränkel, S. 63, 98 α. Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, ehem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11; <i>RE</i> 14 (1930), S. 624, s.v. Makaria 4 (Lesky); Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 793.
MEA	ΜΕΑ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Bemalter Stoff aus Antinoë. Paris, Musée du Louvre o. Nr. Lit. s.v. LASIOS 3.
MELOUSA	Μέλουσα ΜΕΛΟΥ[“die Singende”. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Vatikan, Astarita 701. <i>ARV</i> ² 1623.66 ter (Oltos).
METHYSE	Μεθύση ΜΕΘΥΣΕ ΜΕΘ[]Ε	“die Trunkene” oder “der Trunkenheit geneigt”. 1+2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 07.286.85. Lit. s.v. MALEOS 1.

	ΜΕΘΥΣΕ	3) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Moskau, Puschkin-Museum II 1 b 732. <i>ARV</i> ² 618.4 (Villa Giulia-Maler); <i>Paralipomena</i> , S. 398; Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 270; N. M. Lossewa, in: <i>Die griechische Vase</i> , Kongreß, Rostock 1967 (<i>Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock</i> 16 [1967], Heft 7/8), S. 481, Taf. 44–45.; Schefold, <i>Göttersage</i> , S. 32, 34, Abb. 27; N. A. Sidorowa u.a., <i>Antique Painted Pottery in the Puschkin State Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow</i> (Untertitel, Titel russisch) (Moskau, 1985), Nr. 45, Abb. 85. Möglicherweise hat der Villa Giulia-Maler diesen Namen noch einmal in einer sehr ähnlichen Darstellung verwendet, doch ist dort nur]ΘΥΣ[erhalten, wofür auch Tethys als Ergänzung vorgeschlagen wurde (= TETHYS 1).
MOLPE	Μολπή ΜΟΛΠΕ	“der Gesang”. 1) Fränkel, S. 15, 82 A. Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1; <i>RE</i> 16 (1935), S. 27, s.v. Molpe 1 (Scherling).
MYRO	Μυρώ ΜΥΡΟ	zu μύρον “Myrrhe”. 1) Fränkel, S. 14–15, 82 A. Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1.
NAIA	Ναία ΝΑΙΑ	unklar. Etwa zu Ναϊά[ς] “Najade” zu ergänzen? 1) Fränkel, S. 49, 98 α. Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, ehem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11. Zu diesem Namen im dionysischen Kreis, s. auch E. Simon, <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dione, S. 411; Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 793.
NAIS	Ναίς ΝΑΙΣ	“Najade”. 1) Fränkel, S. 13, 82 B. Chalkidischer Kolonnettenkrater. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire A 135. Lit. s.v. DORKIS 2; <i>RE</i> 16 (1935), S. 1587, s.v. Nais 4 (Krischan).
NYMPHAI	ΝΥΦΑΙ ΝΥΜΦΑΙ	1) Fränkel, S. 20, 84 E. Attisch schwarzfiguriger Volutenkrater (Françoisvase). Florenz, Museo Archeologico 4209. Lit. s.v. SILENOI 1 (Rückführung des Hephaistos). 2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Zypern, Nea Paphos, Haus des Aion. Lit. s.v. TROPHEUS 1. (Vorbereitung des Bades für den neugeborenen Dionysos in Nysa).
NYMPHAIA	Νυμφαία ΝΥΝΦΑΙΑ	“zu den Nymphen gehörend”. Zur Fehlschreibung -νφ- vgl. die Satyrnamen LAMPON 1 und HANBOS 1. 1) Fränkel, S. 44, 92 f. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. London, British Museum E 350. <i>ARV</i> ² 256.2 (Kopenhagener Maler); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 204; <i>CVA</i> British Museum 3, III I c, Taf. 18.1; Simon (a.O. s.v. KOMOS 4), S. 48–49; C. Isler-Kerényi, “Lieblinge der Meer mädchen”, <i>Zürcher Archäologische Hefte</i> 3

