

In presenting this dissertation/thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I agree that the Library of the University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to copy from, or to publish, this thesis/dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written when such copying or publication is solely for scholarly purposes and does not involve potential financial gain. In the absence of the professor, the dean of the Graduate School may grant permission. It is understood that any copying from, or publication of, this thesis/dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without written permission.

Anthony Frank Mangieri

**The Virgin Sacrificed:
Images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in Greek and Roman Art**

By

**Anthony Frank Mangieri
Doctor of Philosophy**

Art History Department

**Bonna D. Wescoat, D.Phil.
Adviser**

**Eric R. Varner, Ph.D.
Committee Member**

**Jasper Gaunt, Ph.D.
Committee Member**

Accepted:

**Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School**

Date

**The Virgin Sacrificed:
Images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in Greek and Roman Art**

By

**Anthony Frank Mangieri
B.A., Pace University, 1998
M.A., Hunter College, 2001**

Adviser: Bonna D. Wescoat, D.Phil.

**An Abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

Art History Department

2008

The Virgin Sacrificed: Images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in Greek and Roman Art

Anthony F. Mangieri

Although the Greeks and Romans did not practice human sacrifice, the myth of the sacrificial virgin resonates powerfully as a subject in the visual arts of ancient Greece, Etruria, and Rome for over a millennium, from the early seventh-century BC to the fourth-century AD. While there are several sacrificial virgins in ancient myth, only two find visual expression: Iphigeneia, daughter of Agamemnon, sacrificed to begin the Trojan War, and Polyxena, daughter of Priam, sacrificed at its end. This dissertation explores how the representations of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in ancient art offer new interpretations on the meanings of the sacrificial virgin as a cultural and ideological construction in ancient Greece and the Roman Empire. The result is a cultural history focusing on the iconography and iconology of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in ancient art. Through an analysis of the imagery of Iphigeneia and Polyxena sacrificed, this dissertation examines *how* and *why* the mythical sacrificial virgins occupied an important place in the thinking and imagination of historical women and men in ancient Greece.

The overarching conclusion is that the figure of the sacrificial virgin in art conveyed a spectrum of meanings informed by the work of art's iconography, medium, context, and intended and unintended viewers. Two further conclusions follow. First, the figure of the sacrificial virgin illuminates a mode of aristocratic fashioning of identity, both of women and men. Secondly, the subject of virgin sacrifice in art presents a more complex view of female agency in the ancient world than has been previously thought, which in turn offers a more nuanced understanding of the role and status of women in ancient Greece, Etruria, and the Roman Empire.

**The Virgin Sacrificed:
Images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in Greek and Roman Art**

By

**Anthony Frank Mangieri
B.A., Pace University, 1998
M.A., Hunter College, 2001**

Adviser: Bonna D. Wescoat, D.Phil.

**A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

Art History Department

2008

Acknowledgements

I have been fortunate in having the opportunity to work with people who are not only excellent scholars and teachers, but also generous and kind people. The time that I spent studying under Mary B. Moore at Hunter College is the reason that I decided to pursue a doctorate in Greek art, and I continue to be inspired by her example. During my time at Emory, it has been my honor and privilege to work with the members of my dissertation committee: Bonna Wescoat, Eric Varner, and Jasper Gaunt. Eric Varner has helped me greatly during my time at Emory, and I thank him for sharing his insights into the Roman world. Bonna Wescoat, my adviser, and Jasper Gaunt have been true mentors and friends, and my debt to them is enormous. Their guidance and suggestions have helped me to refine my ideas and improve the text; any errors in judgment are my own.

I would also like to thank Dr. Dorinda Evans and Dr. Sarah McPhee for the memorable classes that I took with them at Emory. My appreciation also to Dr. Jean Campbell and Dr. Virginia Spate for inviting me to participate in the Andrew W. Mellon Dissertation Seminar they led in the summer of 2006, from which I benefited greatly.

For financial support during my graduate studies, I would like to thank the Art History Department and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at Emory University. A Graduate Research Grant from the Fund for International Graduate Research at Emory helped to cover some travel expenses, and a Dean's Teaching Fellowship (2006-07) allowed me to continue my research and writing in Atlanta. A Dissertation Completion Fellowship from the Bill and Carol Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry at Emory University enabled me to complete the writing of my dissertation during the 2007-08 academic year, and I enjoyed the hospitality and community of the Center.

Many friends and family deserve mention—Michael and Kimberly Mangieri, Katie Baker, Amy Branch, Sienna Brown, Jason Ciejka, Rachel Foulk, Catherine Fernandez-Weber, Susan Schafer, and Amy Sowder. Special thanks go to Rachel Foulk and Catherine Fernandez-Weber for assistance in preparing parts of the manuscript.

I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Dianne and Anthony A. Mangieri, who have made this possible in so many different ways. And to Ron Hockensmith, for so much, but that goes without saying.

The Virgin Sacrificed:

Images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in Greek and Roman Art

Table of Contents

Abstract
Acknowledgements
List of Illustrations
List of Abbreviations

Introduction

Seeing the Sacrificial Virgin.....1
Fashioning of Identity
Issues of Female Agency

Part I: Representing the Sacrificial Virgin

- 1. Traditions of the Sacrificial Maiden in the Ancient Mediterranean**.....27
Literary Sources
Relation between Art and Text
Other Sacrificial Maidens
Relation to Animal Sacrifice
Traditions in the Ancient Near East
Towards a Definition of the *Sacrificial Virgin*
- 2. Images of Iphigeneia in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Art**.....80
- 3. Pictures of Polyxena in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Art**.....130

Part II: Interpreting the Sacrificial Virgin

- 4. Fashioning the Sacrificial Virgin: Comparing Helen, the Sacrificial Virgins, and Representations of Womanhood**.....176
Louvre G152 and Iconographic Ambiguity
British Museum E773 and Catalogues of Women
- 5. Issues of Female Agency and Views of the Sacrificial Virgin**....251
What's a Girl to Do? Consent, Resistance, and the Measure of a Maiden
The Public and Private "Lives" of Iphigeneia and Polyxena
The Sacrificial Virgin and the Politics of Aristocratic Life

Conclusion

A Role Fit for a Princess.....298

Catalogue

**Images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman
Art.....307**

Explanation of the Catalogue
Iphigeneia
Polyxena

Concordance between catalogue numbers in *LIMC* and those in this
dissertation.....377

Appendix: Catalogue of representations of Iphigeneia in Tauris.....384

Selected Bibliography.....420

Illustrations.....469

LIST OF FIGURES

- Fig. 1 IPH 1. Palermo, Museo Archeologico Regionale di Palermo NI 1886.
- Fig. 2 IPH 2. London, British Museum E 773.
- Fig. 3 IPH 3. Kiel, Antikensammlung Kunsthalle zu Kiel B 538.
- Fig. 4 IPH 4. London, British Museum F 159.
- Fig. 5 IPH 5. Hypothetical reconstruction of lost painting by Timanthes of Kythnos.
- Fig. 6 IPH 6. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 31.11.2
- Fig. 7 IPH 7. Athens, National Museum 22633.
- Fig. 8 IPH 8. Berlin, Staatliche Museen 3161 q.
- Fig. 9 IPH 9. Athens, National Museum 2114.
- Fig. 10 IPH 10. Brussels, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire A893.
- Fig. 11 IPH 11. Termessos (Pisidia), two stone relief plaques.
- Fig. 12 IPH 12. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 481, 482, 482a.
- Fig. 13 IPH 13. Chiusi, Museo Nazionale 955 (ex Paolozzi).
- Fig. 14 IPH 14. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 18.
- Fig. 15 IPH 15. Perugia, Museo Nazionale.
- Fig. 16 IPH 16. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 46.
- Fig. 17 IPH 17. Perugia, Museo Archeologico 236.
- Fig. 18 IPH 18. Perugia, Museo Archeologico 343.
- Fig. 19 IPH 20. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 16 (ex San Pietro).
- Fig. 20 IPH 21. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 281.
- Fig. 21 IPH 22. Rome, Villa Giulia 50313.

- Fig. 22 IPH 23. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 43 (139).
- Fig. 23 IPH 24. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 34 (114).
- Fig. 24 IPH 25. Perugia Museo Nazionale 344 (101).
- Fig. 25 IPH 26. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 329 (123).
- Fig. 26 IPH 27. Rome, Villa Giulia 50311.
- Fig. 27 IPH 28. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 49.
- Fig. 28 IPH 29. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 330 (ex 127).
- Fig. 29 IPH 30. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 394.
- Fig. 30 IPH 31. Rome, Villa Giulia 50312.
- Fig. 31 IPH 32. Perugia, Museo Nazionale.
- Fig. 32 IPH 33. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 38.
- Fig. 33 IPH 34. Perugia, Casa del S. Cuore (Villa Monti).
- Fig. 34 IPH 35. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 279.
- Fig. 35 IPH 36. Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco 13902.
- Fig. 36 IPH 37. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 50006 (ex Villa di Compresso).
- Fig. 37 IPH 38. Perugia, Museo Nazionale inv. Palazzone 55.
- Fig. 38 IPH 39. Perugia, (ex ?) Villa Antinori (Monte Vile).
- Fig. 39 IPH 40. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 348.
- Fig. 40 IPH 41. Pischello, Villa Sorbello.
- Fig. 41 IPH 42. ex Mannheim, Reiss-Museum (destroyed in WWII).
- Fig. 42 IPH 43. Volterra, Museo Guarnacci 457.
- Fig. 43 IPH 44. Volterra, Museo Guarnacci 512.
- Fig. 44 IPH 45. Florence, Museo Archeologico 5754.

- Fig. 45 IPH 46. Lost. ex “piccolo tomba Inghirami.”
- Fig. 46 IPH 47. Rome, Villa Giulia 13141.
- Fig. 47 IPH 48. Pompeii VI 5, 2 (Casa del Vicolo di Modesto), destroyed.
- Fig. 48 IPH 49. Naples, Museo Nazionale 9112.
- Fig. 49 IPH 50. Florence, Uffizi 612. Altar of Kleomenes.
- Fig. 50 IPH 51. Oscillum from Bolsena.
- Fig. 51 IPH 52. Rome, “Underground Basilica” of Porta Maggiore, *in situ*.
- Fig. 52 IPH 53. The Veroli Casket. London, Victoria and Albert Museum 216-1885.
- Fig. 53 IPH 55. Rome, Museo Capitolino 9778.
- Fig. 54 IPH 56. Samos, Archaeological Collection of Pythagoreion.
- Fig. 55 IPH 58. New York Market, Christie’s.
- Fig. 56 IPH 59. Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Zv 679.94.
- Fig. 57 IPH 60. Pompeii, deposit of the excavations 10901.
- Fig. 58 IPH 61. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 17.194-2012.
- Fig. 59 IPH 62. Ampurias, Museo Monográfico de las Excavaciones.
- Fig. 60 IPH 63. Antakya, Hatay Archeological Museum 961.
- Fig. 61 IPH 64. Berlin, ex Berlin Museum 790.
- Fig. 62 IPH 65. Berlin, ex Berlin Museum 788.
- Fig. 63 IPH 66. Basel, Loan (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 6.67).

- Fig. 64 IPH 67. Taranto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 76127.
- Fig. 65 IPH 68. Paris, Musée du Louvre CA 2193.
- Fig. 66 IPH 69. Matera, Museo Nazionale Ridola 11013.
- Fig. 67 IPH 71. Volos Museum DP7134,86.
- Fig. 68 IPH 72. London, British Museum 1206.
- Fig. 69 IPH 74. Paris, Musée du Louvre S 4033.
- Fig. 70 IPH 75. Tuscania, Museo Nazionale (ex Rome, Villa Giulia 15531).
- Fig. 71 IPH 76. Tübingen, Sammlung des Archäologischen Instituts W. 61a.
- Fig. 72 IPH 77. Berlin, Altes Museen (Once Berlin 379).
- Fig. 73 IPH 78. Unknown.
- Fig. 74 IPH 79. Berlin, Berlin 859.
- Fig. 75 IPH 80. Copenhagen, Sammlungen Thorwaldsen (L. Müller no. 877).
- Fig. 76 IPH 81. The Portland Vase. London, British Museum.
- Fig. 77 IPH 82. Naples, Museo Nazionale 9022.
- Fig. 78 IPH 83. Šempeter-Celeia, Tomb of the Prisciani, inv. 2, *in situ*.
- Fig. 79 IPH 84. Verona, Negrar di Valpolicella, *in situ*.
- Fig. 80 IPH 85. Berlin, Staatliche Museen FG 488.
- Fig. 81 IPH 86. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum XI B 291.
- Fig. 82 POL 1. London, British Museum 1897.7-27.2.
- Fig. 83 POL 2. Berlin, Staatliche Museen F 1698.
- Fig. 84 POL 3. Berlin, Altes Museum F 1902.

- Fig. 85 POL 4. New York Private, Collection of Gregory Callimanpoulos (The Metropolitan Museum of Art L.1983.71.4).
- Fig. 86 POL 5. Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia 12110.
- Fig. 87 POL 6. Paris, Musée du Louvre G153.
- Fig. 87bis POL 6 bis. Tekirdağ, Museum of Tekirdağ 1855.
- Fig. 88 POL 7. Paris, Musée du Louvre G152.
- Fig. 89 POL 7 bis. London, British Museum B 70.
- Fig. 90 POL 9. Lost Monumental Wall Painting Once In The Lesche Of the Knidians.
- Fig. 91 POL 11. Athens, National Museum 14.624.
- Fig. 92 POL 12. Athens, National Museum.
- Fig. 93 POL 13. Once Berlin, Staatliche Museen 3161 p (destroyed WWII).
- Fig. 94 POL 14. Çannakale, Archeological Museum. Polyxena Sarcophagus.
- Fig. 95 POL 15. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden I. 1896-12.1
- Fig. 96 POL 19. Orvieto, Museo Claudio Faina.
- Fig. 97 POL 20. Rome, Museo Capitolino. Capitoline Tabula Iliaca.
- Fig. 98 POL 21. London, British Museum 1865.1220.103 (ex 1427)
- Fig. 99 POL 22. Madrid, Prado.
- Fig. 100 POL 23. Mykonos, Mykonos Museum 2240.
- Fig. 101 POL 25. Paris Musée du Louvre F29.
- Fig. 102 POL 26. Berlin, Pergamon Museum F1685.

- Fig. 103 POL 27. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 80.AE.154
- Fig. 104 POL 28. Berlin, Antikensammlung F 2280 and Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Vaticano.
- Fig. 105 POL 29. Athens, National Akropolis Museum 212.
- Fig. 106 POL 30. Paris, Musée du Louvre CA 1743.
- Fig. 107 POL 31. Ruvo 901.
- Fig. 108 POL 32. London, British Museum F 160.
- Fig. 109 POL 33. Delphi, Archaeological Museum.
- Fig. 110 POL 34. Naples, Museo Nazionale.
- Fig. 111 POL 35. Naples, Museo Nazionale 81733 (H1779).
- Fig. 112 POL 36. Berlin, Staatliche Museen 3348.
- Fig. 113 POL 36 bis. Drawings of north metopes of the Parthenon, Athens.
- Fig. 114 POL 37. Cerverteri, Museo Nazionale (ex Rome, Villa Giulia 19539). So-called Vaso dei Gobi.
- Fig. 115 POL 38. Paris, Musée du Louvre E 703.
- Fig. 116 POL 39. Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco 13901.
- Fig. 117 POL 40. London, British Museum 743.
- Fig. 118 POL 41. Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco 14561 (74).
- Fig. 119 POL 42. London, British Museum D 21.
- Fig. 120 POL 43. Orvieto, akroterion from shrine at Cannicella cemetery.
- Fig. 121 POL 44. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 03.23.1
- Fig. 122 POL 45. Lyon Musée des Beaux Arts (ex Vermiglioli, Herrn Degerando).

- Fig. 123 POL 46. London, British Museum.
- Fig. 124 POL 47. Staatliche Münzsammlung A. 1607.
- Fig. 125 POL 48. Berlin 484.
- Fig. 126 POL 49. Gotha, Schlossmuseum.
- Fig. 127 POL 50. Berlin, Berlin no. 6889.
- Fig. 128 POL 51. Berlin, Altes Museen 489.
- Fig. 129 POL 52. Pompeii, Casa degli Amorini Dorati, VI 16, 7.38, *in situ*.
- Fig. 130 POL 53. Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmuseum Trier 18 271.
- Fig. 131 POL 54. Paris, Cabinet des Médailles.
- Fig. 132 POL 55. Rome, market.
- Fig. 133 POL 56. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum IX 1922.
- Fig. 134 POL 57. Clusium, Collection E. Bonci Casuccini.
- Fig. 135 POL 58. Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung A.919.
- Fig. 136 POL 59. Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung A. 880.
- Fig. 137 POL 60. London, British Museum 3206.
- Fig. 138 Tavola 6, *Il raptus sacrificiale*, Mnemosyne Atlas.
- Fig. 139 Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum 930.101.3
- Fig. 140 Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1112.
- Fig. 141 Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen NI 5240.
- Fig. 141 bis Present location unknown. On art market in 1930s.
- Fig. 142 Kassel, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen T 43.
- Fig. 143 London, British Museum EI20.
- Fig. 144 Berlin, Antikensammlung 4841 (ex Bourguignon).

- Fig. 145 Tenos Museum, fragment.
- Fig. 146 Würzburg 311.
- Fig. 147 Berlin, Pergamon Museum. Grave-stele of Polyxena from Boeotia.
- Fig. 148 Berlin, Pergamon Museum F2205.
- Fig. 149 Geneva, Musée d'art et d'histoire 15008.
- Fig. 150 New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 56.171.18.
- Fig. 151 Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum L160.
- Fig. 152 Munich 1383.
- Fig. 153 Odessa, Archaeological Museum 21972.
- Fig. 154 Florence, Campana 3777.
- Fig. 155 Berlin, 30835.
- Fig. 156 Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86. AE.296.
- Fig. 157 Copenhagen, National Museum 5613.
- Fig. 158 Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale RC 1646.
- Fig. 159 Halle, Archäologisches Museum der Universität.
- Fig. 160 Taranto 134905.
- Fig. 161 London, British Museum F 175.
- Fig. 162 Atlanta, Michael C. Carlos Museum 1999.11.6.
- Fig. 163 Naples, Museo Nazionale 12.
- Fig. 164 Unknown.
- Fig. 165 Berlin 610.
- Fig. 166 London, British Museum 2071.

- Fig. 167 Munich, Slg. Arndt 1656.
- Fig. 168 Berlin 483.
- Fig. 169 Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlungen.
- Fig. 170 Hannover Kestnermus 671.
- Fig. 171 Viterbo, Museo Archeologico Nazionale della Rocca Albornoz.
- Fig. 172 London, British Museum.
- Fig. 173 New York.
- Fig. 174 Newell Collection, cat. no. 153
- Fig. 175 Ohnefalsch-Richter, Kypros, CL134.
- Fig. 176 Newell Collection, cat. no. 155.
- Fig. 177 Newell Collection, cat. no.157.
- Fig. 178 Barcelona 4333-6.
- Fig. 179 Ménant, *Recherche sur la Glyptique orientale 1. fig 95.*
- Fig. 180 Edward Henry Corbould. *A Dream of Fair Women*, 1859.
- Fig. 181 Panini. *The Sacrifice of Iphigeneia*. Bath, Holbume of Menstrie Museum.
- Fig. 182 Mark Rothko. *Sacrifice of Iphigeneia*, 1942. Collection of Christopher Rothko.
- Fig. 183 Giovanni Battista Tiepolo. *The Sacrifice of Iphigeneia*, 1757. Vicenza, Villa Valmarana.
- Fig. 184 TAU 1. Ferrara, Museo Nazionale di Spina T 1145 (3032).
- Fig. 185 TAU 2. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 82113 (H3223).
- Fig. 186 TAU 3. Pavia, Museo Civico.

- Fig. 187 TAU 4. Naples, Museo Archeologico 80914 (Stg 240).
- Fig. 188 TAU 5. Virginia, private collection 22 (V9105) (ex New York, Atlantis Antiquities).
- Fig. 189 TAU 6. ex Buckingham ancient collection, lost.
- Fig. 190 TAU 7. Sydney, Nicholson Museum 51.17.
- Fig. 191 TAU 8. Moscow, Pushkin 504.
- Fig. 192 TAU 9. Matera, Museo Archeologico (ex Bari market).
- Fig. 193 TAU 10. Saint Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum B1715A (St420).
- Fig. 194 TAU 11. Paris, Musée du Louvre K404 (L112).
- Fig. 195 TAU 12. Saint Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum B2080. (w1033).
- Fig. 196 TAU 13. New York Market, Christie's.
- Fig. 197 TAU 15. Termessos (Pisidia), two stone relief plaques.
- Fig. 198 TAU 16. Berlin, Staatliche Museen FG 792.
- Fig. 199 TAU 18. Intaglio known only from an impression at the Deutsches Archaeological Institute.
- Fig. 200 TAU 19. Florence, Museo Archeologico 5777.
- Fig. 201 TAU 20. Siena Museo Archeologico 730.
- Fig. 202 TAU 21. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek H 298.
- Fig. 203 TAU 22. New York, New York University Collection.
- Fig. 204 TAU 23. Klagenfurt, Landesmuseum für Kärnten
- Fig. 205 TAU 24. Naples, Nazionale 111439.
- Fig. 206 TAU 25. Pompeii, III 4,4 (Casa di Pinarius Cerealis), *in situ*.
- Fig. 207 TAU 26. Stabiae, Villa San Marco, no.30.

- Fig. 208 TAU 27. Naples, Museo Nazionale 9111.
- Fig. 209 TAU 28. Naples Museo Nazionale 9538.
- Fig. 210 TAU 29. Pompeii, IX 8, 3, AND 6 (Casa di Centenario), *in situ*.
- Fig. 211 TAU 30. Pompeii, VI 15, 1 (Casa dei Vettii), *in situ*.
- Fig. 212 TAU 31. Pompeii IX 5, 14-16, partially destroyed.
- Fig. 213 TAU 32. Marseille, Académie des Sciences, Arts, et Lettres 34.
- Fig. 214 TAU 33. Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptotek GL 363.
- Fig. 215 TAU 34. Paris, Musée du Louvre Ma 1607 (1610).
- Fig. 216 TAU 35. Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Profano 10450.
- Fig. 217 TAU 36. Saint Petersburg, Hermitage A 259 and Rome, Museo Capitolino 1049.
- Fig. 218 TAU 37. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 28.57.8a-d.
- Fig. 219 TAU 38. Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano 106467.
- Fig. 220 TAU 39. Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti 614-X4.
- Fig. 221 TAU 40. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 71.AA.266.
- Fig. 222 TAU 41. Rome, Palazzo Giustiani.
- Fig. 223 TAU 42. Rome, Capitolino 3328 (ex Villa Pamphili).
- Fig. 224 TAU 43. Venice, Museo Archeologico 92.
- Fig. 225 TAU 44. Weimar, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Schlossmuseum G 1745.
- Fig. 226 TAU 45. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 105 and 117.
- Fig. 227 TAU 46. Budapest Musée National Hongrois 62.84.2

- Fig. 228 TAU 47. Berlin, Pergamon Museum. (ex Berlin-DDR, Staatliche Museen SK845).
- Fig. 229 TAU 48. Rome, Villa Albani and Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti.
- Fig. 230 TAU 49. Weimar, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Sclossmuseum G 1744.
- Fig. 231 TAU 50. Thebes, Archaeological Museum 109 (?).
- Fig. 232 TAU 51. Present location unknown. Ex England, Windsor Castle 871 (= Dal Pozzo VIII fol. 11).
- Fig. 233 TAU 52. Sens, Musée Municipal 98-99-100.
- Fig. 234 TAU 53. Šempter-Celeia, Tomb of the Prisciani, inv. 601, *in situ*.
- Fig. 235 TAU 54. Croatia, Relief from Bjelovar Parish Church. No longer visible.
- Fig. 236 TAU 55. Slovenia, Relief in the St. Janez Church on Dravinjski Vrh, near Ptuj.
- Fig. 237 TAU 56. Hungary, Stuhlweissenburg (Székesfehérvár) Museum.
- Fig. 238 TAU 57. Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmuseum Trier U194.
- Fig. 239 TAU 58. Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmuseum Trier 9937. So-called "Iphigeneia Pillar."
- Fig. 240 TAU 59. Szombathely (Hungary), Savaria Museum.
- Fig. 241 TAU 60. Varna Archaeological Museum.
- Fig. 242 TAU 61. London, British Museum 1960.2-1.1
- Fig. 243 TAU 62. Arezzo, Museo Archeologico.
- Fig. 244 TAU 63. Rome, Capitoline Museum (once Antiquarium Comunale).
- Fig. 245 TAU 64. Art Market.

- Fig. 246 TAU 65. Museo Archeologico 14468.
- Fig. 247 TAU 66. Frankfurt, Museum für Kunsthandwerk 3610.
- Fig. 248 TAU 67. Basel, Collection of Herbert A. Cahn, inv. No HC 503.
- Fig. 249 TAU 68. Athens, M. Vlasto 216956.
- Fig. 250 TAU 69. Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 1842.
- Fig. 251 TAU 70. Capua, Museo Campano 7559 (P. 14).
- Fig. 252 TAU 71. Brauron Museum 1180. So-called Götterrelief.
- Fig. 253 TAU 72. Izmir, Archaeological Museum.
- Fig. 254 TAU 73. Present location unknown.
- Fig. 255 TAU 74. Berlin.
- Fig. 256 TAU 75. Perugia, Museo Nazionale.
- Fig. 257 TAU 76. London, British Museum 950.
- Fig. 258 TAU 77. Unknown.
- Fig. 259 TAU 78. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Cubiculum M. Villa of Publius Fannius Synistor, Boscoreale.
- Fig. 260 TAU 79. Oplontis Villa of Poppaea, cubiculum 11, *in situ*.
- Fig. 261 TAU 80. Ephesus, house 2, *in situ*.
- Fig. 262 TAU 81. Pompeii VI 9, 6-7 (Casa dei Dioscuri) destroyed.
- Fig. 263 TAU 82. Castellammare di Stabia, Varano hill, Villa Arianna, site (3).
- Fig. 264 TAU 84. Berlin, Antiquarium.
- Fig. 265 TAU 86. Paris 1033.

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviations for periodicals and standard reference works follow the conventions of the *American Journal of Archaeology* 111 (2007): 14-34. Below is a list of the most common abbreviations used.

- ABV* Beazley, J.D. 1956. *Attic Black-figure Vase-painters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Addenda*² Carpenter, Thomas H. 1989. *Beazley Addenda: Additional References to ABV, ARV² and Paralipomena*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy.
- ARV*² Beazley, J.D. 1963. *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- BAD* Beazley Archive Database.
- CFST* Todisco, Luigi. 2003. *La ceramica figurata a soggetto tragico in Magna Grecia e in Sicilia*. Archaeologica 140. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider Editore.
- IA* Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*.
- IT* Euripides' *Iphigeneia Among the Taurians*.
- LCS* Trendall, A.D. 1967. *The Red-figured Vases of Lucania, Campania, and Sicily*. 2 vols. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology, edited by J.D. Beazley, Bernard Ashmole, C.M. Robertson. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- LIMC* *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. 1981-99. Zurich and Munich: Artemis Verlag.
- Para* Beazley, J.D. 1971. *Paralipomena: Additions to Attic Black-figure Vase-painters and to Attic Red-figure Vase-painters*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- RVAp* Trendall, A.D., and Alexander Cambitoglou. 1978. *The Red-figured Vases of Apulia*. 2 vols. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology, edited by Bernard Ashmole, Martin Robertson, and John Boardman. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- ThesCRA* *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum*. 2005-6. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum.

.. Ἄν Βλεφάρου δ' παρψενικῆς Φρυγῶν κείτται ἰστορικὸς πλεμῶν.
“... in her eyes lies all the history of the Trojan War.”

Pollianus (*Greek Anthology* 16.150), describing the figure of Polyxena about to be sacrificed on the tomb of Achilles in a lost monumental wall painting.

Introduction

Seeing the Sacrificial Virgin

Although the Greeks and Romans did not practice human sacrifice, the myth of the sacrificial virgin resonates powerfully as a subject in the visual arts of ancient Greece and Rome for over a millennium, from the early seventh-century BC to the fourth-century AD. While there are several sacrificial virgins in ancient myth, the only visual representations, I argue, are of Iphigeneia and Polyxena.

Both women appear in a variety of media and contexts, ranging from monumental wall paintings and sarcophagi to smaller vase paintings and gems. Iphigeneia of Mycenae, daughter of King Agamemnon, is sacrificed to propitiate Artemis so that the Greeks can sail to Troy at the beginning of the conflict. Polyxena, daughter of King Priam of Troy, is sacrificed to the ghost of Achilles as part of his share of the booty at the end of the War. Virgin sacrifice, as a subject in the visual arts, is defined by its relation to the Trojan War.

This dissertation explores the Greek and Roman depictions of Iphigeneia and Polyxena within the historical, political, social, religious, and gendered contexts in which they were created. The result is a cultural history of the figure of the sacrificial virgin in Greek and Roman art that focuses on iconological questions of interpretation and meaning.¹ In short, my dissertation examines

¹The words *interpretation* and *meaning* require some clarification. The issue of interpretation, and more specifically who is doing the interpreting is discussed below, page 18. The idea of meaning becomes complicated by the question of the intended and unintended messages conveyed by a work. While a theme or subject may have had a dominant meaning in public discourses, that does not preclude other meanings being attached to the same subject or theme by viewers in other contexts. In defining *poetics*, Yatromanolakis and Roilos (2004, 4) also come to a definition of *meaning* that offers a useful working model: Poetics “should be understood in a

how and *why* the image of the mythical sacrificial virgins occupied an important place in the thinking and imagination of historical women and men in ancient Greece and the Roman Empire.

Previous studies of virgin sacrifice have tended to focus on either the archaeological evidence for the historical practice of human sacrifice or on the theme of virgin sacrifice in Athenian tragedy of the fifth-century BC.² I treat the depictions of the sacrificial maiden in Greek and Roman art as a body of evidence, distinct from literature, in articulating virgin sacrifice as a cultural and ideological construction. The catalogue I have assembled of scenes connected with the sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena adds about 50 more works to the representations given in *LIMC*.³

Representations of the sacrificial virgin in art have not been privileged in the scholarly literature for several reasons. First of all, human sacrifice as a

broader sense as the exploration of *dialogic* construction, subversion, negotiation, and conveyance of meaning in a number of interrelated social, cultural, and aesthetic domains of human experience and expression. We should make it clear from the beginning that *meaning*, which is employed here for want of a better term, is not perceived as necessarily intentional or directly encoded and decoded signification. In this respect, we find congenial Tambiah's view of *meaning* not as transmission of information but in the sense of pattern recognition and configurational awareness" (S.J. Tambiah discusses this in his 1985 book *Culture, Thought, and Social Action: An Anthropological Perspective*, Harvard University Press). Drawing on Bourdieu's *practical logic*, Yatromanolakis and Roilos go on to describe meaning as a "*practically* articulated process of communicative interaction."

²The finds, for instance, of children's bones with evidence of cut marks at Knossos and the remains of what has been interpreted as a young man being sacrificed at Anemospilia continue to capture the imaginations of archaeologists, anthropologists and historians of religion. Most recently, Dennis Hughes examines the archaeological, literary and historical evidence for the sacrifice of humans in the Greek world from the Mycenaean through Hellenistic periods in his 1991 book, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*. Similarly, philologists and classicists have expended a great deal of energy in trying to understand the role of human sacrifice in Greek tragedy, as articulated in the works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and especially Euripides. See, for instance: Sansone 1975; Foley 1985; Loraux 1987; Rabinowitz 1993; Scodel 1996; Wohl 1998; Aretz 1999; Foley 2001; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003; Roselli, forthcoming; Sourvinou-Inwood, forthcoming.

³Iphigeneia, *LIMCV*, p. 706-34; Polyxena, *LIMCVII*, p. 431-5.

subject in the visual arts of ancient Greece is relatively uncommon as compared with its greater popularity in Greek myth and literature. Secondly, the visual sources do not form a canonical group in any one medium nor do they adhere to a standardized iconography. Thirdly, depictions of human sacrifice appear over many centuries, and consequently have been perceived as difficult to interpret because they are not conveniently linked to a particular historical or cultural circumstance, or to a regional tradition. The myths of Iphigeneia and Polyxena, however, remain essentially the same over time, and where, when, in which media, and why the different parts of their stories are depicted merit further attention. The sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena are intimately linked in functioning as “bookends” to the Trojan War. Their deaths form part of a specific narrative context bound up in, and deriving meaning, in part, from its particular political, cultural, and epic context. Iphigeneia and Polyxena are a compelling pair because they are both princesses, sisters, daughters, and brides in death, one Greek and one Trojan, thus creating a series of correspondences and oppositions between them.

Furthermore, this dissertation focuses on representations of Iphigeneia and Polyxena as sacrificial victims, and not on other parts of their stories. Depictions of Iphigeneia in Tauris and Polyxena at the fountain house are central to each woman’s myth-history, but go beyond the scope of this study. Appendix A, however, gives a catalogue of works depicting Iphigeneia in Tauris, and a summary of the scenes, because they are a coda to Iphigeneia’s story at Aulis, relating what happens to her after she is rescued. In Tauris, the former sacrificial

virgin becomes a sacrificer of men, and her role inversion sets up a series of parallelisms between the two strands of her story.

Throughout, my emphasis is on the depictions in Greek art, and their legacy in the Roman period. I am interested broadly in how the Roman depictions reflect the persistence of themes from the Greek period, or how they diverge from Greek traditions, uses, and meanings, thus offering a glimpse into the Greek world, so to speak, “through a glass darkly.”⁴ The depictions of Iphigeneia in Etruscan art also form a distinct body of material, which I discuss in Chapter Two.

Two central themes recur throughout the chapters of this dissertation: 1.) the fashioning of identity and 2.) issues of female agency. These have led me to two conclusions. First, the figure of the sacrificial virgin illuminates a mode of aristocratic fashioning of identity of both women and men that reveals constructions of gender that cannot be separated from other cultural concerns such as the religious and political. Second, the subject of virgin sacrifice in art presents more complex ideas about female agency in the ancient world than has been previously thought, which in turn offers a more nuanced understanding of the role and status of women in ancient Greece and Rome.

These two themes have led me to the overarching conclusion: the images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena were polysemic and conveyed a spectrum of meanings depending on the media and contexts in which the works of art appear and on its intended and unintended viewers.

⁴This is how Zanker (1995) refers to the Roman copies of original Greek sculptures in his discussion of depictions of intellectuals in Greek and Roman art.

Fashioning of Identity

The idea of self-fashioning, the conscious construction and manipulation of identity, in the Roman period is now widely acknowledged.⁵ At certain times Roman emperors wanted to associate themselves with their gods and the heroic past, as can be seen, for instance, in the famous marble portrait of Claudius in the guise of Jupiter from Lanuvium in the Vatican and in the portrait of Commodus as Hercules in the Palazzo dei Conservatori of the Capitoline Museums. This holds true for female portraiture as well. Eve D'Ambra, for instance, has written about the practice that began in the first-century AD of putting portrait heads of Roman matrons atop nude bodies in order to present elite women as Venus.⁶ Simon and others have also noticed that the head of the large figure of Diana/Luna on the marble sculpture group with Iphigeneia from the Aventine (IPH 55) is carved with the portrait features of Faustina Major; and the association between Diana/Luna and the apotheosis of imperial and elite women in the Antonine period is well documented.⁷

Similarly, when we encounter the image of Iphigeneia or Alkestis, for example, on a Roman sarcophagus we can imagine that one of the goals was to associate the deceased with the virtue of these celebrated maidens.⁸ This idea is sometimes strengthened by the carving of portrait features of the deceased onto

⁵Stephen Greenblatt introduced the idea of "self-fashioning" in his seminal 1980 book *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*.

⁶D'Ambra 1996.

⁷Simon 1984, 838; Brendel 1935 (discussed in Hartswick 2004, 93 and 182 note 52 and 53).

⁸On Alkestis, see Wood 1978; and postscript to reprinted version of this article in *Roman Art in Context*, edited by Eve D'Ambra, 1993. More generally, see Zanker and Ewald 2004.

the faces of mythological figures on Roman sarcophagi. Wolfgang Schindler has argued that the bronze krateriskos in Varna with three scenes of Iphigeneia in Tauris presents an allegory of Julia Augusta as Iphigeneia (TAU 60).⁹

B. Burrell has shown how a third-century AD Roman provincial coin reflects the “self-representation” of the Lydian city of Philadelphia, using the Iphigeneia myth to bolster its own history and importance in Roman Asia (TAU 86).¹⁰ The reverse of the coin depicts a woman holding a cult statue moving towards a temple with two youths behind her. Using clues in Pausanias and in other Anatolian images, Burrell argues that the statue held by the woman was not the Artemis of Ephesos, but Artemis Anaitis, the patron goddess of Philadelphia, who can be rendered almost identically, creating a link between the two cities. In this way, Philadelphia sought to align itself with powerful Ephesos, appropriating Iphigeneia’s myth-history to claim that when she and her companions fled Tauris, she set up the stolen cult statue in Philadelphia. The image on this coin illustrates how myth-history and contemporary practices could be combined in an effort of self-fashioning, reflecting political rivalries, attempts at currying favor, and the brokering of power.

Etruscan wall paintings in the François Tomb juxtapose mythological and what might be historical subjects on different walls, revealing perhaps Etruscan attempts at self-fashioning. The paintings in this tomb, dating from about 350-330 BC, include a depiction of the sacrifice of the Trojan prisoners in one chamber, and a similar bloody battle scene on the walls of the adjoining chamber.

⁹Schindler 1980.

¹⁰Burrell 2005, 25 (for term “self-representation”).

Opposite the Trojan heroes are the heroes from Vulci, and in that battle scene the names of actual people are recorded in inscriptions. Contemporary events might have been linked with mythological stories for thematic purposes, with historical events likened to or framed in the context of epic struggles of myth-history.

While self-fashioning in the Roman period is widely acknowledged, how the Greeks may have practiced self-fashioning has not yet been fully explored. Discussions of how the Greeks fashioned identity tend to focus on the Hellenistic period rather than the Archaic or Classical. Hellenistic rulers were known to adopt divine attributes, the most famous example being Alexander the Great. At the end of his life, Alexander wanted to be worshipped as a divinity, and the archaeological record of the period also gives us votives to contemporary figures of importance as *isothēoi*, or on a par with the gods.¹¹ In 1988 a conference was held at Berkeley on “Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World,” with papers collected in a volume of the same name.¹² In introducing the essays by Smith, Zanker, and Ridgway on portraits and gravestone, A. Stewart explains how the public nature of these works was “a context in which the self-image of Hellenistic men and women was most self-consciously developed and presented.”¹³

Alan Shapiro organized a conference at Florida State University in 2006 called “Greek Self-Fashioning from Alcibiades to Menander,” which focused on

¹¹Green 2007.

¹²Bulloch et al. 1993.

¹³Stewart 1993, 200.

literature.¹⁴ In addition, scholars have also looked at the role of athletics in Greek self-fashioning. Onno van Nijf has examined the role of athletic festivals for aristocratic male self-fashioning in the Roman east, and Andrew Stewart has given a paper entitled “Nudity, the Olympics, and Greek Self-Fashioning.”¹⁵

Greenblatt’s self-fashioning is one aspect of his study of what he calls cultural poetics or new historicism, which has influenced the fields of classics and archaeology.¹⁶ Books like Dougherty and Kurke’s *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece* (1993) and Ian Morris’ *Archaeology as Cultural History* (2000) reflect this influence, and there are many other examples.¹⁷ Earlier than these works, a cultural history of the Greeks was being pioneered by a group of French scholars, including Jean-Pierre Vernant, Marcel Detienne, Nicole Loraux, and Pierre Vidal-Naquet, whose work is discussed below.

John Boardman’s interpretation of political symbolism in depictions of Herakles in Archaic vase-painting could also be framed as a case of self-fashioning. Herakles as a “favourite” of Peisistratos or as his “alter-ego” reflects how the tyrant manipulated and used myth and art for political and propagandistic purposes in order to associate himself with the hero par

¹⁴The schedule of speakers and titles of papers are available on the website of the Classics Department at the Florida State University: www.fsu.edu/~classics/langford/langfordsp2006.htm.

¹⁵Van Nijf 2001; Stewart 2004.

¹⁶On cultural poetics and new historicism, see Greenblatt 1980; Chartier 1988; Hunt 1989; Greenblatt and Gallagher 2000.

¹⁷Other examples include Nagy 1990, Molyneaux 1997; the role of cultural history in archaeology is also discussed in Snodgrass 2006, 33-8.

excellence of the Greeks.¹⁸ The notorious story told by Herodotus of Peisistratos' return to Athens in the early 550s is another example of self-fashioning.¹⁹

Herodotus tells us how Megakles and Peisistratos designed a trick to achieve the tyrant's return: they dressed a woman named Phye in full armor, coached her on how to hold herself like a goddess and put her in the chariot with Peisistratos, with heralds announcing that Athena herself was escorting Peisistratos back to Athens. Such a scene recalls images on vases with Herakles' Apotheosis. If true, the account in Herodotus gives us a model of how Peisistratos was able to present himself in a certain way through his association with Athena.

Whether we use the terms "self-representation," "self-definition," or "constructing" in reference to how identities might be formed and manipulated, the debt to Greenblatt's self-fashioning, and the work of scholars upon which he builds, is clear, and I have opted to use his term to acknowledge this debt. I hope to show how the depictions of Iphigeneia and Polyxena serve as a case-study of how images in Greek art participated in the fashioning of identity and how this may be used to understand better other subjects.

Issues of Female Agency

Female agency emerges as a central question in studying the subject of virgin sacrifice because of the issues of consent and resistance bound up in this ritual action. The sacrificial virgin in art provides a body of evidence that is

¹⁸Boardman 1972; further argued in Boardman 1975; contra Osborne 1983-4; Cook 1987; replied to in Boardman 1989.

¹⁹Herodotus I.60.

suiting for a study of how female agency, or lack of agency, is represented in these works. Representations of the sacrificial virgin led to sacrifice against her will, for instance, enable us to see how artists visually rendered bodily resistance and violence against women. The circulation of such images expressed ideas about power and what was acceptable in the relation between men and women. In their 2005 book *Reclaiming Female Agency: Feminist Art History After Postmodernism*, Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard identify “the interplay between women’s cultural assertion and the erasure or resistance that both followed and preceded it,” as an important subject for feminist art historians to study.²⁰

In her book on priestesses, Joan Connelly has recently discussed the contribution of agency theory to the study of archaeology.²¹ She refers to the priestesses that she studies as both “sacred servants” and “cult agents” to acknowledge that “there is agency in service and service in agency.” Although the study of female agency has been criticized for its bias defining male agency as the normative position associated with power, this approach allows us to ask questions about how women may have participated in the brokering of power.²²

The 2007 book *Art’s Agency and Art History*, edited by Robin Osborne and Jeremy Tanner, analyzes the benefits, limitations, and significance of Alfred Gell’s anthropological work on art for research in the fields of art history, classics,

²⁰Broude and Garrard 2005, 22.

²¹Connelly 2007, 22-3 with bibliography, especially p. 22 note 126.

²²For a criticism of agency theory, see Gero 2000. Discussed in Connelly 2007, 23.

archaeology, and other disciplines.²³ In *Art and Agency: an Anthropological Theory* (1998), Gell establishes a theoretical framework centered on what he calls the “art nexus,” which sees “art as a system of action intended to change the world, rather than encode symbolic propositions about it.”²⁴ Gell attacks approaches that focus on cultural context, symbolism, and meaning, and in this way his method is contrary to mine. Likewise, Gell’s insistence on the primacy of objects for the expression of agency does not allow for how images on an object may reflect or inscribe ideas about human agency nor does it take into consideration somatic interpretations that identify the body or representations of the body as the locus for ideas about personal agency.

Above all, I am interested in exploring what the images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in Greek and Roman art reveal about issues of female agency in the ancient world. An example of how the two themes of identity and agency bear on the images of the sacrificial virgin might be helpful. These themes, for instance, encourage questions that may lead to a better understanding of the Polyxena Sarcophagus, and what has been seen as its perplexing iconography. Why was the subject of Polyxena’s sacrifice chosen as the subject of this sarcophagus? For whom was the sarcophagus made, and did the choice of subject reflect a fashioning of identity? What is the relation, if any, between the gender of the deceased and the choice of subject? What can be learned about attitudes towards

²³This volume includes an essay by Osborne entitled “Sex, Agency and History: the case of Athenian Painted Pottery,” which finds Gell’s work is useful “for understanding the distinction between the agency which lies in the ‘art’ of a work of art, and the agency which a work may acquire through features not directly connected to its ‘art,’” but also limiting for the understanding of how his conception of agency explains changes in works of art over time.

²⁴Gell 1998, 6. For an excellent overview and analysis of Gell’s theory, see Osborne and Tanner 2007

historical women in light of the decision to represent the violent killing of the mythological Polyxena? How do we account for the differential in power between men and women on the two long sides? On the “presentation of gender relationships,” N. Sevinç observes, “On the side with the murder of Polyxena, all the power, and specifically the power to decide life or death, resides with the men, while in the celebration scene the men are relegated to the status of performers, whose movements follow the rhythms made by female musicians.”²⁵ Another way to frame this observation is to note the agency or lack of personal agency exerted by women on each side. The construction of identity and ideas about agency are not self-contained ideas, but are intimately entwined.

The identification of gender as a locus of self-definition for the Greeks is implicit in the ancient sources. The importance of warfare and fighting for the Greeks allows us to glimpse their ideal of the male warrior-citizen who embodies the prized qualities of *arête* and *andreia*. Both Helen Monsacré and Emily Vermeule have looked at the ways in which war and fighting are related to sex. Vermeule describes how taunts between warriors in Homer “aim to turn the opposing soldier into a female, or into the weaker animal role,” as for instance when Paris is called “virgin-face, shiny with hair wax” (XI.385).²⁶ For the Greeks, gender roles are crucial for articulating the identity of men and women.

The place of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in the context of the Trojan conflict demands that we focus on gender and identity as they become implicated in war, the business of men, but also the domain of women. For the Greeks, gender is

²⁵Sevinç 1996, 262.

²⁶Monsacré 1984; Vermeule 1979, 99-103 (quote cited p. 101).

inseparable from other cultural concerns. The role and status of women are determined by their participation in cultural life, including the worlds of politics, religion, and family life. After examining the images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in their gendered context, we can explore the different meanings attached to the figure of the sacrificial virgin in Greek art.

Polysemic Princesses: The Multiple Meanings of the Sacrificial Virgins

“A scene may indeed be examined from different perspectives without yielding contradictory interpretations. The painters themselves often played on these ambiguities that allow varied approaches. In the ancient world there are numerous examples of objects and monuments interpreted in completely contradictory ways.”²⁷

This passage was written by Claude Bérard in the postscript to *A City of Images* in reference to the “multiplicity of approaches” taken by the authors of the various chapters of this book.²⁸ The figure of the sacrificial virgin in Greek art is one such subject that is interpreted in contradictory ways and approached from different perspectives. The polysemic nature of Iphigeneia is not surprising considering the various roles she plays. In her role as sacrificial virgin, Iphigeneia is also a daughter and bride in death. In other strands of her story, Iphigeneia is a priestess of Artemis and a cult-founder, she is a heroine, and immortalized into a goddess.²⁹

²⁷Bérard 1989, 167.

²⁸The possibility of an image conveying multiple meanings has been explored, for example, by Gernet 1951, Lissarrague 1990, and Neer 2002.

²⁹Lyons 1997, 137.

Questions of valence were also of interest to C. Bérard. In discussing representations of women working wool on Attic vases, for instance, he characterized the women's work as having an "entirely positive connotation." Likewise, in describing a red-figure cup of the mid fifth-century BC with scenes of women gathering fruit on one side, and a congregation of women on the other, Bérard posits that "all of these images present an extremely positive view of female society and of the dignity of women."³⁰ Identifying the range of meanings conveyed by representations of women in Greek art is still a salient iconographic problem in the study of women in ancient art.

The valence or polysemy of the sacrificial virgin was one of the central questions that first prompted my interest in the subject of virgin sacrifice. Was the mythological figure of the sacrificial virgin constructed as an image that celebrated virtuous women who gave their lives for the State, similar to the honor of a warrior who dies in battle, or was she a figure used by a patriarchal regime to control women? Was the sacrificial virgin a symbol of a heroine that empowered women, or a misogynistic fiction used to threaten and intimidate women, ultimately serving to reinforce normative gendered hierarchies? Was her sacrifice a cowering act of submission, a courageous act of resistance, or a choice to act bravely? The images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in art enable us to ask these questions, and help us come closer to answering them.

To address the questions posed in the previous paragraph, the sacrificial virgins were interpreted in different contexts and by different people, in a

³⁰ Bérard 1989, 90-1, and 93. These quotations are discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five.

number of ways. This polysemy is at the core of their mythology and, some would argue of Greek art. Polarizing the status of women as either “victims or rebels,” however, imposes a binary mode of thinking that is limiting. In the chapters that follow, I attempt to sort out the cultural strands or ways in which the sacrificial virgins could symbolize a constellation of different meanings about ancient women.

In reference to the problematic view of women as “victims or rebels,” Roger Chartier argues, “Not all the cracks invading male domination took the form of spectacular breaks, nor were they always expressed by the eruption of a discourse of refusal and rebellion. They often arose within consent itself, employing the language of domination to strengthen a refusal to submit.”³¹ Chartier’s insight is useful in explaining the ways in which the figure of the sacrificial virgin eludes simple interpretation. While most previous scholars have tended to view the sacrificial virgin as the victim of male repression and aggression, I argue that the iconography of the sacrificial virgin utilizes the visual vocabulary of repression to create a crack or break. The word “rebel” is too strong to describe how the sacrificial virgin may have functioned in introducing a female figure that does not fit neatly into how women were visualized. The sacrificial virgin was an idea, not a reality. As an idea, the sacrificial virgin could be used to offer the possibility of a female figure who suffers a heroic death in war for the good of the people, a figure approaching the status of a man. The

³¹Chartier 1997, 24.

appearance of such a figure on personal objects used by women, like vases, offers an opportunity for such contemplation.

METHODOLOGY: APPROACHING THE SACRIFICIAL VIRGIN

The above sections looked briefly at the two themes of the dissertation and how my approach stems, in part, from them. By combining these strategies of interpretation, I develop an interdisciplinary approach that combines feminist, literary, anthropological, and cultural methodologies to come to a richer understanding of the figure of the sacrificial virgin.

French scholars, like Vernant, Detienne, Vidal-Naquet, Bérard, and Lissarrague, have articulated how ancient images have the power to illuminate abstract cultural ideas.³² These scholars are sometimes referred to as the “French School,” even though there are differences in their approaches. In discussing the work of Vernant, Detienne, Loraux, and Vidal-Naquet, Bernard Knox commented, “The main links between them are their cooperation in the direction of the Centre de recherches comparées sur les sociétés anciennes, their teaching and research functions in the *École pratique des hautes études* . . . and the general description ‘structuralist,’ which appears in the subtitle of a recent selection from their work in English translation.”³³ These scholars draw on methodologies in the fields of literary studies, linguistics, and anthropology to

³²The influence of these scholars is immense. In the preface to the paperback edition of *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies* (Bonnet 1992, vii), Wendy Doniger writes, “. . . since World War II, it is French scholarship that has made the greatest contribution to the field of classics in both England and America.”

³³Knox 1986, x.

discover new associations of how material culture reflects Greek modes of thinking.

My approach builds upon the interpretive framework pioneered by the French scholars of ancient cultural history and iconography. This dissertation explores how images in Greek art may be elucidated as cultural constructions that can convey different meanings. My work, however, diverges from their interests in structuralism.³⁴ I hope to move beyond the strictures of binary opposition imposed by structuralist dichotomies, especially as it informs the dialectic of the masculine and feminine. In addition, I add to the theoretical lens of the French scholars an interest in contextualizing works of art within the historical and cultural circumstances in which they were created.³⁵

In *A City of Images*, F. Lissarrague and C. Bron observe that through the images on Athenian vases, “the city displays itself and stages its own fantasies.”³⁶ The representation of the sacrificial virgin in Greek art is one such fantasy. The images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena convey meanings and ideas that are not preserved in any literary source. In his 1951 article “Political Symbolism: The Public Hearth,” Louis Gernet writes, “To study the ‘signified’ in terms of the ‘signifier’ is to study a social mode of thought that is at times actually richer, since

³⁴In Chapter 1, however, I discuss the structural similarities between the myths of Iphigeneia and Andromeda, which proves to be a useful tool in comparing the stories of these maidens.

³⁵This has been a criticism raised against the work of some of these scholars. For instance, in a review of Lissarrague’s *Greek Vases: The Athenians and Their Images* (New York: Riverside Book Company, 2001), J. Barringer writes, “The author’s observations are largely detached from chronology, connoisseurship, or social or political context. . . .The world that Lissarrague describes exists outside history or specificity so the reader is left to fill in the historical context of the vases, which span the archaic and first half of the classical period” (see BMCR 2002.02.06).

³⁶Lissarrague and Bron 1989, 21.

it is not expressed in the usual sort of language. . . . On encountering it, we discover that it is the means of making contact with some historical values that other modes of thought no longer preserve.”³⁷ This expresses the aim of this dissertation as well, to study the “signified,” which is the idea of the “virgin sacrificed” and the role and status of ancient women, in terms of the “signifier,” which is the images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in Greek and Roman art. Written over 50 years ago, Gernet’s approach is still valid and current.

One of the main theoretical difficulties in undertaking the enterprise of “interpreting” the sacrificial virgin is in asking *who* is doing the interpreting?³⁸ For a body of work that spans over a millennium, and encompasses three cultures in different regions over such a long period of time, who are the ideal viewers and do they change? The problem of the ideal viewer is taken up by John Clarke and others influenced by reception theories.³⁹ Theories of the gaze are also much debated, recently with the careful theoretical formulations of A. Stewart.⁴⁰ While we cannot pretend to reconstruct the exact viewing experience of an ancient viewer, male or female, old or young, aristocrat or farmer, Greek or Roman.⁴¹ A

³⁷Gernet 1951, 100-101 (English translation 1981; reprinted 2001. Page numbers are to reprint edition).

³⁸The anthropologist Clifford Geertz, whose work was fundamental for the development of cultural poetics, has been criticized for his over-generalizing, and not taking into account the nuances of different subjectivities and interpretations. See, for instance, Crapanzano 1986; Kessing 1987; discussed in Dougherty and Kurke 1993, 4 (and note 16).

³⁹Clarke 2003.

⁴⁰Stewart 1997.

⁴¹On these difficulties, Greenblatt (1980, 5) wrote “if cultural poetics is conscious of its status as interpretation, this consciousness must extend to an acceptance of the impossibility of fully reconstructing and reentering the culture of the sixteenth century, of leaving behind one’s own situation.”

range of possible interpretations and viewing experiences, however, can be approached, mediated (sometimes distorted) through the scholarly lens that we hold up to the material.⁴² Much is conjectural, but an acknowledgement of these theoretical obstacles encourages us to ask further questions that will hopefully bring us closer to accomplishing our goal.

An approach involving “the construction of hypothetical variant interpretations” has been identified by Sue Blundell and Nancy Rabinowitz as a “valid and fertile” way to recover female subjectivities in ancient art.⁴³ In attempting to reconstruct different interpretations of the sacrificial virgins, my work engages with similar problems as those tackled by Sutton (1992), Stehle and Day (1996), Petersen (1997), Stewart (1997), Younger (2002), and Blundell and Rabinowitz (2005). I attempt to recover female subjectivities, and then to suggest that male viewers might also have identified with the sacrificial virgin.

At the same time, the experience of which women are we studying? Judith Butler first addressed the usefulness and meaning of the category of “Woman” in her 1990 *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, which calls into question the possibility of writing a monolithic women’s history. When I refer to ancient Greek “women” or “womanhood” throughout this dissertation, it should be assumed that I am referring to women of privilege, wealth, and means.

H. Versnel, R. Bagnall, and J. Connelly, among others, have examined how

⁴²Jeffrey Hamburger has written sensitively on the methodological difficulties in writing about women in the Middle Ages in several books on art and female monasticism in Medieval Germany. On the tendency to either romanticize or ignore women’s “voices” in the writing of Medieval history, Hamburger (1998, 16) offers that “at the very least, one can search for a tenable middle ground, one that admits the impossibility of unmediated communication from past to present but nonetheless allows women to speak from the silence within enclosure. There is no Archimedean point on which to rest a definitive interpretation of any given set of historical materials.”

⁴³Blundell and Rabinowitz 2005.

questions of class and status affect our study of ancient Greek women, and how the nature of our surviving sources more often than not record the experiences of the upper classes.⁴⁴ Ultimately, the interpretations that we can imagine involve aristocratic men and women and those of other classes who came in contact with these objects. That is not to say however, that the experiences and ideals of the elite would have been so different from that of other classes. Chester Starr has explained, “Fundamentally the Greek upper classes shared the values and ethical standards of Hellenic civilization as a whole. . . Those historians who explore the lower classes and begin with the premise that their culture is essentially different from that of the elite do not stand in full accord with anthropological studies of peasantries.”⁴⁵

To “see” the sacrificial virgin is not synonymous with an attempt to study only women’s history or to recreate only women’s voices. I aim to interpret the meanings attached to the sacrificial virgin, for both men and women. It is impossible to write about ancient Greek women without writing about men as well. Modern scholarship has tended to see ancient constructions of gender and sexuality as polarized and intransigent. I hope to challenge these assumptions by showing how the figure of the sacrificial virgin bridges the divide between these assumed opposites. By situating the sacrificial virgin in the world of men and women, we are able to recover how she oscillates between male and female subjectivities. In the end, this gives us a better glimpse into women’s experiences.

⁴⁴Versnel 1987; Bagnall 1995; Connelly 2007, 23 (for discussion of this point).

⁴⁵Starr 1977, 130. Discussed in Donlon 1999, 178-9.

The overarching goal of this dissertation is not to formulate or derive a single theory, interpretation, or meaning of the figure of the sacrificial virgin in Greek and Roman art, a period of over 1,000 years. Rather, I aim to locate the images of the sacrificial maidens within the original cultural contexts and artistic traditions in which they were made.⁴⁶ The uses, and meanings of the sacrificial virgin change over time, and I seek to study the sacrificial virgin and her meanings at a certain time, at a certain place and for a certain people, and to understand the change that takes place over time and from one culture to another. In the case of Iphigeneia, for instance, we can examine her significance in specific local contexts in which she was especially important, as at Brauron, as well as her broader place in the Greek world as a pan-Hellenic heroine. Then, looking beyond the Greek period, we can situate Iphigeneia's place in the individual myth-histories of the Etruscans and of the Romans, while distinguishing the traditions to which she belongs in a broader pan-Mediterranean context.

An interest in storytelling is what is common in depictions of Iphigeneia and Polyxena throughout the Greek, Etruscan, and Roman periods. The ways in which images of the sacrificial virgins were interpreted in these periods, however, was different, based on the varying social climates of the cultures that produced them, the times in which they were made, the objects on which they appear, and who was looking at them. In the Archaic and Classical periods of Greece, the

⁴⁶ Michel Foucault (1972, 9-10) marks a critical shift introducing the poststructuralist practice of moving away from a monolithic, totalizing, reductionist interpretation and towards "the space of dispersion." For an overview of Foucault's contribution to the field of ancient art, see Morris 1993, 26-7.

stories of these maidens appealed because of the tension between the sacrifice made for the collective good and that of the individual. The deeply wrought anxieties and tensions surrounding maiden sacrifice are intimately bound up in the infrastructure of human responsibilities, such as the sometimes contradictory obligations to one's family versus responsibilities to the State and to the gods. The dynamics of the tensions between the private and public worlds are articulated, for instance, in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* in which the chorus recounts how King Agamemnon is anguished in having to decide whether or not to sacrifice his daughter Iphigeneia in order to appease the goddess Artemis (lines 206-211).

The Hellenistic period saw a cultural shift towards a greater individualism and cosmopolitanism than in the earlier periods, and this affected how the figure of the sacrificial virgins was interpreted.⁴⁷ The position of women in society was changing. This was the time of Hellenistic queens with great political power, of women poets and artists, and of the first women to formally study obstetrics.⁴⁸ At this time, what I believe was most appealing about the stories of Iphigeneia and Polyxena was not how their sacrifices served the collective good, but on the deeply personal, individually experienced feelings surrounding the maiden's sacrifice. The emphasis was on the emotional tension and struggle of the

⁴⁷In characterizing Hellenistic art, Pollitt (1986, 10) wrote: "Eventually this concentration on personal experience rather than cultural ideals as the principal subject of art led to a fundamental change in the nature of the Greek artistic tradition. The exalted themes and traditional subjects of the culture of the polis were increasingly abandoned in favor of works which permitted a 'hard look' at contemporary social conditions or indulged a private, domestically oriented sense of amusement."

⁴⁸For an overview, see Fantham, et al. 1994, Chapter 5.

individual put in an impossible situation. In the Iphigeneia myth, for instance, this struggle could focus on the maiden, her father, or even the other Greeks.

In art, the cultural ideal of the personal sacrifice made for the benefit of the group, can be expressed in different ways. In the Archaic period, this is sometimes conveyed through the act of witnessing. On the Polyxena Sarcophagus, for instance, the six mourning women who witness the killing of Polyxena and the three men who hold her reinforce that the death of the Trojan princess placates the shade of Achilles so that others will not have to die and so that the Greeks can return home. The three men who hold Polyxena on the Tyrrhenian amphora in the British Museum also bear witness to how the death of the maiden benefits all of the Greeks. In a similar way, in looking at these depictions of Polyxena's sacrifice the ancient Greek viewer is implicated in this act of witness, becoming metaphorically one of the many for whom the maiden dies. On the other hand, the conception of the sacrifice for the good of the State over that of the individual finds a different expression in the mid fourth-century BC painting of Iphigeneia led to sacrifice by Timanthes of Kythnos, lost but known from literary descriptions (IPH 5). Timanthes' painting indicates a shift towards an interest in human emotions, with the countenances of Calchas, Odysseus, and Menelaos each shown sadder than the next. The face of Timanthes' Agamemnon is veiled to suggest the intolerable grief he endures for his responsibility in the killing of his daughter.

In contrast to the often repressive patriarchy of ancient Greece, the greater freedoms enjoyed by aristocratic Etruscan women indicates that the sacrificial virgin was viewed differently in Etruria. Archaeological evidence like the lavish

decoration of women's tombs, literary sources like Theopompus' statement that Etruscan women could raise their own children without their husbands' approval, funerary inscriptions naming women by their own names without a patronymic, and artistic sources like many inscribed bronze mirrors (indicating a level of literacy), and paintings of married women and men dining together at banquets, all point to the privileged place of elite women in Etruscan society.⁴⁹ Depictions of Iphigeneia about to be sacrificed on Etruscan funerary urns illustrate how a Greek myth could be adapted and gain new popularity in the Etruscan world (IPH 13-46). The frequent appearance of Iphigeneia in a funerary context in a culture where elite women had greater autonomy and enjoyed a higher status and rank than in other parts of the Mediterranean suggests that the sacrificial virgin found a particular place and a specific use in Etruria.

