Şahin, Reyhan (2017). "Representatıons of Mythologıcal War Scenes in Attic Figure Pottery and Approaches in Research". *Uludağ University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 18, Iss. 32, p. 259-285.

DOI: 10.21550/sosbilder.298359

REPRESENTATIONS of MYTHOLOGICAL WAR SCENES in ATTIC FIGURE POTTERY and APPROACHES in RESEARCH

Reyhan ŞAHİN*

Sending Date: July 2016

Acceptance Date: November 2016

ABSTRACT

Comprehensive changes in the subject repertoire of the Athenian Figure Pottery manifested itself by the second quarter of the 6th century BC, by which anthropocentric subjects substituted the animal frieses. Gigantomachy, Iliupersis, Centauromachy and Amazonomachy were the most frequently depicted mythological war scenes from the second quarter of the 6th century until the middle of the 5th century BC. On the other hand Grypomachy and Geranomachy along with Amazonomachy were the most favoured subjects on the Athenian Red Figure Pottery in the 4th century BC. Some researchers including S. Colvin, F. Vian, D. Bothmer and B. Schiffler classified the mythological war scenes on the Athenian Figure Pottery typologically and investigated the iconographic changes in the course of time. Also some others like B. Tarbell, T. Hölscher, M. Langner, M. Mangold attempted to explain their meaning and submitted different proposals for their interpretation. Considering the different approaches in research, this paper aims to provide an overview to the compositional and figural iconography of the mythological war scenes on the Athenian Figure Pottery. In the last part some remarks and problems related to the subject are discussed.

Key Words: *Machy, Athenian Figure Pottery, Gigantomachy, Iliupersis, Amazonomachy*

* Lecturer Dr., Uludağ University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Department of Archaeology, reyhansahin@uludag.edu.tr

Attika Üretimi Figürlü Seramiklerde Mitolojik Savaş Tasvirleri ve Araştırmalarda Yaklaşımlar

ÖZET

M.Ö. 6. yüzyılın 2. çeyreği ile birlikte Attika üretimi figürlü vazoların konu repertuvarında antroposentik konulara doğru belirgin bir geçiş gözlemlenir. Bu dönemden itibaren M.Ö. 5. yüzyıl ortalarına kadar Gigantomakhia, Iliupersis, Kentauromakhia ve Amazonomakhia Attika üretimi figürlü vazoların konu repertuvarında önemli bir yer tutar. Öte yandan M.Ö. 4. yüzyılda Attika üretimi kırmızı figürlü vazolar üzerinde en çok tercih edilen mitolojik mücadele sahneleri Amazonomakhia, Geranomakhia ve Grypomakhia'dır. Mitolojik mücadele sahneleri 19. yüzyılın son çeyreğinden itibaren çeşitli şekillerde araştırmalara konu olmuştur. S.Colvin, F. Vian, D. v. Bothmer ve B. Schiffler gibi bazı araştırmacılar sahneleri ya da figürleri tipolojik olarak sınıflandırmışlar ve farklı dönemlerdeki tipolojik değişimlerine değinmişlerdir. Öte yandan F.B. Tarbell, T. Hölscher, M. Langner ve M. Mangold gibi diğerleri ise sahneleri anlamsal olarak değerlendirmişlerdir. Bu çalışmada araştırmalardaki farklı yaklaşımlar dikkate alınarak, mitolojik savaş tasvirlerinde sahne kompozisyonlarının ve figür ikonografilerinin farklı dönemlerde geçirdikleri değişim anahatlarıyla sunulmuştur. Sonuç bölümünde ise genel bir değerlendirme yapılarak araştırmadaki problemler ortaya konmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Makhia, Attika Üretimi Figürlü Seramikler, Gigantomakhia, Iliupersis, Amazonomakhia*

INTRODUCTION

According to Hölscher's standpoint there was no external threat in the early Greek Polis, until the Persians emerged as an enemy. This condition had determinative effects on the ornaments of the early Greek Vases that are decorated with frieses including animals like bull and wild goat, exotic animals and fantastic monsters (Hölscher 2000: 290). From Hölscher's point of view, the nature contained oppositions: It possessed both agricultural areas and the threats against the herds and growing grains. The nature, both beneficial and threatening at the same time was therefore also the main subject for the vase paintings in the early Greek Polis (Hölscher 2000: 288).

By the second quarter of the 6th century BC (by ca. 560 BC) the anthropocentric subjects became dominant on the Athenian Figure Pottery (Shapiro 1990: 135). By this time mythological war scenes started to hold an important place in the subject repertoire.

From the end of the 19th century mythological war scenes on the Athenian Figure Pottery have been constituted the main subject of numerous research topics until today. The composition of the scenes and the iconography of the figures have been discussed from different aspects. The researchers tend to analyse the mythological war scenes with regard to the political developments at that time (Himmelmann 2001: 312; Ferrari 2003: 38 ff.), probably insofar as historical events didn't take part in Greek visual arts (Hölscher 2003, 3. fn. 4).

In the 1st, 2nd and 3rd section of this paper, in addition to the iconographic development of the representations, different considerations to their interpretation are referred. Some general approaches which are not mentioned in the aforecited sections are summarised below.

F. Lissargue, R. Osborne, T. Hölscher: Reflections of epic conventions in visual imagery

Lissargue remarks that mythological war scenes on the Athenian Figure Pottery don't correspond to real war customs at that time. According to him they are the reflections of the epic conventions. Although the epic conventions were not practised in real life, they were integrated into the visual imagery (Lissarague 1990: 80-81). This statement can be exemplified by the scene on the François Vase showing Ajax carrying the dead Achilles. As reported by Osborne this scene doesn't match the real death rituals described in the ancient literary sources, but rather can be interpreted as a metaphor for heroic death (Osborne 2012: 186). Referring the naked warriors on a Black Figure kylix from 6th century BC, Hölscher underscores that these scenes correspond to the Homeros' ideals and therefore contributed to heroise the warriors at that time (Hölscher 2003: 3).

