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Analysis of the Corinthian school in terms of vase-painters may be, in the words of a classic authority, 'a somewhat unremunerative task' but it has its uses, as the passage quoted goes on to demonstrate (1). Some vases invite this method on purely aesthetic grounds; prominent among them are certain Middle Corinthian cups, and pots (especially kraters) closely associated with them, in the 'style of Timonidas'. The term is Payne's - like many of his groupings, tentative, not meant to be pressed too far or taken too literally. Taken literally it is not in fact a good term, suggesting as it does a more direct connection of every work with one personality than one may feel it prudent to postulate: 'Circle of Timonidas' would better describe the relationship.

Study of one subject is a poor approach to questions of style, but padded dancers in two ways have a special relevance here. Elsewhere this motive leads a humble existence, on cheap vases, the backs of pots, and odd spaces left over in a frieze. The painters here in question were often led, by their superior degree of care for all parts of all vases, to emancipate it - enrich and elaborate the commonplace versions. And since such improvement on conventional schemes left scope for individual initiative, we may hope to find a personal element in such pictures. Another consideration which gives an interest to vases of this category, is that of their influence outside Corinth. Of late years the tendency has been to stress - rightly - the independent character of that part of Attic black-figure which used once to be dubbed 'Attico-Corinthian' (2). But the influence is not to be denied altogether in the treatment of this particular subject: a sherd from Perachora (Perachora II, no. 2488, pl. 103) offers interesting new documentation.


This paper is the result of work undertaken, mostly, in Rome in 1962 with a grant-in-aid from the Thomas Fearnley Foundation; my thanks are due to those who made the stay possible, and to friends and colleagues in Rome for all their help and hospitality.

Abbreviations of the titles of periodicals and standard works of reference follow the practice of Fasti Archaeologici; other abbreviations are as follows: GKV: Jack L. Benson, Geschichte der korinthischen Vasen (Basle 1953).


NC: H. Payne, Necrocorinthia (v. supra), catalogue numbers (pp. 264 sqq).

Payne: The same, references to text and plates.


AXEL SEEBERG

Many padded-dancer vases from the Circle of Timonidas have been published and attributed before (1); my purpose is to supplement the available material by presenting such additional relevant vases and sherds as are known to me. In doing this, I must acknowledge my great debt to Professor D. A. Amyx – both to his published work, especially The Medallion Painter, and to his references, criticisms and suggestions, to which much value as the work may possess is due. The mistakes I claim for myself.

I.

A cup to which Greifenhagen referred in 1929 – in the Pushkin Museum, Moscow – was recently published in part and is illustrated more fully here (Pls. I, IIa) (2). It is of rather a heavy model; the lip is decorated outside with a key-pattern, inside with tongues; the medallion inside, framed by similar purple-and-black tongues and by a lotus-and-palmette chain, has the usual tondo motive of such cups – a gorgonoeon. It is an odd one; more will be said later of its typological affinities. For the present, we merely note that it suggests lack of routine on the part of the decorator, which may mean that the cup was an early work of his.

Above the foot, outside, there is a zone of fine double rays. There are two friezes, of which the lower houses the favourites of Middle and Late Corinthian orientalizing work – panthers and goats, neatly drawn if rather lifeless. They pose in confronted pairs, felines to right, ruminants to left, except for one panther that was turned about, and a perched ‘eagle’ inserted behind him (3). Above this group, two sirens confronted sit under one handle. At the other handle, instead of introducing another orientalizing motive, the painter continued the subject of the main frieze round to the reverse of the vase.

The better-preserved and more carefully drawn half of the tall frieze in the handle-zone bears the representation of a cavalcade of youths with spears, turned left, and flying eagles above. A conventional device to show speed, the birds seem rather out of place in this slow and solemn procession. The boys wear headbands and short chitons and have deep profiles with pointed chins and noses; their eyes look surprised, round, with sharply raised brows. One horse ambles, the rest walk. They are large, powerful creatures, top-heavy, but do not dwarf their riders as Early Archaic horses commonly do, and do not have the stilt-legs often seen even in good Middle and Late Corinthian work (4). Some have all four feet firmly planted, others – like some of the goats below – tentatively paw the ground, foreshadowing the freer Late Archaic rendering (5). On the back of the vase, the merry party of 15 padded dancers unexpectedly share something of the sport-

(1) V. Med. Pir., passim; Lo Porto, pp. 145sqq. (fis. 127-124) and pp. 148sqq. (fis. 125-127); CV Louvre (6), pl. 12, i-6 (NC 989); Perachora II, no. 2543 – all cups and kraters. Three kotylai belong to the same strain: NC 952 and 953 (GKV, p. 51), and « MonPiot », xl (1944), pp. 23sqq. (fis. 3-4 and figs. 1-17).