Later in Italy, the story and image of the sacrificial virgins were adapted to suit Roman tastes. In Roman art, Iphigeneia appears most often on sarcophagi and wall paintings. The Iphigeneia myth was deemed especially appropriate for funerary contexts, and the maiden was used to contemplate and comment on the virtues of Roman women in death. Depictions of the Iphigeneia story in wall paintings could serve a similar function, commenting on female virtue. The inclusion of these scenes within the decorative programs of the Roman domus, juxtaposed with other mythological narratives, also created new meanings to learned visitors whose knowledge of mythology allowed them to contemplate the themes of the stories they saw depicted on the walls. In the Roman Empire, the sacrificial virgin circulated in a different cultural milieu than in the Greek world,

⁴⁹For an overview, see Bonfante 1986, 236-238 and Bonfante 1994.

one in which Greek mythology could be used for historicizing and for more overtly social and political purposes.

This introduction is subtitled “Seeing the Sacrificial Virgin” because this is the aim of my dissertation. There are different ways to “see” Iphigeneia and Polyxena, and I explore different ways of looking at these maidens. First, we must look at the images in the visual arts in order to see the iconography of the sacrificial victims. Then we can metaphorically see how the images and iconography of the sacrificial virgins functioned ideologically as cultural constructions. We must distinguish between how we see the sacrificial virgin today, and how she was seen by contemporaries in ancient Greece. We must ask who is looking at these images, and how did they see them. Ultimately, I explore how the experience of seeing the sacrificial virgins in art is different from hearing about her story or seeing her story performed in the theater.

I intentionally use the passive construction in the title of my dissertation, “The Virgin Sacrificed.” In one sense, the virgin is sacrificed, she is acted upon. She is the “object” of the sacrifice, even if she goes willingly to death. In another sense, the sacrificial virgin was the object or figure used by historical men and women to express certain ideas and to articulate certain problems. From the evidence in art and literature, it seems that it was not the act of killing the sacrificial virgin that the Greeks found most compelling, but rather the idea of the virgin sacrificed.

To summarize, the aim of my dissertation is to show how this inquiry into the representations of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in art offers new interpretations

on the meaning of the sacrificial virgin as an *idea* within the reality of religious and secular life in ancient Greece and Rome. As Albert Henrichs observed, “the Greeks clearly preferred the fiction of human sacrifice to its reality.”⁵⁰

Ultimately, the subject of virgin sacrifice raises deep moral and ethical questions about the value of human life; in particular, about the value and expendability of women’s lives, and by extension the place and identity of women in Greek and Roman society.

While my focus is on Iphigeneia and Polyxena, I hope that this study reveals how the depictions of these two maidens evoke broader compelling questions on the interpretation of myth, uses of narrative, and the construction of identity and gender in Greek and Roman art. The significance of these results extends beyond the figure of the sacrificial virgin to probe and challenge hermeneutic concerns central to humanistic studies, such as the processes of interpretation and the creation of meaning.

⁵⁰Henrichs 1981, 195.

Chapter 1

Traditions of the Sacrificial Maiden in the Ancient Mediterranean

This chapter explores traditions of the sacrificial maiden in the ancient Mediterranean with the goal of moving towards a definition of virgin sacrifice. The chapter is divided into five parts. Part I reviews literary sources for the stories of Iphigeneia and Polyxena and considers the relation between text and image. Part II examines briefly the traditions of other sacrificial maidens, such as the daughters of Erechtheus. The relation between animal sacrifice and human sacrifice is discussed in Part III. Ancient Near Eastern parallels and traditions are explored in Part IV. The chapter ends with Part V attempting to come to a better understanding of what constitutes Iphigeneia and Polyxena as sacrificial virgins.

I. Literary Sources

In most accounts, the sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena frame the Trojan War. In order to achieve favorable winds to sail from Aulis to Troy, the Achaians must sacrifice the Greek princess Iphigeneia, the daughter of King Agamemnon. Likewise, at the end of the war, the ghost of Achilles demands the sacrifice of the Trojan princess Polyxena, the daughter of King Priam. A consideration of the stories and portrayal of each maiden in the literary record

allows us to compare how the visual representations are both similar to and different from traditions in literature.¹

IPHIGENEIA

Iphigeneia's name (Ἰφιγυῖα) in Greek means “strong-born,” or “mighty.”² Iphigeneia and her sacrifice are conspicuously missing from the *Iliad*, in which Agamemnon mentions three daughters, Chrysothemis, Laodike, and Iphianassa, but not Iphigeneia.³ Agamemnon has four daughters in the *Kypria*, with the names of Iphigeneia and Iphianassa distinguished from one another.⁴ Our earliest accounts of Iphigeneia's sacrifice are found in the *Kypria* and in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, or *Ehoiai*. In the lost *Kypria* of the seventh or sixth century BC, there was a version of the Iphigeneia myth in which the princess, instead of being sacrificed, was taken by Artemis to Tauris and made immortal. In Proclus' summary of the *Kypria* we are given the following account:

When the expedition had mustered a second time at Aulis, Agamemnon, while at the chase, shot a stag and boasted that he surpassed even Artemis. At this the goddess was so angry that she sent stormy winds and prevented them from sailing. Kalchas then told them of the anger of the goddess and bade them sacrifice Iphigeneia to Artemis. This they attempt to do, sending to fetch Iphigeneia as though for marriage with Achilles. Artemis, however,

¹The literary sources of the Greek period for the stories of Iphigeneia and Polyxena are compiled and discussed in numerous places. Some of the most recent are Burgess 2001; Gantz 1996, 582-8, 657-9, 686-7; Bremmer 2002 (on Iphigeneia); Croisille 1963; *ThesCRA*; *LIMC*. The references to Iphigeneia's sacrifice in Latin literature are compiled in the appendix of Croisille 1963. Polyxena in Latin literature is discussed in Schwarz 1992.

²Liddell and Scott 1996, 845.

³*Iliad* 9.144-45.

⁴The Laurentian scholiast on Sophocles, *Electra* 157 records, “Either he follows Homer who spoke of the three daughters of Agamemnon, or—like the writer of the *Kypria*—he makes them four, (distinguishing) Iphigeneia and Iphianassa” (translation H. Evelyn White 2002, 187).

snatched her away and transported her to the Tauri, making her immortal, and putting a stag in place of the girl upon the altar.⁵

The averted sacrifice, and Iphigeneia's immortalization also appear in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, probably from the sixth-century BC. Here, the maiden named Iphimede is generally understood to be Iphigeneia. The fragment mentioning Iphigeneia/Iphimede tells us:

Iphimede the well-greaved Achaians slaughtered on the altar of famed <Artemis of the golden arrows> on that day <when they sailed in their ships> to Ilion <to exact> a penalty for the <slim-ankled> Argive woman, an *eidôlon*, that is. For <Iphimede herself the huntress> showerer of arrows easily saved, and poured down upon her head <lovely ambrosia, so that her flesh might be unchanging>, and she made her immortal and ageless all her days. And now the races of men upon the earth call her Artemis of the wayside, <the attendant of the famous> showerer of arrows."⁶

While the outcome of Iphigeneia's sacrifice in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* is the same as in the *Kypria*, it is sometimes thought that the use of the *eidôlon* in the former suggests an interpolation. According to T. Gantz, the fact that the Hesiodic *Catalogue* "requires such an improbable replica of Iphigeneia when the *Kypria*'s deer was available can only mean that its author knew a tradition in which Iphigeneia did die, and wished to modify that; almost certainly this was the *Ehoiai* in its original form."⁷ If the Hesiodic *Catalogue* originally preserved a version of Iphigeneia's story in which the maiden was sacrificed, then the two different outcomes of Iphigeneia's sacrifice are already known in our earliest sources.

⁵Proclus, *Chrestomathy*, Loeb translation, p. 493-5.

⁶Fr 23a Merkelbach-West. Translation by Timothy Gantz (1996, 582-3). This passage is discussed further in Chapter 4.

⁷Gantz 1996, 583. On the use of the *eidolon*, see also Solmsen 1981.

From the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, we also learn that Iphigeneia acquired the name “Artemis einodia,” or “Artemis of the wayside.” Iphigeneia is also used as an epithet of Artemis in Pausanias, who tells us in his book on Corinth that “there is also a sanctuary of Artemis surnamed Iphigeneia.”⁸ In his book on Attica, Pausanias mentions the fate of Iphigeneia in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*. Pausanias records:

They say that there is also a shrine of the heroine Iphigeneia; for she too according to them died in Megara. Now I have heard another account of Iphigeneia that is given by Arcadians and I know that Hesiod, in his poem *A Catalogue of Women*, says that Iphigeneia did not die, but by the will of Artemis is Hecate. With this agrees the account of Herodotus, that the Tauri near Scythia sacrifice castaways to a maiden who they say is Iphigeneia, the daughter of Agamemnon.⁹

Pausanias here recalls an account in which Iphigeneia was turned into Hecate. However, we cannot be certain whether this derives from Iphigeneia’s epithet as “Artemis einodia” or whether this reflects a different tradition. The relationship between Iphigeneia and Hecate remains difficult to understand.¹⁰ The only instance in the visual arts in which the identity of Iphigeneia—Hecate plays a role is in the so-called “Relief of the Gods” at Brauron, on which the female figure running into the scene at the break on the right side of the slab has been alternately identified as Iphigeneia or Hecate (TAU 71).

⁸Pausanias 2.35.1.

⁹Pausanias 1.43.1.

¹⁰On the relationship between Iphigeneia and Hecate, see Johnston 1999, 238-47; Ronan 1995; Kraus 1961. In his *Oresteia*, Stesichoros, we are told by Philodemos (fr 215 *PMG*) also made Iphigeneia Hecate as did Hesiod (discussed in Gantz 1996, 583).

While the two versions of Iphigeneia's story, one of rescue and one of sacrifice, were known in the earliest literary sources, it was fifth-century BC tragedy that popularized these stories. Thus we speak of the Aeschylean version of Iphigeneia's story in which the maiden is sacrificed, and of the Euripidean version in which the maiden is saved. It should be kept in mind, however, that the tragedians did not invent the different outcomes of Iphigeneia's story. Rather, speaking of the Euripidean or Aeschylean version refers to a mythological tradition that finds one of its expressions in the creations of these playwrights.

Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* is the first play in the trilogy known as the *Oresteia* (458 BC). While the *Agamemnon* deals with the Greek king's return from Troy, and his murder by his wife, an account of Iphigeneia's sacrifice appears in the parodos. The chorus recounts the sacrifice of Iphigeneia:

So then he [Agamemnon] hardened his heart to sacrifice his daughter that he might prosper a war waged to avenge a woman, and as an offering for the voyaging of a fleet! Her supplications, her cries of "Father," and her virgin life, the commanders in their eagerness for war reckoned as naught. Her father, after a prayer, bade his ministers lay hold of her as, enwrapped in her robes, she lay fallen forward, and with stout heart to raise her, as it were a kid, high above the altar; and with a guard upon her lovely mouth, the bit's strong and stifling might, to stay a cry that had been a curse on his house. . . . What next befell, I beheld not, neither do I tell. The art of Kalchas failed not of fulfillment. (lines 223-238 and 248-249)

In Aeschylus' play, Iphigeneia is sacrificed, and there is no indication that she is saved. The maiden's sacrifice bears on the action of the play because Klytaimnestra cites vengeance for her daughter's death as the reason for killing her husband. Aeschylus' Iphigeneia does not go willingly to death. The fact that a bit was put in her mouth to silence her cries indicates her resistance. Iphigeneia

also “smote each of her sacrificers with a glance from her eyes beseeching pity” (line 240-1). In the *Agamemnon*, we do not learn the reason why Artemis is angered, except that Kalchas interprets two eagles devouring a pregnant hare as an omen that Artemis is angered, equating how “the two warlike sons of Atreus were twain in temper, knew the devourers of the hare for the leaders of the armament” (lines 122-4). This play also includes the famous Carpet Scene in which Agamemnon walks on the tapestry of robes, an act of defiling valuable property that Ruth Scodel likens to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia.¹¹

In *Pythian* 11, from about 474 or 454 BC, Pindar also references Iphigeneia’s sacrifice. “Was it Iphigeneia, slaughtered at the Euripus far from her fatherland, that provoked her [Klytaimnestra] to raise the heavy hand of her anger? Or was she vanquished by another bed and led astray by their nightly sleeping together?”¹² In Pindar’s account, as in the Aeschylean version, Iphigeneia is killed, and this is raised as a possible reason for Clytemenestra’s revenge against her husband.

A lost play by Aischylos entitled *Iphigeneia* probably dealt with the Greek maiden’s sacrifice at Aulis or her tale at Tauris, but nothing is known of this work. Also lost is Sophokles’ *Iphigeneia*, of which a few fragments survive which indicate that the subject was the maiden’s sacrifice. There is also mention of Iphigeneia’s sacrifice in Sophokles’ *Elektra*, where Agamemnon’s boast after killing a deer angered Artemis, who required the sacrifice of his daughter. From the reference in the *Elektra*, the sacrifice of Iphigeneia is carried out.

¹¹Scodel 1996, 117.

¹²Pindar, *Pythian* 11.17-25.

In contrast to the killing of Aischylos' Iphigeneia, Euripides' Iphigeneia is rescued, the sacrifice averted. *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, the last preserved play we have by Euripides, was probably first performed in 405 BC, one of the first staged after his death in Macedon in 407-6. The play is riddled with textual problems: it is believed that several later hands altered the original, and that this play may have been left unfinished at Euripides' death. The premise is that the Greeks are unable to sail from Aulis to Troy because of unfavorable winds inflicted by Artemis. The seer Kalchas prophesies that the only way to appease Artemis is by sacrificing Agamemnon's daughter Iphigeneia. Euripides' Iphigeneia experiences a different reaction to her death compared to the Iphigeneia of Aischylos. Aischylos' Iphigeneia experiences no change of heart, and the pathos and tragedy of the sacrifice are instead highlighted. In the Euripidean version, Iphigeneia is at first afraid and resists her fate, however, by the end of the play she experiences a change of heart, voluntarily offering herself as "a light of salvation to Greece" (line 1502).

In Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, Iphigeneia says:

It is determined that I must die: but to do so gloriously—that is the thing I want to do,¹³ clearing myself from all taint of baseness. Consider with me, mother, the truth of what I am saying. Hellas in all its might now looks to me, and upon me depends the power to take their ships over and destroy the Phrygians, so that the barbarians will not do anything to women in the future [and not allow them to abduct women from rich Hellas, since they have paid for the loss of Helen, whom Paris abducted]. All this rescuing is accomplished by my death, and the fame I win for freeing Hellas will make me blessed (lines 1375-1384).

¹³Alternatively translated by Kovacs as "I have decided to die: my one wish is to act nobly."

In offering herself as a sacrifice, Iphigeneia acknowledges that she will be saving future women from suffering at the hands of barbarians. In this way, Iphigeneia's act benefits all Greek women, and all Hellas, so it is not difficult to see how this presents her as a heroine. A few lines later, she says, "Better to save the life of a single man than ten thousand women!" (line 1394) Iphigeneia goes on to say, "I shall give myself to Greece" (line 1397), and in response to her speech, the chorus leader replies, "Your conduct, maiden, is noble" (lines 1402-3). Iphigeneia's speech underscores the theme of the claim of the State over the individual.

In the preserved text of the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, the play ends with a messenger informing us that at the last moment Artemis substituted a hind for Iphigeneia. The messenger tells Klytaimnestra, "I was there and saw the thing and I say that your daughter clearly has flown away up to heaven" (line 1608). Just as the priest was about to strike Iphigeneia's neck, the maiden disappeared, and in her place was a doe, just slaughtered, her blood soaking the altar. It is suspected, however, that the original text ended at line 1531, so that there would be no animal substitution and the maiden would actually have been sacrificed. The first performance of the play in 405 BC then would have been different from the version that we have, which has been changed by several different hands. Issues like the secret prophecy and metrical inconsistencies at the end of the play indicate interpolations. Kovacs argues that many of these changes were made by an actor or producer, whom he refers to as the "Reviser," in the fourth century.¹⁴

¹⁴See Kovacs's introduction, 157-64. Aelian also adds another line to the *IA*. In *On the Nature of Animals* (7.39), Aelian writes, "And Euripides in his *Iphigeneia* says, 'And I shall put into the dear

The text of the play as we know it preserves two traditions, an older version in which Iphigeneia was sacrificed, and a later one in which she was rescued.

In *Iphigenia Among the Taurians*, composed before the *IA*, Euripides seems to follow the version of Iphigeneia's myth in the *Kypria*. Rather than making Iphigenia immortal, however, Euripides makes her the priestess of Artemis in Tauris, where her job is to sacrifice foreigners who arrive in this land. In the meantime, in order to fulfill a prophesy, Iphigenia's brother, Orestes, must steal the statue of Taurian Artemis and take it back to Greece. Orestes is captured by the Taurians and just before he is to be sacrificed, he discovers that the priestess is his sister. At the end of the play, both Iphigeneia and Orestes are allowed to leave Tauris, as Athena intervenes on their behalf with King Thoas. Athena, as *deus ex machina*, tells how the escape of Iphigeneia and Orestes leads to the founding of the cult of Artemis Tauropolos at Halae, and of cult activity related to Iphigenia at Brauron. While Orestes was to build a temple and set up the statue at Halae, Athena says to Iphigeneia:

And you, Iphigeneia, in the holy meadows of Brauron must serve this goddess as her temple warder. When you die, you will lie buried here, and they will dedicate for your delight the finely woven garments which women who die in childbirth leave behind in their houses (lines 1462-7).

Athena's instructions to Iphigeneia and Orestes offer aetiologies for contemporary cults. Instead of the founding of cults at Halae and Brauron, Pausanias records that Spartans believed Iphigeneia brought the Taurian statue

hands of the Greeks a horned doe: and when they sacrifice it they will suppose that they are sacrificing your daughter" (Frag. 857 Nauck).

to their land to become Artemis Orthia.¹⁵ Hyginus also gives us a recognition story about the post-Tauris episode of Iphigeneia and Orestes on the island of Sminthe, where they meet Chryses, a priest of Apollo, and Chryseis, his daughter, who had given birth to a child by Agamemnon, the half-brother of Iphigeneia and Orestes. Hyginus' story does not appear in Greek art, but is found on a first-century BC Roman silver relief kantharos (TAU 61).

Both Apollodoros and Hyginus also give accounts of Iphigeneia's sacrifice, the reason for which is a boast by Agamemnon. Apollodoros adds that Agamemnon neglected to give Artemis a golden lamb after vowing to give her the most splendid of his flocks.¹⁶ Iphigeneia is also saved in Apollodoros' version, going on to become a priestess in Tauris or an immortal. According to Hyginus, Iphigeneia is also saved, and she becomes a priestess in Tauris.¹⁷ In Diktys, Iphigeneia is saved from sacrifice by Achilles, and the historian Douris and Lykophron tell us that Neoptolemos is the son of Iphigeneia.¹⁸

The literary sources, therefore, preserve two outcomes of Iphigeneia's sacrifice, one in which she is killed and the other in which she is saved. Both versions appear in our earliest sources, and both found expression in tragedy of the fifth-century BC. Evidence of interpolations to the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and to the *Iphigeneia at Aulis* indicate that the version of Iphigeneia's

¹⁵Pausanias 3.16.7.

¹⁶*ApE* 3.21-22 (discussed in Gantz 1996, 587).

¹⁷*Fab* 98.

¹⁸Dik 1.22; 76F88 apud ΣbT Il 19.326; Lykophron 324 (cited in Gantz 1996, 588).

story that we know from these texts represents a later revision to an earlier tradition in which her sacrifice was carried out.

POLYXENA

Whereas Iphigeneia was a Greek princess, Polyxena was a princess of Troy. She was the daughter of Priam and Hecuba, in some versions their youngest daughter. Homer does not mention her in the *Iliad*. Polyxena's name in Greek, Πολυφύνη, means "many foreigners." W. Burkert has even suggested that the name Polyxena might be related to a tradition in which a sacrificial victim had to offer herself to all involved in the funeral before being killed on the bier, an account known from a description by the Arab emissary to the Rus on the Volga.¹⁹

According to the best known version of her story, Polyxena is sacrificed at the tomb of Achilles after the sack of Troy. In our summary of the *Iliou Persis* by Arktinos of Miletos,

The Greeks, after burning the city, sacrifice Polyxena at the tomb of Achilles: Odysseus murders Astyanax; Neoptolemos takes Andromache as his prize, and the remaining spoils are divided.²⁰

Actinus enumerated Polyxena's sacrifice among this list of events after the Fall of Troy, in effect alluding to her sacrifice to Achilles as one of the spoils to be divided. Proclus' summary does not add anything else to the account in

¹⁹Burkert 1983, 67.

²⁰*Iliou Persis* 1. Translation by H. Evelyn White.

Arktinos.²¹ A passage in Ibykos relates that Neoptolemos was the one who killed Polyxena.

We might expect Polyxena's sacrifice to be included in the extant summary of Lesches' *Little Iliad*, but it is not. Polyxena's death, however, appeared in the *Kypria*, where a scholiast tells us that Odysseus and Diomedes wound Polyxena during the Sack of Troy, and that the maiden dies of her wounds.²² Polyxena's fate in the *Kypria* has attracted attention because this account is unique and chronologically does not fit with the events we expect to have recounted in the *Kypria*, which traditionally deals with episodes before the *Iliad*. Various explanations have been offered to reconcile why Polyxena's death appears in the *Kypria*, including that the attributions were wrong, that her story was told as part of a prophecy or prediction, or that an earlier form of the *Kypria* may have told the story of the whole Trojan War.²³

In the fifth-century, Sophokles composed a play entitled *Polyxena*, which survives only in fragments, but seems to be about the maiden's sacrifice. One of our fullest surviving accounts of Polyxena's sacrifice is in Euripides' *Hecuba*, in which the Greek herald Talthybius describes the sacrifice of Polyxena to her mother:

The whole Achaean army stood by at the tomb for your daughter's sacrifice, and Achilles' son took Polyxena by the hand and stood her at the topmost part of the mound, and I stood near. Picked youth of the Achaean army accompanied them, ready to check with their grasp any leap your daughter might make. (lines 521-527)

²¹Bernabé 1987, 89; Davies 1988, 62.

²²Fr. 34 *PEG*.

²³Burgess 2001, 139 for summary and references.

Here we learn that Neoptolemos leads Polyxena to the tomb of Achilles, grasping her by the hand, which is the way the scene is sometimes depicted in Greek art.

The Greeks anticipated that Polyxena might try to flee, so they were prepared to restrain her. Then, Neoptolemos lifted up a gold cup filled to the brim in a libation to his father and says:

Son of Peleus, my father, receive these libations, libations that charm the dead and summon them back up to the land of the living! Come and drink the blood of a maiden, dark and undiluted, which is the army's gift and mine! Be propitious to us, grant us your leave to cast off the mooring cables from our sterns, and allow us all, journeying home in peace, to reach our native land! (lines 534-541)

The sacrifice of Polyxena is intended to propitiate the dead Achilles and to allow the Greeks' safe passage home. In fact, Euripides' play is the first time that we are told the reason for Polyxena's sacrifice. Prior to the sacrifice scene, in the prologue, the ghost of Polydorus, also a son of Hecuba, tells the reason for Polyxena's sacrifice:

For Peleus' son Achilles appeared above his tomb and stopped the entire Greek fleet as they were steering their ships toward home, asking to receive my sister Polyxena as a special sacrifice for his tomb and a prize of honor. And get it he will: he will not be left without a gift by his friends. For fate is leading my sister to her death on this day (lines 37-44).

In this way, the offering of Polyxena parallels that of Iphigeneia, which was necessary for the Greeks to sail to Troy. Just before Neoptolemos makes the libation, Talthybios silences the Greek army, and the messenger relates, "And I brought the multitude into a windless calm" ($\nu \rightarrow \nu \epsilon \mu \omicron \nu \delta \epsilon \text{ } \sigma \tau \eta \lambda \epsilon \xi \lambda \omicron \nu$).²⁴ The choice of $\nu \rightarrow \nu \epsilon \mu \omicron \nu$ or "windless" to describe the calm must have been intended

²⁴Line 533.

by Euripides to bring to mind Iphigeneia's fate at Aulis, since she was sacrificed because of the lack of wind imposed by Artemis.

Then, Neoptolemos draws his sword and motions that the Greeks should restrain Polyxena, but the Trojan princess does not fight back. Instead, she declares:

You Argives who have sacked my city, I die of my own accord! Let no one touch my person, for I shall offer you my neck bravely! In the gods' name, leave me free when you kill me, so that I may die a free woman! For since I am a princess, I shrink from being called a slave among the dead. (lines 547-552)

After Polyxena's brave speech, Agamemnon ordered the men to unhand the girl.

Then Polyxena offered herself for sacrifice:

. . .she seized her robe and tore it from the shoulder to the middle of her waist, by the navel, and showed her breasts, lovely as a goddess' statue, then sinking to her knees she spoke words of surpassing bravery: "Here, young man, if it is my breast you are keen to strike, strike here, or if it is beneath my neck, my neck is yours to cut." And he, for pity of the girl both willing and reluctant, cut the breath's passageway with his sword and blood gushed forth. She, though her life was ebbing out, still took great care to fall in seemly fashion to the ground, concealing from male eyes what should be concealed. (lines 558-570)

Polyxena takes care to fall modestly, underscoring her chastity and virtuousness.

Polyxena's sacrifice is also mentioned by Euripides in his *Trojan Women*, when

Talthybios tells Hecuba, "her [Polyxena's] assignment is to serve the tomb of

Achilles."²⁵ Achilles' love for Polyxena is a motif that has traditionally been

thought to be an invention of writers after the fifth-century BC. The first

suggestion of Achilles' love for Polyxena appears in Lykophron, and then in

Diktys and Dares Achilles is killed in a precinct of Apollo as he attempts to

²⁵Line 264.

negotiate for the maiden's hand in marriage. This tradition culminates in Philostratos in the second-century AD, who has a love-sick Polyxena commit suicide at Achilles' tomb so that they may be together.²⁶ In the Greek period, the motivation for Achilles' choosing Polyxena as the object of his sacrifice was because she was a suitable prize, the beautiful virgin daughter of King Priam. Fragments of an Attic red-figure column krater in Tekirdağ of about 500-450 BC could well place Polyxena in a scene of Hektor's ransom, suggesting that Achilles' interest in Polyxena was a story known earlier than has been previously thought (POL 6 bis).

Polyxena's fate is to die. There is no known version of her story in the Greek period in which she is saved. Death without the possibility of rescue is one of the main differences that distinguishes Polyxena from Iphigeneia as sacrificial virgins.

RELATION BETWEEN ART AND TEXT²⁷

Artists and playwrights could tell the same story but need not draw upon the same mythic-historical traditions. Both art and literature were dependent on an oral tradition that was passed down from generation to generation. I use the term "myth-history" to acknowledge that the stories of the Greeks were not merely "mythology," as we use the word today, but part of their legendary history and past. There is sometimes a tendency to privilege literary sources over visual

²⁶On Achilles' love for Polyxena in Roman sources, see Gantz 1996, 659 and Schwarz 1992.

²⁷On the relationship between the visual arts and literature in the Greek period, see Shapiro 1994; Small 2003. On art and tragedy, see Séchan, 1967; Trendall and Webster 1971, Todisco 2003; Taplin 2007.

ones, and consequently to see the written form of a myth as the main version on which the images in art present variations. This approach is to be avoided. As Claude Calame has shown, we should not look for an Ur-version of a myth.²⁸ Instead, we should see each telling of a myth in art or literature as a separate mythological strand that presents a version of a story that may draw upon different traditions. The story communicated by the depiction of Iphigeneia on the small oinochoe in Kiel (IPH 3) should be accorded equal weight and authority as her portrayal in Euripides' famous *Iphigeneia at Aulis*.

Scholars such as Boardman, Shapiro, and Small have viewed ancient pictures and texts as parallel but separate phenomena, which is an approach that I also follow.²⁹ As Small points out, it is not until the Hellenistic period that we find the first clear interaction between art and text on some Megarian bowls illustrating plays, which inscribe the name of the playwright whose version they are representing. Three such bowls depict scenes of *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, with inscriptions naming Euripides as the source (IPH 8-10).³⁰ I discuss these bowls in greater detail in Chapter Two. Although this dissertation focuses on the images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in art, throughout I consider how the pictures relate to known literary sources. I do not see the images as "illustrations" of texts, except for the bowls mentioned above, but by identifying how the visual traditions agree with or diverge from known literary *traditions*, we are able to understand better how the visual evidence offers new insights on the construction

²⁸Calame 2003.

²⁹Boardman ; Shapiro 1994; Small 2003.

³⁰Small 2003.

of Iphigeneia and Polyxena as sacrificial virgins. Below I offer a few examples of how certain depictions of Iphigeneia reveal the complex relationship between art and literature.

Much attention has focused on whether a certain representation of Iphigeneia in art presents the maiden ἄκουσα or ἑκούσα, that is unwillingly or willingly going to sacrifice.³¹ In both art and literature, there are two traditions around the Iphigeneia story, the Euripidean version, in which the maiden goes willingly to sacrifice, and the Aischylean version in which she does not. It should be kept in mind, however, that these different versions of Iphigeneia's story have earlier roots, and unknown origins. In the Roman period, Lucretius follows the version of a non-consenting Iphigeneia, and Ennius follows the Euripidean version of a consenting Iphigeneia. We might expect the unwilling Iphigeneia to be sacrificed by her father as in Aischylos, and the willing Iphigeneia to be sacrificed by a priest with Agamemnon mourning covering his face as in the *IA*.³² The painting of Iphigeneia's sacrifice from the House of the Tragic Poet, though, is problematic because it does not fit neatly into one tradition or the other, as Iphigeneia is carried against her will to be sacrificed by a priest or Kalchas, as a veiled Agamemnon turns his back, not able to bear watching the scene. Which tradition then does the painting follow? R. Morisset and G. Thévenot thought the painting followed the account in Lucretius, but this is convincingly disproved by Croisille.³³ Tosi thought the painting followed the *Iphigeneia* of Ennius, but

³¹This is the strategy of Tosi 1957 and Croisille 1963 (especially p. 211 and 217), for instance.

³²Aischylos, *Agamemnon* lines 224ff; Euripides, *IA* lines 1543ff.

³³Morisset and Thévenot 1950, 97; Croisille 1963, 217ff.

T.B.L. Webster has pointed out that Ennius probably followed the tradition of Euripides.³⁴ Much has been written about this painting, but Croisille reconciles the difficulties, arguing “cela paraît plus probable que de le croire l’inventeur d’une contamination des deux traditions mentionnées plus haut [that of the willing and unwilling maiden].”³⁵

An approach that studies the images of Iphigeneia with the goal of identifying the maiden as belonging to one tradition or the other has both benefits and pitfalls. The pitfall, as we saw above, is in seeing an image as an “illustration” of a specific literary text or as relating to a lost piece of literature. Referring to the two traditions as a Euripidean and Aeschylaeian version is convenient, but can also be misleading. Artists need not have had one of these specific tragedies in mind, and these plays drew on earlier traditions, which also might have been the inspiration for artists. On the other hand, identifying whether Iphigeneia goes willingly or unwillingly to sacrifice is still a useful enterprise, and is integral for my examination of how the representations of Iphigeneia relate to the negotiation of female agency, both real and imagined. In Chapter Five, I show how the different reactions of each maiden to her fate present different constructions of female identity. When each maiden’s reaction is contextualized within her story, we are offered a spectrum that configures how female agency could be imagined.

³⁴Tosi 1957; Webster 1959, 180.

³⁵Croisille 1963, 220. He also concludes (1963, 219) that “les deux traditions littéraires et artistiques ont interféré.”

On Douris' lekythos in Palermo (IPH 1), Iphigeneia is led to an altar between two warriors who hold swords. Ellen Reeder believes that Douris is "clearly following" Aischylos' version of the myth told in his *Agamemnon*.³⁶ Citing Iphigeneia's calm demeanor, Reeder argues that Iphigeneia is unaware of the swords held by the two men and of the danger that awaits her. Furthermore, Reeder sees the man in front of Iphigeneia, the one who grasps her mantle with his right hand, as Agamemnon. This scene then would reflect how in Aischylos' play *Agamemnon* tricks Iphigeneia into coming to Aulis under the pretext of marriage to Achilles. In contrast, Lilly Kahil, and others, have seen Douris' lekythos as reflecting the version of the myth told in Euripides' *IA*, in which Iphigeneia heroically accepts her impending sacrifice.³⁷ In the *IA*, Iphigeneia forbids her mother to cry on her behalf and declares, as she is about to be led to sacrifice, "For I am departing to give the Greeks salvation and victory!"³⁸ Kahil, however, notes that Iphigeneia's bridal gesture may also suggest the pretext of marriage that Agamemnon uses to trick his daughter into coming to Aulis.

Reeder's interpretation of Douris' scene is plausible, notwithstanding her identification of the warrior in front of Iphigeneia as Agamemnon since he is labeled by an inscription that names him Teukros. It also seems unlikely that Iphigeneia would be unaware of the swords that both men hold. On the other hand, linking Douris' lekythos with the story told in Euripides' play is attractive because it offers a heroic representation of Iphigeneia in art. I argue, however,

³⁶Reeder 1995, 331.

³⁷Kahil 1990, 710 cat. no. 3.

³⁸Euripides, *IA*, 1473-4.

against finding a literary source as the inspiration for Douris' painting. The plays of Aischylos and Euripides represent two versions of a myth that had a long oral tradition, and in Athens of the fifth-century BC Douris need not be quoting a specific literary tradition. Douris' version of the Iphigeneia story introduces into the visual arts another mythic strand. The vase-painter's accomplishment is in his ability to invoke different ideas inherent in traditions of the myth and to combine these in a novel way to create a new telling of the myth without making a direct quotation.

The relationship between representations of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in art and literature is convoluted. On the influence of art on poetry, L. Séchan wrote, "Cette communauté de ton et ces évocations parallèles s'expliquent dans bien des cas, par des influences réciproques."³⁹ Some of the representations in the visual arts are clearly related to theatrical performances, such as the South Italian vase-paintings. Likewise, in tragedy, Iphigeneia and Polyxena are themselves compared to works of art. Artists and writers drew upon the same repertoire of mythological stories and traditions, so sometimes images and texts correspond closely in some details as they tell the same stories. Other times, these traditions diverge as artists and writers work within different conventions, aim for different meanings, and express particular interests, sometimes for different audiences.

³⁹Séchan 1967, 11. This is the subject of his chapter II; in chapter III, he looks at the influence of poetry on art.

II. Other Sacrificial Maidens

Besides Iphigeneia and Polyxena, there are other maidens in Greek myth who are sacrificed or take their own life in a sacrificial gesture, many of whom do not appear in the visual record.⁴⁰ In Athens, there are the daughters of Erechtheus, the daughters of Leos, the daughters of Hyakinthos, Makaria, and Aglauros (daughter of Kekrops). In Boeotia, there is the voluntary sacrifice of Androkleia and Alkis (daughters of Antipoenus) and that of Metioche and Menippe (daughters of Orion). There are also stories of youths as sacrificial victims, whose ritual killings are also intended to ensure victory in battle or to end a plague. Marathus and Molpis are youths who offer themselves willingly for sacrifice, the former for victory against the Tyndaridae and the latter to end a drought. Likewise, Menoeceus, Kreon's son, kills himself in Euripides'

Phoenissae.

Maidens or youths are sometimes offered to monsters, like the stories of Andromeda, Hesione, and the tribute of the Athenian youths and maidens to the Cretan Minotaur. While Andromeda's story may draw on sacrificial imagery and motifs, her story is different from that of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in its happy outcome and tone. Andromeda's rescue by Perseus casts her myth as a lighter, fairy-tale like story, whereas that of Iphigeneia and Polyxena are on some level deeper meditations on the nature of sacrifice and the conflict between the individual and the State. A number of these stories focus on a youth being offered to appease a monster, such as the offering of Kleostratos to a dragon in

⁴⁰Summarized in Hughes 1991, 73-9.

Thespieae and that of Alkyoneos to the monster Sybaris in Delphi. In a reversal of the “damsel in distress” motif, these youths are rescued by men who fall in love with them. In the myth-history of Rome, the rape and suicide of Lucretia and Verginia’s death at the hands of her father were stories that explained the founding of the Roman republic.⁴¹

It has been suggested that the daughters of Erechtheus do find a place in the visual record. The daughters of Erechtheus, the mythical king of Athens, gave up their lives in the founding aition of the city. A little less than 250 lines of Euripides’ *Erechtheus* (ca. 423-421 B.C.) are preserved, which represents approximately one-fifth or one-sixth of the original play. When King Erechtheus asks the oracle at Delphi what he must do to save his city from the invading forces of Eumolpos, he is told that he must sacrifice his daughter. King Erechtheus had three daughters, one of whom he sacrificed. It is unclear from the remaining fragments of this play how the other two die. We know, however, that the three daughters swore oaths that if one were to die, the other two would follow. Cropp’s translation includes the additional 120 lines of this play that were added by Sorbonne 2328, which was found in 1962 and doubled the number of lines known from this play. Sorbonne 2328 includes fragments from the end of the *Erechtheus*, in which Athena addresses Praxithea, Erechtheus’ wife, and mentions some topographical features of and ritual practices that were to take place on the Akropolis.

⁴¹Livy, *Ab urbe condita* I. 57-60 (Lucretia); III.44 (Verginia). On the place of the Vestal virgins, see the collection of essays in MacLachlan and Fletcher 2007.

In a controversial 1996 article, Joan Connelly proposed that the east frieze of the Parthenon represents the sacrifice of the youngest daughter of King Erechtheus.⁴² Connelly draws on the new lines added by Sorbonne 2328 from Euripides' *Erechtheus* to support her interpretation. For Connelly, a mythological subject for the frieze aligns it more closely with the traditions of Greek temple decoration. Likewise, the myth of King Erechtheus and his family helps to explain the identity of the figures on the east frieze, namely the three girls of different ages and the prominent central placement of a female figure above the door, whom Connelly identifies as Praxithea. If one accepts Connelly's interpretation, then one of the most famous monuments in Greek art is added to the iconographical corpus of virgin sacrifice. Connelly's interpretation has not received general acceptance; its greatest weakness lies in the fact that there is no altar, priest, or knife clearly represented on the east frieze, as well as the likelihood that the central figure is not female but male.⁴³

While no clearly identifiable renderings of the daughters of Erechtheus are preserved in ancient art, there are six or so proposed depictions, summarized below:

Sculpture and Relief Sculpture:

1. The korai from the Athenian Akropolis. c. 600-480 BC, and especially 510-480 BC.
2. London, British Museum. The Parthenon Frieze. 442-438 BC.
3. Lost chryselephantine frieze on base of the Athena Parthenos statue, by Phidias, once inside the Parthenon. 447-438 BC.

Vase-paintings:

⁴²Connelly 1996.

⁴³Against Connelly's interpretation, see Hurwit, Niels, Harrison.

4. London, British Museum E 467. Attic red-figure calyx-krater attributed to the Niobid Painter. c. 460 BC.⁴⁴
5. London, British Museum D 4. Attic white-ground cup attributed to the Tarquinia Painter.⁴⁵
6. Policoro, Museo della Siritide 35304. Lucanian red-figure pelike attributed to the Karneia Painter. c. 410-400 BC.⁴⁶

Given that the representation of virgin sacrifice lacks a standardized iconography, the uncertain depictions of the daughters of Erechtheus are important in the context of other scenes of maiden sacrifice. Three of the six works listed above are similar in depicting a woman being crowned (# 3, 4, 5).⁴⁷ On the Niobid Painter's calyx-krater, a girl standing frontally is being crowned with a wreath by Athena. She is often identified as Pandora, but Connelly has interpreted her as the daughter of Erechtheus who gives her life for Athens, in part, because Hephaistos is missing from the scene and because of the "sense of victory in the air," with the girl between Athena and Ares, which would be appropriate for the victory of Athens over Eleusis. For Connelly, the Niobid Painter's vase would then be an iconographic predecessor that helps to identify the sacrificial Erechtheid as the woman on the base of Phidias' lost Athena Parthenos statue once inside the Parthenon. However, both Pausanias and Pliny tell us that the subject on the frieze of the base was the birth of Pandora. I believe this is also the subject of the Niobid Painter's vase. Connelly also suggests that the white ground cup attributed to the Tarquinia Painter in London might depict the daughter of Erechtheus. The girl on the cup is named with an inscription as

⁴⁴*ARV*² 601.23.

⁴⁵*ARV*² 869.55; *LIMCI*, Anesidora.

⁴⁶*LCS* 55, 283, pl. 25.5-6; *LIMC* IV, Eumolpos 19.

⁴⁷Connelly (1996, 73-5) discusses these works in depth.

Anesidora, and she is being crowned by Athena. The name Anesidora is close to Pandora, and the appearance of Hephaistos in the scene convinces me that she is not the daughter of Erechtheus. These scenes lack a clear sacrificial or narrative context that would identify the subject as the sacrificial daughter of Erechtheus. The fact that a goddess crowns the girl in each scene also suggests that these do not have to do with human sacrifice, which emphasizes the role of humans in making an offering to the gods. If the scenes represent the apotheosis of the Erechtheid, then her iconography is different than that of Iphigeneia.

E. Harrison even suggested that the korai from the Athenian Akropolis might represent the daughters of the early mythical kings of Athens, Kekrops or Erechtheus.⁴⁸ This idea is attractive because if dedicated as votives, the statues themselves become types of “sacrificial” offerings, and perhaps even seen as stand-ins for human sacrifices. This brings to mind Pausanias’ account of the sacrifices of the Orneatai at Delphi, who promised Apollo a daily procession and sacrifices if they triumphed over the Sicyonians. “But finding the daily fulfillment of their vow a great expense and a still greater trouble,” Pausanias relates, “they devised the trick of dedicating to the god bronze figures representing a sacrifice and a procession.”⁴⁹ Elsner explains how the offering of the Orneatai indicates that such objects may have been charged with ritual meaning. He argues, “not only did it [the offering] represent the sacrifice and procession they had vowed, but—so far as the god was concerned—it was that sacrifice and procession.”⁵⁰

⁴⁸Harrison 1988, 54; Keesling 2003, 125; 244 note 5.

⁴⁹Pausanias 10.18.5.

⁵⁰Elsner 1996, 527.

This raises the unlikely possibility that the korai from Athens were “substitutes” or stand-ins for human victims reflecting a tradition of human sacrifice. If the korai were intended as dedications in a similar way as the offering of the Orneatai, it would change our understanding of the place of human sacrifice in Greek religion.

I agree with Jennifer Larson, however, in seeing a difference between the myth of Iphigeneia and the tradition of “sacrificial sisters,” like the daughters of Erechtheus, the daughters of Leos, the daughters of Hyakinthos, the daughters of Antipoinos, and the daughters of Orion.⁵¹ Larson outlines how the myths of the Erechtheidai-type lack a human transgression, an offended deity, and a propitiatory element. She sees them instead as a “kind of homeopathic magic, in which the life of one is given as a substitute for many lives.”⁵² What the sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena share with these sacrificial sisters is that their deaths occur in the context of a war or on behalf of the people of a city.

III. Relation to Animal Sacrifice

The relation between human sacrifice and animal sacrifice is a topic that has not yet received a synthetic treatment by scholars, and we await the forthcoming book by Pierre Bonnechere, entitled *Le système sacrificiel en Grèce ancienne: Le sacrifice humain entre l'imaginaire et la réalité sacrificielle*, which

⁵¹The Hyakinthides are sometimes identified with the Erechtheidai. The daughters of Antipoinos are Androkleia and Alkis. The daughters of Orion, the Koronides, are Metioche and Menippe.

⁵²Larson 1995, 105.

will pursue this line of inquiry.⁵³ In the meantime, a brief review of the literature and some preliminary ideas are presented below.

Rene Girard believed, “strictly speaking, there is no essential difference between animal sacrifice and human sacrifice.”⁵⁴ Is there really no difference, for instance, between the sacrifice of Iphigeneia and the slaughter of a goat? Sacrifice is, after all, the fundamental act of Greek religion.⁵⁵ As R.H. Sales has pointed out on the subject of human sacrifice in the Bible, “Any religion that required sacrifice would practice human sacrifice, if the theory behind the system were driven to its logical conclusion.”⁵⁶ Human sacrifice takes the idea of sacrifice to an extreme, pushing the boundaries of what is acceptable in the relationship between humans and the gods.

The representation, iconography, and analysis of animal sacrifices have received careful attention by F.T. Van Straten in his 1995 book *Hiera Kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Van Straten includes representations of the sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in his catalogue of scenes; however, this subject is not his main interest and his discussion of human sacrifice is very brief.⁵⁷ Van Straten adopts in his final chapter a quantitative approach, showing that 90% of the scenes of animal

⁵³A brief abstract describing this book project appears on Bonnechere’s homepage at the Université de Montréal: <http://www.hist.umontreal.ca/U/bonnechere/recherche.html#projets>.

⁵⁴Girard 1977, 10. Refuted by Hughes 1986, 13.

⁵⁵For an overview of sacrificial practices, see *ThesCRA* 2.a, p. 64-128 on animal sacrifice; p.129-134 on human sacrifice.

⁵⁶Sales 1957, 112.

⁵⁷Van Straten 1995, 113-4.

sacrifice depict the Pre-kill, and the chapters of his book are divided according to representations of the Pre-kill, Kill, and Post-kill. His discussion of the sacrificial virgins only appears in the chapter on the Killing. It would have been interesting if Van Straten had taken into account how the procession of animals to sacrifice relates to the depictions of Iphigeneia and Polyxena being led to sacrifice, since this is how the maidens more often appear. Pierre Bonnechere compares the procession of animal and human victims to sacrifice, but draws mainly on literary sources. He concludes that the only difference between the two is that human sacrifices did not allow for the “comedy of innocence” required of animals.⁵⁸

There are ways in which the slaughter of maidens was imagined as corresponding to the actual sacrificing of animals. In Aischylos’ *Agamemnon*, we are told that Agamemnon “bade his ministers lay hold of [Iphigenia] as, enwrapped in her robes, she lay fallen forward, and with stout heart to raise her, as it were a kid, high above the altar.”⁵⁹ In Euripides’ *IT*, Iphigeneia herself, in recounting the episode at Aulis, says, “the Greeks took me in their grasp like a calf and slit my throat.”⁶⁰ Aristotle also observed that menstrual blood flows like the blood of sacrificed animals.⁶¹ Half a dozen works of art in the Roman period depict Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia’s hair, which relate to how the forelocks of an

⁵⁸Bonnechere 1997. He also notes the lack of festive characteristics associated with human sacrifice as a result.

⁵⁹Lines 231-234.

⁶⁰*IT* lines 359-60.

⁶¹Aristotle, *History of Animals* 581b 1-2 and *Peri Gynaikion* 1.6, 72 (Littre); King 1983, 120 (discussed and cited in Reeder 1995, 304-5, and 305 note 9, where she notes that Aristotle “was referring to an age-old Greek image that equated a physically mature girl with an animal soon to be killed”).

animal are cut before sacrifice. This subject appears, for example, on IPH 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 59, 60, and 61.

While there are certainly similarities between human and animal sacrifice, the scenes are not identical. In comparing the sacrifice of Polyxena on the Timiades Painter's Tyrrhenian amphora in London to a black-figure amphora in Viterbo depicting a bull being sacrificed, Joan Connelly comments that in this example "the iconography of virgin sacrifice seems to borrow from the iconography of animal sacrifice" (compare Figs. 82 and 171).⁶² Connelly's observation is sound in that both the maiden and the bull are carried horizontally by a group of men and their throats are cut. On the Viterbo amphora, however, the bull is hoisted on the men's shoulders, something which requires great effort and strain, and there is something noble about elevating the large beast. On the other hand, Polyxena is held under the men's arms like a possession, carried against their bodies, not raised up. I believe these subtleties raise nuanced differences that indicate that the sacrifices of a person and of an animal are not identical. The way in which Polyxena is pressed against the men's bodies draws attention to the erotic aspects of her sacrifice and violation.⁶³ Similarly, the way in which the men hold the maiden on the Polyxena Sarcophagus results in a profusion of arms and hands across the maiden's body that is also charged with sexual overtones.

⁶²Connelly 1996, 62. Viterbo, Museo Archeologico Nazionale della Rocca Albornoz. Circa 550 BC. Illustrated in Van Straten 1995, cat. no. V141, fig. 115.

⁶³On the "sexualization" of virgin sacrifice, see Burkert 1983, 58-72.

“The rite of human sacrifice,” wrote Sarah Morris, “is best understood as one of many tenets of Semitic religion which influenced Aegean culture, like animal sacrifice itself.”⁶⁴ The idea and practice of blood sacrifices, both animal and human, were not invented by the Greeks, but come from the religions of the Near East, and it is to parallels and influences on Greek culture from the Levant that we turn to in the next section.

IV. Traditions in the Ancient Near East

Works by Burkert (1992, 2004), Morris (1995), and West (1997), among others, illustrate the importance of looking towards the ancient Near East for parallels and influences on ancient Greek myth, poetry, art, and culture. Burkert summed it up best when he commented that “it is one of the paradoxes of our profession that neither Nilsson nor Meuli, in their expositions of Greek sacrificial ritual, refer to the Old Testament, which contains the largest extant collection of ancient sacrificial rites,” with those of the Phoenicians and Hebrews “offer[ing] the closest parallel to Greek ritual.”⁶⁵ This section reviews the accounts of virgin sacrifice in the ancient Near East, most notably that of Jephthah’s daughter. While her sacrifice does not appear in Hebrew imagery, this chapter explores possible representations of the ritual killing of human beings in the visual arts of the Levant that might have influenced Greek artists in visualizing scenes of human sacrifice.

⁶⁴Morris 1995, 237.

⁶⁵Burkert 1966, 103, note 34.

In contrast to the Greeks, human sacrifice was practiced, at various times and for various reasons, by cultures of the historical period in Mesopotamia, the Indus Valley, Egypt and Syro-Palestine, and this is the subject studied by Alberto R.W. Green in his 1973 dissertation *The Role of Human Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*.⁶⁶

The closest parallel for a virgin sacrifice in the ancient Near East is the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter given in *Judges 11:30-40*.⁶⁷ The maiden sacrificed has no name in the Old Testament, a fact that reveals something of the status of women. She is known only as the daughter of Jephthah of Gilead, the newly appointed leader of the Hebrews. Jephthah makes a vow to the Lord offering a sacrifice in exchange for military victory over the Ammonites:

And Jephthah made a vow to the Lord, and said, "If You will indeed deliver the people of Ammon into my hands, then it will be that whatever comes out of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the people of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up as a burnt offering." (*Judges 11:30-31*)⁶⁸

The account of Jephthah's vow has often been compared to Euripides' *IT* 20-21, when Iphigeneia recounts how her father Agamemnon had vowed to sacrifice to Artemis "the fairest thing the year brought forth," which happened to be his daughter.⁶⁹ The Greek story of Idomeneus, King of Crete, also parallels that of

⁶⁶Revised and published in 1975 as number 1 in the American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation Series, edited by David Noel Freedman. Citations here refer to the revised 1975 edition of Green's dissertation.

⁶⁷On Jephthah's daughter, see Alexiou and Dronke 1971; Marcus 1986; Tapp 1989; Baker 1989; Ide 1993, 249-62; Morris 1995, 234; West 1997, 441; Neef 1999; Seifert 1999; Noort 2002, 13.

⁶⁸All biblical references are to the New King James version.

⁶⁹See Morris 1995, 234, and note 31.

Jephthah. Caught in a storm at sea, Idomeneus vows to sacrifice to Poseidon the first thing he sees upon landing if he is saved, which happens to be his son.⁷⁰ The sacrifice of Idomeneus' son is similar to that of Iphigeneia in having different outcomes of the story, with the boy being sacrificed in one version, and being saved in the other.

There are also textual issues regarding the translation of parts of Jephthah's vow that affect its meaning. The translation of "whatever" or "whatsoever" for *ko[ish]asher* in reference to the object of the sacrifice is significant. Arthur Frederick Ide points out that "whosoever" is a better translation than "whatsoever" for *ko[ish]asher* because this is how it is translated in the Septuagint and Vulgate editions, and he argues that this follows earlier traditions and signals that Jephthah intended a human sacrifice.⁷¹ There is also debate about the last line of the passage in which Jephthah promises to "offer it up as a burnt offering." Some scholars choose to translate the passage to read "instead of" a burnt offering, because of the difficulty in having human sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible.⁷²

After making his vow, Jephthah was victorious over the Ammonites, and we are told that "the Lord delivered them into his hands" (11:32). Next we learn what happened when he returned home:

⁷⁰Servius on Vergil *Aeneid* 3.121 and 11.264. See Marcus 1986, 41; Hughes 1991, 76-7; West 1997, 441-2. Marcus (1986, 41) also notes the similar story of Maeander, son of Cercaphus and Anaxibia, told by Pseudo-Plutarch. After vowing to the Mother of the gods that he would sacrifice the first person who greeted him when he returned home if he was granted military victory in Phrygia, Maeander sacrifices his son, mother and sister. He is so distraught over the sacrifices, however, that he throws himself into the river, which then took his name.

⁷¹Ide 1993, 253.

⁷²See Ide 1993, 253-4 note 13.

When Jephthah came to his house at Mizpah, there was his daughter, coming out to meet him with timbrels and dancing; and she was his only child. Besides her he had neither son nor daughter. And it came to pass, when he saw her, that he tore his clothes, and said, "Alas, my daughter! You have brought me very low! You are among those who trouble me! For I have given my word to the Lord, and I cannot go back on it." So she said to him, "My father, if you have given your word to the Lord, do to me according to what has gone out of your mouth, because the Lord has avenged you of your enemies, the people of Ammon. (*Judges* 11: 34-36)

The girl's response to her father raises the question of volition.⁷³ Is the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter a voluntary sacrifice or performed against her will? The response of "do to me" offered by Jephthah's daughter is ambiguous. She seems to consent to her fate, but only because she has no choice as the vow must be honored. Scholars also debate the degree of agency exerted by the nameless girl. Anne Michele Tapp argues that Jephthah's daughter is "passive, resigned and helpless," and that her story, like that of other virgin daughters, "suggest[s] that women live only as objects to be bartered, abused and sacrificed by men."⁷⁴ On the other hand, Beth Gerstein argues that Jephthah's daughter "exhibited strength in allowing herself to be sacrificed," and that "a celebration of Bat's⁷⁵ heroic qualities could have become institutionalized as a means of celebrating women's ability to wield their own power over their own lives."⁷⁶ The degree of

⁷³See Baker 1989, 198-9.

⁷⁴Tapp 1989, 171.

⁷⁵Gerstein refers to Jephthah's daughter as "Bat," which is the Hebrew equivalent of daughter. By referring to her in this way, Gerstein (1989, 176) attempt to "re-focus the story to make her a primary actor."

⁷⁶Gerstein 1989, 187. Both Tapp's and Gerstein's articles appear in the collection *Anti-Covenant: Counter-Reading Women's Lives in the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Mieke Bal.

personal agency exercised by Jephthah's daughter is uncertain, and a similar ambiguity marks the figures of Iphigeneia and Polyxena.

After Jephthah tells his daughter of his vow to the Lord, and she agrees that he cannot go back on his word, Jephthah's daughter makes a request of her father:

Then she said to her father, "Let this thing be done for me: let me alone for two months, that I may go and wander on the mountains and bewail my virginity, my friends and I." So he said, "Go." And he sent her away for two months; and she went with her friends, and bewailed her virginity on the mountains. And it was so at the end of two months that she returned to her father, and he carried out his vow with her which he had vowed. She knew no man. And it became a custom in Israel that the daughters of Israel went four days each year to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite. (*Judges* 11:37-40).

Does Jephthah actually sacrifice his daughter? While it is commonly accepted that Jephthah sacrificed his daughter, David Marcus has argued that Jephthah's daughter was not sacrificed, but that the fulfillment of her father's vow entailed a life of celibacy for the girl and her consecration to sanctuary service. In his conclusion, Marcus conveniently lists a summary of the arguments put forth by the "sacrificialists" and the "non-sacrificialists." The sacrificialists maintain that it is clearly stated that Jephthah "carried out his vow with her which he had vowed," meaning that he offered the girl up as a burnt offering. If Jephthah's daughter was to live a life of celibacy, according to the sacrificialists, why would she lament her virginity for only two months rather than for the rest of her life? On the other hand, the non-sacrificialists argue that the text does not explicitly state that Jephthah killed his daughter. They argue that the text emphasizes the girl's virginity and that the fulfillment of the vow is that "she knew no man."

Another argument against a sacrificial outcome is that since Hebrew law prohibited human sacrifice, Jephthah's vow must not have culminated in his daughter's death because Jephthah is not chastised for his actions. D. Marcus admits that while he "personally favor[s] a non-sacrificial fate for Jephthah's daughter, the evidence is so ambiguous that it must be admitted that both conclusions are possible."⁷⁷ He goes on to suggest that the ambiguous fate of Jephthah's daughter might have been intentional, a rhetorical device to emphasize Jephthah's vow, rather than its outcome.

The isolation of Jephthah's daughter in the mountains, with only her female companions with whom to bewail her virginity, recalls initiatory practices that took place in the cults of Artemis, particularly at Brauron and Mounychia. The removal of Jephthah's daughter from her home and her isolation with other girls reflects Van Gennep's "rites of separation."⁷⁸ The death of Jephthah's daughter also created a "custom" in which the daughters of Israel paid tribute to the sacrificed girl, and this too brings to mind the founding of Iphigeneia's cult at Brauron, and how women visited to sacrifice garments to mourn children lost in childbirth. In other words, it is not just that the story of the sacrificial virgin entered Greek myth-history from the Near East, but her role in Greek thought and religion was created and influenced by Semitic traditions, such as the transitions of life undergone by girls and her role in cult.

⁷⁷Marcus 1986, 50-51.

⁷⁸Van Gennep 1909. Victor Turner (1969) has also notably written on rites of passage, and the ideas of liminality and communitas. See Gerstein 1989 for an interpretation of the story of Jephthah's daughter that utilizes the theories of Turner.

While Jephthah's daughter is nameless in the Bible, she is named "Seila," or "she who was demanded," in a lament for Jephthah's daughter that appears in the later *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, or *Book of Biblical Antiquities*.⁷⁹ It was composed by the first century AD by an author known as the pseudo-Philo.⁸⁰ The lament of Jephthah's daughter composed by the pseudo-Philo not only gives the girl a name, but also a voice. Whereas the volition of Jephthah's daughter in the *Judges* account is ambiguous, the sacrifice of pseudo-Philo's Seila is clearly voluntary. Seila says:

For I am not sad because I am to die nor does it pain me to give back my soul, but because my father was caught in the snare of his vow; and if I did not offer myself willingly for sacrifice, I fear that my death would not be acceptable or I would lose my life in vain (40.3).⁸¹

No longer the passive victim found in *Judges*, Seila willingly offers herself for sacrifice. Cynthia Baker has convincingly described how the pseudo-Philo used textual and narrative devices to transform the biblical story of Jephthah's daughter as victim to a story in which Seila "becomes an independent and noble heroine."⁸² The pseudo-Philo's lament of Jephthah's daughter becomes important for the study of Iphigeneia and Polyxena because it reflects Greek traditions. Margaret Alexiou and Peter Dronke have explored the ways in which pseudo-Philo's lament is steeped in the ancient Greek conflation of bridal and

⁷⁹On Seila being the name given to her by destiny, see Baker 1989, 198. Jephthah says, "Rightly was your name called Seila, that you might be offered in sacrifice" (40.1).

⁸⁰The surviving text in Latin was a translation from Greek (probably in the fourth century), which was itself likely based on a Hebrew original. On the lament for Jephthah's daughter, see Alexiou and Dronke 1971; Baker 1989.

⁸¹Harrington 1985 (cited in Baker 1989, 199).

⁸²Baker 1989. See also Alexiou and Dronke 1971.

funerary imagery. For instance, they examine how the language, imagery, and metaphors found in the lament of Jephthah's daughter parallels that found in Sophokles' *Antigone*, Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, and Euripides' *Trojan Women*.⁸³ Alexiou and Dronke suggest that the lament for Jephthah's daughter, in part, "allows us to win an insight into what the unrecorded popular laments of the Hellenistic period must have been like."⁸⁴ If the ennobling of Seila as a sacrificial virgin is seen as revealing something of Hellenistic Greek traditions, then this allows for the possibility that the sacrifice of Iphigeneia might have been seen as honorable or courageous, and perhaps earlier than in the Hellenistic period.

In addition to the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter, Anne Michele Tapp identifies *Genesis* 19.1-11 and *Judges* 19.22-26 as two other biblical examples of "virgin daughter sacrifice."⁸⁵ These accounts involve a violation of guest-friendship with women being offered in return for the safety of men. Tapp misappropriates the term "virgin sacrifice" to describe what happens to them. The unnamed women in *Genesis* 19.1-11 and *Judges* 19.22-26 are not sacrificed, but abused. Their stories differ from that of Jephthah's daughter and Iphigeneia because they are not offered to a divinity and they are not valued by their fathers.

⁸³Alexiou and Dronke 1971, 825-829. "We can say with some certainty," argue Alexiou and Dronke (1971, 851), "that the pseudo-Philo knew a Greek tradition of laments for girls who had died young, in which the elegiac language was deeply imbued with the language of epithalamia." They believe that Seila's lament is stylistically closer to funerary inscriptions, the Grenfell fragment, and later poetry than to the epigrams or tragedies.

⁸⁴Alexiou and Dronke 1971, 851.

⁸⁵Tapp 1989.

Jephthah and Agamemnon loved their daughters dearly, and their anguish over the sacrifice is an important part of the story.

Besides Jephthah's vow, there are other accounts of human sacrifice in the Bible.⁸⁶ One of the most famous examples is the near sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham in *Genesis*.⁸⁷ God wanted to test Abraham's faith, so he told him to offer his only son Isaac as a burnt offering to him. Abraham complies and takes his son to the mountains in the land of Moriah. Isaac, however, does not know that he is to be the victim because when they come into sight of the burning fire on top of a mountain where the sacrifice is to take place, the boy asks his father where is the sacrificial lamb. When they reached the spot, "Abraham built an altar there and placed the wood in order, and he bound Isaac his son and laid him on the altar, upon the wood. And Abraham stretched out his hand and took the knife to slay his son."⁸⁸ At the last minute, an Angel of God stopped him. When Abraham looked behind him, there was a ram whose horns were stuck in a thicket, so he offered the animal as the burnt offering. Abraham's near sacrifice of Isaac follows a similar pattern as some versions of the Iphigeneia story. It

⁸⁶See for instance Sales 1957; Ide 1993; Noort 2002; Bremmer 2006; Finsterbusch et al. 2007. There is also the sacrifice made by Mesha, King of Moab, who "took his eldest son who would have reigned in his place, and offered him as a burnt offering upon the wall" (11 *Kings* 3:27; discussed in West 1997, 484-5). In the New Testament, there is also the question of Jesus' role as a sacrificial victim (Hefner 1980).

⁸⁷*Genesis* 22:1-19. See the collection of essays in Noort and Tigchelaar 2002. Sarah Morris gave a lecture entitled "Isaac and Iphigeneia: Human Sacrifice in the Ancient Mediterranean" at the Western Illinois Society of the Archaeological Institute of America on 20 September 2001.