F.B. Tarbell: Centauromachy and Amazonomachy as a visual imagery

There is no strictly implemented historical subject in Greek monumental art including Parthenon. From Tarbell's standpoint it would be a modern illusion to perceive Centauromachy and Amazonomachy as a metaphor for Greek against Barbar (Tarbell 1920:220). According to him Centauromachy is comparable with the mythological depictions such as Calydonian Boar Hunt and inholds no more than a concrete meaning (Tarbell 1920: 231). Also Shapiro referring a Siana Cup that originated from the tomb of a Thracian soldier supports Tarbell partially. On the obverse of the cup the Greeks are shown as defeated; whereas in the tondo Herakles is ready to abduct an Amazon. In his opinion, these scenes cannot be associated with a specific meaning, since the content of the both scenes are not coherent (Shapiro 1983: 110: fn. 32).

T. Hölscher: Opposite meanings of a single imagery

In his article "Feindwelten, Glückswelten. Perser, Kentauren und Amazonen", Hölscher argues that Attic Vase Paintings on occasion contain the opposite meanings of a spesific imagery. For instance the Persians don't always appeaer as enemy on the vase paintings, as is the case with Calydonian Boar Hunt scene on the François Vase where three men with oriental costume and oriental names are pictured beside the Greek hunters. Hölscher interprets this as a manifestation of the ethos, since both Greeks and men with oriental costume belong to the heroic world (Hölscher 2000: 288, fn.3).

F. Fless, M. Langner, O. J Jäggi, A. Petrakova: Archaeological Context of the Depicted Scenes

For a comprehensive analogy of the mythological war scenes on the Athenian Figure Pottery, literary sources and contemporary architectural sculpture are used in the first place usually. Recent studies

especially about the depictions on the Kerch Vases underscore the importance of the archaeological context for evaluating the pictured subjects. F. Fless refer the statistical data about the distribution of the depicted scenes including mythological war scenes on the Kerch Vases according to their geographical and archaeological context (Fless 2002: 84-86, 93-95). Also M. Langer (Langner 2013: 233, 234, 236), O. Jäggi (Jäggi 2012: 169-171) and A. Petrakova (Petrakova 2012: 151-163) give place to archaeological data in their iconography based studies.

Representations in Attic Figure Pottery:

Their Development and Approaches in the Research

I. 6TH CENTURY BC

By second quarter of the 6th century BC, in parallel with the rapid change in subject repertoire of the Athenian Figure Pottery Gigantomachy, Iliupersis, Amazonomachy and Centauromachy emerged as commonly used subjects. In the research these subjects are usually associated with the raising consciousness for Athenian identity in this period (Hildebrandt 2014: 75; see also Shapiro 1990: 137 f.), which is also evident in construction projects at Athenian Agora, and reorganisation of the Pantahenaia fest (Shapiro 1990: 138, fn. 19). In this regard each of the four subjects contributes to Athenian ideology in its own way: Gigantomachy in which Athena has a special role, is of great importance among the other subjects (Hildebrandt 2014: fn. 32). Iliupersis episodes represent the Greek symposium poetry in this period (Mangold 2000: 141-146). Also Amazonomachy and Centauromachy episodes including Athenian heroes, Theseus, Achilles and Herakles are in foreground in the 6th century BC. On the other hand Geranomachy (Steingräber 1999, 33) and Grypomachy (DNP1, 1996: 1082; Hdt. 3,116; 4, 13; 2) which have rather exotic narratives are rarely used subjects on the vases from the 6th and 5th centuries BC. Again in this period the number of depicted subjects from Corinthian and other external origins decreased and disappeared (Shapiro 1990: 138, 192).

Gigantomachy

In the 6th century BC Gigantomachy pictured to a large extent on the Athenian Black Figure Vases was a rarely used subject outside the Attica (Hildebrandt 2014: 75,fn. 39, 40)[1]. The earliest examples are provided by the Acropolis Vases (560-550 BC). As is the case with Lydos' Dinos in Brunswick (LIMC IV/1, 1988: 220, no. 171) Athena, Zeus and Herakles being in the center the scenes on the Acropolis Vases are composed as a long friese with many figures (Moore 1979: 97). As reported by Hildebrandt, Gigantomachy depicted on the peplos, that was offered to Athena during the Panathenaia Fest must have inspired the painters of the Acropolis Vases (Hildebrandt 2014: 75.fn. 31; Schefold 1978: 55). Also smaller compositions from the second half of the 6th century BC consist of a god against one or two giants[2] or occasionally several gods against several giants[3]. In the last quarter of the 6th century BC the most common depictions with one god on Black Figure comprise Athena and several Giants (LIMC IV/1, 1988: 222-246, Nos. 205-267).

In the 6th century BC both Giants and gods are depicted as hoplites and show no strict distinction in their iconography (Hesiod. Theog. 186). According to Hölscherr, gods can be distinguished from the Giants only by their attributes and special fight technics

[1] For the detailed classification of the Gigantomachy scenes before the Hellenistic Period see Vian 1952 and Vian 1951. The number of the Black Figure examples are 524 out of 652 available vases from the timespan 560-380 BC.

[2] LIMC IV/1, 1988: 226-227; Athena: LIMC IV/1, 1988: 222-246, nos. 205-267; Poseidon: LIMC IV/1, 1988: 226-227 nos. 268-288; Dionysos, LIMC IV/1, 1988: 289, nos. 227-228.

[3] Zeus and Herakles mounted, LIMC IV/1, 1988: 217-218, nos. 124-138; Athena and Herakles mounted: LIMC IV/1, 1988: 218-219 nos. 151-169; More than two gods: LIMC IV/1, 1988: 177-179.

(Hildebrandt 2014: 75). According to Hildebrant and Moore, the main concern of Gigantomachy scenes in the 6th century BC is not to figure a struggle between defending and offending parties, but to express the Athenian hegemonial consciousness (Hildebrandt 2014: 75; Moore 1979: 98).

