

THE RECOVERY OF HELEN

IT is my purpose here to examine aspects of the iconography of the Recovery of Helen on the night that Troy fell. The attempt seems the more worth while now that a canonical pattern of interpretation is likely to be established by Kunze's short but authoritative study and by the detailed, well-illustrated treatment in the recent book by Mme. Lilly B. Ghali-Kahil.¹

The main episodes of the Recovery, established by the end of the sixth century B.C., are credited to the Cyclic Epic poets Arktinos and Lesches, the lyricists Ibykos and his older contemporary Stesichoros. The first three alone are concerned with the iconography of the Recovery as it appears during the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.²

The earliest extant reference to an episode of the Recovery is found at *Andromache* 627-631, Euripides' play staged about 425 B.C.³ The old lord Peleus speaks, insulting Menelaos:

ἐλὼν δὲ Τροίαν . . .
οὐκ ἔκτανες γυναῖκα χειρίαν λαβών,
ἀλλ', ὡς ἐσείδες μαστόν, ἐκβαλὼν ξίφος
φίλημ' ἐδέξω, προδότιν αἰκάλλων κύνα,
ῥήσων πεφυκῶς Κύπριδος, ᾧ κάκιστε σύ.

When you took Troy, you failed to put your wife to death, though you had her in your power—on the contrary, when you looked at her breast, you threw away your sword and accepted her kiss, caressing the traitorous bitch, you miserable wretch, born slave to lust.

¹ E. Kunze, *Archaische Schildbänder (Olympische Forschungen, II, 1950)*, pp. 163-167; Lilly B. Ghali-Kahil, *Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène*, Paris, 1955, particularly pp. 31-32, 39-43, 49-51, 71-112, 325-326. The study by N. Verdeles, 'Αρχ. Έφ., 1937, Part III (issued 1956), is useful for its publication of Athens 14983, a hydria by Polygnotos (Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 681, no. 54).

² As for Stesichoros, a scholiast explains Electra's verse at Euripides, *Orestes* 1287, ἀρ' ἐς τὸ κάλλος ἐκκεκώφονται ξίφη thus: ἀρα εἰς τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης κάλλος βλέψαντες οὐκ ἐχρήσαντο τοῖς ξίφεσιν· οἷόν τι καὶ Στησίχορος ὑπογράφει περὶ τῶν καταλέγειν αὐτὴν μελλόντων. φησὶ γὰρ ἅμα τῷ τὴν ὄψιν αὐτῆς ἰδεῖν αὐτοὺς ἀφείναι τοὺς λίθους ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. . . . (Schwartz, *Scholia in Euripidem*, I, p. 214). Electra: Did her beauty deafen their swords? The scholiast: That is, did they fail to use their swords when they beheld the beauty of Helen. Stesichoros, too, suggests something similar about those who were on the point of stoning her. For he says that the moment they saw the way she looked they let their stones fall to the ground. . . . Who οἱ καταλέγειν αὐτὴν μελλόντες were, the scholiast does not say, nor does he locate the place. If the reference is to be taken as an incident in the Recovery, the inference must remain an assumption. (On the difficulty of reconstructing Stesichoros' *Persis* see Schmid, Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I, 1, p. 475). The Tabula Iliaca Capitolina, which claims to picture incidents of an Iliupersis by Stesichoros, shows in one scene a half-naked woman attacked by a sword-wielding warrior as she stumbles on the steps of a building identified by inscription as ἱερὸν Ἀφροδίτης (H. Stuart-Jones and others, *Cat. of Sculptures*, I, *Museo Capitolino*, pp. 165 ff., pl. 41): "... ganz unsicher ist, wie weit die Bilder der Tabula Iliaca wirklich . . . aus dem Stesichoreischen gedicht entnommen sind. . . ." (Schmid, Stählin, *loc. cit.*).

³ For the date, Schmid, Stählin, *op. cit.*, I, 3, p. 197 and p. 405, note 5.

In three mss. of the play the scholia report of the passage quoted:

. . . ἄμεινον ῥκονόμηται τοῖς περὶ Ἰβυκόν· εἰς γὰρ Ἀφροδίτης ναὸν καταφεύγει ἡ Ἑλένη
κάκειθεν διαλέγεται τῷ Μενελάῳ, ὃ δ' ὑπ' ἔρωτος ἀφήσιν τὸ ξίφος.

It is managed better in the works of Ibykos; for Helen flees to Aphrodite's temple, and from there parleys with Menelaos, and because of love he drops his sword.

The scholion in one of the three mss. adds:

τὰ παραπλήσια <τούτοις καὶ Ἰβυκος ὁ> Ῥηγίνος ἐν διθυράμβῳ φησίν.

An account similar <to this also Ibykos> of Rhegion gives in a dithyramb.

Schwartz reports the lacuna in this ms., Marcianus 471, large enough for three or four words and restores the phraseology on the assumption that the addition is simply a more summary variant of what precedes, himself noting Wilamowitz' observation that the preceding sentence reports the fact that Ibykos' treatment of the meeting differed from that of the Euripides passage.⁴ If one assume that Ibykos is correctly restored in the lacuna,⁵ the possible interpretations of the addition of Marcianus 471 are as many as the possible antecedents of τὰ παραπλήσια, "similar account." (1) If the antecedent is Peleus' insult, ἐλὼν δὲ Τροίαν . . . ὃ κάκιστε σύ, then Schwartz' hypothesis is correct and the whole scholion in Marcianus 471 is a conflation of notes which once stood in two different commentaries. One commentator, on this hypothesis, listed the episodes of the Meeting as told by Ibykos and approved his version over that to be inferred from the phrasing of Peleus' insult (Menelaos sees Helen,—if Peleus says breast, it is only to color his insult,—throws away his sword, falls to petting her). The other commentator in his note on the passage simply called attention to the existence of similarity between the version of the meeting implied by Peleus' insult and the version in a dithyramb of Ibykos and did not specify the extent of the similarity. (2) If τὰ παραπλήσια refers to the preceding sentence of the scholion in Marcianus 471, then obviously the scholion claims two occasions when Ibykos wrote on the Recovery of Helen: (a) the work where Helen flees to Aphrodite's temple, etc.; (b) a dithyramb in which he gave an account of the Meeting similar to that found in his other work. On neither interpretation can one suppose a scholiast to be claiming

⁴ *Scholia in Euripidem*, II, p. 293.

⁵ It is not, I suppose, impossible that the reference was to Kleomenes of Rhegion, a choral lyricist contemporary with Aristophanes (Schmid, Stählin, *Gr. Lit.*, I, 1, p. 479); or to Glaukos of Rhegion, turn of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., whose work *On the Ancient Poets* is attested (Pauly-Wissowa, *R.E.*, s.v. Glaukos no. 36); or even to the historians Hippys, fifth century B.C., and Lykos, third century B.C. (*R.E.*, s.v. Hippys and s.v. Lykos no. 50)—or, for that matter, to some other person completely unknown to us. If the lacuna in fact contained the name of another than Ibykos, we are without guide to the detail of the treatment of the Meeting in the dithyramb of this Anonymous, for the extent to which "similar account" (τὰ παραπλήσια) differs from "same account" (τὰ αὐτά) is a matter to be determined for any particular circumstance.

that Ibykos anywhere wrote a version of the Meeting like that implied by the phrasing of Peleus' insult.

The second earliest extant reference to the Meeting stands in a play of Aristophanes. In the opening scene of *Lysistrata*, produced in 411 B.C.,⁶ women delegates are assembled from the belligerents in the Great War between Athens and Sparta, and the chief of the Athenian delegation sketches the detail of her scheme for stopping hostilities (lines 149-154):

εἰ γὰρ καθήμεθ' ἔνδον ἐντετριμμένοι
καὶ τοῖς χιτωνίοισι τοῖς ἀμοργίνοις
γυμναὶ παρίοιμεν δέλτα παρατετιλμένοι,
στύοιτο δ' ἄνδρες κάπιθυμοῖεν σπλεκοῦν,
ἡμεῖς δὲ μὴ προσείμεθ' ἀλλ' ἀπεχοίμεθα,
σπονδὰς ποιήσαιντ' ἂν ταχέως, εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι.

. . . if we wore make-up and perfume around the house and if we paraded in front of them, naked in our slips of sheer amorgis-cloth, pubes plucked to delta-shape,⁷ our husbands would be aroused and would be wanting very much to make love with us. But if we didn't let them come near us, kept ourselves away, they would negotiate a Treaty of Peace soon enough, I know very well.

And the Spartan delegate's comment (lines 155-156):

ὁ γὼν Μενέλαος τὰς Ἑλένας τὰ μάλ' ἀπα
γυμνὰς παρανιδῶν ἐξέβαλ' οἶδ' ὅτι ξίφος.

At any rate, when Menelaos caught a glimpse of Helen's breasts,—naked in whatever way,—he threw away his sword, I guess.⁸

The scholia in the Codex Ravennas of Aristophanes preserve a note on the Spartan delegate's remark:

ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Ἰβύκῃ· τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ Λέσχης ὁ Πυρραῖος ἐν τῇ μικρᾷ Ἰλιάδι, καὶ Εὐριπίδης·

The story is in Ibykos; and Euripides: "when you looked at her breast, you threw away your sword and accepted her kiss."⁹

Again there is a fuller version of the note. The Codex Leidensis-Vossianus of *Lysistrata* has:

ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Ἰβύκῃ καὶ Εὐριπίδης· ἀλλ' ὡς ἐσείδες μαστὸν ἐκβαλὼν ξίφος φίλημ' ἐδέξω.
ἀλλ' ὡς, κ.τ.λ.

The story is in Ibykos; and Lesches of Pyrrha has the same account in his *Little Iliad*; and Euripides, etc.¹⁰

⁶ Schmid, Stählin, *Gr. Lit.*, I, 4, p. 206.

⁷ For δέλτα παρατετιλμένοι see Wilamowitz' *Aristophanes Lysistrata*, p. 132, note to line 151.

⁸ Interpreted *infra*, p. 57.

⁹ Rutherford, *Scholia Aristophanica*, II, p. 164 ad 155 (Rutherford mistranslates the quotation from Euripides, doubtless neglecting for the moment to consider its context).

¹⁰ Rutherford, *loc. cit.*, Stein, *Scholia in Aristophanis Lysistratum*, p. 9 ad 155.

All the Ravennas note says is that Ibykos wrote about the Meeting of Menelaos and Helen; for what he wrote we must turn to the scholion on *Andromache* 630. Codex Leidensis-Vossianus claims, in addition, that Lesches has the story as found in Ibykos.

The Aristophanes scholia have a further reference to Ibykos and the Recovery. At *Wasps* 713-714 Philokleon complains:

οἱμοι τί πέπονθ' ; ὥς νάρκη μου κατὰ τῆς χειρὸς καταχέεται
καὶ τὸ ξίφος οὐ δύναμαι κατέχειν, ἀλλ' ἤδη μαλθακός εἰμι.

What's the matter with me! Paralysis is spreading through my hand and I can't hold my sword, but now am soft and weak!

The scholion glosses *μαλθακός*, the word translated "soft and weak":

ἀντὶ τοῦ Μενέλαος· τοῦτον γάρ φασιν ὀρμήσαντα ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλένην ἀποβαλεῖν τὸ ξίφος· ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Ἰβύκω.