(2) V. D. Blavatsky, Istoriya antichnvo rasponoi keramiki (Moscow 1953) pp. 9, 11; cf. Greifenhagen, p. 93 n. 5. I am very greatly obliged to Professor B. R. Viper for photographs of this vase and permission to reproduce them.

(3) Cf. Smith, The Hearst Hydria (see note 2), p. 244, with n. 29.

(4) Cf. Payne, pp. 70sqq. Long legs are a sign of high breeding in horses, not necessarily of primitive draughtsmanship.

(5) Besides Payne, l. c., see the interesting discussion of Benson (GKV, pp. 102sqq.) and Llewellyn-Brown (f Schweizer Münzblätter 5, iv (1953), fasc. 14, pp. 49sqq.) on Corinthian coin-Pegasoi compared to horses in the vase-paintings. To reach a definitive result for the chronology of the coinage in this way may be difficult, even if the vases could be precisely dated, because the change in vase-painting seems to be gradual, not sudden. The ‘heraldic’ Pegasoi are likely to be conservative. Disproportionately large heads like those on the Moscow cup occur in some of the earliest coin-types.
ing air of the cavalcade. They are slim and well-proportioned, quite unlike the Falstaffian types usually associated with this subject, and very lively; they dance in pairs with one by himself at one end of the scene — a common form of composition. One or two hold drinking-horns. Those turned to the right (or as many of them as can be studied in the present state of the vase) have purple spots on their clothes, those of their partners are all purple (1). This distinction apart, the garments are alike and of the usual kind, short tight-fitting chitons with an overfold in front (2). Some figures seem to have a misshapen or twisted foot (3).

Padded dancers do not often have this appearance. Those by the Late Corinthian Andromeda Painter approach it (4); but only the exact parallel is furnished by a krater in Paris (Pls. IIb, III) (5): the same small heads, long limbs and supple bodies, the same range of stances, the same expressive use of the arms — pointed elbows, jerked far up behind, or hands jutting out at an improbable angle to touch a neighbour. There can be no doubt that this vase, Louvre E 617, was decorated by the same artist as the cup in Moscow.

Both the main faces of the krater are badly faded, but it deserves to be rescued from oblivion. It attracts attention mainly as a pot. The angle of the handles and handle-plates, the bulge of the neck and the full, taut curve of the body depart from the usual and give it character. The decoration is conventional. There are zigzags on the rim, griffin-birds on the handle-plates; above the rays at the base, a broad black-and-purple band supports the two tall friezes, the lower of which repeats the badly-matched pairs of goats and panthers with the same variation as on the Moscow cup. Fowl similar to that in the frieze — perched 'eagles', regardant — sit under each handle in confronted pairs. The upper frieze has seven dancers on one side (two pairs and a threesome), cocks and a snake on the other (6). Three dancers hold drinking-horns, all wear the normal costume.

Resemblance to the Moscow cup is close in the animal-style also. Either this painter’s manner was remarkably constant, or the two works are close together in date. Among the mannerisms common to both, one notes the heartless one of hitching beasts together by their tails — not uncommon in Corinthian, but barely carried out with such thoroughness. The goats, with their sea-horse muzzles and extremely long, elegant horns, are obviously of one herd. In build, bearing, and incised markings the animals are alike; few of the features are wholly individual, it is rather their combination that is so.

(1) Good MC vases occasionally, as here, show a conformity of iconographical particulars between dancers who are turned in the same direction — e.g., Payne, pl. 37, 7-8 (bearded/beardless); ibid., pl. 33.9, and «MonMot»., xl (1944), pl. 3-4 (plain/patterned chitons); Payne, pl. 33.10 (purple dots). Most purple dots on dancers’ clothes are on vases in or near the ‘style of Timonidas’; but the exceptions (NC 774, 1073) seem to show that they are not merely a stylistic convention. They may represent hair (Webster in «Bulletin of the John Rylands Library», xxxvi (1954), p. 581 sq.; for an alternative interpretation, v. the last section of my article in «JHS», lxxxv (1965).