Iliupersis

The repertoire of the different Iliupersis episodes on the Athenian Figure Pottery was established by the middle of the 6th century BC (Ferrari 2000: 122)[4]. The most frequently used episodes between 570-420 BC are: Rape of Cassandra by Ajax; slaughter of Priamos by Neoptolemos (with the corpse of Astyanax); escape of Aineas and Anchises, rescue of Aithra by her grandsons Demophon and Akamas; Helen and Menelaos (Mangold 2000: 139). Especially in second and third quarters of the 6th century BC the depicted scenes comprise at most two or three of these episodes[5]. By the end of the 6th century BC especially by emergence of the Red Figure Technique, the number of large scale scenes (*grand ensemble*) consisting of three or more scenes increase. Oltos Painter's Kylix at J. Paul Getty Musuem in Malibu (LIMC VIII/1, 1997: 652 no. 5, 6.) shows the episodes of Ajax-Cassandra, Menelaos- Helen and Priamos- Neoptolemos. In contrast to the Black Figured examples, Priamos was shown naked on Oltos Kylix.

In the 6th century BC there is no clear difference between the Troians and the Greeks both in attitude and general appearance (Hölscher 2000: 288). These depictions, as stated by Moraw, including the two main themes: Happiness is a perishable pleasure and human

[4] See also Anderson 1997 passim; for the earliest depictions of Iliupersis on Greek Vases see Ervin 1963: 37-75.

[5] As is the case with Lydos' Dinos in Louvre Museum: LIMC VIII/I, 1997: 651, no. 2: On the Louvre Dinos: Ajax – Cassandra and Neoptolemos- Astyanax Episodes are depicted.

greed, can be associated with the symposium poetry at that time (Mangold 142-144; see also Moraw 2003: 338).

Centauromachy

In respect of their mythos, Centauroi are associated with horror imagery and perceived as a symbol of threat from the side of noncivilized groups which poleis were confronted (Hölscher 2000: 291; Scobie 1978: 142-147; Nash 1984: 273-291)

Centauroi were already depicted on the Geometric Pottery (Colvin 1880: 107). By the second quarter of the 6th century BC the Centauromachy scenes including Greek Heroes like Herakles, Achilles and Theseus are in the foreground (Boardman 1976: 3-18; Shapiro 1990: 128; see also Shapiro 1990: fn. 17). The Centaur's fight against Lapiths at the wedding feast of Peirithoos (Thessalian Centauromachy) emerged about 560 BC on the François Vase for the first time (Boardman 1974: fig. 46.1-8). Along with the Thessalian Centauromachy the widespread depicted Centauromachy episodes in the 6th and 5th centuries BC are: Arcadian Centauromachy including the Herakles on the Mount Pholos episode and Herakles- Nessos episode including Deianeira occasionally (Colvin 1880: 111-116).

On François Vase The friese composition consists of many figures from both parties differ from the Peloponnesian style (Baur 1912: 12). Centauroi whose front legs were equine, depicted with long hair and human face holding a branch in their hands. The Lapiths were depicted as the Greek warriors with their shield, corselet, helmet and spear.

By emergence of the Red Figure Technique in the last quarter of the 6th century BC, the variety of the figure iconography increases clearly. On a Red Figure Kylix in London attributed to Epiktetos Painter, Herakles was depicted in Mount Pholoe episode fighting against 3 Centauroi (LIMC VII/1, 1997: 694, no. 267). As is the case with Herakles, Greek fighters started to be shown with naked body

holding a spear, lance and helmet. Centauroi were depicted both with human and silen features (Schiffler 1976: 23, A70, 89, see also fn. 38).

Also a noteworthy example from this period is Caineus episode of the Thessalien Centauromachy on a neck amphora in Kiel (CVA, Deutschland 55, 1988, 32-33, Fig.11, Pls. 2677, 2678). The depicted scene is unique since two cavallier are attacking Caineus instead of Centauroi. Kaşka specifies this composition as a mythological error since it has no other known parallel (Kaşka 2010: 52).

Amazonomachy

The earliest Amazonomachy scene was represented on an Athenian Black Figure Vase in the second quarter of the 6th century BC, without any precessors on Protoattic Vases (Bothmer 1957: 1-5; Blok 1995). The first episode from the second quarter of the 6th century BC is Herakles and Hippolyte (Shapiro 1983: 105: fn.3; Bothmer 1957: 6). Right after it, around 540 BC Achilles and Pentehesileia and in the last two decades of the 6th century BC Antiope's abduction by Theseus (Shapiro 1983, 105, 106.) were established in the subject repertoire. Among all episodes Herakles and the Amazonomachy was the most preferred one.

The earliest depictions on Thyrrhenian Amphorai (Bothmer 1957: 6-8, Nos.4-22) are composed as crowded scenes consisting of numerous Amazons and Greeks as is the case with Louvre Dinos (CVA, France 2, 1923: Pl. 67, 68, 69). Two heroes Telamon and Herakles are depicted back to back on the scene.

Both Amazons and Greeks are dressed as hoplites over the course of the 6th century BC. But unlike Amazons, Greek warriors wear corselet over chiton (see also Bothmer 1957: 13). Furthermore occasionally used white for skin colour of the Amazons implies femail gender (Shapiro 1983: 105). It is worth quoting Shapiro's considerations about Amazon iconography at this point. As reported by him although the origin of the Amazons are generally assigned to the

very distant lands, they were depicted in almost the same manner with the allies of the Troians like Thracians and Lydians (see Shapiro 1983:106, fn.7; Raeck 1981: 30, 69).

Special iconographies such as Amazon as a Thracian hoplite, equipped with pelta shield, and Alopekis cap or animal skin (Shapiro 1983: 107) or Scythian archer (Shapiro 1983: 111) are usually associated with contact between the Greeks and these communities[6]. According to A. Ivantchik the Scyhian archers that were depicted on the Athenian Vases between 530 to 490 has nothing to do with ethnic identity. They rather refer hierarchy of the depicted figures. In his opinion Schythian Archers symbolise the subsidiary heroes who accompany the main heroes (Ivantchik 2006, 196). These special iconographies can be associated with ethnicity initially in the course of the Persian wars but in this case regarding the Persian ethnicity (Ivantchik 2006, 196; see also Ivantchik 2013: 73-87).

Another extraordinary representations of Amazons are: Amazons fighting each other. This type appears on the Thyrrhenian Amphorai for the first time (575-550 BC). As reported by M. Kaşka this type was rendered consciously and it was a new type on itself (Kaşka 2010: 49-62).