Malthakos, instead of Menelaos, for he is said to have rushed at Helen, then thrown away his sword. The story is in Ibykos.¹¹

In *Die Griechische Heldensage* Carl Robert associated ὥς ἐσεῖδες μαστόν of *Andromache* 629 and τὰς Ἑλένας τὰ μᾶλα . . . γυμνᾶς of *Lysistrata* 155-156, omitted the ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Ἰβύκω of the scholion to *Lysistrata*, and so concluded that by its phrase τὰ δὲ αὐτά the scholion claimed for Lesches' treatment of the episode of the reconciliation ὁ . . . Μενέλαος τὰς Ἑλένας τὰ μᾶλα . . . γυμνᾶς παρανιδὼν ἐξέβαλε . . . τὸ ξίφος—" . . . beim Anblick ihrer schönen Brüste liess er das Schwert sinken." The conclusion so reached, by somewhat arbitrary handling of evidence, Robert carried over to his interpretation of scholion *Andromache* 630 for the Recovery according to Ibykos: "Ibykos . . . liess Helena . . . ihn . . . um Verzeihung anflehen [actually the scholion's *διαλέγεται* is not so specific], die er ihr auch beim Anblick ihrer schönen Brust gewährt."¹² Mme. Ghali follows Robert's interpretation of the passages, but illogically refuses to accept her own position, holding the scholiasts surely wrong to claim for Lesches, or even for Ibykos, a "scène piquante . . . trop moderne."¹³ What all these scholia seem actually to say is this. Neither the playwrights' Peeping-Tom motive of Helen's breasts, draped or naked, nor the Euripidean series of derogatory epithets is to be found in the Ibykos version of the Meeting (schol. *Andromache* 630).

¹¹ Rutherford, *op. cit.*, II, p. 413 ad 714. ἀντὶ τοῦ R: ὥσπερ ὁ Aldine, Rutherford. ὀρμήσαντα R, V: ὀργήσαντα Rutherford tentatively (further, *infra*, p. 52, note 26). After Ἰβύκω the Codex Venetus adds καὶ Εὐριπίδῃ. παίζει δέ, ἐπειδὴ ξίφος ἤτησε, καὶ ὀρᾷ ἑαυτὸν κατακρατηθέντα.

¹² Preller, Robert, *Gr. Mythologie*, II, p. 1263 with note 4 and p. 1264 with note 3. In this publication of 1923 Robert condensed his interpretation of 1881 (*Bild und Lied*, pp. 76-78) and ignored E. Löwy, *Wiener Studien*, XXXIV, 1912, p. 285, where schol. *Lys.* 155-156 was sensibly referred "nur auf das Allgemeine des Vorgangs."

¹³ *Hélène*, pp. 31, 42. Mme. Ghali refers to Ibykos' *Iliupersis*. He may have had a poem so called; the title is not attested.

What is found in the Ibykos version is: (a) The flight to the temple (schol. *Andromache* 630, with schol. *Wasps* 714 where, however, sanctuary is not mentioned and the pursuit is stated from the point of view of Menelaos' attack rather than from that of Helen's flight); (b) conversation between Helen and Menelaos (schol. *Andromache* 630); and (c) the dropping of the sword (schol. *Andromache* 630, using to describe the action in Ibykos the verb ἀφιέναι, more appropriately "drop, let fall," than "throw away"; Euripides at *Andromache* 629 and Aristophanes at *Lysistrata* 156, each appropriately enough for his context, use for Menelaos' action ἐκβάλλειν "throw away"; and the scholiast at *Wasps* 714 with his ἀποβάλλειν, a synonym of ἐκβάλλειν, is doubtless under the influence of the opening scene of *Lysistrata*). And finally, it is worth repeating, the scholia Leidensis-Vossianus at *Lysistrata* 155 inform us, if the phrase τὰ αὐτά is to have its common idiomatic meaning, that the story in Lesches gives the same account of the Meeting as the story in Ibykos.

Ibykos is last heard of at the court of Polykrates of Samos towards the end of the third or beginning of the fourth quarter of the sixth century B.C.¹⁴ Lesches was doubtless his contemporary, perhaps somewhat older contemporary.¹⁵ There is one other testimony for the treatment of the Recovery in the Epic Cycle. It stands in Photios' resumé (ninth century after Christ) of the summary made by Proklos (whether the neoplatonist of the fifth or the grammarian of the second century after Christ)¹⁶ of the *Iliupersis* by Arktinos (the Cyclic poet of, presumably, the seventh century B.C.):¹⁷

Μενέλαος δὲ ἀνευρὼν Ἑλένην ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς κατάγει, Δηίφοβον φονεύσας.

Menelaos killed Deiphobos, found Helen, and led her down to the ships. (Or, the Greek participles being ambiguous: . . . found Helen, killed Deiphobos, and led Helen down to the ships.¹⁸)

What "finding Helen" involved for Arktinos, one does not know; there is no evidence. It is the more astonishing to read: ". . . dans l'*Iliupersis* d'Arctinos Ulysse et Ménélas se rendaient à la maison de Déiphobe. . . Ménélas, séduit à la vue de son épouse, lui pardonnait tout de suite."¹⁹ Actually, there is no evidence that Arktinos located so definitely the death of Deiphobos. It is from the *persis* of Demodokos at *Odyssey*, VIII, 516-518, that one hears of Odysseus and Menelaos going together to the house of Deiphobos after they had left the wooden horse. Unhappily, Demo-

¹⁴ Cf. Schmid, Stählin, *op. cit.*, I, 1, pp. 490, 492-493.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 213 with note 4 and p. 214 with note 3.

¹⁶ Schmid favors the grammarian, *op. cit.*, p. 198 with note 5.

¹⁷ His floruit is placed in the second half of the century by Schmid, *op. cit.*, pp. 212-213.

¹⁸ The ambiguity is not resolved by other references to the Proklos account of the episode; they all omit ἀνευρὼν Ἑλένην (or an equivalent), compress their statements to the Death of Deiphobos and the Escort to the Ships,—as the passages are given by Robert in Preller, Robert, *Gr. Mythologie*, II, p. 1263, note 2.

¹⁹ Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 31.

dokos did not go into detail about the events which took place there. Nor can one know when and for what reason Menelaos forgave Helen, if indeed Arktinos represented him as having anything to forgive. What the evidence says is that he took her down to the ships.

Pictorializations of the Recovery are certainly so identified when the names of the characters are written in the picture. The certain illustrations divide into Attack pictures and Escort pictures. Both are found among the extant work of Oltos, from the last decade or two of the sixth century B.C. The Nikosthenic neck-amphora Louvre G 3 shows warrior and woman running to right.²⁰ He holds his sword in his right hand, blade slightly below horizontal, point towards the woman. With his left hand he has grasped her wrist, drawing the upper part of her body around to face him as he attempts to check her flight. She stretches her right hand towards his chin, imploring mercy. Indeed she seems in need of it. The inscriptions are reported Μενειλος and Ελενε, Menelaos and Helen. The Odessa plate of Oltos gives his version of the Escort picture.²¹ The warrior strides off to left, looking back at the woman whose right wrist he holds with his left hand. "La jeune femme," writes Mme. Ghali, "avance à petits pas."²² But this appears anticipatory; the woman's feet seem motionless. The warrior carries his sword in his right hand, blade slightly above the horizontal across his corslet, point towards the woman, whether in actual threat to the woman,²³ or, better I think, by reason of the mechanics of frontality, only apparently so. Oltos has named the woman ΗΕΝ ΕΝΕ, Helen, and the man ΜΕΝΕΛΕ[ΟΣ], Old Attic for the later Attic Μενέλε[ως], Menelaos.²⁴ This seems to be the only Escort picture where the characters are named. It may, I suppose, be connected with Μενέλαος . . . Ἑλένην ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς κατάγει in Photios' report of the Proklos epitome of the handling of the story in the Arktinos *Iliupersis*,²⁵ but there is surely no very good reason to claim so specific a source for the picture as Arktinos' poem. From the moment (at least) of the *Odyssey*'s account of Helen's life with Menelaos at Sparta, after Troy, the Escort to the Ships is fundamental to her story. The Oltos Attack picture, however, may fairly be taken as illustrating the scholiast on *Wasps* 714, [Μενέλαον] γάρ φασιw ὀρμήσαντα ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλένην . . . ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Ἰβύκω.²⁶ The picture, like the scholiast's language, is a condensed statement of the Ibykos

²⁰ Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 78, no. 44, pl. 49, 2; Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 34, no. 3.

²¹ *Hélène*, p. 103, no. 99, pl. 82, 2; *A.R.V.*, p. 35, no. 10 with Addenda.

²² *Hélène*, *loc. cit.*

²³ Mme. Ghali, *loc. cit.*, supposes so: "Il . . . la menace de son épée. . . ." In this she follows Kunze, *Arch. Schildebänder*, p. 164.

²⁴ This is clear from Mme. Ghali's illustration. In her text she nevertheless reports the warrior's name Μενελα; her last letter is certainly wrong; lambda lacks only its short oblique line.

²⁵ And Mme. Ghali, *loc. cit.*, does so.

²⁶ And so may be taken in evidence that Rutherford's proposal to emend ὀρμήσαντα to ὀργήσαντα is needless.

version of the Meeting sketched in greater detail by the scholiast on *Andromache* 630, ἄμεινον ᾠκονόμηται τοῖς περὶ Ἴβυκον· εἰς γὰρ Ἀφροδίτης ναὸν καταφεύγει ἡ Ἑλένη. . . ., and pictured on Tarquinia RC 5291, a cup in the Brygos Painter's manner, which, though the characters are not named, represents so closely the language of scholiast *Wasps* 714 and scholiast *Andromache* 630 that it might well serve as a book-illustration for the Ibykos passage to which presumably both allude.²⁷ On side B of Tarquinia RC 5291 (ca. 490-480 B.C.)²⁸ Helen is in full flight, violently pursued by Menelaos, on the point of overtaking her, his sword at the height of the back-swing of its thrust. But Helen's foot is already over the stylobate of Aphrodite's temple,—one Doric column and part of the entablature are drawn, in the background the temple's great altar,—and seated inside the temple is Aphrodite herself to receive her protégée and effect the reconciliation. Such an epiphany suits the concrete, personalized style of an illustrator's narrative technique.

Menelaos and Helen are named in another picture of the Attack at this early moment in its development, Boston 13.186, a skyphos by Makron, a contemporary of the Brygos Painter.²⁹ Menelaos (Μενελεος) draws his sword as he pursues Helen (Ἑλενε), who flees to the protection of Aphrodite's outstretched arms. Priam sits beneath the handle to right, Chryseis and Chryses (presumably) stand sedately to left of the main group. All are named: Ἀφροδίτη, Πριάμος, Χρυσείς, Χρυσεύς—conventional side-figures given names suitable to the location of the main scene of the picture. The pursuit and flight of the Attack according to Ibykos are here; the variation is the goddess alone without her temple, in the role of protecting friend—and the illustrator writes his characters' names to make his story clear.

In the report of scholiast *Andromache* 630 the pursuit and flight of the Attack according to Ibykos was followed by parleying between Menelaos and Helen (she from the sanctuary of Aphrodite's temple), love for Helen taking possession of Menelaos and causing him to drop (ἀφιέναι) his sword. (If scholiast *Wasps* 714 writes ἀποβάλλειν, "throw away," he is presumably influenced by his recollection of his author's opening scene in *Lysistrata*.) Now conversation does not easily lend itself to dramatic pictorialization. The vase-painters proceed at once to the dropping of the sword while the pursuit and flight of the Attack are in full course, and they

²⁷ Cf. Robert, *Gr. Myth.*, II, p. 1264, note: "Die Flucht zum Aphroditetempel stellt eine Trinkschale im Stil des Brygos dar. . . ." with reference to Tarquinia RC 5291. Robert had long before accepted connection between cup and scholion (*Bild und Lied* [*Philologische Untersuchungen*, V, 1881] p. 78).

²⁸ Beazley, *A.R.V.*, pp. 256-257 (" . . . extremely close to the Brygos Painter at his height, and may be by him. . . ."): I, hero leading woman. A, Theseus leaving Ariadne. B, Menelaos and Helen. (So Beazley.) Jacopi, *C.V.A.*, Tarquinia, 2, pl. 18. Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 81, no. 54, pl. 56, 2(B), and p. 116, no. 111, pl. 86, 2(I).