		(1977), S. 15, Abb. 5b, S. 35, Abb. 17a; <i>LIMC</i> 3 (1986), s.v. Dionysos 860 mit Abb.; <i>RE</i> 17 (1936), S. 1576, s.v. Nymphai (Herter).
NYMPHE	Νύμφη	“Nymphe”.
	ΝΥΜΦΕ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale, Fr. Basel, Slg. Cahn HC 432. Lit. s.v. ERPON 1. Hier Abb. 6a.
	ΙΦΗ	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 2. Richter macht den Vorschlag, hier zu Nymphe zu ergänzen.
	ΝΥΜΦΕ	3) Fränkel, S. 49, 98 α. Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, chem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11.
OINA	Οἶνα	Kurzform eines Vollnamens mit dem Element oivo-. Dorische Lautform (ā).
	ΟΙΝΑ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Großgriechischer Bronzespiegel. Berlin 8538. W. Züchner, <i>Griechische Klappspiegel</i> , 14. <i>JdI</i> , Ergänzungsheft (1942), S. 43, KS 54, S. 45, Abb. 21; <i>RE</i> 17 (1936), S. 2188, s.v. Oina (Herter); Schefold, <i>Göttersage</i> , S. 42 Anm. 70; Oina sitzt leierspielend unter Reben.
OINANTHE	Οἰνάνθη	oivo- “Wein” + ἀνθος “Blume”.
	ΟΙΝΑΝΘΗ	1) Fränkel, S. 51–52, 102 μ. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1024. Lit. s.v. HEDYOINOS 2; <i>RE</i> 17 (1936), S. 2188, s.v. Oinanthē 2 (Scherling).
	ΙΝΑΝΘΕ	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Skyphoskrater. Basel, Slg. Cahn HC 541. E. Simon, <i>WüJbb</i> , NF 1 (1975), S. 178ff., Abb. 2, 3, 4; L. Burn, <i>The Meidias Painter</i> (Oxford, 1987), Abb. 34b.
OINOTROPHOS	Οἰνοτρόφος	“Wein bauend”, auch als Appellativum belegt.
	ΟΙΝΟΘΡΟΦΟΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriges Kelchkraterfr. Ehem. Neapel, Slg. Dr. Kleinenberg. Lit. s.v. LAMPAS 1. Allgemein: <i>RE</i> 17 (1936), S. 2276ff., s.v. Oinotropoi (Herzog-Hauser); Immerwahr, S. 111, Nr. 769.
OPIS	Ὀπίς	A. Greifenhagen, <i>AA</i> , 1957, S. 12, “die mit dem eindrucksvollen Blick”.
	ΟΠΙΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfigurige Amphora. Frankfurt, Museum für Kunsthandwerk WM 03. Lit. s.v. EUPNOUS 1.
OPORA	Ὀπόρα	“die Ernte”.
	ΟΠΩΡΑ	1) Fränkel, S. 53, 102 μ. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1024. Lit. s.v. HEDYOINOS 2; <i>RE</i> 18.1 (1942), S. 698, Nr. 2, s.v. Opora (Türk).
	ΟΠΟΡΑ	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Skyphoskrater. Basel, Slg. Cahn HC 541. Lit. s.v. OINANTHE 2.

	ΟΠΩΡΑ	3) Fränkel, S. 53, 98 β. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 6; Türk (a.O. s.v. OPOPA 1), S. 697–698, Nr. 1.
	ΟΠΩΡΑ	4) Nicht bei Fränkel. Sizilisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Lipari, Museo Archeologico Eoliano 2297. Lit. s.v. AMPELIS 1.
	ΟΠΩΡΑ	5) Nicht bei Fränkel. Mosaik. Baltimore, Museum of Art 37.127. Lit. s.v. OINOS 3; <i>EAA</i> 5 (1963), S. 702, Abb. 856.
	ΟΠΩΡΑ	6) Nicht bei Fränkel. Klappspiegel. Fundort: Elis. Siehe s.v. KOMODIA 5.
ORANIA	Ὅρανία ORANIA	“die zum Himmel (οὐρανός) gehörende” (Dialekt?). 1) Fränkel, S. 50, 102 ι. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. London, British Museum E 503. Lit. s.v. BAKCHE 2.
ORANIES	Ὅρανίης ORANIΗΣ	ionische Lautform (η). Aber, da ein weiblicher Name vorliegt, überrascht das Sigma. Liegt eine Genetivform vor? 1) Fränkel, S. 50, 102 λ. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 3235. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 7.
OREIAS	Ὅρειάς ORHAΣ	“die auf dem Berg, im Gebirge wohnende”. 1) Fränkel, S. 51, 98 β. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 6; <i>RE</i> 18.1 (1942), S. 938, s.v. Oreias 2 (Frank).
OREITHYIA	Ὅρειθυία ORFITHYIA	“die in den Bergen sich aufhaltende θυία, d.h. Bakchantin”. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. London, British Museum E 437. <i>ARV</i> ² 54.5, 1622 (Oltos); Beazley, <i>Add</i> ² , S. 163 mit Lit.; <i>CVA</i> British Museum 3, III I c, Taf. 19.1a; Philippaki (a.O. s.v. MARSYAS 2+3), S. 2ff.; E. Simon, <i>AuA</i> 13 (1967), S. 108–109 Anm. 43 und 53; <i>LIMC</i> 1 (1981), s.v. Acheloos Nr. 245 (nur Abb. der Gegenseite); <i>RE</i> 18.1 (1942), S. 958, s.v. Oreithyia 5 (Frank).
PAIDIA	Παιδιά ΠΑΙΔΙΑ ΠΑΙΔΙΑ]ΔΙΑ ΠΑΙΔΙΑ ΠΑΙΔΙΑ	“das Spiel”. Allgemein: <i>RE</i> 18.1 (1942), S. 2386–2387, s.v. Paidia (Aly); Shapiro (a.O. s.v. BATYLLOS 1), S. 254–255. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater, Fr. Athen, Agora-Museum P 9189. <i>ARV</i> ² 1685 (Art des Dinos-Malers). 2+3) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum L 491. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 16. Für die Ergänzung von]ΔΙΑ kämen auch noch andere Namen in Frage. 4) Fränkel, S. 63, 106 ψ. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2883 (2045). Lit. s.v. EU... 1. 5) Fränkel, S. 62–63, 104 υ.