Grypomachy

Arimaspoi that were living on the other side of the Issedones, stole the gold of Gryp (DNP1, 1996: 1082; Hdt. 3,116; 4, 13; 2). Grypomachy, battle between Arimaspoi from the northern highlands (DNP1, 1996: 1082; Hdt. 3,116; 4, 13; 27) and winged, bird headed

[6] Contact by means of Thracian or Scyhthian mercenaries or trade relations: Shapiro 1983: 112; see also Ivantchik 2013: 73-87. For Sauromatae from Amazon and Scyhthian origin see Hdt. 4.11 0-16 and 6.40.1.

Gryp (DNP4, 1998: 1218; Flagge 1975: 7-9) is regarded to be a metaphor for protecting Greek wealth (Flagge 1975, 53).

On the Athenian Figure Pottery Grypomachy emerged by the middle of the 6th century BC (Flagge 1975, 53. See also fn. 6). In the 6th and 5th centuries BC it was used as a minor subject and pictured on the small frises on the band cups or less visible parts of the big vessels such as standing of the François Vase (Beazley1956: 76.1, 682). Also it was not a widespread used subject in the Archaic and early Classical Period (MacDonald 1987, 2).

Geranomachy

The most common subject related to the Pygmies is their fight against storks (Steingräber 1999, 33). In Ilias 3,7 Homer compares the Trojans with the belligerent Troians (see also LIMC VII/1, 1997: 594 ff.). Steingräber summarises the incidence they are symbolising as a reaction of the farmers against the storks who damage the growing grains, while wintering in Africa and spending summer in Thracian and Scythian settlement areas in North (*Aristophanes Av. 232*; for detailed bibliography see also Steingräber 1999: 30 fn. 22). Although Pygmie attack on Oinoe or Herakles are known from the literary sources, yet these episodes are not identified in visual arts (Steingräber 1999: 33).

In Archaic Period Geranomachy was a subordinated subject that was pictured on the rim or shoulder of the bigger vessels and on the narrow frieses of band cups (Steingräber 1999: 33). In the 6th century BC the scenes consist of many figures (Steingräber 1999: 36 for figure pottery from Ionian and Corinthian other origin see Freyer-Schauenburg, 1975: 77). The earliest known example is the François Vase among the Athenian productions (Freyer-Schauenburg 1975, 76). They are pictured in human physiognomy but their small size in comparison with the storks refers dwarfness. Pygmies are dressed with breast plate, chitoniskos and pointed cap (Freyer –Schauenburg 1975: 78; Steingräber 1999: 34).Caricatured features as is the case on a band

cup from Berlin was just an exception in this period (Freyer-Schauenburg 1975: 78, Pl. 15c).

Most widespread scenes in the Archaic Period are: Pygmy and a stork on his shoulder and fallen pygmy and a stork on it (Steingräber 1999: 31). Pygmy attacked by the storks from both side on Nearchos' Aryballos (Beazley 1956: 83.4, 682; Freyer –Schauenburg 1975:77 fn. 19) and fallen pygmy assaulted by the storks on Würzburg 414 Painter's Droop Cup (Beazley 1956: 160; Freyer –Schauenburg 1975: 78 fn. 24) are some of the examples for the Archaic compositions.

II. 5TH CENTURY BC

Mythological war scenes on the figure pottery considered to be related with the Persian wars during the first two decades of the 5th century. According to D. Castriota after the victory of the Athenians in the leadership of Athenian politicians, the traditional versions of mythoi were modified to the new version that emphasize the *sophorsyne* (wisdom) versus *hybris* (greed) (F 1996: 413, Castriota 1992: 17-32). The metops of Parthenon in which Athena and the Athenian heroes play a part were interpreted as a allegorie of victorious struggle of justice over the perpetrators of violence (Ferrari 2000, 120). Similar approach is also adopted by the researchers who are engaged in iconography of the Athenian Figure pottery. Especially Gigantomachy and Iliupersis are perceived as metaphor for the Persian wars (Tarbell 1920, 227: Steiner 1996: 413).

Gigantomachy

Iconography of the Gigantomachy scenes in the 5th century BC is predicated on the Red Figure Pottery in this period. Big compositions *grand ensemble* consisting of many figures in the 5th century BC is depicted in Red Figure Technique (LIMC IV/1, 1988: 228-230, nos. 298-322). In the first quarter of the 5th century individual fight is at the forefront. As is the case with Brygos Painter's Red Figure cup in Berlin, warriors offending, defending and fallen on the ground provide a vivid

expression to the scene and by this means contradiction between the two parties is emphasized clearly.

Suessula Painter's Amphora in Paris (Hildebrandt 2014: 76, LIMC IV/1, 1988: 230 no. 322) and Pronomos Painter's Krater in Athens (LIMC IV/1, 1988: 230, no. 316) exemplifiy the fundamental changes in the composition of the Gigantomachy scenes at the end of the 5th century BC. Compositions on these vessels consist of two ledges and giants are placed below. As reported by Hildebrandt Gigantomachy lost its meaning by the end 5th century BC (Hildebrandt 2014: 76).

Iliupersis

According to Ferrari and Mangold different episodes of the Iliupersis scenes on the Athenian figure pottery can be investigated in association with Persian Wars in that period (Ferrari 2000, 121; Mangold 2000: 112). There is a clear increase in Iliupersis scenes by 490 BC on the Archaic Red Figure pottery (Ferrari 2000: 120). The examples from the first quarter of the 5th century BC constitute the 75% of all available examples of Athenian figure pottery. An extensive scene with several different episodes of the battle, was a characteristic of Iliupersis in Red Figure in the first decades of the 5th century BC (Mangold 2000: 112; Moraw 2003: 341). Onesimos' Cup in Rome, Brygos' Cup in Louvre Museum and Kleophrades' Vivenzio Hydria provide insight into the general conventions of the era. All the three of them include the episodes, Priamos' murder by Neoptolemos (in a central position of the vase) and Polyxena taken away by Akamas (to be sacrificed upon Achilles' tomb). According to M.J. Anderson and D. Willimas by these episodes in central position of the vases defeat of the Troians is emphasized clearly (Anderson 1995: 131; see also Williams 1991, 60). Also in these scenes there is an explicit reference to the sacredness through the imagery of the altar with Zeus Herkeios inscription on the Priamos episode and Athena statue on Cassandra episode (Williams 1991, 60). By the early Classical Period, depicted

scenes related to the Troian war decrease in number evidently (Boardman 1976: 3).