²⁹ Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 301, no. 1; Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 81, no. 53, pl. 48(B), and p. 53, no. 11, pl. 4(A). A, Paris and Helen. B, Menelaos and Helen.

not infrequently indicate the cause ($\text{ὅπ' ἔρωτος ἀφίησι τὸ ξίφος}$) by representing Eros himself flying at Menelaos. Thus on Vatican H 525, an oinochoe of *ca.* 430-420 B.C. connected with the Eretria Painter,³⁰ Menelaos (Μενελεως) leaps at Helen and his sword drops from the outspread hand of his sword-arm at the height of its backward swing. To emphasize the causation, Eros is shown flying a wreath at Menelaos. Helen (Ηλενη) still in terrified flight has just reached the sanctuary of Athena's statue. Peitho (Πειθω) stands behind the statue,³¹ Aphrodite (Αφροδιτη) between pursuer and pursued. On a hydria in Rome (Torlonia), *ca.* 440-430 B.C., connected with the group of Polygnotos or with the Painter of the Louvre Centauromachy, the principals in the pursuit and flight are named (Μνελεος, Ηελενε); but of the rest of the cast, Apollo, Aphrodite, four women, only two are named (Απολλων, Αντιοπε).³² The sword is falling toward the ground; Eros is not represented.³³

The Oltos Attack picture is one of sixteen where "Ménélas poursuit Hélène en fuite et la menace l'épée nue à la main."³⁴ The earliest is Mykonos K 31092, *ca.* 550-530 B.C., the only black-figure picture in any degree reasonably classed in the group.³⁵ The latest need not be far from 450 B.C. In essential details of iconography seven of the sixteen pictures are quite remote from the nine others. (1) Louvre 10268 (Campana), fragment of a lip-cup by the Centaur Painter, shows a woman and a man running. His only military equipment is a sheathed sword slung from his shoulder. His dress is a short chiton, with large white ornament on its borders. With forward hand he seems to hold the wrist of the woman's back-stretched arm; his other hand appears to be on his hip. They may be running together, or perhaps dancing; the details of the known iconography of the Recovery are here absent.³⁶ On (2) a

³⁰ Beazley, *Attische Vasenmaler*, p. 430, no. 1; Rumpf, *Malerei und Zeichnung (Handbuch der Archäologie*, IV, 1), p. 109; Ghali, *Hélène*, pp. 90-91, no. 72, pl. 66, 1-3.

³¹ Presumably so in the composition of the cartoon (assuming a cartoon) the Eretria Painter's connection made use of; on the vase the handle-palmette separates Peitho from Athena's statue, though logic demands that the separator fall between Peitho and Menelaos, whose activity she disregards as she is actually posed. (Löwy, *Wiener Studien*, XXXIV, 1912, p. 283, note 5, noted that Peitho is misplaced on the vase.)

³² *A.R.V.*, p. 702 foot; *Hélène*, p. 89, no. 68, pl. 57, 2. Apollo's tripod rolls on the ground, knocked over by Menelaos in the impetuosity of his attack.

³³ The fragmentary picture on a calyx-krater once in the collection of Mrs. E. Strong, Rome, and located by Beazley in the Group of Polygnotos, shows Menelaos (Μενελεος) running, Eros flying, the outstretched arms of Aphrodite ($\text{Αφρο} - - -$); Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 95, no. 78.

³⁴ *Hélène*, pp. 78-83, nos. 42-57 (Type I b): no. 52 is by the Etruscan Praxias Painter (Beazley, *E.V.P.*, p. 195); the rest are Attic.

³⁵ *Hélène*, p. 78, no. 43, pl. 47, 1: "troisième quart du VI^e siècle." What remains of the warrior's right arm implies, as Mme. Ghali notes, his thrusting a sword at the fleeing woman; the weapon itself is lost in a break. For the identification of the characters in the two-figure composition of this simple picture other detail is lacking than the fact that pursuer is in full armor; the identification can therefore be considered no more than possible.

³⁶ *Hélène*, p. 78, no. 42, pl. 47, 2. Mme. Ghali is conscious of difficulty: "Il est tentant de

colander in Athens, from the Ilissos, pursuer swings sword at pursued, but, except for greaves, he is in civilian dress and he is beardless.³⁷ Civilian costume, except for his helmet, is worn by the sword-swinging pursuer on (3) a stemless cup in Warsaw, by the Carlsruhe Painter,³⁸ and by the like figure on (4) Bologna 154, a Panathenaic amphora by the Painter of the Florence Stamnoi.³⁹ On (5) London E 294 and on (6) a vase once Hamilton, both Nolans by the Oionokles Painter,⁴⁰ the pursuer's equipment, except for sword, is completely civilian. The like is true of the naked pursuer on (7) a kylix from the School of the Penthesilea Painter once in Sienna (Chigi 233),⁴¹ where pursued flees to Apollo and another (goddess or mortal) as her companions scatter. If the painter of any of these seven vases intended to represent Menelaos and Helen in Iliupersis, his narrative detail is insufficient to declare his intention. Helen, after all, is not the only woman to have been pursued, and sanctuary with Apollo or another is a commonplace of Greek religion. The seven pictures are doubtless best taken to belong with the anonymous group of pursuit-and-flight pictures which Mme. Ghali considers a "type dérivé,"⁴²—derived, that is, from the Menelaos-and-Helen pursuit-and-flight, though it would indeed be a nice problem to determine indebtedness in any particular instance.

Mme. Ghali catalogues fourteen pursuit-and-flight pictures posed at the moment of the dropping of the sword.⁴³ All are red-figure and range in date from late work of the Berlin Painter (*ca.* 470-460 B.C.)⁴⁴ to the time of the Dinos Painter (*ca.* 420-400

songer ici à Ménélas devant Hélène [an awkward description of the action of the picture]. . . . Cependant des réserves s'imposent. . . ." Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 189, no. 6: "warrior seizing woman (Menelaos and Helen?)." The identification of the characters seems due to Villard, *Studies D. M. Robinson*, II, p. 65, no. 7, pl. 20 b: "Ménélas poursuivant Hélène"; and p. 69, "Les scènes proprement mythologique sont en petit nombre; on ne peut guère citer que la rencontre d'Hélène et de Ménélas . . . (no. 7)." Villard's date for the fragment is *ca.* 540 B.C. or a bit later (*op. cit.*, p. 68).

³⁷ *Hélène*, p. 66, no. 22, and p. 79, no. 47, pl. 68, 1; Threpsiades, *Πρακτικά*, 1950, pp. 101-113. Mme. Ghali reports Threpsiades' date as "fin du Ve siècle" (it is actually middle of 5th century) and prefers the date *ca.* 500 B.C. suggested by D. von Bothmer comparing the cup Louvre CA 2495. For pursuer and pursued Threpsiades tentatively suggested Menelaos and Helen or Orestes and Klytemnestra (*op. cit.*, p. 106).

³⁸ *Hélène*, p. 80, no. 51; *C.V.A.*, Poland, 3, Binental Collection, III I d, pl. 2 (Poland 109), 6 b ("Ménélas et Hélène?"); *A.R.V.*, p. 513, no. 112 ("youth pursuing woman"). The Carlsruhe Painter flourished in the second quarter of the fifth century.

³⁹ *Hélène*, p. 80, no. 50, pl. 53, 1; *A.R.V.*, p. 334, no. 4 ("Melenaios and Helen"). The painter's floruit is second quarter of fifth century.

⁴⁰ *Hélène*, pp. 79-80, nos. 48-49, pls. 49, 1, and 51, 1; *A.R.V.*, p. 438, nos. 13-14. Again second quarter of fifth century for the painter's floruit.

⁴¹ *Hélène*, p. 82, no. 55, pl. 65, 1; *A.R.V.*, p. 626, no. 31.

⁴² *Hélène*, pp. 83-85, a-e.

⁴³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 86-91, nos. 58-72.

⁴⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 86-87, no. 58, pl. 57, 1 (Vienna 741); no. 59, pl. 59, 1-2 (Naples 126053); and no. 60, pl. 60, 1-3 (Northwick Park, Spencer-Churchill). Cf. Beazley, *Der Berliner Maler*, p. 15, for the chronology.

B.C.).⁴⁵ In two the characters are named (*supra*, p. 54). Pursuit and flight, the falling sword are constant elements;⁴⁶ also the pursuer's helmet and shield. These are perhaps sufficient to establish the *mise-en-scène*, Menelaos in Iliupersis, even when corslet and greaves are omitted and the pursuer's body clothed in short chiton or represented quite naked.⁴⁷

In connection with this group of pictures Mme. Ghali elaborates an hypothesis of influence of the pictorial arts upon literature advanced by E. Löwy in 1912.⁴⁸ Mme. Ghali writes: ". . . le roi [Menelaos], à sa vue [Helen's] laissait tomber l'épée. L'avait-elle déjà séduit en dévoilant son sein, comme le laisserait croire la version des scholiastes [a misinterpretation which Löwy did not make; *supra*, p. 50, note 12]. . . . Fort heureusement, les témoignages artistiques peuvent nous aider ici à rétablir la tradition littéraire: il semble bien que l'invention d'Hélène dénudant sa poitrine soit plus récente que Leschès ou même qu'Ibycus. Ainsi que nous le verrons plus tard, son origine fut peut-être picturale; le succès qu'elle obtint expliquerait qu'elle fut ensuite reprise par Aristophane et Euripide."⁴⁹ Later: "L'effet de sa vue sur Ménélas est matérialisé par le geste de la main qui laisse tomber l'épée. Peu à peu, pour bien mettre l'accent sur la beauté irrésistible, les peintres montrent Hélène dévoilant son sein [for "les peintres" Mme. Ghali can cite only Vatican H 525 by the Eretria Painter's connection, described *supra*, p. 54 and note 30]. . . . On peut essayer de voir dans le geste d'Hélène une innovation des artistes eux-mêmes, qui auraient influencé les auteurs . . . il se pourrait que l'on doive chercher dans la grande peinture, ou à la rigueur dans la sculpture, l'origine de ce détail piquant de la rencontre des époux. On a même songé à expliquer que . . . l'artiste a été obligé de traiter le vêtement . . . de manière à découvrir légèrement la poitrine, et ce traitement aurait inspiré aux poètes comme Euripide et Aristophane l'idée d'y voir une

⁴⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 90, no. 71, pl. 64, 1-2 (Syracuse 24121), a vase in the manner of the Dinos Painter (Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 793, no. 14, and p. 789, topmost no. 1, where the vase is held to be perhaps comparable to pieces which display qualities both of the Kleophon Painter and of the Dinos Painter).

⁴⁶ It seems possible from the pose of the sword-hand of the pursuer on the stamnos fragment at Northwick Park (*supra*, note 44) that the Berlin Painter intended to represent him thrusting his sword and then neglected to paint the weapon. If so, the stamnos should be classed among representations of the earlier moment in the Pursuit and Flight. The falling sword of the pursuer on Los Angeles A 5933.51.108 was never painted (*Hélène*, p. 88, no. 65; *Hesperia*, XXIV, 1955, p. 23 towards middle of right column; for this curious vase see also "A Greek Vase and Restorer's Work," *Los Angeles County Museum, Bulletin of the Art Division*, IX, 1957, no. 3).

⁴⁷ Certainly naked on Vatican H 525 (characters named) and apparently so on Louvre G 424 (*Hélène*, p. 88, no. 66, pl. 63, 3; but cf. *C.V.A.*, III I d, pl. 23, 4-6, text: ". . . corps de Ménélas endommagé et réparé").

⁴⁸ *Wiener Studien*, XXXIV, 1912, pp. 282-287.