⁸⁸*Genesis* 22.9-10.

focuses on a father's decision to sacrifice his child in a ritual context and the averted sacrifice by means of a substitute animal victim.⁸⁹

Sarah Morris' article on the Near Eastern elements that influenced the story and visual representation of the ritual killing of Astyanax illustrates how the Greeks, even though they rejected the practice of human sacrifice, "often transformed alien cult into native myth."⁹⁰ The fact that the "sacrifice" of Astyanax occurs in the context of the Trojan epic further encourages us to consider how Near Eastern contributions might have influenced the stories of Iphigeneia and Polyxena, both victims of the Trojan War.

There are no direct visual parallels in the Near East that can be cited as sources for the images of the sacrificial virgin in Greek art. Reliefs of a winged figure carrying a deer from the Palace of Ashurnasirpal, Nimrud, of about 865 BC, however, might be related to Iphigeneia's story.⁹¹ The genie in the British Museum (Fig. 172) once stood by one of the side doors of Ashurnasirpal's throne-room. These have been described as "protective genies," and the figure holds the deer in a way similar to that of Artemis on the Shuvalov Painter's oinochoe in Kiel (IPH 3) and to that of the female figure on the terracotta votive in Toronto (Fig. 139). Like the protective aspect of the Assyrian genies, Artemis also plays a protective role in Iphigeneia's story, and her holding the deer on the oinochoe in Kiel alludes to the substitution that is about to take place.

⁸⁹Although Jesus is often described as a sacrifice for mankind, he is not a sacrificial offering and therefore not part of this study.

⁹⁰Morris 1995, 237.

⁹¹Such as London, British Museum WA 124560 (Room 19) (Reade 1983, 28 fig. 32) and Berlin Museum 952 (Gadd 1936, pl. 1b).

The images on cylinder seals feature prominently in discussions of human sacrifice and ritual killings in the ancient Near East, even though the subjects of these scenes are still debated. Joachim Ménéant first identified a group of cylinder seals from the First Babylonian dynasty as depicting “human sacrifices,” most of which include a core group with what he called a “priest” holding a curved weapon in one hand raised over his head about to strike a victim, a naked man kneeling on one leg and turning to look at the priest, sometimes raising a hand in supplication, as on an example in New York (Fig. 173).⁹² Ménéant’s interpretation of these subjects, however, has not been embraced unanimously. Most notably, William Hayes Ward has argued that these scenes do not depict a human sacrifice, but rather a “god of anger or vengeance” attacking an enemy.⁹³ The figure attacking the kneeling human victim sometimes holds a mace, and A.R.W. Green argues that this may represent a king of this period rather than a god because the figure usually wears a cap rather than a horned miter.⁹⁴ The subject of the seals from the First Babylonian period aside, human sacrifice is

⁹²Ménéant 1887.

⁹³Ward 1889, 42; 1910, 53-8. Ward (1910, 367) concludes, “there is no evidence in the Oriental art of human sacrifice. We see men killed in war, heaped in cages, torn by birds of prey, but never sacrificed to the gods. The literature is equally silent. The cases which have been supposed to have this meaning are those in which a god kills his enemy, and not where a man offers a human sacrifice to his god.” In his response to Ménéant’s interpretation, however, Ward (1889, 42) allows that the cylinder with the victim before a seated goddess may suggest a human sacrifice. Another exception for Ward would be what he called the so-called “bull-altar” scenes on Cappadocian cylinders of the Isin-Larsa period (c. 1950-1840 BC), which he believed might depict child sacrifices (perhaps to Moloch?). On these cylinders representing child sacrifices, see Ward 1910, 307-310; Green 1975, 38-42. For a summary of the arguments, see Green 1975.

⁹⁴Green 1975, 32.

most likely depicted on some seals from the Sargonid period, which depict a man being killed at an altar.⁹⁵

Whether or not the scenes from the First Babylonian Dynasty give us the sacrifice of a person to a god, it seems fair to say that they portray ritual killings that prefigure those found in Greek art. The fact that cylinder seals were small and travelled easily, dispersed widely and often found in Greek contexts, suggests that they may have been a possible source of influence on Greek artists. While no specific parallel or model on cylinder seals in the Near East can be cited as specific sources for depictions of the sacrificial virgins in Greek art, the pictorial language and iconography of scenes of ritual killings and sacrifice on seals reveal a connection with similar kinds of ritual killings in the Greek world.

A Sumero-Akkadian cylinder seal once in the Newell Collection, for instance, depicts a bearded man being attacked by three other men at an altar (Fig. 174).⁹⁶ The iconography of the scene with the bearded man falling back on the altar and being attacked brings to mind Greek depictions of Priam's murder at the hands of Neoptolemos and the killing of Busiris by Herakles. This compositional scheme may also help to explain the scene of the girl being

⁹⁵Green (1975, 37) argues that "since a human victim is in the process of being killed before the altar, in the presence of the deity, whether the attendants are to be identified as human functionaries, or minor deities, the conclusion is inescapable: we have here a clear-cut case of human sacrifice. The fact that the glyptic of this period is noted for its directness, and dramatic portrayal of religious thought, as generally agreed by scholars in this field, only reinforces the conclusion we have reached."

⁹⁶Von der Osten 1934, cat. no. 153, plate XIV. Describing the scene as a "god being killed or sacrificed on an altar," Von der Osten (1934, 155) admits the mythological context of the scene, but argues that the seal may be taken "as evidence that in earlier times in the Near East human beings were sacrificed." He also cites sacrificial attendants in the royal tombs at Ur as corroborating evidence. Arguing against the finds at Ur as corroborating evidence, see Green 1975, 227 note 59.

attacked at an altar on IPH 67. On some examples, a bearded figure is attacked by another figure over a mountain (Fig. 175).⁹⁷ The mountains on these seals are small, and resemble a kind of Greek stone altar or omphalos-shaped mound, not so different from the omphalos-shaped altar over which Polyxena is sacrificed on the Tyrrhenian amphora. It is possible that a Greek artist saw this type of composition and thought of the mound as an altar rather than a mountain. Ward interpreted the seals of this iconographic type as a God attacking an enemy, specifically, some sun-God attacking an enemy of the mountains. Ménant and others, however, have seen these as scenes of human sacrifice.⁹⁸

On another Sumero-Akkadian seal once in the Newell Collection, the pair of figures on the left side depicts a bearded, draped man attacking a naked man on the ground in front of him (Fig. 176).⁹⁹ The composition is of the iconographic type which Ménant saw as a “human sacrifice.” Whether or not he is right, the scenes include features of ritual killings, such as the assailant raising his weapon over his head about to strike his victim, who is crouched on the ground, raising his arms in a gesture of defense or mercy. The composition of the scene recalls representations in Greek art of the rape of Cassandra by the lesser Ajax. The rendering of the victim on the seal, in particular, brings to mind the figure of Cassandra. Naked, crouched down on one knee, upper body turned towards the aggressor, and arms raised, is how Cassandra is often depicted, as on POL 2, POL 5, and POL 25 (Figs. 83a-c, 86e, and 101). This pose is also similar to how

⁹⁷Ward 1910, 136b (Ohnefalsch-Richter, *Kypros*, CLI34).

⁹⁸Ward 1910, 53-8. Ménant 1887.

⁹⁹Von der Osten 1934, cat. No. 155, pl. XIV.

Polyxena might be depicted on at least two uncertain works, the Clazomenian sarcophagus in Berlin and the Etruscan vase in Paris (POL 36 and 38).

Images on cylinder seals may also offer some insight into what have been seen as difficult to interpret scenes of possible ritual killings in Greek art. For instance, it is difficult to understand what is happening between the pair of figures facing one another on the lekythos in Paris attributed the Group of the Haimon Painter (POL 30). A (female?) figure seems to bend at the waist before an armed warrior. The scene on the lekythos, however, closely resembles a scene of ritual killing on a Sumero-Akkadian cylinder seal (Fig. 177).¹⁰⁰ The group of figures on the right side of the hematite seal depicts a bearded man killing another man, with the victim bent at the waist. The quality of painting of the Haimon Painter and those associated with him make it difficult to draw conclusions, as he is not thought of as an overly thoughtful painter, but the scene he painted on the lekythos in Paris could reflect an iconographic type known from seals that he had known.

The fragments of an Attic red-figure cup attributed to Hermonax in Barcelona depicts another scene that is puzzling (Fig. 178).¹⁰¹ Beazley described the scene as an “unexplained subject,” of “a woman attacking another at the altar of Hera, who sits behind it.”¹⁰² Barberà and Sanmartí interpret the subject as the

¹⁰⁰Newell Collection, Von der Osten 1934, cat. No. 157, pl. XIV.

¹⁰¹Barcelona 4333-6. *ARV*² 492, 163; *LIMC*, Hera 493. The iconography of the scene is discussed in Van Straten 1995, 113 note 41.

¹⁰²In *LIMC* IV, Hera, 493, Kossatz-Deissmann interprets the woman on the right as a suppliant in Hera’s sanctuary. Schefold and Jung (1988, 46) describe the scene as “Tyro resist Sideron vom Altar.”

offering of a young woman before the altar of a goddess.¹⁰³ These fragments are relevant to this study because if the woman being brought before the altar was intended as a human sacrifice, then she is the only sacrificial victim in Greek art that cannot be identified as either Iphigeneia or Polyxena. The goddess is identified as Hera because of her diadem, scepter, and elegant throne, but what is the subject of the scene? The iconography of the scene on the cup fragments with a woman dragged before a seated goddess is similar to a subject found on a hematite Babylonian seal with a male figure attacking a figure before a seated goddess (Fig. 179).¹⁰⁴ Ménant described the scene as a human sacrifice to Beltis. Even Ward, who usually eschews Ménant's identification of such scenes as human sacrifices, admits that this cylinder seal may offer a suggestion of a human sacrifice.¹⁰⁵ It is difficult to know the subject of Hermonax's cup without the missing fragments, assuming they would shed further light on the scene. If the iconography of the scene is related to the composition on some Babylonian seals, then the Barcelona fragments might give us a depiction of another ritual killing of a young woman who is someone other than Iphigeneia or Polyxena.

¹⁰³Barberà and Sanmartí 1987, fig. 260.

¹⁰⁴Ménant 1887, 152, fig. 95; Ward 1889, fig. 7.

¹⁰⁵Ward 1889, 42.

V. Towards a Definition of the Sacrificial Virgin

Before proceeding, what is meant by the term “sacrificial virgin” must be explained. Virgin sacrifice is a type of ritual killing. I follow Hughes in using the more common “sacrifice” rather than “ritual killing.”¹⁰⁶ Identifying virgin sacrifice as a type of ritual killing differentiates it from other types of killings, such as executions, murder, or death in battle.¹⁰⁷ The deaths of Iphigeneia and Polyxena are also ritual killings rather than “human sacrifices.” As Donald Kyle notes, “human sacrifice tended to be regular and preventive, while ritual killing tended to be occasional and reactive.”¹⁰⁸ Human sacrifice did not form a regular part of the Greeks’ religious practice, unlike for the Aztecs who regularly offered human victims to their gods. Dennis Hughes, drawing on Walter Burkert’s articulation of a ritual act, offers a working definition of a ritual killing: “a ritual killing (whether of an animal or a human victim) is a killing performed in a particular situation or on a particular occasion (a religious ceremony, a funeral, before battle, etc.) in a prescribed, stereotyped manner, with a communicative function of some kind.”¹⁰⁹ Hughes’ definition provides a useful model of what constitutes a ritual killing, which I follow here. The sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena are ritual killings that meet the above criteria. Iphigeneia is killed on a

¹⁰⁶Hughes (1991, 1) uses the expression “human sacrifice” rather than “the ritual killing of human beings” for the sake of clarity. In his study of human sacrifice in the ancient Near East, Green (1975, 17) defines “human sacrifice” as “the voluntary or involuntary termination of human life in a ritualistic manner or for ritualistic purposes.” For a more theoretical approach to “ritual poetics,” see Yatromanolakis and Roilos 2004.

¹⁰⁷See Hughes 1991, 3-4 on the distinctions between ritual killings and sacrifice.

¹⁰⁸Kyle 1998, 36-7.

¹⁰⁹Hughes 1991, 3.

particular occasion, that is, to appease Artemis so that the Greeks can sail to Troy. Polyxena is also killed on a particular occasion—at the end of the Trojan War, to placate the ghost of Achilles. Both maidens die by their necks, which is the prescribed manner. The “communicative function” of these killings, beyond their ostensible and immediate purposes, is the subject of this study.

The Greeks did not have a phrase for “sacrificial virgin,” although this term has been used commonly in literature and scholarship to refer to both Iphigeneia and Polyxena. In Greek, the “sacrificial virgin” was a virgin or maiden who was sacrificed. In this way, the title of this dissertation, “The Virgin Sacrificed,” is closer to the original Greek in referring to Iphigeneia and Polyxena as virgins who are sacrificed or intended to be sacrificed. A *virgin* was referred to as παρψΥνο], κ)ρη, πα↑], or νε□vi]. Giulia Sissa found that “Greek virginity had nothing to do with the presence of a hymen,” but was a transitional phase between childhood and womanhood.¹¹⁰ Sissa thus agrees with Claude Calame, whom she quotes, on the meaning of the word *parthenos*. Calame explains, “this term [virgin], which we use along with the words *maiden* and *adolescent girl*, should not be allowed to mislead. In Greece it conveyed a concept of virginity quite different from the one impressed upon our culture by twenty centuries of Marian piety. It actually referred to the peculiar status of the young women, who, though pubescent, was not yet married.”¹¹¹

¹¹⁰Sissa 1990, 76, 167. Sissa does not address how the idea of Greek virginity relates to the myth of virgin sacrifice (nor to death nor ritual, a criticism raised by B. MacLachlan in a review in *Phoenix* 1994, vol. 48, p. 78).

¹¹¹Calame, 1977, 65 and cited in Sissa 1990, 76.

There are many different words for *sacrifice* as a noun or verb in Greek, and for the adjective *sacrificial*.¹¹² The Greeks, however, did not have a special verb for “to sacrifice” that was reserved solely for the ritual killing of virgins. The same words that were used for animal sacrifices were also used for human sacrifices, such as σφάζειν and ψίθειν.¹¹³ In the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, for instance, the verb σφάζειν is used for how the Achaians “slaughtered” Iphigeneia/Iphimede on the altar of Artemis. This underscores, to a certain degree, the equivalence and parallels between animal and human sacrifice in Greek thinking.¹¹⁴ On the other hand, the Greeks did have special verbs to describe the sacrifice of bulls (ταυροκτονεῖν), sheep (μηλοσφαγεῖν), and oxen (βουσφαγεῖν, βουψυτεῖν). While the Greeks did not have a special word for a “virgin sacrifice” they could use a compound verb for “to sacrifice a person.” In Euripides’ *Hecuba*, the Trojan queen mentions Polyxena’s sacrifice and asks:

π)τερα τ] ξρ→ σφθ/π→γαγθ □νψρπποσφαγεῖν πρ]σ τ(μβον,
 fnψα βουψυτεῖν μ□λλον πρΥπει;

“Was it Fate that induced them to perform human sacrifice at a tomb, a place where the sacrifice of a bull is more fitting?” (*Hecuba* lines 260-1)

Euripides juxtaposes □νψρπποσφαγεῖν in this passage with βουψυτεῖν to emphasize Hecuba’s point that the sacrifice of an animal would have been more

¹¹²See Woodhouse 1910 for English to Greek translations.

¹¹³See Hughes 1991, 3-5 on Greek terminology for human sacrifices.

¹¹⁴Hughes (1991, 4) argues that the similar terminology used for animal and human sacrifice indicates that the Greeks would have understood these words to mean “to kill ritually like an animal” when used to describe human sacrifices. To support this line of thought, Hughes cites Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 232 which describes how Iphigeneia is raised above the altar “like a she-goat,” and Euripides, *IT* 359 where Iphigeneia’s sacrifice is described as “like a calf.”

fitting than that of a person. In Euripides' *IA*, Klytaimnestra uses $\tau\upsilon\psi\epsilon\hat{\iota}\sigma\iota\nu$ to refer to "sacrificial victims" in reference to her daughter's impending sacrifice (line 1443). This, however, does not specify a sacrificial virgin. In Aischylos' *Agamemnon*, the Mycenaean king at line 208 refers to his daughter Iphigeneia as $\delta\gamma\mu\omega\nu$ $\square\gamma\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha$ or "the ornament of my house," underscoring, as Ruth Scodel points out, the value of the sacrificial virgin.¹¹⁵ When "house" is taken to mean the greater *oikos*, her significance is amplified.

My goal in this dissertation is not to attempt an understanding of the phenomenon of virgin sacrifice in the ancient world, but rather to explore what we can learn about this practice as an idea from the representations of the sacrificial virgins in art.¹¹⁶ Instead of approaching a definition of "virgin sacrifice," we might better ask what constitutes Iphigeneia and Polyxena as sacrificial virgins, and why they are the only sacrificial maidens to be represented in Greek art. I use the terms sacrificial virgin, sacrificial maiden, and sacrificial victim interchangeably in this dissertation to refer to Iphigeneia and Polyxena. I also frequently use the singular collective "the sacrificial virgin," as in the title, to refer to both Iphigeneia and Polyxena, but only to these two maidens. The observations made and conclusions reached here apply only to Iphigeneia and Polyxena, but may serve as a point of departure for the study of other sacrificial virgins who do not appear in the visual record. We can discuss Iphigeneia and Polyxena together because they are the only two sacrificial virgins that can be

¹¹⁵See Scodel 1996, especially p. 114.

¹¹⁶Hughes (1991) provides an overview of the sacrificial virgins that appear in the Greek historic and epigraphic records.

identified with certainty in art, and because their sacrifices occur within the framework of the Trojan War.

WHAT CONSTITUTES IPHIGENEIA AND POLYXENA AS SACRIFICIAL VIRGINS?

Iphigeneia and Polyxena were both princesses, sisters, and daughters. They were loved by their families, and part of the horror of their sacrifices is the devastation and loss endured by their loved ones. The daughters of kings, they had fathers who loved them dearly. They also had mothers who cared deeply for them, as we see in various versions of their stories. In Euripides' *IA*, for instance, Iphigeneia and Klytaimnestra speak affectionately to one another. Likewise, on one of the short sides of the Polyxena Sarcophagus, Hecuba is seen mourning for her daughter. Unlike Jephthah's daughter, Iphigeneia and Polyxena are not nameless maidens. Their names identify them as individuals, and add immediacy and poignancy to what happens to them. It makes the act of sacrifice personal and serves to draw the listener, reader, or viewer into their stories.

As young, beautiful, aristocratic girls, they were seen as valuable, and consequently, suitable sacrifices.¹¹⁷ In exploring the commodification and aestheticization of the virgin body in Aischylos' *Agamemnon* and Euripides' *Hecuba*, Ruth Scodel argues that "the tragedians present virgins as analogous to luxury goods whose proper use is dedication to gods, and human sacrifice as a wasteful form of overconspicuous consumption that involves excessive display of

¹¹⁷The commodification of ancient women is well-covered territory: Rabinowitz 1993; Scodel 1996; Wohl 1998; Ormand 1999; MacLachlan 1999; Ferrari 2002; Rosseli forthcoming. More generally, see the seminal works on this subject by Lévi-Strauss and Gayle Rubin.

the virgin's body."¹¹⁸ One can understand how the depictions of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in art could convey a similar sense of the waste of human life; however, the second part of Scodel's formulation does not find a parallel in the visual arts. In the plays, both Iphigeneia and Polyxena lose clothing and are exposed before men. This "excessive exposure," according to Scodel, is "an important part of the horror of human sacrifice."¹¹⁹ In the corpus of images, however, we do not usually see either Iphigeneia or Polyxena exposing their bodies to men. The two exceptions to this are a lost Greek painting described in an epigram of Pollianus and the Roman painting from the House of the Tragic Poet (IPH 49 and POL 9). Therefore, while exposure before men can be identified as a key feature of virgin sacrifice in Athenian tragedy, it does not figure as a defining characteristic in the representation of virgin sacrifice in art. Instead, the value of the maidens in art is conveyed through their fine garments and jewelry, such as the exquisite dress of Iphigeneia on Douris' lekythos in Palermo (IPH 1).

Another feature shared by the sacrificial virgins is that they die by their necks, or would die by their necks if the episode were more commonly depicted in art. In *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman*, Nicole Loraux identifies the neck as the locus of female death. Both Iphigeneia and Polyxena are to die by the knife, which distinguishes them from some sacrificial victims, like Aglauros, a daughter of Kekrops, who commits suicide by throwing herself from the walls of Athens during the city's war with Eleusis.

¹¹⁸Scodel 1996, 111-2.

¹¹⁹Scodel 1996, 111.

A sacrifice also has to be offered to a “superhuman recipient.”¹²⁰ The victim has to be killed by another human being. So, neither suicide, like that of Aglauros, Antigone, or Makaria, nor exposure, like that of Andromeda or Hesione, count as proper sacrifices.

Above all, the sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena are defined by their relation to the Fall of Troy. Their sacrifices are unique among stories of sacrificial virgins because their deaths define the narrative structure of the Trojan epic, marking both the beginning and end of the Trojan War. The linking of *parthenoi* with war belongs to a tradition that associates women with cities, in that both require protection from violating men. Michael Nagler, Emily Vermeule, H el ene Monsacr e, and Anne Ellis Hanson have explored this metaphor fruitfully.¹²¹ Vermeule observed that in the *Iliad* “Troy herself is seen as a body to be humiliated.”¹²² At *Iliad* XIII.73, for instance, we learn that “Now all steep Ilion is ruined from the head down.” The emphasis on the head here brings to mind how both Iphigeneia and Polyxena will lose their lives, as they die by the neck.¹²³ Vermeule elaborates that as a holy city, dedicated to the gods, Troy is like a sacrificial animal.¹²⁴ Nagler showed how the use of the word

¹²⁰On this point, see Hughes 1991, 3 note 9 with bibliography.

¹²¹Nagler 1974, 44-63; Vermeule 1979; Monsacr e 1984, 279-80; Hanson 1990, 325-6. Du e (2006, 4 note 8) also cites Aischylos, *Seven Against Thebes* 321-32 as an example where the tearing of a woman’s veil is compared to the sack of a city.

¹²²Vermeule 1979, 115-6. *Iliad* XIII.73, XXII.411; XXIV.729. On the links between the sacrifice of Iphigeneia and the sack of Troy in Aischylos’ *Agamemnon*, see Du e 2006, 129 note 32 for bibliography.

¹²³Loroux 1987.

¹²⁴Vermeule 1979, 116.

κρ→δεμνον, or veil, is used by Homer to equate female chastity with the protection of a city. After Hektor's death in the *Iliad*, for instance, Andromache allows her veil to fall, symbolizing the impending doom for Troy.¹²⁵ Monsacré focuses on the erotic aspects of the metaphor to discuss “the eroticization of death.” Hanson is interested in how the sacking of a city by breaching its gate metaphorically symbolizes the violation of a young girl. “With virgins and city walls,” writes Hanson, “a thrust through a closed and protective gate lays the innermost parts within easy reach of an outsider to appropriate as he chooses.”¹²⁶ As bodies that are violated, casualties of the Trojan War, both Iphigeneia and Polyxena are equated with the city of Troy and the fall of the house of Atreus. Later in art, women are often visualized as personifications of cities.¹²⁷

The sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena, therefore, derive meaning from their context and role in the fall of Troy. Embedded in the narrative of the Trojan War, they participate in a network of interconnections with other women and events in the Trojan cycle. In part, they are also defined by their relation to other mythological women in the Trojan epic, especially Helen of Troy, which is the subject of Chapter Four.

In describing the figure of Polyxena about to be killed on the tomb of Achilles in a lost monumental wall painting, Pollianus wrote:

... /ν Βλεφ□ροι] δ' παρψενικ□] J Φρυγῶν κείτται

¹²⁵*Iliad* 22.468-70.

¹²⁶Hanson 1990, 326.

¹²⁷Such as Tyche, Fortune, often appears with a crown of a city on her head.

λο] π)λεμο].

“. . . in her eyes lies all the history of the Trojan War.”
(*Greek Anthology* 16.150)

The epigram of Pollianus suggests that the sacrificial maiden herself was able to encapsulate all of the horrors of the War. The sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena not only mark both the beginning and end of the war, but in many ways their deaths symbolize the Trojan War.

Chapter 2

Images of Iphigeneia in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Art

GREEK DEPICTIONS (certain) [*IPH 1–12*]¹

Iphigeneia can be identified with certainty on 29 works of art from the Greek period: sixteen vases, three lost wall paintings, five relief bowls, one work of architectural sculpture, one free-standing sculptural group, and three gems. Episodes at Aulis appear on twelve of these works, while episodes at Tauris are depicted on sixteen.² One work, an Attic pyxis in the British Museum, shows Iphigeneia outside of her usual narrative context at Aulis or Tauris (*IPH 2*). Here, Iphigeneia, named by an inscription, appears alongside other women in what has been traditionally described as a genre scene, except that the other women are also labeled with the names of Argive heroines. I include the pyxis among the Aulian works because Iphigeneia is often thought of as a bride in the scene, which relates to the Aulis story.

From the surviving evidence, it is possible to make general observations regarding in which mediums and contexts each strand of Iphigeneia's story tends

¹On the representations of Iphigeneia in Greek art, myth, and tragedy see Robert 1875; Wernicke 1896; Macchioro 1909; Kjellberg 1916; Philippart 1925; Studniczka 1926; Löwy 1929; Séchan 1931; Clement 1934; Curtius 1934; Weitzmann 1947, 20-5, 44-6, 159-60; Weitzmann 1949; Lloyd-Jones 1952; Tosi 1957; Ambrosetti 1961; Croisille 1963; v. Geisau 1967; Brelich 1969, 242-9; Burkert 1971, 77-9ff; Trendall and Webster 1971, 91-4; Cambitoglou 1975; Sale 1975; Stinton 1976; Roberts 1978, 184-7; Graf 1979; Henrichs 1980; Solmsen 1981; Albin 1983; Jenkins 1983; Lloyd-Jones 1983; Cunningham 1984; Jouan 1984; Papachatsis 1984; Armstrong and Ratchford 1985; Prag 1985; Huys 1986; Lefkowitz 1987; Seaford 1987; Boegehold 1989; *ThesCRA*; Sourvinou-Inwood forthcoming.

²Appendix A includes a catalogue of the scenes at Tauris.

to appear. Iphigenia at Aulis is represented on three of the vases, two of the lost wall paintings, all five relief bowls, the architectural relief plaques, and the free-standing sculpture group. The Taurian episodes appear on twelve of the vases, one of the lost wall paintings, and all three gems. It seems fair to say that the subject of Iphigeneia at Tauris was more popular in South Italian vase-painting and glyptics, while the Aulis myth seems to have been favored for the relief bowls and some larger works in a more public context, like the wall paintings and architectural reliefs.

Three Attic vases give us the earliest certain depictions of Iphigeneia in Greek art (IPH 1–3). They date between about 500 BC and 420 BC. The earliest certain depiction of Iphigeneia in Greek art is on Douris' white ground lekythos in Palermo. Here she is led to sacrifice between two warriors holding swords (IPH 1). Her name is inscribed. She holds up her veil with her left hand in a bridal gesture, while her right hand picks up her chiton. The warrior in front of Iphigeneia is named by an inscription as Teukros, his face in three-quarter view.³ He grasps Iphigeneia's mantle with his right hand and holds out a sword in his left. There is some question about whether another figure may have been included in the scene because there is room for another figure between the altar and the warrior behind Iphigeneia.

On the Shuvalov Painter's oinochoe in Kiel, Iphigeneia is not led, but rather carried to sacrifice (IPH 3). She has fainted. An unbearded warrior carries her towards a stone altar, on the other side of which stands a bearded man

³On the warrior in front of Iphigeneia as Agamemnon, see Reeder 1995, 330-1, and my discussion of this in the Introduction.

holding a sword. Artemis holding a small deer in her hands on the far right indicates that the sacrifice will be averted and the girl saved. The way in which the Shuvalov Painter's Artemis holds a small fawn in her hands looks very much like a terracotta figurine of Artemis cradling a fawn from earlier in the fifth-century, now in Toronto (Fig. 139).⁴ While images of Artemis with deer or fawns are admittedly numerous, one wonders whether it might have invoked for some people the story of Iphigeneia's substitution (Fig. 139). The meaning of the small figurine takes on another dimension when we consider that the object itself was a votive offering.

Other terracotta votive figurines of Artemis and young girls, many of which are found in large quantities at Brauron, deserve a more careful examination. Examples in Athens and Munich from the fifth-century BC show Artemis with girls. These are often thought to relate to the goddess' protective role in the care of maidens (Figs. 140 and 141).⁵ I suggest that the girls depicted with Artemis on some of these dedications might have been interpreted by the ancients as Iphigeneia, who was after all prominent at Brauron.⁶ Artemis' protection of young girls finds mythic-historical roots in the goddess' protection and saving (sometimes) of Iphigeneia. The overlapping of the girl in front of Artemis on the Athens figurine almost creates a fusion between the two, strengthening the connection between the goddess and young girls, and maybe even between Artemis and Iphigeneia (Fig. 140).

⁴Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum 930.101.3. *LIMC*, Artemis 586; Reeder 1995, 311 cat. no. 92.

⁵Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1112. *LIMC*, Artemis 723a; Reeder 1995, 312 cat. no. 93. Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen München NI5240. Reeder 1995, 313, cat. no. 94.

⁶Kahil 1990b, 1983.

The Shuvalov Painter's arrangement of the figures on the vase also creates a clever play between the imagery of the scene and the use of the oinochoe as a functional object. The figured scene is opposite the handle, with the stone altar and the bearded man holding the knife in the center of the composition. As a pitcher used to pour wine, one can imagine the stream of red wine that would appear to be falling over the altar like sacrificial blood as wine was being served. A similar effect must have been appreciated as drops of wine dripped from the lip of the oinochoe, and streamed down the vase's body, seeming to wet the altar located below the mouth of the vase.

The Attic red-figure pyxis in London diverges from iconographic convention in presenting Iphigeneia in a scene other than at Aulis or Tauris (IPH 2). The scene closely resembles so-called domestic or genre scenes that were becoming popular in the mid fifth-century BC, but with inscriptions naming the figures as women from myth, including Danae, Helen, Klytaimnestra, and Cassandra. Whether one interprets this vase as an example of a mythological scene brought into the domestic realm, or of a genre scene enriched through mythological references is open for debate.⁷ Iphigeneia is sometimes thought of as a bride in the scene, which would connect it with her story at Aulis. In Chapter Four, I offer an alternative interpretation, viewing the women as paradigms of female behavior and linking this vase with the tradition of catalogue poetry.

An Apulian volute-krater in London associated with the work of the Iliupersis Painter gives us what is so far the only South Italian version of

⁷Ferrari (2002, 18) discusses this problem in relation to the BM pyxis, commenting on the difficulty between differentiating between myth and non-myth.

Iphigeneia at Aulis (IPH 4). While the Attic vases discussed above date from the fifth-century BC, this vase belongs to the second quarter of the fourth-century BC. It depicts the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, at the moment of the substitution of the hind for the maiden. The vase-painter ingeniously shows this difficult to render moment in the story by superimposing the body of Iphigeneia over that of a deer standing up on its hind legs. A close correspondence is sought between the girl and the animal. Iphigeneia's head is framed against the deer's head, and the position of Iphigeneia's right arm and left leg seems to echo the contours of the animal's limbs. Artemis stands behind Iphigeneia but on a higher level. The similar arrangement of Iphigeneia and Artemis' bodies serves as a visual cue to link them together. The bearded man standing behind the altar holding the knife in his right hand and a scepter in his left could be Agamemnon or Kalchas; I favor the former because of the scepter. Although Jouan interpreted the subject of this painting as the preliminary offering of the lock of hair from the forehead of the victim, this moment in the Iphigeneia myth is not represented in art until the Roman period.⁸ The only other depictions of the substitution of the hind for Iphigeneia in Greek art are the fragments of a marble sculptural group in Copenhagen (IPH 12) and a stone relief plaque from Termessos (IPH 11). The Copenhagen sculpture consists of a three-figure group with Artemis in the middle. Artemis swoops in holding the antlers of the deer in her right hand, and grabbing the neck of Iphigeneia in her left. On the Termessos plaque, Artemis and the deer are separated from Iphigeneia by an altar between the figures.

⁸Jouan 1984, 67: "Il tend le couteau du sacrifice, mais ce n'est encore que pour le rite préliminaire de l'ablation de la boucle sur le front de la victime, derrière laquelle se dissimule la biche, substitut divin."

The statue group of Iphigeneia, Artemis and the hind in Copenhagen raises questions about the iconography of this subject and of the place of Greek sculpture in the Roman world (IPH 12).⁹ Even with issues of style and date aside, many questions still surround the find spots and original display of the sculpture group in the Gardens of Sallust. The fragments of sculpture were probably found in a nymphaeum, and Hartswick has commented on the appropriateness its subject matter for contemplation in a garden setting, for visitors who wanted to reflect upon the significance of a Greek subject and its relevance to their world.¹⁰ A photograph published by Studniczka of some of the sculptural fragments discovered in 1886, includes Artemis' right foot, part of Iphigeneia's left hand, parts of the hind, and a round altar (detail Fig. 12d).¹¹ The original location of the round altar becomes important for how we interpret the narrative of the group. Studniczka thought the altar belonged on the viewer's right because of a recession in a square brick base that he discovered, although there is not general agreement that this depression indicates the placement of the altar, or that the brick base even belongs to the sculpture. Bieber placed the altar on the viewer's left side, and Simon has suggested that the altar might not even have belonged. If placed on the viewer's right, then Iphigeneia would be seen falling on the altar, the subject probably being the substitution of the hind for Iphigeneia. Drawing on the iconography of the painting from the House of the Tragic Poet, Simon has

⁹For an excellent discussion of this statuary group, a review of the scholarly literature, and its relation to the Gardens of Sallust, see Hartswick 2004, 83-93.

¹⁰Hartswick 2004, 93.

¹¹Studniczka 1926.

suggested that the deer is not the substitute victim, but rather carries Iphigeneia to Tauris, which has also been accepted by Ridgway.¹² Replicas of this statue group dating from the Roman period have been found on Samos and in Bulgaria (IPH 56 and 57). In addition, another statuary group of Artemis, Iphigeneia, and a hind from the sanctuary of Jupiter Dolichenus on the Aventine has been seen as a variant of the Copenhagen statue group (IPH 55).

Two Greek wall paintings, now lost, from the fourth-century BC are known from descriptions by Roman authors (IPH 5 and 70). A painting by Kolotes of Teos is mentioned in passing by Quintilian in the same passage in which he describes Timanthes' famous painting, which we are told surpassed that of his rival Kolotes, but we cannot be certain of its subject (IPH 70). The painting of Iphigeneia's sacrifice by Timanthes of Kythnos, described by Pliny, Cicero, and Quintilian, is one of the masterpieces of Greek art that was long emulated (IPH 5). "Orators have sung the praises of his Iphigeneia," Pliny tells us, "who stands at the altar awaiting her doom." Pliny goes on to say that "the artist has shown all present full of sorrow, and especially her uncle, and has exhausted all the indications of grief, yet has veiled the countenance of her father himself whom he was unable adequately to portray."¹³ While Pliny mentions Iphigeneia's uncle, Menelaos, among those present, both Cicero and Quintilian also mention Kalchas and Odysseus, in addition to Menelaos and of course Agamemnon.

¹²Simon 1987, 291-304; Simon, *LIMC*, Artemis/Diana 337; Ridgway 1990, 283; Ridgway 2002, 83, 105, note 43 (cited and discussed in Hartswick 2004, 90, 181 note 37).

¹³Pliny, *Natural History* 35, 73.

What these authors most admired about Timanthes' painting was the artist's invention of veiling the face of Agamemnon, his face hidden to suggest his indescribable grief over the sacrifice of his daughter. "After representing Kalchas as sad, Odysseus as still more so, Menelaos as in grief," according to Cicero, Timanthes "felt that Agamemnon's head must be veiled, because the sorrow could not be portrayed by his brush."¹⁴ Quintilian echoes this sentiment, commenting how "having exhausted his powers of emotional expression he [Timanthes] was at a loss to portray the father's face as it deserved, and solved the problem by veiling his head and leaving his sorrow to the imagination of the spectator."¹⁵ The fact that both Cicero and Quintilian use Timanthes' painting as an example to illustrate points on the art of oration attests to the importance of this picture and its renown in ancient Greece and Rome, and beyond. Timanthes' invention of veiling Agamemnon's face exerted a strong influence on the Western tradition, an example of which can be seen over 2,000 years later in the Italian Baroque artist Giovanni Battista Tiepolo's inclusion of a veiled Agamemnon in his 1757 fresco *The Sacrifice of Iphigeneia* (Fig. 183).¹⁶

The iconographic device of veiling Agamemnon's face is first preserved in the visual record on three Hellenistic relief bowls depicting scenes from Euripides' *IA*, discussed below (IPH 8–10). A veiled Agamemnon appears in the Roman period on the Altar of Kleomenes and in the painting of Iphigeneia's

¹⁴Cicero, *Orator*, 22, 74.

¹⁵Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 2, 13, 13.

¹⁶*The Sacrifice of Iphigeneia*. 1757. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo. Vicenza, Villa Valmarana.

sacrifice from the House of the Tragic Poet in Pompeii, which has led scholars to see these works as reflections of Timanthes' painting.¹⁷

The Roman painting of Iphigeneia's sacrifice from the House of the Tragic Poet in Pompeii, dating from AD 69-79, has attracted much attention because of its possible relation to Timanthes' lost painting and because it is the only work in Roman art in which Iphigeneia is about to be sacrificed against her will. Iphigeneia's twisting and turning pose, her flailing arms raised to the sky with open palms, looking up to the heavens, indicate her resistance. The draped and veiled figure whose face is hidden at far left is Agamemnon. The relation between Timanthes' lost painting and the painting from the House of the Tragic Poet continues to incite scholarly debate; however, it seems fair to say that "only the faintest notion of Timanthes' painting can be derived from Roman mural paintings and mosaics that treat the same subject."¹⁸ In contrast to the struggling Iphigeneia from the House of the Tragic Poet, Pliny tells us that Timanthes' Iphigeneia stood at the altar awaiting the sacrifice. This has prompted M. Marvin to suggest that the Pompeian painting glosses and perhaps repudiates Timanthes' well-known work.¹⁹ Iphigeneia's twisting body and flailing arms on Etruscan cinerary urns suggests that the painting from the House of the Tragic Poet may have been influenced by traditions in Etruria rather than in Greece.

¹⁷For instance, Löwy (1929) has seen the relief on the altar of Kleomenes as a reflection of Timanthes' painting. H. Froning (1981), however, has dated the relief to the second-half of the first-century BC and has argued that its source is no older than a century earlier (discussed in Linant de Bellefonds 1990, 727).

¹⁸Perry 2005, 43. See also Bergmann 1995, 84-5; Perry 2002, 154-6.

¹⁹Marvin 2002, 220; cited in Perry 2005, 43 note 39.

The five Homeric bowls, and fragments of a sixth, all depict scenes of Iphigeneia at Aulis and form a distinct body of material (IPH 6-10 and 71). “Homeric” bowls, so named because more than half depict scenes from the Homeric epics, are a type of terracotta mold-made bowl that belong to a group of pottery called Megarian bowls.²⁰ Our examples all date from the first half of the second century BC and are important for three reasons. First, these bowls provide the first clear links between the visual and literary traditions. Three of the bowls are inscribed “ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑΣ, √ or the “Iphigeneia of Euripides” (IPH 8, 9, and 10). These may be the earliest examples in the preserved visual record that name an author and his work together, a rare occurrence.²¹ Secondly, the scenes on these bowls use continuous narration, an invention of the Hellenistic period, and these are among the earliest examples of works depicting the Iphigeneia myth that employ continuous narration.²² Thirdly, three of the bowls present us with our earliest preserved occurrences of Agamemnon with his head veiled in mourning in the context of the Iphigeneia myth (IPH 8-10).²³

²⁰On Homeric bowls, see Hausmann 1959; Sinn 1979; Brilliant 1984; Pollitt 1986, 200-202; Akamatis 1993.

²¹Small 2003, 82. Small also explains how the genitival form for both *Euripides* and *Iphigeneia* in the inscription translates literally to “of the Iphigeneia of Euripides,” indicating that “the artist considers the scenes dominant and hence the possessors of the play,” as opposed to a construction with Iphigeneia in the nominative and Euripides in the genitive, which would privilege the playwright’s version. For a discussion on “titles” in art, see Small 2003, 82-6.

²²On continuous narration as a Hellenistic invention, see Pollitt 1986, 200. The earliest, securely dated, example of continuous narration in ancient art is the Telephos frieze, and Pollitt, following Hausmann (1959, 45-51), sees the Homeric bowls as contemporary with the Telephos frieze.

²³Kahil, *LIMC*, 717.

To the five bowls, fragments of a sixth in Volos can probably be added, giving part of a man's body, who holds a letter in his right hand (IPH 71). I include this fragment as an uncertain depiction because Iphigeneia is not preserved. Most likely, this bowl was similar to the relief bowls in New York and Athens (IPH 6 and 7). The figure on the Volos fragment would then be Menelaos, as in scene C on the others. While New York 31.11.2 and Athens 22633 depict the same scenes, they are not identical, as Iphigeneia's name is spelled differently on the Athens bowl. On Athens 22633, Iphigeneia's name is spelled ΕΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ rather than ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ, as it appears on the other four bowls (IPH 7).

These six relief bowls illustrate episodes from about the first two-thirds of Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. IPH 6 and 7 depict five scenes from the first third of the play (lines 111-630) while IPH 8-10 depict five episodes from the middle of the play (lines 623-1344). Alas, we do not have any bowls that preserve scenes from the end of the play. Inscriptions naming Euripides and Iphigeneia appear together on IPH 8, 9, and 10, but not on IPH 6 and 7. It is through the action of the scene and the labels that we know the subject on IPH 6 and 7. All of the figures on these bowls are identified with inscriptions, except for the servant from whom Menelaos intercepts the letter in scene B on IPH 6 and 7.

The scenes on all five bowls are arranged in chronological order as they appear in the play, viewed from right to left, with one out of narrative sequence. For IPH 6 and 7, the scenes from left to right are arranged E, D, B, A, C. In other words, scene C, with Menelaos and Agamemnon, is out of order. Similarly, for IPH 8, 9, and 10, the episodes appear from left to right in the order D, E, C, B, A. On these three bowls, the last two scenes are out of narrative sequence.

While the bowls are most often seen in relation to texts, I argue that the scenes were arranged on the bowl with an eye towards visual composition, with certain scenes juxtaposed for visual and dramatic effect, even if out chronological order. In a thorough analysis of the order, J.P. Small argues that “arranging the scenes out of dramatic sequence, again, indicates an insufficient grasp of the importance of the plot and the absence of a text in front of him to check.”²⁴ Small concedes, however, that chronological accuracy may not have been the artists’ goal, that the expectations of buyers may not have demanded such accuracy, that buyers may not have noticed the differences, or that such a small number of scenes arranged out of order may not have been viewed as a difficulty by buyers.²⁵ U. Sinn believed that Euripides wrote his *Iphigeneia in Aulis* during his time in Pella, and that after his death the Euripidean references on these bowls would have appealed to the learned elite of the Macedonian court.²⁶ Certainly these bowls were appreciated for their literary references and the images may have served as mnemonics of the play. At the same time, the bowls themselves were made as works of art, and the sequence of the scenes on the bowl need not strictly follow the chronological narrative of a literary text with the goal of reproducing its plot.

²⁴Small 2003, 88-9. Weitzmann (1959, 65, and 1970, 45) writes that the scenes on these bowls are consecutive (cited in Small 2003, 200 note 31).

²⁵Small 2003, 88-90, and 200 note 35. Small (2003, 200 note 35) also considers whether or not the scenes might have been visually arranged according to axes, but she finds this less convincing.

²⁶Sinn 1979, 57-8. 46ff.

The order of the scenes on IPH 6 and 7 reveals the artist's contribution in attempting to adapt the scenes for the sake of the bowl's visual and thematic coherence. To review, the order of the episodes is as follows:

- E. Arrival of Iphigeneia in a cart
- D. Announcement of Iphigeneia's arrival
- B. Interception of letter by Menelaos
- A. Letter given by Agamemnon to servant
- C. Confrontation between Menelaos and Agamemnon

The placement of scene C, out of sequence, between scenes A and E on these two bowls serves the composition in at least three ways:

First, it allows scenes A, B, and D to remain together. Scenes A and D are compositionally very similar with a messenger on the left striding towards Agamemnon on the right. The messengers in scenes A and D are in the exact same pose, identical except for the inscriptions naming them. Scenes A and D then flank scene B with Menelaos intercepting the letter from an unnamed messenger. The placement of scenes A and D, interrupted by only one intervening episode, encourages the viewer to look back and forth between them to compare the similar scenes. The viewer's knowledge of the play and ability to read the inscriptions would allow him or her to identify which episodes were intended, and this might have been the entertaining and interesting aspect for some viewers. Then, Agamemnon's conspiratorial interactions with the messengers in A and D are contrasted to Menelaos' attack on the messenger in the intervening scene.

Secondly, the placement of scene C next to scene A has a cause-and-effect relationship, or thematic relevance. In scene A, Agamemnon gives the second letter to the messenger to take to Klytaimnestra, instructing her not to send

Iphigeneia to Aulis. It is Agamemnon's change of mind, his decision not to sacrifice his daughter, which Menelaos rails against in scene C. The positioning of these two scenes side by side creates a narrative coherence in that Agamemnon's actions in scene A anger Menelaos, who upbraids the king in scene C. Agamemnon's legs in scene A overlap those of Menelaos in scene C, creating a visual link between the two episodes. While it is true that other figures overlap into adjacent scenes, the amount of overlapping is greatest in scenes A/C.

Thirdly, the placement of scene C next to scene E creates an interesting juxtaposition between father and daughter that may have been intentional. In scene E, Iphigeneia arrives at Aulis in a cart while in scene C Agamemnon raises his right hand to his head in a gesture of woe, as he is confronted by Menelaos. Agamemnon is burdened by the decision he is forced to make, between conflicting obligations to the Greeks and to his family. I believe the artist intended to put scenes C and E side by side in order to draw a link between Iphigeneia and the anguished figure of her father. Although out of chronological order, the placement of these two scenes next to one another visually communicates the themes of the play.

While the episodes depicted on IPH 6 and 7 end with Iphigeneia's arrival at Aulis, the scenes on IPH 8-10 begin with Iphigeneia's arrival at Aulis. The scenes on IPH 8, 9, and 10 appear in the following order:

- D. Iphigeneia begs Agamemnon to spare her life
- E. Iphigeneia accepts her death
- C. Klytaimnestra learns about Iphigeneia's sacrifice
- B. Klytaimnestra tells Achilles of his marriage to Iphigeneia
- A. Arrival of Iphigeneia, Klytaimnestra, and Orestes to Aulis

A similar concern with composition and the visual dynamics between scenes dictated the decision to place scene D next to scene A on IPH 8, 9, and 10. In scene A, Iphigeneia greets her father upon arriving at Aulis, extending her two arms to him. Behind Iphigeneia is her mother and brother. Scene D depicts Iphigeneia and Orestes pleading with Agamemnon as Klytaimnestra turns her back on the scene. The placement of scene D adjacent to scene A creates a clever series of visual and thematic links and puns between the two groups of figures. To begin with, scenes A and D are both four-figured groups with the same figures named in each group. Iphigeneia greeting her father in scene A, unaware of what is about to happen to her, is contrasted in scene D with the figure of Iphigeneia begging her father for her life. A visual pun is at play in the gesture of greeting Iphigeneia makes in scene A. Iphigeneia's gesture with both arms extended palms up could also be a gesture of supplication, which is what the maiden does in scene D. A comparison is also drawn between the two figures of Agamemnon. In A, the enthroned king raises his right hand to his face in a gesture of concern, while in D he is veiled and mourning. A similar comparison is drawn between the figures of Klytaimnestra in each scene. In scene D, a veiled Klytaimnestra turns her back on Iphigeneia pleading with her father, and this pose is echoed in scene A, in which the queen again turns her head away from the figures of Iphigeneia and Agamemnon. Scenes A and D on the bowl are linked by the veiled figure of Klytaimnestra in D. Ironically, as Klytaimnestra turns her back on her husband and daughter in scene D, she turns to left only to encounter a similar scene of Iphigeneia and Agamemnon in scene A. It is almost as if the veiled, mourning

figure of Klytaimnestra turns to witness the unfolding of scene A, foreshadowing the horror that is to come.

The placement of scenes C and E side by side on these bowls also serves to link the figures of Iphigeneia in scene E with Klytaimnestra in scene C. The strong diagonal created by the old servant's body in scene C visually draws the eye from the figure of Iphigeneia in scene E to her mother in the adjacent scene to whom the servant extends his arms. In other words, while the positioning of scenes A and D next to one another seems to highlight the drama between Iphigeneia and her father, the juxtaposing of scenes C and E draws out the relationship between Iphigeneia and her mother. Klytaimnestra's role in the story is central to the scenes depicted, as she appears five times on these bowls, in contrast to Iphigeneia who appears three times and to Agamemnon who appears only twice.

While the series of Hellenistic relief bowls with Iphigeneia provides us with valuable links between images and literary traditions, there is no need to insist that the bowls' reliance on a text is absolute. IPH 6 and 7 do not include an inscription naming Euripides. The discrepancies in narrative sequencing do not by default indicate ignorance of texts or of the importance of plot. These concerns could have come second to the artist, who was perhaps more interested in taking the Euripidean story and contributing something of his own invention in its visual re-telling. They may also be reflections of lost metalwork, thus drawing inspiration from other visual traditions. For learned viewers or buyers, part of the interest of the bowls may have been in comparing the artistic renderings to performances of the play they have seen or to texts they have read.

Comparisons between our bowls and texts reveal discrepancies beyond chronological order, such as the use of the cart and the appearance of Elektra in scene E on IPH 6 and 7. Elektra of course does not appear at all in the *IA*, a problem discussed in depth by Small.²⁷ While the artist's inclusion of Elektra might be a confusion or mistake, it may also reflect another instance of artistic creativity.

From the last quarter of the second-century BC, two non-joining stone relief plaques from Termessos survive, depicting scenes in the life of Iphigeneia that probably decorated a temple (IPH 11). The subject of the right slab is easier to identify than that of the left. It depicts the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, giving the moment of Artemis' substitution of the hind. The left slab gives us two women and a man. Weitzmann identified the subject as a scene at Aulis, with Klytaimnestra in the center, flanked by Iphigeneia and Achilles.²⁸ In contrast, Staehler interpreted the scene as taking place at Tauris, with Iphigeneia in the center flanked by a servant on the left and Pylades on the right.²⁹ The subject then would be Iphigeneia handing over the letter to Pylades, which is the moment in Iphigeneia's story most often represented in South Italian vase painting. If Staehler's identification of the left slab is correct, then these relief plaques are our only preserved works in Greek art that combine episodes from Iphigeneia's story at Aulis and Tauris on one object or monument. Although only two of the plaques have survived, one imagines that there must have been others, and

²⁷Small 2003, 88.

²⁸Weitzmann 1949, 184-5.

²⁹Staehler 1968, 280-9 (discussed in Kahil 1990, 710-11, cat. no. 5).

further fragments might enable us to understand better the decorative program of the building to which these reliefs belonged.

ETRUSCAN DEPICTIONS (certain) [IPH 13—47]³⁰

Iphigeneia at Aulis appears on 35 works in Etruscan art, all urns except for one cista. The urns are all late Hellenistic and belong in a funerary context, found mainly in Perugia and Volterra.³¹ The sacrifice of Iphigeneia is more popular than the events at Tauris, which appear on only five alabaster urns from Chiusi.

The travertine urns from Perugia and the alabaster ones from Volterra all depict the same subject and follow the same compositional format with various players in the scene (IPH 15-46).³² The urns depict the moment before the sacrifice. The composition consists of a central group with Iphigeneia held over an altar by a man or men on the left, and a bearded man on the other side of the altar holding in his right hand a patera over the maiden's head and in his left the sword. The man, or one of the men, holding Iphigeneia is thought to be Odysseus because he often wears a pilos. The bearded man holding the patera and sword is Agamemnon. Iphigeneia is always held horizontally, face down with toes pointed

³⁰On Iphigeneia in Etruscan art, see *LIMC*; Brunn 1870; Dareggi 1972; Pairault 1972; Rebuffat 1972; Bonfante 1984a and 1984b; Heurgon 1984; Steuernagel 1998.

³¹IPH 14-41 are from Perugia; IPH 42-46 are from Volterra. IPH 13 is the only urn from Chiusi that depicts Iphigeneia at Aulis.

³²In the catalogue, I follow I. Krauskopf's organization and typology. This is why some of my cross-references in *LIMC* consist of a number followed by a lowercase letter. For example under Krauskopf's cat. no. 3, she includes 3a as very similar to 3; 3b, 3c, 3d, and 3e as Variant I of 3; 3f as Variant II; 3g as Variant 3. In my catalogue, each urn is given a separate catalogue number rather than arranging similar urns under one catalogue number.

to the ground, but she often twists and arches her back so her upper body is upturned, giving us a three-quarter view of the front of her body; her face may be seen in profile to right or in three-quarter view. She often gesticulates with both hands, sometimes wildly. She is always dressed. Agamemnon may be dressed in armor as a warrior, or he may wear a short chiton. The altar over which the maiden is held may be square or circular. Sometimes it is adorned with a garland.

In addition to the central group of Agamemnon and Iphigeneia held by a warrior, other figures are included in a number of variations and configurations. As few as two other figures or as many as nine may be present (compare IPH 15 and IPH 38). When more than five figures are depicted, they are arranged in two rows of figures and often include servants, musicians, a mourning woman holding out her hair, Klytaimnestra, and a collapsing youth sometimes identified as Achilles. Despite the variations possible in the figures crowded around the central group, all of the urns, except for two, include a figure holding a deer or calf.³³ This figure is almost always female, and is often identified as Artumes. She may appear in the front row or the back, and she is sometimes winged and dressed as a Fury (such as IPH 44). Her inclusion indicates the averted human sacrifice and the substitution of the animal.

IPH 14–21 are similar in including five figures in the scene, that is two figures in addition to the central group of Agamemnon and Iphigeneia held by Odysseus. This gives the simplest composition we have on the series. A figure

³³Perugia, Museo Nazionale 281 (IPH 41) and an urn from the “piccolo toma Inghirami” (IPH 63) do not include a figure holding a deer.

holding the deer appears on all of these except for Perugia 281 (IPH 21), which includes two youths holding spears rather than two female figures flanking the central group. Villa Giulia 50313 (IPH 22) depicts six figures in the scene, including a youth on the ground with his hand to his head in a gesture of horror.

IPH 23–41 include more subsidiary figures around the central group, and these are arranged in two rows of figures. The core group of Iphigeneia—warrior—Agamemnon is always in the front row. A youth collapsing to the ground is included in the front row of many of these urns, and he is sometimes identified as Achilles.³⁴ He may be naked, as on IPH 27, or clothed, as on IPH 33. He is sometimes assisted by a servant who tries to help him up.

Klytaimnestra is seen kneeling in the front row at the extreme right, beseeching Agamemnon, on IPH 27–32, and 34–41. On IPH 33, a kneeling youth is substituted in the place where we would expect to see Klytaimnestra.

Klytaimnestra appears to be standing rather than kneeling on IPH 38. On the urns from Perugia, Iphigeneia is almost always carried by just one man. She is carried by two men only on IPH 38 and 39, a convention more common on the urns from Volterra. A mourning woman holding out her hair with both hands appears behind on IPH 23, 24, 24 bis, 38, and 40. A servant with an axe is included in IPH 23, 31, 36.³⁵ Musicians often appear, and we see most often musicians playing the pipes, tympanum and kithara.

³⁴Sannibale 1994, 173.

³⁵IPH 24 bis is included in Steuernagel's (1998) catalogue, but not in *LIMC*. Steuernagel (1998) also catalogues two additional travertine urns from Perugia with the sacrifice of Iphigeneia that do not appear in *LIMC*: cat. no. 14 (Monte Luce, Casino Vitiani, not published) and 32 (Perugia, Museo Nazionale).

The five urns from Volterra (IPH 42—46) are similar to those from Perugia in having densely packed compositions. In shape, however, the two series diverge. The square-shaped urns from Chiusi allow for two rows of figures, whereas the rectangular ones from Volterra permit only one. Iphigenia is carried by three men on IPH 42 and 43, or by two on IPH 44—46. On IPH 42—45, the figure holding the deer appears at the far right of the scene and is a winged daimon dressed as a Fury. IPH 46 does not include any figure holding a deer, but a horse is substituted in the place where we would expect to find her. On the urns from Volterra, Klytaimnestra always stands at the far left, with her arms extended in a gesture of supplication for her daughter's life, and she is restrained by two men. A break on the left hand side of Florence 5754 (IPH 45) does not preserve the entire three-figure Klytaimnestra group, but part of a leg visible at the break probably preserves one of the legs of a man restraining her, and therefore the lost figures were probably similar to those found on the others. Museo Guarnacci 512 (IPH 44) is unusual in having three vases set atop the altar. Florence 5754 (IPH 45) is unique in having two altars included in the scene. A second altar between Agamemnon and the winged daimon holding the deer has upon it an omphalos with a snake wrapped around.

Two more observations may be made regarding the series of urns depicting Iphigeneia. First, Iphigeneia is often rendered at a smaller scale than the other figures, which is especially noticeable on Perugia 18 and 330 (IPH 14 and 29). This may have been intended to convey that she is a young girl or to avoid the compositional problem of having her overlap other figures. Secondly, we have to take into account the effigies reclining on the urns' lids. A man

reclines on the lid of an urn in Copenhagen depicting Iphigeneia and Orestes in Tauris (IPH 21), while a veiled woman reclines on the lids of Villa Giulia 50311 and Perugia 49 (IPH 27 and 28). In a funerary context, Iphigeneia's story was appropriate to decorate the urns of both men and women, whose portraits sometimes appear on the lids, signaling for whom her myth held meaning.

Inevitably we must deal with the perplexed question regarding the relation between Greek and Etruscan art, myth, religion and culture. Rather than seeing the different Etruscan treatment of Greek subjects as misunderstandings of Hellenic models, scholars have now advocated an approach that privileges Etruscan artistic agency and innovation. This approach allows for individual interpretations of scenes in a local context, and views re-workings of Greek stories as adaptations for distinct Etruscan beliefs and meanings.³⁶ The urns must be considered as a creation of the time and place in which they were made, without trying to see them only as stylistic variations on Greek prototypes.

It is tempting to look for Greek sources for the images of Iphigeneia on the Etruscan urns.³⁷ For instance, the Tyrrhenian amphora in the British Museum with the sacrifice of Polyxena was found in an Etruscan tomb. Her depiction held horizontally over an altar at once calls to mind the Etruscan urns, but these are later. Admittedly, Timanthes' fourth-century BC wall painting of Iphigeneia about to be sacrificed was famous and exerted a tremendous influence on later

³⁶On the "Greek problem," see, for instance, Simon 1996 and de Grummond 2006 (both with bibliographies). For an example of how Etruscan art has often been characterized as dim reflections of Greek works, consider what Walters (1926, xxxix) wrote about Etruscan scarabs in the early 20th century: "The gem-engraving of the Etruscans exhibits all the characteristics that we have learned to associate with the art of that people. Not only is it devoid of all originality, being entirely derived from Greek art, but it has no inherent artistic life of its own, in spite of great technical skill and knowledge of working hard materials."

³⁷Proposed by Small 1981.

art, but it is not necessarily the source for the urns. The motif of the sacrificial virgin could have entered through pattern books, but, again, insisting on Greek sources denies Etruscan originality, and the composition of the urns is in many ways unique. From literary descriptions it is Agamemnon who is plunged deeply in sorrow, not his wife. On the urns, however, Agamemnon often holds the knife and is about to sacrifice his daughter, and Klytaimnestra is so distraught over her daughter's murder that on the urns from Volterra she needs to be physically restrained by two warriors. If Euripides' *IA* is the source through which Iphigeneia's story was transmitted to Etruria, then why does she extend her arms on so many of the urns in a gesture of supplication? In the *IA*, Iphigeneia goes willingly to her death. On several urns, Iphigeneia's right hand grasps at the warrior holding her as if she is fighting against him or attempting to get free, as on Perugia 394, Villa Giulia 50312, and on a third urn in Perugia (IPH 30—32). Therefore, the Etruscans do not seem to be drawing on a particular Greek literary or visual source or iconographic tradition in formulating the compositions of the Iphigeneia urns.

Etruscan cinerary urns like those depicting Iphigeneia were produced in great quantities and their quality is uneven, some truly uninspired. Used to hold ashes, they were not art objects per se, but rather "mass-produced" works that would have been accessible to people other than the elite.³⁸ The subjects depicted were often bloody, and stories of violence against women were common, such as Orestes' matricide and the murder of Eriphyle. The Iphigeneia myth has

³⁸Briguet 1986, 117-8.

to be examined within this context. In *Menschenopfer und Mord am Altar: Griechische Mythen in etruskischen Gräbern*, D. Steuernagel concludes that the Etruscans chose stories from Greek mythology that had meaning for them, and developed their own traditions.³⁹ While conceding that the Etruscans sacrificed prisoners of war, Steuernagel does not see the depictions of human sacrifice in Etruscan art as related to ritual activity.⁴⁰ De Angelis has observed that the subjects on more than a third of all of the preserved mythological urns from Volterra relate to the theme of the tragic, or threatened family. He argues that the straining of family ties in the scenes served as negative paradigms that reflected the threats of dividing families.⁴¹

In Euripides' *IA*, Klytaimnestra is certainly devastated by her daughter's impending murder; however, the connection between mother and daughter as seen on urns from Perugia and Volterra does not find a parallel in the Greek visual arts.⁴² I argue that this distinctive feature of Etruscan art is due, in part, to the higher status and the more highly regarded role that aristocratic women in Etruria occupied compared with their Athenian counterparts.

³⁹Steuernagel 1998.

⁴⁰The subject of Iphigeneia's sacrifice in Etruria raises the question of whether or not the Etruscans sacrificed humans. It has been thought that the Etruscans did practice some form of human sacrifice in honor of the dead, but there is not universal agreement on this point. On the evidence for human sacrifice as a historical reality in Etruria, see Bonfante 1984a, 1984b, and 1986, 262-3. Bonfante's evidence for human sacrifice includes bloody depictions of sacrifice in the funerary arts thought to be connected with cult practice, the appearance of severed heads in fourth-century Etruscan art (reflecting influence from the Celts), and "historical allusions" to human sacrifices in Livy (7.15.9-10; 22.57).
Against human sacrifice in Etruscan cult practice, see Steuernagel 1998, 149-66.

⁴¹de Angelis 1999, 62-6.

⁴²We do see a mourning Hecuba, however, on one of the short sides of the Polyxena Sarcophagus.

