

passage must be the doubtful position of the adverb *ἀδίκως* (v. 13). With Wilhelm's text *ἀδίκως* belongs, rather belatedly, with *κωλύηται*. Indeed, whatever is restored in the lacuna before *μηδέ* must of necessity belong in the first half of the co-ordination. This leaves *κατάγηται* completely on its own without qualification: it must be interpreted as a *passive* ('be brought to port', i.e. forced to come into port and discharge one's cargo), but the context is perhaps not sufficiently explicit for the verb to convey by itself the full meaning required.<sup>40</sup>

Bearing all these points in mind let us now attempt an alternative restoration. One will hardly doubt that in the first half of the co-ordination we need a verb in the passive (or 'virtual' passive). The clause seems to be emphasising by means of accumulated negatives that the honorand has been at pains to see to it that 'none of the Athenians (*sc.* in Samos, that is to say the Athenian *ἔμποροι* and *ναύκληροι*) may be . . . by anyone at all.' The lacuna could be filled out, for example, with

καὶ μηδεὶς μήτε κ[ακῶς πάσχη]  
Ἀθηναίων μηδ' ὕφ' ἐνό[ς],

'in order that none of the Athenians may be badly treated by anyone at all.'

I suggest that there should be a pause after *ἐνό[ς]*: certainly one does not expect an adverb appearing at this late stage. But the necessary consequence of placing a comma after *ἐνό[ς]* is that the co-ordinate *μηδέ* can now no longer stand: for it cannot appear 6 spaces after the assumed break at *ἐνό[ς]*. On the other hand, a *positive* clause introduced by *δέ* could be fitted into the structure and the lacuna filled with an adverb (or equivalent) of 8 letters. With such a structure *κατάγηται* would be taken in its common *middle* meaning ('come to port') and the whole clause would express some appropriate sense in contrast to *κακῶς πάσχη*. The sense would be satisfied by something like 'but may come to port unforced/unhindered.' Although either *ἀβιάστω* or *ἀκωλύτω* would fit the available space, there is perhaps a slight preference for the former in view of the possible ambiguity of the latter.

Two further points require comment: (i) *μήτε* . . . *δέ* would appear to be the acceptance of one anomaly after the condemnation of another. However, a critical analysis of the total passage does seem to indicate that some change is needed, and the degree of anomalousness is perhaps marginally less.<sup>41</sup> I may add, however, that I do not believe that the

<sup>40</sup> *κατάγειν* is treated by G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (1972) 47 and especially Appendix VIII, p. 314. (I owe this reference to Dr D. M. Lewis). It is perhaps significant that in almost all the examples he quotes the voice is *active*: 'A *κατάγει* B's vessels', where there can be no doubt that B is acting under coercion. But when the verb is used in the *passive*, 'A *κατάγεται*', surely a little more is required to show that A is being *forced into port*, not landing of his own accord. Cf. ii<sup>2</sup>360 vv. 35-6 (315/4): *ἐπειδὴ δὲ καταχθεις | ὑπὸ Ἡρακλεωπῶν πλέων Ἀθή|ναζε παρεῖρη τὰ ἱστία ὑπ' αὐτῶν*. Wilhelm may well have felt that the force of *μηδ' ὕφ' ἐνό[ς]* *ἀδίκως* carried over into the second half of the co-ordination.

<sup>41</sup> See Denniston, *op. cit.* 511 and K-G. II ii 292.

drafter consciously embraced this construction: rather I feel that he carelessly<sup>42</sup> allowed himself to become confused by the preceding multiple negatives, which resulted in a structure which second thoughts might well have inclined him to abandon; (ii) *ἕκαστος* (or *πᾶς τις*) has to be understood from the preceding *μηδεὶς*. This is a common enough feature of classical Attic cf. e.g. Thucydides iv.10 *μηδεὶς ὁμῶν ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἀνάγκῃ ξυνετός βουλέσθω δοκεῖν εἶναι*-----, *μᾶλλον δὲ* (*sc.* *ἕκαστος βουλέσθω*) -----; Demosthenes xviii 199 *μηδεὶς θαυμάσῃ μου τὴν ὑπερβολὴν, ἀλλὰ χωρῆσαι μετ' ἐνοίας δὲ λέγω θεωρησάτω*.<sup>43</sup>