(2) Cf. below, p. 7.

(3) Not uncommon, though it is rare to have so many ‘crippled’ figures in one picture. Cf. Lo Porto pp. 148 sqq., fig. 125, and Athens 992 (below, pp. 505). There are two versions — one, more common on early vases, is a twisting round of one ankle so that the toes point in opposite directions, whether together or apart (cf. Payne, fig. 44A). The other (as here) is a deformity — usually sickle-shaped — of one foot: cf. Payne, fig. 44G. The drawing of this latter version is not always very explicit, and doubt may exist about the intention.

(4) V. Greifenhagen, pl. 5.

(5) NC 1177A. For a full set of photographs, and permission to reproduce them here, I am greatly indebted to the kindness of M. Pierre Devambez.

(6) A rare subject on MC kraters: NC 1160; «Hesperia», xx (1931), pl. 936; «Auktion XXII, Münzen und Medaillen A. G. (Basel 1961), no. 112. NC 1186 has cocks and snakes under one handle. The jug in Boston, Fairbanks no. 553, pl. 63, with this subject, may be by the Cavalcade Painter (v. Med. Plur., p. 11 n. 35). Cf. Perachora II, no. 2454.
The Moscow Gorgoneion Painter (as he may be called) was a minor artist, to judge by these two early works, though his padded-dancer scenes have some distinction. His animal-style, however, links him with an interesting division of the 'style of Timonidas', as it were its left wing, to which belong the Cavalcade Painter and the Detroit Painter (1). The former often composed his animal-friezes in this way (see, e. g., C. Zervos, L'Art en Grèce (Paris 1946), fig. 103); the Detroit Painter did not, but the resemblance to both is strong. All differ from their master, the Medallion Painter: his figures, solid and effective by themselves, rarely achieve convincing integration in a scene without the aid of filling-ornament. The Cavalcade Painter had a lighter hand, and mastered the use of line to give unity to complicated scenes of action. The other two must have learned from him, but they were decorators at heart – more concerned with surfaces than with subject-matter.

Of the same type as the cup in Moscow, and very similar in its stylistic affinities – though it need not be by the same hand – is a fragmentary cup from Perachora (2545) (2). The obverse had a boar-hunt flanked by riders (contrast the Cavalcade Painter’s in Zervos, l. c.), and there were riders on the reverse. One of the familiar birds occupied the space under a handle, and the animal-frieze seems to have been arranged in the 'Moscow manner'; the forms of the goats and panthers are a little looser, and the interior Gorgon was more sophisticated than that in Moscow.

One point, however, it is still possible to see that the two gorgoneia had in common: the ears were set very high – and the implications of this feature may be interesting. If we compare the Moscow gorgoneion to early gorgoneia by the Cavalcade Painter (as Payne, fig. 25B) we see a difference not merely in quality, but in approach to the problem of composition. Each eye, of the Moscow version, is set carefully in the middle of its generous allotment of blank space, and aligned with ears and nose-wrinkles – which makes for a strong horizontal emphasis: the design is, in fact, 'bi-axial', based on a balance of the top and bottom segments as well as on lateral symmetry. No doubt the Perachora gorgoneion was also bi-axial. Other good examples are the late Gorgoneion by the Cavalcade Painter (?) on the Vatican krater (NC 1452) (3), and Hector’s shield-blazon on the Troilos krater in Paris (E 638.1) (4), by another excellent artist whose animal-style is extremely close to that of the Moscow Gorgoneion Painter.

Gorgoneia constructed on this principle appear to have had a limited currency among a close group of good painters in the years of transition from Middle to Late Corinthian. They are not a logical development from the type favoured by the Cavalcade Painter in his earlier work; we cannot say how they originated. Of the examples mentioned, that in Moscow is the most primitive. In the others, the disadvantage of the design, the deadness of the middle surfaces, is countered by tinting them; on the Troilos krater, this was done by means of a brown wash, and the richer colour schemes of free painting may have suggested the way (5).