The subjects depicted on Etruscan urns seem often to be drawn from the tragedies of Euripides, so it is interesting that Etruscan sculptors or the patrons who commissioned the urns chose to feature Klytaimnestra so prominently.⁴³ On the urns from Perugia, Klytaimnestra begs Agamemnon to spare their daughter's life, kneeling at his feet and pulling at his garments. On the urns from Volterra, Klytaimnestra extends her arms out in a gesture of supplication toward her husband, so great is her grief that she must be restrained by two warriors. The only time Klytaimnestra is depicted with her daughter in the Greek period is on the three Homeric bowls discussed above. Images of mothers and children are more common in Etruscan than in Greek art. While many of the Etruscan examples represent mothers and infants or young children, the linking of Iphigeneia and Klytaimnestra on the urns reflects a similar interest.⁴⁴ In fact, Iphigeneia's small size on some of the urns indicates that she was a young girl. Pendant to the frequent depictions of mothers and children in art, Bonfante has cited the common epithet of "ati," or "mother," for goddesses in the epigraphic record as further evidence for the "importance of mothers" in Etruria.⁴⁵ This is not to suggest that Etruscan women had a closer bond with their children than did Greek mothers. Instead, it was the cultural climate and attitudes towards women in Etruria that allowed this aspect of experience to be expressed in the

⁴³On the influence of Euripides on the urns see Briguet 1986, 117.

⁴⁴Examples of mothers and children in Etruscan art are the numerous terracotta votive statues representing seated mothers with infants or children on their laps (for examples, see Bonfante 1994, 255 fig. 8.9); this is also the same subject of the "Mater Matuta," a fifth-century BC limestone cinerary statue from Chiusi in Florence (Museo Archeologico, illustrated in Briguet 1986, 94, fig. IV-2).

⁴⁵ Bonfante 2006, 20.

material record. The appearance of Iphigeneia and her mother on the series of Etruscan urns casts the mother—daughter bond in a mythological context.

The iconography of the urns from Perugia and Volterra may also offer a clue in understanding a scene on a now lost Homeric bowl from Greece, which is contemporary (Fig. 141 bis).⁴⁶ It depicts four episodes from Book 23 of Homer's *Iliad*, the funeral games for Patroklos. Three of these scenes are straightforward: the wrestling match between Odysseus and Aias, a chariot team, and Phoinix as a judge in the chariot race. The fourth scene is more difficult to understand.

Achilles (labeled) sits at a low table (?), his right arm extended in front of him holding a wreath. On the other side of the table is Agamemnon, named by an inscription, and another male figure who seems to rest his hands on the table in order to balance his body at a diagonal. Sinn identifies this scene as Achilles distributing the prizes to Agamemnon, and perhaps also to a kneeling man, Meriones (?), thus illustrating *Iliad* 23.890ff. The unnamed, so-called kneeling figure in this scene is difficult to interpret. First of all, he is rather horizontal. When a kneeling figure is intended on these bowls, like the kneeling figure of Polyxena on Staatliche Museen 3161q, artists do not render the pose so awkwardly. Also, in the *Iliad*, Achilles gives a spear to Meriones and an unfired cauldron with a pattern of flowers to Agamemnon, which are not the prizes offered on the bowl, although this need not be entirely consistent.

I suggest that the arrangement of the figures on the bowl draws on the visual iconography of sacrifice, that of Iphigeneia preserved on contemporary

⁴⁶Sinn 1979, 81, cat. no. MB12. Present location unknown. On art market in 1930s.

Etruscan urns, to depict Achilles' sacrifice of one of the Trojan captives.⁴⁷

Achilles' slaying of the twelve Trojan captives on Patroklos' grave is rare in Greek art, appearing only a handful of times.⁴⁸ The lack of a standardized iconography for this subject allows us to question whether or not the bowl could depict it.

Achilles' killing of the Trojans is mentioned twice in Book 23, lines 19-23, and 175-83, and is therefore from the same book as the other three scenes depicted on the bowl. Agamemnon and the unnamed man are somewhat difficult to make out, but the arrangement of the figures resembles depictions of Iphigeneia held over an altar on Etruscan urns from Perugia and Volterra. Compare the bowl to Vatican 13902 (IPH 36). Iphigeneia's arms are extended out and her body is prone, at a diagonal, foot touching the ground. The way that Achilles holds the circular object, perhaps a wreath or phiale, over the man's head recalls how Agamemnon holds a phiale over Iphigenia's head. The scene on the bowl then would depict the preparations for the sacrifice of one of the Trojan captives. This interpretation solves the problem of the awkward pose of the unnamed man.⁴⁹ It has often been thought that it was the Greeks who exerted a strong influence on

⁴⁷The influence could have been through the objects themselves or through the use of pattern books. On the contact between Greeks and Etruscans in the Hellenistic period, see Turfa 1986, 80-1 (in Bonfante, ed.).

⁴⁸*LIMC*, Achilleus, p. 118, cat. nos. 487 and 488. In Greek art, it appears on an Apulian volute-crater, Naples H 3254, and on several gems.

⁴⁹The difficulty with this interpretation, however, is that Achilles seems to sit before a table rather than an altar, but it is difficult to say. The bowl, whose present location is unknown, is unpublished except for Sinn's line drawings. If Achilles sits before a table, then this scene might relate to the "gloomy feast" Achilles requests Agamemnon to have his men prepare in *Iliad* 23.48ff, perhaps even conflating this banquet scene with the sacrifice of the Trojan prisoners mentioned only a few lines earlier (Hektor's dead body in scenes of Achilles' feasting as Priam ransoms his son's body in Attic vase-painting may argue for this as a possibility).

the Etruscans, but this relief bowl may help us to see that the influence must have been more reciprocal than is usually thought.

Besides the series of cinerary urns, only one other Etruscan work depicts Iphigeneia with certainty. On a fourth-century BC Praenestian cista in Rome, Villa Giulia 13141, Iphigeneia is about to be sacrificed by Kalchas (IPH 47). She is naked except for jewelry and a piece of drapery she holds up in both hands behind her back to form a backdrop. To right of Iphigeneia is a deer and Kalchas who holds a knife in his right hand, raised over his head as if he is about to sacrifice the maiden. Included in the scene is Klytaimnestra, glimpsed through a window, Agamemnon, and several youths.

ROMAN DEPICTIONS (certain) [IPH 48—65]⁵⁰

Of the 60 odd works with certain representations of Iphigeneia in the Roman period, all but fifteen take place in Tauris. On wall paintings in Klagenfurt and Stabiae, Iphigeneia is depicted alone, silhouetted against the solid background of the wall, but these too most likely belong in Tauris (TAU 23 and 26). In both paintings she holds the statue of Artemis in her left hand and either an inverted torch or branch in the other. The inclusion of the statue identifies her as Iphigeneia, which along with her elaborate dress, including wreath and pearls in her hair, present her as a priestess of Artemis in Tauris.

In representing Iphigeneia at Aulis, the episode most often depicted by artists is Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair, which appears on two-thirds (10 out of

⁵⁰On depictions of Iphigeneia in Roman art, see *LIMC*, Robert 1876; Philippart 1925; Löwy 1929; Curtius 1934; Weitzmann 1949; Croisille 1963; Parra 1978; de Caro 1984; Jouan 1984; UPDATE**

15) of the works. This subject does not survive on any known work of Greek or Etruscan art, nor is it found in Euripides.⁵¹ The interest in this subject reflects the way in which Greek myth-history could be transformed and developed in different ways by Roman artists. The earliest preserved example is the Altar of Kleomenes, often thought of as a prototype for later works (IPH 50). Löwy thought its composition reflected Timanthes' lost painting because of the veiled and draped figure of Agamemnon, whose face is hidden.⁵² Kleomenes signs the altar beneath the figure of Kalchas, and one wonders whether there might be some reason for this, perhaps some comment on the artist's role as creator or agent of the work of art and the sacrificer in the scene as the agent of the sacrifice. Both are offering something. Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair appears on a now lost Pompeian wall painting from the Casa del Vicolo di Modesto, a stucco relief from the Underground Basilica of Porta Maggiore, an oscillum, three examples of relief pottery, and two gems. The latest example is on the front of the Byzantine Veroli Casket, of about 1000 AD. While the Altar of Kleomenes and the terracotta relief oinochoe include five and six figures, respectively, in the composition, the subject can be condensed to just the two figures of Iphigeneia and Kalchas as on the intaglio in Berlin 790, the oscillum fragment, and a stucco relief from the underground Basilica of Porta Maggiore (IPH 64, 51, 52). In compositions of this subject with three figures, the figure of Agamemnon is

⁵¹Kalchas is mentioned at the sacrifice of Iphigeneia in Latin literature by Cicero, Valerius Maximus, and Quintilian; Lucretius and Ovid might make allusions to him. See Croisille 1963, 214 for references.

⁵²Löwy 1929; discussed by Linant de Bellefonds 1990, 727.

added, as on the wall painting from Pompeii and on another intaglio in Berlin, inv. 788 (IPH 48 and 65).

An oscillum fragment with Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair on one side is paired with a man penetrating a woman on the other (IPH 51). There are correspondences between the two sides. Kalchas stands on the left and Iphigeneia on the right side, an arrangement echoed on the opposite side with the man on the left and the woman on the right. The swag of garland at the altar in front of Iphigeneia recalls the swag below the couch. The pairing of Iphigeneia on one side with a scene of intercourse on the other highlights the erotic aspects of virgin sacrifice, which has been described by W. Burkert as an example of the "sexualization of ritual killing."⁵³

Besides representations of Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair, a few other scenes of Iphigeneia at Aulis appear in Roman art. The famous wall painting from the House of the Tragic Poet in Pompeii depicts the maiden carried to sacrifice.⁵⁴ Similarly, Iphigeneia is led to sacrifice on a mosaic of the first-century AD from Ampurias (IPH 62). A Severan mosaic from Antioch represents a scene at Aulis before her sacrifice (IPH 63). Two free-standing sculptures depict Artemis' substitution of the hind for Iphigeneia (IPH 54 and 55). A consideration of the original contexts of the works allow us to reconstruct how they may have been experienced, offering insight what could have been an intimate encounter between viewer and image.

⁵³Burkert 1983, 59.

⁵⁴Discussed above in the section on Greek wall painting. Also discussed in Chapter 4 in its Roman context as part of the decorative program of the House of the Tragic Poet.

The mosaic from the House of Iphigeneia in Antakya features Iphigeneia with her mother and father before her sacrifice (IPH 63). Klytaimnestra puts her arm around her daughter's shoulder. Agamemnon stands to their right, framed in the doorway of a temple, his right hand extended towards his daughter as if beckoning her to follow him. The mosaic from Ampurias has Iphigeneia being led to sacrifice (IPH 62). The large number of figures in this scene again makes it tempting to see it as a reflection of Timanthes' lost painting, which Pliny tells us included Kalchas, Odysseus, Menelaos, and Agamemnon. In the background at the top right is Artemis with a deer, signaling the goddess' intervention and the substitution of the animal. In Roman art, Artemis' substitution of the deer for the maiden is also attested from the painting from the House of the Tragic Poet, and probably from the two free-standing sculptures with Artemis, Iphigeneia, and a deer (IPH 49, 54, and 55). The significance of the deer is that it implies that Iphigeneia will be rescued, her death averted.

The original context of the mosaics from Ampurias and Antakya offers clues to how the mosaics were experienced and understood (IPH 62 and 63). As decorations on the floor of a house, the images were literally walked on. The idea of procession is central to these two mosaics, as one shows Iphigeneia led to sacrifice, and the other gives the moment before. The owners of the house and visitors to these rooms were themselves able to walk or "process" up to and over the pictures, in the process contemplating the story of Iphigeneia. The original location of the painting of Iphigeneia's sacrifice in the House of the Tragic Poet offered a similar opportunity for contemplation (IPH 49). Located at the end of the peristyle around the atrium, one had the opportunity of walking up to the

painting along the colonnade (see Bergmann's reconstruction, Fig. 48g). Situated in the peristyle, the left side of the painting was open to the courtyard and then to the sky. The female figure holding onto the deer in the top left of the painting could have been imagined as being whisked in from the actual sky, the composition of the painting taking into consideration its placement in the house, creating a clever play between the real world of the viewer and the imagined, mythical world of the painting.

The representation of Iphigeneia on the mosaics from Antakya and Ampurias raises questions about her volition that are addressed in Chapter Five. Does the Iphigeneia from Ampurias go willingly to sacrifice? Likewise, while the mosaic from Antakya shows the moment before the sacrifice, can we predict whether or not her sacrifice will be voluntary? With all of the attention focused on Iphigeneia's consent or lack of consent in art and literature, I draw attention to the hands of Iphigeneia on the mosaics in Ampurias and Antakya. Both figures are veiled and draped, their hands lost in the folds of their garments. In Chapter Five, I explore how their hidden or suppressed hands, which are often the "locus of agency, both literally and symbolically," relate to ideas of female agency, and by extension constructions of womanhood.⁵⁵

The deer is often the iconographic clue that signals the averted human sacrifice by indicating the animal substitution. For the statue groupings of Artemis, Iphigeneia, and the hind in Copenhagen and the Capitoline Museum (IPH 54 and 55), is the deer the substitute victim for Iphigeneia, or the mode of

⁵⁵Garrard 2005, 64. Garrard adopts this approach in examining hands in the work of Artemisia Gentileschi, and its cultural meanings in 17th century Italy. Aristotle also commented that "the hand is for the body as the intellect is for the soul."

transport that whisks the maiden off to Tauris? As discussed above, Simon saw the deer as the latter for the statue group in Copenhagen. The same question may be asked of the sculpture from the Sanctuary of Jupiter Dolichenus on the Aventine (IPH 55). Simon has interpreted the diminutive figure of the Aventine Iphigeneia as an iconographic attribute of Taurian Diana, a variant of the subject represented on the statue group in Copenhagen.⁵⁶

None of the Roman works representing Iphigeneia at Aulis have a clear funerary function or context.⁵⁷ The sacrifice of Iphigeneia would seem to be a suitable subject to decorate sarcophagi or funerary monuments with the association of the maiden and death based on Etruscan material. The Aulian episode, however, does not appear on any sarcophagi. Iphigeneia as sacrificial victim at Aulis appears primarily on wall paintings, mosaics, ceramics, and gems. The wall paintings and mosaics were decorations for houses, and the story of Iphigeneia at Aulis probably appealed to elite and educated viewers interested in Greek myth-history and learned references. The gems and ceramics are smaller, more personal objects not necessarily bound for the grave, but for the living. The story of Iphigeneia as priestess of Artemis at Tauris is the subject that appears on the series of sarcophagi and funerary reliefs.

⁵⁶Simon 1984, 838.

⁵⁷The use of the Underground Basilica of Porta Maggiore is unclear, but it might have been used for ritual dining in cult practice relating to the dead.

UNCERTAIN DEPICTIONS [*IPH 66—86*]

Greek (IPH 66—72)

The earliest uncertain depiction of Iphigeneia or Polyxena in Greek art appears on the fragments of a Protoattic krater in Basel attributed to the New York Nessos Painter (IPH 66=POL 24). Preserving only the lower legs and feet of a female figure carried by at least three men, the subject has long been thought to depict the sacrifice of Iphigeneia because her feet point to the sky.⁵⁸ This identification is based on the Roman painting from the House of the Tragic Poet, where Iphigeneia is depicted facing upwards, a sacrifice for the gods. By contrast, Polyxena on the Tyrrhenian amphora in the British Museum is held over the altar face down, with her toes pointed to the ground, a blood sacrifice for the dead Achilles. Based on these two works, it was thought that the direction which the maiden faced was diagnostic. The discovery of the Polyxena Sarcophagus in 1997, however, showed that Polyxena could also be represented being sacrificed face up, with her feet pointing towards the sky. In addition, scholars have tended to overlook the numerous Etruscan urns from Perugia and Volterra on which Iphigeneia is sitting up, body twisted, but still held over the altar with her toes pointed to the ground.

Without further fragments of the Basel krater, we cannot say with certainty whether Iphigeneia or Polyxena is represented.⁵⁹ S. Morris also mentions the “attractive if unlikely possibility” that the maiden might be

⁵⁸Vermeule and Chapman 1971.

⁵⁹Other “suggestions of desperation” noted by Vermeule and Chapman (1971, 291 note 17) include Aerope, Alkestis, Hesione, Eurydike; mythological corpse; rape; Helen and the Dioskouroi; statue being taken to a temple.

Makaria, the daughter of Herakles and Deianeira, whose voluntary sacrifice is a rare subject in Greek art. This idea is attractive because the Basel krater could then be seen as a “convenient sequel” to the New York amphora with Deianeira and Herakles.⁶⁰

More, however, can be said about the position of the maiden’s body. It has been thought that the figure on the Proto-attic fragments was bent at the waist, her upper body raised, based on comparisons with the painting from the House of the Tragic Poet, with the reliefs on Etruscan urns, and with the account given in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* (228ff). Vermeule and Chapman have also commented that for the Painter of the New York Nessos Amphora, a composition similar to that on the Tyrrhenian amphora with a procession of similar men carrying a passive body would be “an extremely tame and insipid composition” and would also be “out of character for the period in general.”⁶¹ They conjectured that “the lost part of the vase might have shown her sitting up with a strongly twisted body, her chest rendered frontally and her head facing right, with outflung hands appealing to her father who stands on the left with the sacrificial knife.”⁶² This is, however, unlikely for two reasons. First, I am hesitant to use a first-century AD Roman painting to reconstruct an image on a seventh-century BC Greek vase. We do not know when the motif of a twisting, sitting up Iphigeneia entered the iconographic repertoire, even though it does appear

⁶⁰Morris 1984, 69 note 120. On Makaria in Greek art, see Schmidt, *LIMC*, Makaria I, 341-4, whose catalogue consists of six entries, including the fragments of the Basel krater.

⁶¹Vermeule and Chapman 1971, 291.

⁶²Vermeule and Chapman 1971, 292.

earlier than the Iphigeneia from the House of the Tragic Poet. On the Etruscan urns from Perugia and Volterra of the second-century BC, Iphigeneia is held over the altar and her body often twists and turns, her upper body raised.⁶³ Also, the question aside of whether or not the painting from the House of the Tragic Poet even reflects Timanthes' lost painting, there is no guarantee that Timanthes had even drawn upon earlier iconographic traditions in rendering his scene. So there might not be a link between Timanthes' fourth-century painting and the seventh-century vase, the two works themselves separated by about 300 years. The figure of Polyxena on the Tyrrhenian amphora and on the Polyxena Sarcophagus are both held completely horizontal and neither one sits up or twists at the waist, and this is how I would reconstruct the sacrificial maiden in Basel. The two works with Polyxena are also closer in date to the Proto-attic fragments than Timanthes' painting.

Secondly, conventions of vase painting might support the suggestion that the maiden was held horizontally. In depictions of the prothesis on Geometric vases, horizontality indicates death. Steeped in the conventions of earlier vase-painting, the New York Nessos Painter may well have rendered a scene of

⁶³It is tempting to use the representations of Iphigeneia on Etruscan urns to reconstruct the Proto-attic Iphigeneia in Basel. In discussing the series of Etruscan urns with the matricide of Alkmaeon, a Greek story but without an established visual iconography in Greek art, J.P. Small (1981, 165-6) concludes that "it is likely that the iconography of the Etruscan reliefs was derived from a Greek depiction." She concludes, "thus the urns can help to complete gaps in and add to the understanding of the Greek tradition."

The urns were likely influenced by Timanthes' painting, but there is no definite link between the Basel fragments and the lost fifth-century painting. Likewise, on most of the urns only one man, and sometimes two, hold Iphigeneia, while on the Polyxena Sarcophagus and the Tyrrhenian amphora, three men hold Polyxena. From the preserved fragments of the Basel krater, it seems likely that at least three men held the maiden, suggesting that the iconographic scheme follows the conventions of the two Polyxenas in Greek art, rather than the Iphigeneias in Etruria.

sacrifice with the victim horizontal.⁶⁴ The mourning women watching Polyxena's sacrifice on the Polyxena Sarcophagus are not so far removed from the mourning women who tear out their hair on Geometric kraters. In short, I believe the maiden's body was held horizontally rather than sitting up, bent at the waist.

Although no new fragments of the Proto-attic krater have come to light, the discovery of the Polyxena Sarcophagus has changed our understanding of the fragment's imagery, requiring us to reconsider some of Vermeule and Chapman's suggestions. Vermeule and Chapman offered several minor points in support of their interpretation of the Protoattic maiden as Iphigeneia, which we might reconsider in light of new evidence.⁶⁵ First, they suggest that the unarmed men on the Protoattic fragments seem more like the civilian attendants at Aulis, described in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (231), than the armed Greek warriors at Troy. On the Polyxena Sarcophagus, however, the three men who hold Polyxena are unarmed and wear only short tunics. Neoptolemos also wears a short tunic, and except for the knife with which he kills Polyxena, he does not have any other arms or wear any armor. Secondly, Vermeule and Chapman also found the bearded man on the back of the krater difficult to identify in the context of Polyxena's story, preferring to see him instead as Kalchas. However, there is an old man, sometimes identified as Nestor although without a beard, with his left hand raised to his face as if in mourning or disapproval watching the scene of the maiden's sacrifice on the Polyxena Sarcophagus. Likewise, on the Tyrrhenian

⁶⁴My appreciation to M. Moore for suggesting that I consider a connection with prothesis scenes, but I take full responsibility for the interpretation put forth here.

⁶⁵Vermeule and Chapman 1971, 292-3.

amphora in London, Phoenix turns his back on the scene of Polyxena's sacrifice, as if in protest. Thirdly, Vermeule and Chapman suggest that if the frieze of sea monsters is related with the scene of sacrifice, then "they would be more in place at Aulis, where the ships are drawn up to begin their crossing of the fish-filled waters, than beside a burial mound on the plain of Troy."⁶⁶ It should be remembered, however, that the sacrifice of Polyxena to Achilles after the fall of Troy was to enable the Greeks to sail home. The sea monsters then might be viewed as a reminder of the need to sacrifice the Trojan princess in order to gain safe passage home.

The difficulty in interpreting the Proto-attic scene is also due in part to how the subject has been described. Vermeule and Chapman described the scene as "a living woman being carried by unarmed men without a struggle."⁶⁷ We may ask, however, if the woman was not struggling, then would she need to be carried to sacrifice by three or four men? I argue in Chapter Five that the horizontality of the maiden signifies resistance. Does this, then, argue for the identification of one maiden over the other? These questions are pursued in Chapter Five, with the goal of exploring what displays of consent and resistance signify in the context of each maiden's story.

Meanwhile, however, Iphigeneia is not once shown being carried horizontally to sacrifice on any surviving work of Greek art. Iphigeneia is only carried to sacrifice in the Roman painting from the House of the Tragic Poet and on the series of Etruscan urns, and for these we cannot be certain of the influence

⁶⁶Vermeule and Chapman 1971, 293.

⁶⁷Vermeule and Chapman 1971, 291.

of Greek prototypes. Iphigeneia has been thought to have been carried to sacrifice in Timanthes' painting, but again Pliny tells us that the girl was standing at the altar awaiting sacrifice. In other words, while the iconographic convention of representing a woman being carried horizontally by men has been interpreted as appropriate for the stories of Iphigeneia and Polyxena, this may not be true. In fact, the only time Iphigeneia may have been carried to sacrifice is in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, however even here we cannot be certain.⁶⁸ Without one known example of Iphigeneia represented in this way in the visual corpus, it is not safe to assume that this is part of the maiden's iconography in the Greek period. At this point, the practice of carrying the maiden horizontally to sacrifice seems more appropriate for the iconography of Polyxena than Iphigeneia; however, we should keep this as a working hypothesis subject to revision as new evidence comes to light. In reference to the Polyxena Sarcophagus, G. Hedreen has observed, "Given that the sacrifice of Polyxena occurred relatively more frequently in Archaic art than did the death of Iphigeneia, it now seems more likely that the Protoattic vase depicted the death of Polyxena."⁶⁹ For the reasons outlined above, I would agree with him.

An Attic red-figure volute-krater found in a tomb in Gravina and now in Taranto attributed to the Boreas Painter depicts a female figure being attacked on

⁶⁸In the *Agamemnon*, of course, Iphigeneia's sacrifice did not take place on stage. The chorus recounts how Agamemnon "bade his ministers lay hold of her as, enwrapped in her robes, she lay fallen forward, and with stout heart to raise her, as it were a kid, high above the altar; and with a guard upon her lovely mouth . . . (lines 231-237). Even here, however, we cannot be certain that Iphigeneia was carried in procession to the altar. But we know that she was held over the altar. Aeschylus' version also includes a bit or gag in the Iphigeneia's mouth, which is something we never see in art; this may caution against seeing Aeschylus as the inspiration for any of the images.

⁶⁹Hedreen 2001, 131 note 40.

an altar by a youth (IPH 67). A. Ciancio identifies the girl being attacked as Iphigeneia, the youth with sword attacking her as Diomedes, and the bearded man wearing petasos and chlamys who tries to restrain the sword-wielding youth as Odysseus. Behind Diomedes and Odysseus, she sees the man with his right hand raised as Agamemnon, and the woman behind him who moves to left with arms extended behind her as Klytaimnestra. Then, to the right of Iphigeneia, Ciancio sees the bearded man with scepter as Kalchas and the old woman with white hair behind her as the substitute victim. She suggests that this vase might preserve a less well known version of Iphigeneia's story, preserved in Tzetzes' commentary on Lycophron 183, in which an old woman is substituted for her.⁷⁰

While broadly accepting Ciancio's identification of the subject of the vase, I am not convinced of the link to Tzetzes' version of the myth, and would like to suggest alternate identifications for some figures. The commentary of Tzetzes, a twelfth-century Byzantine poet and grammarian on the work of the Greek poet and grammarian Lycophron from the third-century BC, is our only source for this alternate version of the Iphigeneia myth. Our vase therefore was made about 200 years before Lycophron.

The rich garments and banded scepter of the bearded man to right of Iphigeneia befit a king. He may therefore be Agamemnon. The woman to his left, partly overlapped by the altar, should therefore be Klytaimnestra, whose propinquity to Iphigeneia and her husband seems appropriate. She reaches her right arm out towards the armed youth in a gesture of supplication for her

⁷⁰Ciancio 1996, 87.

daughter's life. Like her husband, she is dressed regally, wearing a diadem, necklace and a bracelet on each wrist.

The general composition of the scene with a figure falling back on an altar being attacked by an armed man recalls scenes of Priam's death at the hands of Neoptolemos, a popular subject in sixth-century Attic vase-painting. In scenes of Priam's murder, we often find female figures behind the altar pleading for Priam's life. These women are sometimes identified as his wife Hecuba, or one of his daughters. If the Boreas Painter was drawing on this iconographic tradition, then it makes sense for the woman behind the altar to be Klytaimnestra pleading for the life of her daughter. Iphigeneia's sacrifice on an altar on the Taranto volute-krater also recalls depictions of Herakles' murder of the Egyptian king Busiris, who is often depicted in sixth-century Attic vase painting as falling back on an altar. Busiris' murder is also one of the only depictions of a human sacrifice in Greek art, aside from the few representations of Polyxena's sacrifice and the even fewer examples of Achilles slaying the Trojan captives.

As for the white-haired woman, I see her as one of the three women who are witnesses or mourning/fleeing figures in the scene. If she was intended to be the substitute victim, she would likely have been depicted being led to sacrifice, perhaps led to the altar by a Greek warrior. The elderly, white-haired woman raises both hands to her head in a gesture of mourning. If her safety was in jeopardy as a substitute victim, she would more likely be supplicating for her life than making a mourning gesture. Besides her, there are two other fleeing women who lament the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, one under each handle. One under handle B/A has a matronly aspect with her hair worn in a bun at the back of her

head. The other seems younger, with her hair worn up in a diadem. These figures therefore represent women of three different age groups. Representing these women at different stages in the life cycle highlights the brutality of Iphigeneia's sacrifice, underscoring the fact that she will not experience the transition in life from maiden to wife, and then wife to grandmother.

The volute-krater in Taranto prompts us to reassess several other vases, which depict a woman being attacked by a man at an altar. On an Attic oinochoe in Kassel attributed to the Shuvalov Painter, a woman falls back on an altar as she is threatened by a man (Fig. 142).⁷¹ The woman has a youthful look with long tresses cascading down to her shoulders. The youth is naked except for a pilos and chlamys. Similar to the Boreas Painter's depiction, the attacking youth strides to right, with his left arm extended straight out in front of him and his sword held across his body in his right hand. The Shuvalov Painter's youth, however, holds his scabbard in his left hand, and is not as close to the maiden as is the attacking youth in the Boreas Painter's scene. The main difference between the two scenes is the appearance of Apollo standing between the attacking youth and the woman on the Shuvalov Painter's oinochoe. The subject of the Shuvalov Painter's oinochoe has been interpreted as Ion and Kreousa, or Orestes and Hermione.⁷² But could the Kassel oinochoe present us with another depiction of Iphigeneia's sacrifice? How then do we interpret the figure of Apollo? Although unparalleled elsewhere in Greek art, Apollo does intercede on Iphigeneia's behalf on the classicistic Roman bronze relief krateriskos in Varna, in which the god

⁷¹Kassel, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen T 43. *ARV*² 1206.1; *Addenda*² 344. c. 450-400 BC.

⁷²*CVA*, Kassel, Antikenabteilung der Staatlichen Kunstsammlungen 1, 61.

stands between Thoas and his soldiers and the fleeing ship with Iphigeneia, Orestes, and Pylades (TAU 60). The Shuvalov Painter is also the same artist who gave us the depiction of Iphigeneia being led to sacrifice on the oinochoe in Kiel (IPH 3). Boardman remarked that the Shuvalov Painter “delights in the life of women,” but perhaps too in their death.⁷³

A woman being attacked on an altar by a man also appears in the tondo of an Attic red figure cup attributed to the Marlay Painter (Fig. 143).⁷⁴ The woman is seated to right on the altar, and she extends both hands out towards her attacker, her right palm facing up in a clear gesture of supplication. The assailant wears a pilos and chlamys, and holds his scabbard in his left hand, and raises his right hand over his head. His arm is cropped by the border of the tondo, but he probably held a sword. The Marlay Painter’s aggressor is bearded, and so older than the youths on the vases by the Boreas and Shuvalov Painters. In light of the Boreas Painter’s volute-krater, the Marlay Painter’s scene could perhaps give us another depiction of Iphigeneia. In 1896, C.H. Smith suggested Neoptolemos and Polyxena as the figures in the scene. J. Dörig and Schefold and Jung have suggested Orestes and Hermione. In her article on the matricide of Alkmaion, J.P. Small suggests Orestes too.⁷⁵ I Krauskopf, on the other hand, catalogues the scene as a questionable depiction of Alkmaion and Eriphyle. The range of possible figures that could be represented in this scene underscores how similar

⁷³Boardman 1989, 97.

⁷⁴London, British Museum E120. c. 410 BC. *ARV*² 1280.61; *Paralipomena* 472; *Addenda*² 358; *BAD* 216249; Schefold and Jung 1989, 370 fig. 330.

⁷⁵Krauskopf, in *LIMC*, Alkmaion 13 (with summary of previous interpretations and bibliography); see too Schefold and Jung 1989, 370 and 418 note 330 for additional bibliography.

iconographic conventions can operate to bring to mind the stories of various mythic-historical women in vase-painting.

An Apulian plastic vase in Matera in the form of a woman's head from which sprout antlers suggested to Trendall an allusion to the substitution of the deer in Iphigeneia's story (IPH 69). The antlers sprouting out of the woman's head, however, seems to convey a metamorphoses rather than a substitution. Indeed, Lattanzi saw the subject of this vase as Aktaion being changed into a stag.⁷⁶ At the same time though, I believe the vase gives the likeness of a woman's head. Who then is the female figure on the head vase? If one wanted to find a mythological reference, might the woman be Artemis? Apollodoros tells a story about how Artemis changed into a hind in order to escape from the Aloadai, Ephialtes and Otos, who courted her and Hera.⁷⁷ We are told that when Artemis turned into a deer, that both brothers threw their spears, and ended up killing each other on Naxos. She need not be a specific mythological figure. The metaphoric association in Greek thought between women and animals, the wild, and sexuality is well attested. Women are often seen as animals, prey to be hunted by predatory male lovers in the rhetoric of courtship.⁷⁸ Deer are often characterized as docile and weak, and therefore gendered as "feminine."

The headless female figure between the winged figure of Thanatos (?) and Hermes Psychopompos on the famous *columna caelata* from the Temple of

⁷⁶Lattanzi 1976, 123.

⁷⁷Apollodoros, *Library* 1.7.4. Discussed in Gantz 1993, 170.

⁷⁸On these metaphors in the context of metamorphosis, see Forbes Irving 1990, 64-5; especially 65 note 10 on women as animals to be "hunted" and "tamed" by men; see too Sourvinou-Inwood 1987.

Artemis at Ephesos in the British Museum has alternately been identified as Iphigeneia, Alkestis, or Persephone (IPH 72).⁷⁹ Of these three possible figures, A. Stewart prefers Iphigeneia because she “both fits the iconography and is relevant to Artemis.”⁸⁰ The identity of this figure is still debatable, but may perhaps more likely be Alkestis or Persephone than Iphigeneia. On no other work of art or architecture do we find Iphigeneia with a winged figure or with Hermes.

Etruscan (IPH 73–80)

Half a dozen Etruscan works may preserve Iphigeneia in various scenes at Aulis. The so-called Vaso dei Gobbi, an Etrusco-Corinthian column-krater in Cerveteri, once thought to depict Iphigeneia probably represents Polyxena instead, and I discuss this vase in the next chapter (IPH 73 = POL 37). On the other hand, I believe the five painted slabs found in a tomb in Cerveteri tell the story of Iphigeneia at Aulis (IPH 74). The paintings have most often been seen as representing a funeral procession, but E. Petersen and M. Pallottino first interpreted the subject of these paintings as Iphigeneia’s sacrifice. The slabs have a narrative character, and specific details seem to make reference to Iphigeneia’s story. In slab 2, for instance, a woman is being led to sacrifice between two men. In slab 4, the scene may be interpreted as a winged Artemis rescuing Iphigeneia, accompanied by Apollo. The two aged men who face one another in slab 5 might then be Kalchas and Agamemnon. Although we cannot be certain that these

⁷⁹On the relief drums being at the bottom rather than the tops of the columns, see Wesenberg 2001.

⁸⁰Stewart 1990, 195.

paintings originally belonged in or were intended for a tomb, we would not be surprised to find Iphigeneia's story appropriate for works in a funerary context in Etruria. The pinakes from the sixth-century BC, however, give us different moments in the story from that favored by the urns of the second-century BC, which usually depict Iphigeneia being held over the altar about to be sacrificed. As I have argued above, the urns represent distinctively Etruscan contributions and elaborations of the Iphigeneia myth, rather than reflecting lost Greek works. On the other hand, the terracotta pinakes from Cerveteri seem more closely related to Greek traditions. The slabs with Iphigeneia being led between two men and with Artemis rescuing the girl, for instance, are scenes that find parallels in Greek works.

One of the short sides of a stone sarcophagus in Tuscania has been seen as depicting the moment before Iphigeneia's sacrifice (IPH 75). A female figure sits on an altar with her right hand to her head. A bearded man wearing a himation, who might be Agamemnon or Kalchas, stands in front of her, his left hand grasping her shoulder and his right hand holding a knife raised high. The scene probably does depict a human sacrifice, but not necessarily that of Iphigeneia because such scenes are common in Etruscan art. Thematically, this scene is linked with the two long sides of the sarcophagus, which also depict scenes of human sacrifice.

Three gems are decorated with a female figure and a deer at an altar (IPH 77–79). Berlin 379 and a gem whose present location is unknown are very close, with the female figure on each holding a foliate spray in her left hand and a patera with offerings in the right (IPH 77 and 78). The woman stands in front of

the altar, which overlaps the deer standing behind it. The figure on Berlin 379 (IPH 77) was identified by Furtwängler as Diana Nemorensis and by Zwierlein-Diehl as possibly Iphigeneia as a priestess of Diana Nemorensis.⁸¹ The figure on the missing gem (IPH 78) was identified by Furtwängler as Iphigeneia or Nemesis.⁸² These gems may not, however, depict Iphigeneia. The scenes are too generic, and the presence of a woman at an altar with a deer does not have to signify Iphigeneia. Iphigeneia was to be sacrificed at an altar, but nowhere else in art do we have the maiden making a sacrifice at an altar.

While I argued above that a female figure at an altar with a deer is not enough to identify the woman as Iphigeneia, Berlin 859 may depict the Greek princess (IPH 79). Despite the similar subject matter and general composition shared by Berlin 379 and Berlin 859, the gems create a different impression. First, the maiden's posture or body language: her head is slightly inclined downward, and her hands are folded in her lap, giving her a more introspective appearance. She is not making an offering, but she is the offering herself. Secondly, the way in which the woman overlaps the deer is different. On Berlin 859, she is placed in the center of the gem, so that she overlaps the animal's midsection, but the deer's head and chest and hindquarters are still visible on either side of the woman. On the other two gems, however, the female figure is placed slightly to right of center so that she overlaps the entire hindquarters of the deer's body. This difference in overlapping conveys a different meaning. The unassuming woman placed directly over the docile deer seems to create a double

⁸¹Furtwängler *AG III* 225, 231; Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 397.

⁸²Furtwängler *AG III*, 108 no. 26.

image or to suggest a substitution that is at the heart of some versions of Iphigeneia's story.

Finally, a gem in Copenhagen gives an uncertain depiction of Iphigeneia's sacrifice (IPH 80). The inclusion of the altar and the upper body of a female figure watching the sacrifice caused Müller to identify the scene as Iphigeneia's sacrifice, the woman watching being Artemis.⁸³ I would like to draw attention to the tree in the background, which may be an iconographic feature that alludes to the setting of the scene at Aulis. The branches would rustle in the breeze, and would register the wind, or lack of wind, which was the ostensible reason for Iphigeneia's sacrifice.

Roman (IPH 81–86)

Half a dozen works of art of the Roman period present uncertain depictions of Iphigeneia: a wall painting, two gems, a vase, a mosaic, and a relief. The wall painting is likely the only one of these that depicts her.

The Herculaneum painting (IPH 82) has been interpreted by Bendinelli as Iphigeneia in Argos preparing for her wedding in the presence of Klytaimnestra. If so, then it is our only preserved work in ancient art of Iphigeneia in Argos. This identification of the subject is supported by the fact that a nearby painting represented Achilles.

Berlin FG 488 and Vienna XI B 291 both depict a bearded man before an altar holding a knife in one hand and a bowl with offerings in the other (IPH 85

⁸³Cited in Fürtwangler 1900, pl. XXIV, no. 2. While Müller thought the woman witnessing the scene held a bow, Fürtwangler saw her instead as holding a sword, not convinced that the subject pertained to Iphigeneia.

and 86). On the altar of each is the upper body and head of a woman. On Berlin FG 488, the woman faces the same direction as the man, and she is often thought to be kneeling behind the altar (IPH 85). On Vienna XI B 291, the female figure faces the man, and she is rendered on a smaller scale (IPH 86). It is unclear whether she, and her sister on the Berlin gem, is standing on top of the altar or behind it. These scenes are difficult to interpret. If the woman on the Berlin gem was intended to be kneeling behind the altar, it is unusual that we do not see her legs. These two gems are related to other scenes of sacrifice, such as the sacrifice of a deer on an Etruscan sardonyx in Naples (compare Fig. 163).⁸⁴ The Naples gem follows the same compositional formula with a man before an altar, holding a knife in one hand and a bowl of offerings in the other. We could ask too whether or not the deer on top of the circular altar on the Naples gem references the substitution of the maiden in the Iphigeneia myth.

Smart identified the reclining female figure holding the lowered torch in her left hand on the Portland Vase as Iphigeneia, but this interpretation has not been widely accepted (IPH 81). The draped and veiled female figure holding the olive branch over the flaming altar on the relief from the Tomb of the Prisciani is more likely Artemis rather than Iphigeneia, but the scene is certainly related to two other reliefs on the monument that depict episodes in the Iphigeneia myth (IPH 83; see also IPH 53). The presence of the deer in IPH 83 makes it difficult to tell if the scene takes place at Aulis or in Tauris. The other two reliefs depict scenes of Iphigeneia in Tauris, so the uncertain scene probably takes place there as well.

⁸⁴Naples, Museo Nazionale 12. Martini 1971, 144, cat. no. 149, pl. 29.4.

A mosaic from Verona has been described by Levi as representing either Iphigeneia supplicating Menelaos or Klytaimnestra beseeching Achilles (IPH 84). It gives us a different subject than the mosaics from Ampurias and Antakya, both from the Provinces. If the Verona mosaic depicts Iphigeneia, it may suggest that a different moment in her story was of interest to Italian artists than those outside of Italy.

Chapter 3

Pictures of Polyxena in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Art

GREEK DEPICTIONS (certain) [POL 1–18]¹

The catalogue of this dissertation focuses only on depictions of Polyxena's sacrifice and those moments directly related to this event. The story that artists favored above all was the ambush of Troilos, her brother, in which she often played a role. Brother and sister alike are killed by Achilles, both with ritualistic or religious elements.² Interpreted in this way, representations of Polyxena at the fountainhouse with Achilles make an analeptic reference to the later moment when the hero's ghost will demand the sacrifice of the Trojan princess.

Besides scenes at the fountainhouse, Polyxena appears primarily in scenes of her sacrifice and of the sack of Troy in Greek art.³ She appears on vase-paintings (8), lost monumental wall paintings (3), relief bowls (3), sarcophagi (2), and lost statue groups (3). Four moments are depicted:

- 1.) Polyxena's sacrifice, moment of slaughter (POL 1, 11, 12, 14, 17, and 30)
- 2.) Polyxena's sacrifice, moment before slaughter (POL 7bis, 8, 10, 13, 16, and 18)
- 3.) Polyxena's sacrifice, Polyxena led to sacrifice (POL 3, 4, 6, 7, 15)

¹To the works catalogued in *LIMC*, I add POL 4, 6 bis, 12, and 14.

²Robertson (1990) and Hedreen (2001) have described how Polyxena and Troilos were entwined in Greek art and myth. Discussed below in Chapter 4.

³On a sixth-century BC Corinthian krater in Paris, Louvre E638, Polyxena (name inscribed) is depicted beside Cassandra (also named) in a scene of Hektor's departure (*LIMC*, Polyxena 1). A Roman sarcophagus in Madrid has been traditionally thought to depict the marriage of Polyxena (POL 22), a subject not known in Greek art.

4.) Iliupersis scenes (POL 2, 5, 9, 6bis)

The above list shows that depictions of Polyxena's sacrifice appear most frequently, and can be divided into three moments. The *moment of slaughter* refers to those scenes in which Polyxena has already been slashed or stabbed, and in which she is bleeding or about to bleed, her death imminent. The *moment before slaughter* makes the distinction that she is about to be sacrificed, but she has not yet been wounded. *Polyxena led to sacrifice* refers to the scenes of Polyxena being led to the tomb of Achilles, where she will be slaughtered. Besides the various moments of her sacrifice, Polyxena is included in scenes of the Sack of Troy. At least twice she is a bystander or witness to atrocities against members of her family.

Polyxena's sacrifice, moment of slaughter. The moment of Polyxena's slaughter is known on six works of art (POL 1, 11, 12, 14, 17, and 30): a Tyrrhenian amphora in London, the Polyxena Sarcophagus, two Megarian bowls, and a description by Libanius of a lost statue group. The composition of the Tyrrhenian amphora and the sarcophagus, both from the sixth-century BC, are similar in having Polyxena held horizontally by three men as Neoptolemos cuts her neck (POL 1 and 14). On the Tyrrhenian amphora, Polyxena is held by the three armed warriors with her face and toes pointing down towards the ground (POL 1). On the Polyxena Sarcophagus, three unarmed men hold her face up towards the sky. In addition, while Nestor, Diomedes, and Phoenix (who turns away) watch Polyxena's sacrifice on the Tyrrhenian amphora, it is primarily a group of six mourning women who witness her slaughter on the Polyxena

Sarcophagus. The gender of the spectators in each work and their reactions cue different ways of looking at the action of each scene. The display of mourning by the women on the Polyxena Sarcophagus casts the scene in the world of women, presenting the death of the maiden as a loss of a daughter of Troy. In contrast, the armed Diomedes and Nestor watching Polyxena's sacrifice on the Tyrrhenian amphora presents the scene as a necessary part of war in the world of men.

In reference to the Tyrrhenian amphora in London, K. Schefold observed that "the emphasis it places on violent action, at the expense of artistic understanding, once again suggests the influence of a scene from a picture-book."⁴ The scale of Polyxena is intentionally distorted. Her body is elongated and if she were to stand up she would be the tallest figure in the scene. Lengthening her body, however, solves the compositional problem of filling the space of the scene, and draws attention to her as the most important figure. At the same time, I believe it was important to the painter to have three men, rather than just two or one, carry her. Three figures moving together convey the idea of procession and of community better than just two, and they become accomplices. The sacrifice of Polyxena served the collective good by allowing the Greeks to sail home at the end of the Trojan War. At the same time, the inclusion of the lesser Ajax among these men was probably intended to allude to his role in the abuse of Polyxena's sister Cassandra. The fact that three men have to hold Polyxena, when two or even one would suffice, also suggests that she was struggling or not going willingly to sacrifice, and that it took more men to quell her resistance.

⁴Schefold 1992, 286.

Polyxena's resistance becomes important in Chapter Five when the question of consent is identified as central to the interpretation of the sacrificial virgin.

The Timiades Painter seems to display an interest in depicting women, and he might also have had a special sensitivity to the figure of the Trojan princess. On a neck-amphora attributed to him in Munich, Polyxena appears in the center of the composition in a scene of Achilles's ambush of Troilos.⁵ Her prominent placement, standing between Achilles and Troilos, highlights her role in this episode more so than in the work of other painters. The same painter's neck-amphora in Boston depicting Herakles fighting the Amazon queen Andromache is also illuminating.⁶ Herakles has Andromache down on one knee and his large sword is raised over his head, about to strike. The other Greek warriors flanking Herakles fight the Amazons with spears, not swords. While violence against the Amazons is a common subject in Greek vase-painting, and the second most popular of Herakles' labors, the Timiades Painter's treatment of the subject is subtle. While Herakles holds his sword in his right hand, he grasps Andromache's wrist with his left. The hand grasping wrist, or *cheir epi karpou*, is a gesture that conflates marriage and death. In marriage scenes, a man seizes his bride this way, leading her to his home. It is the same gesture used to lead a virgin to sacrifice, as when Neoptolemos leads Polyxena to sacrifice on the Acheloos Painter's lekythos in New York. Similar to Neoptolemos' murder of Polyxena on the British Museum amphora, Herakles' killing of Andromache retains a tinge of nuptial significance, invoking the idea of marriage in death.

⁵Munich, Antikensammlungen J89. *ABV* 95.4; *Paralipomena* 36; *Addenda*² 25.

⁶Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 98.916. *ABV* 98.46, 684; *Paralipomena* 37; *Add*² 26.

The Timiades Painter also depicted the death of Eriphyle at the hands of her son, Alkmaion, on a Tyrrhenian neck-amphora in Berlin (Fig. 144a-b).⁷ She has collapsed dead over the tomb of Amphiaraos as a rearing snake attacks Alkmaion. Hauser once thought that the amphora depicted the death of Polyxena.⁸ Similarities between this painter's Eriphyle amphora in Berlin and his Polyxena amphora in London include the omphalos-shaped mound and the fact that both women's feet point toward the ground. But different stories are being told.

The spectacular discovery of the so-named Polyxena Sarcophagus transforms our understanding of the representation of maiden sacrifice in Greek art (POL 14). The sarcophagus was unearthed during the salvage excavations conducted by the Çanakkale Museum at Gümüşçay in northwestern Turkey. The large, white Proconnesian marble sarcophagus dates from the late Archaic period, ca. 520-500 BC, and is the earliest stone sarcophagus with figural reliefs ever found in Asia Minor. It depicts on one long side the sacrifice of Polyxena by Neoptolemos, and on the other a female celebration attended by male dancers. On the short side to the right of the Polyxena scene, there is a mourning female figure often identified as Hecuba, Polyxena's mother. The other short side depicts a symposium comprised of five female figures. The iconography of this

⁷Berlin, Antikensammlung 4841 (ex Bourguignon). *ABV* 97.22; *Add²* 26; *LIMC*, Alkmaion 3. Illustrated in *LIMC*, Alkmaion cat. no. 3; Schefold 1993, 282 fig. 301; Cornell and Lomas 1997, 145, fig. 16; Lewis 1997, 145 fig. 16. Attributed to the Guglielmi Painter in Sian Lewis 1997.

⁸Hauser, *JdI* 1893, 98, pl. 1; Roscher, s.v. Polyxena, p. 2739, fig. 13. Loeschcke (*AM* 1897, 263) and Thiersch ("Tyrrhenian" Amphoren, 56) first identified the subject as the death of Eriphyle. References cited in Haspels 1936, 62 note 1. Likewise, in 1896, C.H. Smith thought the man attacking a woman in the tondo of a red figure cup attributed to the Marlay Painter in London depicted Neoptolemos and Polyxena, although more recently Alkmaion and Eriphyle or Orestes and Hermione have been preferred (*LIMC*, Alkmaion 13).

sarcophagus and its ramifications for our understanding of gender relationships are only now being realized.⁹

Polyxena's sacrifice on one long side may at first seem incongruous with the female celebration on the other long side. While the iconography of the Polyxena sarcophagus is unique, N. Sevinç identifies comparanda from Daskyleion, Phrygia, and Lycia as the closest parallels for scenes of funerary banquets and symposia.¹⁰ The Polyxena Sarcophagus' connection with Lycian tombs may offer a clue to interpreting its imagery. I. Jenkins has noted that Lycian tomb art exhibits "a self-conscious tendency to apply contrasting but complementary themes to opposite sides of a monument."¹¹ A similar program might help to explain the imagery of the Polyxena Sarcophagus with its scene of death on one side contrasted with a celebration on the other.

The Megarian bowls in Athens (POL 11 and 12) with the sacrifice of Polyxena belong to a different time and place from the two earlier works, and thus to different artistic traditions. So-called Homeric or Megarian bowls are often thought to be illustrations of scenes from literature, and our examples, made in the mid second-century BC, depict Polyxena in one scene among other episodes from the Trojan cycle. On Athens 14.624 (POL 11), Neoptolemos comes up behind Polyxena, bending her body backwards and plunging his sword into her chest. The ghost of Achilles, visualized as a full sized man, sits to left of the

⁹See Sevinç 1996; Sevinç, et al. 1998; *ThesCRA*: Sacrifice, p. 130, cat. no. 596 and Dance, p. 315, cat. no. 125; Draycott 2001 and forthcoming.

¹⁰Sevinç 1996, 262.

¹¹Jenkins 2006, 184.

scene and watches the murder. The same scene was likely repeated on POL 12, of which all that remains is a fragment with part of the inscriptions naming Neoptolemos and Polyxena as on POL 11. The fourth-century AD description of Libanius tells us that Neoptolemos killing Polyxena was the subject of a lost statue group, but we do not know its original location or date. The authenticity of Libanius description, however, has been contested.

The scene on the Haimon Painter's lekythos in Paris is, as Haspels described it, a "curious subject" with a tripod sticking out of a tomb around which two chariots race, while a warrior and maiden are at the back (POL 30). Haspels suggested the funeral games for Achilles and Neoptolemos sacrificing Polyxena as the subjects.¹² In Chapter Five, I argue that the tripod on the tomb helps to identify the subject as the sacrifice of Polyxena. A tripod also appears at the tomb of Achilles on the Polyxena Sarcophagus and a large tripod stands behind Polyxena on the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup. More than just a topographical feature, the tripod's link with aristocratic life, politics, and the polis indicates that it may have a place in Polyxena's iconography.¹³

The provenance of five of the works with Polyxena's slaughter indicates the wide diffusion of this subject, even with such few examples. It is impossible to say who the original intended viewer of the Tyrrhenian amphora was, but it was exported to Etruria, where it is often thought that its gory subject matter was best appreciated. In addition, the Polyxena Sarcophagus is East Greek, and the

¹²Haspels 1936, 135 note 1.

¹³Among other examples, a tripod also appears behind a crouching female figure in an Iliupersis scene depicted on a fragment of an Attic red-figure volute-krater in Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.202.

Megarian bowls were made in northern Greece. These find-spots suggest something of where this subject found its resonance.

Polyxena's sacrifice, moment before slaughter. Six works of art likely depicted the moment just before the sacrifice of Polyxena (POL 7bis, 8, 10, 13, 16, and 18). Only one of these, an Etrusco-Campanian amphora in London, is extant (POL 7bis). It depicts a man holding a woman over an altar on the other side of which is a warrior with a knife. The three mourning women on the reverse recall the short side of the Polyxena Sarcophagus with Hecuba. Based on this, we might identify the figure on the obverse as Polyxena.

Pausanias describes a lost monumental wall painting once in the Pinakothek in Athens attributed to Polygnotos as “Polyxena about to be sacrificed near the grave of Achilles” (POL 8). Similar perhaps to the painting from the Pinakothek in Athens was another painting of Polyxena in Pergamon (POL 10). Our only evidence for this a passing reference to it by Pausanias as he describes the figure of Polyxena from the lost painting by Polygnotos once in the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi (POL 9). Pausanias tells, us, “Poets sing of her death at the tomb of Achilles, and both at Athens and at Pergamus on the Caicus I have seen the tragedy of Polyxena depicted in paintings.” If Pausanias was referring here to the painting of Polyxena about to be sacrificed from the Pinakothek in Athens, then the Pergamon painting might have depicted the same moment.

A relief bowl once in Berlin, but destroyed in WWII, depicted Polyxena kneeling before the tomb of Achilles with both arms raised in the air in a gesture of alarm or mercy as Neoptolemos approached her with a sword in his right hand

(POL 13). Similar to the relief bowl with Polyxena in Athens (POL 11), the Berlin bowl also included the ghost of Achilles watching the scene.

The final two works are lost statue groups known from literary descriptions (POL 16 and 18). Christodoros of Koptos describes a lost bronze Greek statue that once decorated the Baths of Zeuxippos (POL 16). Pyrrhus, described as naked and beardless, raises his right hand in victory over Polyxena who is crying. He asks her, “what forces thee to shed hidden tears now thou art of mute bronze, why dost thou draw thy veil over thy face, and stand like one ashamed, but sorry at heart?” If the description is accurate, we infer that Polyxena was rendered in a desperate manner, crying, ashamed, but still clothed as she has her veil. The final work is known from an epigram of the monk Cosmas in the *Greek Anthology*, which has been thought to describe a lost statue group, although this is not explicit (POL 18). Cosmas’ epigram is known only from the Planudean Anthology, which refers to the manuscript written by the scholar Maximus Planudes in the twelfth or thirteenth century, who preserved epigrams of works of art. All we know is that as Pyrrhus was about to sacrifice Polyxena, “the shameless girl” called on Athena, who of course was not an advocate of the Trojans.

Polyxena’s sacrifice, Polyxena led to sacrifice. Polyxena is led to sacrifice on four Attic vases (POL 3, 4, 6, 7) and on the headpiece of a Clazomenian sarcophagus in Leiden (POL 15). The vases include a black-figure hydria attributed to the Leagros Group in Berlin, a black-figure lekythos attributed to the Acheloos Painter in New York, and two red-figure kylikes in Paris, one attributed to Makron and the other to the Brygos Painter. The two black-figure

vases follow similar conventions (POL 3 and 4). In both, Polyxena is led by a warrior, probably Neoptolemos, to the tomb of Achilles. The warrior grasps her wrist, *cheir epi karmo*. The funeral mound is painted white, and a snake is highlighted against the white of the tomb. Above the mound, the soul of Achilles leaps from his tomb. While the soul of Achilles leaps to left towards the figure of Polyxena on the hydria in Berlin, just the opposite appears on the lekythos in New York, as Achilles leaps to right away from the maiden. The Berlin Polyxena proceeds solemnly to the tomb, her head veiled and inclined downward. Her left hand, lost in the folds of her garment, is raised to her face in what is perhaps a gesture of emotion. On the lekythos in New York, Polyxena turns her head to look behind her, raising her free hand to her head in despair. The tomb of Achilles and the hero's soul above the mound are the iconographic clues that allow us to identify the subject of these scenes. The snake that appears at the tomb of Achilles on both vases makes reference to the soil and earth and to the chthonic and fertility-related associations bound up in serpents. While it is obvious how death relates to the sacrificial virgin, fertility also plays a crucial role. As a virgin in death, the sacrificial maiden has not reproduced, and has therefore not performed her civic duty in providing male heirs, important for the perpetuation of aristocratic families.

On Makron's cup in Paris, Polyxena is led to the tomb of Achilles between two men (POL 6). The armed warrior in front of her holds a sword and the bearded man in a himation behind her carries two spears. Polyxena turns her head to look behind her, as she does on the Acheloos Painter's lekythos in New York. The tomb of Achilles, reserved in the color of the clay, is placed cleverly

beneath and around the space of a handle. It is a large omphalos shaped mound set on a step, upon which are some arms and armor. The soul of Achilles, however, is omitted. The tondo of Makron's cup depicts the ransom of Hektor, with Achilles reclining on a kline holding a makhaira in his hand with the dead body of Hektor at his feet. The makhaira gives Achilles the aspect of a sacrificer, and makes a proleptic reference to his role in demanding the sacrifice of Polyxena after his death, depicted on the exterior of the cup. Scholars have often noted the close association between Polyxena and Troilos in myth and literature, however this depiction also argues for an association between the Trojan princess and her brother Hektor as well. The Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup depicts Polyxena led to sacrifice by Akamas, both figures named by inscriptions (POL 7). This is the only depiction of Polyxena's procession to sacrifice that does not include the tomb of Achilles.¹⁴

On the headpiece a Clazomenian sarcophagus in Leiden, Polyxena is led to sacrifice by a warrior who grasps her right wrist and threatens her with a sword (POL 15). The warrior mounts the first step of a two-step platform on which is set the tomb of Achilles, a black omphalos-shaped mound. At least one other warrior stood behind Polyxena, the extant painting preserving just one foot and part of a greave. The group of Polyxena and the warriors approaching the tomb on the right side is balanced by another warrior wearing a cuirass, greaves and helmet mounting the first step on the left side. Behind this man, are two more warriors holding shields; the device of the better preserved is a whirligig. Then

¹⁴This vase is discussed in detail in Chapter Four.

there is a break in the headpiece, and just the arm and part of the body of another figure is left on the last fragment, which also preserves the maeander border denoting the end of the composition. R.M. Cook notes nothing on top of the tomb, but he records that J. Brants saw flames and E. Pfuhl saw two confronting seated sphinxes.¹⁵ The sarcophagus is decorated in what is called the black-figure style, which is different from the black-figure technique of Athenian vases. The black-figure technique of the sarcophagi consists of figures painted in black on the surface of the sarcophagi. Inner details are not incised, but rather painted in white, and supplemental purple is also used. Unlike Attic black-figure, female flesh on the sarcophagi is always black.¹⁶

It is tempting to see the figure of Polyxena on the Clazomenian sarcophagus as an especially suitable subject for the funereal context of a coffin, which is also the case for the Polyxena Sarcophagus. Cook believed that painters chose subjects deemed suitable for their customers' social status consisting of "heroic legends or, much more often, the activities and ambit, sometimes heroised, of ideal aristocratic life."¹⁷ The subject of Polyxena's sacrifice on both the Clazomenian sarcophagus and the Polyxena Sarcophagus combines references to death within a matrix of aristocratic life. A Trojan princess, Polyxena's story and her fate tells of how an aristocratic woman of renown died. Cook's observations on the dominance of symmetry in the composition of Clazomenian sarcophagi is also significant. In reference to the one in Leiden, he

¹⁵Cook 1981, 36 note 80. Cf. Brants 1913, 58-60 and Pfuhl 1914, 33-6.

¹⁶On the black-figure style, see Cook 1981, 110ff.

¹⁷Cooke 1981, 131.

acknowledges that the painter certainly intended to depict Polyxena because if the painter had wanted to depict a general scene, he probably would have included another woman on the left side of the tomb for the sake of symmetry.¹⁸ In part then, the conventions of artistic representation on Clazomenian sarcophagi help to identify this subject with certainty. When this sarcophagus is considered together with the Polyxena Sarcophagus, we may conjecture that the subject of Polyxena's sacrifice was deemed especially appropriate for funerary art in East Greece.¹⁹

Iliupersis scenes. Polyxena also appears in scenes of the Sack of Troy, with certainty on at least one black-figure vase, one red-figure vase, and a lost wall painting (POL 2, 5, 9). In a related context she also likely appears on POL 6 bis. On POL 2 and 5, Polyxena is a bystander or witness to acts of violence against members of her family in well-known Iliupersis episodes. On the Group E amphora in Berlin, Polyxena, named by an inscription, watches as Cassandra is violated by the lesser Ajax (POL 2). Similarly, in the tondo of Onesimos' cup in the Villa Giulia, Polyxena stands behind the altar of Zeus tearing out her hair as her father, King Priam, is attacked by Neoptolemos (POL 5, Fig. 86b-c). Her identification is certain because her name is inscribed. Onesimos repeated this composition at least one other time, on fragments in Berlin and the Vatican (POL 28). These preserve part of her profile, but not the inscription. Without this, we cannot be certain that Onesimos intended the maiden witnessing Priam's murder

¹⁸Cook 1981, 114.

¹⁹The place of Polyxena's sacrifice as a subject within the corpus of Anatolian funerary monuments will likely be addressed in Draycott's forthcoming thesis on *Images and Identities in the Funerary Art of Western Anatolia, 600-450 BC: Phrygia, Hellespontine Phrygia, Lydia*.

to again be Polyxena, although it is likely her. The image of Astyanax, Polyxena, Priam, and Neoptolemos in one scene must have had a powerful effect.

Neoptolemos' pummeling of Priam with the dead body of his grandson as the king's daughter watched would represent three generations of Trojans suffering at the hands of Neoptolemos. Astyanax is already killed, Priam is in the act of being murdered, and Polyxena is soon to be killed, all victims of the son of Achilles. The dead warrior on the ground in Onesimos' Villa Giulia cup is labeled .]ΑΙΦΟΝΟΣ. D. Williams wondered whether Onesimos might have intended Daïphobos instead of Daïphonos. Daïphobos was a son of Priam, and described by Hektor in the *Iliad* as his dearest brother.²⁰ The vase-painters' inclusion of Polyxena in scenes of Cassandra's rape and Priam's murder looks proleptically to the Trojan maiden's death at the hands of Neoptolemos.

Polyxena was also depicted in a lost Iliupersis wall painting attributed to Polygnotos once in the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi (POL 9). Pausanias tells us that the painting was of Troy already taken, with Polyxena among the throng of Trojan women who were "represented as already captives and lamenting." The painting therefore depicted the moment after the violent sacking of Troy, but, for Polyxena, the moment before she is to be sacrificed to the shade of Achilles.

