

drapery, c. 475-450 BC. The 'Athena Elgin' has been seen as a work contemporary with and strongly influenced by the Athena *Promachos*; Langlotz and Richter saw this work as a free version of the Athena *Promachos*, and Mathiopoulos is also one of the advocates for the interpretation of the 'Athena Elgin' as being inspired by the Athena *Promachos*.⁸⁰ The owl attribute which is carried by the 'Athena Elgin' cannot be securely supported by the coins of Group 1, but the winged object seen on some of these coins makes this a possibility.⁸¹ In addition, the 'Athena Elgin' wears a heavy peplos, and although she clearly has one leg relaxed and set back, still stands with the whole of the foot set firmly on the ground, an indication of the Early Classical date of this type. The type was popular in vase painting, as well as on decree and votive reliefs, and in sculpture in the round. The identification first made by Langlotz has found widespread support; recently both Ridgway and Demargne have argued for a possible echo of the *Promachos* in the 'Athena Elgin'.⁸² As Ridgway writes, the Athena *Promachos* was not a cult image but a votive offering and one which might have been a preliminary model for the Athena Parthenos. However, there are still elements in the 'Athena Elgin' that make a secure identification difficult: helmet type and the winged object. Neither the Corinthian helmet type nor the owl can be fully supported by the only secure coin representations in Group 1, so this statuette must also be considered as nothing more than a tempting or potential representation of the Pheidian Athena *Promachos*.

To sum up, the Roman coins from the second and third century AD depicting the Akropolis provide us with a general idea of the outdoor setting of the great bronze statue by Pheidias on the Akropolis, which is consistent with the indications given by Pausanias as well as the remains of the foundations of the statue base. The coins also provide a rough idea of the colossal size and general outline of the statue type. This statue was a standing Athena wearing a helmet and probably a peplos. One arm was held forward, the hand carrying a winged attribute, while on the opposite side her spear rested against her shoulder. The shield is only seen a few times and then leaning against the leg of the same side as the spear which makes it likely that it did so in reality. The later epithet of *Promachos* associated with Pheidias' statue suggests a warlike Athena, and this has in turn lent support to a raised shield. This, however, is plainly contradicted by the evidence of the secure coin representations in Group 1. The other related coins and lamps should all be rejected as representations of the great bronze Athena. Further, the Byzantine manuscripts

⁸⁰ See the previous note; Tölle-Kastenbein (n.22) 49-51 no. 8c however, probably correctly, finds there is too little evidence to draw such a conclusion.

⁸¹ The owl as a suitable attribute for the Athena *Promachos*; see Mathiopoulos 25-9. The owl was in general often used as an attribute of Athena in representations of the goddess from the second half of the sixth and early fifth century BC, cf. M.H. Groothand, *BABesch* xliii (1968) 35-51; this attribute is also associated with the Athena Polias, see Kroll (n.41).

⁸² B.S. Ridgway, *Fifth century styles in Greek sculpture* (Princeton 1981) 169; *LIMC* ii (1984) s.v. 'Athena' no. 205 (Demargne).

are of little use, and their value is very limited. There are obvious similarities with the Parthenos, but how great these were in reality and whether or not they were made intentionally is impossible to say. Finally, it is impossible to make a secure identification with a statue type in the round, as indicated above.

Perhaps the more famous Parthenos was so similar to the *Promachos* that it was 'copied' more readily than the *Promachos* in the following centuries. Far-fetched attributions are best avoided and it is only natural that Athens should choose the image of Athena as its symbol on coins and lamps, but to attempt to attribute every single type of Athena found on these objects to a particular statue type is a fruitless exercise.

The problems of attempting to reconstruct the appearance of Athena *Promachos* recur whenever scholars decide in advance that they are going to recover the appearance of a lost original by a famous sculptor by identifying copies, no matter how unsatisfactory the evidence is. A careful analysis of the archaeological, numismatic and literary evidence reveals that none of the candidates so far put forward as a copy or a version of the Athena *Promachos* is convincing or even plausible.

BIRTE LUNDGREEN

Ashmole Archive, King's College London

Cratinus' Διονυσιαλέξανδρος and the Head of Pericles

The hypothesis of Cratinus' Διονυσιαλέξανδρος (*POxy* 663), one of the most important pieces of evidence for non-Aristophanic comedy, raises many problems, some of which, notably the reconstruction of the pre-parabolic plot and the staging problems in the κρῖσις-scene, have received a fair amount of scholarly attention.¹ I propose to look at a feature of this play to which much less thought has been devoted in print, but which, I believe, is central to an appreciation and understanding of it: the significance of costume and costume-change.