Towards the middle of the century the compositions consist of two episodes: One on obverse and one on reverse. The general characteristics of the period can be traced on the Altamura Painter's crater in Boston[7] (Beazley 1963: 590, 11.), Niobid Painter's volute craters in Bologna[8] (Beazley 1963: 598, 1; 599, 8) [9] and in Ferrara Museo Nazionale (Beazley 1963: 601, 18) [10]. Altar in the scenes where Priamos is murdered and Athena Statue on Cassandra epidodes refer destroyed temples and hopeless appeal of the affected people for help (Moraw 2003: 341) . According to Mangold there are two main themes on these scenes from 470-420 BC: disrespectful violence against god and contrast of the human behaviour (Moignard 2002: 395-396; Moraw 2003: 337-341). After the Persian wars, the time interval of 470-420 BC considered to be the last phase of the Iliupersis episodes on the Athenian Figure Pottery (Moraw 2003: 341; Mangold 2000: 149).

Centauromachy

By the first half of the 5th century BC red figure examples are also determinant for the iconography of Centauromachy (Schiffler 1976: 26). On the Red Figure cup of Paris Gigantomachy Painter with Herakles on the Mount Pholos episode, the Centauroi are shown with an animal skin on their body (Schiffler 1976: 25; A87, 91, 96, 100). Also some of the Centauroi with short hair and long beard emphasize the contrast between the two parties (Schiffler 1976: A 85, 89, 92/ Taf. 5).

---

[7] Reverse: Aeneas carries Anchises from Troy; obverse: Cassandra-Ajax, Priamos – Neoptolemos.

[8] Cassandra- Ajax and Aithra-Demophon- Akamas; reverse: Priamos-Neoptolemos.

[9] Aithra- Akamas- Demophon; Menelaos-Helen in front of the Apollo Temple.

[10] Reverse: Aeneas- Anchises, Menelaos ve Helen; obverse: Priamos- Neoptolemos.

From the middle of the 5th century BC Theseus and Peirithoos Wedding Episode of Thessalian Centauromachy become very popular (Schiffler 1976: 24, dn. 43, see also. Tül Tulunay 1986: 19-35). Centauroi were started to be pictured in silen physiognomy before the middle of the 5th century BC. (CVA, Italy 37, 1967: Pl.(1681) 37,1-2). In the last quarter of the 5th century BC iconographic variety of the depicted figures reached its peak that can be exemplified by the Aristophanes' Cup in Boston (LIMC VIII/1 1997: 687, 184). On the exterior of the Boston Cup Thessalian Centauromachy is depicted whereas on the tondo Herakles, Nessos and Deianeira Episode. Centauroi are shown with human face and equipped with diverse weapons such as broken hydria rim and lamp stand.

Amazonomachy

By the introduction of the Red Figure also Amazonomachy scenes show a wide range of compositions. On the tondo of Penthesileia Painter's name vase from the beginning of the 5th century BC the main composition here consists of two fighting figures. Standing Achilles stick a knife into the Penthesileia's chest (Bothmer 1957: 147). Penthesileia is now depicted with a short chiton and hairband on her head rather than equipped like a hoplite. Second Amazon on the right side of the scene is dressed with a long sleeved oriental costume whereas Achilles is naked.

In the Early Classical Period, Theseus and Antiope became a popular episode on the Red Figure pottery (Bothmer 1957: 167, no. 6). The icographic variety of the Early Classical Period can be exemplified by Berlin Hydria Painter's calyx crater (Beazley 1963: 616.3, 1662). Frontal pictured, mounted Amazon (Antiope?) on the obverse is dressed with short chiton, long oriental trouser and animal skin. The other Amazons on the scene dressed only with chiton or alternatively armor over the chiton. The Amazons are equipped with peltashield and oriental cap with rounded end. The Greeks are depicted with chiton,

armor, helmet and shield. On the other hand on the reverse of the vase there is a naked Greek warrior with a petasos on his head.

Bothmer investigates the Early Classical Amazonomachy on the figure pottery in consideration of the sculptures rendered by Mikon and Pheidias to whom the sculptures of Stoa Poikile, Parthenon West Metops and Schield of the Athena Parthenos' cult statue are attributed (Bothmer 195: 163). Also with regard to compostion of the scenes and iconography of the figures, Niobid Painter's craters in Napoli (LIMC I/1, 1981: 606, no. 298) and in Ferrara Museum (Boardman 1989: Fig. 6) are comparable with the wall paintings of the Early Classical Period (Bothmer 1957: 167).

Again in this period Amazon mounted on a rampant horse was depicted for the first time, which will be the characteristic of the 4th century Amazonomachy (Beazley 1963: 613.1, 1662). According to Langner, by late 5th century Amazons were no longer depicted as defeated; on the contrary they were shown as a threat against the Greeks (Langner 2013: 223). Chiton and corselet, conventional outfit of the Amazons were already disappeared by 420 (Langner 2013: 225).

4TH CENTURY BC

In the 4th century BC Gigantomachy and Iliupersis were rarely pictured subjects on the Athenian figure pottery; they lost their meaning in the 4th century BC (Hildebrandt 2014: 76; Mangold 2000:112). Mangold represents the standpoint that Iliupersis scenes make sense only if they are investigated in association with the Persian wars (Mangold 2000:112). Centauromachy also fall out of favor in this period. Available examples show incoherent iconography as is the case with Leningrad Kerch Pelike (Schiffler 1976: 24; A136/Taf. 4) and Berlin Pelike (Schiffler 1976: 29, A135). On these vases Centaur occurs with both human or silen features, occasionally also with white skin. Depicted weapons show likewise a greater variety than ever.