Vv. 12-14 may therefore now read, *exempli gratia*

καὶ μηδεὶς μήτε κ[ακῶς πάσχη]  
Ἀθηναίων μηδ' ὕφ' ἐνό[ς], ἀβιάστω  
δὲ κατάγηται.<sup>44</sup>

ALAN S. HENRY

Monash University, Australia

<sup>42</sup> Drafters of inscriptions seem frequently to have been careless. But no doubt less accuracy was demanded of them than of their modern counterparts.

<sup>43</sup> See K-G. II ii 566-7: 'So ist aus *οὐδὲ εἰς, οὐδεὶς* der Begriff von *εἰς, ἕκαστος* oder *πάντες* zu entnehmen.'

<sup>44</sup> I have to thank Professor K. J. Dover and Mr A. G. Woodhead for sharing with me the frustrations of this seemingly innocent stone. I have profited greatly from discussion with them on this text in particular and on epigraphical negatives in general. They are, of course, in no way responsible for the views put forward in this paper.

### The Death of Talos

In *Clio Medica* 7 (1972) 1 ff. D. Gourevitch published an article (which I have not seen) on 'Les représentations des soins donnés a Philoctète'. Among these the author included the picture on an Attic red-figure column-krater in Salerno. The next year Albin Lesky republished the pictures with a new interpretation: the death of Talos, the brazen giant who guarded Crete and was destroyed by the Argonauts with Medea's help.<sup>1</sup> It has since been published again, for the first time officially, by the excavator, G. d'Henry, who gives the correct provenance: Montesarchio (the ancient Caudium), near Benevento.<sup>2</sup> He reverts to the interpretation as Philoctetes on Lemnos. I know the vase only from these publications, none of which illustrates or describes the picture on the back of the vase, but it is not likely that this is iconographically relevant or interesting. One detail as well as the general view of the main picture is given by Lesky (after Gourevitch).

On the spectator's right a bearded man, larger than the other figures, leans backwards, seeming to collapse as he struggles against two youths who hold his arms and support him. A third youth kneels in front and does something to the bearded figure's right foot which is stretched forward; his left leg is doubled under him. Behind the kneeling youth stands a woman, bending forward, a bowl in her left hand, her right extended forward and down and

<sup>1</sup> *AA* (1973) 1115-19 figs. 1-2.

<sup>2</sup> *SE* 42 (1974) Scavi e scoperte 508, pl. 82,b.

hidden by the kneeler's back. Behind her, closing the picture on the left and not well seen in the published photographs, stands another woman with slightly bent head. The figures are set at slightly different levels ('Polygnotan' composition), and below the bearded man's feet stands a tiny winged figure, bearded, facing left, his right hand laid on the big figure's right heel, while with his left he seems to indicate the ankle. The kneeler has both hands folded tightly over an instrument with which he is doing something to the inside of the ankle, which is marked by a very small circle. If the object of the operation is Philoctetes, this must be the ankle-bone, but it is a curious way of rendering it, and what is being done is quite obscure. Also the presence of the two women is unexplained, as well as that of the bearded, winged manikin. Lesky sees the small circle as a nail-head, that which held in Talos' precious ichor; and the kneeling hero as wrenching or prising it out. The woman with the bowl will then be Medea; the other either an attendant on her or, perhaps as Lesky suggests more probably, Crete personified as a Nymph; and the manikin, Thanatos. This little figure stands on his right leg, slightly bent, the left doubled up under him, almost repeating the position of Talos' legs, as though the sprite were mocking his throes; for Talos it surely is—Lesky's interpretation must be right.