The plot of the Διονυσιαλέξανδρος as is recoverable from the hypothesis is, briefly summarized, as follows: Hermes moves off creating actor-free stage for a parabasis of the chorus of satyrs; Dionysus re-enters (line 10 παραφανέντα), which causes the satyrs to ridicule him, presumably because of his new shepherd-outfit. The title of the play, at any rate, suggests that Dionysus dressed up as Paris (cf. *Ran.* 499: Ἡρακλειόξανθος and Kassel-Austin vol. III 2 p. 34). There

¹ To the literature mentioned in Austin *CGFP* p. 35 and Kassel-Austin vol. IV p. 141 add W. Ameling, 'Komödie und Politik zwischen Kratinos und Aristophanes: Das Beispiel des Perikles', *QC* iii (1981) 383-424, P. Lerza, 'Alcune proposte per il *Dionysalexandros* di Cratino', *SIFC* liv (1982) 186-93, A. Tatti, 'Le *Dionysalexandros* de Cratinos', *MHTIS* i (1986) 325-32, G. Bona, 'Per un' interpretazione di Cratino', in: E. Corsini (ed.), *La polis e il suo teatro* ii (Padova 1988) 181-211, esp. 187-94, M. Vickers, *Pericles on stage: political comedy in Aristophanes' early plays* (Austin 1997) 193-5.

follows the κρῖσις-scene with the usual outcome, the theft of Helen—perhaps off-stage action—and the return to Mt. Ida. In view of the pending return of Paris, Dionysus-Paris hides Helen in a basket and transforms himself into a ram (lines 31-3: ἐαυτὸν δ' εἰς κρῖδὸν μετασκευάσας ὑπομένει τὸ μέλλον). *fr.* 48 seems to refer to this costume-change, and if so would imply that it was conducted invisibly for the audience. The whole trick is spotted—how exactly is regrettably irrecoverable—Helen somehow manages to get Paris to marry her, whereas Dionysus is to be handed over to the Achaeans who have invaded in the meantime. Exit Dionysus towards captivity, accompanied by the chorus who promise never to leave him.

The frequent change of identity through disguise, for which the theatre-god Dionysus has a penchant, is one of the most remarkable features of this play. In the course of the plot Dionysus disguises himself twice, as Paris and as a ram. What such a comic ram-costume could look like can be seen on a recently published Apulian bell-crater dated to the 370s and attributed to the Rainone Painter.² As regards disguise in drama, it suffices in principle to *tell* the audience that A is playing B. But playwrights can also *show* this to the audience by juxtaposing the two identities visually and/or aurally through disguise which is somehow incomplete. Because the original identity is shining through in one way or another (costume, voice, movements, gestures), the audience are persistently reminded that this is A trying to act and look as if he/she were B. This technique, capable of being employed with various degrees of refinement, can be extremely effective and allows for a wide range of serious and humorous exploitations.³ It therefore comes as no surprise to see it regularly employed in comedy, particularly Old Comedy. Incompleteness of costume and a resulting incongruous visual co-existence of identity are clear from the text of the comic metamorphosis in Aristophanes' *Ach.*, *Th.*, *Ran.* and *Ec.* This technique is also confirmed by comic disguises shown on South-Italian vase-paintings: the New York bell-crater just mentioned (human being (standing on two feet, human hands) -ram), the 'St.-Agata Antigone' (man-woman)⁴ and the 'Würzburg Telephus' (again man-woman).⁵ In the prologue of the *Amphitruo*, finally, Plautus notably points his audience to the visual markers of costume by which the spectators will be in a position to distinguish Iuppiter from Amphitruo

and Mercurius from Sosia throughout the play (*Amph.* 142-7).⁶

In the Διονυσαλέξανδρος the incompleteness of comic disguise makes for two double identities, Dionysus-Paris and Dionysus-ram, perhaps even Dionysus-Paris-ram. In addition to this comic doubling or even tripling of identities there is the final remark of the hypothesis which maintains (lines 44-8): κωμωδεῖται δ' ἐν τῷ δράματι Περικλῆς μάλα πιθανῶς δι' ἐμφάσεως ὡς ἐπαγωγῶς τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὸν πόλεμον. Bearing in mind that ἐμφάσις is a technical term in ancient literary theory denoting innuendo⁷ and that πιθανῶς, having lost its connotations with persuasion, is used by the scholiasts as 'skilfully',⁸ this is to be translated: 'In this play Pericles is ridiculed very skilfully as the one who brought the war to the Athenians'.