(3) Payne fig. 27C. For the whole vase, see now P. E. Arias and M. Hirmer, Tausend Jahre griechische Vasenkunst (Munich 1960), pl. x-xi. For Timonidas’ own bi-axial Gorgo, v. now Antike Kunst, vi (1963), pl. 19.2.
(4) NC 1196. «MonPliot», xvi (1908), pp. 113sqq., pl. 13; Payne fig. 25C; Recueil Charles Dugas (Paris 1960), pl. 15.
(5) Ch. Dugas in his iconographical study, re-published op. cit. (see preceding note), plausibly suggested a model in great painting for the obverse picture of the Troilos Krater (p. 71). To arguments from iconography, add that of colour technique.

The interesting and controversial article by Mogens Gjöde- sen in «AJA», lxvii (1963), pp. 333sqq., reached me too late for consideration here; it contains several new illustrations of vases relevant to section 1 of the present paper. To these, and to Mr. Gjödesen’s many fresh and evocative comments on them, I must be content to refer in a general way. The resemblance of the gorgoneia on the bronze krater from Vix to some which are mentioned above, seems to me less striking than he claims.
PADDED-DANCER VASES IN THE ‘STYLE OF TIMONIDAS’

2.

In the material from Perachora the ‘style of Timonidas’ is abundantly represented, if mostly by scraps – in a humble way, it is also present in the krater fragments 2253, 2254, and others which are mentioned with them (1). Some of the latter are illustrated in Pl. Vc, I-VII, where we are mainly concerned with fragments I-V: VI and VII may or may not be related. As for size, I, III and V might belong to one vase; the scale of II seems slightly smaller, that of IV slightly larger.

The padded dancers of III-IV are beardless, that in II bearded, in I both are combined. Such mixing of age-groups usually occurs only in scenes executed with a certain amount of care and ambition. In III, as in 2253, one dancer has purple dots on his chiton (2); the other costumes are normal. In I-III the headbands seem twisted in a series of loops across the forehead, like those of the sirens in 2254 (3). In some of the cases this feature is combined with a special way of rendering the hair at the temples – a broad, angular ear-tress outlined in incision, the ear being omitted (4).

The combination recurs on two good vases: one a padded-dancer vase, the fragmentary cup Athens 992 (Pls. IV, VI) (5), the other a fragment of a kotyle from Selinus, with a youthful horseman (4). Strictly speaking it is a parallel of iconography, not of style, and the distance in quality is considerable. Fluctuations in care and quality do, however, happen in the work of a single artist; the passage of time must be taken into account; and quite apart from the consideration that there were few illustrated hairdressers among Corinthian painters, we can point to other resemblances – more properly of style – which have the stamp of individuality. Time has been particularly unkind to the vases in question, and it is not possible to apply every criterion to

(1) Perachora II, pls. 76, 78, and cf. pp. 231sq. The illustrations here are from a photograph which the late T. J. Dunbabin, with his customary generosity towards junior colleagues, placed at my disposal; it is used with the kind permission of the Managing Committee of the British School at Athens.

(2) Cf. above, p. 3, n. 1.

(3) A similar trait is sometimes found in the Cavalcade Painter’s work (e. g., Payne, pl. 32,1); cf. Med. Pth., pl. 40 (Painter of Brussels A 2182). Obviously related is the more elaborate rendering seen in Payne, fig. 47, and AJA xxx (1926), p. 448 fig. 3; in Attic, on the François Vase and often in sculpture (G.M.A. Richter, Kouroi (London 1960), pp. 70, 80sq).

(4) In the text to CV San Francisco, pl. 2,4, H. R.W. Smith interprets this ‘flap’ as an indication of ruffled hair – plausibly, in view of the contexts: padded dancers often have it, riders occasionally (e. g., Payne, fig. 18c), other figures hardly ever. An exception is Hippotion on the Amphiparos Krater (NC 1471), who is perhaps characterized by hair-style and name as a ‘horseman’ – grooms, squire. Two unpublished aryballoi by one hand (Toulouse, Musée St. Raymond 26.026; Hanover, Kestner-Museum K. S. 690) combine padded dancers and running figures, and all have flaps; here again Smith’s interpretation would apply, though iconographical ‘contagion’ may give sufficient explanation. The hair would normally be brushed back behind the ears, and violent movement would cause it to slip forward so as to conceal them (‘flap’) or hang before them (‘side-whiskers’): the latter version is also common, see, e. g., Med. Pth., pl. 12a, and here, pl. VI. Side-whiskers are less readily distinguishable from such features as the side-plaits of sphinxes and sirens (e. g., Delos X, no. 410; the plait of the bearded siren in Perachora II, pl. 59, no. 1526, looks like a ‘flap’). There are side-whiskered horsemen on, e. g., the Eurystyes Krater (NC 780); the groom Lapythos on the aryballos once at Breslau, Payne, fig. 45A, is a ‘side-whisker’ parallel for Hippotion. The two versions are not combined: painters preferred either the one or the other. Flaps are particularly often found on two series of padded-dancer aryballoi, each by one hand – as CV San Francisco, pl. 2,4; and as MALinc x (1958), no. 113, fig. 10. On the larger and better MC vases they are rare.