Kerch Vases that constitute the significant part of the Red Figure pottery of 4th century BC. encompass notable changes in the repertoire of the depicted subjects (DNP 6, 1999: 448: see also Langner 2007, 19; see also Braund 2007: passim.). Amazonomachy, Grypomachy and Geranomachy become the most frequently pictured mythological war scenes (Steingräber 1999: 33). This case attempted to be clarified in different ways: According to the first standpoint, these subjects were pictured toward the demand from the settlements on Black Sea Coast (DNP 6, 1999: 448; Steingräber 1999: 33). Langner supports this statement by the statistical data about the available examples. Accordingly Amazonomachy, Grypomachy and their protomes constitute the most frequently depicted subjects on the Vases of Group G that originated from Crimea and Bosporan Kingdom. However in Italy, Egypt and Kyrenaika Greeks fighting against Persians were most preferred war scenes at that time (Langner 2007: 18, 19).

Likewise Jäggi predicates his assumptions to the statistical data from the Kerch region but she approaches the case from a different standpoint. As reported by Jäggi the Kerch Vases from Pantikapaion were found only from the graves of ordinary communities, whereas the necropoleis of the dynasts (e.g. Yuz Oba Kurgan) lack the Kerch Vases (Jäggi 2012,169; for the statistic see also: Petrakova 2012: 151-163). This data indicates that Kerch Vases didn't have a special importance for the settlements in Bosporan Kingdom, they were rather regarded as a massware there (Jäggi 2012, 170). In Jäggi's point of view Kerch Vases were already produced according to Athenian taste, but they gained a new meaning in the Pantikapaion region (Jäggi 2012,168, 169, see also Schefold 1934, 148). Also import continuity of the Kerch Vases in Pantikapaion throughout the 4th century BC has got to do with the central location of the city on the shore of Black Sea (Jäggi 2012: 170).

Amazonomachy and Grypomachy

In research Amazonomachy and Grypomachy, most frequently pictured subjects on Kerch Vases, are classified into three groups (Langner 2007: 19, see also Jäggi 2012: 167). The stereotypes of the first group are comprehensible by an Amazonomachy scene on a Kerch Pelike in Ermittage Museum: Amazon mounted on a rampant horse fights against Greek warriors. Amazon holding a spear is dressed with a long sleeved garment and long trousers (Jäggi 2012: 167, Fig. 6), whereas both of the opponents holding spear are shown naked with a chimation on shoulder. The eye contact between the Amazon and Greek warrior appear to be another cliche of the first group (Langner 2013: 232).

Grypomachy

In the second type a bearded man (Arimasp/Persian?) pursues a Gryp (Langner 2013, 226 f.). In this group besides the masculine figures there are also feminine figures that fight against Gryps (Langner 2013: 226: fn. 31, see also Langner 2007: 19) as is the case with pelike from Olba (Jäggi 2012: 168 Fig. 9). This refers a confused iconography of the depicted figures. It is not easy, in some cases impossible to determine the difference between the Arimaspoi and Amazons. Langner associated the ambiguity of Amazon and Arimasp iconogographies with the uncertainty of their origins (Langner 2013: 228 for detailed bibliography sees also Langner 2013: 228, fn. 38)

Protomes of Amazon/Arimasp? Horse and Gryphon

The 3rd group constitute the 15% of all available subjects on Bosporan Pelikai (Langner 2007, 18, see also Jäggi 2012: 168). In research promotes are interpreted as abbreviations of the Amazonomachy and Grypomachy scenes and explained in different ways. According to Schefold, Amazon promotes were representing the image of the local mother goddess which was associated with Artemis in the beginning and later on with Aphrodite in Bosporan Kingdom

(Shefolld 1934, 148). Since these vessels are originated from the burials from the northern shores of Black Sea, some researchers tend to associate them with chthonic deities of the region (Jäggi 2012: 169 dn. 28; here he refers K Scheffold and N. Jijina). Gryp was the emblem of the Bosporan Kingdom. The coins of Phanagoreia was minted with gryp, and horse promote depicted mutually (Langner 2007: 34). Iconographic intricacy can also be observed in third group. As is the case with first and second group, in some examples difference between Amazons and Arimaspoi is not shown by the details like white skin or beard (Langner 2013: 227, fn. 35).

Amazons that fight each other emerge also in this period (Kaşka 2010: 49). As reported by M. Langner these scenes symbolise a conflict between two different Scythian tribes (Langner 2007: 34).

Geranomachy

In the 4th century BC Geranomachy is depicted for the first time as the main subject on the Athenian Figure Pottery (Steingräber 1999: 34). As is the case with Grypomachy, also Geranomachy scenes consist of small number of figures in this period (Steingräber 1999: 36). In the 5th and 4th century BC the pygmies are pictured with khlamys or animal skin and helmet or cap (Steingräber 1999, 35). Caricatured features are widespread in the 4th century BC (Steingräber 1999, 35; see also LIMC VII/1, 1994: 595, no. 15, 16).

CONCLUSION

Until the middle of the 20th century the researchers tend to classify the mythological war scenes on the Athenian Figure Pottery extensively according to their typology. S. Colvin, V.C.P. Baur, D. Bothmer, B. Schiffler and F. Vian concentrated on the changing figure iconography mainly. On the other hand by the second half of the 20th century increasing interest in interpreting the scenes is explicitly identifiable. Considering the iconographic changes and literary sources

researchers including M. Mangold, F. Hildebrandt, A. Ivantschik and G. Ferrari attempted to interpret the meaning of the scenes recently.

Although each of the mythological wars has different narratives, from time to time they refer similar messages. The depicted scenes from the 6th century BC are generally associated with the raising consciousness for Greek identity and Greek hegemonial thought. There is neither offender nor defender side also no significant iconographic difference between the two fighting parties. Giants, Amazons and Troians are very similar with their opponents. In the 5th century BC mythological war scenes on the Athenian Figure Vases are usually associated with the Persian wars. Especially Iliupersis consisting of different episodes represents most comprehensive scenes in this period. Discrepancy between the two fighting parties is emphasized by composition of the scenes and iconography of the figures. By the second half of the 5th century BC Gigantomachy and Iliupersis scenes on the Athenian Figure Pottery decrease in number and lose their meaning. Centauromachy emerge occasionally but also without a coherent iconography and message. Amazonomachy, Grypomachy and Geranomachy become the major subjects on the Kerch Vases in the 4th century BC. According to Langner Amazon mounted on a rampant horse expresses a real threat in this period.