Lesky illustrates and compares the famous 'Talos vase', the great volute-krater in the Jatta Collection at Ruvo,<sup>3</sup> discussing both representations and their relation to the literary sources for the story. He mentions a near-replica of the Ruvo picture on a fragment from Spina in Ferrara, but evidently knows it only from Sichtermann's brief note.<sup>4</sup> It is, however, published,<sup>5</sup> and deserves further consideration, since it differs in important respects from the Ruvo picture and is in some points closer to the representation on the Salerno vase. The figure of Talos himself is virtually a repeat of that on the Ruvo krater: painted white, to distinguish his metal form from those of his fleshly adversaries; three-quartered right, leaning back, and grasped in much the same way. The head is missing, but it seems likely that here too he was beardless as he is in Ruvo. The youths seizing him, however, are different. On the Ruvo vase the one on the spectator's right (Kastor; the names are inscribed) is on horseback, while Polydeukes has just alighted from his horse which forms an important element in the composition. On the fragment both figures are on foot, and enough is preserved to show that no mounts were there. Even without the names, the horses would almost assure that the heroes on the Ruvo vase are the Dioscuri, but the close resemblance of the two pictures make it

safe to give that name to those on the fragment also; and this in turn confirms Lesky's cautiously qualified conjecture that the corresponding youths on the Salerno vase are the same. His very attractive suggestion that the hero busy with the nail in that picture may be Jason himself receives no confirmation but is surely inherently probable. Medea on the Ruvo vase stands behind the hero who is taking the bronze man from behind, towards the spectator's left of the picture, near the Argo's stern. She holds a bowl in her left hand, approaching it with the empty right; a figure analogous in action to her counterpart on the Salerno vase, but there she is in Greek here in oriental costume—a matter of date.<sup>6</sup> On the fragment most of this figure is lost, but what remains shows significant difference. She was again behind Talos, but sitting, at the level of his feet and near them, a box held on her knee with her left hand, the right resting in her lap with naked blade. The end of her name is preserved above. Opposite her, on the other side of the brazen feet and seemingly gesturing towards them, is preserved from the fork up a tiny winged figure, male but beardless, who has no counterpart on the vase in Ruvo. He looks like Eros, and so he has always been called, but the presence of Eros in this scene is not readily accounted for. Montanari and Dohrn<sup>7</sup> thought he was attendant on an Aphrodite, identified either with a female figure holding a sceptre, the lower part of whom is preserved behind and above him, or else with a lost figure somewhere lower down the vase. Poseidon and Amphitrite are shown watching the scene on the Ruvo krater, but their presence is more natural than Aphrodite's in an Argonaut picture. Moreover, the little figure seems not merely a spectator but a very interested one. I once suggested<sup>8</sup> that he tells us something about the story which we did not otherwise know: that the spell the witch cast on the giant was a love-sickness, bemusing him so that he fell more easily into the hands of his enemies. Were that so, the figure above might still be Aphrodite, but from what remains she could equally well be some other goddess, as Dohrn notes, suggesting Hera. One might also think of the Argonauts' patron Athena (she appears among them on the Ficoroni cista), the staff being not a sceptre but a spear. Some such interpretation I now think more likely; for the little figure now no longer seems to me Eros but, by comparison with the Salerno picture, Thanatos. The miniature Hypnos cited by Lesky (and there are others<sup>9</sup>) is indistinguishable from Eros except by context and action. The

<sup>6</sup> See D. L. Page, *Medea* (Oxford, 1938) lxii n. 1; B. B. Shefton in *AJA* 60 (1956) 161. On the dates of these vases see below.

<sup>7</sup> *L.c.* (note 5) 37.

<sup>8</sup> *Gnomon* 39 (1967) 821. A scene on an Etruscan mirror which seems to show the capture of Talos is flanked by figures of Athena and Turan (below, n. 13); but see Montanari *l.c.* (note 5) 186.