(5) NC 995. Part, ‘Epigrav’, 1885, pl. 7. The splendid new photographs, and the permission to make use of them here, I owe to the generosity of Mrs. Semni Papaspyridi-Karouzou.

(6) From the Malophoros Sanctuary. MALinc, xxxii (1927), pl. 86, 8.
every sherd. On principle we must allow the possibility that some of them are by close followers. But all can be the work of one artist, the Klyka Painter, who also probably decorated the following, all krater fragments: Oxford 1888.185; (1) Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology, NA 173 (Pl. Va) (1); and Corinth KP 1785, which has two padded dancers about a krater, one of them holding two drinking-horns, and KP 2228 (9).

Athens 992 is among the best Middle Corinthian cups. Its battle-scenes and chariots associate it both with the Medallion and Cavalcade Painters, though they lack the solidity of the former as well as the latter’s lightness of touch. The padded-dancer scene was substituted for the normal animal-frieze, a unique procedure which argues a particular interest in the subject on the artist’s part. The execution bears out this impression: the scene is a tour de force. It had at least 21 figures — a record (4); the composition was apparently a pair-dance of the usual sort, but its monotony was relieved by much turning of heads and waving of arms. There is a very wide range of spirited types and stances, and an elaboration of detail far beyond what we see in the krater fragments (or indeed anywhere else) — more finished ears, curly hair, incision marking the upper edges of chitons, the fingers, even fingernails. Unusual features include figures with misshapen feet, one with his legs crossed, one holding two drinking-horns (as on the fragment at Corinth) (9), one with a jug and a horn.

Broad of shoulder, long in the waist, the dancers both on the cup and on the fragments (wherever it is apparent) have something of the jumping-jack about their movements and articulation. A very distinctive detail is the rendering of the hip-region with the lower part of the chiton: a system of curves, a correlation of incision and body outline (9). There is often minute correspondence between figures on the several vases and sherds, in movements, shape of heads, rendering of beards, eyes, and other details.

By virtue of his best work, the Klyka Painter belongs to the core of the ‘style of Timonidas’ — a reminder that in this study quality and personal style should not be confused. The best artists were guilty of occasional careless work; less good painters might rise above their usual level, if only once in the course of an undistinguished career.

3.

The lekythos in the Hermitage Museum, Leningrad (B 4) which is illustrated in Pl. VI, is the only Corinthian vase of that shape decorated with padded dancers (9). The dearth of such figures on vases of peculiarly Late Corinthian shapes, suggests that the subject was going out

(2) I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. R. M. Cook for the photograph and for permission to use it. Mr. Cook also kindly provided the following note, ‘Clay brownish with a few white particles; surface has a paler, slightly yellow tinge. Largest measurement 6,8 cm. Purple on all of chiton’.
(3) American School negative 6386, top row. I am obliged to Professor J. L. Benson for permission to refer to these sherds, which will be published by him.
(4) The runner-up is a kotyle at Athens (271; NC 943), with 20. Elsewhere the number of figures in padded-dancer scenes rarely exceeds 10. Odd numbers are preferred to even.
(5) The only other parallel is the aryballos Gela 7456 (‘MALino 5, xlv (1962), pl. 208): Professor Orlandini very kindly sent me photographs of the vase, but I am relying for this particular feature on his description. Two dancers clutching one horn (struggling for possession?) appear on Athens 271 (cf. preceding note), where there is the same pre-occupation as here with drinking-vessels and other paraphernalia — one is reminded of the Epeleios Painter (v. Recueil Charles Dugas (Paris 1960), p. 34).
(6) This rendering recurs, if I can trust my mediocre sketch, on an MC krater sherd (thick-walled, very pale clay) at Lipari.
(7) Ex Pizzati; Stefani, no. 94. NC 1368. Height 26,7 cm; no red slip. For the photographs and per-
of fashion; the style here is not strikingly different from Middle Corinthian, so that the date may be rather early. The vase seems relevant in the present context, though at present its relation to the 'style of Timonidas' is not easily defined (7). It invites examination of a point of iconography, for which Payne gives the clue when he cautiously speaks of 'padded figures', not dancers. What is the relationship between such pictures as this, and the more usual dancing-scenes?