Although it does not depict an episode from the Sack of Troy, an Attic red-figure column-krater discovered in Tekirdağ in 1989 deserves mention in this group of images because it presents Polyxena in a scene of violence against another member of her family, this time Hektor (POL 6 bis). The vase depicts the

²⁰Williams 1991, 51.

ransom of Hektor. Achilles reclines on a cushioned couch, with the corpse of Hektor on the ground under his kline. Achilles holds a sword in his right hand and its scabbard in his left. Priam approaches him, extending his left hand under the hero's chin in a gesture of supplication for the body of his son. To the left of Achilles' couch is Hermes, wearing a petasos, mantle and boots, leading a woman before Achilles. Hermes grasps the maiden's left wrist, *cheir epi karmo*. The maiden stands to right with her head inclined downward, wearing a chiton and himation with a band at the bottom hem. She raises her right hand out in front of her as if she is about to speak or interrupt the scene. Tuna-Nörthing has interpreted the subject as Polyxena offering herself as the ransom for Hektor's body, which is known from Diktys Cretensis' *Journal of the Trojan War*, a first or second century AD fictional account of the Trojan War.²¹ The romance between Achilles and Polyxena has long been thought to be a Hellenistic or Roman invention, but this vase, combined with other late Archaic vases depicting Achilles and Polyxena at the fountain without Troilos, signals that this tradition might have been known earlier.²² Tuna-Nörthing also suggests that the Achilles in the tondo of Makron's cup (POL 6) might have been expecting the arrival of not

²¹Tuna-Nörthing 1999 and 2001. Diktys Cretensis, *Ephemeris tou Troikou poleμου*, III 20-27 (see Eisenhut 1973; Merkle 1989).

²²On the relationship between Achilles and Polyxena, see Förster 1882; Schwarz 1992; Tuna-Nörthing 1999 and 2001. Examples of Achilles and Polyxena at the fountain without Neoptolemos include: St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 628, an Attic red-figure hydria attributed to the Berlin Painter (*ARV*² 210.174; *Paralipomena* 510; *Addenda*² 195; Toledo, Toledo Museum of Art 1947.62, an Attic black-figure, white ground lekythos attributed to the Athena Painter (*ABV* 523, 5); Athens 552 (CC 1003), a white ground lekythos attributed to the Sappho Painter, gives Polyxena holding a hydria flanked on either side by Achilles crouching behind the fountain (*ABL* pl. 35, 3). The Sappho Painter had enough room to include Neoptolemos in the picture, but chose to exclude him in order to focus the subject on Achilles and Polyxena, to the extent that Achilles is depicted twice.

only Priam, but also Polyxena, as on the Tekirdağ column-krater. These two vases together offer evidence for a closer connection between Polyxena and Hektor than has been previously thought.

Although never a popular subject, depictions related to Polyxena's sacrifice occur in all periods of Greek art, and in all parts of the Greek world. The two sarcophagi from Turkey point to a special resonance of the subject in East Greece, perhaps due to its geographic connection with Troy. While the two depictions of Polyxena's throat being cut have attracted much attention, it is not the moment most often seen. This, however, is a difference between Iphigeneia and Polyxena. We have no surviving work depicting Iphigeneia pierced by the sword. Why might Polyxena have been shown this way, but not Iphigeneia? Could this be because she was a Trojan? In a new interpretation of the Sarpedon krater, J. Neils has argued that the mutilated corpse of the enemy was a sign of victory for the Greeks.²³ This idea could be used to explain the representation of Polyxena as a conquered foreigner. However, there might be another explanation. After all, the Greek's conception of the Trojans as "barbarians" occurred after 480/79 BC, and our two works of art are earlier.²⁴ Iphigeneia's slaughter may not have been shown because in some versions of her story she is rescued, whereas Polyxena is always killed.

²³Neils 2008.

²⁴Haubold 2007, 48-9. He explains that in epic especially, the Greeks and Trojans are described as sharing the same language, pantheon of gods, and values. Xerxes' invasion of Greece in 480/79 BC is seen as marking the changing point.

ETRUSCAN DEPICTIONS (certain) [POL 19]

The only certain depiction of Polyxena in Etruscan art appears on a fourth-century BC sarcophagus from Torre San Severo, now in Orvieto (POL 19). In the center of one long side, Polyxena is about to be sacrificed by Neoptolemos. She is down on one knee before the tomb of Achilles, which is represented as a stele. Polyxena's garment has fallen around her thighs, exposing her above the chest. Neoptolemos steps on Polyxena's right leg to hold her down and grabs her hair, about to deliver the death blow with his sword. The ghost of Achilles stands to right of Polyxena, watching the sacrifice. The central group of Polyxena, Neoptolemos and the ghost of Achilles is flanked on either side by groups of Greek warriors.

The sacrifice of Polyxena on one long side of this sarcophagus is, interestingly, paired with Achilles' slaughter of the Trojan captives at the tomb of Patroklos on the other. The composition of Achilles' sacrifice of the Trojans is similar to that of the Polyxena scene, with a central group consisting of a figure on the ground in front of a stele being attacked by a man. While Polyxena is about to be sacrificed, the neck of the Trojan captive seated in front of the tomb of Patroklos has already been slashed. The similar compositions of the two scenes serve to link visually and thematically the figure of Polyxena on one side with that of the Trojan captive on the other. Both sides also highlight the role of Achilles in demanding or executing human sacrifices.

ROMAN DEPICTIONS (certain) [POL 20–22]

Polyxena appears for certain on only three works of Roman art (POL 20–22). On the first-century AD Capitoline Tabula Iliaca, Polyxena is depicted twice (POL 20). The tablet, used to teach the stories and order of scenes from Homer and the Epic Cycle, is divided into numerous friezes and panels, with inscriptions identifying the source of the stories and numerous inscriptions labeling individual figures.²⁵ These tell us that the scenes depicted illustrate stories from Homer's *Iliad*, Stesichoros' *Iliou Persis*, Arktinos' *Aethiopsis*, and Lesches' *Little Iliad*. The two representations of Polyxena, both inscribed, appear in the large main panel depicting scenes from the *Iliou Persis* of Stesichoros.²⁶ She appears first as a young girl below the walls of Troy. She stands in front of her mother, Hecuba, on the first step of her brother Hektor's tomb. Hecuba's left hand is raised to her head and she seems to touch Polyxena with her right. Polyxena's right hand is raised in front of her mother's face. To their right are two figures seated on the steps, the closer one named Andromache with her hand to her head in a gesture of mourning, and the further figure is labeled Helenos, who is in conversation with Odysseus. On the short side of the tomb, Andromache and Helenos appear again seated on the steps and between them is Cassandra seated to right with her hand to her head. On this side, Andromache has her baby. Talthybios appears at the corner of the monument behind Andromache. The

²⁵On the Tabulae Iliacae, see Jahn 1873; Sadurska 1964; Horsfall 1979; Petrain, forthcoming; and Heuser, forthcoming.

²⁶On the Iliupersis panel drawing on more than just Stesichoros for the scenes, see Bowra 1961, 105–6 and Pipili, *LIMC*, 657. This is likely considering the prominence of Aeneas on the tabula and the significance of Virgil in the Roman period.

placement of Polyxena at the tomb of Hektor reminds us of the possible pairing of the two siblings in Greek art, as on POL 6 and 6 bis.

Polyxena appears for the second time on the Capitoline tabula on the right hand side below the walls of Troy, about to be sacrificed at the hands of Neoptolemos. Both are named by inscriptions. Polyxena is on her knees, hands tied behind her back, upper body exposed, her garment fallen around her waist. She kneels on the stepped platform and base of the stele-like tomb of Achilles, which is also labeled by an inscription, ΑΞΙΛΛΕΩΣ ΣΗΜΑ. Neoptolemos stands behind Polyxena, lunging to right, with his chlamys fluttering in the air behind him. He wears a corselet and a Corinthian helmet low on his head, face turned down. He grabs Polyxena's hair with his left hand and moves her head to left to expose her neck. In his right hand he raises a sword just above her neck. In the next moment, his blade will pierce her neck. Three figures watch the sacrifice, two of whom are named by inscriptions. To the right of Achilles' grave, Odysseus sits on a rock with his right hand to his head in a gesture of mourning. Kalchas stands next to Odysseus. Behind Neoptolemos is a young servant boy who holds sacrificial implements in his hands to help in administering the blood sacrifice to Achilles.

The composition of the main panel with the sack of Troy is carefully arranged, the space organized around architectural structures and around the inscription naming the literary source of the scenes. This organization of space creates strong horizontal and vertical lines intended to direct the viewer's attention to the most important figures. The literary source that the tablet illustrates was important to the artist and the inscription citing the *Iliou Persis* of

Stesichoros is at the center of the composition.²⁷ The inscription commands attention because of the negative space around it, to which the eye is drawn in contrast to the some of the more densely packed scenes around it. The play between image and text is clever, because the inscription is flanked on the left by the tomb of Hektor, the best of the Trojans, and on the right by the tomb of Achilles, the best of the Greeks. It is only after the deaths of these two warriors that Troy is taken. The placement of Hektor's tomb, the inscription labeling the scene, and Achilles' grave creates a strong horizontal line that is reinforced by the dominating horizontal line created by the walls of Troy just above. The groups of figures around the sepulchral monuments are also related. The seated, mourning pose of Odysseus on the right is echoed in the figures of Andromache and Cassandra on the left. The use of continuous narrative allows the artist to include Polyxena as a young girl with her mother at Hektor's tomb on one side, and directly across, the maiden's death. This depiction of a young Polyxena is the only representation of the Trojan princess that shows her as a young girl. In the scene of her sacrifice, Polyxena is clearly older. She is the same size as the other adults and has clearly defined breasts.

The horizontal line formed by the inscription linking the two depictions of Polyxena is strengthened by the walls of Troy directly above and by the three episodes that take place in the horizontal space in the foreground just inside the walls of Troy. On the left, Aeneas receives the penates, or household gods, that

²⁷The inclusion of ΤΡΩΙΚΟΣ, an adjectival form of "Trojan," after ΙΑΙΟΥ ΠΙΕΡΣΙΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΣΤΗΣΙΕΟΡΟΝ is difficult to understand. It is thought that perhaps the person who added the inscriptions had intended to add the word *cycle* or *π\leftrightarrowναφ*. See Sadurska 1964, 31-2 (especially note 39) for a discussion and bibliography.

he brings to Italy. On the right is the rescue of Aithra by her grandsons. In between these two scenes just outside the gates of Troy Aeneas escapes the sacked city with his son Askanios, led by Hermes. These three scenes, linked horizontally in space, highlight not the destruction of the sack, but the glimmers of hope among such devastation. The escape of Aeneas from Troy occupies an important place in the composition, visually framed by the gates and walls of Troy and directly above the central inscription identifying the scene. The prominence of Aeneas here, and then his escape in the ship below, is not surprising considering the significance of his story for the founding of Rome. In this work, Greek myths are adapted and reworked to draw out Roman themes.

Above the gates of Troy, framed by the architecture of his own palace, Priam is attacked by Neoptolemos and a Trojan woman is attacked by a Greek, probably intended to represent one of the king's daughters. The placement of Priam's murder (and above that Apollo's temple), Aeneas' escape from Troy, and the central inscription, creates a strong vertical line down the center of the composition that counters the horizontality previously mentioned. This vertical line down the center is strengthened by the architectural arms of the structures inside the walls of Troy and by the entrance to the gates of the city, both of which literally frame the central episodes. Flanking this central vertical axis on both sides, other verticals are emphasized. To the left of center, a strong vertical line is created from the placement of Hektor's tomb, the temple to the left of Priam's palace inside the walls of Troy and by the walls of Troy and the left wings of the

structures inside the city.²⁸ Likewise, to the right of center, a similar vertical emphasis is created by the placement of Achilles' tomb, Aphrodite's temple, the walls of Troy, the right arm of the structures inside the city, and the ship in which Aeneas escapes. This vertical axis serves to link the figures of Polyxena and Helen, which I argue in Chapter Four was an intentional narrative device. An interest in symmetry and balance would have been reinforced by the inclusion of another long stele-like panel with inscriptions to the left of the main scene, similar to the one to right of the Ilioupersis panel. The left side of the tablet is broken, but it is believed that a pilaster with inscriptions was originally at this break, which would have listed the contents of the earlier books of the *Iliad*.

Similar to the Capitoline Polyxena is her depiction on a fragment of a sigillata relief bowl in London (POL 21). Both depict Polyxena kneeling to right, upper body exposed, with Neoptolemos holding a sword in his right hand. Whereas Neoptolemos stands behind Polyxena with the girl's hands tied behind her back on the Tabula Iliaca, on the pottery fragment Neoptolemos stands in front of Polyxena who pleads for her life.

These two Roman depictions of Polyxena are notable because they join three other representations of her shown on her knees, on two Hellenistic relief bowls (POL 11 and 13), and on the Etruscan sarcophagus in Orvieto (POL 19).²⁹

²⁸There are two structures with two long colonnaded arms that create an enclosed space within the walls of Troy. The structure on top is a precinct of Athena (labeled) with a temple in the middle. The structure below this is the palace of Priam, with a temple to Aphrodite to right of it, and another unnamed temple to left. These three temples form a pyramidal composition that follows the diagonal line formed by the arms of the two colonnaded buildings.

²⁹Actually on three relief bowls if we include POL 12, which is fragmentary but very similar to POL 11. POL 12 does not preserve the figures, but only the inscriptions naming Neoptolemos and Polyxena.

The supplicating Polyxena with Neoptolemos in front of her on the relief bowl in Berlin (POL 13) is similar to the composition of the London sigillata fragment. There are, however, even more striking correspondences between the Polyxena scenes on the two Hellenistic relief bowls and on the Capitoline tabula. The positioning of Neoptolemos behind Polyxena, pulling her hair and raising his sword over her head to stab her from behind is similar on the Tabula Iliaca and on the Homeric bowl in Athens (POL 11). Likewise, the tomb of Achilles on the Capitoline tablet and on the two Hellenistic relief bowls (POL 11 and 13) are all rendered as tall funerary stele slabs topped by decorative cornices. On the Tabula Iliaca, the stele is depicted in profile to show two sides of it, while on the bowls, the slab is shown frontally. The stele on the Athens bowl is difficult to see, but it is just behind Polyxena and is much thinner than the other two examples. It is topped by a triangular shaped pediment that interrupts the inscription naming Polyxena.

On no other works of art in the Greek or Roman periods is the tomb of Achilles rendered as a funerary stele. This correspondence between the Capitoline Tabula Iliaca and the relief bowls indicates a close relation. Pollitt has suggested that the similarities between some Homeric bowls and Tabulae Iliacae may indicate that the Roman tablets reflect Hellenistic traditions of illustration, and this may explain the similarities among our three works.³⁰ It is also worth noting that the depiction of Polyxena on her knees about to be sacrificed is

³⁰Pollitt 1986, 202.

unique to the Trojan princess. While both Iphigeneia and Polyxena may be depicted being led to sacrifice, only Polyxena is shown kneeling.

The third certain image of Polyxena in Roman art is on the left short side of an Attic marble sarcophagus from the middle of the third-century AD (POL 22). In the center of the preserved panel, a man and woman stand frontally next to one another. The subject of the scene has been traditionally described as the marriage of Polyxena and Achilles. Schröder has argued instead that the scene depicts the sacrifice of Polyxena by Neoptolemos. The man next to Polyxena held something that has been broken off in his left hand. Schröder argues that the man held a sword, not a marriage contract, as has been previously thought. The man whom Schröder identifies as Neoptolemos also points to the ground with his right hand, which he interprets as indicating where the hero's sacrifice was intended, towards the ground to his dead father. The lack of the *dextrarum iunctio* between the man and woman also argues against the scene as one of marriage.

UNCERTAIN DEPICTIONS [POL 23–60]

***Greek (POL 23–36 bis)*³¹**

Touchefeu-Meynier has commented that “dans bien des publications, le nom de P[olyxena] est suggéré sans véritable raison pour des jeunes femmes menacées de mort ou tuées.”³² It is true that without an inscription or a clear

³¹To the uncertain depictions of Polyxena given in *LIMC*, I add for consideration POL 7bis, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 36 bis. The following uncertain works are not discussed in this chapter because they receive detailed attention in Chapter Four: POL 27, 29, and 33.

³²Touchefeu-Meynier 1994, 434.

iconographic clue, such as the tomb of Achilles, that it is not possible to identify the figure of Polyxena with certainty in Greek art. Touchefeu-Meynier's interpretive stance, however, seems unduly pessimistic. Even though an image may not clearly depict Polyxena as we might expect to see her, the iconography of sacrifice and the narrative context of some scenes depicting Iliupersis episodes must have invoked the Trojan princess for some viewers.

Polyxena has been suggested as the identity of two of the women on the relief pithos in Mykonos with the sack of Troy, one of the earliest Iliupersis scenes in Greek art (POL 23). M. Ervin has noted that metope 7 with the woman lifting her veil who is being threatened by a sword-wielding man might be Polyxena about to be led to sacrifice by Neoptolemos. Based on later comparanda, however, Ervin identifies the subject as the recovery of Helen, which is now generally accepted.³³ Meanwhile, G. Schwarz has suggested that the woman on metope 13 is Polyxena. Unlike most of the other metopes that consist of a man attacking or killing a woman, some with a child present, metope 13 consists of a single female figure standing in profile to left. Her arms are crossed in front of her breasts and her wrists are bound. The female figure in metope 13, the first scene in the bottom register, probably belongs in a narrative context with the single warrior of metope 12, which is the last scene in the middle register. The warrior faces left and is about to draw his sword from his scabbard. Schwarz argues convincingly that the bound hands are an important iconographic feature that allows us to identify her as Polyxena. She notices that

³³Ervin 1963, 61; discussed in Ahlberg-Cornell 1982, 79. On iconographic ambiguity between the stories of Polyxena and Helen, see my Chapter Four.

the hands of Polyxena on the Polyxena Sarcophagus are also bound, and that in art the hands of sacrificial victims, like Orestes and Pylades in Tauris and the Trojan prisoners to be sacrificed by Achilles on the tomb of Patroklos, are often bound.³⁴ Furthermore, she links the woman's crossed arms on metope 13 with the crossed arms of Polyxena on the fragments of another seventh-century BC relief vase in the Tenos Archaeological Museum (Fig. 145).³⁵

Both Ervin and Ahlberg-Cornell have seen the woman in metope 13 as Cassandra, in part because she is one of the women expected to be seen at the sack of Troy. Identifying the warrior in metope 12 as the Locrian Ajax, Ahlberg-Cornell asks, "is it possible that the bound hands serve as an iconographic expression of this [Ajax's] particularly cruel and impious outrage?"³⁶ Schwarz's identification of the maiden in metope 13 as Polyxena is more convincing because she is able to account for the figure's bound hands, otherwise not well explained. In addition, the fact that the warrior in metope 12 does not have a beard might also lend support to Schwarz's identification, since this is how Neoptolemos is often shown.

G. Ahlberg-Cornell has also already commented on the divergence in tradition between the scenes on the pithos and literary accounts of the Fall of

³⁴Schwarz 2001, 42-3. Schwarz concludes (2001, 43), "Es ist demnach aus ikonographischen Gründen viel wahrscheinlicher, in der gefesselten, isoliert stehenden Frau auf Metope 13 Polyxena zu sehen, die ja tatsächlich zum Tode geführt wird."

³⁵Tenos Archaeological Museum, n.a. From Tenos. Illustrated in Ahlberg-Cornell 1982, 53, fig. 77.

³⁶Ahlberg-Cornell 1982, 81. She goes on to suggest that "it is also possible that the artist worked with a tradition different from that preserved to us." Ervin (1963, 62) does not see the warrior in metope 12 as Ajax, and Zindel (1974, 91) identifies him as one of Cassandra's suitors (also cited in Ahlberg-Cornell 1982, 80 note 34).

Troy. While the Mykonos pithos includes nine metopes with children who are either wounded, being killed, or about to be killed, our preserved literary sources record that Astyanax and Polyxena were the only Trojan children killed during the fall of Troy.³⁷ While the visual and literary versions may highlight different parts of a story, the emphasis on the slaughter of Trojan children on the Mykonos pithos might suggest that we are to see one of the female figures as Polyxena, one of the most famous maidens whose life is lost in the Sack of Troy.

The inclusion of Polyxena as a bystander or witness to the atrocities against her sister Cassandra and her father Priam, as on POL 2 and 5, raises the possibility that Polyxena might be identified as the onlooker in some Iliupersis scenes in which no inscriptions are given. The inscription naming the girl Polyxena in the tondo of Onesimos' Iliupersis cup in the Villa Giulia (POL 5) has expanded our knowledge of the Trojan princess' iconography and raised new questions about the identification of unnamed women who watch the murder of Priam. D. Williams, for instance, recognized that Onesimos' pairing of Polyxena and Priam might encourage us to see the woman behind Priam on the Niobid Painter's calyx-krater from Spina as Polyxena rather than Hecuba.³⁸ While Onesimos' Polyxena (POL 5) tears at her hair with both hands, we are to imagine that at some point she wielded a pestle, which can be seen overlapping the fallen warrior on the ground as it passes behind Priam's sandaled right foot, extending below the ground-line towards the right. Williams has already noted that only

³⁷See Ahlberg-Cornell 1982, 81-4. And Troilos before the sack of Troy. Ahlberg-Cornell (1982, 82-3) discusses the metopes with children: metopes 2B, 3, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19.

³⁸Williams 1991, 63 note 51.

women fight with pestles, and that pestle-wielders are rare, appearing in only three other Iliupersis scenes.³⁹ This caused him to wonder whether or not Polyxena might be the pestle-wielder on two of these, the Kleophrades Painter's Vivenzio hydria and the Tyskiewicz Painter's column-krater in the Villa Giulia, where she would be "still attempting to defend her father and her city."⁴⁰ Either way, Onesimos' tondo, as Williams put it, "sets Polyxena alongside Andromache as a pestle-wielder of some distinction."⁴¹ The third pestle-wielder appears on the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup, where she is named by an inscription as Andromache. But even on the Brygos Painter's cup the figures of Polyxena and Andromache are juxtaposed, as the vigorous action of Andromache contrasts with Polyxena's stillness.

On the Louvre amphora signed by Lydos, for instance, two women appear in the scene in which Priam falls back on an altar as Neoptolemos swings Astyanax over his shoulder about to hit the king (POL 25). One woman cradles Priam's head in her left arm as he is sprawled over the altar. The other woman stands behind the altar with both arms outstretched in a gesture of supplication towards Neoptolemos. Schefold identified the woman holding Priam's head as Hecuba and the woman behind the altar as Polyxena.⁴² Is Polyxena begging for

³⁹Williams 1991, 52. They are: Louvre G 152 (POL. 7); Naples 2422, *ARV*² 189.74; Villa Giulia 3578, *ARV*² 290.9. Williams (1991, 52, 63 note 57) also notes that a daughter of Nereus wields a pestle to defend her father's home on Myson's pelike in Munich (Munich 8762, *ARV*² 1638, 2bis). And of course the woman paired with Sthenelos in the interior zone of Villa Giulia 121110 also fights with a pestle.

⁴⁰Williams 1991, 52.

⁴¹Williams 1991, 52.

⁴²Schefold 1992, 286.

her father's life or pleading for her own? Schefold thought the Trojan princess was pleading on her own behalf, but I see her as begging Neoptolemos to spare her father. Both father and daughter are closely aligned in the composition. The contour of Polyxena's body as she emerges from behind the altar and the arc of her extended arms seems to echo the arc of Priam's arms as they fall on the side of the altar. It is almost as if Polyxena's torso and arms are an extension of the king's body, pleading for his life. Schefold praised Lydos' composition for the way in which he managed to avoid the paratactic style of earlier pictures.⁴³ In this scene, the overlapping of Polyxena's body by that of Priam conveyed meaning, bringing together the fates of father and daughter. The fact that Polyxena stands behind the altar might also allude to her role as a sacrificial victim. Here, physical overlapping serves to create a corporeal analogue. Just as Priam is being murdered, Polyxena will also soon be killed. The overlapping of the girl by the altar and by Priam argues for the identification of this maiden as Polyxena.

In a slightly later Iliupersis picture by Lydos in Berlin, two women stand behind an altar on which Priam is being attacked by Neoptolemos (POL 26). The one closer to Priam extends both arms out in supplication. The other touches Priam's arm with her right hand and tears at her hair with her left. Schefold suggested that these two women might be Hecuba and Polyxena, the girl being the one with one hand to her head. I do not see any distinguishing characteristics, however, that would suggest that Polyxena is the figure on the

⁴³Schefold 1992, 286.

right rather than the one on the left. Citing the certain identifications of Polyxena on the Group E amphora in Berlin and on the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup, Schefold comments that the "identification of the girl as Polyxena [on Lydos' Berlin amphora] is suggested by her prominence as a victim of Greek brutality on other pictures of the sack of Troy."⁴⁴ Here I believe Schefold is correct. The subject on the other side of the Berlin amphora makes the identification of one of the women in the Priam scene as Polyxena even more attractive. The ambush of Troilos on the reverse includes a running maiden and her fallen hydria in front of Troilos' horse. She must be Polyxena. Since the subjects on the two sides of the vase are related, the ancient viewer might have imagined one of the women behind Priam as Polyxena, the maiden fleeing the scene as her brother is attacked on the reverse. While the identities of the supplicating Trojan women in the scene of Priam's murder are uncertain, it seems fair to say that their fates are being contrasted with that of Helen who is confronted by Menelaos, in the scene to left of Priam's murder.

A phlyax vase in Ruvo may give us a depiction of Polyxena being attacked by two men (POL 31). Trendall and Cambitoglou offer Odysseus and Elpenor with Circe or Odysseus and Diomedes with Theano as the subject, but conclude that is "more likely a scene from everyday life showing two men coming to blows over a woman, as each tries to grab her for himself."⁴⁵ The low platform supported by posts on which the scene takes place convinces me that the subject

⁴⁴Schefold 1992, 286.

⁴⁵*RVAp* I 70. Trendall and Cambitoglou suggest and then dismiss Circe as a possible identification because she would not yet have been changed back into human form.

is drawn from a performance, rather than what has traditionally been called genre. Polyxena's sacrifice would have been known from the Trojan Cycle, Euripides' *Hecuba*, and Sophokles' lost *Polyxena*. The appearance of figures like Priam, Helen, Cassandra, and Antigone on phlyax vases raises the possibility that the woman on Ruvo 901 could be Polyxena.⁴⁶ The woman on the phlyax vase recalls two other uncertain depictions of Polyxena. With her arms extended out and collapsing on the ground she is similar to the female figure on the short side of an Etruscan sarcophagus in the Vatican (POL 41). Similarly, the composition of the scene with a female figure flanked by men threatening her with swords recalls the painting on the Clazomenian sarcophagus in Berlin (POL 36).

On the volute-krater in London, two women seek sanctuary at a statue of Athena in a scene of the sack of Troy (POL 32). They are each approached by a warrior holding a spear in one hand and armed with a sword in a scabbard. The pair on the right side is often taken to be Cassandra and Ajax, because of the way the upper part of the woman's garment falls, exposing her left breast.⁴⁷ When he first published the vase, Raoul-Rochette identified the pair on the left as Polyxena

⁴⁶On phlyax vases, see Trendall 1967b, and Trendall and Webster 1971. The following is a list of examples of the subjects cited: The death of Priam appears on Berlin F 3045, an Apulian bell-krater of the Eton-Nika Group (Trendall and Webster 1971, IV, 29). Matera 9579, another Apulian bell-krater, gives Helen being led to Paris for their wedding (Trendall and Webster 1971, IV, 28). Ajax and Cassandra, their roles reversed, is the subject of the well-known Paestan calyx-krater signed by Asteas in Rome, Villa Giulia 50279 (Trendall and Webster 1971, IV, 30). Antigone led before Kreon appears on an Apulian bell-krater by the Rainone Painter in St. Agata dei Goti (Trendall and Webster 1971, IV, 33).

⁴⁷This vase is discussed in detail by Moret (1975, 63-7). Moret (1975, 64) argues. "Que l'une des suppliantes soit Cassandre, et l'un des guerriers Ajax, nul ne le contestera." Following Klein's interpretation (1877), might the woman on the right be Helen? In Chapter 4, I suggest that the less aggressive aspect of the warrior on the right might be better suited for Menelaos than Ajax. Menelaos, in some versions of the story, drops his sword when he sees Helen exposed.

and Neoptolemos.⁴⁸ Raoul-Rochette saw the appearance of the Ionic column with a fillet tied around it as a reference to the tomb of Achilles, on which Polyxena would be sacrificed. The Ionic column as a possible marker for the tomb of Achilles appears on two other uncertain pictures of Polyxena and Neoptolemos, on vases attributed to the Caivano Painter and the Painter of Naples 1778 (POL 34 and 35). Moret gives two reasons for rejecting the identification of the female figure on the left as Polyxena. First, he argues that there are no other works on which Polyxena is known to seek sanctuary at a statue of Athena, and Neoptolemos is not known to have violated a place sacred to Athena. Secondly, there are no other examples on which the destinies of Cassandra and Polyxena are brought together.⁴⁹

In response to Moret's first objection, O. Touchefeu-Meynier has pointed out that in the epigram of Cosmas in the *Greek Anthology* (16.114), Polyxena, about to be sacrificed by Neoptolemos, pleads to Athena (see POL 18).⁵⁰ As for Moret's second objection, I argue in Chapter Four that the figures of Polyxena and Cassandra were entwined in Greek art and myth. The over-turned oinochoe on the ground in front of the woman on the left might also offer support for seeing her as Polyxena, a reference to her presence at Achilles' ambush of Troilos at the fountainhouse. If such an allusion were intended, we would prefer to see a hydria rather than an oinochoe. The Iliupersis Painter, however, diverges from iconographic conventions in other ways, so such a possibility should not be

⁴⁸Raouel-Rochette 1833, 300-9, pl. 66. Also cited in Moret 1975, 64 note 4.

⁴⁹Moret 1975, 65.

⁵⁰Touchefeu-Meynier 1994, 434.

discounted.⁵¹ There are a number of vases on which two women seek asylum at the same statue, with one of them most often identified as *Kassandra*. Moret acknowledges that one could think of *Polyxena* as a possibility for the other victim, but, following *Jacobstahl*, he argues that it is better to interpret her as an “anonymous Trojan.”⁵² *London F 160*, combined with the epigram of *Cosmas*, might encourage us to examine whether *Polyxena* may have been overlooked as the identity of some of the so-called anonymous Trojan women who flee to a cult statue with one of her sisters in *Iliupersis* scenes.

A *hydria* attributed to the *Cavaino Painter* and an *amphora* attributed to the *Painter of Naples 1778*, both in *Naples*, are similar in having a woman at an *Ionic column* being approached by a man (*POL 34* and *35*). On the *Cavaino Painter's hydria (POL 34)*, the woman with her hands tied behind her back is seated on the ground in front of the column, which is adorned with a *fillet*. On the *amphora by the Painter of Naples 1778 (POL 35)*, the woman's hands are not bound, and she sits on the base on which the column is set. Both may depict *Polyxena* at the tomb of *Achilles*. The *Cavaino Painter's* positioning of the woman with her back towards the youth strongly suggests her identification as *Polyxena*. The youth may be about to take his sword out of its scabbard, and the woman's pose, with her head tilted up and neck exposed, is in the right position for the youth to cut her throat from behind. *Neoptolemos* also approaches *Polyxena* from behind on a relief bowl in *Athens (POL 11)*. It is to be admitted

⁵¹The old man and child on the top right, for instance, are probably *Anchises* and *Ascanius*, but in art *Aineas* usually plays a central role in carrying his father or at the least leading him away, and on our vase he is missing.

⁵²See Moret 1975, 65.

though that the youth does not appear threatening. The composition of the scene on the amphora by the Painter of Naples 1778 (POL 35) clearly draws on the iconography of Orestes and Electra at the tomb of Agamemnon. As Moret has pointed out, however, the youth on POL 35 holds a sword and he touches the maiden's arm (Orestes does not grab Electra's arm). "Selon toute probabilité," observed Moret, "le peintre a voulu représenter le sacrifice de Polyxène, et il a conservé certains éléments de l'autre scène [that of Orestes and Electra], beaucoup plus populaire dans les ateliers de Grande-Grèce, notamment à Paestum."⁵³ A similar iconographic borrowing between the stories of Electra and Polyxena also occurs on a gem in Berlin, whose composition is similar to that of the Paestum amphora, but the man holds the knife over the woman's head, and she buries her face in her hands (POL 51).

The painted Clazomenian sarcophagus in Berlin with a woman being attacked by two men might also give us a depiction of Polyxena (POL 36). If the artist had intended to depict the sacrifice of Polyxena at the tomb of Achilles, he could have rendered the scene as it appears on the headpiece of the sarcophagus in Leiden, which includes the tomb of Achilles (POL 15). Instead, the scene seems more appropriate for the account of Polyxena's death known to us from a scholiast on the *Kypria*, which tells us that during the Sack of Troy Polyxena was wounded by Odysseus and Diomedes, and that she later died of her wounds. This alternate version of Polyxena's death probably also appears on an Etruscan

⁵³Moret 1975, 65.

Pontic amphora in Paris (POL 38). If she were *Kassandra*, why would two warriors attack her?

We may also wonder whether *Polyxena* might have been depicted on one of the poorly preserved and fragmentary north metopes of the Parthenon which treated the Sack of Troy (POL 36 bis). K. Schwab has commented that Pausanias describes approximately 66 figures in Polygnotos' *Iliupersis* painting at Delphi, which is comparable to the number of figures originally represented among the Parthenon north metopes.⁵⁴ While the groupings of figures are different between the painting and the metopes, *Polyxena*'s inclusion in Polygnotos' painting, prominent enough for Pausanias to be able to pick her out, may encourage us to consider her among the lost figures of the Parthenon north metopes, where she might have been juxtaposed alongside *Helen* on metope 24-25.⁵⁵ The rescue of *Aithra* is sometimes suggested as the subject of either metope D (no. 23?) or metope 27.⁵⁶ Although poorly preserved, these metopes seem to include fragments of a man leading a woman. The Brygos Painter's Louvre *Iliupersis* cup with *Akamas* leading *Polyxena* to sacrifice raises the question of whether metope D or metope 27 might preserve *Polyxena* led to sacrifice. If *Polyxena* were to appear on the Parthenon north metopes, we must imagine that it would not be the moment of her death that would be shown, but rather her procession to

⁵⁴Schwab 1999, 367-9 (with bibliography). Schwab (1999, 369 note 4) credits A. Mantis with this observation, shared with her via personal communication in November 1995.

⁵⁵The rape of *Kassandra* should probably also be added among the missing metopes, as Schwab (1999, 367) points out, "not only as a counterpoint to the safety obtained by *Helen* at the statue, as in North 24-25, but also as a visual reminder of *Athena*'s power and wrath to those who defy accepted norms of civilized behavior."

⁵⁶For instance, see *Delivorrias* 1996, 118.

sacrifice, which appears not only on the Brygos Painter's cup, but also on the lekythos by the Acheloos Painter and on the hydria by the Leagros Group.

One final work should be mentioned in connection with Polyxena's slaughter. Auguste Picard suggested that the Dying Niobid in the Museo Nazionale della Terme in Rome might have been the inspiration for Euripides' sacrificed Polyxena in the *Hecuba*, but he acknowledged that there is no Attic temple to which it could belong.⁵⁷ On such uncertain ground, I have omitted it from the catalogue.

Etruscan (POL 37–51)⁵⁸

Uncertain depictions of Polyxena appear in a variety of mediums in Etruria, including two vase-paintings, an urn, a cista, two sarcophagi, a relief, an akroterion, two mirrors, and five gems. The uses and contexts of these works give some indication of how the imagery may have been interpreted. The urn, sarcophagi and akroterion, for instance, belong in clear funerary contexts. The cista and mirrors point toward the use of these objects by women. Likewise, the more private context of gems suggest more personal meanings.

Two Etruscan vases may give us depictions of Polyxena's impending death. T. Fischer Hansen has argued that the sacrifice of Polyxena is the subject of an Etrusco-Corinthian column-krater in Cerveteri (POL 37). The scene is fragmentary and difficult to make out, but depicts a man carrying a woman, toes facing down, towards an "altar-tomb" from which rises the bearded head of a

⁵⁷Picard, *sculpt ant. II*, 44. Also cited in Dinsmoor 1939, 42.

⁵⁸To the uncertain depictions in *LIMC*, I add POL 37, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51.

man and a pair of arms. A snake appears behind the man's head. Fischer-Hansen interprets the scene as the sacrifice of Polyxena, with the ghost of Achilles rising from his tomb, his arms extended out in front of him demanding the sacrifice of the Trojan maiden. His identification might be correct, but I believe the image of the head rising out of the altar-tomb with a pair of arms extended might have drawn on a different source.

In his account of child sacrifices at Carthage, Diodorus Siculus tells us that in order to make up for past transgressions, the Carthaginians sacrificed publicly 200 aristocratic youths.⁵⁹ Diodorus records how the youths were sacrificed:

There was in their city a bronze image of Cronus, extending its hands, palms up and sloping toward the ground, so that each of the children when placed thereon rolled down and fell into a sort of gaping pit filled with fire. It is probable that it was from this that Euripides has drawn the mythical story found in his works about the sacrifice in Tauris, in which he presents Iphigeneia being asked by Orestes: "But what tomb shall receive me when I die? A sacred fire within, and earth's broad rift."⁶⁰

This practice of the Carthaginians and the image of Cronus with his arms extended out may have been a point of reference known by the painter of the Cerveteri vase. Ward also suggested that the image of a "bull altar" on Near Eastern seal cylinders might be connected with the practice of sacrificing children to Moloch.⁶¹ In fact, the head coming out of the altar on the Cerveteri columnkrater is not so unlike depictions of bull altars on some Near Eastern seals. An account of the sacrifices to Moloch given by a Jewish midrash was thought by

⁵⁹Diodorus Siculus 20.14.5.

⁶⁰Diodorus Siculus 20.14.6. The lines cited in the *IT* are 625-6.

⁶¹Ward 1910, 309.

George Moore to have been derived from the account cited above in Diodorus Siculus.⁶² The unparalleled iconography of the scene on the Etruscan column-krater may have been influenced by historical practices of the Carthaginians known by the vase-painter. It need not be a direct source of inspiration or influence, but perhaps an oblique allusion.

On a Pontic amphora in the Louvre attributed to the Silenos Painter, a woman seeks sanctuary at an altar as she is pursued by two armed men (POL 38). M. Robertson has argued convincingly that the scene depicts the version of Polyxena's death known from the *Kypria*, in which she was wounded by Odysseus and Diomedes during the sack of Troy, and that she would later die from these wounds. G. Hedreen observed that the iconography of the scene is more appropriate for the flight of Helen than for Polyxena. If the woman was intended as Helen, however, how do we account for her being pursued by two men, rather than just by her husband, which is how the scene is commonly depicted? The bird perched on top of the altar to which the woman runs may offer a further link to her identification as Polyxena. On numerous Attic black-figure vases with Polyxena at the fountain in representations of Troilos' ambush, a bird often appears, an omen of the events to come. If the bird on Louvre E 703 was included as an omen, it might be more appropriate for the iconography of Polyxena rather than Helen.

Besides the two vases and a series of gems, to be discussed at the end of this section, the sacrifice of Polyxena has been suggested as the subject of scenes

⁶²Moore, "The Image of Moloch" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. XVI, p. 155 (cited in Ward 1910, 309).

on an urn, a cista, two sarcophagi, an akroteria, and a chariot relief (POL 39-44). In addition, two bronze mirrors may represent Polyxena in scenes outside the usual narrative context of her sacrifice (POL 45 and 46). It is difficult to assess these uncertain depictions because Polyxena lacks a standardized iconography in Etruria. The sarcophagus in Orvieto is the only known certain depiction of Polyxena in Etruscan art, and the authenticity of this object has been questioned. What is striking about these works is the range of mediums in which the subject appears, and the various uses of the objects. While the cista, would have been used by an aristocratic woman, the akroteria would have decorated a public monument, and the chariot would have commemorated the life of an elite man. Whether these works of art depict Polyxena or some other woman, the iconography of the death of a maiden appears widely and was deemed appropriate for a broad range of objects and purposes.

The travertine urn from Perugia, the cista in London, and the sarcophagus in the Vatican are similar in having the woman on the ground or falling to the ground and nude or partially nude (POL 39-41). This is also how Polyxena appears on the sarcophagus in Orvieto (POL 19), which may lend some support for the identifications. On POL 39-41, however, the tomb of Achilles is not present. On another sarcophagus from Tarquinia in London (POL 42), a man impales a woman on his sword. The fact that the woman was standing would seem to argue against her identification as Polyxena, as she seems to have appeared in Etruscan art. The composition of this scene along with that of the terracotta akroterion from Orvieto (POL 43) share affinities with scenes of

Orestes' matricide of Klytaimnestra as it appears on some Etruscan mirrors.⁶³ When Orestes threatens Klytaimnestra, his sword is often directed towards her chest rather than her neck. The akroterion from Orvieto was from a large shrine in the Cannicella cemetery. Adorning the roof of a monument in a cemetery, the Orvieto akroterion makes us wonder which subject might have been more appropriate in this context, the sacrifice of Polyxena or the matricide of Klytaimnestra?

A relief on the famous bronze chariot from Monteleone in the Metropolitan Museum of Art may include another depiction of Polyxena (POL 44). On the right side of the central panel, the woman under the horse has been seen by Hampe and Simon as Polyxena in a scene of Achilles' apotheosis. They interpret the maiden raising her left hand as helping to lift the chariot to the heavens. Other scholars have seen the woman under the horse as a personification of earth or "Mother Earth." If the figure is Polyxena, it presents her sacrifice in a different way, depicting her as a trampled or conquered figure rather than emphasizing the moment of her sacrifice. This would be fitting with the decoration of the chariot, which emphasizes the scenes in the life of a hero, rather than focusing on the maiden's story. If the chariot depicts scenes in the life of Achilles, then the woman is likely Polyxena.

Polyxena has also been seen on two bronze mirrors, outside of her usual sacrificial context (POL 45 and 46). On the mirror in Lyon, the naked female figure sitting on the lap of a woman has been seen as Polyxena, but I see no suggestion of this in the scene (POL 45). On the mirror in London, a figure

⁶³See for instance Stopponi 1991 figs. 25-27, with discussion.

named ΦΥΛΦΣΝΑ is an onlooker in a scene of Elinai's (Helen's) recovery (POL 46). The closeness of the name *Phulphsna* to *Polyxena* has led to the suggestion that she is Polyxena. Phulphsna is nude except for earrings, necklace, and a swag of drapery that wraps around her left shoulder and right leg. She also holds two spears in her right hand. If she is Polyxena, then this is the only representation of an armed and fully naked Polyxena preserved in ancient art.

Five Etruscan gems may give us the sacrifice of Polyxena (POL 47–51). The most difficult of these to understand is the carnelian scarab in Munich (POL 47) because it depicts the female figure standing behind the male figure holding the knife. Set on the ground in front of the figures is a thymiaterion, which does not appear in any other depictions of the story. The sardonyx gems in Berlin and Gotha share similar compositions (POL 48 and 49). Both show a female figure kneeling on the ground, neck exposed, as a man leans over her, raising a knife over her head about to kill her. The same scheme appears on gems in Munich and Copenhagen (POL 59 and IPH 147). A brief consideration of scenes of human sacrifice on Etruscan gems helps in understanding the iconography of these scenes.

Killing and death are common subjects on Etruscan gems. Scenes of a warrior holding a decapitated head appear often, such as on Fig. 164.⁶⁴ Likewise, the two figure composition consisting of one figure on his knees, and the other a standing warrior holding a knife or grabbing the defeated by the hair about to kill

⁶⁴Present location unknown (Martini 1971, 137, cat. no. 66, pl. 14.3.) For a selection of other examples, see Martini 1971, cat. nos. 74, 87, 88, 328, and 329. Of a carnelian scarab in London, BM 744, with a seated man holding a human head in his left arm, Walters (1926, 91-2, cat. no. 744, pl. XII) wrote that it was “formerly interpreted as Tydeus with the head of Melanippos, but probably has some reference to a myth of human sacrifice.”

him is also common. This is the compositional format we see, for instance, in depictions of Priam's murder and of Achilles' sacrificing of one of the Trojan prisoners on Etruscan gems (compare Figs. 165-167).⁶⁵ Likewise, there are numerous scenes described as human sacrifices that often depict a youth on his knees with a bearded warrior stooped over him with a knife, such as on a sardonyx in Berlin (Fig. 168).⁶⁶

The representations of a woman being sacrificed on the gems in Berlin and Gotha (POL 48 and 49) must be understood within the iconographic traditions described above. Without the tomb of Achilles, however, we cannot be certain that Polyxena was the maiden intended on the Berlin and Gotha gems.⁶⁷ It seems fair to say that the iconography of maiden sacrifice on these gems is similar to that of other scenes of human sacrifice in Etruscan glyptics. In fact, the similarities between representations of Achilles sacrificing one of the Trojan prisoners and those of a woman being sacrificed, like our examples in Berlin and Gotha, may argue that the maiden intended was Polyxena. These two subjects were also linked on the two long sides of the sarcophagus from Torre San Severo in Orvieto (POL 19).

⁶⁵Fig. 256 and 257 are images of Achilles sacrificing one of the Trojan prisoners: Berlin 610 (*AG*, pl. 23, no. 55) and BM 2071 (Walters 1926, pl. 26). On glyptic representations of Achilles' sacrifice of the Trojan captives, see Kossatz-Deissmann, *LIMC*, Achilleus, 118, cat. no. 488 (eight examples given).

Figure 258 depicts Priam's murder on a sardonyx in Munich, Slg. Arndt 1656 (Martini 1971, 142, cat. no. 125, pl. 24.6).

⁶⁶Berlin 483 (Martini 1971, 144, cat. no. 148, pl. 29.3). For examples of other "human sacrifices" on Etruscan gems, see Martini 1971, cat. nos. 60, 224, 236, 262, and 270.

⁶⁷Depictions of human sacrifice in Etruscan art are not necessarily mythological. Briguet (1986, 262-3, and 263 fig. VIII-43.) discusses a sarcophagus from Tuscania of the Hellenistic period thought to depict the burial of two couples who were allegedly buried alive in the Forum Boarium in the third-century BC. Recounted in Livy 22.57, the Roman burial of Gallus et Galla, Gaecus et Graeca was thought to reflect an Etruscan practice.

On the other hand, both Berlin 6889 and Berlin 489 include a monument in the background. If these represent the tomb of Achilles, then they depict the sacrifice of Polyxena, rather than of Iphigeneia (POL 50 and 51). The garlanded monument on Berlin 6889 is an elaborate affair, with columns set on a high base and supporting an entablature (POL 50). The high quality of this gem may also explain the ambitious pose of the woman. On Berlin 489, the female figure is seated on an altar, hunched over with her head in her hands (POL 51). Behind her is a column topped by a vase. The column is an iconographic feature denoting a tomb, and its inclusion in Berlin 489 convinces me that she is Polyxena. A similar column appears behind the Trojan whom Achilles is sacrificing on Berlin 610 (Fig. 165), where it stands for the tomb of Patroklos. Likewise, another column appears behind a woman seated on an altar on a sardonyx intaglio in Munich, where it stands for the tomb of Agamemnon, allowing us to identify the figures as Elektra and Orestes (Fig. 169).⁶⁸ We know that the Munich gem depicts Elektra and Orestes rather than Polyxena and Neoptolemos because Orestes does not raise a knife over the woman's head, as does Neoptolemos on POL 51.

The close relation between the figures of Neoptolemos and Polyxena on Berlin 489 (POL 51) and the figures of Elektra and Orestes on the Munich gem illustrates how the iconography of maiden sacrifice is embedded in representational conventions that connect it with other mythological stories (compare Figs. 128 and 169). In this way, the uncertain depictions of Polyxena

⁶⁸Munich Staatl. Münzslg. n.a (Martini 1971, 138, cat. no. 81, pl. 18.3).

are also related to glyptic representations of Perseus beheading Medusa. For instance, Perseus decapitating Medusa on a carnelian scarab in London, with the hero stooped over a kneeling Medusa recalls compositions of a woman on her knees about to be sacrificed, as on Berlin 484 and Gotha n.a. (POL 48 and 49).⁶⁹ Likewise the seated Polyxena on Berlin 489 being threatened by Neoptolemos is related compositionally to the seated Medusa about to be beheaded by Perseus on a sardonyx in Hannover.⁷⁰ The similarities between possible depictions of Polyxena and Medusa suggests that there is an iconographic link for women who, as Loraux put it, die by their necks, but for different reasons and to different ends.

Roman (POL 52–60)⁷¹

In Roman art, the uncertain depictions of Polyxena appear primarily on gems (POL 54-60), but there is also a painting and a grave relief (POL 52 and 53). A wall painting from the House of the Gilded Cupids in Pompeii depicts a woman sitting on the ground with her right hand to her chin (POL 52). Parts of two men's bodies can be seen standing to left of her. She does not, however, appear to be threatened by anyone. On the other hand, in the fragmentary relief on a grave monument from Neumagen, a warrior grabs a woman by the hair and threatens her with a sword (POL 53). Although the lower half of the relief is not

⁶⁹London, British Museum 65.7-12.97. 500-350 BC. Richter 1968, 209, cat. no. 854. We can identify Perseus by his winged hat and harpe; Medusa holds a snake in her left hand.

⁷⁰Hannover, Kestnarmus. 671 (Martini 1971, 139, cat. no. 89, pl. 18.3). Perseus turns his head away from Medusa to avoid being turned to stone.

⁷¹None of these uncertain depictions appear in *LIMC*.

preserved, she must have been down on her knees. This relief appears on the so-called “Iphigeneia-Pillar,” which also depicts the flight of Iphigeneia on one of its pilasters. If the woman being threatened in the relief is Polyxena, then this is the only work of ancient art in which the stories of Iphigeneia and Polyxena appear together on the same monument.

Uncertain depictions of Polyxena appear on seven gems, five of which might depict the Trojan maiden in Phrygian costume in a scene other than that of her sacrifice or at the fountain-house (POL 54–58). On these five gems, the figure crouches before a trough of water lifting an amphora to her lips to drink, as a group of horses behind her also drink. On four of these five intaglios, the most spectacular of which is the sardonyx cameo of three layers in Paris (POL 54), a youth seen as Troilos is also present. There are variations among the scenes. For instance, while the Paris cameo includes a herm in the background behind the horses, the Vienna carnelian has instead a bearded warrior in the background. The number of horses also sometimes changes. E. Zwierlein-Diehl has suggested that the variations among this group of gems indicate that it might have been taken from a larger composition, perhaps from a painting.⁷² These are included in the catalogue because if they depict Troilos and Polyxena then the scenes might have been copied from or related to a painting of the Trojan cycle. The female figure in Phrygian dress appears alone with the horses, without the youth, on Munich A.919 (POL 58), which might suggest that she was the most important figure in the story told in these scenes. If the woman is Polyxena, her crouching-

⁷²Zwierlein-Diehl 1973, 104, cat. no. 278.

kneeling pose might have alluded to how she will later lose her life, kneeling on the ground as she is sacrificed by Neoptolemos, as she probably appears on other intaglios, like the last two uncertain representations of Polyxena on Roman stones, Munich A. 880 and London 3206 (POL 59 and 60). The composition of these scenes are close to depictions of the same subject on Etruscan gems, as discussed above, like the examples in Berlin and Gotha (POL 48 and 49).

The following table summarizes the uncertain depictions of Polyxena by assessing the relative likelihood of the identifications⁷³:

	<u>Likely</u>	<u>Possible</u>	<u>Unlikely</u>
Greek	23, 24, 28	25, 26, 27, 29 31, 32, 33, 34 36, 36 bis	35
Etruscan	38, 50, 51	37, 40, 41, 43, 44 46, 48, 49	39, 42, 45, 47
Roman		52-60	

⁷³Numbers given refer to catalogue numbers.

Chapter 4

Fashioning the Sacrificial Virgin: Comparing Helen, the Sacrificial Virgins, and Representations of Womanhood

The importance of women in the Trojan cycle was observed by Karl Schefold, who commented that the frequent appearance of Helen on Archaic shield bands “seems to exalt the person of Helen to such an extent that the Trojan War appears more as a poem about the divinely beautiful Helen than as a poem about Achilles.”¹ Helen, the face that launched a thousand ships, emerges as a central figure against which other women are compared. In the context of the Trojan Cycle, the comparison between Helen and the sacrificial virgins is central since the sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena mark the beginning and end of the Trojan War.² The comparison between Helen and the sacrificial virgins highlighted different types of womanhood, the representation of which both reflected and participated in the fashioning of aristocratic identity.

This chapter explores how two vases, Louvre G152 and British Museum E773, provide the point of departure for new ideas and interpretations on the visual and semantic links between Helen and the two sacrificial virgins of the Trojan epic.³ Part I of this chapter focuses on Louvre G152, an Attic red-figure

¹Schefold 1966, 85.

²On the sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena framing the Trojan War, see, for instance, Anderson 1997 and Lyons 1997, 155 and 161.

³Paris, Louvre G152. *ARV*² 369.1; *Para* 365; *Add*² 224. London, British Museum E773. *ARV*² 805.89.

cup dating c. 480 BC that depicts Polyxena being led to sacrifice, signed by Brygos as potter and attributed to the Brygos Painter (POL 7, Figs. 88a-o). Using the Brygos Painter's Iliupersis cup in the Louvre as a case study, I argue that artists intentionally used similar iconography, narrative imagery, and formal scheme to depict the recovery of Helen on the one hand, and the leading to sacrifice of Polyxena and Iphigeneia on the other.⁴ The similar mode of rendering these two sets of stories itself conveyed meaning, and was an intertextual device used for "thematic juxtaposition," or comparison, in the context of the Trojan cycle.⁵ It allowed for a type of allusion that makes reference to another story, an *index* that refers to another person and event outside of the immediate narrative.⁶ "The scene depicted on a Greek vase," wrote Claude Bérard, "reveals its full meaning only in the framework of an indirect connection,

⁴On the iconography of Helen's recovery, see especially Kahil 1955; *LIMC*; Clement 1958; Hedreen 2001, 1996. The bibliography on Helen is vast. Recent books include Suzuki 1989; Austin 1994; Gumpert 2001; Meagher 2002; Hughes 2005.

⁵The word "intertextual" is problematic. I do not propose that images are like texts nor do I believe that pictures can be "read." The word "inter-image" is closer to my meaning, but is not commonly used and sounds inelegant. The term "inter-textuality" was coined by Julia Kristeva (1984, 59-60) to refer to the "transposition of one (or several) sign system(s) into another," which is not how the term is most often used. For an account (in English) of the development and use of intertextuality, see Allen 2000. In "Intertextuality in Painting," Wendy Steiner (1985, 58) argues that "it is only by viewing paintings in light of other paintings or works of literature, music, and so forth that the 'missing' semiotic power of pictorial art can be augmented—which is to say that the power is not missing at all, but merely absent in the conventional account of the structure of art." While Steiner does not focus on ancient art, her conclusions still shed light on the study of images in Greek art.

In using the term intertextuality to refer to the ways in which images play off of one another and derive meaning from this interplay, I have been influenced by the French School, which draws on structuralist approaches in the interpretation of images on Greek vases. See for instance, Bérard 1989; Ferrari 2002. On Roman art as a semantic system, see Hölscher 2004 (first published in 1987). On Greek mythology as an "intertext," see Dowden 1992, 8. On "intratextuality," see Sharrock 2001.

⁶For the definition of an index as one of the basic functions in a narrative's micro-structure, see Barthes 1966 and Stansbury-O'Donnell 1999, chapter 2.

established by the reader's memory, with other scenes figured on other vases."⁷ My goal is to come to a better understanding of the meaning of the sacrificial virgin by recovering her connections to depictions of Helen on other vases, and by extension in other mediums.

Part II focuses on British Museum E773, an Attic red-figure pyxis attributed to a follower of Douris, which depicts Iphigeneia in a scene alongside Helen and other mythological women of renown, all named by inscriptions (IPH 2, Figs. 2a-f). As a concrete example of Helen and Iphigeneia appearing in the same scene, the London pyxis suggests that representations of mythological women in art were thought of in relation to one another. I believe this practice of comparison was intended more widely, which reflects a tradition paralleled in early Greek catalogue poetry. I propose that depictions of female figures in Greek art sometimes participated in an allusive system of references in which they were intended to be compared with other female figures (present or not), and that the comparisons between these women in art reflects, but is separate and parallel to, that in catalogue poetry, with both traditions revealing a similar mode of thinking about women in relation to one another.⁸

The overarching aim of this chapter is to discuss *how* and *why* Helen was linked with the sacrificial maidens of the Trojan Cycle. It then suggests that the relationship between these women may be expanded to include a denser network of interrelations among women in the Trojan epic. Finally, I analyze how some

⁷Bérard 1989, 167. Bérard thus describes one approach taken by scholars of the French School, which sees the images in Greek art functioning as signs in a semiotic system.

⁸On the relation of Greek art and literature as separate but parallel developments, see Small 2003.

depictions of Helen and the sacrificial virgins both inform and complicate our understanding of how womanhood was represented in Greek art, how these representations may have been interpreted by contemporaries, and what purpose these constructions of womanhood served.

COMPARING FEMALE FIGURES: SCHOLARLY APPROACHES

Scholars such as Michael Anderson, Mark Stansbury-O'Donnell, and Guy Hedreen have explored how the visual representation of scenes from the Trojan Cycle belong to a semantic system in which the visual language and iconography of the scenes play off of one another and in which meaning is generated or enriched through the use of allusion to related stories and themes.⁹ A Corinthian krater in Paris dating c. 570-560 BC that depicts Hektor's departure serves as an example of how the composition of scenes and the juxtaposition of figures can generate meaning in a work. While the depiction of Hektor's departure on this vase seems to focus on the preparations of the horses and chariots, other figures are named by inscriptions, including Priam, Hekabe, Kebriones, Cassandra and Polyxena. In describing this work, Karl Schefold observed that "the painter clearly knows the whole story of the war, and wants to suggest much more than is really necessary for the ostensible subject of his picture," commenting in particular on the inclusion of Polyxena in this scene and her fate at the fall of

⁹Anderson (1997, 192 and 245) has written about the arrangement and juxtaposition of *Iliupersis* scenes in Attic art; Hedreen 2001; Stansbury-O'Donnell 1989, 1999. In his reconstruction of Polygnotos' lost *Iliupersis* from the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi, Stansbury-O'Donnell (1999, 183) argues that "contrasts between scenes and between individual characters create abundant references to earlier and later stages of the story and the moral implications of choice and action." On the juxtaposition of mythological subjects in Roman art, see Bergmann 1994 and 1999.

Troy.¹⁰ What has not been explored, as far as I know, is how the representation of women in the Trojan cycle gains meaning through the use of allusion and juxtaposition. In 1886, Arthur Schneider noticed the similar iconographic type used in black-figure to represent scenes of escort involving Aithra, Polyxena, Briseis, and Helen, but he does not offer reasons why a similar pictorial type may have been used.¹¹ The narrative imagery has not yet been analyzed for meanings created in a gendered context.

In arguing that the same visual formula was used in some depictions of Helen and the sacrificial virgins as a narrative device for the sake of comparison, I draw on J. Hurwit's approach of examining the use of iconography and "visual clues" as a form of allusion to link different myths and themes. He argues that the Old Seer (Figure N) on the east pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia recalled a type associated with a Halimedes-type figure represented in the myth of Amphiaraos, thus bringing together the stories of the House of Atreus and that of Amphiaraos-Alkmaion.¹² Hurwit's case-study serves as a model of how visual cues could trigger associations between myths in order to create a "narrative resonance" that adds layers of meaning to the messages conveyed by images.

At the same time, Bettina Bergmann has analyzed how paintings with mythological subjects were arranged and juxtaposed in Roman houses of the first-century BC to first-century AD in a way that formal similarities and differences served to elucidate different themes and associations for elite viewers

¹⁰Schefold 1992, 220. Illustrated in Schefold 1966, pl. 71b.

¹¹Schneider 1886, 106-109.

¹²Hurwit 1987.

who walked through these houses.¹³ Drawing on parallels in Latin literature and rhetoric, Bergmann explores how “the compositional formula serves as a prod to remember, compare and reason.”¹⁴ In “The Roman House as Memory Theater,” Bergmann examines how the painting of Iphigeneia’s sacrifice in the peristyle of the House of the Tragic Poet in Pompeii allowed for “multiple interpretations” by participating in an “associative web” with the subjects and female figures of the other paintings in the house, so that Iphigeneia could be compared both formally and thematically with Amphitrite, Hera, Briseis, Alkestis, and Helen.¹⁵

Bergmann’s study encourages us to ask new questions and to consider how the images on Greek vases may have belonged to a similar network of associations as those found in Roman wall-painting, but in a different context.

Scholars have identified the didactic or educative role that images on Greek vases may have played in the socialization of men and women. I. Scheibler, for instance, has explored the educative aspects of mythical subjects on belly amphorae for Athenian youths of initiatory age.¹⁶ A. Steiner has explored how some depictions of Herakles and the lion are presented as paradigms and juxtaposed on Athenian vases with scenes of a non-mythological or generic man

¹³Bergmann 1994 and 1999.

¹⁴Bergmann 1994, 245. In “Rhythms of Recognition: Mythological Encounters in Roman Landscape Painting,” Bergman (1999, 103) observed that “the various media for representations of myth—paintings, orations, poems and ecphraseis—all share rhetorical modes of arrangement that engaged the viewer/hearer with familiar images and stimulated open-ended mental play.”

¹⁵Bergmann 1994 249-251. In discussing the paintings of Helen, Hera, and Briseis in the atrium of the House of the Tragic Poet, Bergmann (1994, 245) notes that “for those who know their stories, the formal resemblances invite consideration of the very different situations of the three women.”

¹⁶Scheibler 1987.

and lion for didactic purposes. She formulates that a contemporary man would identify with the non-mythological figure presented as a type, and in this way would relate himself to the hero Herakles.¹⁷ Andrew Stewart has suggested that gendered ideologies of men's control over women are reflected in some scenes of forceful male-female intercourse on sympotic vases. For Stewart, these scenes "map Greek painting's generalized representational language of social domination and submission onto the sexual landscape."¹⁸ Gloria Ferrari also offers a model for seeing the images on Greek vases as "visual metaphors" or "projections of thought," using images of wool-making as a paradigm for virtuous female behavior. Unlike Ferrari, I see a less literal translation of the images on vases because I do not believe they were always linked closely with specific literary texts.¹⁹

The extensive parallels and links between Helen and Iphigeneia in Greek myth and literature,²⁰ and in cult and ritual²¹ have already been recognized by

¹⁷Steiner 1993, 216. On negative paradigms in Etruscan art, see de Angelis 1999.

¹⁸Stewart 1997, 156-171, especially pages 156 and 162.

¹⁹Ferrari 2005.

²⁰A comprehensive and insightful summary of the parallels and connections between the myths of Iphigeneia and Helen is given by Deborah Lyons (1997, 138-9, 157-62, especially 161-2), the main points of which include: 1.) Cause and effect: the virginal Iphigeneia being killed because of the adulterous Helen. 2.) Maiden sacrifice to avert a plague: Iphigeneia's story related to a tradition recounted in Ps.-Plutarch (Hist. Parall. 314c) of Helen who was to be sacrificed in Sparta to avoid a plague, but whose sacrifice was averted by an eagle who picked up the knife. 3.) *Eidōlon* used to revise their stories. 4.) Both are rescued, transported east, and then rescued again returning to Greece. 5.) Both are brides of Achilles in death. 6.) Both are heroines who become goddesses. Scholars have also enumerated the similarities in terms of structure and plot between Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Tauris* (c. 414 BC) and his *Helen* (412 BC) (Lattimore 1973, 3 [introduction]; Mizera 1984; Wright 2005, especially 120 and 152).