⁴⁹ *Hélène*, p. 42.

tentative de séduction de la part d'Hélène ⁵⁰ . . . un des cas plus rares où la littérature est directement influencée par l'art. . . ." ⁵¹

This hypothesis of influences is based upon and complicated by misconceptions. The Helen of Vatican H 525 is in fact represented neither "dénudant" nor "dévoilant son sein." She is in considerable disarray. The movement of her terrified flight has tumbled her hair, opened the skirt of her peplos to show most of her right leg and, apparently, a part of its bodice to show the side of her right breast uncovered by a gap in the heavy folds of the garment above her waist. But all this is hardly more than the painter's pleasant scheme for indicating the violence and terror of Helen's flight.⁵² Clearly the painter intends nothing of the nature of Lampito's τὰς Ἑλένας τὰ μάλ' αὖτε γυμνὰς παρανιδῶν at *Lysistrata* 155-156, however good the gloss the Helen on Vatican H 525 provides for the poet's παρανιδῶν.⁵³ The phenomenon was doubtless an ordinary enough occurrence in places and periods where the peplos was fashionable.⁵⁴ What the Eretria Painter's connection did intend as motivation for the dropping of the sword he clearly showed by painting Aphrodite between Menelaos and Helen, and Eros flying a wreath at Menelaos. Lampito's quip needs no source beyond her countrywomen's fashion of dress and the immediate context of her remark. Her τὰς Ἑλένας . . . γυμνὰς ⁵⁵ counterpoints *Lysistrata*'s γυμναί, her τὰ μάλ' αὖτε γυμνὰς *Lysistrata*'s εἰ . . . παρίοιμεν δέλτα παρατετιλμένα, her ἐξέβαλ' οἶδ' ὅτι τὸ ξίφος *Lysistrata*'s σπονδὰς ποιήσαιντ' ἂν ταχέως, εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι.⁵⁶ The work which does

⁵⁰ This sentence somewhat misrepresents Löwy's interpretation, which is both more illogical and more realistic (see note 54).

⁵¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 97-98; the hypothesis is repeated on pp. 326-327.

⁵² This was accurately noted by Löwy, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

⁵³ The concord was the irresistible inducement for Löwy to construct his theory of an hypothetical Polygnotan painting for the source of Aristophanes' verses: "Eine der Vase gleichende Zeichnung, also das ihr zugrunde liegende Gemälde, ist des Aristophanes Quelle" (*op. cit.*, pp. 286-287 with p. 283).

⁵⁴ Löwy, *op. cit.*, p. 287: "Das Gewandmotiv der Helena . . . war dem Künstler sicher von der Erinnerung an ihre Spartanische Heimat eingegeben. . . ." And the disarray of the garment a straightforward indication of the terror and violence of Helen's flight: "Ein Teil des athenischen Publikums freilich fasste es anders; und ein Niederschlag des Stadtwitzes, der diese Gestalt kommentierte, ist es, was uns bei Aristophanes . . . vorliegt." However reasonable within itself this last sentence may be, it plays hob with the logic of Löwy's construction: The Aristophanes passage and Vatican H 525 provide him the evidence for his hypothesis of a Polygnotan painting (made no less hypothetical by invoking also the ruined metopes, Parthenon North XXIV and XXV) as a source for the Aristophanes passage which he then interprets not in relation to the source he has argued but in relation to a ribald witticism (hypothetical) of Athenian sophisticates.

⁵⁵ Löwy, *op. cit.*, p. 283, note 3: "Die Synekdoche bedarf keiner Belege." The synecdoche is secondary.

⁵⁶ Wilamowitz' note *ad loc.* is an unnecessarily literary excursion into Quellenforschung: "Was Lampito sagt, ist, dass Menelaos irgendwie die Brüste der nackten Helene Verstoßen sah. Sie kennt die Geschichte also nicht richtig; bekanntlich hat Helene in dem späteren Epos ihn durch den Anblick ihrer Schönheit entwand, ganz bewusst, aber ohne Aufbietung ihrer körperlichen Reize

reflect something of the Aristophanes passage is Villa Giulia 1197, a calyx-krater of the early fourth century, with an Iliupersis by the Etruscan Nazzano Painter. Menelaos drops his sword; Helen is half way through her stripper's routine, her aim accomplished with little more than formal help from the somewhat pudgy and matronly madam who stands in Aphrodite's place.⁵⁷ The Nazzano Painter's picture is bar-room art—I do not suggest that it is directly inspired by the *Lysistrata* passage, merely that it inhabits the same quarter of the town. Naked Helens, or partially naked, recur (if the woman is rightly so identified) in fourth-century Italiote and Etruscan: the somewhat sadistic composition on a lekythos in Frankfurt where Eros interrupts the sword of the man who has forced the woman to her knees, his left hand entwined in her hair;⁵⁸ the picture on a cup in Chiusi where the man, equipped with sword, shield, and spear, lifts back the garment of a woman already all but completely naked, who has sought refuge (it seems) on a beldam's lap.⁵⁹ Elements of the pose of warrior and woman on the Frankfurt lekythos are found also on fourth-century Etruscan mirrors,⁶⁰ one of which obligingly gives Menelaos his name.⁶¹ These Italian documents stand at the beginning of a new cycle in the iconography of the legend,⁶²—these and not the Dwarf Painter's Nolan London E 336 (*infra*, note 66), as Mme. Ghali has it.⁶³ What is fatal to Mme. Ghali's hypothesis of art influencing literature and to Löwy's is that they have found no ribald picture of a naked Helen in a Recovery scene earlier in date than the production of *Lysistrata* (411 B.C.).⁶⁴

Mme. Ghali has catalogued a group of pictures which show pursuer carrying a spear.⁶⁵ One, the Dwarf Painter's Nolan London E 336,⁶⁶ uses for pursuit and flight the scheme of composition used in picturing Ajax's attack upon Cassandra,⁶⁷ except

. . . Aristophanes lässt die Spartanerin so halb unterrichtet sein wie den Dionysos über die Perser des Aischylos, Frösche 1028" (Wilamowitz, *Aristophanes Lysistrata*, 1927, pp. 132-133).

⁵⁷ Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 192, no. 164, pl. 73, 2-4; Beazley, *E.V.P.*, pp. 6-7, pl. 23; *C.V.A.*, 2, IV B r, pl. 10, 2.

⁵⁸ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 190, no. 160, pl. 71, 2-4.

⁵⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 192, no. 163, pl. 72, 1.

⁶⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 270-271.

⁶¹ London 627 (Walters), Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 270, no. 225, pl. 94, 1.

⁶² See for example, the Pompeii murals, Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 247, nos. 201-202, where warrior's hand is entwined in the hair of the half-naked woman.

⁶³ *Hélène*, p. 96, no. 82, and p. 327.

⁶⁴ Löwy, conscious of the difficulty, put himself to some trouble to explain away the absence of "das Sinnliche" in what he conceived to be the pictorial source (*op. cit.*, pp. 283-284, 287).

⁶⁵ *Hélène*, pp. 95-97.

⁶⁶ *C.V.A.*, 5, pl. 65, 2 a; Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 651, no. 4. The painter's floruit is about 450-425 B.C.

⁶⁷ For example: (1) Bologna 268, a volute-krater by the Niobid Painter (Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 418, no. 1, and *A.V.*, p. 337, no. 1; Webster, *Der Niobidenmaler*, pl. 6 b). Juliette Davreux, *La légende de la prophétesse Cassandra*, 1942, p. 159, no. 92, fig. 54, and *ibid.*, note 1: "J. Hoppin attribue ce cratère au peintre des Niobides." This note has replaced the proper note 2 on p. 158,

that on London E 336 the woman seeks asylum at Apollo's statue rather than Athena's, Cassandra's canonical protector. This has caused several before Mme. Ghali to suggest that pursuer and pursued were intended for Menelaos and Helen,⁶⁸ and others to entertain at least the possibility that they were so intended.⁶⁹ But if Helen can find refuge with Aphrodite, with Athena, with Apollo, or some combination of these,—as she does,—the Dwarf Painter may perhaps be allowed to send a Cassandra to Apollo, whether because she was Apollo's priestess (Schefold's suggestion) or because it seemed to him suitable enough for a Trojan princess to seek asylum with Troy's friend among the gods.⁷⁰ In this matter, it seems to me, the composition outweighs the god.

On several other vases of this division of the pursuit-and-flight group the spear-carrying warrior is specifically identified by Mme. Ghali as Menelaos chasing a fleeing Helen. (1) New York 41.162.20, a stamnos by the Deepdene Painter,⁷¹ has more the appearance of an escort than of pursuit and flight.⁷² Whichever the action, there is no detail in the composition of the picture to individualize the characters (but "Menelaos and Helen," Beazley, *loc. cit.*). (2) Louvre G 482, a volute-

and for the rest is inadequate if not inaccurate. Hoppin himself noted, *Handbook Attic R.-F. Vases*, II, p. 236, no. 5, that Bologna 268 is no. 1 in the Niobid Painter's list published by Beazley, *V.A.*, p. 147, and had already been associated with other vases of the list by Furtwängler in *Gr. Vasenmalerei*, I, p. 133. (2) Louvre G 458, a cup by the Codrus Painter (*A.R.V.*, p. 740, no. 10, and *A.V.*, p. 425, no. 3; *Enc. phot.*, III, pl. 28, b). Inscriptions: AIAΞ, KAΞΞANΔPA (see the drawing in Roscher, *Lexikon d. Gr. u. Röm. Mythologie*, II, col. 982, reported after *Annali*, 1877, pl. N; cf. Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, p. 936, fig. 1208). Davreux, *op. cit.*, p. 158, no. 91, fig. 55: "Coupe attique à fond blanc [cf. Preller, Robert, *Gr. Myth.*, II, 3, p. 1266, note 6: "... einer Schale mit weissem Grund, *Ann. d. Inst.*, XLIX 1877 tav. d'agg. N"] ... du début du Ve siècle av. J. C." The cup is red-figure, not white-ground. The date is third quarter, not beginning of fifth century. (3) London E 470, a volute-krater connected with the Geneva Painter (Cecil Smith, *Cat. Vases in B.M.*, III, p. 290; Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 430). Davreux, *op. cit.*, p. 163, no. 98: "Première moitié du IVe siècle. ... Le céramiste Italiote. ..." The date is third quarter of fifth century; the vase is Attic.

⁶⁸ F. Eichler, *Jahreshefte*, XIX, 1919, p. 96, note 157; H. B. Walters, *C.V.A.*, London, 5, 1930, text to pl. 65, 2; Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 651, no. 4.

⁶⁹ Cecil Smith, *Cat. Vases in B.M.*, III, 1896, p. 230; K. Schefold, *Jahrb.*, LII, 1937, p. 44; G. M. A. Richter, *Kouroi*, 1942, p. 3.

⁷⁰ For Apollo and Troy see Nilsson, *Gesch. d. Gr. Religion*, I, 2nd ed., 1955, pp. 559-560; on asylum, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-78.

⁷¹ Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 95, no. 79, pl. 69; Gallatin in *C.V.A.*, Hoppin and Gallatin, III I c, pl. 14 (U.S.A. 34), 3; Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 326, no. 8. The date is second quarter of fifth century.

⁷² Cf. Gallatin, *loc. cit.*: A, warrior arming (warrior, woman, old man); B, warrior departing (warrior, woman, old man). Gallatin's interpretation of B: "The same three figures ... as on A ... the warrior walks with rapid stride ... before him ... striding to r. with head and shoulders turned back to l., the young woman. ... Both her hands are raised as she drapes a scarf about her shoulders. ... On the l. the old man ... stands. ..." On this interpretation, the woman accompanies, for whatever interval, the departing warrior.

krater connected with the Geneva Painter,⁷³ shows a vigorous pursuit. If one is to claim the painter intended Menelaos and Helen, the argument must depend upon identifying as Aphrodite the woman between pursuer and pursued, and there is in fact nothing to characterize her as other than one of the several alarmed companions of the pursued who appear in the picture (Beazley, *loc. cit.*, again "Menelaos and Helen"). Even the suggestion of the canonical three-figure composition, pursuer—intervener—pursued, fails on (3) the nestoris in Naples⁷⁴ with warrior pursuing woman and companions in presence of king.⁷⁵ And in the pursuit and flight on (4) the Berlin Painter's late Nolan London E 310 the warrior is a youth.⁷⁶ It is perhaps better to leave unidentified the subject of the pictures of all five of this group.