P. N. Ure was aware that the distinction is not always obvious between padded dancers and the 'runners' who also occur on Corinthian vases, as on those of other fabrics (8). The typical runners are a subject with a different history: part and parcel of the true Orientalizing style, they are popular in the 7th century and peter out in the 6th together with animal-friezes. For a couple of generations at least, however, this history overlaps that of the padded dancers; and though the latter are more properly a 'figure-subject', they sometimes occur in orientalizing contexts (9). Your runner as well as your dancer, moreover, will occasionally have a small vase to himself (4); and runners in a very few cases are seen to overcome their native individualism and to hunt in packs, like the 'padded figures' of the vase in Leningrad (6).

Often the 'runners' are naked, but sometimes they are dressed in a short chiton. Their iconography altogether is not consistent; so probably the pictorial formula covers not one subject, but many. A plurality of runners is likely to mean simply a footrace (6).

Padded dancers, even when typical attributes such as drinking-horns are lacking, normally have distinguishing features which reduce the possibilities of confusion — namely (a) proportions, (b) costume, and (c) certain recurring stances. The costume differs from that of every other category of figure found in pictorial art of this period, in that a fold of material overhangs the belt in front and conceals it (7). Apparently, this feature would suffice by itself to show that a figure was intended for a padded dancer. Relying on it, a painter might vary the proportions to suit his style (9), or the movements to suit the context — though in fact, this was not done often. Conversely, where movements and/or proportions were typical, the costume was felt to be less important. Usually this means merely that a painter working in a hurry might omit some of the incised markings (neck-opening, lower edge, even belt) — as was done on the Leningrad lekythos. More rarely, the dancers are gratuitously undressed — the painter may even indulge in

mission to use them, I am greatly indebted to Dr. A. Peredoliskaja, who also supplied this note on the condition of the vase: reassembled from sherds, the central portion of the second figure from left restored, with some repainting.

(1) The resemblance to Med. Pitr., pl. 13b is superficial, as Professor Amyx points out; nor does the vase agree in type with the lekythoi associated with the Medallion Painter. Cleaning would make stylistic comparisons easier.

(2) A. D. and P. N. Ure, Aryballoi and Figurines from Rhetzosa in Boeotia (Cambridge 1934), p. 96.

(3) E. g., Perachora I, pl. 27:4; Payne, pl. 20, r-2. The alabastron Perachora II no. 1353, pl. 69, has one runner in the bottom frieze; the figure in the middle frieze called a 'padded dancer' is, I suspect, another, nude, seen from the back, legs lost. T. J. Dunbabin was kind enough to send me a tracing on which my opinion is based.

(4) Dancer — e. g., CV Louvre (8) pl. 19,26-27,30; CV Mainz (1), pl. 30,1-2. Runner — CV Heidelberg (1), pl. 11,4. Cf. also NC 1258, and CV Norway (1) pl. 2,11 and 3,3-4, two very odd 'runners' whose relation to padded dancers is difficult to determine.

(5) CV Paris, Bibl. Nat. (Cabinet Méd.), pl. 10,5-6 and 16, 3-5; Payne, pl. 34,6; Lo Porto, fig. 47 b.

(6) This interpretation should be safe for the aryballos-fr. Lo Porto, i. c., in which he sees dancers (padded ?) and a priestess or deity: the tripod is a prize as in the parallel which he quotes (NC 552); Cf. also Perachora II no. 1584, pl. 150 — and Pindar, Pyth. IX. 118 (?).