Apart from the aforecited assessments, a group of researchers including T. Hölscher, D. Castriota, and G. Ferrari who approach the subject from different aspects provide another point of view to the spectators. As reported by Hölscher Attic Vase Paintings on occasion contain the opposite meanings of a specific imagery. D. Castriota refers the intricacy of the myth, ethos and actuality on the depicted scenes in his monography. Also G. Ferrari attempts to draw attention to the difference between the myth and genre in his article.

The Mythological war scenes on the Athenian Figure Pottery have been interpreted extensively by analogy with literary sources, architectural sculptures and wall paintings. An important deficiency in

the research is lacking archaeological context of the investigated scenes. Since the archaeological context may shed light on the intended purpose of the vessel, it provides another dimension for interpreting the depicted scenes. In recent years some researchers including F. Fless, M. Langner, A. Petrakova and O. Jäggi attempt to associate the archaeological context with the depicted scenes.

It is crucial to state that certain flexibility is required in interpreting the mythological war scenes since the vase painters in comparison with sculptors, enjoyed the freedom that material and technique offer. It became apparent especially in variety of compositions and figure iconography. There are unusual compositions such as Amazons fighting each other; also some minor types in figure iconography like Amazon with Thracian pelta and Amazon as Scythian archer. Besides these there are unique scenes which are in view to be error products such as Caineus being attacked by the cavalry men instead of the Centauroi.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Michael John (1995). ”Onesimos and the Interpretation of the Iliupersis Iconography”, The JHS 115/1: 130-135.

Anderson, Michael John (1997). The Fall of Troy in early Greek Poetry and Art, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Baur, Paul Victor Christopher (1912). Centaurs in ancient art: The Archaic Period, Berlin, Curtius.

Beazley, John Davidson (1956). Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Beazley, John Davidson (1963). Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters 2nd Edition, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Blok, Josine (1995). The Early Amazons. Modern and Ancient Perspectives on a Persistent Myth, Leiden, Brill.

Boardman, John (1974). Athenian Black Figure Vases, London, Thames & Hudson.

Boardman, John (1976). "The Klephrades Painter at Troy" AntK, 19/ 1, 3-18.

Boardman, John (1989). Athenian Red Figure Vases, the Classical period: a Handbook, London, World of Art.

Bothmer, Dietrich von (1957). Amazons in Greek Art, Oxford: Clarendon.

Braund, David (2007). Black Sea Grain for Athens, from Herodotus to Demosthenes, The Black Sea in Antiquity, V. Gabrielsen- J. Lund (eds.), Aarhus, Aarhus University Press.

Colvin, Stephen (1880). "On Representations of Centaurs in Greek Vase-Painting" JHS 1: 107-167.

Castriota, David (1992). Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth Century B.C. Athens. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press.

CVA, Deutschland 55 (1988). Kiel 1, Kunsthalle Antikensammlung 1, von Brigitte Freyer-Schauenburg, München, C.H. Beck.

CVA, France 2 (1923). Louvre 2, by. E. Pottier, Paris, Champion.

CVA, Italy 37 (1963). Ferrara 1, Museo Nazionale 1, by P.E. Arias, Roma, Libreria dello Stato.

DNP I (1996). "Arimaspoi", R. Gordon, Stuttgart, Weimer, J.B. Metzler: 1081.

DNP IV (1998). "Gryp" Maria Leventopoulou, Stuttgart, Weimer, J.B. Metzler: 609-610.

DNP VI (1999). "Kertcher Vasen", S. Drougou, Stuttgart, J.B. Metzlersche Verlag: 447-448.

Ervin, Miriam (1963). "A relief Pithos from Mykonos", Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον18/1: 37-75.

Ferrari, Gloria (2000). “The Ilioupersis in Athens”, HSCP 100: 119-150.

Ferrari, Gloria (2003). “Myth and Genre on Athenian Vases” ClAnt 22/1: 37-54.

Flagge, Ingeborg (1975). Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des Greifen, Sankt Augustin, Richarz.

Fless, Frederike (2002). Rotfigurige Keramik als Handelsware: Erwerb und Gebrauch attischer Vasen im mediterranen und pontischen Raum während des 4.Jhs. v. Chr. Rahden/Westf. : M. Leidorf.

Freyer-Schauenburg, Brigitte (1975). “Die Geranomachie in der Archaischen Vasenmalerei. Zu einem pontischen Kelch in Kiel”, in: Wandlungen. Studien zur antiken und neueren Kunst Ernst Homann-Wedeking gewidmet, Institut für Klassische Archäologie der Universität München (ed.), Walsassen, Stiftlang Verlag: 76-83.

Hildebrandt, Frank (2014). “The Gigantomachy in Attic and Apulian Vase-Painting. A New Look at Similarities, Differences and Origins”, in: Athenian Potters and Painters 3, J.Oakley (ed.), Oxford, Oxbow Books: 75-79.

Himmelmann, Nicolaus (2001). “Klassische Archaeologie, Kritische anmerkungen zur Methode”, JdI, 15 (2000): 254-323.

Hölscher, Tonio (2000). “Feindwelten, Glückswelten. Perser, Kentauren und Amazonen”, in: Gegenwelten: zu den Kulturen Griechenlands und Roms in der Antike, T. Hölscher (ed.): München: Leipzig: Saur: 287-320.

Hölscher, Tonio (2003). “Images of war in Greece and Rome: between military practice, public memory, and cultural symbolism” JRS 93: 1-17.

Ivantchik, Askold (2006). “Scythian' Archers on Archaic Attic Vases: Problems of Interpretation”, Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia 12/ 3: 197 – 271.

Ivantchik, Askold (2013). “Amazonen, Skythen und Sauromaten: Alte und moderne Mythen”, in: Amazonen zwischen Griechen und Skythen : Gegenbilder in Mythos und Geschichte, C. Schubert, A. Weiss (eds.) , Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 310, Berlin: De Gruyter: 73-87.