In the black-figure of the generation or two preceding Oltyos two types are recognized in pictorializations of the Recovery: (a) the climax of the Meeting, where Menelaos with drawn sword confronts an undisturbed Helen; (b) an Escort, where Menelaos again with drawn sword is leading Helen off presumably to the Greek ships. The characters are named in no black-figure picture, only in the red-figure Escort on the Odessa plate by Oltyos (*supra*, p. 52 and note 21). The sword drawn in threat against the woman (it is maintained) establishes the classification of anonymous pictures and the connection between the two types. The argument for this interpretation was stated in considerable detail by A. Schneider, and again by Kunze whom Mme. Ghali followed, though less cautious than he in claiming connection between pictures and poets.⁷⁷ It has not seemed to Beazley that the weapon carried by the warrior in Escort pictures is particularly significant for the interpretation: "Menelaos and Helen(?)" apropos of London B 244, by the Antimenes Painter, where escorting warriors carry spears, and citing with approval Furtwängler's Menelaos and Helen for Berlin 1842,⁷⁸ again by the Antimenes Painter, where escorting warrior carries sword — — — ". . . Helen recovered by Menelaos . . . I adopt . . . provisionally: it is at least sometimes correct."⁷⁹ The interpretation "Recovery of

⁷³ Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 96, no. 81, pl. 70; Pottier, *C.V.A.*, 5, III I d, pl. 30, 1-3; Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 430. Date second quarter of fifth century.

⁷⁴ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 96, no. 82 bis, pl. 71, 1. The date is doubtless third quarter of fifth century.

⁷⁵ The "king" Mme. Ghali describes as ". . . un jeune homme contemple la scène en appuyant une lance sur le sol." The "lance" seems to be staff or scepter with fleur-de-lys over ball for finial; the man, though obscured by the curve of the pot, does not seem young.

⁷⁶ *C.V.A.*, 5, III I c, pl. 56, 1 a. Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 136, no. 69 ("warrior pursuing w."). Mme. Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 96 at foot, puts London E 310 at the head of her list of the "Type dérivé," but categorically identifies ". . . Ménélàs . . . Hélène sans doute. . . ." This compensates her treatment of the Naples nestoris, last of the group where "Ménélàs armé d'une lance poursuit Hélène," but its characters anonymous in her description, "Un guerrier . . . poursuit une jeune femme. . . ."

⁷⁷ A. Schneider, *Der troische Sagenkreis*, 1886, pp. 106-109 (Escort pictures) and 181-183 (The Meeting); Kunze, *Arch. Schuldbänder*, pp. 163-165 with earlier literature in note 5 on p. 163; Ghali, *Hélène*, pp. 71-77, 99-105.

⁷⁸ *Beschreibung*, I, p. 336.

⁷⁹ *J.H.S.*, XLVII, 1927, p. 78, p. 82, no. 2, p. 83, no. 14.

Helen" is retained for both pictures in Beazley's most recent statement.⁸⁰ The proposition that the warrior's sword is drawn in threat against the woman, whether in the Meeting or in the Escort, is dependent upon interpretation all the more uncertain for being involved with the non-illusionistic formulae of black-figure drawing.⁸¹

The best document for the Meeting is the Iliupersis by Lydos on the amphora Berlin 1685 (ca. 550 B.C.),⁸² where warrior and woman share the picture with a Death

⁸⁰ *A.B.V.*, p. 271, no. 74, and p. 273, no. 110.

⁸¹ Cf. Robert on the Escort pictures London B 244 (*Hélène*, pl. 77), Berlin 1842 (*op. cit.*, pl. 80, 1), Gerhard 72 (*op. cit.*, pl. 78, 3), and Gerhard 171 (*op. cit.*, pl. 78, 2): ". . . der Mann hat das Schwert nicht gezückt, um die Frau zu bedrohen, sondern um sich und sie zu schützen. . . ." (*Bild und Lied*, pp. 56-57). This seems to me right (further, *infra*, note 119), except of course that the warriors on London B 244 carry spears, not drawn swords. It does not seem to me right to argue from this interpretation, as Robert does, that the pictures therefore represent the abduction of Helen by Paris and Aeneas. Mme. Ghali repeats the argument for Paris and Helen (*Hélène*, p. 51), but changes the list of pictures connected with it. These are certain of the Olympia shield-reliefs, the amphora Munich 1383 (Amasis Painter), the neck-amphorae Florence C 3777 and Louvre C 10236 (ca. 540-520 B.C.), and the r.f. lekythos Berlin 30835 (Painter of the Yale Lekythos). The last is a warrior's departure ("warrior leaving w.": Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 444, no. 25). The rest are anonymous Escorts. Florence C 3777 has an escort on both sides, woman and two warriors. The argument that the escort proceeding left (side B) is Menelaos and Helen (Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 51, pl. 76, 1), and therefore the similar escort on side A likely to be Paris and Helen (already Schneider, *Der troische Sagenkreis*, pp. 107-108), falls when one realizes that the position of the first warrior's sword on B is doubtless like that of his congener's on A with escort towards right (Ghali, *op. cit.*, pl. 3, 1), the fact that on B it points back towards the woman due to the reversal of the direction of the action rather than to any intention on the part of the painter to represent it as a threat to the woman. The truth is one would not expect Paris and Aeneas, on leaving Sparta, to be fully armed as if for battle, and in fact they are not so represented in the certain Abduction pictures on Makron's Boston 13.185 and Berlin 2291 (Ghali, *Hélène*, pp. 53-54, nos. 11-12, pl. 4 and pl. 3, 3). (I do not know why Kunze lists Florence C 3777 among pictures "auf denen Menelaos Helena wie bei Oltos am Handgelenk führt" [*Arch. Schilddb.*, p. 165 and note 1]; on side A neither warrior touches the woman, on side B the first warrior holds an edge of her himation.) Kunze's arguments (*Arch. Schilddbänder*, p. 170) for considering the Olympia relief-pictures an anonymous Bride's Abduction seem to me still valid. But I cannot share his confidence, and most recently Mme. Karouzou's, that the characters in the Amasis Painter's picture (Munich 1383) are to be identified as Menelaos and Helen (*Arch. Schilddbänder*, p. 164). Indeed, Mme. Karouzou's description of the picture (*The Amasis Painter*, p. 5), ". . . warrior, with sword drawn from its sheath, gazes threateningly at a woman whom he is about to strike. . . . Menelaos preparing to take his revenge on Helen. . . ." no more reflects the fact of the detail of the picture's composition than her "According to the story related in the *Little Iliad*, Helen will unveil her beauty . . ." reflects the fact of the evidence for the treatment of the story in that poem (*supra*, p. 49). However, cf. Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 150, no. 7: "Recovery of Helen"; and von Massow, *Ath. Mitt.*, XLI, 1916, p. 60: ". . . fasst Menelaos seine Gattin nicht an, sondern sieht sich nur drohend um" (Haspels, *B.C.H.*, LIV, 1930, p. 437, seems to propose the transfer of the vase from one of von Massow's groups [*ibid.*, p. 438] to another).

⁸² Or a bit later. Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 109, no. 24, reporting Bloesch's opinion that the potter work is by Amasis. Rumpf, *Sakonides*, p. 27, no. 67, and p. 20, comparing the corpse in the Berlin picture to a giant in the Siphnian Treasury frieze at Delphi (ca. 530-525 B.C.) would presumably place the vase still later. But cf. Beazley, *D.A.B.*, p. 48: Lydos' "middle or later period, the years

of Priam with which clearly they have nothing to do. Kunze writes of the pair: "Menelaos tritt mit gezücktem Schwert der Ungetreuen entgegen, die, der Wirkung ihrer Schönheit gewiss, ruhig vor ihm steht."⁸³ And Mme. Ghali classes warrior and woman in her group with "Ménélas seul face à Hélène, l'attirant d'une main par un pan de l'himation, et la menaçant de l'autre de son épée dégainée."⁸⁴ Now the logical implications of this position, that the picture displays a Threatening of Helen, immediately drive one to the forthright interpretation Attack upon Helen, as Schneider realized and expressed very well: "Helena sucht nicht zu fliehen. . . . Eine Bedrohung ist unnöthig—also will er sie tödten. Allein, dass er dies nicht thun wird, zeigt die Handbewegung der Helena, sie hebt, ihres Erfolges sicher, den Schleier."⁸⁵ It may, I suppose, be the fact that Lydos imagined himself painting warrior murderously attacking woman; nevertheless, his intention in thus posing the pair, it seems to me, can better be interpreted otherwise. In doing so, I take for talisman Schneider's own phrase: "Natürlich kann hier alles nur hypothetisch ausgesprochen werden. . . ."

The warrior's sword is in his right hand, lifted with blade slanting back over his right shoulder.⁸⁶ The woman's himation is draped, veil-like, over her head. She has grasped an edge of it with her right hand, the warrior has taken hold of the same edge with his left hand placed just above her right, and both together, it seems, have joined in drawing open the himation clearly to reveal the identity of the wearer. Lydos' draughtsmanship was not so primitive that he would have been compelled to indicate hostility by the simple device of an unsheathed sword thus held in his warrior's hand. If naked sword is carried ready for quick use, it is perhaps because Lydos knew that the capture and sacking of a city was dangerous business not soon over:

Quondam etiam victis redit in praecordia virtus
victoresque cadunt Danai, crudelis ubique
luctus, ubique pavor et plurima mortis imago.⁸⁷

Warrior and woman are in fact posed, it seems clear, in a Recognition scene. If they are to be identified as Menelaos and Helen, the argument must depend upon their

around the middle of the sixth century." Illustrations of Berlin 1685: Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung*, III, fig. 241; Rumpf, *op. cit.*, pl. 16 bottom.

⁸³ *Arch. Schilddbänder*, p. 164 with note 1.

⁸⁴ *Hélène*, p. 77; cf. the section-heading in the Catalogue p. 71, associating the picture with the version of the Recovery she considers Lesches'.

⁸⁵ *Der troische Sagenkreis*, p. 182 and note 1, A; cf. von Massow, *Ath. Mitt.*, XLI, 1916, p. 65: "... die Bedrohung Helenas. . . ."

⁸⁶ Mme. Ghali says, wrongly, "... le guerrier pointe son épée obliquement vers la tête de sa femme" (*op. cit.*, p. 72, no. 26).

⁸⁷ *Aeneid*, II, 367-369. Cf. Robert, *supra*, note 81.

presence in an Iliupersis taken in connection with the report of the Arktinos version of the Recovery, the ἀνέυρεσις Ἑλένης pictured at the moment of the ἀναγνώρισις (further, see *infra*, p. 64).⁸⁸

Another example of the Recognition and an example of its sequel, the Greeting of Menelaos, may perhaps be identified in rather poorly preserved red-figure pictures. The Greeting is the older. Acropolis 212, a fragmentary kylix of about 500 B.C. or a little earlier,⁸⁹ has an elaborate Iliupersis: parts of a Rape of Cassandra, a Death of Priam, fights, corpses. In the midst of all this are two figures, their lower parts alone preserved: a warrior carrying shield and spear, point down, walking towards a woman whose arms are raised, outstretched, it seems, in friendly greeting rather than the terrified appeal which Mme. Ghali's classification would require. The final letter of the woman's name is preserved: — — — ε, presumably [Ἑλεν]ε though not certainly so, and Langlotz' query of the identification as Menelaos and Helen must be noted.⁹⁰ The fragments of the Iliupersis on Ferrara T 936, a calyx-krater by the Niobid Painter,⁹¹ in addition to a Death of Priam and an Aeneas and Anchises, show a scene

⁸⁸ If the pair are indeed Menelaos and Helen, it may well be true that the corpse partly visible behind Helen, as Robert suggested (*Bild und Lied*, pp. 60-61, and *Arch. Hermeneutik*, pp. 221-222), is that of Deiphobos: Μενέλαος . . . Δηϊφωβον φονεύσας.

