

War and Greek Art

Lise Hannestad

The strongest impact war had on Greek art was undoubtedly that it might provide occasion (i.e. victory) and thus the economic basis,¹ in the form of booty, for a considerable number of large scale building projects which contributed significantly to the development of, for instance, Greek temple architecture. The best known example is, of course, the Periclean building programme on the Acropolis. The temple of Zeus in Olympia, one of the most famous temples in the Greek world, can be mentioned as yet another example of a temple built from the spoils of war.² Thus chapters from a handbook on Greek architecture would perhaps be the obvious response to the question of war as a cultural force in relation to Greek art.

Another choice of topic, demonstrating even more directly the relation between art and war, might be the victory monuments, also paid with booty, and with which many Greek sanctuaries were packed.³

Instead, I have chosen a more speculative approach to the theme, i.e. to focus on how the effect on the individual of warfare and combat experience is reflected in the visual arts. In this, my paper may be said to draw inspiration from Victor Hanson's studies of the Greek hoplite battle. I have chosen to study the theme from two viewpoints and with two aims in mind. One is realism in fighting scenes in Greek art, with particular reference to the archaic period and for a purely art historical purpose: did war contribute to the stylistic and iconog-

raphic development of the visual arts? The other is to examine if a specific group of art can contribute anything to the question of whether Greek culture was a war culture?

It may be useful to begin with a few remarks on my use of the term war and on the source material. I use the terms war and warfare in a very broad sense and the word fighting is perhaps better suited for many of the monuments and scenes I shall present. The source material will include sculpture and painting from both public and private spheres. In sculpture I shall mainly discuss grave reliefs and friezes from public monuments. Large scale paintings are rarely preserved in Greek art; but an idea of some famous paintings has come down to us through literary sources, whereas the richest archaeological sources as to scenes of war and combat are vase paintings which show an unbroken line from the late eighth to the late fourth century BC. I shall concentrate on war on land, which is by far most often represented in art, apart from the geometric period where representations of sea battles are just as common as battles on land.⁴ I do not intend a systematic chronological study but have felt free to move forth and back in time. I have attempted to concentrate on well-known monuments as far as possible, since my purpose is not to present hitherto unknown or little known material but a reinterpretation or rather a study in greater detail of battle scenes and scenes related to war.

Realism in archaic art

It is well known that in Greek visual art, scenes of war and fighting, which are extremely common, are usually taken from mythology, whereas combat scenes from real

life are rare. Thus scholars have often stressed that scenes showing fighting in phalanx are very rare; that the heroic duel is preferred to the anonymous fighting between a

mass of warriors;⁵ and that combat scenes in vase-painting are usually stereotyped.⁶ In the following I shall argue that, though Greek art usually expresses the fighting experience through mythological subjects and not through the historical battles which were part of the experience of the majority of the male population of a Greek polis in the archaic and classical periods, many features in these mythological pictures reflect personal experiences of war and fighting. I shall demonstrate in more detail how realism with regard to the wounded and the dead, which we traditionally consider a phenomenon non-existent in Greek art before the hellenistic age, makes its appearance already in the archaic period.

A paper aiming to study the direct influence of contemporary warfare on Greek visual art can hardly leave out two of the scenes that are usually seen as the rare exceptions from the rule that war and fighting are expressed in mythological language. One is on a ceramic jug from the middle of the seventh century BC: the so-called Chigi vase, made in Corinth but found in an Etruscan grave;⁷ the other is the famous Alexander mosaic from a house in Pompeii, which undoubtedly copies a famous Greek painting of the late fourth century BC, probably a royal commission. More than three centuries divide these two pictures, and yet they are in one aspect closer to each other than to most Greek art from the periods in between, i.e. that they attempt to depict the phalanx tactics of their own times, the Chigi vase the phalanx in its early stage, the Alexander mosaic in a period where the Macedonian version of the phalanx is still a central element in combat during the wars of Alexander. A difference may be that the Chigi vase does not necessarily depict a specific battle whereas the Alexander mosaic probably depicts a specific event, though it is disputed which of Alexander's two battles with the Persian king, Issos (333 BC) or Gaugamela (331 BC) it is from.⁸