²¹In terms of cult, scholars have linked the significance of Helen's cult at Sparta with the initiation of young women, and thus the role of Helen at Sparta being similar to that of Iphigeneia at Brauron (see Calame 1977, 333-50; Bonnechère 1994, 127-8; Larson 1995, 61, 80-81).

scholars. The connections between these two women in myth-history suggest that they were intimately linked in Greek thinking. These associations would also be triggered in looking at art. The visual links may also have strengthened their association in myth-history and in literature. In Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, for instance, Orestes asks Iphigeneia if she remembers weaving a tapestry depicting the quarrel between Atreus and Thyestes (lines 812ff). One cannot help but think of Helen's legendary tapestry of scenes of the Trojan War told in the *Iliad* (3.121-7). M. Wright sees the references to Iphigeneia's tapestry in the *IT* as "illustrat[ing] another way in which Iphigeneia has become more like Helen—is Euripides trying to conflate or confuse the roles of the two women?"²² The same may be said of some of the visual representations. While Lyons and others have already established a firm relationship between Iphigeneia and Helen, I explore how and why the interconnections between these two women are cued in the visual arts. The relationship between Helen and Polyxena has received less attention, and my main contribution here is in arguing for a closer association between Polyxena and Helen than has been previously recognized.

Part I: Louvre G152

The exterior of the Brygos Painter's cup depicts episodes from the Iliupersis or Fall of Troy²³ (Figs. 88a-o). On side A, Polyxena, the only female figure depicted, is named by an inscription (Fig. 88a, c-d). The Trojan princess is

²²Wright 2005, 152.

²³For descriptions and discussions of this cup, see Cambitoglou 1968, 30-3; Robertson 1992, 94-5; Anderson 1997, 229-31.

being led to sacrifice by a warrior, named by an inscription as Akamas. As Polyxena is escorted to left, she looks over her shoulder at her father, King Priam, who is about to be beaten with the dead body of his grandson, Astyanax, by Neoptolemos. On the center of side B, a Greek attacks a fallen Trojan warrior (Figs. 88b, g, k). This pair is flanked on the left by a woman running wildly to left and on the right by a woman swinging a pestle who is named as Andromache (Figs. 88h, l, m). Behind Andromache, Astyanax (name inscribed) runs to right under the handle (Fig. 88h-i). Beneath the other handle is a fallen Trojan warrior attacked by a Greek. In the tondo, Briseis pours a libation into a phiale held by Phoinix. The names of both figures are inscribed (Fig. 88n).

If we did not have an inscription naming the maiden Polyxena, the iconography of the Brygos Painter's scene would seem better suited for other women's stories, such as the rescue of Aithra, who is often saved by her grandsons Akamas and Demophon, or the recovery of Helen by Menelaos. Alexander Cambitoglou even suggested that it was not the Brygos Painter himself, but a "clumsy" assistant who put the inscriptions on the vase and that he might have mislabeled them.²⁴ Since Menelaos and Helen were Spartans, according to Cambitoglou, the Brygos Painter's assistant named the man Akamas, an Athenian hero of importance for the Akamantis tribe. "Why did he [the Brygos Painter's assistant] not call the woman Aithra as one would expect

²⁴Cambitoglou 1968, 32-3. In reference to Akamas and Polyxena, Cambitoglou suggests "that in drawing these figures the Brygos Painter had Menelaos and Helen in mind and that the names given them are misnomers due in this case not to the artist himself but rather to a young and ignorant assistant who was asked to write the inscriptions." Also cited in Robertson 1992, 95. For the bibliography on arguments for and against the mislabeling of the vase, see Hedreen 2001, 42 note 69.

him to do,” asks Cambitoglou, “but gave her a name which in this case seems to be altogether arbitrary?” Cambitoglou offers two possible answers: either the assistant did not remember Aithra’s name, or he knew it, “but subconsciously decided not to give her name to a youthful-looking figure because his conception of her was that of an old woman.”²⁵ Cambitoglou’s theory of a dimwitted assistant is attractive because Astyanax appears twice on the vase, once dead and once alive, which is unusual (Figs. 88i-j). The identification of the woman as Polyxena, however, is not “altogether arbitrary.” In relation to the other figures on the cup’s exterior and compared to other Iliupersis pictures, the naming of the Trojan princess seems to be a careful decision on the artists’ part.

The Brygos Painter’s Polyxena is unique in three ways: 1) it does not include the tomb of Achilles on which the maiden is to be sacrificed; 2) the maiden is escorted by a warrior named Akamas; 3) the Polyxena scene is paired with Priam’s murder. Besides the representation by the Brygos Painter, the subject of Polyxena being led to sacrifice appears for certain on only four other known works of art: a black-figure hydria attributed to the Leagros Group in Berlin, a black-figure lekythos attributed to the Acheloos Painter in New York, the painted face of a Clazomenian Sarcophagus of about 500-470 BC in Leiden, and on a cup attributed to Makron in Paris (POL 3, 4, 6, and 15). Both the lekythos and hydria date c. 500 BC and include a snake on the tomb and the ghost of Achilles over the mound.

²⁵Cambitoglou 1968, 33.

While only five surviving Greek works depict Polyxena led to sacrifice, the recovery of Helen appears more than 150 times in Greek art, and at least another thirty or more depictions may be interpreted as Helen's abduction or recovery. Representations of the two subjects are connected by a similar composition and interaction between the figures. Most often, a man threatens a woman or leads her away. His hand is sometimes on her wrist, *cheir epi karpou*. Occasionally, two men threaten or lead her away. Scenes of Polyxena are distinguished from those of Helen by the inclusion of the tomb of Achilles to which she is led. Without this iconographic clue, it is not possible to discern between Polyxena and Helen in these types of scenes without inscriptions.

The closest parallel for the composition and pictorial type used by the Brygos Painter in his pairing of Polyxena and Priam is an earlier fragmentary red-figure cup at the Getty attributed to Oltos (515-505 BC), which pairs Priam's murder at the hands of Neoptolemos with the recovery of Helen (compare POL 7 and 27, Figs. 88c-d and 103b-c).²⁶ We can be certain that Oltos intended the recovery of Helen because the warrior's name is inscribed as Menelaos. The pairing of Helen and Priam appears earlier than Oltos, on a black-figure belly amphora by Lydos in Berlin.²⁷ At the same time, the inclusion of Polyxena as a witness in scenes involving Priam's murder are known, most famously in the tondo of a cup attributed to Onesimos as painter and signed by Euphronios as

²⁶Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 80.AE.154.

²⁷Carpenter 1991, fig. 67. On a slightly earlier black-figure amphora, Lydos pairs Priam's murder with the rape of Cassandra side by side in the same panel (Paris, Louvre F29. *ABV* 109.21 and 685; *Para* 44). Was a comparison intended to be drawn between Helen and Cassandra? See POL 25.

potter now in the Villa Giulia and dating 500-490 BC (POL 5, Figs. 86a-b).²⁸

Scholars have often commented that the inclusion of Polyxena in the scene of Priam's murder by Neoptolomeos is a proleptic reference to her fate at the hands of the same agent.²⁹ This juxtaposition may go back to as early as 560-540 BC, when Lydos painted a black-figure amphora on which Polyxena might be included in a scene of Priam's murder (POL 25, Fig. 101a-c).³⁰

The Brygos Painter's cup is not the only depiction of Polyxena being led to sacrifice that recalls representations of Helen's recovery. On a cup by Makron, also in the Louvre, Polyxena is led to sacrifice by two warriors, one holding a sword in front and a second equipped with a spear behind her (POL 6, Fig. 87a). This pictorial type finds its roots in black figure. On these, a woman is led away between two men. There are many examples and variations of this type, such as an amphora in Munich attributed to the Amasis Painter (compare Figs. 87a and 152).³¹ Likewise, the Clazomenian Sarcophagus in Leiden depicting Polyxena closely resembles the depiction of Menelaos' recovery of Helen on a fragmentary red-figure cup by Oltos, c. 515-500 BC, in which the painter names both figures

²⁸It would be tempting to think that the Brygos Painter's pairing of Polyxena and Priam was influenced by or a reflection of Onesimos' tondo, since Beazley commented that the Brygos Painter's early work "runs parallel" with late Onesimos, and Boardman characterized the Brygos Painter's style as "deriv[ing] from that of early Onesimos."

A similar composition appears in the tondo of another cup attributed to Onesimos as painter, fragments of which are in Berlin and the Vatican. This painting probably gives us another depiction of Polyxena, but without the inscription we cannot be certain. See POL 28.

²⁹See, for instance, Anderson 1997, 229-31.

³⁰Paris, Louvre F29. *ABV* 109.21, 685; *Para* 44. Anderson 1997, 210-11. Polyxena might also be the girl holding a flower on a hydria by the Leagros Group, Wurzburg 311: Schefold 1992, 287, fig. 344.

³¹Munich 1383 (Kahil 1955, cat. no. 6). Compare also Louvre, Campana no. 10235 (Kahil 1955, cat. no. 9).

with inscriptions (compare Figs. 95 and 153).³² The arrangement of figures on both is similar, with the warrior moving to left and turning his upper body to threaten the woman behind him with his sword.

While we have thus far focused on Polyxena, we must now turn to Iphigeneia, the other sacrificial virgin of the Trojan cycle. On a white-ground lekythos in Palermo by Douris of about 470 BC, Iphigeneia (name inscribed) is escorted to an altar of Artemis between two warriors, who both hold swords (IPH 1, Figs. 1a-i). The general composition once again recalls black-figure depictions of what have traditionally been interpreted as scenes of Helen, such as the scene on an amphora in Florence (Fig. 154).³³ Douris' lekythos also brings to mind a slightly later red-figure lekythos in Berlin attributed to the Painter of the Yale Lekythos that also depicts Menelaos and Helen (Fig. 155).³⁴

The presence of the sword in the iconography of Helen's recovery has been seen as crucial because it is almost always present, as Menelaos either holds the sword, threatens Helen with the sword, or drops it. In her typology of scenes of Helen's abduction and recovery, Lily Kahil identified Oltos' cup in the Getty as a "type dérivé," a "dégénérescence du motif," because a warrior leads a woman

³²Odessa, Archaeological Museum 21972. *ARV*² 67.137. *LIMC*, Helen 310. Illustrated in Hedreen 1996, fig. 2.

³³Florence, Campana 3777. Kahil 1955, cat. no. 7, plate III, 1.

³⁴Berlin 30835. Kahil 1955, cat. no. 10, plate III, 2.

away without threatening her with the sword (POL 27, Figs. 103b-c).³⁵ Kahil added about 40 additional vases to this derivative category.

Guy Hedreen has argued that Oltos' cup in Malibu is the only extant Attic representation of Helen's recovery that includes inscriptions naming the figures in which Menelaos holds a spear rather than a sword.³⁶ But an Attic lekythos attributed to the Brygos Painter in Berlin may be another candidate (Figs. 148a-d).³⁷ Schefold identified the subject of this vase as the recovery of Helen and he recorded an inscription naming the figure of Menelaos. When I examined this vase in person, I also noted the inscription. The first four letters of Menelaos' name are still discernible beneath his right arm (see detail Fig. 148c). Whether this vase was unknown to Hedreen or whether he interprets this scene as the wedding of Helen and Menelaos (as is sometimes the case), I cannot say, but this vase offers new insights.³⁸ Here, Menelaos holds a spear rather than a sword in his right hand. I cannot help but wonder whether the Brygos Painter thought about his earlier painting of Polyxena being led to sacrifice on his Louvre cup when he painted the later lekythos depicting Helen's recovery, since both women are depicted being escorted by a man holding a spear (compare Figs. 88c-d and

³⁵Kahil (*LIMC*), p. 549 cat. no. 336 bis.

³⁶Hedreen 2001, 42. Contra, Cambitoglou (1968, 31 note 151) described the representations of Menelaos holding a spear in scenes of Helen's recovery as "not infrequent." Besides Berlin F2205, discussed below, Cambitoglou also cited London B 244, a neck amphora by the Antimenes Painter (*ABV* 271.74) and New York 41.162.20, a stamnos by the Deepdene Painter (*ARV*² 499.11).

³⁷Berlin, Pergamon Museum F2205. *ARV*² 383.202; *Para* 366; *Addenda*² 113. *LIMC*, Helen 302. Illustrated in Schefold 1989, 117, figure 95.

³⁸Kahil (*LIMC*) identifies this scene as the wedding of Helen and Menelaos. I see Menelaos' spear as more appropriate for his recovery of Helen, than for his wedding to her. Oltos' cup at the Getty with a spear holding Menelaos recovering Helen provides an iconographic parallel.

148). That the same painter represents both Polyxena and Helen in a similar manner argues for an intentional linking of their iconographies. Although the sword has traditionally been thought to be critical in scenes of Helen's recovery, the Brygos Painter's lekythos suggests that we need to be less insistent on iconographic consistency in our interpretation of the images.

ICONOGRAPHIC AMBIGUITY

Many Attic black-figure vase-paintings without inscriptions depict a warrior or warriors escorting a woman, and these scenes may represent Helen, Aithra, or Polyxena, and perhaps even Briseis or Iphigeneia. Figures 156, 157, and 158 illustrate three such examples that give an idea of the number and variety of such scenes.³⁹ Guy Hedreen notes that "the representations of a woman being led by a warrior with a spear are as likely to represent the rescue of Aithra as to picture the recovery of Helen."⁴⁰ The fact that there are many such black-figure scenes of which we cannot be certain of the subject suggests that the iconography might have been left intentionally open-ended. I would add that these depictions could also represent Polyxena or Iphigeneia. A red-figure fragment in Athens, Akropolis 212, encourages us to be more flexible in how we interpret the pictorial narrative, as the iconography of the scene and the fragmentary inscription with only a final epsilon preserved supports an

³⁹Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.150=S.80.AE.296 (*LIMC*, Helen 321); Copenhagen, National Museum 5613 (*LIMC*, Helen 355); Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale RC 1646 (*LIMC*, Helen 344). Despite the fact that the subject of these vases are uncertain, they are often described as depictions of Helen, and are not given as possible depictions of Polyxena or any of the other women.

⁴⁰Hedreen 2001, 42.

identification of the female figure as either Helen or Polyxena (POL 29, Fig. 180).⁴¹

The point is not just to rename or reclaim these works as depictions of Polyxena rather than Helen, but to recognize that the visual iconography and visual narrative is ambiguous, to acknowledge that this vagueness might have been intentional, and then to ask why this may have been done. Rather than identify the women on vases like those illustrated in Figs. 156-158 as uncertain depictions of Helen, it should be acknowledged that the iconography of the scene is appropriate for a range of female figures, including Aithra, Polyxena or Iphigeneia.

In her study of visual redundancy, Ann Steiner observes that “the act of comparison is not necessarily limited to scenes on a single vase, but takes place from vase to vase as well, and it depends on the viewer’s familiarity with families of visual formulas.”⁴² The iconography of Helen’s recovery by Menelaos and the sacrificial virgin’s procession to sacrifice can be seen as belonging to the same “family of visual formulas.” I refrain, however, from adopting A. Steiner’s use of the word “template” to refer to the standard or canonical way in which a myth is represented because the word “template” seems to infer the primacy of an Ur-depiction of a myth that exerts a hegemonic influence over subsequent depictions.⁴³ I prefer not to see the iconography of Helen’s recovery as a “template” for scenes of this configuration. So many of the black-figure scenes of

⁴¹Athens, Akropolis National Museum 212. Discussed in Hedreen 2001, 43, note 69.

⁴²Steiner 1993, 219. See also Steiner 2007.

⁴³Steiner 1993, 217.

a man leading off a woman do not have inscriptions, so we cannot be certain that these depict Helen and Menelaos, representations of which were then used as templates for the representation of other myths.

In *Style and Politics in Athenian Vase-Painting*, Richard Neer formulates a theoretical framework that finds pictorial uncertainty or ambiguity at the heart of Attic red-figure vase-painting, whose images he interprets through the “connecting and coordinating” of *form* and *ideology*. Neer writes: “...the slippery, uncertain aspect of vase-painting is at once a formal and an ideological property. Pictorial ambiguity was ‘good to think with’: it provided vase-painters and their audiences with a uniquely supple matrix in which to work out new conceptions of Athenian civic identity.”⁴⁴ Neer is especially interested in how pictorial ambiguity conveyed meaning in a political context, arguing that “ambiguity or uncertainty of representation becomes an ambiguity or uncertainty about class, status, and the exercise of power.”⁴⁵ As the many black-figure representations of a warrior or warriors escorting a woman illustrate, pictorial ambiguity is not the invention of red-figure artists. While Neer is concerned primarily with how formal uncertainty illuminates political ideology, I am interested in shifting the focus of his theoretical lens to explore how pictorial ambiguity illuminates ideologies of gender and sexuality. The uncertainties outlined by Neer need not reflect merely ideas about class, status, power, and civic identity, but also a working out or reflection on ideas of womanhood, sexual agency, and gendered identity. The female figures in the Trojan epic and what

⁴⁴Neer 2002, 2-3.

⁴⁵Neer 2002, 185.

they stood for were indeed also “good to think with” regarding issues of gender and identity.⁴⁶

POLYGNOTOS’ LOST WALL PAINTINGS

From his reconstruction of Polygnotos’ lost wall painting of the fall of Troy from the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi (POL 9), M. Stansbury-O’Donnell argues that “the responsibilities of both Trojans and Greeks for their actions and the closely linked relationships between events of the past, present, and future emerge as important themes in the *Iliupersis*.”⁴⁷ This interweaving of themes in the Classical *Iliupersis* panel painting was not an invention of Polygnotos, but rather the culmination of a long tradition that finds an equally careful expression in the earlier vase-paintings of the Kleophrades Painter, Onesimos, and the Brygos Painter, among others.

Among the throng of Trojan women in Polygnotos’ painting, Polyxena was the last female figure on the lower level, a position that drew attention to her, enough so that Pausanias was able to identify her (POL 9). He records:

Γυναίκε] δ’ α↓ Τροϙδε] α⇒ξμαλϙτοι] τε ≥δη κα← | δυρομΥναι]
 /ο⇔κασι. γΥγραπται μ’ν εΑνδρομϙξη, κα←] πα↑] ο↓ προσΥστηκεν
 ωλ)μενο] το\ μαστο\— . . . γΥγραπται δ’ Μηδεσικϙστη,
 ψυγαΥρων μ’ν Πριϙμου κα← α[τη τ\ν ν)ψων, /φϙκ⇔σσαι δ’ /]
 Π→δαιον π)λιν φησ⇐ν α[τ↓ν ϙΟμηρο] ϙΙμβρ⇔ϙ ΜΥντορο]
 συνοικο\σαν. “ μ’ν δ↓ ϙΑνδρομϙξη κα← “ Μηδεσικϙστη
 καλ(ματϙ ε⇒σιν /πικε⇔μεναι, ΠολυφΥνη δ’ κατϙ τϙ ε⇒ψισμΥνα
 παρψΥνοι] ϙναπΥπλεκται τϙσ/ν τ≈ κεφαλ≈ τρ⇔ξα]: ϙποψανε↑ν
 δ’ α[τ↓ν/π⇐ τⓈ ϙΑξιλλΥϙ] μν→ματι ποιητα⇔ τε ϙδουσι κα←

⁴⁶On the use of characters in epic to think through political ideas, see Goyet 2006.

⁴⁷Stansbury-O’Donnell 1993, 214.

$\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\sigma f\nu \tau\varepsilon \square A\psi\rightarrow\nu\alpha\iota\rfloor \kappa\alpha\leftarrow \Pi\varepsilon\rho\gamma\mu\otimes \tau\approx \mid \pi\rho \text{Κα}\lambda\kappa\omicron\upsilon$
 $\psi\varepsilon\alpha\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\rfloor \omicron^{\text{TM}}\delta\alpha/\xi\omicron(\sigma\alpha\rfloor/\rfloor \tau^{\circ}\rfloor \text{Πολυφ}\Upsilon\nu\eta\rfloor \tau\rfloor \text{πα}\psi\rightarrow\mu\alpha\tau\alpha.$ ⁴⁸

The Trojan women are represented as already captives and lamenting. Andromache is in the painting, and near stands her boy grasping her breast; . . . In the painting is also Medesicaste, another of Priam's illegitimate daughters, who according to Homer left her home and went to the city of Pedaeum to be the wife of Imbrius, the son of Mentor. Andromache and Medesicaste are wearing hoods, but the hair of Polyxena is braided after the custom of maidens. Poets sing of her death at the tomb of Achilles, and both at Athens and at Pergamon on the Caicus I have seen the tragedy of Polyxena depicted in paintings.

As the last female figure on the lower level of Trojan captives, Polyxena stands in opposition to the seated figure of Helen in the center of the composition. In Polygnotos' painting, Polyxena appears near Andromache and Astyanax—all these figures are also woven into the composition of the Brygos Painter's cup in Paris. Is it mere coincidence that Polyxena is depicted next to Medesicaste, an illegitimate daughter of Priam? I believe the viewer was to compare the status of these two women as daughters of Priam, one legitimate and the other not.

Stansbury-O'Donnell describes how Polygnotos "effectively placed contrasting or complementary images on either side of a group, on an adjacent wall, or on a facing wall, achieving a highly symmetrical and reflective interweaving of images and ideas."⁴⁹ For instance, both Polyxena and Astyanax appear on the northeast corner of the north wall, and are juxtaposed with the figure of Neoptolemos, at whose hands both will die, on the left hand side of the

⁴⁸Pausanias 10.25.9-10.

⁴⁹Stansbury-O'Donnell 1989, 212. See Simon (1962, 48) on the use of antithetical pairs used by Polygnotos. Cited in Stansbury-O'Donnell (1989, 212, note 32).

east wall. In his reconstruction, Stansbury-O'Donnell comments that the seated figure of Helen was the "primary focus" of the Sea Scene on the north wall (POL 9, Fig. 90) and that this arrangement followed Pausanias' description, as he used her as the reference point in locating the groups of figures around her.⁵⁰ The composition of the scene was balanced by having, in part, a group of female figures including Briseis to Helen's left, and a throng of captive Trojan women on two levels to Helen's right.

In terms of representing women, the figure of Helen is at the center of the composition, and Stansbury-O'Donnell observes that the other women around her, such as Briseis, Aithra, and Polyxena, physically or visually serve her.⁵¹ I would expand Stansbury-O'Donnell's observation and suggest the women around Helen also serve her thematically, as they are juxtaposed to present different types of women, thus creating an even richer network of allusions in the Sea Scene. The seated Helen, and her place of privilege, is then juxtaposed with that of the standing Trojan women, already conquered and stripped of their status.

Besides the paintings at Delphi, Polygnotos also painted at least three of the six pinakes that Pausanias saw in the Pinakothek in Athens, one of which he tells us depicted "Polyxena about to be sacrificed near the grave of Achilles" (POL 8). E. Simon has brilliantly described how three of the pinakes thematically present a princess in relation to a Homeric hero as the main subject.⁵² Of the other two paintings, one depicted Nausikaa and Odysseus, and the other

⁵⁰Stansbury-O'Donnell 1989, 207.

⁵¹Stansbury-O'Donnell 1989, 207.

⁵² Simon 1963, 60-1.

Deidameia in a scene with Achilles on Skyros. Deidameia, like Polyxena, was a bride of Achilles. Simon's insights show how Polygnotos thought of his female figures in relation to one another, and how we may characterize him as "a painter of female beauty and destiny."⁵³

A skyphos in Boston sheds further light on how vase-painters juxtaposed female figures to create meaning. On an Attic red-figure skyphos signed by Makron as painter and Hieron as potter in Boston,⁵⁴ G. Hedreen interprets the inclusion of Kriseis, the daughter of the priest Kriseus, in a scene of Helen's recovery as an example of "thematic juxtaposition" because these two women "effected the deaths of the greatest numbers of Achaians and Trojans."⁵⁵ In discussing the same scene, M. Anderson is aware of the potential gendered meanings of the scene by suggesting that Kriseis' "inclusion here seems to be asking whether we can categorize these two women [Kriseis and Helen] together as passive victims of male aggression."⁵⁶ I would like to take Hedreen's sensitive interpretation a step further and suggest that the iconography of Helen's return in Makron's picture also recalls scenes in which Briseis is led to Agamemnon's camp, and in which Polyxena is led to sacrifice.⁵⁷ In other words, the network of juxtapositions in Makron's painting include not only Helen and Kriseis, but also invoke Briseis, Polyxena, and Iphigeneia, so that the role of Helen in the Trojan

⁵³Simon 1963, 61.

⁵⁴Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 13.186. ARV² 458.1.

⁵⁵Hedreen 1996, 177.

⁵⁶Anderson 1997, 260.

⁵⁷On the relation between Briseis and Chryseis in the *Iliad*, see Brulé 2003, 44-54.

Cycle is visually and semantically linked and in dialogue with the presentation of the roles and fates of these other maidens as well. In a similar way, the figure of Helen in Polygnotos' sea scene was juxtaposed with the Trojan women, contrasting their fates.

In addition to the juxtaposition of figures in the composition, artistic style may also have generated meaning in a painting. In describing either the figure of Polyxena depicted in the Pinakothek in Athens or in the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi, an epigram of Pollianus tells us, "This is the Polyxena of Polykleitos, and no other hand touched this divine picture. It is a twin sister of his Hera" (POL 9).⁵⁸ Despite the confusion over the name of the artist, we must imagine that the physiognomy and/or general appearance of this Polyxena closely resembled the figure of Hera, enough so that this was observed by at least one viewer. Since Polyxena is described in this epigram as supplicating for her life and covering up her nakedness, as her garment was torn, we can assume that the faces of the two women must have been very similar, as Hera would not have been depicted in such a desperate manner. I believe that a similar physiognomy was used in the rendering of Polyxena and Hera in order to contrast the situations and fates of these two women. Polyxena, the captive Trojan and soon-to-be bride of Achilles in her marriage-death, was then to be contrasted with Hera, the wife par excellence of Zeus.⁵⁹ Comparing Polyxena to Hera could also

⁵⁸*Greek Anthology* 16.150.

⁵⁹Bergmann (1994, 245) argues that paintings of Hera, Briseis, and Helen in the atrium of the House of the Tragic Poet in Pompeii were juxtaposed for thematic purposes, and that comparison among these women would have been encouraged through the use of similar formal elements that link the paintings. "For those who know their stories," according to Bergmann, "the formal resemblances invite consideration of the very different situations of the three women—Hera, the

have been a way of ennobling the Trojan maiden, glorifying her sacrificial role in the Trojan epic, all the more so because Hera was against the Trojans in the *Iliad*.

The iconographic ambiguity between Helen and Polyxena also appears in one of the earliest works of Greek art with a combination of Iliupersis scenes, that is the seventh-century BC terracotta relief pithos in Mykonos (POL 23, Figs. 100a-r). Metope 7 has attracted attention because of the more elaborately embroidered dress of the female figure compared to the other women on the vase (Fig. 100b). The woman wears a long tunic, mantle and shawl and is confronted by a sword-wielding man who threatens her. The scene is thought to be the recovery of Helen, which is the identification that M. Ervin settles upon, although noting that it might also depict Polyxena led to sacrifice.⁶⁰ The woman holds out her shawl with her right hand, and has her left hand pulling at her garment, baring her shoulder, and about to reveal more. This has been taken to be a visualization of how Menelaos drops his sword when he sees Helen's breasts, a story known from Aristophanes, and mentioned by a scholion as appearing in Lesches' *Little Iliad*.⁶¹ We must remember, however, that in Euripides' *Hecuba*, Polyxena also bares her breast, and the exposing of the body may be another way in which the traditions of Helen and Polyxena are brought together.⁶²

goddess bride and model for wives; Briseis, torn prize of war; and Helen, the abducted and adulterous queen."

⁶⁰Ervin 1963, 61. See also Ahlberg-Cornell 1992, 79.

⁶¹Aristophanes, *Lys*, 155-6. Hesiod, Loeb, 519. Discussed in Hedreen 1996 and Ahlberg-Cornell 1992, 78-9.

⁶²On the exposing of the maiden's body as a defining characteristic of virgin sacrifice, see Scodel 1996.

The composition of metope 7 also raises the possibility that a similar arrangement of figures appeared on the Chest of Kypselos. In describing a scene on the chest, Pausanias observes, “Menelaos, wearing a breastplate and carrying a sword, is advancing to kill Helen, so it is plain that Troy has been captured.”⁶³ The scene with Menelaos and Helen, Pausanias tells us, is between Alcmena and Zeus (in the likeness of Amphitryon) on one side, and Jason, Medeia and Aphrodite on the other side. The latter scene bore an inscription, “Jason weds Medeia, as Aphrodite bids.” The themes of rape and marriage tie together the three scenes, whether the figures in the middle are Helen and Menelaos, or Polyxena and Neoptolemos. I do not suggest that Pausanias’ identification of Helen and Menelaos is wrong, although he does make mistakes in describing some of the scenes on the chest.⁶⁴ Pausanias’ description, however, is just one interpretation, and does not preclude how the imagery also relates to the iconography of Polyxena. Metope 7, and perhaps also the scene on the Chest of Kypselos, indicate that the iconographic ambiguity between Polyxena and Helen appears as early as the seventh-century BC.

KASSANDRA

The interconnections among women in the Trojan epic extend beyond Helen and the sacrificial virgins. For instance, an Iliupersis scene on the body of a fourth-century BC Apulian red-figure volute-krater attributed to the Baltimore Painter in the Michael C. Carlos Museum combines the recovery of Helen with

⁶³Pausanias V.19.3.

⁶⁴Snodgrass 1998, 108-114.

the violation of Cassandra (Figs. 162a-b).⁶⁵ Both Helen and Cassandra seek sanctuary at a temple sacred to Athena, and both women are rendered in a similar manner as they reach for the cult statue, framed and highlighted by the white architectural setting of the temple. These two women and their relation to one another literally take center-stage in the composition, both formally and thematically. The Baltimore Painter's vase at the Carlos Museum illustrates that the network of allusions among women in the Trojan cycle is dense, and that the practice of juxtaposition was used to allude to other mythological figures. While Cassandra has been linked with Helen by both Hedreen and Mangold, among others, the link between Polyxena and Cassandra has not been explored adequately despite the fact that they are both daughters of Priam.⁶⁶

O. Touchefeu-Meynier has commented on the difficulty of distinguishing between Polyxena and Cassandra in Iliupersis scenes without inscriptions, and this question is raised on an Apulian volute-krater in the British Museum (POL 32, Fig. 108a-l).⁶⁷ The vase is attributed to the Iliupersis Painter, and depicts two women seeking asylum at a cult statue. Raoul-Rochette suggested that the woman on the left side was Polyxena based on the Ionic column with a fillet tied around it at the top left of the scene, which he interpreted as the tomb of Achilles (Figs.108a-e).⁶⁸ The male figure pursuing Polyxena would then be Neoptolemos, who will lead her to sacrifice. The woman on the right side has most often been

⁶⁵Atlanta, Michael C. Carlos Museum 1999.11.6.

⁶⁶Hedreen 2001, 22-63; Mangold 2000, 34-62. On Kasandra, see Davreux 1942, Mason 1959.

⁶⁷London F160. Touchefeu-Meynier (1994, 435) observes, "Quant aux scènes de l'Iliupersis, les confusions entre P[olyxena] et Cassandre sur des documents sans inscription sont inévitables."

⁶⁸Raoul-Rochette 1833, 300-9 (discussed and cited in Moret 1975, 64).

interpreted as Cassandra because of the way her garment falls exposing her breast, with the male figure next to her being the lesser Ajax (Fig. 108f-h).⁶⁹ If the pair on the right side is Cassandra and Ajax, then we would expect the warrior to threaten the woman. In scenes of the rape of Cassandra, Ajax is more often represented as an aggressive, threatening warrior, rather than in the more subdued aspect of the figure on London F 160. Klein suggested that the pair on the right side might be Helen and Menelaos, based on the woman's exposed chest.⁷⁰ To support this identification we can add that the warrior's seemingly non-threatening demeanor seems more appropriate for Menelaos who has just seen Helen's beauty and has fallen in love again, rather than for Ajax who would be about to violate Cassandra.

The figures around the central group at the statue on the Iliupersis Painter's volute-krater in London may also offer further clues. Although problematic because of the absence of Aeneas, I see the old man and child at the top right as Anchises and Ascanius (Fig. 108j). Likewise, although Akamas and Demophon are missing, the figure below the old man and child could be Aithra (Fig. 108k). The arrangement of the figures in the composition may relate to their fates at the fall of Troy. The figures on the right side of the composition all

⁶⁹Schefold and Jung (1989, 293) identify the subject as Cassandra and Ajax, and Helen and Menelaos.

⁷⁰Klein 1877, 259. Discussed and cited in Moret 1975, 66. Moret disagrees with Klein's identification, arguing that Cassandra is more often shown with her chest exposed. However, Moret concedes that Klein's interpretation is supported by an Apulian volute krater in Berlin with the recovery of Helen (Berlin 1968.11, attributed to the Group of Berlin-Branca, illustrated in Moret 1975, pl 22-23, cat. no. 17, p. 31). The woman on the right side of London F 160 is very similar to the figure of Helen on Berlin 1968.11, who is seated on an altar clutching a statue, her garment fallen and her left breast exposed. The figure of Eros intervening on the woman's behalf on the Berlin vase makes it clear that Helen was intended.

escape Troy. This may encourage us to see the woman on the right side of the statue as Helen, because she too is “recovered” during the sack of Troy. In contrast, on the left side of the composition are figures or references to figures who lose their lives at the fall of Troy, including Polyxena, and the column denoting the tomb of Achilles, the warrior himself another casualty of the war. In this framework, Athena sits appropriately above the scene on the left side, herself an agent of the devastation at Troy.

The significance of London F 160 is that it shows the difficulty of differentiating between Polyxena and Cassandra, between Polyxena and Helen, and between Cassandra and Helen in Iliupersis scenes without inscriptions. The vase might preserve Polyxena and Helen juxtaposed side-by-side in the same scene. The central group with Polyxena and Helen would then endow the subject of the work with a thematic ambitiousness, telling the whole story of the Trojan War in just one vignette, depicting two women who embody the cause and consequences of the war.

To illustrate that instances of comparison or allusion are intended, we must examine other contexts in which Polyxena appears. An amphora attributed to Group E in Berlin of about 550 BC depicts Polyxena appended to a scene of the rape of Cassandra (POL 2, Fig. 83).⁷¹ In discussing Polyxena’s inclusion in this scene, Anderson comments that “there is little stimulus here to direct the viewer’s thoughts towards her [Polyxena’s] sacrifice.”⁷² I believe, however, that Polyxena’s inclusion in this scene alludes to her later violation or sacrifice at the

⁷¹Berlin, Staatlich Museen F1698. *ABV* 136.54; *Add²* 37.

⁷²Anderson 1997, 214.

hands of Neoptolemos. This idea finds support on the other side of the vase, where one of the Athenian sacrificial maidens present at the fight between Theseus and the Minotaur resembles Polyxena greatly. The vase-painter uses a similar compositional format on both sides in a way that visually links the soon-to-be sacrificial victims in each scene.

The Lesser Ajax's violation of Cassandra was the reason for the institution of the Lokrian maiden tribute.⁷³ During the sack of Troy, Ajax violated Cassandra in a temple of Athena, and to propitiate the goddess for Ajax's transgression, the Lokrians were required to send as tribute virgin maidens to serve in the temple of Athena at Troy for a period of 1,000 years. Some sources report that the Trojans would kill the maidens if the girls were caught before reaching Athena's temple. Despite questions regarding the accuracy of the preserved literary sources, a third-century BC inscription found in western Lokris in the late nineteenth-century seems to prove that the Lokrian maiden tribute was not just a mythical invention, but a historical reality. The inscription (*IG IX*² 1, 3, no. 706), although fragmentary and much contested, seems to preserve a compact regarding the charge of the Lokrian maidens.⁷⁴ Whether the Lokrian tribute is interpreted as a type of human sacrifice, *pharmakos*, ritual killing, or initiation, it is, at its most basic level, a transaction involving the transfer of a virgin maiden or maidens, and in this regard it is related to Iphigeneia and

⁷³For a summary of the literary evidence and its interpretation, see Hughes 1991, 166-184. See also Graf 1978; Redfield 2003.

⁷⁴See Hughes 1991, 249 note 12.

Polyxena.⁷⁵ Also, the Lokrian maiden tribute follows the general pattern of transgression—plague—oracle—institution of human sacrifice—abolition of human sacrifice.⁷⁶ Therefore, Cassandra’s association with the institution of the Lokrian tribute may have linked her with both Iphigeneia and Polyxena, the two sacrificial virgins of the Trojan epic.

Both Schwenn and Farnell have commented that the tribute of seven Athenian youths and maidens to the Minotaur at Knossos is the closest parallel to the Lokrian maiden tribute.⁷⁷ I do not believe it coincidental that the amphora attributed to Group E in Berlin pairs the rape of Cassandra on one side with Theseus and the Minotaur on the other (POL 2). I suggest that the vase-painter might have intentionally drawn a relation between the tribute of Athenian youths to the Cretan Minotaur and the tribute of virgin maidens from Lokris to the temple of Athena at Troy. The violation of Cassandra depicted on the vase could be a proleptic reference to the institution of the Lokrian tribute. If so, then the inclusion of Polyxena as an on-looker in this scene may have been intended to associate her as the soon-to-be sacrificial offering to Achilles with the offering of the Lokrian maidens to Athena.

The amphora attributed to Group E in Berlin argues that Polyxena had a place in Cassandra’s story. Slightly earlier than the Group E amphora, Polyxena may be included on the fragments of a black-figure amphora in Paris attributed

⁷⁵The following works explore the commodification of ancient women in transactions of exchange between men: Rabinowitz 1993; Scodel 1996; Wohl 1998; Ormand 1999; Ferrari 2002; Rosseli forthcoming. More generally, see the seminal works on this subject by Lévi-Strauss (1949) and Rubin (1975).

⁷⁶Redfield 2003, 89; Hughes 1991, 82.

⁷⁷Schwenn 1915, 52 note 1; Farnell 1921, 300. Cited in Hughes 1991, 166, 248 note 2.

to Lydos, c. 560-540 BC, that depict in the same panel the rape of Cassandra along with the murder of Priam by Neoptolemos (POL 25).⁷⁸ In Lydos' representation, Polyxena is included behind the altar on which Priam is killed. Polyxena pleads for her father's life, her arms extended in a gesture of supplication, just as Helen's arms are extended as she pleads for her life in Onesimos' depiction of her recovery on his cup in the Villa Giulia.

Polyxena and Cassandra may also appear together on a polychrome relief lekythos depicting scenes of the Iliupersis found at Delphi (POL 33, Figs. 109a-d).⁷⁹ Although poorly preserved, one can still make out its general composition. Two groups of figures flank a Palladium, which stands in the center of the scene. To the left of the Palladium is a Greek warrior (head missing), nude except for a cloak that flutters behind him, who has his arms wrapped around the waist of a woman. The group to the right of the Palladium consists of a Greek warrior with a shield on his left arm and who grabs a woman by her hair with his right hand, causing her knees to bend. In front of the Palladium is a woman kneeling on the ground, head bent down and right arm to her chest. Perdrizet suggests that the Trojan woman on the ground in front of the Palladium, whom he describes as disheveled and in a desperate attitude, might be Cassandra; and he suggests that the woman who seems to be struggling in vain against the Greek who has his arms around her might be Polyxena.⁸⁰ He also offers Ajax as a possible

⁷⁸Louvre F29. Illustrated in Anderson 1997, 210-11.

⁷⁹Perdrizet 1908, 166 cat. no. 365, pl. XXVI, 3-5; Courby 1922, 138 cat. no. 7, pl. IV, a.

⁸⁰Perdrizet 1908, 166.

identification of the warrior grabbing the woman's hair and leaning on her knees. Unfortunately, no explanations are given for these identifications.

Although the relief lekythos is Attic, it is tempting to look to Polygnotos' earlier Iliupersis wall painting once in the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi as a possible influence.⁸¹ We are offered little insight though because Pausanias tells us that the Trojan women in Polygnotos' painting "are represented as already captives and lamenting," that is the moment after the sack.⁸² Pausanias does record, however, that in the painting Cassandra "is sitting on the ground, and holds the image of Athena, for she had knocked over the wooden image from its stand when Ajax was dragging her away from sanctuary."⁸³ The woman on the relief lekythos does not hold the Palladium, but she does sit on the ground in front of it. To right of the woman, and just past the other group of figures, Perdrizet identifies what he calls a seat or perhaps a cult object that rolls to the ground. Might there be some connection here with Pausanias' description of Cassandra in Polygnotos' painting? The difficult to interpret object on the relief vase might be the stand or cult object knocked over in Cassandra's ordeal, a reference or allusion to the episode represented in Polygnotos' painting.

Even if we cannot identify with certainty the Trojan women on the relief lekythos, it is fair to say that the experiences of three different women during the sack of Troy are being juxtaposed on this vase. If one of these women was

⁸¹Courby (1922, 138) describes it as probably Attic. The lekythos was made c. 425 BC, and the lost wall painting from the Lesche of the Knidians is from about 475-450 BC.

⁸²Pausanias 10.25.9.

⁸³Pausanias 10.26.3.

intended to be Cassandra, which is possible since her story was so closely linked with her flight to the Palladium, perhaps some ancient viewers would have imagined the other two women as her sisters, daughters of Priam. The daughters of Priam are likely linked on other works of art as well. Later in this chapter, I propose that the figure of Polyxena on the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup is linked with the running female figure on the opposite side of the cup, who may be Cassandra.

A fragment of a seventh-century BC relief pithos from Tenos also highlights the visual ambiguities among representations of Polyxena, Helen, and Cassandra (Fig. 145).⁸⁴ The fragment preserves part of the body of a female figure standing with her arms crossed in front of her chest, similar to the pose of the woman in metope 13 of Mykonos 2240, but without her hands being bound. Behind the woman, all we have is part of the face of a warrior, and part of his spear and round shield. J. Schäfer saw the subject as the recovery of Helen.⁸⁵ Noticing that the warrior's head is lower than the woman, M. Ervin interpreted the subject as the rape of Cassandra, with the Trojan maiden standing on the step of an altar.⁸⁶ G. Ahlberg-Cornell has identified the woman as Polyxena, with the kneeling warrior behind her as Achilles waiting to ambush Troilos.⁸⁷ In part, the difficulty of the Tenos shard lies in its fragmentary nature, but even with more

⁸⁴Tenos, Tenos Archaeological Museum n.a. Illustrated in Ahlberg-Cornell 1992, 53 cat. no. 25, 304 fig. 77; Schwarz 2001, pl. 10.4.

⁸⁵Schäfer 1957, 82-3.

⁸⁶Ervin 1963, 62.

⁸⁷Ahlberg-Cornell 1992, 54 (with summary of previous interpretations p. 54 note 75). Both Fittschen (1969, 171-2) and Canciani (1984, 54) have also mentioned Polyxena as a possible identification of the woman, but with caution and not convinced.

preserved, the scenes on Mykonos 2240 suggest that we still might not be able to identify the figures with certainty. The Tenos fragment reminds us of the range of possibilities of how women in the epic cycle may be represented and the similar compositional formulae that ties them together.

An Apulian hydria in Taranto shows how the iconography of the sacrificial virgins may also be related to other women's stories outside the Trojan cycle (Fig. 160).⁸⁸ The Taranto hydria, closely associated with the Painter of the Berlin Dancing Girl, presents us with a nude youth wearing a chlamys and holding a spear who grasps the wrist of a veiled woman. To left of the woman is a youth in a short chiton holding a spear, and to left of him is a bearded man holding a staff. The motif of a man, or men, armed with a spear who leads a woman or grasps her arm connects the Taranto hydria with the Brygos Painter's Iliupersis cup in Paris and with other depictions of Helen's recovery, like Oltos' cup in Malibu. The Taranto hydria, however, has been described as Antigone being led by two guards before Kreon. Without any reference to other episodes from the sack of Troy, and because of the presence of the bearded man, the iconography of the Taranto vase seems more appropriate for Antigone's story than for Helen's or that of the sacrificial virgins. Although the subject of Antigone is uncommon in the visual arts, she may have been linked with the sacrificial virgins because of her tragic fate, suicide tinged with sacrificial undertones of martyrdom. The image of Antigone on a relief bowl in Halle also closely resembles a representation of Polyxena on a Megarian bowl once in Berlin, but now lost (compare Figs. 93 and 159). Both women are on their knees with their hands up in the air. While

⁸⁸Taranto 134905. *RVAp I*, 8, 18, pl. 3.4.

Antigone and Polyxena belong to different traditions, their similar fate allowed them to be visually and thematically drawn together.

THE SACRIFICIAL VIRGIN IN ILIUPERSIS TABLEAUX

Works of art like the Kleophrades Painter's hydria in Naples, Onesimos' cup in the Villa Giulia, Oltos' cup at the Getty, the Brygos Painter's cup in the Louvre, and Polygnotos' lost wall paintings in Delphi indicate that the compositions were carefully constructed, exhibiting a coherence in subject matter and theme. While Anderson looks at the "correlations" in the Trojan epic and the combination of Iliupersis scenes on Greek vases, he does not look specifically at how the various female figures of the Trojan epic are combined in vase-painting.⁸⁹

The Brygos Painter ties together the pictures on the two sides of his Louvre Iliupersis cup through the use of gesture and composition in such a way that the figures, or groups of figures, are visually linked across the bottom of the bowl of the cup (Fig. 88o). For instance, the central scene of Neoptolemos attacking Priam, falling back on the altar of Zeus, on the center of one side is echoed in the compositional format of the Greek attacking a fallen Trojan warrior on the other side (Fig. 88o, C-D and I-J). Neoptolemos' action in swinging the body of Astynax over his shoulder relates in the opposite position, across the circumference of the cup, to the movement of Andromache who uses both arms to swing a pestle over her head (Fig. 88o, D and K). Astyanax appears twice on

⁸⁹Anderson 1997.

the exterior of the vase, and both appearances are opposite of one another, in one instance dead, and the other alive (Fig. 88o, E and L, detail figs. 88i-j). The shield device of a snake on Akamas' shield recurs in the shield device of the Greek at the handle on the other side (Fig. 88o, A and G).

If there is a network of interconnections across the cup's exterior, then Polyxena is being linked with the female figure opposite her (Fig. 88o, B and H). M. Robertson has made the attractive suggestion that the unnamed running figure in this scene may be Cassandra (Fig. 88, H; detail figs. 88 l-m).⁹⁰ If so, two daughters of Priam would be connected on this vase. Also, the fleeing female figure's right leg is exposed, so one could argue that this is because she is simply running quickly. Andromache, however, also lunges vigorously to right and we do not see her exposed leg, but just the outline of her leg pressing against her chiton (compare Figs. 88h and l). I interpret this as a proleptic reference to Cassandra's violation by the Lesser Ajax (Fig. 88l). Just as Polyxena's left hand lifts up her garment, so too does the running woman grasp at her mantle with her right hand. While the head of each woman is turned to right as she moves to left, when the cup was tipped over or when it would have been hung up on a peg, the effect is to have both women facing and moving in opposite directions.

In looking at the scenes on the exterior of the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup, the viewer is invited to compare the female figures. Polyxena stands out as the only female figure on one side of the cup, and she is distinguished from the two women on the other side of the cup by her lack of

⁹⁰Robertson 1992, 95.

movement. In contrast to the vigorous movement and action of Andromache swinging the pestle and of the running woman, Polyxena is characterized by a quiet stillness as she is led off to her death.⁹¹

On Oltos' cup in the Getty, the scenes on the exterior include the depictions of Priam's murder, Helen's recovery and the rape of Cassandra (Figs. 103a-c). How then are we to interpret the running female figure holding a hydria on the interior tondo of this cup (Fig. 103a)? It seems strange considering the careful thematic unity of this cup's decoration to suggest that the tondo decoration merely depicts a genre scene. Without an inscription, we cannot be certain of her identity. I would like to see her, however, as Polyxena. While Polyxena's sacrifice is a relatively uncommon subject in Greek art, she appears frequently in scenes at the fountain house with or without her brother Troilos. It was at the fountain that Achilles ambushed Troilos, whom the Greeks had to kill, according to prophesy, in order to take Troy. In scenes at the fountain, Polyxena is often seen dropping her hydria as she runs away.⁹² The identification of the woman as Polyxena would then make an analeptic reference back to her earlier participation in the episode at the fountain house.⁹³ Polyxena at the fountain would be a prelude to the current action and narrative taking place on the exterior of the cup, similar to how Briseis and Phoinix on the tondo of the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup has been interpreted as a prelude to the action on the outside. Depicting Polyxena in the tondo would juxtapose her with Helen and

⁹¹Anderson (1997) also makes this observation.

⁹²See *LIMC*, Polyxena cat. nos. 2-16.

⁹³On analepsis, see Hedreen 2001, 88 and 223; Stansbury-O'Donnell 1989.

Kassandra on the same vase. Such thematic cohesion would not be unparalleled for Oltos. J. Neils has suggested that Oltos may have presented an “interrelated trilogy” of Theseus and his loves on a cup in London, which might give us the hero with Antiope on the obverse, with Helen on the reverse, and with Ariadne in the tondo.⁹⁴

POLYXENA AND TROILOS

Oltos’ reference to Polyxena’s role in the ambush of Troilos at the fountain may have been intentional. Later writers saw Polyxena’s participation in this episode as the moment when Achilles first saw the Trojan maiden and fell in love with her, and this subject became a trope in Hellenistic and Roman romances. According to Hedreen, the “visual similarities” between two Tyrrhenian amphorae by the Timiades Painter, one in London with Polyxena’s sacrifice and one in Munich depicting the death of Troilos, suggests a “further elaboration of the many correlations between the stories of Troilos and Polyxena.”⁹⁵ In particular, Hedreen cites the similar omphalos-shaped altar with cross-hatching as a landscape device that visually links the stories of Troilos and Polyxena. As Hedreen points out, both Troilos and Polyxena are children of Priam, and both are killed at the hands of or because of Achilles.⁹⁶ Hedreen seeks to increase the correlations between brother and sister by interpreting the murder of Troilos as a

⁹⁴Neils 1981. London E 41. *ARV*² 58.51. Signed by Kachrylion and attributed to Oltos. c. 520 BC.

⁹⁵Hedreen 2001, 135. Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen 1426. *ABV* 95.5.

⁹⁶Hedreen 2001, 135.

human sacrifice, which I believe takes the comparison too far.⁹⁷ The death of Troilos would better be described as a ritual killing.

Hedreen goes on to suggest that both Troilos and Polyxena might have been killed in places sacred to Apollo. While Troilos was killed in the Thymbraion of Apollo, Hedreen cites the appearance of the tripod in the scene of sacrifice on the Polyxena Sarcophagus to suggest that Achilles was buried in a place sacred to Apollo, and consequently that Polyxena was killed in a place sacred to Apollo.⁹⁸

Martin Robertson has also explored the “interweaving” of the stories of Troilos and Polyxena in myth and literature.⁹⁹ He identifies the fleeing woman on an Etruscan black-figure neck-amphora in Paris, Louvre E 703, as Polyxena (POL 38, Fig. 115a-b).¹⁰⁰ In this scene, attributed to the Silen Painter and dating from the mid sixth-century BC, a female figure flees to right up the stairs of an altar or fountain as she is pursued by two warriors, one brandishing a sword and the other raising a spear.¹⁰¹ On the other side of this vase, Achilles drags Troilos from his horse, leading him to his death. Robertson believes the scene with the woman depicts the story of Polyxena known from the *Kypria*, in which she was wounded during the sack of Troy by Odysseus and Diomedes and then buried by

⁹⁷Hedreen 2001, 135, 164. Hedreen (2001, 164) acknowledges that his interpretation of Troilos as a sacrificial victim is “unconventional,” but he argues that “the sacrifices of Troilos, Polyxena, and Iphigeneia had comparable aims, that is the removal of impediments to the progress of the Achaians’ Trojan campaign.”

⁹⁸Hedreen 2001, 136.

⁹⁹Robertson 1970 and 1990.

¹⁰⁰Dohrn 1937, 146 no. 74.

¹⁰¹Dohrn (1937, 146) attributed it to the Paris Painter.

Neoptolemos. Robertson takes the pairing of Polyxena and Troilos on this vase as evidence that the stories of the siblings were told together.¹⁰² Robertson's interpretations are attractive and I believe he is probably right. As the only surviving depiction of this version of Polyxena's story in art, and uncertain at that, the subject had no established iconography. I am interested in asking why the Silen Painter depicted the scene as he did.¹⁰³

If the Silen Painter had intended to depict the episode from the *Kypria*, could he not have depicted the moment when Polyxena was being wounded by Odysseus and Diomedes? Such a depiction would have parallels. The depiction of Polyxena's throat being cut by Neoptolemos on the Tyrrhenian amphora in London indicates that such violence could have been shown and may have been of interest in Etruria. Likewise, a woman appears about to be killed by two men with swords on a Clazomenian sarcophagus in Berlin, Staatliche Museen 3348 (Fig. 112). There are also numerous depictions on Etruscan urns of Iphigeneia held over an altar about to be sacrificed as she pleads for her life (see for instance figs. 14-46). My point is that the painter of Louvre E 703 visualized Polyxena's story in the *Kypria* as a flight of the maiden to a sanctuary or altar of some type. The scholium that preserves our summary of the *Kypria* tells us that Polyxena was wounded during the sack, but it does not mention her flight or asylum at an altar. This, however, may have been known but not included in the summary. I believe that in depicting Polyxena about to be wounded, the Silen Painter drew on

¹⁰²Robertson 1990, 64-5.

¹⁰³It is tempting to think that this is also the subject on a Clazomenian sarcophagus in Berlin, Staatliche Museen 3348, which depicts a woman between two men who have drawn swords and look about to stab her (POL 36, Fig. 112). However, the inclusion of the horsemen, dogs and other figures flanking the scene are difficult to explain.

his knowledge of Attic vases and iconography, especially those depicting Helen and Cassandra, both of whom sometimes flee to sanctuaries as they are pursued by men who intend to harm them. In other words, Polyxena's story in the *Kypria* was associated with these other myths of fleeing women being threatened. The effect is that the similar composition of these scenes is a visual cue that draws the lives and fates of these women together. At the same time, the composition of Louvre E 703 also functions on another level by recalling that of numerous Attic vases that depict Achilles' ambush and pursuit of Troilos at the fountain-house, with Polyxena fleeing. If the so-called altar on Louvre E 703 is taken to be a fountain-house, and if one visually replaced the man with the spear with a youth on horseback, then this picture would resemble scenes in which Polyxena flees as Achilles pursues Troilos. In this way, the fleeing Polyxena on Louvre E 703 might also have referenced the maiden's role at the fountain-house, and served as a way to draw together the stories of both brother and sister, even before looking at the other side of the vase.

PAIRING WOMEN

A black-figure amphora in Geneva attributed to the Painter of London B174, of about 550 BC, also sheds some light on our puzzle because it seems to depict the recovery of Helen twice, side by side in the same panel (Fig. 149).¹⁰⁴ One pair could certainly be Helen and Menelaos, but who are the other two figures? Ann Steiner's research on "visual redundancy" on Attic vases may not be

¹⁰⁴Geneva Musée d'art et d'histoire 15008. *ABV* 141.2; *Para* 58; *Add²* 16; Chamay 1984, 23; Kahil 1955, p. 73, cat. no. 32, pl. 44, 2. ; *LIMC*, Helen 212.

useful in interpreting this scene because the repetition that Steiner analyzes usually occurs not in one scene, but in different zones of decoration on the same vase. It is tempting to think that the recovery of Helen on the Geneva vase is paired with Polyxena being led to sacrifice. The inclusion of the owl standing in for Athena, however, is difficult to interpret. Could Athena be approving of Menelaos' retrieval of his wife? Could the owl be sanctioning the capture of a Trojan captive or approving of Polyxena's procession to sacrifice to honor Achilles, since Athena was on the side of the Greeks in the Trojan War? An owl also appears in the scene of the rape of Cassandra, which is witnessed by Polyxena, whose name is inscribed, on an amphora attributed to Group E in Berlin (POL 2, Fig. 83, a-c). While we often think of Athena as being near heroes in Greek art, perhaps the appearance of the owl on the Geneva amphora and the fleeing of Cassandra and Helen to cult statues of Athena argue for a greater significance of Athena to women than has been previously thought.

Similar to the Geneva amphora, and of about the same date but better preserved, is an Attic black-figure neck-amphora attributed to Group E in New York, which also pairs the same two scenes side by side (Figs. 150a-d).¹⁰⁵ At first glance, it seems that the scene on the New York amphora is depicting two different moments in the narrative of Helen's recovery. The pair on the left with the warrior approaching the woman would represent the first meeting of Helen and Menelaos, and the pair on the right, with the warrior moving to right and leading the woman away, would then represent Menelaos' leading of Helen back

¹⁰⁵New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 56.171.18. *ABV* 137.61; *Para* 55; *Add²* 37; *LIMC*, Helen 305.

to his ship. I do not think this is what is depicted here, however, because there are subtle differences between the two couples, as if an effort were made to differentiate them. These are most pronounced in the depiction of the warriors' armor and dress. The helmets and short chitons of the two warriors are not decorated the same and the warrior on the right does not carry the shield that is held by the warrior on the left. Similarly, the two warriors on the Geneva amphora wear helmets with different crests, one has a raised crest and the other does not. I see these incongruities not as an example of Archaic variation, but as an attempt to denote distinct figures. If variation between the couples was the sole goal, then the painter could have varied the patterns on the women's garments as well. However, the two women on the New York amphora are dressed almost identically, the only difference that I see between them is in the widths of the patterned borders at the neck of their peploi (that of the woman on the left is wider than that of the woman on the right), but this is almost negligible.¹⁰⁶ And the two women on the Geneva amphora also appear almost identical.

The main difference between the two women on the New York amphora is in their facial expressions, which is admittedly unusual in the Archaic period (compare figs. 150 c and d). The difference is subtle, but is conveyed through the rendering of the women's mouths. The mouth of the woman on the left is rendered with a single straight line, whereas the mouth of the woman on the right is rendered with a single curved line that is down-turned at the inside corner.

¹⁰⁶The woman wear similar peploi, both upper and lower parts painted in red and girded. The red paint is not entirely preserved on the peplos of the woman on the right, so it looks different.

The effect is that the woman on the right with her down-turned mouth appears to be frowning, and she looks more upset or gloomier compared to the woman on the left with her expressionless lips. The eyes of the two women are also different. The eye of the woman on the left is in more of an almond shape compared to the narrower, longer slit of the other woman's eye, and this too contributes to creating a different expression. I concede, however, that the eyes of both women were probably rendered quickly as the drawing is not careful. Even if one does not accept the difference in the rendering of the eye, the eyebrows of both women are also depicted differently. The eyebrow of the woman at left is shorter and more arched compared to the longer, straighter incised line that denotes the eyebrow of the woman at right, giving her face a heavier look. The nose of the woman on the right is also bigger, and has more of a hook on the underside compared to the smaller, more elegant nose of the woman on the left.

Morellian analysis has shown us that painters tended to render certain elements like drapery folds and anatomical parts, such as ears, ankles, and mouths, in the same way, and it is the similarity in these details of draftsmanship that allow us to identify the hands of individual painters. If the vase-painter of the Leagros Group had just incised hastily the mouths of the two women on the amphora in the Metropolitan, then they would probably be rendered in the same manner. The fact that they are different argues that the painter made a conscious decision to render the two mouths differently, perhaps in an attempt to convey different emotions in the two women. The fact that the two women are dressed similarly but have different visages and expressions would contribute to the subtlety of the composition.

To what extent these differences between the two women help us to interpret the scene is still debatable. Would ancient viewers have interpreted the couple on the left as Helen and Menelaos and the couple on the right as Polyxena being led to sacrifice, two episodes from the end of the Trojan War, based on the different visages of the women? This idea could be supported by the fact that the features of the woman on the left are generally more delicate than that of the woman on the right and therefore she was supposed to be seen as Helen, the more beautiful woman. The down-turned mouth and gloomier look of the woman on the right could also have evoked for viewers Polyxena's fate, as she was led to sacrifice. In this way, Helen and Polyxena could have been compared on this vase. Unfortunately, this is a matter of guesswork. Once again, however, the ambiguity of the scene may have been intentional, and considering how rare it is to see what appears to be the same scene depicted side by side, a sixth-century BC Athenian may also have pondered over this scene and the identity of these figures, the artist's intention being for people to bring their knowledge of myth to complete the scene and its meaning.

A Chalcidian black-figure krater in Würzburg, attributed to the Inscription Painter of about 530-520 BC, provides further evidence that the two pairs of figures on the amphorae in Geneva and New York represent different couples (Fig. 151a-b).¹⁰⁷ The Würzburg krater gives us two pairs of figures, but unlike the previous vases discussed, the vase-painter has named all of the figures with inscriptions. The couple on the left is Helen and Menelaos, and the pair on the

¹⁰⁷Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum L160. See Schefold 1992, 220-1.

right is Andromache and Hektor. Influenced by the *Iliad*, the Inscription Painter wanted to compare the happy marriage of Hektor and Andromache with the troubled union of Menelaos and Helen. Subtle visual cues, like the way Helen turns her head away from Menelaos, reveal the different relationship between the two couples.¹⁰⁸ The Inscription Painter's sensitive painting not only compares different types of marriage, but also, by extension, different wives and husbands. Andromache, the faithful and loyal partner is contrasted with Helen, the adulterous wife. The Würzburg krater signals that vase-painters were interested in comparing figures in a scene, and this may help us to understand other examples, like the amphorae in Geneva and New York, that have pairs of figures appearing side-by-side in a scene but without inscriptions.

RESONANCES IN THE ROMAN WORLD

The iconographic and semantic links and comparisons between Helen and the sacrificial virgins were not limited to the Greek period. The similarities in their iconographies have caused confusion for scholars. In 1907, for instance, E. Espérandieu identified the subject on the fragment of a Roman sarcophagus in Marseilles as the abduction of Helen rather than the flight of Iphigeneia from Tauris (TAU 32, Figs. 213a-b).¹⁰⁹ Likewise, T. Szentléleky interpreted the subject of the fragmentary relief from Szombathely as the rape of Helen rather than the

¹⁰⁸Woodford (2003, 71) observes that “visually the two standing couples are not very expressive, but to anyone who has Homer’s verses ringing in his ears, the image of Helen, closely wrapped in her cloak and turning away from her lover as opposed to Andromache, who, though she has her head modestly veiled, holds her cloak open as she faces her husband, speaks volumes.”