In principle, there is no obligation to trust the author of a hypothesis whose remarks may have no basis in genuine tradition. It is also noteworthy that we have no evidence that the one part of the play in which one might expect a great deal about Pericles, the parabasis, dealt with Pericles and the war-issue at all. Whatever the correct restoration of the cryptic line 8 of the papyrus may be,⁹ according to the more than terse account of the hypothesis the parabasis was on the procreation of sons or pigs or poets, but not Pericles. On the other hand, none of these objections is particularly strong, let alone undermines the trustworthiness of the thesis that the play was indeed an attack against Pericles. And the very affirmative mode in which the statement is made, κωμωδεῖται (...) μάλα πιθανῶς δι' ἐμφάσεως, suggests that the author of the hypothesis had substantial textual evidence before him which linked Dionysus with Pericles.

On the assumption that this information is correct, it has always been difficult to understand how the connection between Pericles and Dionysus, i.e. between political comedy and mythological burlesque, was made. In

² Published by A.D. Trendall in: *A passion for antiquities. Ancient art from the collection of Barbara and Lawrence Fleischman* (Malibu 1994) (The J. Paul Getty Museum in association with the Cleveland Museum of Art) no. 57, p. 129 f., *cf.* also Taplin's remarks on p. 23.

³ Hardly the last word, but important on disguise in fifth-century drama, particularly tragedy, is F. Muecke, 'I know you—by your rags. Costume and disguise in fifth-century drama', *Antichthon* xvi (1982) 17-34.

⁴ Apulian bell-crater ca. 370, also attributed to the Rainone Painter (A.D. Trendall, *Phlyax Vases* (London 1967) (*BICS* suppl. no. 19) [= *PhV*² in the following] no. 59 and pl. IVa, O. Taplin, *Comic angels and other approaches to Greek drama through vase-painting* (Oxford 1993) fig. 21.22 and line-drawing on p. 84.

⁵ Taplin (n.4) fig. 11.4 and p. 36-40.

⁶ It is worth noting in this context that, by contrast with Plautus, Molière and Heinrich von Kleist in their *Amphitruon*-plays completely dispensed with such distinctive visual markers (Iuppiter and Mercurius appear 'sous la figure d'Amphitruon/de Sosie' and 'in der Gestalt Amphitruons/des Sosias').

⁷ The best discussions of ἐμφάσις are to be found in the still invaluable book by R. Volkmann, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht* (Leipzig 1885) (reprint Hildesheim/Zürich/NY 1987) 445 f., and in R. Janko, *Aristotle on comedy: towards a reconstruction of Poetics II* (London 1984) 202 f. The *LSJ*-entry on ἐμφάσις is poor in this respect, with the 1996-supplement being no improvement.

⁸ A. Koerte, 'Die Hypothesis zu Kratinos' Dionysalexandros', *Hermes* xxxix (1904) 481-98 who aptly adduces (490 with n.1) Σ Aristophanes V. 248a (ὦ πάτερ): παρέπονται αὐτοῖς παῖδες λόχνον φέροντες. καὶ πιθανῶς, ἵνα ἡ ὄρχηστρα πληρωθῆ, *Hyp. Ran.* Ia 25-7 Dover: καὶ τέλος, πάντα ἐλεγχον καὶ πᾶσαν βᾶσανον οὐκ ἀπιθάνως ἑκατέρου κατὰ τῆς θατέρου ποιήσεως προσαγαγόντος, κρίνας παρὰ προσδοκᾶν ὁ Διδόνυσος κτλ. and Plut. *Quaest. conv.* IX 15 (747B): ὄρχησατο γὰρ πιθανῶς τὴν πυρρῆχην κτλ. See also Σ *Ar. Pax* 849.