The Chigi vase (plate 1) shows a unique representation of hoplites in formation, on the point of joining battle. The painter very effectively depicts all warriors in a line making exactly the same movement. Not the individual, but the formation is depicted.⁹ In the middle, the front ranks are already about to engage in battle, their spears lowered to a horizontal position. The flute player, famous from the Spartan phalanx, is fol-

lowed by yet another rank consisting of more hoplites, some of them running to catch up with the line. In fact the picture is something of a *tour de force*, bringing to life very effectively the impression which the phalanx must have produced. One has to study the picture carefully to realise, for instance, that in the case of the front line advancing from the right there are 4 warriors if one counts the shields and heads, but there are actually 10 legs. Whereas the warriors on the left side, whose shields are shown from the inside, carry only one spear, as is customary later in the history of the phalanx, those to the right carry two, those in the front rank one held horizontally, ready to attack, and another one still held upright. The two warriors preparing to fight on the far left (Plate 2) also have two spears—we cannot rule out the possibility that this was indeed used in the early history of the phalanx¹⁰ rather than just a device used by the painter to mass the weapons on both sides, adding to the impression of numbers. From an art historical point of view, perhaps the most interesting question raised by this representation is whether the scene is intended to show a single moment in time, with the two warriors to the left showing that the hoplites did not put on their heavy armour until the very moment of battle,¹¹ or whether it shows a progressive method of narration reading from the left (and right) towards the centre of the frieze.

The representation of the phalanx on the Chigi vase is perhaps best explained by the novelty of the phalanx tactic and the fascination it evoked among its contemporaries.¹²

The Alexander mosaic, on the other hand, shows how a purely infantry battle was gradually transformed, from the fifth century BC onwards, into battles with diversified units, with cavalry playing an important role. Instead of the anonymous fighting of robot-like men, the mosaic is built up of single episodes, the most important being, of course, the meeting of the two main adversaries, Alexander and Darius. In this respect the mosaic, or rather the painting behind it reflects traditional combat scenes in visual arts of the archaic and classical periods, with their focus on the individual. The mastery of the composition lies in the way in which these isolated episodes are interwoven and set against a background of the extra-long Macedonian spears, the so-

called *sarissa*, effectively used to produce an impression of depth and the din of battle.¹³

Pollitt¹⁴ has rightly pointed out that the artist whose painting is reflected in the Alexander mosaic was a master of dramatic narrative with an unsurpassed ability for bringing the dramatic tension to a climax through the emotional interplay between the figures.

Written sources tell us that paintings of historical battles were produced earlier than the period of Alexander. Thus, two such paintings were exhibited in the famous Stoa Poikile on the Athenian Agora. The paintings—probably made around 460 BC—were of battles in which the Athenians had been victorious. One showed the battle of Marathon, another the battle between Athenians and Spartans at Oinoë. C. 500 years later they were described in detail by Pausanias (1.15.3), the indefatigable traveller of the second century AD:

At the end of the painting (in this case a series of four different paintings) are those who fought at Marathon; the Boeotians of Plataea and the Attic contingent are coming to blows with the foreigners. In this place neither side has the better, but the centre of the fighting shows foreigners in flight and pushing one another into the morass, while at the end of the painting are the Phoenician ships and the Greeks killing the foreigners who are scrambling into them. Here is also a portrait of the hero Marathon, after whom the plain is named, of Theseus represented as coming up from the under-world, of Athena and of Heracles. — Of the fighters the most conspicuous figures in the painting are Callimachus who had been elected commander-in-chief by the Athenians, Miltiades, one of the generals, and a hero called Echetlus, of whom I shall make mention later.¹⁵

Pausanias begins his description of the paintings in the stoa in this way:

This portico contains, first, the Athenians arrayed against the Lacedaemonians at Oinoë in the Argive territory. What is depicted is not the *akme*, i.e. the height of the battle, nor when the

action has advanced as far as the display of deeds of valour, but the beginning of the fight when the combatants were about to close.¹⁶

Pausanias' choice of words 'nor when the action has advanced as far as the display of deeds of valour' offers us, I think, a kind of key to understanding the fighting scenes usually seen in Greek art, i.e. the battle broken up into duels or fighting in small groups.