<sup>9</sup> Lekythos in Taranto with Theseus deserting Ariadne (cited by Lesky): *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 560, Near the Pan Painter no. 5; *ÖJh.* 38 (1950) Hauptblatt 1-16, 41 (1954) 77-90. Others in scenes of Alkyoneus attacked by Herakles, collected by B. Andrae in *JdI* 77 (1962) 130-210, with many pictures: Hypnos in figs. 10, 22, 27, 34-5, 37, 41, 44, 45, 47, 50, 53-4, 56.

<sup>3</sup> *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1338 Talos Painter no. 1; H. Sichtermann, *Griechische Vasen in Unteritalien aus der Sammlung Jatta in Ruvo* (Munich, 1966) 23 ff. no. 14, pls. 1 and 24-34; Lesky, *l.c.* (note 1) fig. 3; and often.

<sup>4</sup> *L.c.* (note 3) 24.

<sup>5</sup> Ferrara, Erratico presso T. 312; *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1340, middle; *NSc.* (1927) pl. 19; G. B. Montanari in *Riv. Ist.* 4 (1955) 179-87, figs. 1-4 (the fullest publication); S. Aurigemma, *Le Necropoli di Spina in Valle Trebbia I* (Rome, 1960) 117 f., pl. 138; T. Dohrn, *Die Ficoronische Cista* (Berlin, 1972) 36 ff., pl. 34; *EAA* 587 fig. 700.

*daimones* on the Salerno and Ferrara vases are on the same minute scale and occupy closely similar positions in the picture. The differences in their gestures and in the relation to the bronze man's feet are accounted for by the different moments in the story represented: capture at Ferrara, execution at Salerno. Both are winged; only one is bearded, the other beardless.

On Euphronios' great krater with Sarpedon, painted late in the sixth century, both Hypnos and Thanatos are bearded, but on a beautiful contemporary cup with the same scene they are both shown youthful.<sup>10</sup> The little figures of Hypnos already mentioned, beguiling Alkyoneus or Ariadne, which run from the late sixth century well into the fifth, are always beardless; and on the Attic white lekythoi of the second half of the fifth century Hypnos is always so shown, Thanatos always with a beard;<sup>11</sup> but a century later, on a carved drum of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus, we see a young Thanatos.<sup>12</sup> Many gods and heroes, normally shown bearded earlier, are sometimes youthful in late fifth-century and fourth-century art: Dionysus, Hermes, Herakles; Talos himself—compare the Salerno and Ruvo renderings; though for all except the last<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Krater: New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 1972.11.10; *MMBull.* Fall 1972, cover and centre. Cup: London, B.M. E 12; *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 126, Nikosthenes Painter no. 24, with refs. Both: Robertson *HGA* pl. 73.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. Pfuhl *MuZ* fig. 535 (London, B.M. D 58; *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1228, Thanatos Painter no. 12); Robertson *GP* 150-1 (London, B.M. D 59; *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 851, Saboufff Painter no. 272).

<sup>12</sup> London, B.M. 1206, *Cat. Sc.* II pl. 22; Robertson *HGA* pl. 131a; and often.