		Attisch rotfigurige Pelike, Fr. Barcelona, Museo Arqueológico 33. Lit. s.v. GALENE 3.
	ΠΑΙΔΙΑ	6) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum L 492. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 4; Immerwahr, S. 118, Nr. 827.
	ΪΙΑ	7) Bei Fränkel, S. 60, ist noch die frühere Lesung Euthalia zitiert. Relief. Athen, Nationalmuseum 1500. Froning, S. 8ff. mit Lit.
PANNYCHIS	Παννυχίς ΠΑΝ(Ν)Υ(Χ)ΙΣ	“das nächtliche Fest”. 1) Fränkel, S. 59, 104 φ. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. Ehem. Paris, Slg. Raoul-Rochette. Lit. s.v. BATYLLOS 1.
PERIKLYMENE	Περικλυμένη ΠΕΡΙΚΛΥΜΕΝΕ	vielleicht zum Pflanzennamen Περικλύμειον “Geißblatt”. Oder eher “die ringsum Berühmte”. 1) Fränkel, S. 50, 98 α. Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, ehem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11; Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 793.
PHALLODIA	Φαλλωδία ΦΑΛΛΟΔΙΑ	vielleicht etwa “die beim Phallos-Fest ein Lied singt”. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Großgriechischer Bronzespiegel. Berlin 8538. Lit. s.v. OINA 1; RE 19 (1938), S. 1672–1673, s.v. Phallos (Herter).
PHANOPE	Φανόπη ΦΑΝΟΠΕ ΦΑΝΟΠΕ	etwa “Fackel-Licht”? 1) Fränkel, S. 50, 98 α. Attisch rotfigurige Bauchlekythos mit Goldschmuck. Verschollen, ehem. Berlin F 2471. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 11; RE 19 (1938), S. 1784–1785, s.v. Phanope (Raubitschek); Immerwahr, S. 114, Nr. 793. 2) Fränkel, S. 50, 98 γ. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Berlin F 2532, und Rom, Villa Giulia, Slg. Castellani o. Nr. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 3; Raubitschek (a.O. s.v. PHANOPE 1).
PHILIA	Φιλία ΦΙΛΙΑ	“Freundschaft”. 1) Fränkel, S. 50, 94 q. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1772. Lit. s.v. EUPOLIS 1; RE 19 (1938), S. 2172, s.v. Philia 2 (Fiehn).
PHILOPOS...	Φιλοποσ[ΦΙΛΟΠΟΣ[belegt ist seit Xenophon φιλοποσία “Liebe zum Trinken, zum Wein”; davon könnte ein PN abgeleitet sein; wegen der Spuren eines runden Zeichens hinter dem Sigma könnte man auch auf einen (sonst aber nicht bezeugten) PN fem. φιλοποσώ raten. 1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch schwarzfiguriger Kolonnenkrater, Fr. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum L.87.AE.120.4 (Lydos). Hier Abb. 2a.
PHOIBE	Φοίβη ΦΟΙΒΕ	“rein, glänzend”. 1) Fränkel, S. 14, 82 B.