The actual pattern of fighting in hoplite battles has been much debated in recent years, perhaps because it varied from battle to battle.¹⁷ The initial clash between two phalanxes, the thrust (*othismos*) in ranks, is never depicted in Greek art. The reason is, I would argue, that it was the individual engagements in which personal courage, dexterity and ingenuity were crucial, and the opportunities they offered to 'display deeds of valour' which were considered the height of a battle. Rather than seeing the fighting scenes as idealized, we should recognise that they reflect a psychological reality.¹⁸ What the Greeks saw as the memorable episodes of a battle were these individual engagements, not the anonymous action of the phalanx. Thus the usual fighting scenes in the visual arts are a result of a selectivity as to which part of battles would and should be remembered. This concentration by the artists and their patrons on a psychological reality with focus on the individual and his fate reflects, I think, a lack of interest in tactics etc.; something which has often been compared with Herodotus' descriptions of battles,¹⁹ but which is something also to be seen in much later European visual art, where artists' main interest in battle scenes are very similar: the individual and his fate, not tactics or the totality of a battle.²⁰

It has often been pointed out that Greek artists—and similar anachronisms are of course common also in much later art—depicted contemporary dress and equipment in mythological fighting scenes; and not least Victor Hanson²¹ has stressed the intimate knowledge of how armour and weapons were handled that pervades many depictions. As an example may be mentioned how the shifting trend from very heavy armour in the early archaic period with its heavy bronze cuirass, greaves and the Corinthian helmet (all of which must have hampered movement severely) towards much lighter equipment in the classical and later periods is clearly reflected

in the visual arts. The handling of the heavy shield and spear when not fighting is, for instance, to be seen on the famous red figure krater by the Niobid Painter (Plate 3). In a rocky landscape, Heracles and some other heroes are resting, watched by Athena. The scene undoubtedly reproduces a wall painting, but its identification is much debated.²² The heavy shield and the helmet of the seated hero are placed on the ground, the hero himself leaning on his two long spears. Above him, on Heracles' right, a hero who is still wearing his helmet supports his shield against his knee and leans on his spear.

But not only in such details as the equipment and the handling of it do we meet an intimate knowledge of war and battle. One of the most striking traits in archaic Greek art, usually very formulised in its expression, is the realism that suddenly appears in the representation of the dead and wounded in battle.²³ One of the masterpieces of late archaic sculpture is the dying warrior in the left corner of the east pediment of the Aphaia temple on Aigina (Plate 4). Much has been written in recent years about the burden of the hoplite shield. Here it serves as the last support of the dying, his arm still in the arm grip (*porpax*), whereas in his almost unconscious state he is no longer able to hold on to the handgrip (*antilabe*). With his right hand, he still holds the sword. Though this can never have been visible from below, the artist has portrayed the pain and the fleeting consciousness in the warrior's face with the slightly opened mouth and the deep furrows from nose to cheeks. His legs are moving to no effect, and in a moment he will collapse completely, his arm probably slipping through the grip of the shield. He has been fatally wounded by an arrow (Heracles') in the right part of the chest. Blood streaming from the wound was probably painted on to heighten the effect, as we often see it in vase painting. The sculpture is actually one of the most poignant portrayals of a dying warrior in the whole history of Greek art.

The wounded warrior supporting himself on the shield and with a last grip on the sword is a motif we can find again and again in vase-painting. Among the most distinctive depictions are those of the Brygos Painter, for instance the mortally wounded opponents of Poseidon, Athena and Hermes in a gigantomachy on a kylix now in Berlin (Plate 5a-b).²⁴ The wounded amazon on a

krater by Euphronios is a couple of decades earlier (Plate 6).²⁵

Characteristic of this motif is that the wounded or dying have all drawn or tried to draw their sword in a last attempt to ward off their opponents who still fight with a spear or a similar weapon (the gods). It should be noted that the motif as such is not an invention of the late archaic artists but is already to be found in a version lacking the realistic details in the early sixth century.²⁶

The use of the double-edged iron spearheads in hoplite combat resulted in large wounds, which must have caused severe haemorrhages. Victor Hanson has stressed that the literary descriptions of some battles, with the ground turned red with blood are to be taken literally.²⁷ Many vase-paintings, too, stress this enormous loss of blood (see for instance Plates 5-6). However, there is a characteristic limit to the realism of rendering of wounds in the visual arts. Even in the hellenistic period this discretion or even aestheticism with regard to death is still characteristic of Greek art. I know of only one example in Greek art of the depiction of bowels emerging from a wound and that is in the representation of the hunt on the Calydonian boar, on the François vase from c. 575 BC, where we see such wounds very clearly on the dead hound and more discreetly on the dead hunter (Plate 7). This restraint as to 'total realism' is perhaps surprising considering the descriptions in the Iliad, known to all Greeks. Characteristically, such realism as to wounds is not to be found again until much later, in the archaistic Aegistos relief from the early Roman period (last half of the first century BC or perhaps rather the first century AD) which clearly draws upon literary rather than visual prototypes.²⁸