¹⁰⁹Espérandieu 1907, vol. I, 101-2, cat no. 120. Also cited in Toynbee 1977, 391, cat. no. viii.

escape of Iphigeneia (TAU 59, Fig. 240).¹¹⁰ V. Brunšmid thought the Bjelovar relief of Iphigeneia represented the flight of Medea and Jason with the help of the Argonauts (TAU 54, Fig. 235).¹¹¹

At the same time, the web of comparisons extends beyond Iphigeneia and Helen. The sacrificial virgins may also be compared to other women in Greek myth-history. B. Bergmann has shown how the famous painting of Iphigeneia's sacrifice from the House of the Tragic Poet thematically relates to other paintings of women in transition in the house, including one of Helen's recovery in the peristyle. A similar interpretive paradigm to that used by Bergmann at the House of the Tragic Poet would attach meaning to the painting of Iphigeneia from Klagenfurt, in which the single figure of the sacrificial virgin on one wall is juxtaposed with Cassandra, Io, and a bust of Dionysos, among other figures, on the other walls (TAU 23, Figs. 204a-l). The Klagenfurt example is evocative because Iphigeneia appears alone, silhouetted against the red of the background. Without a narrative context, it was up to the viewer to "compare" her to the other women and to the figure of Dionysos on the other walls, the similar red background serving to unite the figures. H. Kenner has suggested that the dancer might be Agaue, so that the figures of Dionysos and Agaue might illustrate a scene from Euripides *Bacchae*.¹¹²

On the Capitoline Tabula Iliaca, the figures of Helen and Polyxena are also linked visually (POL 20, Fig. 97a-h). The recovery of Helen takes place to the

¹¹⁰Szentléleky 1971, 63, cat no. 125. Also cited in Bielfeldt 2005, 219 note 588.

¹¹¹Brunsmid 1901, cited in Erdélyi 1950, 83.

¹¹²Kenner 1985, 53ff; cf Piccottini 1989, 190.

right of Priam's palace within the walls of Troy (Fig. 97h). Helen is not named by an inscription, but the female woman, whose garment has fallen, is threatened by a warrior in front of a temple labeled "ΙΕΡΟΝΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΗΣ,∇ so this must be her.¹¹³ Helen is seen in three-quarter view from behind, and she has fallen on her right knee. Below this scene, just outside the walls of Troy, is the sacrifice of Polyxena by Neoptolemos at the tomb of Achilles (Fig. 97g). Polyxena is kneeling, her hands tied behind her back, and her garment has fallen around her waist exposing her chest. The figures of Helen and Polyxena are linked by a strong vertical line that is created by the careful arrangement of figures in the composition and by the framing architectural structures, including the right wing of Priam's palace and of the precinct above it, the temple of Artemis, Achilles' grave stele, the walls of Troy with their strong vertical pillars in between crenellated walls, and by the long thin stele bearing inscriptions that separates the sack of Troy from the friezes on the right side of the tablet. The partial nudity of both women is a further visual cue that links them, as their garments fall. In seeing Helen exposed from behind and Polyxena frontally, it is almost as if we are seeing two sides of the same person.

The verticality that draws together Helena and Polyxena on the Capitoline Tabula Iliaca also links them with the figure of Aithra, whose rescue is depicted in

¹¹³Campbell (2001, 107 [Loeb *Greek Lyric III*]) has observed that the representation of Menelaos threatening Helen with a sword is difficult to see as Stesichorean because of Stesichorus 201 and Ibycus 296. Stesichorus 201: a scholiast on Euripides' *Orestes* records, "I.e., after looking on Helen's beauty did they fail to use their swords? Stesichorus indicates something similar in connection with the men who are on the point of stoning her: he says that the moment they saw her face, they dropped their stones on the ground." Ibycus 296: a scholiast on Euripides' *Andromache* comments, "fawning on the treacherous bitch": overcome by sexual desire. The incident is better handled by Ibycus; in his version Helen takes refuge in the temple of Aphrodite and speaks from there with Menelaos, who is overcome by love and drops his sword. Ibycus of Rhegium in a dithyramb gives a version similar to this."

between Helen's recovery and Polyxena's sacrifice. In this carefully composed composition, the rescue of Aithra is framed vertically by scenes of women being threatened by men. Horizontally, Aithra's rescue is linked visually with the other events that are framed by the front walls of Troy, which include Aeneas escaping from Troy, and Aeneas receiving the penantes. The inclusion of Kalchas to right of the scene of Polyxena's sacrifice might also have evoked the seer's role in the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, thus comparing the sacrifices of the two maidens.

Among the stuccoes in the ceiling of the nave of the Underground Basilica of Porta Maggiore, there is a representation of Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair (IPH 52, Fig. 51). Another panel from the nave with a seated woman holding a Palladium facing a standing youth may depict Iphigeneia and Orestes in Tauris. The composition of the panel recalls the mosaic in the Capitoline Museums (TAU 63), but with Orestes seated and Iphigeneia standing. In other words, two episodes from Iphigeneia's life may have been intentionally juxtaposed, one from Aulis and one from Tauris, comparing two aspects of the maiden, one as sacrificial victim and one as priestess. Other famous women from Greek myth also appear on the ceiling, including Hesione, the Leukippidai, and Eurydike. In the apse there is also a painting of Sappho committing suicide. The Greek poet jumps off a cliff into the sea, welcomed by Leukothea and a merman, as Apollo and Phaon watch. Although it is not known what the Underground Basilica of Porta Maggiore was used for, themes of rape and/or death seem to bind the mythological women in the decorative scheme of the ceiling.

The links and confusions between the stories of Helen and Iphigeneia in the Roman period can also be glimpsed humorously in Petronius' *Satyricon*. In his version of the Trojan War, Trimalchio recounts,

“You see, there were these two brothers, Ganymede and Diomedes. Now, they had this sister called Helen, see. Well, Agamemnon eloped with her and Diana left a deer as a fill-in for Helen. Now this poet called Homer describes the battle between the Trojans and the people of a place called Paros, which is where Paris came from. Well, as you'd expect, Agamemnon won and gave his daughter Iphigeneia to Achilles in marriage. And that's why Ajax went mad. . .”¹¹⁴

Trimalchio ridiculously confuses the stories of Helen and Iphigeneia by telling how Diana left a deer as a substitute for Helen. The humor of Trimalchio's mix-up is underscored by the mention of Iphigeneia just a few lines later, an intertextual pun that would not have been lost on a knowledgeable elite Roman audience.

Italian Renaissance art reflects the persistence of artists in connecting Helen and Polyxena. They are both identified by name as queens on engravings of the Sola-Busca Tarocchi, a deck of tarot cards probably made in Italy in the second half of the fifteenth-century and named after the family that owned the cards. Helen appears in the engravings as the Queen of Coins and Polyxena is named as the Queen of Cups. In this series, Pallas Athena is the Queen of Batons and Olympias (inscribed as “Olinpia”; Alexander's mother?) is the Queen of Swords. The iconography of the cards is difficult to interpret and it is not known whether or not these mythological women were selected for a particular reason.

A courtly connection between these women recognized in fifteenth-century Italy

¹¹⁴Petronius, *Satyricon* 59. D. Lyons (1997, 161) discusses Trimalchio's account of the Trojan War in relation to the confusion over the *eidōlon* in the stories of Helen and Iphigeneia.

might preserve an association or relation between Helen and Polyxena that was known in the Renaissance, perhaps from ancient sources that have not survived. All four of these women also appear in Giovanni Boccaccio's *De Claris Mulieribus* ("*Illustrious Women*") of about 1362.¹¹⁵ An early fifteenth-century French copy of Boccaccio's *Illustrious Women*, known as *Des cleres et nobles femmes*, links the figures of Polyxena and Cassandra. Only one intervening folio separates the beheading of Polyxena from the beheading of Cassandra in the pages of this illuminated manuscript, and both women are depicted kneeling on the floor.¹¹⁶

I do not believe the figure named as Polyxena was mislabeled on the Brygos Painter's cup in Paris. It was not just that a similar pictorial type or convention was used in scenes of Helen's recovery and the virgin maidens' procession to sacrifice, but that these formal schemes were narrative devices that encouraged juxtaposition and allusion, to invoke comparison between the ideas of womanhood represented by women like Polyxena and Helen. The general pictorial type, iconographic conventions, and narrative imagery used by the Brygos Painter may have been intended to link visually and semantically the figure of Polyxena with other representations of not only Helen, but Aithra, Briseis, and perhaps even Cassandra as well. Locating the visual representations of Polyxena within the iconographic tradition of Helen's recovery suggests a closer relationship and a greater significance between these two women than has been previously thought. As we'll see in the next section, the relation between Helen and Iphigeneia on the pyxis in London further explores the comparison.

¹¹⁵See H. Wright 1943; Buettner 1996; Franklin 2006.

¹¹⁶Buettner 1996, figs. 32 and 34 (reproductions of fol. 46v and 48v).

Part II: British Museum E773 and Catalogues of Women

“We are women, and our sex wish each other well and are most firm in defending our common interests.”
Euripides, *Iphigeneia Among the Taurians*, lines 1061-2.

A pyxis in the British Museum by a follower of Douris further argues for an intentional juxtaposition of Helen with Polyxena and Iphigeneia (IPH 2, Figs. 2a-f).¹¹⁷ It is decorated with a series of women in a domestic setting engaged in what were considered appropriate female activities such as adornment and wool-making. At first glance, we would interpret this picture as a so-called “genre” scene.¹¹⁸ The artist, however, has given the name of mythological heroines to all of the figures except for one. The painter has arranged the women in pairs facing one another. Iphigeneia stands half concealed in the doorway posed frontally tying a fillet around her head, in profile to right. She is approached by Danae carrying a chest (Fig. 2 a, c, and f). Iphigeneia stands. Moving from right to left in the rolled-out image (Fig. 2b), the next pair consists of two women standing between a column and the doorway (Fig. 2e). The woman on the left holds a basket filled with fruit. One of these women is Cassandra, the other is the only unnamed figure. The final pair is Helen and Klytaimnestra (Fig. 2d). Helen sits on a stool working wool with a kalathos in front of her, while Klytaimnestra stands facing her with an alabastron in her outstretched right hand.

¹¹⁷IPH 2. Discussed in Reeder 1995, 97.

¹¹⁸On “genre” scenes, see Ferrari 2003. On the “interplay of myth and genre in imagery,” but relating to men, see Marinatos 2002. On Hellenistic genre, see Ridgway 2006.

This vase is the only example preserved in Greek art in which Iphigeneia appears in a scene outside of her usual episodes at Aulis or in Tauris. It is unusual to have all of these mythological women appearing in one scene, and rare that they are depicted outside of their specific narrative contexts. All of these women have rich histories, but do not appear together in one story, so attempts to interpret the scene within a unified narrative framework fail. If the women are not linked in a narrative context, why is Iphigeneia included among the gathering of women on this vase?

WHAT'S IN A NAME?: THE INSCRIPTIONS

The iconography of the London pyxis appears unremarkable. The women's activities, the way in which they are represented, and the composition of the scene are variations on a type that can be found on many other Greek vases. What is remarkable about the London pyxis is that the vase-painter identified almost all of the figures as mythological heroines through the use of inscriptions. Timothy Gantz believes the inscriptions naming the women "confirm that the artist has conflated heroines from different stories to produce a series of unrelated vignettes."¹¹⁹ In attempting to understand the scene on the pyxis, S. Woodford saw the figures of Helena and Klytaimnestra as still young maidens living in their father's home before their marriages.¹²⁰ Deborah Lyons describes the scene as an example of how "it was possible to assimilate heroines to Athenian women in their everyday life" and how these acted as "models for

¹¹⁹Gantz 1996, 584.

¹²⁰Woodford 2003, 119 caption to fig. 113.

correct behavior.”¹²¹ F. Jouan saw the imagery of the pyxis as combining the themes of sacrifice and marriage, and he hypothesized that it had a funerary function, being intended for the tomb of a young girl who had died before marriage.¹²² In discussing the pyxis’ decoration, Lissarrague comments that while the painting does not depict a specific story, “le travail esthétique du peintre est redoublé par la valeur mythique de ces noms.” For him, the scene does not illustrate everyday life, but offers “une dimension poétique” to women’s spaces with the inscriptions naming the figures serving as “une parure supplémentaire.”¹²³ I agree with Lissarrague and hope to show how the inscriptions add another layer of meaning to the scene.

My argument is that by inscribing the names of specific characters, the artist prompted the viewer to think about these women in relation to one another. The inscriptions naming the figures not only identify the women, but remove them from the present narrative and make reference to the stories that made them famous. The inscriptions, therefore, themselves become semiotic signs standing for different types of women, different personifications or ideas of womanhood. The juxtaposition of these different women in the picture invited the ancient viewer to compare what these women stood for and why they were combined on the vase. Beazley remarked that Iphigeneia might have been thought of as the bride here.¹²⁴ If so, then Iphigeneia would be juxtaposed here

¹²¹Lyons 1997, 41. See also C. Lyons 2008.

¹²²Jouan 1984, 65.

¹²³Lissarrague 2002, 264.

¹²⁴ARV² 805.89.

with one of the most famous of all brides, Helen. This pyxis suggests that vase-painters thought of their mythological heroines in relation to one another.

Like both Iphigeneia and Polyxena, Helen is also romantically linked with Achilles in some later sources, perhaps encouraging the network of interconnections among these three women. Pausanias (3.19.13) writes of Achilles and Helen as married in the afterlife on White Island. Lykophron (139-74) references Achilles as the fifth husband of Helen and the scholia to this Lykophron passage refers to Achilles as the fifth husband of Helen “in a dream.”¹²⁵ Both Iphigeneia and Polyxena were destined, in their deaths, to be “brides” for Achilles, and the conflation of wedding and funerary iconography in Greek art and literature has been carefully examined by scholars.¹²⁶ In one genealogical tradition, Helen is the mother of Iphigeneia, which, as Lyons has explained, may be “a way of spelling out the necessary logical relation given their importance in starting and continuing the Trojan War.”¹²⁷

The metopes with scenes of Trojan women threatened and killed by Greek warriors in the sack of Troy on the seventh-century BC relief pithos in Mykonos discussed earlier also illustrates how different women could be combined on a vase (POL 23, Figs. 100a-r). Although the vase seems to evoke the generic

¹²⁵For a careful discussion of the evidence see Gantz 1996, 135; 596. See also Vermeule (1979, 101ff.) on the connection between sex and death in war.

¹²⁶See Seaford 1987 and Rehm 1994.

¹²⁷Lyons 1997, 161.

horrors of the sack of a city, that is the atrocities against women and children, scholars have sought to identify specific women from myth in the scene. For instance, the woman with the elaborate dress in metope 7 is often seen as Helen, the woman with her hands bound on metope 13 as Cassandra or Polyxena, and the woman begging for the child's life on metope 17 as Andromache (Figs. 100b, d, r).¹²⁸ With the Trojan horse on the neck of the vase, it is likely that the scenes on the body refer to the sack of Troy, and there has been a tendency to recover the identities of famous women we would expect to see at the sack of Troy. In this way, the modern day interest in identifying specific mythological figures in such scenes may not have been so different from that of contemporary seventh-century BC viewers of the vase who also thought of women from myth-history as paradigms of female behavior. Part of the interest may have been in trying to identify specific figures, in finding the specific reference in the general presentation.

It is also possible that what seems to us today to be a generic scene of a city sack, also carried more specific references that have been lost. Polygnotos' painting from the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi of Troy "already taken" should be noted in this context. Among the throng of Trojan women shown as captive, divided into two levels, Pausanias was able to identify specific women by name. Although the relief pithos and the lost wall painting are separated by two centuries and depict different moments in the story, we must wonder whether the Mykonos vase belongs to the same tradition in which the identity of specific

¹²⁸Metopes 7 and 13 are discussed by me earlier in this chapter, and in Chapter Two. For the woman in metope 17 as Andromache, see Ahlberg-Cornell 1992, 81-2 (with bibliography).

women would have been understood for all of the female figures, or to which viewers could bring their knowledge of myth to the pictures to tell their own stories.

An example of how the mythological maidens held meanings for contemporary men and women can be seen in the Boeotian grave stele of “Polyxena” in Berlin from about 420 BC (Figs. 147a-e).¹²⁹ Following the conventions of some fifth-century funerary reliefs, the female figure stands in a shallow architectural space between two columns that support a lintel and pediment. The name “Polyxena” is inscribed in Boeotian letters across the lintel (detail figs. 147c-e). The figure of Polyxena wears a peplos with a triangular over-fold in front, and the back of her garment is pulled up over her head as a veil; she also wears shoes. In her left hand she holds a cult statue, although one cannot discern of which goddess. Her left hand would have held something, probably in the form of a metal attachment, as there is a hole drilled between her thumb and other fingers. Polyxena is sometimes thought to be a priestess because of her veil, the cult statue, and the possibility that she could have held a bronze temple key, the architectural frame then referring to the temple that was in her charge.¹³⁰

The inscription naming the figure Polyxena on the Boeotian relief can be interpreted in one of two ways: either as the personal name of the deceased or as a label presenting the deceased as Polyxena. I believe the inscription is most

¹²⁹Berlin, Pergamon Museum, inv. 1504. Illustrated in Dillon 2002, 83; with bibliography 82, note 64.

¹³⁰Dillon 2002, 82-3.

likely a personal name that identifies the deceased, the name itself loaded with mythic and epic meanings.

The fifth-century Polyxena for whom the stele was erected was probably a priestess. Her characterization in the relief resembles depictions of Iphigeneia in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman art in her aspect as priestess of Artemis. In south Italian vase-painting of the Greek period, Iphigeneia sometimes holds a temple key, and in paintings, reliefs, and mosaics of the Roman period, Iphigeneia often holds a cult statue in her hand. Iphigeneia, however, was not a personal name used in the Greek world, most likely because of the heroine's divine status in certain versions of her story.¹³¹ After all, in the Greek world it would have been hubristic to name a child after a divinity. On the other hand, we have evidence for the name Polyxena appearing as a personal name just under 30 times.

Πολυφύνα appears as a personal name about 26 times in the regions of Central Greece, and two more times in uncertain contexts but probably in Attica.¹³²

Here, we see how myth intersected with reality. The naming of a daughter Polyxena certainly would have brought to mind the maiden of mythic renown.¹³³

The Boeotian relief in Berlin is not a hapax. Another example is a marble grave stele of about 460 BC that was found at Larissa in Thessaly.¹³⁴ In this relief, the name Polyxena is inscribed in the pediment. The maiden is depicted

¹³¹On Greek personal names, see Fraser and Matthews 1987-2005.

¹³²Fraser and Matthews 1987-2005.

¹³³I imagine this being similar to how certain names today conjure certain associations. Today in the United States, for instance, the name Eve might reference the Biblical first woman, the names Lincoln and Kennedy might remind us of past presidents, and the name Farrah might bring to mind the 70s star Farrah Fawcett, whose name still brings to mind a certain hairstyle.

¹³⁴Athens, National Museum 733.

alone, holding a pomegranate in her right hand and holding out her veil with her left. The association of the pomegranate with death and the veiling gesture's referencing of marriage in death for a young girl is well-covered territory. It is the inclusion of the inscription naming the girl Polyxena here that adds another layer of meaning. The mythological Polyxena was destined in her death to be a bride to Achilles, and the maiden named Polyxena on the Larissa relief, holding a pomegranate and making a bridal gesture, must have cued the Trojan princess. These associations must have been especially meaningful in the case of this relief since Achilles was said to come from Larissa.¹³⁵ The purpose may have been to equate the death of the historical Polyxena from Larissa with the death of the mythological princess from Troy, thus imbuing her death with the epic significance of the mythological maiden.

CATALOGUES OF WOMEN

The London pyxis makes sense when interpreted within the tradition of catalogue poetry, like the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, because the vase-painter engages in the same practice as the poet of catalogue poetry by juxtaposing diverse heroines. The tradition of catalogue poetry has not yet been connected with the representation of women in Greek art. I see a link between catalogue poetry and some images of women in Greek vase-painting in that both reveal a similar way of thinking about women in relation to one another, reflecting a cognitive mode that was firmly entrenched in the Greek mind. I believe this practice of comparison was more widespread than has been

¹³⁵Virgil, *Aeneid* ii. 197.

previously acknowledged. While the London pyxis literally places different mythological women side by side, I would also include the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup, with its referencing of Helen in depicting Polyxena, as another example. This practice of thinking about women in comparison to one another is ingrained in some mythological stories. The Judgment of Paris, for instance, is often visualized in Greek art as a procession of Hera, Athena and Aphrodite before Paris, who must literally compare the goddesses to one another to decide who is the fairest. Other figures in myth, like the Muses, or Seasons, were also thought of in relation to one another.

The fact that catalogue poetry sometimes presented women in comparison to one another is not obvious considering that the women in Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* are generally accorded only brief descriptions of their physical appearance, with the emphasis of the whole on genealogy.¹³⁶ The *Catalogue of Women*, Γυναικῶν Κατάλογος], also known as the Ἡοίαι, probably dates from the sixth-century BC and gives the genealogy of offspring that resulted from the union between mortal women and gods.¹³⁷ One of the *Catalogue's* distinguishing features is the use of the formula ±ὅς, “or such as,” to introduce different women. Robin Osborne has already linked the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* with “ordering” women in society and thus links the catalogue with ideas about

¹³⁶The physical descriptions, however, can sometimes reveal comparison. For instance, “more beautiful than the goddesses” is sometimes used as a description in the catalogue.

¹³⁷The Greek editions of the *Catalogue of Women* include Merkelbach and West 1967 and Hirschberger 2004. For a discussion of date, see Hunter 2005, 2 and 2 note 8 for references. Standard reference works on the *Catalogue* include West 1985 and Hunter 2005 (with references). On the place of lists and catalogues in oral performances, see Minchin 1996. On invocation as an “appeal for information,” see Minton 1962.

female behavior. Osborne discerns a plot in the *Catalogue*, namely the attraction of men to beautiful women.¹³⁸ Glenda McLeod has also looked at catalogues of women from a broader historical perspective from the time of Hesiod and Homer to that of Christine de Pizan in the fifteenth-century, and how they reflect attitudes of “virtue” and “venom” towards women.¹³⁹ Lillian Doherty has sought how the *Catalogue of Women* might reflect lost women’s traditions, arguing that the *Catalogue* could have been about women, and not just their genealogy.¹⁴⁰ These works mark a shift in seeing more than just genealogy in the *Catalogue of Women*. While acknowledging the primacy of genealogy in the *Catalogue of Women*, I argue that the reference to Iphigeneia (called Iphimede) and Helen in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* was intended to invoke comparison between these two women.

Our earliest known literary reference to Iphigeneia’s sacrifice appears in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. In this work, it is generally agreed that the girl named Iphimede refers to Iphigeneia. Fragment 23a.17-26 M-W tells us:

□ΙφιμΥδην μ’ν σφ□φαν/υκν→[μ]ιδε] □Αξαιο←	17
Βωμ[ι fπθ □ΑρτΥμιδο] ξρυ]ηλακ]□τ[ου] κελαδειν°,]	
≥ματ[ι τρι τε νηυ]←ν □νΥπλ]εον □Ιλιον ε[δσπ	
ποιν↓[ν τει.]μενοι καλλι.]φ(ρου □Αργει<[νη]],	
εδδπ[λον: α[τ↓ν δθ/λαφηβ)]λοσ ⇒οξΥαιρα	21
ρ□ε[ί]α μ□λθ/φε]□[πωσε, κα← □μβροσ]↔ην [ρ]ατε[ιν↓ν	
στ□φε κατ□ κρ°[ψεν, <να ο↓ ξ]ρ∅] [f]μπε[δ]ο[σ] ε[εδη,	
ψ°κεν δθ □ψ□νατο[ν κα← □γ→ρ]αον ≥μα[τα π□ντα.	
τ↓ν δ↓ ν\ν καλΥο[υσιν/π← ξ]ψον← φ\λθ □ν[ψρ⊕πων	25
□Αρτεμιν ε⇒νοδ↔[ην, πρ)πολον κλυ]το\ ⇒[ο]ξ[ε]α↔ρ[ησ.	

¹³⁸Osborne 2005.

¹³⁹McLeod 1991.

¹⁴⁰Doherty 2006.

Iphimede was sacrificed by the well-greaved Achaians on the altar of hunt-crying Artemis of the golden bow, on the day when they sailed their ships to Troy to avenge the theft of beautiful-ankled Argive Helen, But it was a phantom, for the arrow-pouring deer-slayer easily rescued her, anointing her with lovely ambrosia from head to foot, so that her flesh would not perish, and made her immortal and unaging for all time. Now the tribes of men on the earth call her Artemis Einodia, servant of the glorious arrow-pourer.¹⁴¹

This passage explicitly states that Iphimede was sacrificed in order to avenge Helen's abduction. There is a cause-and effect link, a non-genealogical relation, drawn between these two women. This interpretation agrees with the grammar of the original Greek in that $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ is a present middle/passive participle in the masculine nominative plural agreeing in gender, case, and number with the subject of the sentence $\square\text{A}\xi\alpha\iota\omicron\leftarrow$. The circumstantial use of the participle in this sentence functions as an adverbial clause explaining the "why" of the action of the main verb. A more literal translation then would be that "the well-greaved Achaians killed Iphimede on the altar. . . exacting a penalty for. . ." ¹⁴²

Elsewhere in literature, Helen is also given as the reason for Iphigeneia's sacrifice, drawing a comparison between the two women. The *IT* opens with Iphigeneia saying, "my father sacrificed me—so it is believed—to Artemis for Helen's sake in the famous clefts of Aulis".¹⁴³ In the *IA*, the chorus leader comments, "Cruel Helen, because of you and your marriage, a great struggle has

¹⁴¹Translated by Deborah Lyons (1997, 142).

¹⁴²This is closer to the translation given by Gantz 1993, 582-3: "Iphimede the well-greaved Achaians slaughtered on the altar of famed <Artemis of the golden arrows> on that day <when they sailed in their ships> to Ilion <to exact> a penalty for the <slim-ankled> Argive woman, an eidolon, that is.

¹⁴³Lines 8-9.

descended on the sons of Atreus and their children”.¹⁴⁴ Later in the *IA*, when Klytaimnestra finds out about Agamemnon’s plan to sacrifice Iphigeneia, she confronts her husband and says, “And if someone asks you why you will kill her, tell me, what will you say? Or shall I say your words for you? ‘So that Menelaus may get back Helen.’ What a fine thing, to pay for a bad woman in the coin of your own children, buying what is most hateful at the cost of what you love best!”¹⁴⁵ Klytaimnestra refers to Helen as a \forall κακ^οσ γυναικ]σ, \forall and a comparison is drawn between Helen as a bad woman and Iphigeneia as an innocent child. Klytaimnestra’s diatribe is also framed in the discourse of exchange, having to pay for the life of one woman with that of another.

Earlier in Fragment 23a, we are told that Klytaimnestra bore Iphimede and Electra, at which point Iphimede is described as [καλλ \leftrightarrow]φυ]ρον, beautiful-ankled.¹⁴⁶ Five lines later, the same epithet is used to describe Helen.¹⁴⁷ While this epithet is not used exclusively for these two women, I believe the use of the same adjective so close together in the same passage to refer to two different women was an intentional device used to draw attention to them as a pair.¹⁴⁸

The mention of the *eidôlon* at lines 21ff. is another way in which I see the poet of the catalogue drawing a comparison between Iphimede and Helen.

¹⁴⁴Lines 153-4.

¹⁴⁵Lines 1166-1170.

¹⁴⁶F. 23a.15 M-W.

¹⁴⁷F. 23a.20 M-W.

¹⁴⁸Hebe is described as “of the beautiful ankles” (F. 25.28); Mestra is “a maid with delicate ankles” (F. 43a.37); Atalanta is “a delicate-ankled maiden” (F. 73.6); Danae is “with fair ankles” (F. 129.14). Cited in Osborn 2005, 11. Is it a coincidence that Helen, Iphimede, and Danae are all described as “fair ankled” and these three all appear on the pyxis in the British Museum?

Setting aside the difficulties of whether or not the six lines referring to the *eidôlon* are an interpolation and notwithstanding the debate over who introduced the version of Helen's *eidôlon*, the motif of the *eidôlon* as a revisionist strategy to correct narrative inconsistencies is common to the stories of both Iphigeneia and Helen.¹⁴⁹ Deborah Lyons has argued that the use of the *eidôlon* and the idea of apotheosis serve to "bring together" Iphigeneia and Helen, underscoring the rare transformations they experience as heroines who become goddesses.¹⁵⁰ My argument is that the mention of the *eidôlon* in fragment 23a at the beginning of line 21, appearing directly after $\square\text{A}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\angle[\text{v}\eta]\square$ (referring to Helen) at the end of line 20 was another device intended to invoke comparison. While the syntax of *eidôlon* grammatically refers to Iphimede, its close placement next to Helen may have brought to mind for some listeners the story in which an *eidôlon* was substituted for Helen, and thereby invited comparison between Helen and Iphimede in the context of the *Catalogue*. Considering how unusual it is for a mortal to achieve apotheosis and immortality, it is interesting that a few lines earlier in the same fragment we learn that Iphimede's aunt, Klytaimnestra's sister, Phylonoe was also immortalized by Artemis.¹⁵¹ Although Phylonoe is a somewhat obscure figure compared to Helen and Iphigeneia, the idea of immortality links all three of these women, and their inclusion so close together in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* probably encouraged contemporary listeners to compare these womens' stories.

¹⁴⁹On the *eidôlon* in Greek vase-painting, see Peifer 1989.

¹⁵⁰Lyons 1997, 157-62. On the interpolation of F. 23a.21ff, see Gantz 1993, 583-4.

¹⁵¹F. 23a.10-12 M-W.

While I see an effort at juxtaposing Iphimede and Helen in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, I believe this preserves just an echo of the comparisons between these women, and between others, that has come down to us from non-genealogical catalogues of women. The appearance of the different women on the London pyxis, I believe, belongs to the same tradition of non-genealogical catalogues of women, in which different ideals of womanhood are juxtaposed. I do not see the images on Greek vases as reflections of lost non-genealogical catalogues, but as parallel developments that reveal a way of thinking about women in comparisons.

The existence at one time of a tradition of non-genealogical catalogue poetry has been convincingly argued for by Ian Rutherford, who has offered a development and evolution of *ehoie*-poetry that identifies two antecedents that lead to the canonical form of the catalogue as represented by Hesiod. The earlier stage consisted of *ehoie*-poetry as “loosely arranged catalogs of prominent women, perhaps originally aretalogical in character, using the *ehoie*-formula.”¹⁵² At this stage, the *ehoie*-formula was a prominent, functional feature used to present “paradigms of female excellence.”¹⁵³ The next stage, the direct predecessor of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, was *ehoie*-poetry that crossed genealogical poetry with the tradition of non-genealogical poetry, preserving the *ehoie*-formula, but without its original meaning. At this stage, the *ehoie*-formula

¹⁵²Rutherford 2000, 95.

¹⁵³Rutherford 2000, 92.

transforms from a “functional” to a “formal” device.¹⁵⁴ In reference to the development of *ehoie*-poetry formulated by Rutherford, Helen Asquith comments that his argument for a tradition of non-genealogical catalogue poetry seems to be supported by the fact that the “syntactic implications of $\pm\Box$ $\omicron\langle\eta$ suggest a *comparative function*” (emphasis mine).¹⁵⁵ Rutherford also cites the importance of comparing female virtues in the *Odyssey*, such as the juxtaposition of Penelope and Klytaimnestra, as one of the reasons why the poet of the epic uses *ehoie*-poetry in the Nekuia episode of Book 11.225-332. L. Doherty has argued that *Odyssey* 11 provides textual evidence for women’s genres in its focalization of female characters.¹⁵⁶

At the same time, there are examples of catalogue-like poetry that are not expressly of the *ehoie* type, such as the presentation of types of women in Simonides 7.¹⁵⁷ Semonides’ poem presents a typology of different types of wives who are articulated in comparison to one another and for their potential value to men as wives, ranging from the lazy, dirty woman made from a hairy sow to the aristocratic woman who avoids housework made from a mare. “Among the throngs of other women,” according to Simonides, the woman made from a bee “shines as an example” and is the ideal wife on account of her faithfulness and

¹⁵⁴Rutherford (2000, 92) explains this evolution in the genre by turning to the model of “automatization” theorized by Russian formalists, the Antomatezatsiya as articulated by Tynjanov and Sklovsky among others.

¹⁵⁵Asquith 2005, 272.

¹⁵⁶Doherty 2006, 303 and 312-13.

¹⁵⁷Later examples in which different kinds of women are being compared are found in Aeschylus (*Choephoroi* 585-652), Euripides (*Hippolytus* (616ff), and Theophrastus (*Characters*). These are cited in Browning 2007.

industry.¹⁵⁸ Catalogue poetry may not have been the only genre that encouraged comparison and allusion. C. Dué has argued that “the traditional nature of Homeric poetry allows . . . Briseis to evoke such other figures as Helen and Andromache, thereby bringing additional richness to the scenes in which she appears.”¹⁵⁹

THE WOMEN ON THE LONDON PYXIS: COMPARING IDEAS OF WOMANHOOD

The women named and their arrangement in the composition create an intricate network of associations between the individual figures in each pair, and then between pairs of figures as they form a sextet. Helen and Klytaimnestra were sisters and queens, and this could explain why they are paired. Then there is Cassandra and an unnamed woman. But why are Iphigeneia and Danae paired? I propose that the vase-painter paired Iphigeneia and Danae because they were both destined to be brides in death. In fact in Sophocles' *Antigone*, just after Antigone is led off to the cave that is to become her tomb, which she describes as her “bridal-bed,” the chorus compares her fate to that of Danae. The chorus sings, “Danae, even she endured a fate like yours, in all her lovely strength she traded the light of day for the bolted brazen vault—buried within her tomb, her bridal-chamber.” The chorus juxtaposes and compares the fates of Antigone and Danae. A connection between Iphigeneia and Danae is that in various strands of their stories, both women are sometimes rescued or saved from their

¹⁵⁸Lattimore 1960, lines 88-9.

¹⁵⁹Dué 2006.

tragic deaths, and Danae's son Perseus founded Mycenae, the kingdom of which Iphigeneia was a princess.

The figures on the pyxis not only derive meaning from their relationship in pairs, but the web of interconnections extends to individual figures within pairs as well. Klytaimnestra is connected with figures in the other groups of women, for she was not only Helen's sister, but also the mother of Iphigeneia, who appears in the doorway. It is she who kills Cassandra out of jealousy when the Trojan princess was taken to Mycenae to become Agamemnon's concubine. The characterization of these women is richly nuanced, and their portrayal multi-dimensional. So, while Klytaimnestra might often be characterized as an adulterer and murderer, she was also a good mother who loved her daughter Iphigeneia dearly. These differing aspects of Klytaimnestra's character are alluded to through the inclusion of both Cassandra and Iphigeneia on the vase.

In addition, the arrangement of figures conveys meaning as an overall composition. We can imagine one interpretation, in which the pairing of Helen and Klytaimnestra, who are sisters, present models of so-called "undesirable wives," in contrast to the pairing of Iphigeneia and Danae, who represent innocent maidens whose lives are threatened.

When the composition is taken as a whole, two figures stand out among the group of women. The figure of Helen draws our attention because she is the only seated figure in the scene, which is also how she appeared in a contemporary lost painting by Polygnotos once in Delphi. The figure of Iphigeneia is also highlighted because she is literally framed by the doorway in which she stands. Iphigeneia's location in the doorway also emphasized her liminal position.

Doorways or thresholds are often symbolic of transitions. On the vase, the doorway that Iphigeneia stands in not only marks a division between interior and exterior space, but also her liminal position between girlhood and womanhood, and between life and death, echoing marriage imagery. It is no accident that Iphigeneia and Helen were highlighted because they were firmly linked in Greek myth and art, and on the London pyxis these legendary women were intentionally juxtaposed. This recalls the passage in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* discussed above in which a non-genealogical link is drawn between Helen and Iphigeneia.

I do not believe it is coincidental that Iphigeneia and Helen appear together on the pyxis in London. The vase-painter's juxtaposition of different mythological women was a narrative device to invoke comparison and reflection about what these legendary women stood for. The inscriptions naming the women on the pyxis were a way for the artist to highlight different ideas about womanhood, the representation of which both reflected and participated in the fashioning of historical women's identities.

The pyxis is a box for cosmetics or jewelry that would have been used by a woman. One imagines that the aristocratic woman who owned this pyxis could read the inscriptions and this would have prompted her to remember and reflect on these women's stories. A lovely pyxis such as this, with unique inscriptions, must have been admired and treasured. There is only one unnamed woman on the London pyxis. While it is tempting to see her as another mythological figure, perhaps Polyxena, I believe that she may have been intended to provide a point of

entry for the original owner of the vase, who could have imagined herself as the anonymous woman. The original owner of the London pyxis probably would have looked at its painting every day at her toilette, and it would have invited her to think about the lives and fates of the women pictured, and how they related to her own life, or her future life.

The juxtaposition of different mythological women on the London pyxis invited the ancient viewer—and us today—to contemplate why they were combined on the vase. Part of the interest in the picture resides in the visual connections and mythological associations the viewer had to make in order to figure out how these legendary women were related. Such knowledge of myth-history would have been a conceit prized by aristocratic maidens, who we sometimes see reading and playing music on other vases.¹⁶⁰ Besides representing different ideals of womanhood, something darker binds the women named on the pyxis: in some strands of their stories they are all victims of male violence. Helen is threatened by Menelaos during her Recovery at the end of the Trojan War. Klytaimnestra is killed by her son Orestes to avenge his father's death. Cassandra is raped by the Lesser Ajax at the Fall of Troy and is made the concubine of Agamemnon. Iphigeneia is sacrificed to Artemis at the beginning of the Trojan War so that the Greeks can sail to Troy. Danae is raped by Zeus, and then locked by her father in a wooden chest and cast off to die at sea. To some scholars, this would seem to make the iconography of the scene grim. While these women are sometimes the victims of male violence, their tragic fates are also sometimes subverted. For instance, Helen wins back Menelaos' love, with

¹⁶⁰Bundrick 2005.

the help of Aphrodite. Danae is cast off to sea by her father, but she is saved through the intervention of Zeus and Poseidon. And Iphigeneia is not always sacrificed—in some versions of her story she is saved through the intervention of Artemis. The divine favor of these women carries positive connotations. After all, the figures named on the London pyxis are some of the most prominent and powerful women in Greek myth, and their stories and fates reveal the complex spectrum of human strengths and weaknesses that the Greeks saw reflected in their heroes and heroines.

The London pyxis stands in a long line of works that have been influenced or inspired by the tradition of catalogues. A modern counterpart to the heroine's pyxis would be the British painter Edward Henry Corbould's *A Dream of Fair Women* (1859) (Fig. 180).¹⁶¹ Corbould's painting draws on Alfred Tennyson's 1842 poem of the same name, which itself was inspired by Chaucer's *The Legend of Good Women*. The two large women standing in the foreground are Iphigeneia and Helen of Troy, with Ilium burning in the background. Reclining in front of them is Cleopatra. In the distance behind Iphigeneia and Helen is Jephthah's daughter, the sacrificial virgin from the Old Testament. Women from other historical periods are also included, such as Joan of Arc, Rosamond Clifford, and Margaret Roper. Our experience of looking at Corbould's painting today, thinking about why these famous women are juxtaposed in one work, may

¹⁶¹Edward Henry Corbould. *A Dream of Fair Women*. 1859. Mixed media on paper laid down on panel. New York, art market. Christie's, October 24, 2007, 19th Century European Art and Orientalist Art.

help us to understand how a work like the Greek pyxis in London was interpreted by contemporary viewers.

If we accept that both Iphigeneia and Polyxena were sometimes intended to be linked with Helen, then we must wonder what these women stood for and how they were interpreted by the Greeks. Was Helen really viewed as the so-called femme-fatale that caused the death of so many men, while Polyxena was the warning to women of what could happen as a consequence? It seems fair to say that the similar mode of rendering Helen's recovery and the virgin maidens' procession to sacrifice was intended to invoke comparison between different ideas about womanhood. Helen, the woman over whom so much blood was shed during the Trojan War, was to be compared with Iphigeneia and Polyxena, the virtuous maidens who lose their own lives in the war. Iphigeneia and Polyxena were the innocent parthenoi, brides only in death, in contrast to Helen, cursed to be "twice-wed and thrice-wed" and a "husband-deserter."¹⁶² The comparison between Helen and the sacrificial virgins, and the oppositions set up by this comparison, exemplifies the way in which female figures are often dichotomized.¹⁶³ One way to interpret the comparison between Helen and the sacrificial virgins is as illustrating Roland Barthes' *neither-norism*, which "consists in stating two opposites and balancing the one by the other so as to

¹⁶²Stesichorus fragment 223. A scholiast on Euripides' *Orestes* records that Stesichorus tells of how Tyndareus angered Aphrodite by forgetting to sacrifice to her, and in return she cursed Helen and her sisters to be διγμου] τε κα< τριγμου]/τ<ψει κα< λιπεσ<νορα].

¹⁶³Seiter (1986, 70) examines how these "stereotypes" or "archetypes" manifest in modern film.

reject them both.”¹⁶⁴ In other words, the ideal woman in reality was defined by being neither like Helen nor like the sacrificial virgin. On the one hand, it was not desirable to be like the beautiful Helen, who ignited men’s passions and invited unfaithfulness. On the other hand, it was not desirable to be like the virgin maidens who are killed.

While the dichotomy between Helen and the sacrificial virgins is certainly one interpretation, the wealth of associations among these women is far richer. The gathering of women on the pyxis in London shows that the relation between pairs of figures and groups of figures revolve around connections that are simultaneously genealogical, mythological, narrative, thematic, and ideological. “The heroes of the Graeco-Roman past were not straight-forward *exempla*, as is so often stated,” Bettina Bergmann reminds us, as “their characters and actions were ‘up for negotiation.’”¹⁶⁵ Helen is not always cast as the notorious wife in contrast to the virgin maidens. On the London pyxis, in fact, Helen is likened to Iphigeneia. Helen is depicted working wool, a conventional activity for women that conveyed female virtue and industriousness. Helen’s wool working fashions her as a “good” wife, like Penelope for instance. In Euripides’ *Iphigeneia Among the Taurians*, Orestes mentions Iphigeneia as a weaver of tapestries, and Helen’s spinning on the London pyxis thus draws a similarity between her and the maiden too.

¹⁶⁴Barthes 1956, 143.

¹⁶⁵Bergmann 1999, 101. Although Bergmann is commenting on the use of mythological figures in Roman painting, her point applies equally well to how the Greeks viewed the mythological figures of their own “historic” past.

The iconographic ambiguity noted between Helen and the sacrificial virgins also raises the question of the ambiguity between depictions of Iphigeneia and Polyxena being led to sacrifice. Without an inscription naming Iphigeneia on Douris' lekythos in Palermo, for instance, the iconography and composition of the scene would seem to be equally well-suited for Polyxena's procession to sacrifice. The similar iconography between some depictions of Iphigeneia and Polyxena accounts for our difficulty in knowing which maiden was intended on the Protocorinthian fragments in Basel (IPH 66). Without an inscription we cannot be certain of the identity of the maidens; however, this ambiguity between Iphigeneia and Polyxena may have been intentional. The sacrifices of these two maidens mark the beginning and end of the Trojan War, and I believe the representation of this subject in art was a "shorthand" or narrative device used by artists to encapsulate the story of the whole war. The image of a maiden being sacrificed, or being led to sacrifice, could represent Iphigeneia or Polyxena—or maybe even both. This ambiguity would allow artists to capture simultaneously an episode from the beginning of the war and one at the end, and in the process they would be able to tell more of the Trojan epic than if an image represented just one maiden or the other.

The ambiguity between the two sacrificial virgins in art could also have invited comparisons between Iphigeneia and Polyxena.¹⁶⁶ The comparison between these two princesses seems likely, and the depictions in art reveal

¹⁶⁶There is one example in all of Greek, Etruscan, and Roman art that might give us Iphigeneia and Polyxena on the same work. The so-called "Iphigeneia-Pillar," a funerary monument from Neumagen of AD 160, pairs an image of Iphigeneia with an uncertain representation of Polyxena. See TAU 58 and POL 53.

another way in which Iphigeneia and Polyxena serve as “analogues” of one another in Greek myth and literature.¹⁶⁷

The analogy between Iphigeneia and Polyxena is not weakened by the fact that many of our vase-paintings preserve inscriptions naming one maiden or the other.¹⁶⁸ A literate, likely aristocratic, person who was able to read the inscriptions would also probably have known the stories of the Trojan Cycle, and the inscription naming one of the sacrificial virgins could have cued for him or her the story and fate of the other sacrificial maiden. In this way, looking at a representation of either Iphigeneia or Polyxena would reference the story of the other maiden, so that either the beginning or end of the Trojan War was completed in the viewer’s mind, thereby recounting the whole story of the War. After all, in describing the figure of Polyxena about to be sacrificed on the tomb of Achilles in a lost monumental wall painting, Pollianus wrote “in her eyes lies all the history of the Trojan War.”¹⁶⁹

The comparisons between the sacrificial virgins and other women in the Trojan cycle imbue them with meaning that helped to define them. The sacrificial virgins, then, are defined in relation to other women and in the context of the Trojan War. In turn, Iphigeneia and Polyxena are also defined, in part, by their relation to one another.

By alluding to Helen in depicting Polyxena being led to sacrifice, Greek artists, and the Brygos Painter in particular, not only enabled and encouraged

¹⁶⁷Lyons 1997, 155.

¹⁶⁸Also, not everyone who looked at the vase would be able to read the inscriptions.

¹⁶⁹*Greek Anthology* 16.150.

viewers to contemplate larger issues, such as the role of women in Greek society and different ideas of womanhood, but they also participated in the fashioning of identity by creating images that embodied gendered ideologies and that presented paradigms of female behavior. “The idea of the heroine as a standard of comparison is well documented in Greek literature,” wrote Deborah Lyons. She has observed that heroines, like Iphigeneia and others, had value for contemporary women and men who modeled their behavior(s) after these figures and strived to achieve the same glory.¹⁷⁰ The figures of Helen, the sacrificial virgins, and other women, in myth and art were a way for the Greeks to map out different ideas about womanhood. The mythological women are compared to one another to draw out what were perceived to be various female characteristics and traits, both virtues and flaws. The relational system created by these comparisons articulated cultural values and beliefs that historical men and women used to compare themselves to mythological figures. As standards of comparison, the sacrificial virgins in art both participated in and reflected the fashioning of identities.

¹⁷⁰Lyons 1997, 42.

Chapter 5

Issues of Female Agency and Views of the Sacrificial Virgin

“All of these images present an extremely positive view of female society and of the dignity of women.”

Claude Bérard, “The Order of Women,” in *A City of Images*, 1989.¹

C. Bérard thus explained the images decorating the exterior of an Attic red-figure cup attributed to the Wedding Painter of about 460 BC depicting on one side women gathering fruit, and on the other a group of women engaged in “animated discussions about flowers or perfume.”² Other scholars have argued the opposite: that images on Greek vases present a negative view of women, or the attempt of men to control them.³ It is relatively easy to see how the representation of women in scenes of ritual, wool-making, or even adornment may be interpreted as admirable.⁴ But does an image of Iphigeneia or Polyxena about to be sacrificed at the hands of a man represent the dignity of women? The relation between the representations of women in Greek myth and art and the lived reality of historical women is difficult to decipher.⁵ Also difficult to untangle is the relation between the portrayal of “dominant” women on the tragic

¹Bérard 1989, 93.

²Compiègne, Mus. Vivenel 1090. *ARV*² 922.1. Bérard 1989, 93 and 95, fig. 129a-b.

³For the opposite view, see Williams 1983; Keuls 1985; Frontisi-Ducroux 1995 (discussed and cited in Goff 2004, 249-50).

⁴On wool-making, see Ferrari 2002; on adornment, see Rabinowitz and Blundell 2005; Bundrick forthcoming.

⁵Dowden 1995; Ferrari 2003.

stage and the degree of agency exercised by real women in their day-to-day lives. This chapter explores how the image and interpretation of the sacrificial virgin in Greek art relates to the presentation of the sacrificial maiden in tragedy of the fifth-century BC and to the agency of historical women in ancient Greece. Does the image of the sacrificial virgin in art speak to the dignity of women? What can we learn about the lives of historical women and men from the representation of the sacrificial virgin in art?

“The important principle that meaning is created in context, through relationships,” writes C. Sourvinou-Inwood, “is not only relevant in the obvious way to the reading of texts and images, it also has important implications for the study of all phenomena.”⁶ A recent example of the importance of context in interpreting imagery is J. Hurwit’s case study of the inversion of heroic nudity on the Dexileos stele.⁷ Similarly, there is not just one general meaning or interpretation of the sacrificial virgin. The subject of virgin sacrifice does not always have to signify the control of men over women. Nor is virgin sacrifice always a noble act that casts the maiden as a heroine. The sacrificial virgin gains meaning in context. As was argued in Chapter Four, for instance, this can be in relation to other women in Greek myth. This chapter examines how meaning is ascribed to the sacrificial virgin in the context of her own story as part of the narrative of the Trojan War and in the context of the work of art itself. The

⁶Sourvinou-Inwood 1991, 5.

⁷Hurwit 2007, 35. He concludes that there is not just one kind of “heroic nudity” in Greek art, but many different kinds of nudity as costume, the meaning of which is “determined by context and subject rather than by abstract principle.”

meanings attached to the sacrificial virgin, and the spectrum of ways in which she could be interpreted, depends on two sets of questions:

1.) **What's a Girl to Do? Consent, Resistance, and the Measure**

of a Maiden *Which maiden is being sacrificed, and what is the narrative context of her story? Does she go willingly to sacrifice or against her will? Concomitant with the question of volition, what does her reaction mean in the context of her story?* Previous scholars have tended to draw together the fates and to highlight the similarities between Iphigeneia and Polyxena. Their stories, however, are different, and their reactions present different views of women. Volition emerges as central in deciding whether the maiden's response is courageous or cowering in the context of her story.

2.) **The Public and Private 'Lives' of Iphigeneia and Polyxena**

What is the medium of the work or to what class of objects does it belong? What is the context of the work of art, and what is the nature of its public and private lives? What was its original function? For whom was it intended, and who looked at it? These questions compare the meanings of these women on the clearly public tragic stage and in the wide range of contexts established in the visual arts. The media, uses, and contexts of some works of art provide "frames" that allow for different interpretations from those that emerge in Attic tragedy.

**Part I:
What's a Girl to Do?
Consent, Resistance, and the Measure of a Maiden**

The similarities between the sacrifices of Iphigeneia and Polyxena as narrative frames to the Trojan War have been emphasized. The differences, however, are more significant. These focus on outcomes, agency, and volition. The main difference is that while Iphigeneia is sometimes saved by Artemis, Polyxena is always killed. The story of the Trojan princess has no mythological strand involving an averted sacrifice or substitute victim. Another difference is that while Iphigeneia is loved by her sacrificer, the Greeks feel less conflict in sacrificing Polyxena. The point of sacrifice is to offer something valuable and meaningful, so in this way Polyxena's sacrifice is different from that of Iphigeneia.

The consent or resistance of the sacrificial virgin has to be considered in the context of each story. When Iphigeneia is sacrificed, it is to propitiate Artemis so that the Greeks can sail to Troy. Her sacrifice is therefore for the collective good. An unselfish, voluntary sacrifice glorifies her as a heroine, losing her life nobly in war. Conversely, when Polyxena is sacrificed, it is to appease the shade of Achilles. Having watched her city destroyed and her father murdered, Polyxena's sacrifice is the final humiliation in the sack of Troy, the eternal enslavement of the princess in death.

The different circumstances surrounding the ritual killings of Iphigeneia and Polyxena affect how we interpret each maiden's reaction to her death. An image of Iphigeneia going willingly to sacrifice presents a noble view of women, a

maiden able to serve the State like a man, her unselfish act benefiting all of Hellas. “The ruin of one person's house is of less consequence and brings less grief than that of the whole city,” proclaims Praxithea in the *Erechtheus*, who goes on to say, “I hate women who in preference to the common good, choose for their own children to live.”⁸ Led against her will, Iphigeneia offers a different view of women as weak, selfish, overly emotional, even irrational. For Polyxena, the situation is reversed. An acquiescing Polyxena in effect offers a portrait of women as weak, conquered, defeated, and betraying her city and family, even if she goes to her death with dignity. A non-consenting Polyxena who struggles or fights back as she is sacrificed, or led to sacrifice, presents a noble view of women. No glory is to be had for Polyxena or her family in being offered to the ghost of a conquering foreign power. Polyxena’s resistance is not selfish but ennobling, her refusal to be sacrificed highlights her loyalty to her city and family. Therefore, it is not possible to offer just one interpretation of the sacrificial virgin. The consent or resistance of Iphigeneia and Polyxena does not mean the same thing, and the different reaction of each maiden in the face of death constructs different views of womanhood.

Studies of Iphigeneia in Greek art and literature have tended to focus on her willingness or unwillingness to be sacrificed. While it is clear that the struggling Pompeian Iphigeneia is carried off against her will, and that the Shuvalov Painter’s fainting Iphigeneia is led unwillingly to the altar, does lack of consent have to register so dramatically? What are the visual cues used by artists that enable us to discern volition or resistance? While previous scholars have

⁸Quoted by Lycurgus (*Leoc* 100).

looked at Iphigeneia's willingness or unwillingness to be sacrificed as a way of correlating an image to one literary tradition or another, I aim to show how the question of consent informs the discourse about female agency and views of women. Although attention has focused almost exclusively on Iphigeneia's consent or resistance, I also consider Polyxena. By examining the representations of the sacrificial virgins being sacrificed or being led to sacrifice, I hope to show how the rendering of physical mobility and volition in art are entwined with personal agency and constructions of womanhood.

The following list summarizes the representations of the attitudes of Iphigeneia and Polyxena as they are led to sacrifice:

	<u>Willing</u>	<u>Unwilling</u>
<i>Iphigeneia:</i>	IPH 1, 4, 11	IPH 3
	<u>Acquiescing</u>	<u>Unwilling</u>
<i>Polyxena:</i>	POL 3	POL 1, 11, 14
	<u>Despairing</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
	POL 4, 6, 12	POL 7, 15

While the actual sacrifice of Iphigeneia is not shown in Greek art, she is led to sacrifice or about to be sacrificed on four works of art. She goes willingly to sacrifice on the white ground lekythos attributed to Douris in Palermo, the Apulian volute-krater associated with the work of the Iliupersis Painter in London, and on a stone relief plaque from Termessos (IPH 1, 4, 11). On Douris' lekythos, Iphigeneia is led to the altar between two warriors, depicting the procession to sacrifice, while the volute-krater in London and the relief plaque represent the next moment in the story, that is Iphigeneia at the altar in the moment before the sacrifice. The deer on the volute-krater and plaque signal the

animal substitution that is to take place. The maiden's lowered head is the iconographic clue that signals her assent.⁹ The bowing of the head was the nod of assent that W. Burkert identified as an important part of animal sacrifice.¹⁰ In the visual representations, however, signs of consent are not always shown, and it is common to see an animal being coerced or restrained in the moments before sacrifice.¹¹

The only preserved work with Iphigeneia as an unwilling victim appears on the Shuvalov Painter's oinochoe in Kiel (IPH 3). As Iphigeneia is led to the altar, where a man holding a knife waits for her, she faints. The verbs meaning *to faint* in Greek also convey the sense of to flag, swoon, or lose heart, and sometimes to decline or refuse.¹² In Euripides' *Hecuba*, just as Polyxena is led off to sacrifice by Odysseus, Hecuba cries:

ο⊕ εγ⊕, προλε↔πϖ: λ(εται δΥ μου μΥλη.

Ah, ah! I swoon and my limbs faint (line 438).¹³

These words are uttered by a distraught Hecuba, whose fainting reflects her terror, despair and lack of consent to the unfolding events. On the oinochoe in

⁹Reeder (1995, 331) sees Douris' Iphigeneia as following the Aeschylean version of the story.

¹⁰Burkert 1966; 1983; 2001. Discussed in Naiden 2007. In arguing against the idea of the willing animal victim, Naiden (2007, 68) points out that a sacrificial animal going willingly to sacrifice is attractive "because it runs parallel to acts of human sacrifice in which the victim does the same." In other words, even though Naiden argues for the "fallacy of the willing victim," he admits that there is such a thing as a willing human victim.

¹¹Van Straten (1995, 102) observes that in images of animal sacrifice "the formal sign of consent of the sacrificial victim clearly was not an aspect of the ritual that was thought particularly interesting or important."

¹²Verbs like ππειπείῖν, πρ↔εστψαι; /κψν→σκειν; ψυμείῖν.

¹³Translation given in Woodhouse 1910, 302. Translated by Kovacs (1995) as "Ah, ah! I am faint! My limbs are unstrung!"

Kiel, Artemis observes the scene at right holding a small fawn in her hands. Just as the deer on the London volute-krater and the Termessos plaque signify animal substitution, so too here the animal she carries indicates human sacrifice will be averted. For scholars who would like to see the Shuvalov Painter's vase as an illustration of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, with a non-consenting Iphigeneia led to sacrifice, how are we to account for the figure of Artemis with the deer? Is it merely an attribute? In the play, Iphigeneia is not rescued, there is no animal substitution. The Shuvalov Painter's oinochoe may thus preserve a version of Iphigeneia's story not known in literature: an unwilling Iphigeneia who is rescued.

The question of Iphigeneia's consent is also a matter of debate. In Euripides' *IA*, Iphigeneia at first does not want to be sacrificed, but then experiences a change of heart. In a character sketch, Aristotle described Euripides' Iphigeneia (at Aulis) as "inconsistent in character," an assessment that has interested scholars.¹⁴ Schmitt has argued that although her decision is often described as made of free will, Iphigeneia really had no choice.¹⁵ In contrast, Siegel believes that Iphigeneia's decision to go to death is made of her own will, even if she "whitewashes, rationalizes, justifies and ennobles its causes, nourishing an illusion of glory and viewing everything as if it were something else."¹⁶ I believe that Iphigeneia's decision to go to sacrifice in Euripides' *IA*, and

¹⁴*Poetics* 15,9. Discussed in Holmberg Lübeck 1993, 30ff. Funke agrees with Aristotle; Siegel 1980 does not.

¹⁵Schmitt 1921, 22; Holmberg Lübeck 1993, 26.

¹⁶Siegel 1980, 314 (discussed in Holmberg Lübeck 1993, 32).

in the tradition of her story that he follows, is made with her consent. Her psychological state aside, Iphigeneia's sacrifice is voluntary, and in this she follows the tradition of other voluntary sacrifices, like that of the daughters of Erechtheus, the daughters of Hyacinthus, the daughters of Leos, and Makaria. An element of patriotism runs through all these stories.¹⁷

While scholars have identified the issue of consent or resistance as central to Iphigeneia's myth-history and as defining the various mythological traditions at the heart of her story, I argue that volition also plays a role in Polyxena's story. Polyxena could be depicted as going quietly to sacrifice, as despairing or supplicating for her life, or as being unwillingly sacrificed. These differing responses to her fate present different portrayals of female agency. The images expand what we know about Polyxena's possible responses to her sacrifice from the literary tradition. Our fullest account of Polyxena's sacrifice is in Euripides' *Hecuba*, in which Polyxena goes willingly to sacrifice. When Odysseus arrives to lead Polyxena to sacrifice, the maiden tells him, "I shall follow you, both because I must do so and because I want to die. If I refuse to die, I will show myself to be a craven and cowardly woman."¹⁸ It is more appropriate to refer to Polyxena as an acquiescing rather than a willing victim in the sense that she complies or goes without fighting, but not necessarily of free will. The visual evidence indicates that there were other traditions around Polyxena's story, besides the version known from Euripides.

¹⁷Hughes 1991, 73; Holmberg Lübeck 1993, 26.

¹⁸Lines 346-348.

Representations of Polyxena in art offer us a wider range of how she reacts to her death. The lowered head of Polyxena on the hydria in Berlin attributed to the Leagros Group gives the only example of an acquiescing Polyxena who does not make any gestures of despair, supplication, or resistance as she is led to sacrifice (POL 3). Polyxena's downturned head and the gesture she makes with her left hand recall the figure of Iphigeneia on Douris' lekythos. More often, Polyxena registers her lack of consent by signs of despair or supplication, as on the lekythos in New York attributed to the Acheloos Painter, the kylix in Paris attributed to Makron, and the relief bowl in Athens (POL 4, 6, 12). On the Acheloos Painter's lekythos, Polyxena turns her head to look away, as if unable to bear looking at Achilles' tomb in front of her, and she raises her right hand to her head in a gesture of despair (POL 4). On Makron's cup, Polyxena also turns her head to look away (POL 6). The man behind her in particular seems to be physically pushing her forward. On the relief bowl in Athens, Polyxena is already on her knees before the tomb of Achilles, raising her arms in a gesture of surrender or desperation (POL 12).

The images of Polyxena being sacrificed on the Tyrrhenian amphora in London, the Polyxena Sarcophagus, and a relief bowl in Athens give us representations of a most unwilling victim (POL 1, 11, 14). First let's consider the two Archaic works. On these, Polyxena's resistance can be inferred because it takes as many as three men to hold her. Polyxena's legs are parted, as if she is attempting to kick free. Most importantly, her hands are bound, signaling that the sacrifice is being performed against her will. On the Tyrrhenian amphora, we

do not even see Polyxena's arms, because her body is rendered as a cylindrical tube without appendages.

The bound hands of Polyxena on the Çanakkale Sarcophagus and her lack of hands on the Tyrrhenian amphora merit further attention. Besides these two examples of suppressing the maiden's hands, we also have the Polyxena on the Leagros Group hydria in Berlin, whose left hand is lost in the folds of her garment (POL 3). Mary Garrard has demonstrated the "gender dimension" of hands as "the locus of agency, both literally and symbolically."¹⁹ The association of hands with agency is not a post-antique idea. In *On the Parts of Animals*, Aristotle observed, "The hand is for the body as the intellect is for the soul."²⁰ Likewise, it is gesture more often than facial expression that conveys emotion in Greek art.²¹ On the Polyxena Sarcophagus, for instance, the grief of the mourning women watching the maiden's murder is expressed not through facial expression, but through gesture, with hands tearing at hair, thrown up in the air, or clenched in fists.

Separated by time and space from the ancient Greeks, we are still bound by the same somatic movements and possibilities of the human body.²² Hands still perform actions. Polyxena dies at the hands of Neoptolemos. The *cheir epi karmo* gesture is a grasping of hand on wrist. In the Roman period, the *dextrarum iunctio* also locates marriage in a ritual clasping of hands. On Greek

¹⁹Garrard 2005, 64.

²⁰Cited also by Garrard 2005, 71.

²¹See T. McNiven's work on the use of gesture in Athenian vase painting.

²²See Mary Douglas' *Natural Symbols* (1970), for the relationship between the physical body and the social body.

vases, industrious women of *sophrosyne* work wool with their hands. In the *Odyssey*, Penelope uses her hands to weave, and then to undo her weaving, as a way of putting off the suitors. It is by her hands that she is able to gain some control over her fate. The denial of Polyxena's hands in these works of art represents the physical and symbolic imposition of power over her personal freedom. The need for such restraints attests to Polyxena's unwillingness to go quietly to sacrifice. In Roman art, Iphigeneia's hands are sometimes suppressed. On mosaics from Ampurias and Antioch depicting moments before her sacrifice, Iphigeneia's hands are lost in the folds of her heavy drapery, a way of commenting both on her state of mind and her control over the situation (IPH 119 and 120).