		Chalkidischer Kolonnettenkrater. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire A 135. Lit. s.v. DORKIS 2; <i>RE</i> 20 (1950), S. 346, s.v. Phoibe 9 (Eitrem).
POLYERATE	Πολυεράτη ΠΟΛΥΕΡΑΤΗ	“die Vielgeliebte”. 1) Fränkel, S. 50, 104 φ. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike. Ehem. Paris, Slg. Raoul-Rochette. Lit. s.v. BATYLLLOS 1.
POLYNIKA	Πολυνίκα ΠΟΛΥΝΙΚΑ	“die mit vielen Siegen”. Dorische Lautform. 1) Fränkel, S. 50, 92 l. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142355. Lit. s.v. MIMAS 1.
PONTIA ?	ΠΤΙΑ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Korinthisch rotfiguriger Skyphos. Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum 919.5.5 (C 421). Lit. s.v. KADOLOS (?) 1.
RHODANTHE	Ῥοδάνθη ΡΟΔΑΝΘΕ	“Rosenblüte”, vgl. sub Ῥαθεΐα. 1) Fränkel, S. 45, 90 a. Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 43. Lit. s.v. CHORANTHE 1; Immerwahr, S. 69, Nr. 402.
RHODO	Ῥοδώ ΡΟΔΟ	zu “Rose” oder zum Namen der Insel Ῥόδος. 1) Fränkel, S. 45, 92 g. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Compiègne, Musée Vivienel 1093. Lit. s.v. ERATON 1.
	ΡΟΔΟ[2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 33. Lit. s.v. PEON 1. Es scheint, daß hier ein längerer Name beigeschrieben war, bei dem Rhodo- nur das Vorderglied bildete (Rhodopis?).
SATYRA	Σατύρα ΣΑΤΥΡΑ	weiblicher Satyr. 1) Fränkel, S. 49, 94 q. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1772. Lit. s.v. EUPOLIS 1; <i>RE</i> 3 A (1929), S. 52, s.v. Silenos (Hartmann).
	ΣΑΤΥ[2) Fränkel, S. 50. Böotischer Kabirenskyphos, Fr. Athen, Nationalmuseum 10426 (CC 1142). P. Wolters und G. Bruns, <i>Das Kabirenheiligtum bei Theben</i> , Bd. 1 (Berlin, 1940), S. 43, Nr. 53, S. 96 K 1, Taf. 5, 44.1; Braun und Haevernick (a.O. s.v. ECHL. . . 1), S. 62, Nr. 302; Roscher (a.O. s.v. BATYLLLOS 1), Bd. 4 (1909–1915), S. 444, s.v. Satyra 3 (Höfer).
SIMA		Fränkel, S. 16, 82 C. Entfällt (keine Mänade).
SIME	Σίμη ΣΙΜΕ	“die mit der stumpfen Nase”, vgl. den Satyrnamen Σίμος. 1) Fränkel, S. 21, 84 K. Attisch schwarzfigurige Schale. Neapel, Museo Nazionale SA 172. Lit. s.v. KALIS 1; <i>RE</i> 3 A (1929), S. 136, Nr. 2, s.v. Sime 1 (Leonard).
TERPSIKOME	Τερψικώμη ΤΕΡΣΙΧΟΜΕ	“die sich am Komos erfreut”. 1) Fränkel, S. 59, 96 v.

		Attisch rotfiguriger Teller. Ehem. Paris, Slg. Pourtalès 183. <i>ARV</i> ² 788 (Dish Painter); Th. Panofka, <i>Antiques du Cabinet du Comte de Pourtalès-Gorgier</i> (Paris, 1834), Taf. 29.2; C. O. Müller und F. Wieseler, <i>Denkmäler der alten Kunst</i> ² (Göttingen, 1854), II 2, S. 57, Nr. 581, Taf. 46; <i>RE</i> 5 A (1934), S. 790–791, s.v. Terpsikome (van der Kolf).
TETHYS	Τῆθύς Τῆθύς	Name einer Göttin.
		1) Fränkel, S. 57, 92 i. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. London, British Museum E 492. Lit. s.v. MAINAS 3; <i>RE</i> 5 A (1934), S. 1069, s.v. Tethys 2b (Scherling). Vielleicht läßt sich der Name auch zu Methyse ergänzen, vgl. hier weiter s.v. METHYSE 3.
	ΤΗΘΥΣ	2) Fränkel, S. 56, 98 z. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142458. Lit. s.v. AIETOS 1; Scherling (a.O. s.v. TETHYS 1), S. 1069, Nr. 2a; Immerwahr, S. 115, Nr. 799.
THALEA	Θαλέα, Θαλεία, Θαλία ΘΑΛΕΑ	“die blühende”.
		1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfigurige Pelike, Fr. Barcelona, Museo Arqueológico 33. Lit. s.v. GALENE 3. Fränkel führt zwar die Vase auf, gibt aber Thalea nicht an. Auch im <i>CVA</i> fehlt der Name. Lesung erst bei Trias de Arribas (a.O. s.v. GALENE 3).
	ΘΑΛΕΑ	2) Fränkel, S. 51, 102 λ. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 3235 (81401). Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 7; Roscher (a.O. s.v. BATYLLOS 1), Bd. 5 (1916–1924), S. 455–456, s.v. Thaleia 5A (Höfer).
THALEIA	ΘΑΛΕΙΑ	1) Fränkel, S. 45, 51, 60, 88 S. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire R 253, und Vatikan, Astarita 306. Lit. s.v. EU...OS 1.
	ΘΑΛΕΙΑ	2) Fränkel, S. 51, 60, 100 θ. Attisch rotfiguriger Stamnos. Neapel, Museo Nazionale H 2419. Lit. s.v. CHOREIA 1.
THALIA	Θ[]ΑΙΑ	1) Fränkel, S. 45, 92 g. Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Compiègne, Musée Vivienel 1093. Lit. s.v. ERATON 1. Bruhn, <i>Oltos</i> , S. 40–41, Nr. 29, zieht die beiden Namen Rhodo und Thalia zusammen und kommt zur Lesung Rhodothyia.
	ΘΑΛΙΑ	2) Fränkel, S. 51, 60, 104 ρ. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Providence, Rhode Island School of Design 23.324. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 9.
	ΘΑΛΙΑ	3) Nicht bei Fränkel. Sizilisch rotfiguriger Kelchkrater. Lipari, Museo Archeologico Eoliano 9341 D. Lit. s.v. SIMOS 21.
THEOS	ΘΕΟΣ	1) Fränkel, S. 47, 88 U (liest Thero). Attisch rotfigurige Schale. Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale Archeologico RC 6848. Lit. s.v. TERPES 1; Roscher (a.O. s.v. BATYLLOS 1), Bd. 5 (1916–1924), S. 661, s.v. THERO 5 (Höfer). Nach <i>CVA</i> Tarquinia 1, 4 zu Taf. 3.1 ist jedoch