⁸⁹ Langlotz in Graef and Langlotz, *Die ant. Vasen d. Akropolis*, II, p. 17, no. 212, pl. 10. Mme. Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 75, no. 39, cites Davreux, *Cassandre*, p. 130 (170 is correct), no. 112, and reports ". . . coupe . . . proche d'Épictète (des environs de 500). . . ." Mlle. Davreux, *loc. cit.*, writes "Style d'Épictète de la dernière période" (which would mean ca. 480 B.C.: cf. Rumpf, *Malerei und Zeichnung*, p. 64); cites Hoppin, *Handbook R.-F. Vases*, II, p. 459, where no. 1 is Acropolis frag. of an Ajax and Cassandra by the Tyszkiewicz Painter (actually Acropolis 812); cites also Beazley, *V.A.*, p. 55, no. 25, thus garbling items in Hoppin's bibliography and should have cited instead Beazley, *A.J.A.*, XX, 1916, p. 152, no. 26 (not no. 25, an error Mlle. Davreux shares with Hoppin), the same Acropolis 812 by the Tyszkiewicz Painter (Langlotz, *op. cit.*, II, pl. 73; Beazley, *A.V.*, p. 116, no. 34, and *A.R.V.*, p. 188, no. 60) which, so far as I can see, does not appear in Mlle. Davreux's lists of the scene (nor, apparently, does Acropolis 355, compared to work of the Stieglitz Painter, with Ajax and Cassandra in an Iliupersis: Langlotz, pl. 26; *A.R.V.*, p. 546, no. 1 bottom). But part of Mlle. Davreux's bibliography, *loc. cit.*, does concern Acropolis 212, and it is apparently from the note by Richards in *J.H.S.*, XIV, 1894, pp. 186-191,—which she cites,—that the name of Epiktetos came to be connected with Acropolis 212, for Richards there wrote (p. 190): "As to the style of the vase [i.e., Acropolis 212], no doubt Hartwig's estimate of it is correct, that it is a work of the school of Epiktetos." I do not find Acropolis 212 in *A.R.V.*

⁹⁰ Mme. Ghali's view of the scene was explicitly stated by Richards, *op. cit.*, p. 188: ". . . the woman is supplicating mercy from one who advances with hostile intent." But there is in fact nothing in the preserved parts of the woman to indicate supplication and nothing about the man to show hostile intent. Richards does not doubt that Helen and Menelaos correctly identifies woman and warrior and, further, Deiphobos the dead warrior behind the pair (p. 189) and Odysseus Menelaos' follower whose foot alone was known to Richards. Deiphobos is not impossible, though several fallen warriors are in the composition. Richard's Odysseus in the event turned out to be a Phrygian bowman (see Langlotz, pl. 10).

⁹¹ Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 94, no. 76, pl. 68, 4; Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 419, no. 16; Aurigemma, *Spina*², p. 235.

with woman facing right towards a figure whose hand and forearm alone remain, outstretched towards the woman. Between the two, also looking to right, stands Apollo. The woman wears chiton and, drawn over her head, a himation which she has now thrown open, a hand on each edge of the garment. The gesture seems designed plainly to reveal her identity to the person she faces. That she is Helen is probable enough, and Menelaos the person to whom hand and outstretched arm belong.⁹² The moment pictured is the same as that chosen by Lydos on Berlin 1685, but here Helen alone throws back her cloak, there Helen and Menelaos together. Acropolis 212, which stands in time between Berlin 1685 and Ferrara T 936, poses the next moment in the development of the action, Helen's arms outstretched in welcome. To see hostility in any of these pictures is to see, I think, what they do not show.

The Attack upon Helen is claimed for other black-figure pictures besides Berlin 1685. The characters are woman (in Recognition pose) and warrior, or generally two warriors; often there are side-figures, more or less meaningless space-fillers. One element of composition is shared by all members of the group: woman and one warrior face each other. This element marks out the group from other woman-and-warriors compositions customarily (if not always) interpreted as Escorts, and associates it (so the claim goes) with warrior and woman in Iliupersis on Berlin 1685. I have argued that the pair on that vase represent not an Attack, but a Recognition. It seems to me reasonable to argue that the pair, or trio, on these represent neither an Attack nor a Recognition, but one or another of the early stages of an Escort.

The earliest stage may be taken to appear in the picture on Manchester Aa 45 (*ca.* 540 B.C.), an amphora by the Towry Whyte Painter.⁹³ The woman faces left in the Recognition pose of Berlin 1685. The first warrior stands before her and reaches out across her with his left hand to grasp her left forearm at elbow. On the right the second warrior stands facing the pair. Of first warrior and woman Mme. Ghali writes: "De la main droite, il la menace de l'épée obliquement dirigée vers le haut." She does not comment on his skillless swordsmanship in interposing his own left arm between the blade of his sword and the person against whom his sword is supposedly raised. One can readily believe that the first warrior's hand, as action continues, will come down the woman's forearm and he will turn, sword in his right hand ready against possible attack, and all three will move off towards the left.

On Vatican 358, a neck-amphora by the Towry Whyte Painter, the woman is

⁹² The action is located at Apollo's sanctuary: the god himself, his statue on a Doric column, an altar (these last two on Aurigemma's report; they are not visible in the detail photograph published by Mme. Ghali). Mme. Ghali's "à l'intérieur du temple" is a mistranslation of Aurigemma's "innanzi al tempio."

⁹³ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 74, no. 33, pl. 45, 2; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 142, no. 4, the painter's work "near Group E."

turned towards right.⁹⁴ The first warrior stands facing her. His sword hand is concealed behind his own body; the tip of his sword and his other hand and forearm are concealed behind the outstretched edge of the woman's himation.⁹⁵ When Mme. Ghali writes "... Hélène . . . menacée par Ménélas," she ignores the complete absence of hostility in the position at which the sword is carried, pointing off towards the field behind the woman. Logic and position of scabbard indicate that the view of the first warrior's corslet presented is of the back, facing, in spite of pectoral scrolls characteristic of a corslet's front, consequently that sword-arm is the right, the arm extended behind the woman the left, and sword is held across front of corslet in a reasonable position for defence. One may believe the narrative intent of the painter indicated by the second warrior, posed behind the woman and stepping out towards right: presumably the first warrior will now turn and start right, the woman following after.

Much the same pose of woman and warriors occurs on a neck-amphora (ca. 520-510 B.C.) once in the Hasselmann collection,⁹⁶ except that the second warrior stands (facing right) and the first is represented in a step to left, towards the woman. "L'imprécision de la reproduction empêche de savoir s'il tient une épée dans la main gauche" misses the mark: the hand is his right and, while the reproduction is sufficiently bad to make one unsure of recognizing the upper end of a sword blade behind woman and warrior, the position of visible parts of warrior's right arm suggests that he does in fact carry a sword across the front of his corslet. The pose here, as on Vatican 358, is most inappropriate to suggest that sword threatens woman. It may be that first warrior is posed in his final step towards the woman, a moment before his position on Vatican 358, will now bring his feet together, turn, and go off to right with his companions.

The next stage in the development of action in the Escort,—both warriors moving, the woman still standing,—appears on Vatican 350, Baltimore 48.16, London B 245. The first two pictures, one by the Painter of the Vatican Mourner (ca. 540 B.C.),⁹⁷ the other comparable to that painter's work,⁹⁸ are not exact replicas, but they are close. The woman stands turned to left. Facing her, the first warrior steps out to right, his sword horizontal, point forward, in his right hand, and his left hand

⁹⁴ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 73, no. 31, pl. 43, 1: "... Hélène, debout vers la gauche. . . ." is an error. Kunze, *Arch. Schilddänder*, p. 164, note 1, no. 6: the Threatening of Helen. Miss Haspels, *B.C.H.*, LIV, 1930, p. 438, classed it among Escort pictures. For the attribution: Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 142, no. 7.

⁹⁵ Or so it seems; yet Albizzati, *Vasi del Vaticano*, p. 144, claims "... il re . . . tiene con la s. la moglie. . . ."

⁹⁶ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 75, no. 37, pl. 46, 2: "... Hélène est debout vers la gauche. . . ." is an error; she faces right. Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 588 foot: "resembles" neck-amphorae by the Painter of Toronto 313.

⁹⁷ Vatican 350: Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 140, no. 1; Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 72, no. 28, pl. 43, 2.

⁹⁸ Baltimore 46.16: Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 140 foot, no. 1; Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 73, no. 29, pl. 43 bis, 1.

grasping the lower part of the edge of her himation held forward by her right hand. To right of the pair, the second warrior strides right, looking back at them. It is easy to suppose, with Mme. Ghali, with Kunze, with Beazley, and with Schneider, that in these pictures the first warrior threatens the woman.⁹⁹ The forward inclination of his body in motion and consequently the forward position of his sword lend verisimilitude to the interpretation. But the first warrior's hand is unnaturally low on the edge of the woman's himation to go with a threatening gesture of the sword in his right; one may interpret the first warrior's striding to right to be not so much directly towards the woman as, passing in front of her, towards the second warrior, and that the first has taken hold of the lower edge of the woman's himation one may interpret to be an indication that she is to turn and follow the two warriors—*longe servet vestigia coniunx*.¹⁰⁰

The composition is reversed on London B 245, a neck-amphora in the manner of the Lysippides Painter (ca. 525 B.C.).¹⁰¹ The woman faces right. The back of the corslet of the first warrior is represented. His right arm, with hand holding sword, point down, is swung back, balancing his left arm stretched out towards the woman. The hand attached to the outstretched arm and grasping the lower part of the edge of the woman's himation is, illogically, a right hand; this is the single confusion caused by the reversal. Kunze interpreted the picture as an Attack,¹⁰² and Mme. Ghali so classed it. A reasonable possibility of interpreting the pose of the first warrior's sword-arm as indicating his threatening the woman with his weapon seems precluded by the fact that the warrior's other hand grasps her left himation-edge rather than her right. For, if one imagine the action momentarily stopped with sword on the point of beginning its upward thrust (and how else could the pose be taken as threatening the woman?), the resumption of action will find the woman's body offset, the sword thrusting at empty space. Furthermore, the threatened-attack interpretation leaves the second warrior dangling (as on Vatican 350 and its Baltimore replica), looking back at the action, yet inexplicably walking away from it. One may in fact suppose the action represented at a moment when the first warrior, who is posed in a stride towards left, the direction taken by the second warrior, is about to pass behind the woman, and she to turn, taking her place with her two escorts.

⁹⁹ *Hélène*, pp. 72-73, nos. 28-29; *Arch. Schildbänder*, p. 164, note 1, no. 3 (Vatican 350); *D.A.B.*, p. 74 (Vatican 350); *Der troische Sagenkreis*, p. 182, note 1, B (Vatican 350). Also Haspels (*B.C.H.*, LIV, 1930, p. 438), von Massow (*Ath. Mitt.*, XLI, 1916, p. 65), and Albizzati, *Vasi del Vaticano*, p. 137) envisage the action of Vatican 350 as the Threatening of Helen—the last most emphatically: “il re . . . in atto di colpirla con la spada, afferra il velo di lei.”

¹⁰⁰ The right hand of the second warrior in both pictures is closed as if about sword hilt or spear shaft, but in neither picture was any weapon drawn.

¹⁰¹ *A.B.V.*, p. 257, no. 13: “among the school-pieces.” *Hélène*, p. 74, no. 34, pl. 45, 1.

¹⁰² *Arch. Schildbänder*, p. 164, note 1, no. 7, following Schneider, *Der troische Sagenkreis*, p. 182, note 1, D; Haspels, *loc. cit.*, takes the picture for a Threatening of Helen.

On Edinburgh 1881.44.27, a neck amphora by the Painter of Vatican 365 (*ca.* 540-530 B.C.),¹⁰³ the woman stands facing left and the warriors on either side of her stride out to right, each with an arm behind her as if to encourage her turning and accompanying them.¹⁰⁴ The first warrior's right hand is closed as though holding a sword.¹⁰⁵ The position of hand and arm implies that, had the sword been rendered, it would have been drawn carried blade up at about 45 degrees across the front of the first warrior's corslet, ready for defence.