⁹ On the problem see Kassel-Austin on the passage, W. Luppe, 'ΠΕΡΙ ὙΩΝ ΠΟΙΗΣΕΩΣ?', *ZPE* lxxii (1988) 37 f. and Kassel-Austin vol. VIII p. 435 on *fr. adesp.* 1109. Koerte's (n.8) suggestion (p. 484) to read περὶ τῶν ποιητῶν, endorsed by Luppe, is the most plausible one.

his fundamental discussion Koerte (n.8) 491 argued that there was some abuse against Pericles somewhere in the play, but that on the whole politics was subordinate to parody of myth: 'Hätte Perikles als zweiter Alexandros geschildert werden sollen, der um eines Weibes willen den Krieg entfesselt, so war die Einfügung des Dionysos nicht nur überflüssig, sondern geradezu störend, der Dichter hätte dann eben keinen Διονυσαλέξανδρος, sondern einen Περικλεαλέξανδρος geschrieben. Dass ihm die Hauptsache die Mythentravestie war, geht aus jedem Satze der Hypothese hervor, in der schlechterdings nichts an Perikles erinnert.' But why is the author of the hypothesis so sure that there was political innuendo in the play, and, more importantly, what provoked his laudatory remark about Cratinus' skill with respect to the innuendo? What was extraordinary about Cratinus' achievement?

The solution, I wish to propose, can be achieved by asking the following questions: how were the audience driven towards making the connection? Is there any chance that not only verbal, but visual means of identification may have played a crucial part? Is the following scenario possible: A is transformed into B with comic residues of A, then A is transformed into C with comic residues of A, while A has been equipped with features of D all along?

I suggest that in the case of Pericles there is a very simple and extremely efficient visual means of making exactly this sort of transformation and thus ensuring that a fundamental point of dramatic meaning was commonly grasped by the audience: the head.¹⁰ Plutarch (*Per.* 3,3-7) reports that Pericles had one distinct physical abnormality, an outside and asymmetrical head (τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τὴν ἰδέαν τοῦ σώματος ὁμοίωτον, προμήκη δὲ τῆ κεφαλῆ καὶ ἀσύμμετρον). This is, says Plutarch, why artists would always portray him wearing a helmet and why the comic playwrights called him 'onion-head' (σχίνοκέφαλος). Plutarch quotes jokes based on Pericles' head from two plays by Cratinus (*Χείρωνες fr.* 258 and *Νέμεσις fr.* 118), from Telecleides (*fr.* 47 *inc. fab.*) and Eupolis' *Δῆμοι* (*fr.* 115). An outside head is a feature which can be represented on a mask quite easily. Profile-views of tragic and comic masks¹¹ show that forehead and hair were all part of the mask, and the

material of which the masks were made, plastered linen,¹² allowed for some flexibility. Indeed, on one of our best pieces of evidence on comic costume presently available, an Athenian jug dated to around 400,¹³ one of the masks, that of a bald-headed and apparently old man, seems to show just this feature, which naturally calls for exaggeration on a comic mask. I am therefore sure that when the comic playwrights called Pericles 'onion-head', they also made him look like one. Cratinus appears to have been particularly persistent in exploiting this comic potential. Of the four jokes on Pericles' head quoted in Plutarch, at any rate, two are from plays by Cratinus. Later in a different context (*Per.* 13,9 f.) there is a head-joke from a third play by Cratinus, the *Θρόνται* fr. 73. More importantly, the fact that in the *Δῆμοι* Eupolis makes use of this joke more than a decade after Pericles' death proves that the shape of the head had become a sort of caricature-shorthand which never ceased to stick to Pericles on the comic stage, as effeminacy stuck to Cleisthenes and pallor to Chaerophon.¹⁴ I am therefore confident that by 430, the likely date of the *Διονυσαλέξανδρος*, the playwrights knew that they only had to put an 'onion-head' on stage and make some verbal innuendo about it, and at least the vast majority of the audience would know what was going on.

If these considerations are correct, the conspicuous form and size of the head, which would be pointed out verbally in the performance-script similarly to those other jokes on Pericles' head quoted by Plutarch, secured the continuous double-identity Dionysus-Pericles, which was even tripled when Dionysus-Pericles disguised himself as Paris or as a ram. Indeed, I would even go as far as to suggest that the whole plot and the comic idea of Cratinus' fascinatingly sophisticated play are tailored to exploit this distinct physical feature of the eminent politician by which the comic Pericles could easily adopt several additional identities. Pericles' head must have been God's gift to comedy. In the *Διονυσαλέξανδρος*, I suggest, it provides the clue to an understanding of the play by providing—μᾶλα πιθανῶς—a persistent and conspicuous visual link between mythological burlesque and political comedy. Cratinus wrote, to solve Koerte's dilemma as regards the fusion of political and mythical identity, a *Διονυσπερικλεαλέξανδρος*.¹⁵