		ΘΕΟΣ zu lesen.
THERO s. THEOS		
THYMEDIA	Θυμηδία	zu θυμηδέω "fröhlich sein", wörtlich "sich in seinem θυμός freuend" (zu ἡδομαι).
	ΘΥΜΗ[1) Fränkel, S. 61 Anm. 2, S. 100 δ (hier Lesung Ephymnia). Attisch rotfigurige Oinochoe. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 00.352. Lit. s.v. SIKINNOS 4. Die Ergänzung des Namens ist problematisch, s. bei CB, S. 93ff. "The name of the second maenad remains to be discussed. Hartwig read [EY]ΘΥΜ(I)H (= Euthymie), which ist not Attic. Wünsch conjectured ΘΥΜΗ[ΔΙΑ, Robinson read ΕΦΥΜΝ[ΙΑ. Eitrem took ΘΥΜΗ to be a complete proper name. . . . Wünsch's suggestion is probably best".
	ΘΥΜΗ[2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Athen, Agora-Museum P 9189. Lit. s.v. PAIDIA 1.
THYONE	Θυώνη	sonst Epitheton der Semele.
	ΘΥΩΝΗ	1) Fränkel, S. 54, 98 β. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1093. Lit. s.v. MARSYAS 6; RE 6 A (1936), S. 735–736, s.v. Thyone (K. Preisendanz; deutet Thyone als Mutter des Dionysos).
	ΘΥΩΝΗ	2) Fränkel, S. 54, 102 κ. Attisch rotfigurige Amphora. Verschollen. Lit. s.v. SIMOS 19. Preisendanz (a.O. s.v. THYONE 1), S. 735–736.
	ΘΥΩΝΗ	3) Fränkel, S. 49, 104 π. Pelike. Verschollen. Lit. s.v. HEDYMELES 1; Preisendanz (a.O. s.v. THYONE 1), S. 736.
TRAGODIA	Τραγωδία	vgl. κωμωδία.
	ΤΡΑΓΟΙΔΙΑ	1) Fränkel, S. 62, 96 s. Attisch rotfiguriger Glockenkrater. Compiègne, Musée Vivenel 1025. Lit. s.v. KOMOS 4; RE 6 A (1936), S. 1897, s.v. Tragodia (Herter).
	ΙΩΙΔΙΑ	2) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Volutenkrater. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 24.97.25. Lit. s.v. CHORILLOS 2.
	ΙΑΓΩΙΔΙΑ	3) Nicht bei Fränkel. Attisch rotfiguriger Chous. Florenz, Museo Archeologico 22 B 324, und Leipzig, Universitätsammlung T 727. Lit. s.v. KISSOS 7; Herter (a.O. s.v. TRAGODIA 1), S. 1897.
	ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΙΑ	4) Fränkel, S. 62, 100 ε. Attisch rotfigurige Oinochoe. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum V 534. Lit. s.v. KISSOS 6; Herter (a.O. s.v. TRAGODIA 1), S. 1897.
	ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΙΑ	5) Nicht bei Fränkel. Choregisches Monument. Thasos. Lit. s.v. DITHYRAMBOS 2. Figur nicht erhalten, Namensbeischrift auf der Basis. Herter (a.O. s.v. TRAGODIA 1), S. 1898.
TRIETERIS	Τριετηρίς	"die mit dem Dreijahres-Fest".
	ΤΡΙΕΤΗΡΙΣ	1) Nicht bei Fränkel. Großgriechischer Bronzespiegel. Berlin 8538. Lit. s.v.

XANTHO	Εανθώ XANΘO	OINA 1; <i>RE</i> 7 A (1948), S. 124, s.v. Trieteris 2 (Herter). Vgl. hier die Festpersonifikationen PANNYCHIS 1, sowie auch die literarisch (Athen. 5.198b) bezeugte Penteteris. “die Blonde”. 1) Fränkel, S. 14, 82 A. Chalkidische Amphora. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626. Lit. s.v. ANTIES 1; <i>RE</i> 9 A 2 (1967), S. 1351, s.v. Xantho 1 (Radke).
	XANΘOI	2) Fränkel, S. 14, 82 B. Chalkidischer Kolonnenkrater. Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire A 135. Lit. s.v. DORKIS 2; Radke (a.O. s.v. XANTHO 1), S. 1351 (hier jedoch fälschlich als rotfigurig bezeichnet).

