foolish to accept Goulet's interpretation simply to support his hypothetical or demonstrably false arguments. So, in the final analysis, his proposals with regard to the chronology of both Eunapius' life and his literary activity are of quite limited value.[41]

THOMAS M. BANCHICH
Canisius College, Buffalo, New York

Sophistenbiographien des Eunapios', *Hermes* lviii (1923) 441–7, and T. M. Banchich, '*Vitae Sophistarum* x 2.3 and the terminus of the first edition of Eunapius' *History*, *RhM*, forthcoming.

[41] Strictly speaking, arguments for or against a break in the *History* c. 378 do not figure in the matter at hand and hence have been ignored. Blockley i (n. 2) 3–26, summarizes the debate.

Pots and Pisistratan Propaganda

It has become fashionable to discover political allusions in subjects painted on Attic pottery of the Archaic period. These allusions are of two kinds, not always clearly distinguished. One is deliberate party propaganda, especially for or against Pisistratus or his sons. The other, which reflects results of political action, need not have political intent: Theseus, for instance, was becoming more popular in Athens by the end of the sixth century, with official encouragement it seems, and his more frequent representation in art may be due simply to that popularity.[1] Here I am concerned only with partisan propaganda, and particularly that concerning Pisistratus and his equation with Heracles. Though the propagandist theory has by now quite a literature,[2] it is surprising that there has been little objection, at least in print.[3]

To begin with generalities, there is no suggestion in our sources, literary or monumental, that before the end of the fifth century the Greeks tolerated any equation of living persons, however powerful, with gods or heroes.[4] The alleged portraits of Pericles and Phidias in the Amazonomachy on the shield of the Parthenos statue[5] have been cited as parallels; but whether the story is true or not, there it was intrusion into heroic company rather than assimilation to a hero, and even so the perpetrator died in prison. If then Pisistratus equated or encouraged the equation of himself with Heracles, it is surprising that tradition, usually hostile to tyrants, did not fasten on this, though we are told that because of his interest in oracles he was nicknamed Bakis.[6]

Another problem is who devised or adopted subjects intended for political propaganda. The initiative must have come from the court of Pisistratus, from customers of the potters, or from the potters themselves. For the court it is hard to believe in direct instructions to potters, and there is no evidence for models on public display in major works of art sponsored by the tyrant. Customers presumably had some influence on choice of subjects because of what they bought or did not buy; but unless one accepts T. B. L. Webster's second-hand market[7] (which seems to me fantastic) there is very little evidence for special ordering of what after all were cheap products.[8] As for the potters, one would not expect time-wasting conferences on the subjects of fairly ordinary pieces and, if they had wished to express loyalty to the regime, it would be surprising that they should do it so obliquely.

Further, the choice of Heracles to represent Pisistratus is not an obvious one. Admittedly Heracles was a protegé of the city goddess, but he was a notoriously violent and aggressive hero, while Pisistratus was sedulously mild, preferring peace and prosperity. Nestor, whom he also claimed as an ancestor, would have been a more appropriate counterpart, or Odysseus, another favourite of Athena.[9] Anyhow, from the silence of our sources it seems unlikely that Pisistratus did much to promote the cult of Heracles and, unless the Archaic pediments of the Acropolis are relevant, there is no evidence of his having any particular interest in him. Statistics of comparative frequency of representations of Heracles in the arts of various Greek cities[10] are not relevant; if the popularity of Heracles at Athens was connected with his assimilation to Pisistratus, it should have fallen off correspondingly as soon as the Pisistratids were evicted, but there was no sudden fall-off.

Of specific subjects which have been interpreted politically the most crucial is that in which Athena conducts Heracles by chariot to—presumably—Olympus. Here J. Boardman has suggested that Heracles represents Pisistratus.[11] Briefly his main arguments are these. The subject appears first towards the middle of the sixth century, when Pisistratus was trying to

[1] An added attraction may have been a clean-shaven alternative to the bearded Heracles.

[2] The initiative came from J. Boardman in *RA* (1972) 57–72. Though he put his case well and scrupulously, others—whether from misunderstanding or enthusiasm—have gone much further than he thinks justified (see ed. H. A. G. Brijder, *Ancient Greek and related pottery* [Amsterdam 1984] 239–47 and especially 240, where he expressly limits political allusions to 'imagery'). In this essay I deal mainly with Boardman's interpretations, since they are the best argued and, if they fail, then the less well argued interpretations by others fail also; but the criticisms I make are as much of interpretations of Boardman as of Boardman's own interpretations, and I think he agrees with much that I say.