One of the finest representations of a battle in Greek art is the gigantomachy on the north frieze of the Siphnian treasury in Delphi, dating from c. 525 BC.²⁹ The frieze is 8.6 m long and only 64 cm high and in this confined space the sculptor brilliantly structures his composition. The gods attack from the left, a convention that signals that the victory will ultimately be theirs. Though using the traditional scheme with fighting in clearly defined groups, not in ranks, the sculptor nevertheless succeeds in simulating the tactics of a hoplite combat with the giants attacking in groups of two or three, their shields overlapping to form a wall (*e.g.*, Plate

8). The ruthlessness of this, the ultimate battle according to Greek mythology, is rendered in a way that still deeply affects the modern spectator, seeing for instance the giant attacked by the lions of Cybele (Plate 9). Originally, painted blood, portrayed as streaming copiously from the wounds made by the lions' teeth and claws would have further increased the sense of horror. The battle ground is already strewn with dead or fatally wounded, and the artist has taken great pains to depict them individually. One is lying naked on his side, and—very unusual in reliefs—his face is shown en face, his mouth open in pain. His head is resting on one arm, the other arm hanging feebly (Plate 10). Another naked giant, still wearing his helmet, is lying on his back, one arm bent back over his head. Both his legs are slightly bent and it seems that in a moment the running warrior will tread on him (plate 11)—a theme to appear again in the hellenistic period in the gigantomachy on the Great Altar of Pergamon.³⁰ Yet another giant, supporting himself on his right elbow, expends his last strength in an attempt to lift his shield for protection against the spear of a goddess (Plate 11). To the right, one giant is still fighting back, though he is already on his knees and trying to protect himself with his shield, which is pierced by the spear of his opponent. His right hand held the sword in a final attempt to defend himself against his successful opponent (Plate 11).

It has often been stressed that the early red figure vase painters of the so-called Pioneer Group of the very end of the sixth century BC must have studied the male anatomy, probably in the palaestra. Similarly, there can be no doubt that the sculptor of the north frieze of the Siphnian Treasury or the artistic tradition from which he grew, had an intimate knowledge of contemporary warfare, which was also applied to the mythological fight between gods and giants in the Siphnian Frieze.

The first efforts of an army after a battle would have been directed toward carrying or dragging off the wounded who still had some chance of survival.³¹ Of primary importance was also a proper burial of the dead in order to fulfill the obligations to both dead and living in a Greek community.³²

Tending to the wounded is a very rare motif in Greek visual arts. One such motif is on a late archaic drinking cup by the Sosias Painter, now in Berlin (Plate

12).³³ Patroclus is shown seated on his shield, biting his teeth in pain, and turning his head aside in the characteristic reflex movement of not wanting to see one's own bleeding wounds, while Achilles dresses a wound in his left biceps. The cause of the wound is also indicated: an arrow has pierced the rim of Patroclus' shield, which he carried on his left arm, when the arrow hit him.

In contrast, the motif of carrying the dead from the battlefield is quite common in archaic art. Among the earliest representations are those on the handles of the François vase, showing Aias carrying the dead Achilles (robbed of his armour and weapons, something happening not only in the epics but which was also normal practice in contemporary warfare) (Plate 13). Thus, in its mythological disguise, this motif must have had a deeper significance for contemporary viewers than a story from an epic. Whereas Aias is rendered in a very schematic manner, characteristic of early archaic art, the so-called 'Knielauf'; the dead Achilles shows realistic traits, his long hair hanging in front of his face and his eyes closed.³⁴ The magnitude of the deed must certainly have been recognised by contemporaries of the vase-painter Exekias from his portrayals on an amphora in Munich of a warrior wearing all his own heavy armour while carrying on his back a dead comrade in full armour (Plates 14-15).³⁵ This must have been something of a superhuman effort, with the warrior's own armour weighing about 35 kg and added to that the dead man and his armour, altogether more than 120 kg.³⁶ The shape of the shields shows that on this amphora too, the theme is mythological, again probably Aias carrying Achilles.

Also from the cycle of the Trojan war is the scene on the calyx krater by Euphronios, with Hypnos and Thanatos lifting the dead Sarpedon from the battlefield (Plate 16). Hypnos and Thanatos, Sleep and Death, wear Corinthian helmets, a fact which reveals the similarity of this mythological scene to what was part of contemporary warfare, where comrades-in-arms would have carried the dead.³⁷ We find a variation of this motif on a cup, formerly in the Hunt collection, also by Euphronios, where Sarpedon is being carried away by the same two personifications in a kind of procession.³⁸

A completely different pictorial tradition is to be seen in the tondo of a Laconic black figure drinking cup from the middle of the sixth century BC (Plate 17)³⁹ where a

procession of warriors are carrying the dead. Nothing here suggests a mythological theme.