<sup>13</sup> Talos is likewise beardless on several Etruscan bronze mirrors, if as seems likely they illustrate this story (G. A. Mansuelli in *SE* 20 [1948/9] 87). On one (Gerhard *ES* pl. 58) the attackers are inscribed Castur and Pultuce, but their victim is not named. On another (Gerhard *ES* pl. 56,1) they are Kasutru and Pulutuke seizing Chaluchasu in the presence of Athena (not inscribed) and Turan (above, n. 8). Beazley (*EVP* 199) associates these representations with that on an Etruscan vase of earlyish fifth-century date, and does not suggest that the subject is the capture of Talos, remarking of Chaluchasu that 'linguistically the name may be equivalent to Chalchas' but that it cannot be the Chalchas we know. In *AA* 1948/9 62 (with fig. 5) L. Curtius revives a plausible conjecture by Panofka (*AZ* 4 [1846] 317) that the name is connected with the root *χαλκ* and indicates the Man of Brass, Talos. He is illustrating and discussing (58 ff., figs. 3 and 4) two unscripted mirrors in Berlin, one engraved like all the others (Gerhard *ES* pl. 255), the other, of beautiful quality, with the design in relief. On these the attackers are bearded and winged, and Curtius postulates a version of the story in which the doughty deed was assigned not to the Dioscuri but to the other Argonaut twins, the sons of Boreas, Kalais and Zetes, shown seated in the Argo on the Ruvo vase. The central figure, unbearded on both, has on the engraved piece a crescent-moon on his brow and a star beside him; and Curtius quotes some evidence for an association of Talos with heavenly bodies, see also Montanari (*l.c.* n. 5) 186 f. Yet another engraved mirror without inscriptions bears an analogous composition (Gerhard *ES* pl. 353; Dohrn *l.c.* 38 and pl. 35), in which the wingless victim is bearded; but he is on his knees and his hands seem bound behind him, and Dohrn is no doubt

bearded types continue also. I wonder if the splendid great winged and bearded figure on the Ficoroni cista, where he looks on grimly as Amykos is strapped to the tree, may not (despite his cloak and shoes) be another Thanatos, contemporary with the romantic young version on the Ephesus drum but a very different conception.<sup>14</sup> I see no difficulty in any case in accepting an unbearded Thanatos on a vase of about 400 B.C.

Lesky says that he must leave the question of date to those better qualified; but he goes on to cite Furtwängler as placing the Ruvo vase in the time of the Parthenon pediments, and adds that if that is right it must be earlier than the Salerno vase. This, however, is impossible. By modern reckoning the Ruvo krater and the closely related fragment in Ferrara cannot be earlier than about 400, whereas d'Henry is certainly right in dating the column-krater in Salerno to the third quarter of the fifth century. It is a work of nice quality, rather exceptionally so for a column-krater of this period, but I cannot place it stylistically. One might perhaps think of the Orpheus Painter.<sup>15</sup>

Dohrn, in his valuable study of the Ficoroni cista,<sup>16</sup> considers representations of the capture of Talos along with other adventures of the Argonauts. He thinks that the Ruvo and Ferrara vase-pictures are derived from a wall-painting, the Ferrara version being closer to the original, and in this I find him entirely convincing. He associates this original with wall-paintings of other Argonaut-scenes which seem to lie behind other vase-paintings, and he postulates a cycle, perhaps by Mikon in the Anakeion at Athens. There are reasons to doubt this identification,<sup>17</sup> but the existence of such a cycle is not improbable. The Salerno picture also looks derived from a wall-painting, surely one of the time and circle of Mikon and Polygnotos. I should myself guess that the Ferrara fragment, and more remotely the Ruvo vase, took their inspiration from a later wall-painting, which itself owed much to the earlier one.<sup>18</sup>

MARTIN ROBERTSON

*Ashmolean Museum  
Oxford*

right, following Gerhard, in interpreting him as the defeated Amykos between the Dioscuri.

<sup>14</sup> Dohrn *op. cit.* pls. 4, 17 and 19. The figure is generally interpreted as either Boreas or Sosthenes; see Dohrn 17 f. with n. 53.

<sup>15</sup> *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1103 ff.

<sup>16</sup> Above, n. 5.

<sup>17</sup> See Gnomon 46 (1974) 827 (M.R.)

<sup>18</sup> Nostalgic echoes of works from around the mid century are common in Athenian art in the aftermath of the Peloponnesian War; see Robertson *HGA* 421.

#### **Apollodoros and a new Amazon cup in a Private Collection**

(PLATES III-V)

A small Attic red-figure cup of considerable charm was recently acquired by a private collector in Hamburg.<sup>1</sup> It is decorated outside as well as inside

<sup>1</sup> My first debt of thanks is to the owner of the