The author of the hypothesis, I believe, gathered the connection with Pericles from textual allusions to the

¹⁰ I did not have access to Bona's article (n.1) until I was finalizing the draft for publication. On p.189 he remarks: 'Se poi esteriormente il personaggio [i.e. Dionysus] presentasse qualche tratto anche fisico ad evocare alla mente di chi ascoltava la figura dello statista non sappiamo, ma non è affatto da escludere: forse bastava che venisse in qualche modo richiamata la caratteristica forma del cranio di Pericle che anche altra volta Cratino ha dileggiato'. I am therefore not the first one to have brought Pericles' head into the game, but Bona remains indeterminate and does not go into depth about how the point was actually made or put the phenomenon into the wider context of visual humour in Old Comedy. I would also take issue with his earlier formulation (188) 'Pericle non compariva di persona sulla scena'.

¹¹ A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The dramatic festivals of Athens* (Oxford 1988) (reissued with supplement and corrections by J. Gould and D.M. Lewis [= *DFA*² in the following] figs. 34, 49, 54a, 78, 85 and 88.

¹² *DFA*² 191, Laura M. Stone, *Costume in Aristophanic comedy* (New York 1981) (reprint Salem/New Hampshire 1984) 21f. Plato comicus (*fr.* 151) used the expression ὀθόνινον πρόσσωπον ('face (or mask) made of fine linen').

¹³ *DFA*² fig. 54a, Margarete Bieber, *The history of the Greek and Roman theater* (Princeton 1961) 45, fig. 184, *PhV*² no. 6.

¹⁴ Those readers who are well acquainted with German politics will recall how the label 'Birne' (pear), again derived from the peculiar shape of the head, continues to stick to Chancellor Kohl, and how it has been exploited by cartoonists ever since the early 80s.

¹⁵ It is at least possible that in his *Νέμεσις* Cratinus resorted to the same stratagem of combining political comedy with mythological burlesque by visual double-identity. If so, the double-identity would have been Zeus-Pericles (*fr.* 118). The play may well have been produced in 431, only one year before the *Διονυσαλέξανδρος* (see Kassel-Austin vol. IV p. 179).

strange shape of Dionysus' head and his familiarity with this feature as a stock-characteristic of the comic presentation of this politician. Perhaps Pericles was also named in this play, in the parabasis or elsewhere. But, if my argument is correct, this is not essential: the caricature-shorthand 'onion-head' and some remarks drawing attention to it would be sufficient to ensure the identification without explicit mention of the real name.¹⁶

MARTIN REVERMANN

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

¹⁶ I am indebted to an anonymous referee for forcing me to clarify my general remarks on disguise in comedy.

A Wedding Scene? Notes on Akropolis 6471*

Acorn lekythos attributed to Aison, found in 1956 in a grave near Syntagma Square; 0.182 m high; c. 420 BC (Beazley, *Delivorrias*) or c. 410-400 BC (Brouskari); Athens Akropolis Museum no. 6471. *ARV*² 1175, 11, with Beazley *Addenda*² 339; M. Brouskari, *The Akropolis Museum: a descriptive catalogue* (Athens 1974) 111, pls. 219-20. A. Delivorrias with G. Berger-Doer and A. Kossatz-Deissmann, *LIMC* II s.v. 'Aphrodite' 210 (pl.).

The iconography of this well-preserved lekythos (PLATE III) has provoked little discussion.¹ Beazley enters it as an 'unexplained subject' and declines to identify any of the figures; Brouskari and Delivorrias read it as a 'wedding scene', identifying the female standing at the far right as Aphrodite. Commenting on the Berlin amphoriskos by the Heimarmene Painter (Plate IV),² Shapiro notes that Aison's lekythos offers a close parallel for the group of Helen and Aphrodite, but he takes the observation no further.³ Elements of the scene do indeed fit into the 'adornment of the bride' iconography, documented in Oakley and Sinos' collection of images of the Athenian wedding.⁴ But a number of points suggest that it is strongly influenced by a 'persuasion of Helen' typology, in the tradition explored

by Kahil.⁵ In addition, there are two problematic elements not explained by either wedding or abduction scenario: the outdoor setting and the female at the far left watering plants. The absence of inscriptions makes any interpretation debatable, but I should like to offer a few observations which I hope will prompt renewed discussion of this intriguing vase.