These examples—and many more could have been mentioned—clearly disprove the traditional view that in the visual arts, the Greek artists of the archaic period

simply followed a stereotyped pattern of rendering scenes of warfare. On the contrary, Greek artists in this period, when hoplite warfare was at its peak, took great pains to present what Hanson has called the misery of the hoplite battle.⁴⁰

Warrior Ideology

In the past decades many scholars of ancient history have viewed Greek culture as a culture deriving its values from war. Recently Yvon Garlan has formulated the viewpoint in this way: 'On all levels and in all realms of society the significance of the warrior model was asserted: within families the soldier, as portrayed on Attic vases, was the central figure around whom the internal relationships of the *oikos* was organized.'⁴¹ Some scholars, however, have begun to question this view, among them W.R. Connor (1988) who has stressed that also in this aspect Greek culture should not be seen as a unit, but in all its complexity over time and space. In the following I have attempted to examine if (or what) the iconography of the funerary monuments of private burials may contribute to this discussion of the social importance of the warrior.

Within the scope of this paper I shall concentrate on the Attic evidence, but in order to study the phenomenon over a longer period of time I shall include the grave stelai from Delos, which are from the hellenistic period when the Attic production of sculptured funerary monuments had ceased. Delos was under Athenian domination from 166 BC until the destruction by pirates in 69 BC.

In the archaic period two types of sculpture were used as grave markers in Attica: sculpture in the round and a relief-decorated stele. Of sculpture in the round, the type used for men was the *kouros*, i.e. the naked young man with no attributes marking him as a warrior or in any other role. An example is a *kouros* from Anavysos in Attica from around 525 BC (Plate 18).⁴² Here nothing suggests that the relatives wanted to commemorate the deceased as anything but a splendid young human being. However, the sculpture may belong together with a base carrying the epigram: *Stay and mourn the monument of dead Croesus, whom furious Ares destroyed*

one day as he fought in the front ranks,⁴³ indeed a valid warning against any straightforward interpretation of a piece of art without information on its context.

A couple of decades later, the grave stele of Aristion from Velanideza in Attica represents the deceased as a bearded hoplite (Plate 19).⁴⁴ The inscription tells us only his name and that of the sculptor. There are other warrior stelai; in fact they seem to be the most frequent type of stele for a man, though for young men commemorations as athletes were also popular. However, the total number of archaic Attic grave stelai is relatively small and it is hardly possible to come to any conclusion beyond the fact that it was, in fact, common for men to be commemorated as hoplites: i.e. men of the elite, since it is important to realise that the archaic sculptured grave markers must have been the prerogative of the aristocrats. Sparse though the material is, it nevertheless appears to confirm the view of the central importance of the warrior expressed by Garlan.

The evidence becomes more complex when the sculptured Attic grave marker surfaces again around 430 BC after having disappeared during the first generations of the democracy. From then on, it continues in use until the late fourth century, offering us a splendid opportunity to study the iconography preferred by Athenian citizens (and others)—not only of the uppercrust, but also those of at least some means. Moving into the apparently simple world of Attic classical gravestones is, however, rather like walking into a minefield. We should not be deceived by the fact that they present to us Athenians of both sexes and all ages, and probably from elite to slave status, or by our spontaneous impression that we understand the message these gravemarkers seek to convey. Any attempt at a closer interpretation of the iconography of many of these stelai will immediately meet with difficulties as any classical archaeologist will

know.⁴⁵ For that reason I have chosen a rather simplistic approach, which nevertheless, I think, can offer us some idea of the development of the warrior ideology in the sphere of private burials in the most powerful polis in Greece after the Persian wars.⁴⁶

In the first decade of the renewed production of sculptured grave stelai, i.e. 430-420 BC, there is still only a very small number made and no warrior representations can be attributed to this decade. In the next two decades, at the height of the Peloponnesian war, the warrior representations reach their peak. 15% of all preserved funerary monuments show one or—less often—more hoplites.⁴⁷

In the period 400-375 BC, the percentage of grave-stones with warriors has fallen to 6%, and when the production of sculptured funerary monuments has reached its peak in the period 375-350 BC, warrior representations are to be seen on only about 1.5%. In the last half of the century, or rather until the end of the production, possibly in 317 BC,⁴⁸ they are to be seen on *c.* 2.5% of the gravestones (Plate 20).