(7) Exception: horsemen flanking a dancer on the alabastron Délos X no. 460, p. 139 fig. 4, wear the dancer-chiton — a case of 'contagion', as with the hairstyles on the aryballoi at Hannover and Toulouse, cited above (n. 22 ?). The garment worn, e. g., by a Boreas in Payne, pl. 28,ro, is, of course, different.

(8) E. g., NC 1000; Lo Porto, fig. 176 sq.
anatomical description (nipples, clavicula) — and the costume must, as it were, be supplied from the context, or it is represented by the belt and overfold alone (1).

If a Corinthian painter ever drew a figure intended for a padded dancer, without characterizing him as such by any of the above means, we shall never discover it, and so the proposition lacks practical interest. When the application of the term ‘padded dancer’ is limited accordingly, the difficulty noted by Ure disappears.

‘Padded dancers, running’ are found on the following vases:

Olpe Vatican 87. C. Albizzati, Vasi antichi dipinti del Vaticano (1924), p. 31, figs. 11-12. NC 1136.
Olpe Villa Giulia 458: ‘padded men running’ according to Payne, NC 1135; I have not seen the vase.
Plaque Berlin F. 905. Antike Denkmäler, i, pl. 7, 14.
Lekythos Leningrad B 4.

A possible addition (cf. the Leningrad lekythos) is the fr. from Perachora, pl. Vc, IV, but similar figures occur in pair-dance scenes.

Taken by itself the picture on the lekythos could represent comical lewd pursuit, for which contemporary Boeotian has parallels (2) — especially since the quarry is a young boy. The pictures listed above do not corroborate this interpretation, and since Corinthian padded dancers have an old reputation for being lassiv and ausgelassen, it is a pleasure to testify that they are more clean-living than their Boeotian brethren (3). There remain at least two explanations that may be valid for all such pictures. One is that this form of composition is merely a livelier version of an extremely common scheme which shows rows of identical padded dancers, all turned in the same direction and in one attitude (4); that this scheme was utilized and improved by a painter in the ‘style of Timotheas’, we know (5). The other accords with the spirit of simple humour which pervades the Corinthian padded-dancer scenes — it is that fat people running are a subject calculated to provoke mirth; we may think of the pictures according to our preference, as purely pictorial inventions, or as more or less faithful representations of the antics of padded clowns. The two explanations are not, of course, mutually exclusive.

(1) E. e.g., Med. Pt., pls. 12b, 13c; CV Norway (1), pl. 3, 1-2; NC 1000.
(2) E. Bielefeld, Komödienzene auf einem griechischen Vasesbild? (Leipzig 1944), fig. 1.
(3) In only one case does the distinction bearded-beardless seem likely to refer to pederasty — Payne, pl. 31, 7-8; it is possible that ibid., pl. 38,1 contains another example.
Moscow, Pushkin Museum; Corinthian cup.
A. Seeberg, *Padded-dancer vases*  

PLATE III

Paris, Louvre (E 617): Corinthian krater.
A. Seeberg, *Padded-dancer vases*  

ATHENS, NATIONAL MUSEUM (1992): DETAILS OF FRAGMENTARY CORINTHIAN CUP.
A. Seeberg, *Padded-dancer vases*

PLATE VI

a) Leu
gra, Hermitage Museum (B 4): Corinthian lekythos. 

b)
Multiple portrait types

JAMES D. BRECKENRIDGE

Any attempt to define just what a portrait is — a matter not quite so simple as may at first appear — must surely involve the question of 'likeness', that is to say, of the recognizability of the image in relation to its subject (*). This being the case, it would seem to be of greater significance than has usually been acknowledged that at a very few periods in the development of Western art, we seem to have preserved for us what I call multiple portrait types, that is to say, physically dissimilar representations purporting to depict the same specific and historic individual. Since the historical periods that produced multiple portrait types occurred so infrequently, an examination of the character of the period itself should lead to a better understanding of the significance and the development of portraiture, if not of all the representational arts, at these times.

The case to be examined here would seem to be of special interest in that it involves three of the most famous personalities from the apogee of Athenian culture: Socrates, Sophocles, and Euripides, all contemporaries of the last decades of the fifth century B.C. In each case (as well as possibly in a few others), we have preserved for us not just one but two noticeably different portrait-types, each of which was copied with some frequency for the Roman collectors, to whom we owe nearly all our knowledge of the physical appearance of the distinguished Greeks of antiquity. Despite occasional efforts either to reject one or another of these variant portrait-types, or to assert that evident physical differences do not exist (1), we do seem in fact to have a series of firmly identified likenesses showing, not different views of the same physical individual at the same or a different age, but images of irreconcilably different physical specimens, nonetheless identified by the ancients as representing the same person.