The whole scene is reminiscent of that on the slightly earlier Berlin amphoriskos (c. 430 BC): the central group represents two female figures seated together, apparently in earnest communication, with another standing behind in attendance; to the right, Eros attends a naked youth; the scene is framed by standing female figures. On the Berlin vase inscriptions identify the central female group as Helen, seated on Aphrodite's lap, attended by Peitho, and the youth as Paris, with Himeros. On our lekythos 'Aphrodite' is seated on 'Helen's' lap, rather than *vice versa*, but this is paralleled in several other representations of the persuasion of Helen collected in Kahil, and the reversal does not affect the basic message of close association.⁶ A seated Helen with Aphrodite calls to mind the episode in *Iliad* iii where the goddess, having led Helen to Paris' bedroom, draws up a chair for her; Helen's contempt for Paris, beaten in combat by Menelaos, is quickly overcome by concern for his life, and the scene ends in love-making.⁷ In the absence of inscriptions, we should perhaps not actually identify our seated pair as Helen and Aphrodite, but even at a mundane level a young woman's sitting on another's lap would indicate affection and trust between the two. A parallel is provided by a red-figure lebes gamikos by the Painter of Athens 1454, in what is unequivocally a wedding preparation context: a woman holds the bride on her lap as she crowns her with the bridal *stephane*, while Eros hovers above, holding out a wreath above each woman's head. The woman has often been identified as Aphrodite, but, as Oakley and Sinos point out, she need only be the mortal *nympheutria* putting the finishing touches to the bride's adornment.⁸

The female standing immediately behind our seated pair is linked with the hovering Eros, looking and gesturing towards him with her left hand, while he looks back over his shoulder at her.⁹ She is well placed to fasten the seated figure's necklace, a stage further for-

* For comments on drafts of this paper at various stages I am much indebted to Duncan Barker, Sue Blundell, Alan Griffiths, Alan Johnston, David Noy, *JHS*'s Editor and anonymous referees.

¹ U. Knigge uses the figure of the youth on the Akropolis lekythos in her argument that Aison should be identified with the young Meidias Painter, but does not offer an interpretation of the whole scene: 'Aison, der Meidiasmaler? Zu einer rotfiguren Oinochoe aus dem Kerameikos', *AM* 90 (1975) 123-43, pl. 51. For a summary of this argument and points against it see L. Burn, *The Meidias painter* (Oxford 1987) 12-13.

² Berlin inv.30036. Kahil (n.5) pl.8.2-3.

³ H.A. Shapiro, 'The origins of allegory in Greek art', *Boreas* 9 (1986) 11 n.42. He takes this to be a 'preparation of a bride' scene, and the Berlin amphoriskos to be an adaptation of the genre.

⁴ J.H. Oakley and R.H. Sinos, *The wedding in ancient Athens* (Wisconsin 1993).

⁵ The lekythos was not found until after the publication of L.B. Ghali-Kahil's *Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène* (Paris 1955) which supplies many of my parallels (henceforth 'Kahil').

⁶ Kahil pls.34.1 (Naples relief 6682) and 2 (Conservatori kraeter 39G), 35.4 (Vatican relief, Cortile del Belvedere 58d), 37.1 (Pompeii mural, Casa di Amantes, Casa Reg. I 7.7). Cf. Alkibiades on Nemea's lap, (Athen. xii 534d, Plut. *Alk.* xvi 199; cf. Pind. *Isthm.* 2.25-6). On the lap-sitting motif, see M. Robertson, *The art of vase-painting in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1992) 237 and n.9 (Alkibiades and Nemea), 239 (Paidia and Hygieia on a hydria by the Meidias Painter, *ARV*² 1322, 1), and 146-7 (Berlin amphoriskos).

⁷ *Il.* iii 421-47; this is a reminiscence of Paris' original seduction of Helen. On the elements of wedding imagery in the scene, see S. Constantinidou, 'Evidence for marriage ritual in *Iliad* iii', *Dodona*, 1990.2, 47-59: 'the details mentioned above present the couple's sexual union as an actual wedding' (57).

⁸ Athens NM 1454; Oakley and Sinos (n.4) 18, figs. 28-9.

⁹ Brouskari describes her as 'pointing at' Eros, but if so no one is paying any attention.