[3] The only detailed opposition I have come across is by W. G. Moon in ed. Moon, *Ancient Greek art and iconography* (Madison 1983) 97–118 (esp. 101–6); and this concentrates on one particular subject. More theoretical attacks, which I do not find altogether convincing, have been made by J. Bazant (*Eirene* xviii [1982] 21–33) and R. Osborne (*Hephaistos* v/vi [1983/4] 61–70); Bazant argues that current political interpretations are contrary to Greek conceptions of symbolism in art, and Osborne considers the representation of the scenes on Boardman's pots too complex ('sufficiently excessive') to be political propaganda. For these last two references I thank M. Vickers.

[4] The earliest instance seems that of Lysander after the surrender of Athens in 404 BC: even so, this was elevation to divine or heroic status rather than equation with a particular deity or hero.

[5] Plut. *Per.* 31.4–5.

[6] Suidas *s.v.* Bakis.

[7] *Potter and patron in Classical Athens* (London 1972) 52, 62.

[8] Even the François vase, for all its elaboration, does not seem to have been designed to suit a particular customer (as A. Stewart asserts in ed. Moon [n. 3] 69–70); at least that is the simplest deduction from its being found in Etruria.

[9] This argument has less force if Pisistratus took Heracles over from the Alcmaeonids, though one may still wonder how so universally popular a Greek hero could have been appropriated by one family and transferred to another.

[10] J. Boardman, *JHS* xcv (1975) 1–3.

[11] *RA* (1972) 57–72, esp. 60–67. N. J. Spivey has kindly referred me to an extension of Boardman's theory in ed. M. Cristofani, *Civiltà degli etruschi* (Milan 1985) 123; here F. Zevi attributes to Tarquinius Superbus an Etruscan terracotta group of the Introduction from a temple at Sant' Omobono in Rome and sees in it 'un tema squisitamente "tirannico" '.

establish his tyranny. According to Herodotus,[12] Pisistratus began his second spell as tyrant by entering Athens in a chariot with a woman called Phye masquerading as Athena and afterwards, according to Clidemus,[13] married her off to his son Hipparchus, so that she became his daughter by marriage: an amphora by the Priam painter, of the last quarter of the sixth century, has Athena and Heracles and the chariot, and Athena is labelled ΗΕΡΑΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΟΡΕ—that is 'daughter of Heracles'.[14] Again according to Herodotus,[15] Pisistratus had a bodyguard armed with clubs, when he first made himself tyrant: Heracles regularly has a club, and in one of these scenes—of the later sixth century—Iolaus (or some other attendant) has another.[16] Further, Boardman considers that the portraits on the shield of Phidias's Parthenos are parallels for assimilation of Pisistratus to Heracles. For Pisistratus's interest in Heracles he cites pedimental sculptures of the Acropolis, perhaps all of the time of the tyranny, which show the hero twice fighting Triton, once fighting the hydra and once being introduced on Olympus.

There are, of course, counter-arguments. The subject may, as W. G. Moon suspects, be earlier than Pisistratus's second tyranny and its greatest popularity is in the last quarter of the sixth century;[17] still an existing subject could have been given a new meaning, and propaganda might have been intensified later. But Moon's objection to the second argument is more cogent, that an impersonation of Athena would have been considered impious, anyhow by people pious enough to have accepted the tyrant's return because they believed him sponsored personally by a goddess; and if the Phye story is true (which he seems to doubt), Pisistratus and his sons would afterwards have hushed it up (so that it might be more plausible to find political intention against rather than for Pisistratus).[18] The marriage of Phye to Hipparchus is much more dubious: Herodotus implies that she was a commoner by mentioning only her deme, Aristotle in one account follows Herodotus and in the other describes her as a Thracian garland-seller, and even Clidemus has her a garland-seller (though presumably Athenian), so that she was not a suitable match for an aristocrat and son of a tyrant and Herodotus's silence is the more significant. Admittedly, the inscription on the Oxford amphora remains puzzling: I agree with Boardman that it can hardly be a slip of the painter and can only suppose he was amusing himself by describing Athena as 'Heracles' girl'. On the clubs Moon reasonably sees nothing remarkable in Iolaus's extra one; and though Pisistratus seized power the first time through guards armed with clubs, it does not follow that later his guards were so armed.[19] The supposed portraits on the Parthenos's shield have been discussed already. As for the Acropolis pediments, the awkward shape of the field was still a major problem, so that fish or snake tails were welcome for corners and Heracles was the obvious candidate to fight monsters so equipped; in the Introduction pediment, which was more ambitious in its composition, Heracles is at the end and not, as on the pots, at the beginning of his journey to Olympus; and pediments of this time are too rare for safe comparison of subjects in Athens and other Greek states.