Jäggi, Othmer (2012).” Attische Vasen des 4. Jhs. Aus Kerc und Umgebung: Fragen zu Gebrauch, Verteilung und Rezeption”, in: Vasenbilder im Kulturtransfer: Zirkulation und Rezeption Griechischer Keramik im Mittelmeerraum, S. Schmidt, A. Stähli (eds.), München: C. H. Beck: 165-176.

Kaşka, Mehmet (2010). “Darstellungen Gegeneinander Kämpfender Amazonen”, Arkeoloji Dergisi 15: 49-62.

Koçel Erdem, Zeynep (2008). “The Cult and the Mythological Scenes on Athenian Export Red Figure Vases During the 4th Century B.C”, Anodos. Studies of the Ancient World 6/7 (2006/2007): 241-252.

Langner, Martin (2007). “Fremdheit im Mythos”, in: Griechen, Skythen, Amazonen in: U. Kästner, M. Langner, B. Rabe (edts.), Berlin, Freie Universität, Institut für Klassische Archäologie: 31-33.

Langner, Martin (2013). “Amazonen auf Kertscher Vasen: Wechselnde Blickwinkel auf ein populäres Bildmotiv”, in: Amazonen Zwischen Griechen und Skythen, Gegenbilder in Mythos und Geschichte, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 310, Berlin, de Gruyter: 221-257.

LIMC I/I (1981). “Amazones”, P. Devambez, A. Kaufmann-Samaras, Zuric, Munic, Artemis Verlag: 586-653.

LIMC IV/I (1988). “Gigantes”, F. Vian, M. B. Moore, Zuric, Munic, Artemis Verlag: 191-270.

LIMC VII/I (1994). “Pygmaioi”, V. Dasen, Zuric, Munic, Artemis Verlag: 594-600.

LIMC VIII/I (1997). “Iliupersis”, M. Pipili, Zurich/Düsseldorf, Artemis Verlag: 650-657.

LIMC VIII/I (1997). “Kentauroi et Kentaurides”, C. Weber-Lehmann, Zurich/Düsseldorf, Artemis Verlag: 671-727.

Lissarague, François (1990). L’autre guerrier Archer, peltastes, cavaliers dans ı’imageri attique, Paris, La Découverte.

Macdonald, Kathleen (1987). The Grypomachy In Fourth-Century Attic Vase-Painting, unpubl. Master Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies at Mc Master University, Hamilton/ Ontario.

Mangold, Meret (2000). Kassandra in Athen: die Eroberung Trojas auf Attischen Vasenbildern, Berlin, Reimer.

Moignard, Elizabeth (2002). “Meret Mangold: Kassandra in Athen. Die Eroberung Trojas auf attischen Vasenbildern. Berlin: Reimer 2000”, rev. in: The Classical Review New Series 52/2: 395-396.

Moraw, Susanne (2003). “Meret Mangold: Kassandra in Athen. Die Eroberung Trojas auf attischen Vasenbildern. Berlin: Reimer 2000”, rev. in: Gnomon, 75/4: 337-341.

Moore, Mary (1979). “Lydos and the Gigantomachy”, AJA 83/1: 79-99.

Nash, Harvey (1984). "The Centaur's Origin: A Psychological Perspective", CW, 77/5: 273-291.

Osborne, Robin (2012). “Polysemy and its Limits: Controlling the Interpretation of Greek Vases in Changing Cultural Context”, in: Vasenbilder im Kulturtransfer: Zirkulation und Rezeption griechischer Keramik im Mittelmeerraum, S. Schmidt, A. Stähli (edts.). München: C. H. Beck:177-186.

Petrakova, Anna (2012). ” Late Attic Red-figure Vases from Burials in the Kerč Area: The Question of Interpretation in Ancient and Modern Contexts”, in: Vasenbilder im Kulturtransfer: Zirkulation und Rezeption Griechischer Keramik im Mittelmeerraum, S. Schmidt, A. Stähli (eds.), München: C. H. Beck: 151-163.

Raeck, Wulf (1981). Zum Barbarenbild in der Kunst Athens im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Bonn, R. Habelt.

Shapiro, Harvey Alan (1983). "Amazons, Thracians, and Scythians", GRBS 24: 105-114.

Shapiro, Harvey Alan (1990). "Old and New Heroes: Narrative, Composition, and Subject in Attic Black-Figure", ClAnt 9: 114-148.

Schefold, Karl (1934). Untersuchungen zu den Kertscher Vasen, Berlin, de Gruyter.

Schefold, Karl (1978). Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen in der Spätarchaischen Kunst, München, Hirmer.

Schiffler, Birgitta (1976). Die Typologie des Kentauren in der Antiken Kunst: vom 10. bis zum Ende d. 4. Jhs. v. Chr. (Archäologische Studien; No. 4) Frankfurt/M, Bern, Lang.

Scobie, Alex (1978). "The Origins of Centaurs", Folklore 89/2: 142-147.

Steiner, Ann (1996). "David Castriota. Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth Century B.(Athens. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992" Rev. in: The Classical World 89/5: 413.

Steingräber, Stefan (1999). "Zum Ikonografischen und Hermeneutischen Wandel von Pygmäen- und speziell Geranomachiedarstellungen in Vorhellenistischer Zeit, 6. - 4./3. Jh. v.Chr.", MeditArch 12*:* 29-41.

Tarbell, Frank Bigelow (1920). "Centauromachy and Amazonomachy in Greek Art: The Reasons for Their Popularity", AJA 24/ 3: 226-231.

Tül Tulunay, Elif (1986). Theseus ve Kentauromakhi, İstanbul, Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları.

Vian, Francis (1951). Répertoire des gigantomachies figurées dans l'art grec et romain, Paris, C. Klincksieck.

Vian, Francis (1952). La Guerre des Géants: le Mythe avant l'Époque Hellénistique, Paris, C. Klincksieck.

Williams, Dyfri (1991). "Onesimos and the Getty Iliupersis". Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum 5, Occasional Papers on Antiquities 7: 41-64.