In two pictures woman and first warrior are excerpted from the customary trio. In both the woman faces left. On Berlin 1687 (*ca.* 560-550 B.C.) the warrior's left arm extends across the woman's body, his left hand closed over her left wrist.¹⁰⁶ His sword in his right hand is held horizontal. If the illustrator intended to suggest that the sword is posed as a threat to the woman, he left, it is true, sufficient space for the blade to pass unobstructed beneath the warrior's outstretched left arm,¹⁰⁷ but he has also displayed, in imagining the thrust about to develop across the outstretched arm, an astonishing ignorance of positions and movements natural to the universal weapon of his society. The warrior's legs are spread in a stride to right. He may be thought to be in course of walking on in front of the woman, leading her with him, his sword ready against possible opposition.

On the amphora Geneva 15008 (*ca.* 550-540 B.C.) doublets of the pair appear.¹⁰⁸ The leftmost doublet is a close replica of the pair on Vatican 350 (*supra*) except for the position of the Geneva warrior's sword, the blade of which is up at about 45

¹⁰³ Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 312, no. 4; Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 74, no. 36, pl. 46, 1; Kunze, *Arch. Schildbänder*, p. 164, note 1, no. 4; Schneider, *Der troische Sagenkreis*, p. 182, note 1, C.

¹⁰⁴ This is not the intent of the second warrior, to right of the woman, if the line which appears in the field between woman and first warrior is in fact a part of the shaft of the second warrior's spear the rest of which the painter, though intending to show him carrying the weapon, neglected to represent. Compare with Mme. Ghali's illustration the photograph on Beazley's plate 4 in *B.S.A.*, XXXII, 1931-32.

¹⁰⁵ Mme. Ghali is in error in saying, *loc. cit.*, that it is the first warrior's right hand which is behind the woman's body. And her ". . . ne la menace pas de son épée" is perhaps ambiguous as to whether she thought the first warrior provided with a sword, but is quite explicit in contradicting her criterion of classification for the group in which the picture is catalogued.

¹⁰⁶ *Hélène*, p. 72, no. 27, pl. 44, 1: Mme. Ghali wrongly, or at least ambiguously, likens the pose to that of the pair on Berlin 1685, ". . . la position de Ménélas et Hélène est semblable. . . ." But see the illustration figured on her plate and compare Furtwängler, *Beschreibung*, I, p. 225: ". . . Helena, die er mit der L. an ihrem l. Handgelenke fasst. . . ." The comparable piece for the pose is Manchester Aa 45 (*supra*).

¹⁰⁷ And Kunze, *Arch. Schildbänder*, p. 164, note 1, no. 2, following Schneider, *Der troische Sagenkreis*, p. 182, note 1, addendum after F, lists the picture among representations of the Threatening of Helen; so does von Massow, *Ath. Mitt.*, XLI, 1916, p. 65.

¹⁰⁸ Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 73, no. 32, pl. 44, 2. The same museum number is given by Kunze, *Arch. Schildbänder*, p. 164, note 1, no. 5. Both also cite the vase as Beazley, *B.S.A.*, XXXII, 1931-32, p. 3, no. 3, which seems to be the same vase as Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 141, no. 2, identified Geneva 30 and listed in the Group of London B 174 near Group E.

degrees rather than horizontal, ready for defence against an enemy rather than a threat to the woman. The warrior of the rightmost doublet in the Geneva picture has his left arm extended behind the woman. If the pose has not been falsified by the modern restorer,¹⁰⁹ one may compare the position taken by the first warrior on Edinburgh 1881.44.27 (*supra*, p. 67 and note 103).

The proposition here argued, then, for Manchester Aa 45 and the eight other black-figure pictures just reviewed is this: they by no means clearly represent warrior threatening woman, much less attacking her, but do in fact show one or another moment in the early stages of an escort. They are better classed with the group of Escorts catalogued by Mme. Ghali (Type II) as inspired by the *Iliupersis* of Arktinos (doubtless with a degree of temerity: *supra*, p. 52).¹¹⁰ On the identification of the characters, there is nothing to add to Beazley's remarks of 1927 (*supra*, p. 9).

The earliest of the Escort group is a lekythos by Lydos from the middle of the sixth century.¹¹¹ Most are black-figure pictures from the second half of that century; the theme is particularly popular with the Antimenes Painter and his circle. Two, in addition to the Odessa plate by Oltos, are red-figure, the later from the first quarter of the fifth century. The figures in the pictures of this group, also, are posed at one or another moment in the early stages of an escort. Some of the pictures, moreover, show an escort well under way, all the figures in motion. Among the most lively of these is the Edinburgh Painter's version on the small neck-amphora once San Simeon 9520.¹¹²

On Boston 13.190, a cup by the Elpinikos Painter,¹¹³ the warrior turns, taking his first step. The position of his sword I take to be due to the mechanics of frontality rather than to any intention of the Elpinikos Painter to represent him threatening the woman with it. Indeed, the warrior's fixed stare suggests that he is loath to take his eyes from the woman's prominent (if well draped) breast.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁹ See Beazley's warning against the repainting, *loc. cit.*

¹¹⁰ *Hélène*, pp. 99-113.

¹¹¹ At Taranto. Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 99, no. 83; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 111, no. 39.

¹¹² Now belonging to Mrs. Myron Prinzmetal, Beverly Hills. Published by H. R. W. Smith, *A.J.A.*, XLIX, 1945, p. 470. Cf. Haspels, *Attic Black-Figured Lekythoi*, p. 220, no. 81 (reporting the attribution Beazley's); Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 478, iv, no. 2; Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 108, k; Kunze, *Arch. Schildbänder*, p. 165, note 3.

¹¹³ End of sixth century: Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 103, no. 100, pl. 82, 1; Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 86, no. 3; Caskey in Caskey and Beazley, *Cat. Boston*, I, p. 6, no. 7.

¹¹⁴ A natural impulse: literary or artistic connection with *Andromache* 629 or *Lysistrata* 155 is not arguable. Caskey, *loc. cit.*, whom Mme. Ghali follows, held that warrior threatens woman with his sword. This gave him his argument for suggesting the identification Menelaos and Helen. A like interpretation provided Kunze an argument for identifying Menelaos and Helen on the Athena Painter's lekythos Berlin 3253 (*Arch. Schildbänder*, p. 165, note 1; Haspels, *A.B.L.*, p. 255, no. 29, pl. 46, 1 a-b; cf. Furtwängler, *Arch. Anz.*, 1893, p. 86, no. 21): the warrior escorts the woman to right, his right hand on her left wrist; the advanced edge of his torso and left thigh

On Tarquinia RC 2460, a stamnos by the Painter of the Munich Amphora,¹¹⁵ the warrior seems to have taken a step or so from the woman, then stopped, turned, and is now (for once) shaking his sword at the woman presumably to expedite her getting under way.¹¹⁶

Of woman and first warrior on the neck-amphorae Berlin 1842 and once London market, both by the Antimenes Painter, Mme. Ghali writes: "... Ménélas se retourne et l'entraîne par un pan de l'himation, tout en tenant l'épée obliquement dirigée contre elle."¹¹⁷ But it seems unlikely that the Antimenes Painter intended to suggest that first warrior's sword threatened the woman. Surely the intent of the pose is betrayed by the replicas by the Antimenes Painter himself on London B 244 and Villa Giulia 15537¹¹⁸—replicas except for the weapon held by the first warrior, a spear carried in his right hand across the farther side of his torso, obliquely, point up towards rear, exactly the position in which the sword is carried on Berlin 1842 and the amphora once in the London market. It is clear that the warrior cannot be threatening the woman with his spear as the escort gets under way. It should be equally clear that the sword's position is a matter of convenience to the carrier, that the first impression of the blade's being directed against the woman is illusionary—indeed consideration of its position in relation to warrior's back-stretched left arm and hand grasping an edge of the woman's himation shows that the point is directed into the field behind the woman. Robert's interpretation of the significance of the drawn sword (*supra*, p. 61, note 81) seems to me, on the basis of this argument, correct.¹¹⁹

In the pictures on London B 244, Villa Giulia 15537, Berlin 1842, and the neck-amphora once in the London market, the Antimenes Painter apparently shows the back of the first warrior's corslet, his weapon carried in his right hand across the

is not so damaged as to conceal the fact that about half the blade of the drawn sword in his left hand lies on the far side of his body and so suggests no threat to the woman.

¹¹⁵ First quarter of fifth century: Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 162, no. 9; Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 103, no. 101, pl. 42, 2.

¹¹⁶ Mme. Ghali illustrates the picture with those of her Attack group (Type I a), but catalogues it with the Escort (Type II), writing of the pose of the sword simply: "Il tient dans la main droite l'épée nue dirigée verticalement." Of course the picture represents both a threat (not attack) and an escort.

¹¹⁷ *Hélène*, p. 101, nos. 92-93, pl. 80, 1, and pl. 78, 1.

¹¹⁸ Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 108, h, pl. 77, and p. 107, f. For the latter see *C.V.A.* Villa Giulia, 1, III H e, pl. 3, 2 (the second warrior here is stepping, or beginning to step, out towards right after his companion; on London B 244, Berlin 1842, and the vase once in the London market the second warrior stands).

¹¹⁹ *Bild und Lied*, pp. 56-57: offered for London B 244 (by the Antimenes Painter: *op. cit.*, p. 56, a; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 271, no. 74; Ghali, *Hélène*, pl. 77), for Berlin 1842 (same painter: Robert, *op. cit.*, p. 56, d; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 273, no. 110; Ghali, *Hélène*, pl. 80, 1), for the similarly posed first warriors on Gerhard, *A.V.*, pl. 72 (same painter: Robert, *op. cit.*, p. 56, b; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 271, no. 78; Ghali, *Hélène*, pl. 78, 3) and on Gerhard, *A.V.*, pl. 171 (Robert, *op. cit.*, p. 56, c; Ghali, *Hélène*, pl. 78, 2).

front of his corslet, his left arm stretched back towards the woman, and, clasping the edge of her himation, a right hand attached to his left arm. When the painter chose to represent first warrior carrying weapons at ease, as on Los Angeles A 5933.50.7,¹²⁰ he merely added pectoral scrolls to his corslet, so changing the view from corslet-back to corslet-front, and thus the back-stretched arm became the right with a right hand properly attached to it, and left hand and arm remained to carry spear and shield in expected fashion.

In the pictures on the neck-amphorae Gerhard, *A.V.*, pl. 72, and London B 243, the former by the Antimenes Painter and the latter by a member of the Eye-Siren Group of his circle, the second warrior, standing behind the woman, holds an unsheathed sword across the lower part of his corslet, its point apparently directed at the woman's back.¹²¹ Of the woman on Gerhard 72 Mme. Ghali writes: "... Ménélas ... se retourne vers elle en la menaçant d'une épée dirigée obliquement. ... Le second guerrier tient ... une épée dirigée contre la jeune femme. ... " This is to take an unnecessarily pessimistic view of the young woman's situation. The position of the second warrior's weapon, like that of his companion's, may be taken as indication that the escort is to proceed through dangerous terrain. The second warrior's attitude towards the woman is expressed by the gesture of his left arm: outstretched, his left hand at her back, encouraging her to proceed, aiding and abetting the gesture of the first warrior whose left hand holds an edge of the woman's himation as the escort gets under way. This same compositional scheme, I take it, is displayed by the picture on London B 243 where the situation is somewhat obscured by the extraordinary compression of the trio. The anonymous member of the Eye-Siren Group who decorated this pot loaded his field with side-figures (two at right, one at left) and, thus compelled to squeeze first and second warrior embarrassingly close together, elected to give his woman prominence by bringing her out into the foremost plane at the expense of verisimilitude in the representation of an escort.