On many sixth-century Attic pots Heracles grapples with a fish-bodied monster, apparently at first Nereus, but from about the 560s (at least more usually) the less benevolent Triton. The new version, it has been suggested, might commemorate Pisistratus's amphibious campaign against Megara in 566 BC.[20] Our sources, though, do not record any naval engagement; where ships are mentioned, it is only for unopposed transport.[21] Another suggestion is that the subject refers to Pisistratus's activity in the Hellespont;[22] but the dates do not seem to fit. The earlier version too has been interpreted—as perhaps publicising Solon's struggle against stasis;[23] but why Stasis should be a half-fish creature and not the hydra or some other opponent of Heracles needs explanation.

Pisistratus's final return to power was secured by a battle at Pallene, where—Herodotus relates—he surprised his opponents dicing or sleeping.[24] Soon after, according to the conventional chronologies, a new subject appears on Attic pottery, first—as far as we know—on an amphora painted by Exekias: Ajax and Achilles, both fully armed, are throwing dice, oblivious (so other versions show) to fighting around them. The choice of players rules out mockery of the losers at Pallene: but it has been proposed that we have here a consolatory message for them that even the greatest heroes were sometimes inattentive.[25] This is subtle,

[12] i 60: *cf* Ar. *Ath. Pol.* 14.4.

[13] In Ath. xii 609c–d.

[14] Oxford 212; *CVA* ii, pl. 409.5, 410.3; pp. 99–100.

[15] i 59.

[16] *RA* (1972) 63 fig. 2.

[17] See ed. Moon (n. 3) 101–6 for this and his other objections. Bazant (n. 3) 22–3 had already stressed chronological difficulties. Another objection comes from Osborne ([n.3] 66–7) that Pisistratus would not have wished to recall his return with Phye, since he was expelled again soon after. A different and interesting approach is that of W. R. Connor (above, pp. 42–47) who suggests that Pisistratus's use of Phye was ritual and not deceptive (or impious) though, because attitudes had changed in the meantime, Herodotus misunderstood it: yet the parallel to which Connor gives most space—from Xenophon of Ephesus—is much later than Herodotus.

[18] Incidentally Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 14.4) and Clidemus (Ath. xiii 609d) say that Phye was a passenger and not the driver of the chariot, as Athena usually is on the pots; but it would be niggling to press this.

[19] It is perhaps worth noting that in Aristotle's account of the tyranny at Athens Pisistratus's guards when he first seized power are κορυνηφόροι, but the guards when Hipparchus was killed are δορυφόροι (*Ath. Pol.* 14.1, 18.4; *cf.* Thuc, vi 57). I do not know of any study of clubs (though it would be surprising if there was no Ph.D. thesis on them); but clubs cannot have been uncommon objects, so that the three men with clubs on an amphora of about 540 BC (*ABV* 306 no. 43; E. Böhr, *Der Schaukelmaler* [Mainz 1982] no. 48, pl. 50b) need not have a special significance.

[20] Boardman, *RA* (1972) 59–60.

[21] Pisistratus is said to have distinguished himself in war against Megara and to have captured its port of Nisaea (Hdt. i 59), but no naval action is mentioned. He is also commended over a Megarian raid on Eleusis or Kolias, where he used the enemy ships or ship for a return raid on Megara or Salamis, the action being on land (Aen. Tact. iv 8; Plut., *Sol.* 8.4–6).

[22] R. Glynn, *AJA* lxxxv (1981) 130–2.

[23] G. Ahlberg-Cornell, *Herakles and the Sea Monster in Attic B.-F. vase painting* (*AIARS* xxxiii) 18, 103.

[24] Hdt. i 63.

[25] Boardman, *AJA* lxxii (1978) 18–24. His contention that Exekias was against Pisistratus is attacked by D. Williams (*AK* xxiii [1980] 144 n. 55); and if there was an Archaic sculptured representation of this subject on the Athenian Acropolis, as K. Schefold surmised (*JdI* lii [1937] 30–33: see also W.-H. Schuchhardt in H. Schrader, *Die archaischen Marmorbildwerke der Akropolis* [Frankfurt a/M 1939] 284–7 and D. L. Thompson, *Arch. Cl.* xxviii [1976] 30–39), it could hardly

perhaps too much so: it would be more natural to bury so shameful a memory.

After the victory at Pallene, Herodotus continues, Pisistratus sent his sons (of whom there were five) to ride after the fugitives and tell them to be confident and go home. It is suggested that the incident is recorded on a cup by the Lysippides painter, which shows a group of hoplites, archers and horsemen gathered round a bearded man in a chariot.[26] If so, this would be the earliest illustration we have in Greek art of a historical event, and one might expect that the painter (who could write) might have added a name or two to help identification, as not much later other vase-painters did for Anacreon and Croesus.[27] Also, Pisistratus should hardly be wearing civilian dress or in a chariot nor should he be so unattentive to his sons.