The majority of classical funerary reliefs with warrior representations present either the warrior, i.e. the deceased, alone (normally standing peacefully) or as part of a group, usually relatives or comrades-in-arms. Such representations follow the general trend in the iconography of the funerary monuments of the classical period, showing the deceased either alone or together with relatives or friends. In contrast, the theme 'Warrior in action' is a comparatively rare motif, mostly to be seen after 400 BC, with the Dexileos stele⁴⁹ as the most famous example.⁵⁰

The hellenistic grave stelai from Delos, often of a rather modest quality, represent male figures in much the same way as the late fourth century Athenian funerary monuments, i.e. as 'civilians' dressed in chiton and mantle, sometimes with allusions to the gymnasium.⁵¹ Only 2.5% of the stelai depict a warrior (on board a ship).

This, admittedly very simple, examination of sculptured funerary monuments suggests that, in contrast to Athens in the sixth century BC, when the role model as hoplite was clearly an important aspect of aristocratic life, this changes during the period of democracy. Why do we find warrior representations on only 15% of the funerary monuments during the period of the Peloponnesian war? The traditional conclusion that only men who died in action were commemorated as warriors probably accounts for part of it. However, the fact that though the Athenians usually served in the army from they were 18 until they were 60, by far the majority of the males depicted on the funerary monuments are represented not as hoplites but as civil citizens (signified by their wearing a cloak) or the young men very often as athletes, strongly suggests that it was not only acceptable but the norm (in the wealthier part of society) to be commemorated as a civilian. The warrior cannot have been 'the central figure around whom the internal relationships of the oikos was organized.' (Garlan 1995)

This tendency becomes much stronger in the fourth century and the hellenistic period, when the role model for a man as a warrior has ceased to be popular, at least in Athens and on Delos. This fall in the percentage of warrior representations on the funerary monuments seems actually to coincide with the establishing of an official cult for Eirene in Athens in 374 BC.⁵²

Thus, the funerary monuments of private persons of the archaic and classical periods in Athens and on hellenistic Delos, confirm, I think, the importance pointed out by Connor of viewing Greek culture and its attitude to war not as a unit but in all its variations over time and space. The sculptured funerary monuments of private burials in Athens certainly show a distinct change through time in the popularity of the warrior as the role in which the male population was depicted on funerary monuments.

Conclusion

The question raised in the beginning of this paper was how the effect on the individual of contemporary warfare and combat experience was reflected in the visual arts.

A closer study of fighting scenes in the visual arts of the archaic period indicates that though they appear to be stylized and often stereotyped, still we meet, particularly in works of art of high quality, examples of a real-

ism that bears evidence of the same feeling that Pindar expresses in a poem for the Thebans:

Sweet is war to the untried, but anyone
who has experienced it
dreads its approach exceedingly in his heart.⁵³

War was not about just about glory but most of all something to be feared. And the evidence from the Athenian sculptured funerary monuments suggests a development from an aristocratic warrior ideology in the

archaic period to, in the fifth and particularly the fourth century BC, a society with different ideals. War had not become a less important part of everyday life, but there seems to have been a change in values, so that the male role model was no longer so strongly concentrated on the warrior, a development which becomes very clear in the hellenistic period, when armies to a large extent were mercenaries and the civilian is the 'Idealbürger' of the Greek *poleis*.