INDEX DER AUFBEWAHRUNGSORTE

Das nachfolgende Verzeichnis soll zugleich aufzeigen, welche Namen gemeinsam auf einem Objekt vorkommen. Bei nicht vollständig erhaltenen Namen wird z.T. der ergänzte Name genannt. Wenn keine Gattung angegeben ist, handelt es sich immer um Vasenbilder.

<i>Aufbewahrungsort</i>	<i>Männlich</i>	<i>Weiblich</i>
Athen, Agora-Museum P 9189		PAIDIA 1 THYMEDIA 2
Athen, Nationalmuseum, Akropolis 1611	SILENOS 2	
10426 (CC 1142)		SATYRA 2
12594 (Nicole 1138)		IOLEIA 1 MAINAS 7
1500 (Relief)		PAIDIA 7
Baltimore, Museum of Art 37.127 (Mosaik)	OINOS 3	OPORA 5
Barcelona, Museo Arqueológico 33		GALENE 3 KOMODIA 3 PAIDIA 5 THALEA 1
Basel, Slg. Cahn HC 432	ERPON 1 OINAREUS 1	NYMPHE 1
HC 436	MARSYAS 5	
HC 541		OINANTHE 2 OPORA 2
HC 600	PHLEBIPPOS 2	
HC 1623		DINA... 1
Berlin, Staatliche Museen 8538 (Spiegel)		OINA 1 PHALLODIA 1 TRIETERIS 1

<i>Aufbewahrungsort</i>	<i>Männlich</i>	<i>Weiblich</i>
F 2160	OREIMACHOS 1 OROCHARES 1	
F 2244		BRIAKCHOS 4
F 2532 (und Rom, Villa Giulia, Slg. Castellani o. Nr.)	CHORILLOS 3 KISSOS 3-5 KOMOS 13+14	CHORO 2+3 KALE 4 PHANOPE 2
F 2589	CHORILLOS 1	
F 3257		EUNOMIE 1 EUTHYMIE 1
F 4220	SIKINNOS 2	IANTHE 1
V.I. 3151	SILENOS 1	
V.I. 3364	SAMON 1	
1966.19	STYSIPPOS 1 TERPAULOS 1	
Berlin, Pergamonmuseum (Relief)	SATYROI 1	
Bologna, Museo Civico PU 286	SIMOS 15	BAKCHE 1
Boston, Museum of Fine Arts (Wandbehang) (zugehörig Frr. Cleveland 1975.6 und Riggisberg, Abeggstiftung)	SATYROS 1	
00.352	SIKINNOS 4	KRAIPALE 1 THYMEDIA 1
10.221		GALENE 1
Brüssel, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire A 135	DORKIS 2 HIPPOS 1 MEGAS 1 PORIS 1 SIMIS 1 SIMOS 3	FIO 2 NAIS 1 PHOIBE 1 XANTHO 2
R 253 (und Vatikan, Astarita 306)	EU..OS 1 KALLIAS 1 SIMAIOS 1	LIGEIA 1 THALEIA 1
Byblos (Mosaik)	SILENOS 7	
Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 163	BRIAKCHOS 1	
Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale Cerite	AGRIOS 1 AITHON 1 (oder LITHON 1) ELASISTRATOS 1 LAMPON 1 LASIOS 1 SPHOLEAS 1	

<i>Aufbewahrungsort</i>	<i>Männlich</i>	<i>Weiblich</i>
Cleveland (Ohio) Museum of Art 1975.6 (zugehörig Frr. in Boston und Riggisberg, Abeggstiftung) (Wandbehang)	SATYROS 1	
Compiègne, Musée Vivanel 1025	KOMOS 4	TRAGODIA 1
1093	ERATON 1	CHIONE 1 EUOPE 1 RHODO 1 THALIA 1
Florenz, Museo Archeologico Etrusco 4209	SILENOI 1	NYMPHAI 1
16 B 8; B 19; B 40 (und Rom, Villa Giulia o. Nr.)	KISSOS 2	
22 B 324 (und Leipzig T 727)	KISSOS 7	TRAGODIA 3
Frankfurt, Museum für Kunsthandwerk WM 03	EUPNOUS 1 PHANOS 1 SIMOS 5 SPHOLEAS 2	ANTRO 2 OPIS 1
Hillsborough, California, Slg. Hearst	MOLKOS 1	
Ismailia, Museum 2401 (Mosaik)	SKIRTOS 3	
Jerusalem, Israel-Museum o. Inv. (Mosaik)		BAKCHE 4
Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B 3	MARSYAS 1 POSTHON 1 SOTELES 1	MAINAS 2
Kopenhagen, Thorvaldsens Museum H 597	DITHYRAMBOS 1	
Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1626	ANTIES 1 DASON 2 DORKIS 1 HIPPAIOS 1 OFATIES 1 SIMOS 2	CHORA 1 FIO 1 KLYTO 1 MOLPE 1 MYRO 1 XANTHO 1
Leipzig, Universitätssammlung T 727 (zugehörig Florenz 22 B 324)	KISSOS 7	TRAGODIA 3
Lipari, Museo Archeologico Eoliano 2297		AMPELIS 1 OPORA 4
9341 D	SIMOS 21 SKIRTOS 1	THALIA 3