In Gerhard 72 the Antimenes Painter gave one solution to the problem of perspective: three in file, facing in one direction, physical contact between central and terminal figures emphasizing the intimacy of their connection. In the picture on Compiègne 983¹²² he gave another: first warrior stepping out vigorously to right, second warrior the like to left, both turning heads to look back at the woman standing between them, both with back-stretched hands clasping the edge of her himation. It is not of course that each wishes to tear the woman from the other, simply that the

¹²⁰ *Hesperia*, XXIV, 1955, p. 23; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 273, no. 108.

¹²¹ Gerhard 72: see note 119. London B 243: *C.V.A.*, 4, pl. 59, 3 a; *Hélène*, p. 104, no. 104, pl. 81; *A.B.V.*, p. 286, no. 7.

¹²² Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 100, no. 89, pl. 78, 4 (cf. the "Errata des Planches"). From Miss Haspel's listing of the vase in *B.C.H.*, LIV, 1930, p. 437, I do not know how she interprets the problem of perspective.

Antimenes Painter fails to use the illusionistic devices necessary correctly to represent warriors stepping out shoulder to shoulder and leading the woman behind them. This interpretation may also serve to explain the pose on Florence 76179, a neck-amphora by the Antimenes Painter,¹²³ on Munich 1392, a type B amphora related to him,¹²⁴ on Gerhard 171, a neck-amphora which should at least be contemporary with the Antimenes Painter's work,¹²⁵ and even perhaps on Florence 4148, which is doubtless somewhat later.¹²⁶

Into her group of Escort pictures Mme. Ghali has admitted, in addition to the red-figured lekythos Berlin 30835 by the Painter of the Yale Lekythos,¹²⁷ a considerable number of other pictures which are doubtless to be taken as a Warrior's Departure.¹²⁸ I list the pieces in question. Amporae B: Copenhagen 5613,¹²⁹ Rhodes 10604,¹³⁰ and Rhodes 13447.¹³¹ Neck-amphorae: Tarquinia RC 2464,¹³² and the following, by the Antimenes Painter or by members of his circle, Villa Giulia 15731,¹³³ Toronto 309,¹³⁴ Villa Giulia 1203,¹³⁵ Florence 3845,¹³⁶ and Copenhagen 3858.¹³⁷ Lekythoi: London B 26¹³⁸ and Berlin 1739.¹³⁹ Tripod: Louvre F 151.¹⁴⁰ Most of these pictures are

¹²³ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 100, no. 88, pl. 79, 2; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 269, no. 38.

¹²⁴ *C.V.A.*, 1, pl. 26, 2; Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 107, g; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 281, no. 16.

¹²⁵ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 101, no. 94, pl. 78, 2.

¹²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 101, no. 91, pl. 79, 1.

¹²⁷ *Supra*, p. 61, note 81.

¹²⁸ For the subject see Beazley on Vatican G 19 (*Rac. Guglielmi*, p. 31), who refers to Mingazini, *Vasi Cast.*, pp. 244-245, where a list of Departure pictures is to be found: cf. Kunze, *Arch. Schildbänder*, p. 165, note 3.

¹²⁹ Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 109, i; *C.V.A.*, 3, III H, pl. 103, 1 b, and text *ad loc.*, of woman and warriors: "... tous trois marchant à gauche"—but actually the woman seems to be posed as standing.

¹³⁰ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 109, c; *C.V.A.*, 1, III H e, pl. 1, 2. Again the woman stands, *pace* Jacopi, *C.V.A.* text *ad loc.*

¹³¹ By the Rycroft Painter: Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 110, 1; *C.V.A.*, 2, III H e, pl. 21, 2; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 336, no. 15 (replica on the neck-amphora Ghent 12, *ibid.*, no. 21).

¹³² Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 109, h, pl. 83, 2.

¹³³ By the Antimenes Painter: Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 110, m; *C.V.A.*, 3, pl. 18, 5; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 272, no. 98.

¹³⁴ Related to the Antimenes Painter: Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 110, n; Robinson, Harcum, Iliffe, *Gr. Vases Toronto*, pl. 44; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 281, no. 8. Singled out by Kunze for a Departure picture, *Arch. Schildbänder*, p. 165, note 3.

¹³⁵ Eye-Siren Group: Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 109, g; *C.V.A.*, 1, pl. 7, 2 (woman stands, *pace* Giglioli); Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 286, no. 9.

¹³⁶ Compared to the Eye-Siren Group: Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 109, e, pl. 84, 1; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 287, no. 1 towards top.

¹³⁷ Akin to Group of Würzburg 199: Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 109, j; *C.V.A.*, 3, pl. 107, 2 a; Beazley, *A.B.V.*, p. 290, no. 1 at top.

¹³⁸ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 108, a; Haspels, *A.B.L.*, p. 29, pl. 9, 1 a-b.

¹³⁹ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 109, d; Furtwängler, *Beschreibung*, I, p. 282 ("Wohl eine halbverstandene Darstellung von Menelaos und Helena"); Haspels, *A.B.L.*, pp. 29-30 ("woman and warriors").

¹⁴⁰ Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 104, no. 105, pl. 80, 2.

summarily listed in the Escort sub-group where "le guerrier ne touche pas la femme."¹⁴¹ Another item there listed belongs elsewhere, the lekythos Fogg 2205,¹⁴² clearly an Escort since the first warrior holds firmly an edge of the woman's himation as he steps to right. Indeed, of the fifteen items listed in Mme. Ghali's sub-group none appears to belong except possibly the three or four which lack a readily available illustration.¹⁴³

When so much of literature's record of the Recovery is lost and so much of the pictorial record is anepigraphic, very little can be argued about the nature or direction of influences. It does seem clear, however, that there is no very good reason to suppose that either Euripides at *Andromache* 629 or Aristophanes at *Lysistrata* 155-156 wrote under the influence of any work of one of the representational arts. The earliest pictorialization of reasonably possible identification, the pair in the Iliupersis by Lydos on Berlin 1685,¹⁴⁴ is a fair illustration of the language of Photios in his account of

¹⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 108-110.

¹⁴² *Op. cit.*, p. 110, k; *C.V.A.*, III H e, pl. 11, 7.

¹⁴³ *Op. cit.*, p. 108, b; p. 109, f; p. 110, o; and p. 110, note 1.

¹⁴⁴ *Supra*, p. 61. The murder scene on one face of the early sixth-century Sparta Base, Wace no. 1 (Tod and Wace, *Cat. Sparta Museum*, pp. 132-133), is frequently held to represent Menelaos' attack upon Helen (so, for example, Picard, *Manuel*, I, pp. 456-457, followed by Ghali, *Hélène*, p. 71, no. 24; Möbius, *R.E.*, s.v. Stele, col. 2310; Kunze, *Arch. Schilddbänder*, p. 164; and, with a query, Lippold, *Gr. Plastik*, p. 31). Wace's sentences of 1906, serpents notwithstanding, remain true: "The scenes have been variously explained as (1) A. Orestes and Clytemnestra, B. Orestes and Electra; (2) A. Eriphyle and Polynikes, B. Eriphyle and Alcmaeon; (3) A. Menelaos and Helen meeting at the sack of Troy, B. Alcmene and Zeus. It is impossible to say if any of these is right or if the true explanation is still to seek." The figures in the Escort pictures on the Olympia shield-reliefs of the first half of the sixth century are anonymous on Kunze's convincing argument (*op. cit.*, pp. 165-166, 170), represent Paris' abduction of Helen if one give credence to Mme. Ghali's unpersuasive interpretation (*op. cit.*, pp. 49-50, 51-53); on the uncertainties of the early fifth-century Escort picture on Olympia relief XI d, control Mme. Ghali's description (*op. cit.*, p. 103, no. 102) by means of Kunze's (*op. cit.*, p. 16)—as for the escorting warrior's sword, if there was a sword, its position shares the ambiguity of the weapon's position in other escorts. The picture of Menelaos and Helen in Iliupersis on the Kypselos Chest (Ghali, *op. cit.*, p. 72, no. 25), of the turn of the seventh and sixth centuries (von Massow, *Ath. Mitt.*, XLI, 1916, pp. 13-15; Lippold, *R.E.*, s.v. Kypselos, cols. 121-126), is lost. What Pausanias in the second century after Christ thought it represented, he says (V, 18, 3): *Μενέλαος δὲ θώρακά τε ἐνδεδυκὼς καὶ ἔχων ξίφος ἔπεισιν Ἑλένην ἀποκτείνει δῆλα ὡς ἀλίσκομένης Ἰλίου*. "Menelaos, armed in corslet and holding his sword, attacks Helen to kill her, clearly at the sack of Troy." As models for the interpretation of the scene von Massow cites Berlin 1685 and 1687, Vatican 350, and Edinburgh 1881.44.27 (dealt with *supra*, pp. 61-63, 65-66, 67), but in his drawing (plate 1, sixth from left in lower row of metope-panel pictures) constructs a two-figure composition more clearly in accord with Pausanias' interpretation than is any of his models. Von Massow cites also the Murder of Ismene on the Late-Corinthian neck-amphora Louvre E 640 (ca. 575-550 B.C.: Pottier, *Vases antiques du Louvre*, I, p. 58, pl. 50; Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung*, III, fig. 178; Robert, *Arch. Herm.*, p. 140, fig. 109; Payne, *Necrocorinthia*, p. 327, no. 1437, pl. 40, 1-2; Benson, *Die Geschichte der Korinthischen Vasen*, p. 61, Tydeus Painter no. 1—cf. Payne, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-111)—a lively murder scene, but

the summary of the content of the *Iliupersis* by Arktinos, but confidently to claim that Lydos therefore was painting directly under the influence of the Arktinos poem is another matter, for Μενέλαος ἀνευρὼν Ἑλένην, like ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς κατὰγει, is fundamental to her legend at least from the *Odyssey*'s time. Even more problematical is the true identification of the characters in any one of the black-figure pictures of warrior or warriors escorting woman, and, *a fortiori*, problematical also a connection between picture and Arktinos' poem. The Pursuit-and-Flight series, and its sub-class which shows Menelaos' sword falling, illustrates well enough the reports of scholiasts *Wasps* 714 and *Andromache* 630 of Ibykos' version of the Recovery. The work of Oltos, the earliest attested producer of Pursuits and Flights certainly concerned with Menelaos and Helen, was enjoyed—or should have been—by those friends of the sons of Peisistratos whose companion was Anakreon, once the associate of Ibykos at the court of Polykrates and now the intermediary between that gay court and the Athenian. Three considerations effectively block an attempt to associate these facts in a pleasant account of Anakreon's role as popularizer of the court-poetry of Polykrates and the sons of Peisistratos among pottery ateliers of Athens. (a) It is a possibility that the characters in the Pursuit and Flight on Mykonos K 31092, which was doubtless painted before Anakreon came to Athens, were in fact intended for Menelaos and Helen. (b) The sub-class with the sword of Menelaos falling, Ibykan on the showing of schol. *Andromache* 630, is not attested earlier than the period of the Berlin Painter's late work, some decades after Oltos' time.¹⁴⁵ Finally, and most important of all, (c) scholiast Leidensis-Vossianus *Lysistrata* 155 explicitly claims also for the *Little Iliad* of Lesches the story of the Recovery found in Ibykos. The Pursuits and Flights are doubtless indebted for inspiration to one or the other, or perhaps now to one and now to the other. Connections are obscure.

PAUL A. CLEMENT

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

unrelated in composition either to the Attic pictures or to von Massow's own drawing for the Kypselos Chest picture.

¹⁴⁵ Somewhat later too than the period when it occurred to vase-painters to put Anakreon's portrait in their pictures: on London E 18, a cup by Oltos himself (Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 40, no. 69); on fragments of a calyx-krater in Rome, or once so, very early work of the Kleophrades Painter (*A.R.V.*, p. 123, no. 29); on Syracuse 26967, a lekythos by the Gales Painter (*A.R.V.*, p. 31, no. 2 at top). See further, Richter, *Attic R.F. Vases*, pp. 44 and 58.