Socrates:

A) (Pl. I a) Known in four examples, of which the closest to the original in most respects is generally considered to be the bronze in Munich (2). Spherical skull, broad flat face, small

(*) This paper is a by-product of preparatory studies for a "Conceptual History of Portraiture", undertaken in 1959-60 under a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies. Full thanks are due the directors and staffs of the Warburg Institute of the University of London, and the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, for generous help and facilities provided during this period.

(1) The most determined attempt to divorce the two Sophocles types was made by Th. Reinach in "J.H.S.", XLII, 1922, pp. 50-69. Cf. the controversy with Studniczka, ibid., XLIII, 1923, pp. 57ff. and 149ff.; ibid., XLIV, 1924, pp. 54 and 281ff. More recently, G. M. A. Richter, in Greek Portraits, II. To what extent were they faithful likenesses? (Collection Latomus, XXXVI), Brussels 1959, pp. 31ff., has challenged the identification of the 'Rieti' type as Euripides (cf. below), while reviving the old suggestion that the 'Lateran' and 'Farnese' types of Sophocles may be taken as representations of the same person at different ages (her p. 41). Neither suggestion seems fully convincing.

(2) Glyptotek, No. 448. Comprehensive bibliography to date, as with numerous other Greek portrait subjects, in M. Bieber, The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age, New York 1955, pp. 44ff.
eyes set shallow under flat brows (1), button nose with large nostrils, thick lips fully visible under mustache; rather low forehead, almost wholly bald, hair short at sides and drawn back to reveal ears; beard broad and rather long. Little sense of surface texture, or differentiation between flesh and hair.

B) (Pl. I b). Known in some ten examples, usually identified by the copy in the Museo Nazionale delle Terme, Rome (4). Shape of head quite different from Type A: face longer and narrower, forehead high and squared; cheekbones also high and prominent; much hair over top and sides of head, and hair and beard plastically differentiated from flesh. Mustache closer to corners of mouth; nose longer and more bridged, although retaining deep indentation at root. Slightly quizzical expression of Type A replaced by wholly serious, almost pessimistic mien. Identification of subject secured by inscribed herm in Farnese Collection, Museo Nazionale, Naples (6).

Sophocles:

A) (Pl. I c). Known in 13 examples, and named for the full-length statue in the Lateran, although a more accurate impression of the original is gained from the plaster cast taken from the head of this statue before its disastrous ‘restoration’. (1) Head characterized by blocky shape; squarish face framed by hair and beard in thick locks; hair only slightly confined by the taenia. Eyes fairly deep-set, nose narrow and straight. The head broadens at the temples before disappearing under the hair; the upper part of the skull swells out over the lower. Identified by an inscribed herm in the Vatican (5).

B) (Pl. I d). Known in over 25 examples, usually named for the not-too-well preserved head in Naples from the Farnese Collection, although the finest copy is probably the one in the British Museum (6). Head long and solemn, face rather narrow; hair on crown relatively thin, and waved downward under the taenia. Hair becomes fuller at sides and back, leaving the ears free; beard and mustache long and full. Identified by an inscribed, but severely weathered herm in the Belvedere of the Vatican, as well as by Ursinus’ engraving of a now-vanished marble medallion or clipeus (7). A later development of this type seems to be represented by the group exemplified by the Arundel bronze in the British Museum (8), distinguished by a greater particularization of detail, and an expression of pathos unfamiliar in earlier portraits.

(1) There is some dispute as to the priority of this type of brow treatment over that exemplified by the Berlin and Vatican copies, in which the brows are sharp, projecting, and angular; cf. Bieber, op. cit., p. 53.
(2) B. M. Felletti Mai, Museo Nazionale Romano, I Ritratti, Rome 1953, No. 11, pp. 15f.
(3) Cf. R. Paribeni, Il Ritratto nell’Arte Antica, Milan 1934, pl. XIX.
(6) Naples: J. J. Bernoulli, Griechische Ikono