<i>Aufbewahrungsort</i>	<i>Männlich</i>	<i>Weiblich</i>
London, British Museum		
E 65	BABAKCHOS 1 DROMIS 1 ECHON 1 HYDRIS 1 LEPSIS 1 STYON 1 TERPON 1	
E 82	KOMOS 15	
E 253	BRIAKCHOS 2	EROPHYLLIS 1
E 350		NYMPHAIA 1
E 437		OREITHYIA 1
E 447	SILENOS 4	
E 492		MAINAS 3 TETHYS 1
E 503		BAKCHE 2 ORANIA 1
Madaba		
(Mosaik)	SATYROS 2	BAKCHE 3
Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum		
L.87.AE.120.1-31	EOI... 1 HERMOTHALES 1 KRATAIOS 1 MOLPAIOS 1 OUKALEGON 1 ...PISIOS 1	PHILOPOS... 1
81.AE.214a-b, 81.AE.214.A.2-3	EHE... 1 PHLEBON 1	DORA 1 KALE 1
86.AE.305	BRIAKCHOS 3	
Matera, Museo Nazionale		
9974	SIMOS 6	
Moskau, Puschkin-Museum		
II 1 b 732		METHYSE 3
München, Antikensammlungen		
2302	HIAKCHOS 1	EUMELPE 1
2360	HYBRIS 1 SKOPAS 1	
2384	SIMOS 11	
2606	OINOS 1	
2612	LASIOS 2	
2619 A	(SILANOS) TERPON 3	
Nea Paphos (Zypern)		
(Mosaik)	MARSYAS 9	
(Mosaik)	SKIRTOS 2 TROPHEUS 2	

<i>Aufbewahrungsort</i>	<i>Männlich</i>	<i>Weiblich</i>
(Mosaik)	NEKTAR 1 TROPHEUS 1	AMBROSIA 1 ANATROPHE 1 NYMPHAI 2
Neapel, Museo Nazionale		
o. Nr.	SIMON 1	
H 2369	KOMOS 7 SIMOS 14	CHOIROS 1
H 2419		CHOREIA 1 DIONE 1 MAINAS 6 THALEIA 2
H 2617 (81330)	DORKIS 3 PHLEBIPPOS 1 STYSIPPOS 2	
H 2883 (2045)	EU... 1	PAIDIA 4
H 3235 (81401)	MARSYAS 7 SIMOS 20 TYRBAS 1	ORANIES 1 THALEA 2
SA 172		KALIS 1 SIME 1
New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery		
1913.132	MARSYAS 2+3	HELIKE 1
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art		
07.286.85	MALEOS 1 MYRIS 1 OINOBIOS 1+2	CHRYSEIS 1 MAINAS 4 METHYSE 1+2
08.258.22	KOMOS 12	
12.235.4	MARSYAS 8	
24.97.25	CHORILLOS 2 KOMOS 2 SATHON 1 SIMOS 7-10	EURYDIKE 1 EURYPYLE 1 HEGESICHORA 1 KOMODIA 2 NYMPHE 2 TRAGODIA 2
26.49	DOPHIOS 1 PHSOLAS 1 TERPEKELOS 1	
1989.11.4	TYBRON 2	
Oxford, Ashmolean Museum		
1937.983	KOMOS 6 SIKINNIS 1 SIMOS 13	
V 534	KISSOS 6	TRAGODIA 4
Paestum, Museo Archeologico		
21370	TYBRON 1	
Palermo, Museo Nazionale		
1109		ARIAGNE 1