Department of Classical Archaeology, University of Aarhus

Bibliography

- Ahlberg, G. 1971. *Fighting on Land and Sea in Greek Geometric Art* (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 4^o, 15). Stockholm
- Anderson, J.K. 1991. Hoplite Weapons and the Offensive Arms, in Hanson 1991, 15-37.
- Arias, P. & Hirmer, M. 1960. *Tausend Jahre griechische Vasenkunst*, Munich: Hirmer.
- Bilde, P. & others (eds). 1993. *Centre and Periphery in the Hellenistic World* (Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 4). Aarhus, Oxford and Oakville, Conn.: Aarhus University Press.
- Bilde, P. & others (eds). 1996. *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship* (Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 7). Aarhus, Oxford and Oakville, Conn.: Aarhus University Press.
- Boardman, J. 1974. *Athenian Black Figure Vases*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- Boardman, J. 1989. *Athenian Red Figure Vases, the Classical Period*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- Clairmont, C.W. 1993. *Classical Attic Tombstones*, Kirchberg: Akanthus.
- Cohen, A. 1997. *The Alexander Mosaic, Stories of Victory and Defeat*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, W.R. 1988. Early Greek Land Warfare as Symbolic Expression, *Past and Present* 119, 3-29.
- Froning, H. *Marmor-Schmuckreliefs mit griechischen Mythen im 1. Jh. v. Chr.* Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Garlan, Y. War and Peace, in Vernant 1995, 53-85.
- Hannestad, L. 1993. Greeks and Celts: The Creation of a Myth, in Bilde et al. 1993, 15-38.
- Hannestad, L. 1997. Death on Delos, in Bilde et al. 1997, 285-302.
- Hanson, V.D. 1989. *The Western Way of War—Infantry Battle in Classical Greece*. London: Hogger and Stoughton.
- Hanson, V.D (ed.) 1991. *Hoplites: the Classical Greek Battle Experience*, London: Routledge.
- Harrison, E.B. 1972. The South Frieze of the Nike Temple and the Marathon Painting in the Painted Stoa, *AJA* 76, 353-78.
- Hölscher, T. 1973. *Griechische Historienbilder*, Würzburg: Konrad trilstsch.
- Jeppesen, K. 1970. Dilemma der Sieben von Theben, *Acta Archaeologica* 41, 155-79.
- Johansen, K. Friis. 1951. *The Attic Grave-Reliefs of the Classical Period, An Essay in Interpretation*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Kurtz, D.C. 1975. *Athenian White Lekythoi*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lisserague, F. 1984. Autour du guerrier, *La cité des images*, 35-48, Paris: Editions de la Tour.
- Lullies, R. 1979. *Griechische Plastik*. Munich: Hirmer.
- Pollitt, J.J. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pritchett, W.K. 1971. *Ancient Greek Military Practises*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rice, E. 1993. The glorious dead: Commemoration of the fallen and portrayal of victory in the late classical and the hellenistic world in Rich & Shipley, 224-57.
- Rich, J. & Shipley, G. (ed.) 1993. *War and Society in the Greek World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Richter, G.M.A. 1960. *Kouroi, Ancient Greek Youths*. London: Phaidon.
- Richter, G.M.A. 1961. *The Archaic Gravestones of Attica*. London: Phaidon.
- Schmidt, E. 1962. *Le grand autel de Pergame*, Leipzig.
- Stibbe, C.M. 1972. *Lakonische Vasenmalerei des sechsten Jahrhunderts*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Vaughn, P. 1991. The Identification and Retrieval of the Hoplite Battle-Dead, in Hanson 1991, 38-62
- Vernant, J.P. (ed.) 1995. *The Greeks*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Notes