It is, as Boardman says, impossible on present evidence to prove or disprove the theory of political allusions in the subjects of painted pottery, and one must be content with probabilities. Tests that may be applied are whether a political interpretation explains difficulties of an interpretation that is not political, whether it was appropriate to the political situation, whether it would have been reasonably intelligible to the viewer, and perhaps whether modern interpreters are consistent in their results. To the first question, with the very doubtful exception of the Introduction scene on the Oxford amphora, the answer is no: by the middle of the sixth century Attic potters had become confidently vigorous and innovative and readily invented new subjects, most of them—so far at least—not suspected of having political purpose. As for appropriateness, reminders of Phye and of dicing at Pallene seem unhappy: and for intelligibility Triton rates low. Lastly modern interpretations of the same subject do differ, though (to be fair) some are argued less rigorously than others. At present, I think, arguments for the politically allusive and still more for the propagandist theory are too tenuous to be convincing.

R. M. Cook
Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge

have been anti-Pisistratid, unless put up after the expulsion of Hippias, and then the disgrace would no longer have been a fresh memory. The subject could, of course, have been suggested by negligence at Pallene, but without any message.

[26] Williams in ed. F. Lissarrague and F. Thelamon, *Image et céramique grecque* (Rouen 1983) 135–6.

[27] *ARV*² 36, Gales painter no. 2; 185, Cleophrades painter no. 32; 238, Myson no. 1.

'Artful Crafts': A Commentary

In *JHS* cv (1985) 108–28 M. Vickers makes far-reaching claims for the dependence of Attic fine pottery on metalwork. I take them more or less in his order.

I *The Colours of Classical Fictile Vases*

Vickers starts by remarking, fairly enough, that the colouring of Attic pottery needs to be explained and then gives his explanation—red (that is the reserved surface of the pot) imitates gold, black silver, purple copper and white usually ivory. He does not say definitely when these equations were made. In his section IV he detects instances to well back in the Bronze Age and not only in Greece, but perhaps he reckons such imitation a recurrent phenomenon. At any rate his principal concern is with mature Black-figure and Red-figure.

The most surprising imitation is that of silver by black paint. Vickers argues that till well into the Hellenistic period the Greeks liked their silver tarnished. His evidence is a statement attributed to the probably Presocratic philosopher Thrasyalces that silver is black,[1] a gibe by Theocritus on skinflints who would not give away the tarnish on a coin,[2] Asclepiades' commentary on Nestor's cup in the *Iliad*, and the use of silver for some naturally dark areas of the decoration of a bronze chariot presumably found in Macedonia.[3] He also suggests that the so-called degeneration of the black paint (or 'glaze'), which from the fourth century on gives much Attic pottery a duller but more metallic look, should rather be considered a technological advance, since it makes the imitation more convincing.

These arguments seem to me insufficient. Vickers himself admits that not all Classical silver was allowed to tarnish, notably the silver teeth of some bronze statues; but the usage of such words as ἀργυροδίνης, ἀργυροειδής and ἀργυρόπεζα imply that from Homer on silver was generally thought of as light in colour, and Sappho is said to have described the moon as ἀργυρία in a context that cannot refer to an eclipse.[4] As for Thrasyalces' statement, we do not know in what context it was made[5] and the unknown author who mentions it does so with surprise; Theocritus's remark has more point if tarnish was not desirable; and Asclepiades is indulging his interpretative fancy, nor was he far in date from Diodorus, for whom untarnished silver was evidently normal.[6] The Macedonian chariot is more serious, but what was intended may have been contrast of colour rather than verisimilitude and anyhow it may well be as late as Diodorus.[7] Further, if the radical change from tarnished to polished silver had occurred in the late Hellenistic period, it would be surprising for this to be so completely forgotten that Pliny did not mention it in *NH* xxxiii. On the change in Attic paint in the fourth century, we might perhaps expect it to have been sudden, if it was the welcome result of some new process; but, as Vickers says, it was only gradual.

If Attic black does not imitate silver, then the case for the other materials becomes unimportant. Still, the red is not very like gold nor the purple like copper; and if, as Vickers asserts in his introductory paragraph, the familiar colours are not the only ones compatible with Attic clay, one may wonder why better matches were not made (though I suspect that in practice these colours were the most convenient ones to obtain and that this

[1] *POxy* liii (1984) 3659.5–8.

[2] *Id.* xvi 16–17.

[3] G. Seure, *BCH* xxviii (1904) 224–5.

[4] [Julian], *Ep.* 19 (Bidez-Cumont no. 194). I am grateful to J. M. Cook for this reference.

[5] D. Hughes and P. J. Parsons suggest that it might have been a paradox ([n.1] 62).

[6] ii 48.8; xix 98.3.

[7] The use here of silver seems inconsistent: Vickers notes the stripes and spots of felines and the eye of a horse (though it is not clear from Seure's description whether for the white or the pupil) but it occurs also on the legs of riders. The date should be late Hellenistic, so P. J. Callaghan kindly told me.