<i>Aufbewahrungsort</i>	<i>Männlich</i>	<i>Weiblich</i>
2158	ONNASEUAS 1	
Paris, Musée du Louvre		
C 10784	PHLEBODOKOS 1	KISSINE 1
G 33	HANBOS 1 PEON 1	RHODO 2
G 34	TERPON 4	
G 43		CHORANTHE 1 RHODANTHE 1
G 421 (N 3402)	MARSYAS 4	KOMODIA 1
G 430 (CA 303)	KOMOS 1	
o. Nr. (Wandbehang)	LASIOS 3 LENAIOS 1 SKIRTOS 4	BOTRYOCHARIS 1 INO 2 LYDE 1 MEA 1
Pella, Archäologisches Museum		
81.97 (Formschüssel)	MAINOMENOS (?) 1 SATYROI 2	INO 1
Phlious	DASON 1 SIMOS 1	
Plovdiv, Archäologisches Museum		
3199 (Goldrhyton)		ERIOPE 1
Providence, Rhode Island School of Design		
23.324	KOMOS 9 OINOS 2	EUDIA 3 THALIA 2
Riggisberg, Abeggstiftung		
(zugehörig Frr. Wandbehang, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, und Cleveland 1975.6)	SATYROS 1	
Rom, Villa Albani		
957	BAT... 1 ITALOS 1 TO... 1	EUROPE 1
Rom, Villa Giulia		
o. Nr.	TERPAULOS 2	
Slg. Castellani o. Nr. (zugehörig Berlin F 2532)	CHORILLOS 3 KISSOS 3-5 KOMOS 13+14	CHORO 2+3 KALE 4 PHANOPE 2
o. Nr. (zugehörig Florenz 16 B 8, B 19, B 40)	KISSOS 2	
Ruvo, Museo Jatta		
1093	MARSYAS 6 OINOPION 2 SIKINNOS 3 SILENOS 5 SIMOS 16+17	EUDAIMONIA 1 EUDIA 2 HEBE 1+2 OPORA 3 OREIAS 1 THYONE 1

<i>Aufbewahrungsort</i>	<i>Männlich</i>	<i>Weiblich</i>
Shahba–Philippopolis (Mosaik)	MARON 1	
Syrakus, Museo Archeologico Regionale 24.114	KOMOS 3	
Tarent, Museo Nazionale 52444	EUMAS 1	
o. Nr.	BYBAX 1	
Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale Archeologico RC 6843	SIMADES 1	KISSINE 2
RC 6848	TERPES 1 TERPON 2	KALIS 2 THEOS 1
Thasos, Dionysosheiligtum (nicht erhaltene Statuengruppe)	DITHYRAMBOS 2 NYKTERINOS 1	KOMODIA 4 TRAGODIA 5
Theben, Archäologisches Museum K 400	ECHL... 1	
Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum 919.5.5 (C 421)	KADOLOS (?) 1	PONTIA 1
Vatikan, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Astarita 280	PHLE... 1	
306 (zugehörig Brüssel R 253)	EU...OS 1 KALLIAS 1 SIMAIOS 1	LIGEIA 1 THALEIA 1
701		MELOUSA 1
Warschau, Muzeum Narodowe 142332	BRIKON 1	
142355	MIMAS 1 OINOPION 1	MAINAS 5 POLYNIKA 1
142458	AIETOS 1 DEMON 1 KISSOS 1 LEMNOS 1	CHORO 4 DELOS 1 EUBOIA 1 KINYRA 1 TETHYS 2
Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1011	HEDYOINOS 1 KOMOS 8	KALE 3
1024	HEDYOINOS 2 KOMOS 5	DIONE 2 EIRENE 1 OINANTHE 1 OPORA 1
1772	EUPOLIS 1	PHILIA 1 SATYRA 1
Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum H 5708	MIMOS 1	

<i>Aufbewahrungsort</i>	<i>Männlich</i>	<i>Weiblich</i>
L 474	EUKRATES 1 SIBYRTAS 1	
L 491	KOMOS 16 PHYMOS 1 SIMOS 18	PAIDIA 2+3
L 492	CHORILLOS 4	PAIDIA 6
Privatbesitz (Mosaik)	MARON 2 SATYROS 3	
Verschollen (chem. Rom, Kunsthandel Penelli) (chem. Berlin F 2471)	SIMOS 4 KOMOS 11 SILENOS 6	ANTRO 1 ANTHEIA 1 CHORO 1 CHRYSIS 1 KALE 2 KISSO 1 MAKARIA 1 NAIA 1 NYMPHE 3 PERIKLYMENE 1 PHANOPE 1
(chem. Deepdene, Slg. Hope 141)	KOMOS 10	EUDIA 1 GALENE 2
(chem. Neapel, Slg. Kleinenberg)		LAMPAS 1 OINOTROPHOS 1
(chem. Paris, Slg. Pourtalès 183) (chem. Paris, Slg. Raoul-Rochette)	BATYLLOS 1 EURYTION 1 SYBAS 1	TERPSIKOME 1 EIRENE 2 ERATO 1 PANNYCHIS 1 POLYERATE 1
Verschollen	HEDYMELES 1 SIMOS 12	MAINAS 8+9 THYONE 3
Verschollen		KALYKE 1
Verschollen	SIMOS 19	DIONE 3 THYONE 2
Kunsthandel, Basel, MuM ebendort	PAIDIKOS 1 SIKINNOS 1	CHARIS 1
Kunsthandel, Genf (chem. Castle Ashby)		MAINAS 1
Aufbewahrungsort noch nicht sicher. Fundort: Elis (Klappspiegel)		KOMODIA 5 OPORA 6