- 1 Cf. Connor 1988, 16: 'The taking of booty was perhaps the largest movement of capital in Greek civic life' (with reference to the figures given by Pritchett 1971, 75ff).
- 2 A victory of the Eleans over their neighbours from Pisa (Pisatis), cf. Pausanias 5.10.2.
- 3 See Rice 1993.
- 4 Cf. Ahlberg 1971.
- 5 E.g. Lissérague 1984, 40. See also Cohen 1997. This monograph had not appeared when this paper was written. Cohen's ch. 2 contains a brief analysis of battle images and battle narratives, mainly of the classical period, as a background for the analysis of the Alexander Mosaic.
- 6 Boardman 1974, 208 (for the archaic period). Id. 1989, 220 'Fighting scenes follow traditional schemes and there is still no explicit demonstration of a hoplite rank rather than individual duels.'
- 7 For the Chigi vase, see also Morgan, this volume, note 6.
- 8 For a discussion of whether the mosaic or rather the painting it copied depicted a specific battle or was to be seen as a more general rendering of Alexander's battles with the Persians see Pollitt 1986, 46.
- 9 Cf. Hölscher 1973, 28.
- 10 See Anderson 1991, 19 who suggests that the first spear was meant to be thrown as suggested by the loops on the spears of the preparing warriors on the far left. The loop is intended to give extra purchase when the spear is thrown. Others (see references by Anderson) have interpreted the second spear as a spear held in reserve by a servant.
- 11 Cf. Hanson 1989, 60ff.
- 12 The frieze on the Chigi vase has often been seen as the visual parallel to Tyrtaios' description of the early hoplite battle.
- 13 The literature on the Alexander Mosaic and its prototype is vast. A recent monograph with an analysis of the two contexts, the Greek of the fourth century BC and the Roman, is Cohen 1997. For the composition of the Mosaic in comparison with classical battle images see *ibid.* 37.
- 14 1986, 45. Cohen 1997 (see also note 5)
- 15 The translation is by H.L. Jones, Loeb Classical Library. For a discussion and reconstruction of the Marathon Painting see Harrison 1972. See also Hölscher 1973, 50ff.
- 16 Thus this painting may actually have shown the very beginning of a hoplite battle just as the Chigi vase does. In the Stoa Poikile these two paintings of contemporary battles flanked two mythological scenes, an amazonomachy and the Greek kings gathered after the fall of Troy.
- 17 Cf. Connor 1988, 14 and note 41 for further references.
- 18 A related discussion of the painting of the battle of Marathon in the Stoa Poikile is to be found in Hölscher 1973, 82 who also stresses a psychological reality in contrast to a physical reality. Cf. *id.* 29.
- 19 Cf. Hölscher 1973, 82.
- 20 A recent example in a different medium is the film *Saving Private Ryan*.
- 21 1989 Chap. 6
- 22 The interpretation of the scene has been much debated. See Arias & Hirmer 1960, 86. See also Jeppesen 1970.
- 23 See also Hannestad 1993.
- 24 *CVA Berlin* 2 Taf. 67 and 68.
- 25 *Euphronios* p. 128ff no. 13.
- 26 E.g. the C-painter's kothon, Louvre CA 616, see for instance Arias & Hirmer 1960 fig. 48. See Hölscher 1973, 26 for a discussion of the fighting scene on this vase.
- 27 Hanson 1989, 203.
- 28 Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek I.N. 1623, see Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek Catalogue Etruria and Central Italy no. 97. For a discussion of the dating of the relief see Froning 1981, 82ff. I am indebted to my colleague Pia Guldager Bilde for drawing my attention to this relief.
- 29 Billedhøvisninger
- 30 See on the east frieze, Artemis treading on a fallen opponent and Aphrodite placing her left foot on the face of a fallen giant, see for instance Schmidt 1962 figs. 15 and 40-41.
- 31 Cf. Hanson 1989, 208.
- 32 See also Vaughn 1991.
- 33 *CVA Berlin* 2, 7-9 no. 49.
- 34 A very similar rendering of this motif is seen in a cup by Phrynos in the Vatican no. 317, *ABV* 169, 4; see *Albizzati* pl. 34.
- 35 *CVA München* 7 Taf. 351-53.
- 36 Cf. Hanson 1989, 56 with further references.
- 37 The other side of the krater shows an armouring scene, one of the most popular motifs in Greek vase painting, but here, as one would expect from this painter, with a number of realistic details showing Euphronios' familiarity with such scenes, see *Euphronios* 93-105 no. 4
- 38 See *Euphronios* 182-186 no. 34. The other side of the cup shows a hoplite dancing, a flute player accompanying him.
- 39 Attributed by Stibbe (1972 no. 218 (Taf. 74) to the Hunt Painter.
- 40 Hanson 1989, 225.
- 41 Garland 1995. Garland's assertion that representations of warriors on Attic vases support the view that the soldier was the central figure around whom the internal relationships of the oikos were organized will not bear a closer examination of the material.
- 42 See Richter 1960, pp. 118f no. 136.
- 43 Richter 1960, 115f. The translation is the one given by Richter.
- 44 See Richter 1961, 47 no. 67.
- 45 Illustrated in an as yet unsurpassed analysis by Friis Johansen 1951. One of the central issues in grave reliefs with more than one person is to identify which of the depicted persons represents the deceased.
- 46 Private burials understood as funerary monuments financed by

- private persons and erected in family burial plots. All these monuments also had a very public function in that they were visible for all passers-by on the roads to and from Athens.
- 47 The quantifications and datings are based on Clairmont 1993.
- 48 The end of the production is usually connected with the laws of Demetrios of Phaleron. See Johansen 1951, 13 and Clairmont 1993, Introduction 2.
- 49 See for instance Lullies 1979 Taf. 188.
- 50 A parallel phenomenon be be observed on the white ground lekythoi, the typical grave vases of the fifth century, where the traditional iconography is suddenly in the last years of the fifth century supplemented with battle scenes. See Kurtz 1975, 64 f.
- 51 See Hannestad 1997.
- 52 See *Der neue Pauly* III and *LIMC* III.
- 53 Stobaeus, Anthology on War; Pindar, Hyporchemata Fr. 110.