The meaning of Polyxena's sacrifice on the Tyrrhenian amphora is complicated by questions of provenance and of audience. Painted in Athens, the vase was exported to and found in Etruria. Was the vase ever used in Athens or intended for an Athenian consumer, or was the subject of Polyxena's sacrifice chosen to appeal to an export market? Considering the different status of women in Etruria compared to those in Athens, the interpretations of Polyxena's sacrifice would also have been different. In discussing how to interpret Athenian vases in Etruscan contexts, Sian Lewis suggests that "while we might expect Etruscan buyers to be favourable to strong female roles, it is in keeping with Greek ideas that artists should offer a negative interpretation of the idea."²³ The intended and unintended meanings of a subject may therefore be different depending on

²³Lewis 1997, 146. On Athenian vases in Etruscan contexts, see also Reusser 2002; Avramidou 2006.

the audience. The appeal of Iphigeneia on Etruscan urns must surely be due to her role as a strong female figure, but that does not mean that the Greeks had to depict her in a derogatory way.

Issues of female agency also tie together the two long sides of the Polyxena Sarcophagus. N. Sevinç observes, “On the side with the murder of Polyxena, all the power, and specifically the power to decide life or death, resides with the men, while in the celebration scene the men are relegated to the status of performers, whose movements follow the rhythms made by female musicians.”²⁴ This proposes a differential in power between the two sides, with one empowering women and the other oppressing them. It seems fair to say that the two short sides and the long side with the celebration seem to present an admirable view of women. Even the appearance of an aged Hecuba seems ennobling in the context of her daughter’s story. In light of the meritable presentation of women on three sides, might the long side with Polyxena’s murder also have been interpreted in a similar way? My interpretation of a resisting Polyxena as representing a positive view of the Trojan princess would explain how the scene of murder on the Polyxena Sarcophagus fits thematically with the scene on the other three sides.

The relief bowl in Athens depicts Neoptolemos is in the act of sacrificing Polyxena, whose arms seem to flail (POL 11). Her hands are not bound, but she attempts to fight back or to defend herself. From the middle of the second-

²⁴Sevinç 1996, 262.

century BC, the bowl preserves an unwilling Polyxena over 300 years later than the two Archaic works, showing the persistence of this version of her story.

It is not always certain whether Polyxena is an acquiescing or unwilling victim (POL 7 and 15). On the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup, it is unclear whether the maiden is being led against her will (POL 7). Akamas' shield covers her right arm and hand, so it is not possible to know whether the warrior grasped her wrist. Also, Polyxena turns her head in profile to right to look over her shoulder, the opposite direction in which she is being led. On the Acheloos Painter's lekythos and Makron's cup, the gesture of turning the head away was identified as a sign of despair. On the Brygos Painter's cup, however, Polyxena could be turning her head to look at her father who is being murdered adjacent to her. Likewise, the fragments of the Clazomenian sarcophagus in Leiden with Polyxena led to the tomb of Achilles do not allow us to identify the maiden's reaction to her death (POL 15). Her head and left arm are missing, so we cannot be sure if she turned away or if she gestured wildly. Parts of the greave and foot of another warrior behind her, however, allow us to reconstruct that she was led to sacrifice between two men.

To summarize, we have seen that both Iphigeneia and Polyxena could be depicted as either acquiescing or unwilling victims, and that the response of each conveyed different meanings in the context of her story. The images of a consenting Iphigeneia and of a resisting Polyxena are striking because they are represented in ways outside of the normal conventions for representing women in Greek art. When women are attacked or threatened, they most often flee or supplicate for their lives. Iphigeneia and Polyxena, however, are sometimes

represented as women who do not behave like women. When Iphigeneia, for instance, is led to sacrifice on Douris' lekythos in Palermo, she seems to face her fate bravely, and does not beg for her life or make any wild gestures. Her demeanor is placid and she shows no emotion; the only gesture she makes is one of veiling.²⁵ Timothy McNiven's work on the use of gestures in Athenian vase-painting helps to interpret Douris' depiction of Iphigeneia. According to McNiven, in sixth and fifth century Attic vase-painting, the Other was visually represented by a lack of *sophrosyne* (self-control) and by a lack of *andreia* (courage). Women, for instance, are often depicted fleeing and gesticulating wildly, or begging for mercy or help. The gesture of supplication, touching the chin of another person, was a sign of "ritual debasement and submission, a desperate acknowledgement of one's own weakness."²⁶ Men act and women react. Women do not normally show courage. McNiven argues, "the use of unrestrained gestures, especially those that indicate fear, was a powerful tool for marking the behavior of the Other."²⁷ According to the conventional uses of gestures in Attic vase-painting as outlined by McNiven, Douris' Iphigeneia does not "behave" like a woman. On the other hand though, she is exquisitely arrayed in the *kosmos* befitting a princess. She does not have to affect masculine dress or armor, like Amazons. This image of Iphigeneia blurs the distinction between the

²⁵On the display of emotions, see Van Wees 1998, 42-5. Rabinowitz (2004) also discusses how women may have been excluded from public life based on their perceived emotional nature. See also Blundell and Rabinowitz 2005.

²⁶McNiven 2000, 77.

²⁷McNiven 2000, 77.

masculine and the feminine, another way that the sacrificial virgin transcends boundaries.

A representation of a woman being murdered by a man elicits a strong reaction. Such violence against women today is seen as misogynistic, the most extreme manifestation of patriarchal repression of women, and on a fundamental level this is certainly true. Under such oppression, freedom and agency may have been read in different ways. Iphigeneia's voluntary sacrifice could have been interpreted as empowering. This could be argued in the same way that Gerstein describes the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter, referred to as Bat, as heroizing: "It is possible that the 'daughters of Israel' see Bat as a heroine. Bat exhibited strength in allowing herself to be sacrificed. . . . A celebration of Bat's heroic qualities could have become institutionalized as a means of celebrating women's ability to wield their own power over their own lives."²⁸ At the same time, Polyxena's resistance to authority, as on the Polyxena Sarcophagus and the Tyrrhenian amphora, is also empowering. The power to decide life and death may be the domain of men, but Polyxena decides whether or not she will accept their decision. Polyxena's resistance is a sign of solidarity with and loyalty to her family and city. I argue that we are to interpret the figure of Polyxena being held horizontally as an image of resistance. The fact that she is held by three men signals struggle, and we are to imagine that she is being held so tightly because she was fighting back, which would also explain why her hands are bound . It is

²⁸Gerstein 1989, 187.

Polyxena's refusal to submit quietly to Neoptolemos' attack that casts her as a powerful figure; her resistance is noble, even though her sacrifice is a horrible act.

Part II: The Public and Private "Lives" of Iphigeneia and Polyxena

While much modern scholarship has interpreted the theme of virgin sacrifice in Athenian tragedy as ultimately reinforcing normative gendered hierarchies because of the public nature of these performances, I argue that the more private nature of the visual representations allowed the figure of the sacrificial virgin to be interpreted in different ways. Whereas the public message of Greek tragedy had to endorse masculine ideologies, the private viewing of many individually commissioned or purchased works did not impose the same restrictions on the viewer's interpretation of these images.²⁹ Certainly, for many viewers the representation of sacrificial virgins in art served a similar function as when presented in tragedy, that is, to reinforce male hegemony. My argument, however, is that this was not the only reading of these images, and the private context of much of the visual material allowed for resistant interpretations.

Many scholars have explored the complex ways in which Athenian tragedy, despite its many gender inversions, ultimately served to reinforce patriarchal

²⁹An exception to this would be the famous wall paintings by Polygnotos in Athens and Delphi, which were of a public nature and probably encouraged an interpretation that enforced masculinist ideologies.

values and social institutions.³⁰ According to Nicole Loraux, for instance, the presentation of women in Athenian tragedy “was a chance to state the difference [between the sexes] before obscuring it, and then to find it again, all the richer for having been obscured, and more firmly based for having been finally reaffirmed.”³¹ A similar idea was developed by Helene Foley, who sees “tragic play with gender [as] permitted in a sphere carefully circumscribed and authorized by the strictures of myth and ritual, but ultimately subject at its conclusion to the constrictions of social and political reality.”³² As a final example, Nancy Rabinowitz argues that “[women in tragedy] are not normalized as a power in the public realm; rather, their physical desires (often those associated with nature) lead them to be represented as the transgressors of a boundary that must be maintained.”³³ The images of virgin sacrifice in Greek art also “obscure” and “play with gender.” Even in antiquity, however, the images were silent, and it was up to each viewer to bring his or her “mental universe” to each depiction, to rely on his or her own subjectivities and knowledge of various “intertexts,” both textual and visual, in order to interpret the scenes, as conditioned by conventions of representation.

³⁰Besides Loraux and Foley cited below, see also the work of Winnington-Ingram, Thomson, Zeitlin, Katz, des Bouvrie, Goldhill, Segal, Wohl 1998; and Rabinowitz 1992, 1993, and 2004.

³¹Loraux 1987, x.

³²Foley 2001, 331.

³³Rabinowitz 2004, 47. In an earlier work, Sorkin Rabinowitz (1993, 12) established, “As a public art form, tragedy served the polis in part by describing, inscribing, and prescribing gender, transforming the biologically male and female into the socially masculine and feminine.”

The “gendered spaces” of the Greek world were both physical and ideological.³⁴ The public forum of the theater for instance was a gendered space that reinforced masculine ideologies. We do not know for certain whether or not Athenian women even attended the theater.³⁵ It is easy to see how the images of the sacrificial maidens in art could be viewed in a similar way as in tragedy, as a way of “policing” women.³⁶ And for some viewers in some contexts, this certainly would have been the message conveyed. A consideration of the media or classes of objects, their original uses, and archaeological contexts to which works of art depicting the sacrificial virgin belong allow for different interpretations compared to the meanings attached to her in tragedy.³⁷ Identifying certain types of objects as public or private is a starting point, and is most often how the discourse is framed, reinforcing the dichotomy between public/private, civic/domestic, and *polis/oikos*.³⁸ Sarah Pomeroy’s articulation of the Athenian family as comprised of entirely public, domestic/public, and domestic/private forms signals a shift towards a more nuanced understanding that goes beyond the binaries of public/private.³⁹

It should be kept in mind that one can also have a personal reaction to something public, and one can bring very mainstream, public ideas to a private

³⁴Cole 2004.

³⁵For opposing views, see Henderson 1991 and Goldhill 1994.

³⁶Hunter 1994. Stewart (1997) on forceful male-female sex as a means of controlling women.

³⁷For an example of how archaeological context is used to interpret images, with a review of the literature on archaeological theory, see Senta German’s study of Late Bronze Age Aegean art (2005, chapter 4).

³⁸Sourvinou-Inwood 1995b; Strömberg 2003; Rabinowitz 2004.

³⁹Pomeroy 1997, Chapter 1 (discussed in M. Skinner’s review, *BMCR* 98.2.18).

object. Many classes of works can have both public and private aspects. Greek vases are a good example because they often circulate in public and private realms. White ground lekythoi, like Douris' with Iphigeneia in Palermo, could have private aspects, being used to make libations to the dead in funerary rituals by women, but could also have public functions, for instance, if placed as offerings at a grave where they could be seen by passers-by. A kylix, like the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup, may be thought of in a private, domestic context, but when used at a symposium or drinking party of men, it would have circulated in a more public way.

In the Greek period, Iphigeneia appears chiefly on objects rather than monuments. She can be identified with certainty on about 17 vases, 3 lost wall paintings, 5 relief bowls, 1 architectural relief, 1 free-standing statue, and 3 gems. With the exception of the wall paintings and the single example each of the statue and architectural relief, most of the images of Iphigeneia appear on smaller objects, bought by individuals or privately commissioned. Iphigeneia's appearance on gems identifies her story as appropriate for personal adornment, and allows us to think about her story in different ways. Personal objects, like gems, need not convey the same meanings as those conveyed by a play. We cannot be certain whether these gems were owned or worn by a man or woman, but the gender of who wore them would also affect how the images were interpreted. Gems were often used as seals, and from literary sources we know, for example, that Julius Caesar had a gem of an armed Aphrodite (to present himself as a descendent of Aphrodite through Aeneas) and Commodus had a gem

with a portrait of his mistress Marcia as an Amazon.⁴⁰ Iphigeneia's appearance on gems also raises the possibility that her story appeared on textiles, on garments whose embellishment might have reflected personal taste and expression. The sixth or seventh century AD textile with a depiction of Iphigeneia in Tauris offers just a glimpse of what might have been possible (TAU 66).

Representations of Polyxena also appear more often on objects rather than monuments, but she seems to have appeared on works with more public contexts more frequently than Iphigeneia. In Greek art, Polyxena can be identified with certainty, outside of her appearance at the fountain-house, on 8 vases, 3 lost wall paintings, 3 relief bowls, 2 sarcophagi, and 3 lost statue groups. The conceivably more public dimensions of the wall paintings, statue groups, and sarcophagi comprise just under half the total number of certain works.

Studies in sociology have introduced ideas of “framing” and “cultural scripts” that influence how people interpret and respond to images.⁴¹ Beth Eck, for example, identified three frames within which contemporary people comprehend nude images, that is, as art, pornography, or information, like medical texts.⁴² Cultural scripts are learned ways of understanding and processing various stimuli. This allows us to see how the public context of the theater helped ancient people to understand the themes presented in the

⁴⁰Richter (1968, 1) on gems used as seals. Richter (1920, xxii-xxiii) gives the literary sources: on Julius Caesar's gem: Dio Cassius XLIII, 43; Commodus' gem: Aelius Lampridius, Commodus Antoninus, 11).

⁴¹Swinderl 1986; Eck 2001, 2003.

⁴²Eck 2001.

performances they viewed. In other words, theater-goers had a cultural script to understand how to interpret the figure of the sacrificial virgin in tragedy. The performance itself provided a cultural frame for how to understand the appearance of a strong female figure on the tragic stage that fit with society's values.

It is exactly these ideas that allow us to argue the opposite. The private nature of some works of art allowed for a different cultural script. In the context of aristocratic life, works of art in the domestic sphere provided women with a different cultural frame within which to interpret the sacrificial virgin as embodying noble qualities.

Identifying the private context of some works of art allows for the possibility of women as viewers and patrons of images, and not merely as objects of the male gaze. Recent work by Sutton, Stehle and Day, Petersen, Younger, and Blundell and Rabinowitz have examined female spectatorship and subjectivities in ancient Greece.⁴³ In reviewing the literature on the female gaze, Blundell and Rabinowitz cite the approach of these authors, and others, in "the construction of hypothetical variant interpretations" by analyzing works of art and studying social contexts as a "valid and fertile way of attempting to recreate women's ways of seeing in an age when females were generally denied a public voice, so that their readings cannot be conveyed to us directly."⁴⁴

⁴³Sutton 1992; Stehle and Day 1996; Petersen 1997; Younger 2002; Blundell and Rabinowitz 2005 and forthcoming.

⁴⁴Blundell and Rabinowitz 2005.

Much scholarship has tended to ignore and to deny the cultural agency of women in ancient Greece, thereby reinforcing, whether intentionally or otherwise, the patriarchal repression of women's voices. Ancient Greek women are often characterized as secluded in the home and as having little or no power, a tradition that began in the scholarship of the 19th century.⁴⁵ An example of the misogyny that riddles early modern scholarship is A.W. Gomme's comment, "when Theognis said, 'I hate a woman who gads about and neglects her home,' I think he expressed a sentiment common to most people of all ages."⁴⁶ At the same time, scholars who have described ancient women as commodities in transactions of exchange between men have also consequently denied women's cultural agency and often overlook that men too are often construed as "commodities," in subtle but different ways. In *Art, Desire and the Body in Ancient Greece*, A. Stewart explores not the perspective of a female gaze, but a sophisticated theorization of the male gaze, positing the igniting of male homosexual desire as a large part of the purpose of Greek art.⁴⁷ Even a feminist scholar like Eva Keuls can become, in retrospect, complicit in the denial of female agency. In *The Reign of the Phallus*, Keuls interprets Athenian art of the fifth-century as evidence of men's oppression of women. Keuls' book was

⁴⁵Marlilyn Katz's "Ideology and 'the Status of Women' in Ancient Greece" (1995) provides a good historiographical account of modern writing about the history of ancient women. Katz (1995, 23-4) points out that Friedrich Jacobs' 1830 essay "The History of the Female Sex," which refutes the then contemporary view of the "demeaned" and secluded role of women, illustrates how this idea was already commonly accepted.

⁴⁶Gomme 1937, 115; cited in Katz 1995, 25.

⁴⁷Stewart 1997. Stewart (1997, 15, 108-18), however, does believe that in some cases the gaze may have been androgynous, for which he discusses as an example the nude female forms of Spartan sixth-century bronze mirror handles. He also sensitively calls attention to the question of female seclusion in ancient Greece.

groundbreaking when it was published and continues to be important; however, her insistence on seeing only the power of men over women in the imagery reads as reductionist today. As a final example, B. Knittlmayer's *Die Attische Aristokratie und Ihre Helden* does not at all address the role of women in fashioning aristocratic life.

Recent research has attempted to offer more nuanced understandings of gender and sexuality in the ancient world. While scholars have traditionally interpreted the myths recited by young women in choral performances as evidence of the imposition of patriarchal hegemony, W. Ingalls interprets them as “messages of empowerment.” Ingalls argues that these myths taught young women about the power of their sexuality (in creating conflict among men), as well as the importance of their roles both at home and in the religious life of the polis.⁴⁸ Likewise, L. Llewellyn-Jones explores the subject of female agency in his book *Aphrodite's Tortoise: The Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece*. He challenges the long-held belief that veiling was simply a manifestation of women's oppression by illustrating how it also allowed women the freedom to move outside the home and to express themselves.⁴⁹ In addition, through a careful re-examination of fifth- and fourth-century Attic lawsuits, V. Hunter suggests that some Athenian women wielded greater economic power than was previously thought.⁵⁰ As a final example, Blundell and Rabinowitz argue that scenes of all

⁴⁸Ingalls 2000, especially 18.

⁴⁹Llewellyn-Jones 2003. See also Patterson 1998.

⁵⁰Hunter 1994, 9-42. Hunter (1994, 39) argues that “a woman with a disproportionately large dowry was also formidable” and probably represented “a threat to male authority.” See also Patterson 1998.

female adornment in Attic vase-painting not only presented women as decorative objects of a male gaze, but also “simultaneously offer women an avenue of resistance by furnishing them with evidence of their own subjectivity, showing them gazes that are affectionately reciprocated, and displays of beauty that are actively admired.”⁵¹

To sum up, scholarship on the Iphigeneia plays and their relation to the place of women in Greek society paints a picture that tragedy ultimately reinforced normative gendered hierarchies. Traditions preserved in the visual representations offer other interpretations, which suggest that the figure of the sacrificial virgin may have been interpreted in multiple ways. While the images seem to present the repression of women, it is the private context of many visual works, as opposed to the public context of tragedy, which allows us to consider alternate interpretations.

VIEWS OF THE SACRIFICIAL VIRGIN IN ETRUSCAN AND ROMAN ART

In Etruria, Iphigeneia’s sacrifice appears on a series of urns from Perugia and Volterra, which depict her held over the altar (IPH 35-66). These works are all from the Hellenistic period and belong in a funerary context. On these, she almost always extends her arms out in a gesture of despair or supplication. Her resistance sometimes registers strongly as on IPH 50-53, where she attempts to free herself from the man restraining her by fighting back with her hands.

⁵¹Blundell and Rabinowitz 2005.

Almost all of these scenes include a figure holding a deer to allude to the animal substitution and thus the averted human sacrifice. The tradition of a resisting Iphigeneia rescued by Artemis is not paralleled in Greek literary sources. It does, however, appear on the oinochoe in Kiel attributed to the Shuvalov Painter, whose fainting Iphigeneia must be saved by the figure of Artemis holding a small fawn on the opposite side of the altar (IPH 3). Therefore, the Etruscan urns may develop a version of Iphigeneia's story that was known but never popular in Greece, or they may be an independent Etruscan invention. Iphigeneia is sometimes thought of as a so-called "strong woman" of Greek myth whose story would have appealed to Etruscan artists and patrons. If so, then how were her supplications, despair, and resistance interpreted on the urns? As a subject for commemoration appropriate in a funerary context, the Etruscan portrayal of a resisting Iphigeneia who is saved must have been viewed as noble in some way, and this reflects a development of the Greek story, and perhaps local traditions.

Considering the popularity of Iphigeneia's sacrifice on urns in Etruria, it is at first surprising that the subject of Polyxena's sacrifice was not embraced by Etruscan artists or patrons. It could be that Polyxena's fate, in contrast to that of Iphigeneia, seemed less suitable as a subject of commemoration on the urns of Etruscans sensitive to the meanings attached to certain myths. Iphigeneia's sacrifice is a sacred act, a sacrifice for the collective good, even if highly flawed, while that of Polyxena is a tomb offering to satisfy blood lust. Whereas Polyxena is always sacrificed, killed by a conquering foreign power, Iphigeneia is sometimes rescued from death, and enjoys a new life as an immortal or as a priestess of Artemis. In fact, most of the Etruscan urns with the sacrifice of

Iphigeneia include a figure, sometimes Artemis/Artumes, holding the deer to signal the animal substitution. Iphigeneia's story thus held greater appeal for Etruscans than that of Polyxena because her story was that of an aristocratic young princess whose life was cut short, but who was shown divine favor and rescued, perhaps achieving immortality.

At the same time, Iphigeneia's popularity on Etruscan urns might lead us to think that the Aulis story would also have been an appropriate and appealing subject for Roman sarcophagi because of its themes highlighting a life cut short, (self-) sacrifice for the greater good, female virtue, divine favor, and the possibility of immortality. Roman sarcophagi were often decorated with stories from Greek mythology that were used to comment on the character of the deceased. This is how the story of Alkestis' self-sacrifice on sarcophagi is often explained, with portrait features of historical women carved onto the mythological wife in order to associate the deceased with her exemplum of female virtue.⁵² Yet Iphigeneia as a sacrificial victim is not known on Roman sarcophagi. Of the dozen depictions of the Aulis episode in Roman art, none belong in a clear funerary context.⁵³

More than half of these representations show Kalchas cutting the forelocks of Iphigeneia's hair, and almost all of these appear on works in a domestic context. Kalchas cuts Iphigeneia's hair on a wall painting from the Casa del Vicolo di Modesto in Pompeii (now destroyed), a stucco relief from the

⁵²Wood 1978; Matheson 1996, 190.

⁵³Roman depictions of Iphigeneia at Aulis appear on IPH 73, 74, 99, 100, 101, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120.

Underground Basilica of Porta Maggiore,⁵⁴ the Altar of Kleomenes, a marble oscillum fragment, two fragments of Arretine pottery, and a terracotta relief oinochoe (IPH 73, 99, 100, 101, 115, 116, 117). This subject is also depicted on the front long side of the Veroli Casket (IPH 110).

Kalchas' cutting of Iphigeneia's hair is a moment in the story not depicted in Greek or Etruscan art, and not known in Euripides. What was it about this moment that explains why it was depicted most frequently of the Aulis episodes in Roman art, and why does it appear in a domestic context? Likewise, do these images present an acquiescing or unwilling Iphigeneia? Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair must have been evocative for Roman artists and viewers. This subject seems to have been a Roman invention, and I will show how it reflects contemporary artistic interests and modes of viewing revolving around ideas of *phantasia* and death as spectacle.

Phantasia was a rhetorical and artistic mode that involved mental imaging, or the completing of a picture in the mind's eye.⁵⁵ Quintilian makes reference to *phantasia* in discussing Timanthes' painting of Iphigeneia's sacrifice (IPH 117). Unable to depict Agamemnon's indescribable grief, the painter, Quintilian tells us, "solved the problem by veiling his head and leaving his sorrow to the imagination of the spectator." As M. Koortbojian has pointed out in reference to this commentary, "the spectator played a necessary and active role in establishing not only such a painting's affect and its meaning, but in the fullest

⁵⁴This is the exception, as it is not in a domestic environment.

⁵⁵Perry 2005, 150-171; Koortbojian 2005.

possible sense, *what it represented*" (emphasis mine).⁵⁶ The images of Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair provide the visual cues that prompt the viewer to complete the image in his or her imagination. The artists have depicted "the pregnant moment," the moment before the climactic action, filled with all of the anticipation, tension, and pathos of the scene.⁵⁷ Kalchas' cutting of Iphigeneia's forelocks is the preliminary act before her slaughter, the moment before the climax. For Roman viewers, these images allowed the individual to decide which version of Iphigeneia's story they wanted to see.

Iphigeneia is depicted in a similar manner on the half dozen or so works with Kalchas cutting her hair. Her head inclined slightly downward, she raises one hand to her chin and the other across her chest. She is almost always veiled. Do these images present her as a consenting sacrificial victim? Linant de Bellefonds describes Iphigeneia's pose on this series of images as evoking her "douloureuse résignation," which is a sensitive description.⁵⁸ "Resignation" does not imply consent. Does Iphigeneia's body language, especially her downturned head and the placement of her arms, communicate that she is a willing victim going quietly to sacrifice, or an unwilling victim subdued and resigned to her fate? It would have been up to the viewer to remember the details of her story and decide for themselves the outcome or her attitude.

⁵⁶Koortbojian 2005, 287-8.

⁵⁷On "the pregnant moment," see Lessing 1766; Bergmann 1994, 1996. In reference to Seneca, Varner (2000, 127) observes "the choice of such 'pregnant moments' demands direct viewer involvement in the events represented."

⁵⁸Linant de Bellefonds 1990, 727.

In a sense, Iphigeneia was depicted as both willing and unwilling at the same time, and the viewer activated the work. E. Perry has observed that artists used *phantasia* to convey the emotional states of figures, which is what ancient sources praised about Timomachus' famous painting of Medea. "In rhetorical terms," she argues, "this simultaneous representation of two emotions would have been a tour de force."⁵⁹ The images of Iphigeneia and Kalchas present her different emotional states. The scenes capture her as willing yet timid, or as unwilling but resigned. At this moment in the story, viewers not only decided her fate and how her story would end, but also contemplated her emotional state and how she might be feeling.

By depicting the moment before Iphigeneia's sacrifice, the artists prompted the viewers to complete the story in their own imaginations. It was up to the viewers to supply the details and decide whether her sacrifice was completed or whether she was rescued by Artemis at the last minute. In this way, the viewer became complicit in Iphigeneia's sacrifice, deciding whether she lived or died. The "spectacle of death" captivated Romans, for whom the gruesome killing of people was a recreation of everyday life known, for instance, from gladiatorial contests and executions presented as mythological enactments.⁶⁰ Within this cultural context of killing as entertainment that could convey public, State sanctioned messages about the need to maintain order, Iphigeneia's story may have appealed to Roman viewers eager for bloodshed. Romans of all classes would have been exposed to bloody spectacles, so it would not have been difficult

⁵⁹Perry 2005, 168.

⁶⁰Coleman 1990; Kyle 1998; Bergmann and Kondoleon 1999; Shelton 2000.

for them to visualize what the sacrifice of Iphigeneia might look like.

Nevertheless, the sacrifice itself was not the culturally meaningful part of the story, but rather the complex of human emotions bound up in the choice to make the sacrifice.

Most of the works with Kalchas and Iphigeneia originally belonged in a domestic context.⁶¹ This choice of subject for a wall painting in a home and for pottery, in particular, points to women as viewers of the images and as users of the objects. Women may also have commissioned these works. It is not surprising that the subject of virgin sacrifice appears in the home, as scenes of killing were not only known from public spectacles, but are also commonly found on works of art in domestic contexts.⁶² The appeal of gore and death, however, were likely not the only way in which the images were seen. The cutting of Iphigeneia's forelocks may also have evoked for some viewers contemporary cult practices, thus highlighting the prominent place of women in the religious sphere. For educated elites, the figure of Iphigeneia could also have triggered associations of her story in Tauris, thereby providing an opportunity to reflect on the different roles she played at Aulis and in Tauris.

Polyxena's sacrifice also has to be considered within Roman modes of viewing. On the Capitoline Tabula Iliaca, an inscription tells us that the depiction of Polyxena's sacrifice is among illustrations of Stesichorus' *Iliupersis*, a poem of the sixth-century BC about which not much is known. While the Capitoline tablet

⁶¹Except for the relief from the Underground Basilica of Porta Maggiore, the use of which is uncertain.

⁶²Kondoleon 1999, 321-42; Shelton 2000, 96; Varner 2000, 125.

was likely used to teach the stories illustrated, Roman viewers must have brought to it their knowledge of contemporary versions of the stories, such as Seneca's *Troades*, which also tells the story of Polyxena's sacrifice.⁶³ Seneca's Polyxena goes bravely to sacrifice. Just as Neoptolemos is about to deliver the death blow, the messenger tells us that "the brave heroine did not step back: she stood facing the blow, proud with defiant mien."⁶⁴ Roman viewers may have drawn on their knowledge of myth and literature to compare Seneca's portrayal of Polyxena with her depiction on the Tabula Iliaca, on which she is kneeling on the ground, garment fallen around her legs, hands tied behind her back. The Capitoline tablet depicts the moment before Polyxena is pierced by the sword, and viewers may have completed the scene in their imaginations, perhaps remembering Seneca's description of her violent death, "a sudden huge spurt of blood burst from her wound; yet dying she still did not cast off her spirit: She fell so as to make the earth heavy for Achilles, face down with furious impact."⁶⁵

Schröder believes Seneca's *Troades* might have been a source of inspiration for the short side with Polyxena on a third-century AD sarcophagus in Madrid (POL 22). Traditionally thought to depict the marriage of Achilles and Polyxena, he argues instead for the subject being her sacrifice at the hands of Neoptolemos.⁶⁶ The conflation between marriage and death is explicit in Seneca,

⁶³Fantham (1982, 56) comments on the linking of Polyxena and Astyanax at the tomb of Hektor on the Capitoline Tabula Iliaca as reflecting the Senecan tradition.

⁶⁴Lines 1151-2.

⁶⁵Lines 1156-9. On Seneca as a possible source used by viewers to imagine such scenes, see Bergmann 1996, 200ff; Varner 2000, 127.

⁶⁶Schröder 2004, 503-507.

where Polyxena's procession to sacrifice is described as advancing "like a wedding" and Helen is referred to as her "matron of honor."⁶⁷ If the Madrid scene depicts the moment before her sacrifice, Polyxena's brave pose beside her soon-to-be-killer would be worthy of the Senecan description. The onlookers behind the central pair of figures on the sarcophagus glance in different directions, as if registering conflicting emotions to what is about to happen. Their role as spectators enhances the representation of the scene as the moment before a "spectacle" of killing, and Roman viewers may have interpreted Polyxena as achieving freedom in death.⁶⁸

INTERPRETING SACRIFICIAL WOMEN IN ANCIENT GREECE

What does the civic and religiously sanctioned murder of a woman at the hands of a man tell us about the status of ancient women in Greek society? Are there ennobling aspects of the sacrificial virgin, or is she merely a means to an end? The fact that the stories of the sacrificial virgins were passed down, performed, and represented in art at first seems to reinforce the inferior status of young girls in a patriarchal regime. On one level, we may understand intellectually how Iphigeneia's martyrdom casts her as a heroine. From the perspective of women's history, however, it is difficult to see how the murder of a woman in a patriarchal society does anything to advance the status of women.

⁶⁷Lines 1132-3.

⁶⁸Shelton (2000, 98, 112) explores how, in the *Troades*, Seneca presents death as "both liberating and ennobling," by drawing on his other writings, such as *Epistle* 70.

The work of the French cultural historian Roger Chartier helps to interpret the figure of the sacrificial virgin in ancient Greece in her ancient context. In his book *On the Edge of the Cliff: History, Language and Practices*, Chartier writes:

Recognizing the mechanisms, the limits, and above all the uses of consent is a good strategy for correcting the privilege that history has long accorded to the view of women as “victims or rebels” . . . Not all the cracks invading male domination took the form of spectacular breaks, nor were they always expressed by the eruption of a discourse of refusal and rebellion. They often arose within consent itself, employing the language of domination to strengthen a refusal to submit.⁶⁹

Chartier identifies consent as an important category of inquiry for female agency. The figure of the sacrificial virgin, which may have been intended in some contexts like tragedy to control and police women, could have been embraced by women in a domestic setting who saw in her admirable qualities. Iphigeneia was a Panhellenic heroine, and it is not difficult to see how her voluntary sacrifice for the good of the State could have been interpreted as noble, a story told by mothers and nurses to daughters. Using Chartier’s language, the figure of the sacrificial virgin represents a resistance to male oppression by working within the language of domination. By embracing the story of the mythical sacrificial virgin’s consent, an act of oppression could be transformed into one of empowerment for real, historical women.

Resistance to male power need not have been intended by the artist creating the image, but in how it was interpreted by female viewers. As L.

⁶⁹Chartier 1997, 24. The following is the omitted clause in the quotation above, in which he quotes and footnotes Farge and Perrot 1992: “—as ‘active, or [as] actresses of their destiny,’ to the detriment of ‘passive women, judged to consent too easily to their condition, although, precisely, the question of consent is utterly central in the functioning of a system of power, be it social or (or social and) sexual.’”

Petersen has argued on female spectatorship of Greek vases, “it was possible for a woman of ancient Greece to liberate herself from the oppression of patriarchal constructs by actively reading her subjectivity in the images of female companionship even when. . . they depict groups of females engaged in activities that patriarchy deemed appropriate for women in Attic society.”⁷⁰ The image of the sacrificial virgin represents another subtle way in which resistance to masculine ideologies registered in the visual arts of ancient Greece. Myths and legends were passed down from mothers to daughters, and they often preserve women’s traditions and histories that have been lost.⁷¹ It was in stories that formed part of their myth-history that Greek women could insert their own voices, adapt them for their needs. Through mythological figures like Iphigeneia, Polyxena, and others, historical women found a range of different female attitudes and behaviors.

Images of women’s overt resistance to male authority are not common in Greek art, and one can imagine that such a display would have made an impression. The idea of a woman “fighting back” seems modern, but is not unknown in Greek art. For instance, on the Brygos Painter’s Louvre Iliupersis cup, Andromache swings a pestle, fighting against the Greeks to protect her city, home, and family. A woman also fights back on the Vivenzio hydria attributed to the Kleophrades Painter, but the number of pestle-wielders in Iliupersis scenes is

⁷⁰Petersen 1997, 51.

⁷¹Doherty 2006 on myth as a mode of transmitting women’s traditions. On using myth to study ancient women, see Dowden 1995.

small.⁷² It is no coincidence that these instances of women fighting back occur in Iliupersis scenes. In fact, it is the context of the Trojan War that allows for Iphigeneia and Polyxena to appropriate the masculine death of the warrior.⁷³

Antigone is one of the most famous women in Greek myth and literature who resists male authority. In Sophokles' play, Antigone bravely accepts her punishment of death for giving burial rites to her brother Polyneices, forbidden by man's law. She boldly and fearlessly stands up to Kreon, admitting her crime, saying, "I did it. I don't deny a thing."⁷⁴ In the end, Antigone hangs herself, a suicide. Women often die by hanging or suicide in tragedy, and this distinguishes her from Iphigeneia and Polyxena, who die by the sword.⁷⁵ However, Antigone's resistance to male power and her righteous indignation in the face of death links her story to that of Polyxena. As we saw in Chapter Four, the woman led away between two armed men on a late fifth-century BC Apulian hydria in Taranto might depict Antigone, and it was noted that the iconography of the scene is similar to that of the sacrificial virgin led to sacrifice (Fig. 242).⁷⁶ I. Krauskopf rejects her identification as Antigone because she interprets the man's grasping of the woman's wrist as more appropriate for bridal imagery than for leading off a

⁷²Williams 1991, 52.

⁷³Loraux 1987, 58-60. Discussed by me in the conclusion.

⁷⁴Line 492.

⁷⁵Loraux 1987, 7-31; Garrison 1991, 1995, 2000.

⁷⁶Taranto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 134905. *RVAp I*, 8.18; *LIMC*, Antigone 22; Taplin 2007, cat. No. 24, p. 94-6.

prisoner.⁷⁷ I see the woman on the Taranto hydria, however, as Antigone. The bridal imagery does not dissuade me because in Sophokles' play Antigone refers to the cave she is led to as her "tomb" and "bridal-bed," and the chorus calls it her "bridal chamber."⁷⁸ This is also how Polyxena is sometimes shown.

The Taranto hydria must be considered alongside another uncertain depiction of Antigone on a Lucanian nestoris in London (c. 370 BC), which depicts a woman led between two men armed with spears before a seated king (Fig. 242 bis).⁷⁹ The woman stands on a rock, and I believe this supports her identification as Antigone, perhaps an allusion to the cave to which she is to be led. The vases with Antigone in Taranto and London are related to the representations of the sacrificial virgins because they present another myth in which consent and resistance are central, and they shed light on how this may be rendered on a vase. The Taranto and London vases have often been thought to depict Antigone, in part, because of her downturned head. In Sophokles' play, Antigone stands before Kreon this way because the king says to her, "You, with your eyes fixed on the ground—speak up."⁸⁰ In reference to the London vase, Taplin comments that "lovers of the play [of Sophokles] may admire Antigone's

⁷⁷*LIMC*, Antigone 22. Discussed in Taplin 2007, 96. While he argues against Krauskopf in noticing that the figures' gazes do not meet, he still sees this vase as only a possible depiction of Antigone.

⁷⁸Lines 978 and 1039.

⁷⁹London, British Museum F 175. *LCS* 103.539; Séchan 1926, 141-2; Trendall and Webster 1971, III.2.4; *CFSTL* 32; *LIMC*, Antigone 11; Taplin 2007, 94. Krauskopf (in *LIMC*) accepts the identification of the woman as Antigone; Taplin rejects it because the king is seated and dressed in Oriental costume.

⁸⁰Lines 489-90.

defiance as she stares at the ground.”⁸¹ But do the images portray her as defiant? Iphigeneia and Polyxena are sometimes similarly depicted with a downcast head and quiet stance. This is how Polyxena appears on the hydria attributed to the Leagros Group in Berlin, which is almost always interpreted as quiet acceptance, resignation, or defeat (POL 3). Narrative context then may have helped the viewer in interpreting the womens’ body language. The vases with Antigone show that resistance does not have to register dramatically. Here, too, it may have been up to the viewer to supply the details of the story and interpret the scene. Antigone’s “quiet defiance” may also have been a way of linking her iconography with that of other women, like the sacrificial virgins. The vases in Taranto and London are not the only examples that connect Antigone with the sacrificial virgins. On a Homeric bowl in Halle, Antigone, named by an inscription, kneels before the body of her dead brother with both arms raised in the air (Fig. 241).⁸² Her pose is very similar to that of Polyxena on a Homeric bowl once in Berlin (POL 13).

This chapter began with a quote by Bérard about Athenian women, to which we should return. In discussing the many images of women spinning wool, Bérard explains that this was not a demeaning chore or tedious work. Instead, the working of wool allowed Athenian women to model themselves after their patron goddess Athena, in her aspect as worker, or Ergane, and the making of garments affected a religious dimension that recalled the role of women in the

⁸¹Taplin 2007, 94.

⁸²Halle, Archäologisches Museum der Universität. Late third—first half of the second century BC. *LIMC*, Antigone 7; Sinn 1979, pl. 18, 3.

ritual celebrations of Athena that culminated in the offering of the embroidered robe to the cult statue of Athena. “This type of work has an entirely positive connotation,” according to Bérard, who goes on to observe that “the constant reference to a transcendent order charges the work with a positive symbolic weight which modifies its primary meaning.”⁸³ The way in which a religious context, or the religious framing of a scene, can change its meaning is vital to consider in representations of the sacrificial virgin. As D. Kovacs points out in the introduction to Euripides’ *IA*, “the theme of death by sacrifice of young persons in the cause of their community is one that Euripides dramatized several times throughout his career, and there is no indication that the death of Menoeceus or of Heracles’ daughter was intended as anything but an effective remedy, calling forth wholehearted admiration, for a real problem.”⁸⁴

The gendered spaces in which the sacrificial maiden belonged were not just a matter of public and private uses, but also that of religion.⁸⁵ The sacrifice of Iphigeneia was made to appease a goddess, and the offering of Polyxena was to appease the heroic dead. Iphigeneia and Polyxena participate in a “transcendent order,” belonging to the world of the gods and of the dead, and their involvement in these sacred realms signifies their importance.

⁸³Bérard 1989, 90-1.

⁸⁴Kovacs 2002, 62.

⁸⁵On the religious sphere as a realm where women could exercise power, see recently Goff 2004 and Connelly 2007.

THE SACRIFICIAL VIRGIN AND THE POLITICS OF ARISTOCRATIC LIFE

The private context of many of the works of art considered here carved out a different kind of gendered space in the physical and ideological landscapes of the Greek world, and in turn allowed for different interpretations. Beyond the categories of “public” and “private,” and those in between the two, for whom were these works made or commissioned? Most likely all of the objects and monuments on which images of the sacrificial virgin appear belong in aristocratic contexts.⁸⁶ The representations in art illuminate aristocratic traditions of the sacrificial virgin as the purview of the upper class. Walter Donlan has identified an “aristocratic ideal” distinct from the greater Greek ideal, and I argue that the sacrificial virgin articulates elite concerns of maintaining their position in society with “appeals to birth, wealth, and ‘inherited’ excellence of mind and character.” The necessity for a “visible demonstration of superiority” finds one expression in the sacrificial virgin, like Iphigeneia, who is herself valuable, destined by birth to endure her fate, but virtuous of heart to go willingly to sacrifice, in some versions of the story at any rate. What follows is a case study of how Polyxena may have gained different meanings in an aristocratic context.

TRIPODS, TROY, AND POLYXENA

The tripods on Louvre G 152 and the Polyxena Sarcophagus have been described as iconographic landscape elements locating the action of the scene in a

⁸⁶On aristocratic life in ancient Greece, see Greenhalgh 1972; Arnheim 1977; Van Bremen 1983; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989; Starr 1992; Knittlmayer 1997; Donlan 1999.

sanctuary.⁸⁷ Drawing on N. Papalexandrou's research on the poetic and semantic dimensions of tripods, I argue that the tripod, as a fixture of aristocratic life, may have resonated with other metaphorical meanings in connection with the sacrificial virgin, and may have formed part of Polyxena's iconography.

Scholars have understandably wanted to connect the tripod with Apollo, but it does not always make sense. The tripod in between the scenes with Polyxena and Priam on the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup has been seen as problematic because Priam is known to have been killed by Neoptolemos at the altar of Zeus Herkeios, not in a sanctuary of Apollo as the tripod would seem to indicate (POL 7).⁸⁸ Heydemann believed that the Brygos Painter's scene might preserve a version of the story in which Priam was killed in a precinct of Apollo.⁸⁹ M. Anderson argues that the tripod on the Brygos Painter's vase and the palm tree on Oltos' Malibu cup "stand out as imported symbols of Apollo" making a proleptic reference to Neoptolemos' fate at the hands of Apollo in Delphi.⁹⁰ Hedreen argues that the tripod on the Brygos Painter's cup, along with the palm trees in other depictions of Priam's murder, Cassandra's rape, and Helen's

⁸⁷For instance, Sakowski 1997, 171-2. Anderson (1997, 239) comments that the two tripods flanking the statue in the scene of Cassandra's rape on the interior of Onesimos' Villa Giulia cup was intended to highlight the sacredness of the sanctuary and to underscore the sacrilege taking place.

⁸⁸Hedreen (2001, 67ff) discusses the vases on which tripods and palm trees, attributes of Apollo, appear in scenes of Priam's murder at the altar of Zeus Herkeios: Florence 73140 (*ARV*² 568.51), Vivenzio hydria, and Oltos' Malibu cup. The appearance of tripods in association with Zeus need not bother us too much, as tripods have been found in great quantities at Olympia.

⁸⁹Tosi 1905, 172-5; discussed in Hedreen 2001, 68, and 68 note 22.

⁹⁰Anderson 1997, 198-9.

recovery, are “allusions to Apollo’s construction of parts of the city of Troy,” linking the sack of Troy with its mythological construction.⁹¹

Turning to the Polyxena Sarcophagus, N. Sevinç identifies the tripod in front of the tumulus as an analeptic reference to Apollo’s role in Achilles’ death.⁹² Hedreen’s attractive suggestion, drawn from the visual evidence, that the tripod may indicate that Achilles was not buried at the Skaian Gate of Troy, but in a sacred precinct of Apollo, allows him to draw more parallels between the stories of Neoptolemos and Achilles, and those of Troilos and Polyxena.⁹³ On the Polyxena Sarcophagus, according to Hedreen, the tripod “suggests that storytellers were already speculating that the death of Achilles was connected in some way with the sanctuary of Apollo Thymbraios.”⁹⁴ This was the spot where Achilles killed Troilos, and later, in Hellenistic and Roman romances, where Achilles was to meet with Polyxena, and where he died.

Looking beyond topographical references, what meanings might have been conveyed by tripods? Scholars have recently explored the meanings of tripods as statements of power and social status.⁹⁵ Tripods were not only dedications, but also aristocratic commodities that could be exchanged. In his book *The Visual Poetics of Power*, N. Papalexandrou explores “the semantic content of the tripod

⁹¹Hedreen 2001, 67-90 (with a summary of previous interpretations), 223.

⁹²Sevinç 1996, 258.

⁹³Hedreen 2001, 135-6. For Hedreen (2001, 135-6), in refuting Sevinç’s interpretation, “. . . the employment of a pictorial element that usually conveys a sense of space, location, or physical ownership to symbolize a nonspatial idea seems a bit strained.”

⁹⁴Hedreen 2001, 136.

⁹⁵Papalexandrou 2005, 4, and 4 note 10, with references to Morgan 1990 and De Polignac 1996.

as the symbol par excellence of authoritative discourse, and hence, of political power and territorial domination.”⁹⁶ He argues that tripods not only symbolized political hegemony, but were also linked with women. In the *Iliad*, for instance, the first-prize winner of the chariot race during the funeral games for Patroklos would receive “a woman faultless in the work of her hands to lead away and a tripod with ears and holding twenty-two measures.”⁹⁷ Likewise, in Book Nine of the *Iliad*, Agamemnon’s expiatory gifts for Achilles include seven tripods, seven women, and seven citadels or cities to rule.⁹⁸ Papalexandrou finds that “the collocation of women and tripods consistently appears in several symbolic manifestations of political leadership in the *Iliad*.”⁹⁹ The conceptual link of “tripod-woman-polis”¹⁰⁰ can also help us to interpret the tripod that appears with Polyxena on Louvre G152 and on the Polyxena Sarcophagus.

In the context of Plutarch’s account of the tripod and the story of the seven sages, we learn that Helen of Troy threw the tripod into the sea. When fishermen originally caught this tripod in the sea, they argued over its ownership, so possession, ownership, and strife are at the origins of this object. As Papalexandrou observes, “it is possible that Helen’s golden tripod epitomizes the lost sovereignty of the fallen city.”¹⁰¹ I believe Papalexandrou’s formulations

⁹⁶Papalexandrou 2005, 4.

⁹⁷*Iliad* 23.263-5.

⁹⁸*Iliad* 9.121, 128, 148; and 270, 264, 291.

⁹⁹Papalexandrou 2005, 49-50. He further observes that tripods are paired with women of “exceptional status,” like Helen and Hippodameia (2005, 49).

¹⁰⁰Papalexandrou 2005, 214 note 61.

¹⁰¹In Plutarch, *Sol.* 4. Papalexandrou 2005, 49.

regarding the territorial and political associations of the tripod can be expanded to help explain the appearance of tripods in Iliupersis scenes in the Greek visual arts. The tripod is a valuable commodity, often a rich dedication of religious and civic pride, whether collective or individual. It is a symbol of stability, as it will literally always rest firmly on the ground. As a feature of aristocratic life, the tripod comes to symbolize Troy as well; it is not only laden with ideas of territorial domination, but also charged with architectonic associations.¹⁰² In Chapter One, I have already reviewed, following Vermeule, how Polyxena is equated with Troy as a body to be violated in the Iliupersis. Therefore, the loss of political power and domination represented by the sacking of Troy finds visual manifestations not only in the sacrifice of Polyxena, but also in the use of the tripod, a symbol of wealth, power, stability, and autonomy. On Louvre G152, the linking of Polyxena and the tripod intimates that what is about to happen to her is related to the loss of power and wealth that will follow the sack of the city.

The tripod represented in the two scenes with Polyxena may imply not only the loss of power and “territorial domination” of the city of Troy, but also of the maiden’s own body and personal agency. The sacrifice of Polyxena at the hands of Neoptolemos, penetrated by the warrior’s sword, enacts the ultimate loss of power, that of personal sovereignty and somatic agency. Therefore, the appearance of a tripod with Polyxena on Louvre G152 and on the Polyxena Sarcophagus can be understood as embodying a conceptualization of “tripod-woman-city,” similar to that found in epic, and forms a part of Polyxena’s iconography.

¹⁰²Jones 2002.

The “tripod-woman-polis” triad adds another layer of meaning not only to the two works with Polyxena, but also to representations of the rape of Cassandra and the recovery of Helen that include tripods. The tripod included in the scene of Helen’s recovery on an Attic red-figure volute-krater in Bologna must have symbolic value rather than topographic meaning, as is shown by its small size and placement in the field in the space between the heads of Menelaos and Athena.¹⁰³

Linking the tripod with ideas of political power and territorial domination also helps to explain its significance in scenes of Priam’s murder. Interpreted in this way, the Brygos Painter’s placement of a tripod between the scene of Priam’s murder and Polyxena’s procession to sacrifice is an ingenious narrative device that metaphorically links the two scenes. The tripod as symbol of aristocratic wealth and power and its loss in the sack of Troy, stands as a witness to the end of Troy’s political power, symbolized by the death of the king on one side, and to the end of Troy’s future, represented by Polyxena on the other. The connection between Priam and a tripod also occurs on an Early Mannerist pelike in Florence.¹⁰⁴ One side depicts the death of Priam at the hands of Neoptolemos on an altar, and the other represents an old man and woman who appear to be rushing to help Priam. The man swings a staff over his head. Between the two Trojan figures is a tripod set on a block. Its placement between the two figures makes it seem as if they are fighting to protect it. Finally, while the tripod behind the altar on Onesimos’ cup with Achilles killing Troilos in Perugia may indicate

¹⁰³Bologna, Museo Civico Archeologico 269 (17190). Attributed to the Niobid Painter. ARV2 599.8. Illustrated in Hedreen 2001, fig. 19a-c.

¹⁰⁴Florence, Museo Archeologico Etrusco 73140. ARV² 586.51, 1660. Discussed in Hedreen 2001, 67.

the sanctuary of Apollo Thymbraios where the scene takes place, it may also on another level symbolize the loss of political power for Troy that Troilos' death portends.¹⁰⁵

The tripod as a symbol of military power with aristocratic and political connotations could also be argued in its frequent use as a shield device in Greek vase-painting. The seemingly random use of devices on Greek vases makes it difficult to interpret any symbolic meaning, but is a subject that merits further study.¹⁰⁶

We have seen that the tripod appears at least twice in representations of Polyxena's sacrifice, but it does not appear in any depiction of Iphigeneia at Aulis in Greek art. A tripod, however, does appear on a vase in Matera representing Iphigeneia in Tauris (TAU 9), where it is set on a base at ground level directly below Iphigeneia. Set before the naiskos, it is almost as if the tripod appears as an altar of sorts, alluding to the sacrificial activities over which Iphigeneia presides in Tauris. Placed directly below Iphigeneia, the tripod is visually linked

¹⁰⁵Perugia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 89. *ARV*² 320.8. Illustrated in Hedreen 2001, fig. 20a-b. A fragment of an Attic red-figure volute-krater at the Getty preserves the legs of a tripod set behind a crouching woman in an Iliupersis scene (Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.202.).

¹⁰⁶On shield devices, see Chase 1902. It is interesting to note that on two vases attributed to Group E, a tripod is used as the shield device for the statue of Athena to which Cassandra flees in a representation of her violation at the hands of the lesser Ajax. In light of the connections between women, tripods and cities discussed above, one may read metaphoric value into the use of the tripod as a shield device on these two vases. The two representations of the subject are so similar that we may ask whether the same painter executed them identically, or whether one painter copied the composition from another painter in his workshop right down to the shield device. Or was the use of the tripod as a shield device a conscious iconographic feature used by painters in this workshop for symbolic meaning? (compare Munich, *Antikensammlungen* 1380 [*ABV* 135.34] and New York, MMA 41.162.143 [*ABV* 134.25; *Parlipomena* 55]).

Similar symbolic meaning may also be attached to the shield devices of the two warriors on a black-figure amphora of about 550-500 BC in Rhodes, Archaeological Museum 10604 [CVA 1, III.H.E.3, pl. (433) 1.1-2]. A woman (Helen? Iphigeneia? Polyxena?) is being led between two warriors, each of whom has a tripod as a shield device. If we accept that the choice of shield device was meaningful, and that the tripod sometimes figures in the iconography of Helen and Polyxena, but not that of Iphigeneia, then this may help to narrow the possibilities of which woman might be depicted.

with her, perhaps indicating the “authoritative discourse” she exercises in her role as priestess of Artemis.

The place of the tripod in Polyxena’s iconography may also help us to understand better the Haimon Painter’s black-figure lekythos in Paris, which gives an uncertain depiction of Polyxena (POL 30). She is not led to a tomb, but seems to offer her neck beside a funerary mound. This has been thought to depict the funeral games for Patroklos because of the burial mound and chariot, but why would Polyxena appear in the same scene? The combination of the burial mound and tripod suggests that this might be the grave of Achilles, finding a parallel in the imagery on the Polyxena Sarcophagus. The two chariots could be part of his funeral games, and the tripod one of the prizes for the winner. Tripods are often prizes at funeral games, like those for Patroklos described in the *Iliad* (23.261-70) and represented on the neck of the François Vase. The pairing of Polyxena with two chariots is found on another Attic vase, a black-figure hydria attributed to the Leagros Group in Berlin (POL 3): on the body, she is led to sacrifice by Neoptolemos, towards the grave of Achilles, while on the shoulder two chariots race. On the analogy of the Berlin hydria we can propose to identify Polyxena on the lekythos in Paris because of the combination of tripods, chariots, tombs, women and necks.

Conclusion

A Role Fit for a Princess

“The death then of a beautiful woman is unquestionably the most poetical topic in the world. . . .”
 Edgar Allen Poe, *The Philosophy of Composition*, 1870

The persistence with which the stories of the sacrificial virgins Iphigeneia and Polyxena appear in Western art and literature seems to support Poe’s assertion, its misogynistic underpinnings aside. There is something poetic about the idea of virgin sacrifice that appealed not only to the ancients, but also translated to capture the Romantic imagination of other peoples in other places. As subjects in art, Iphigeneia and Polyxena, the two sacrificial virgins of the Trojan epic, appear not only in the ancient world, but they enjoy a rich *nachleben*, the subject of numerous works of art, literature, plays, and operas from late antiquity to the present day.¹ Iphigeneia, the sacrificial virgin par excellence, appears in medieval manuscripts and in paintings by artists from Tiepolo to Goya, and from Benjamin West to Mark Rothko (Figs. 182-183). In a *capriccio* by Panini, the sacrifice of Iphigeneia takes place among antique ruins, including a statue of the famous *Diane Chasseresse* (Fig. 181). Iphigeneia has also enjoyed sustained popularity on the stage, the subject of famous works by Racine and Goethe.² Although less popular than Iphigeneia, Polyxena also appears quite often. She is the subject of works by Francesco Primaticcio, Pietro

¹See Reid 1993; Gliksohn 1985.

²Jean Racine’s *Iphigénie en Aulide* was first performed in 1674, and Goethe’s *Iphigenie auf Tauris* was first performed in 1779.

da Cortona, and Nicolas Poussin, among others. Polyxena's story was also told in the 15th-century romance of Raoul Lefèvre and in an unfinished work by Molière.

The fascination with these women continues in the modern world. Barry Unsworth's novel *The Songs of the Kings* (2003) re-tells the story of Iphigeneia, and Elizabeth Cook's "Iphigeneia's Wedding" (2006) is a short story told from the perspective of the Greek princess. Charles Mee's *Iphigeneia 2.0* (2007), is an off-broadway re-interpretation of the *Iphigeneia at Aulis* in what has been described as a "tabloid style." In a *New York Times* review of this play, Jason Zinoman writes, "If you think Lindsay Lohan has family problems, meet the new party girl on the scene, a blond ditz who should make the editors of *Us Weekly* drool."³

It is, however, Anselm Feuerbach's dreamy paintings of Iphigeneia (1862 and 1871) that epitomize the Romantic post-antique place the Greek princess has come to occupy. Seated in a contemplative pose and looking out at the sea, Feuerbach's Iphigeneias not only capture the plight of the maiden caught in an impossible situation, but they are also meditations on human mortality and on the passing of time, and, by extension, reflections on the place of Greek culture in the modern world.

Poe's comment on the poetic nature of the death of a beautiful woman also raises broader interpretive and ethical questions. Is there a difference between the death of a man and of a woman? Is the sacrifice of a person a horror against humanity? Is this culturally determined, or a social constant throughout time

³*The New York Times*, 27 August 2007. The review is entitled, "Way Before Lindsay and Britney, Chaos Swirled Around Iphigenia."

and place? Is there a difference between sacrificing a man or woman? Can we ever escape our own cultural prejudices to locate the place of virgin sacrifice within the “mental universe” of the ancient Greeks? An example may help to highlight some of the cultural biases that sometimes intervene in our understanding of the ancient world. In the June/July 2007 edition of the popular magazine *Details*, horror film director Eli Roth was interviewed about his new movie *Hostel: Part II*. In the first movie, a group of male backpackers lured into staying at an Eastern European hostel are abducted and brutally tortured. As to why the sequel focuses on the torture of women rather than men, Roth responded, “It was a sequel, so we had to take it up a notch. Torturing women is inherently more horrible. We can watch a guy get hacked up and deal with it, but if you kill a woman too violently you ruin the whole movie. People just can’t take it.”⁴ I cannot help but wonder whether or not Aischylos and Euripides would agree.

With all of the tension, horror, and gore imagined in the act of virgin sacrifice, it is easy to see why representations of Polyxena’s sacrifice at the hands of Neoptolemos have garnered so much attention, as on the famous Tyrrhenian amphora in the British Museum and the so-named Polyxena Sarcophagus. This, however, is not the moment depicted most frequently in Polyxena’s story, and Iphigeneia is not even once depicted being murdered. Greek artists more often depicted the sacrificial virgins in other moments in their narrative. General and scholarly interest on these unique images of Polyxena’s throat being cut has lead

⁴Interview of Eli Roth. In *Details* (June/July 2007), p. 52.

to a distorted view of the iconography of the sacrificial virgin and her place in Greek thinking. A survey of the representations of the sacrificial virgin reveals that it was not the visualization of the *act* of sacrificing a woman that was most important, but rather the *idea* of her sacrifice that was of greater interest.

Whereas previous scholars have sought to ascertain whether the myths of virgin sacrifice were inspired by or a memory of actual human sacrifices from the Greeks' past, I explore them as a cultural and ideological construction. Building upon the work of the French School, this dissertation has explored the "cultural arbitrariness" of the image as a sign and how "the image is an artificial creation whose relationship to actual reality is indirect and immensely complex."⁵ Our understanding of virgin sacrifice has evolved from that captured in T. Panofka's 1843 *Bilder Antiken Lebens*, which includes a drawing of the Iphigeneia painting from the House of the Tragic Poet as an illustration of "sacrifice" in the ancient world.

Throughout, I have argued that the sacrificial virgin in both art and literature offers a polysemic view of ancient women. Images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena could be interpreted in a range of different ways, depending on the work of art's iconography, medium, use, context, and intended and unintended viewers. These mythological maidens were used to "think through" contemporary social and cultural concerns, such as the place and status of women in Greek society, and in this way were relevant to the lives of historical women and men.⁶ Their depiction in art both reflected and participated in the

⁵Ferrari 2002, 21. See also Ferrari 2003.

⁶On epic "thinking through characters," see Goyet 2006.

fashioning of Greek ideas about identity, gender, and personal agency. The impact of myth on real people can be glimpsed through an Attic lawsuit in which Antiphon tells us that a woman convicted for killing her husband could claim that she had been playing the role of Klytimestra.⁷ Antiphon's anecdote reminds us that mythological figures loomed large in the collective conscious of the Greeks and were linked with cultural values and behaviors.

Jan Bremmer has observed that "the desire to claim the glory of the Trojan War for their own community led a number of Greek cities to appropriate the assembly at Aulis from the pan-Hellenic myth, and Iphigeneia was in a way the icon of this assembly."⁸ In particular, he cites the case of the Spartan king Agesilaus, who at the beginning of the fourth century BC went to Aulis to sacrifice a deer to Artemis before initiating war against Persia, in emulation of Agamemnon.⁹ Pausanias tells us that when his forces were assembled, Agesilaus "went to Aulis to sacrifice to Artemis, because Agamemnon too had propitiated the goddess here before leading the expedition to Troy."¹⁰ Plutarch adds that Agesilaus also dreamt in Aulis that Artemis demanded the sacrifice of his daughter. The account of Agesilaus illustrates that the historical Greeks thought of the events of the Trojan War as part of their myth-history that could affect the present. After Agesilaus dreamed of Artemis' request for the sacrifice of his daughter, Plutarch mentions that he could not comply because he loved her. The

⁷Antiphon 1.17 (discussed and cited in Hall 2006, 28).

⁸Bremmer 2002, 41.

⁹Xenophon, *Hell.* 3.43, 3.5.5; Plutarch, *Life of Agesilaus* 6; Pausanias 3.9.3-4. Discussed in Bremmer 2002, 32-3 and 35.

¹⁰Pausanias 3.9.4.

fact that Agesilaus did not sacrifice his daughter shows that myths could resonate but still had their practical limits.

Iphigeneia and Polyxena are best known for the role they play in men's stories. Iphigeneia's sacrifice is a consequence of Agamemnon's conflict between his obligations to the State and those to his family. Likewise, Polyxena's sacrifice is the result of Achilles' demand for his share of the Trojan war booty. Their stories are couched in larger narratives of war and the relations between men. When the sacrificial virgin appears as the protagonist of plays, scholarly consensus is that "the tragedian is often a male 'maker' (poietes) of women to be viewed by men."¹¹ In art, it is also thought that "Athenian vase-painting was essentially a man's view of a man's point of view."¹² While admittedly often the case, this view does not take into consideration women as viewers of images, the possibility of women's traditions separate from those of men, or the multivalence of myth in allowing for more than one interpretation.

This dissertation has argued that the stories of Iphigeneia and Polyxena were also important for women, and my emphasis has been on recovering women's subjectivities or ways of looking. By offering hypothetical interpretations of how aristocratic women may have interpreted the sacrificial virgin in private contexts, I have argued that Iphigeneia and Polyxena were sometimes interpreted as noble figures by women. While these myths articulated ideas about Greek womanhood, they also played a role in the fashioning of men's

¹¹Hall 2006, 120.

¹²Williams 1983, 105. Discussed in Goff 2004, 249-50.

identities. I believe that some Greek men may have identified with the sacrificial virgin as a strong figure, and admired her courage. As Dennis Hughes has observed, the “tales of women who died selflessly to save their country effectively inspired men to be prepared to do the same.”¹³ A third-century BC papyrus fragment preserving the musical score of excerpts from Euripides’ *Iphigeneia in Aulis* also suggests that her sacrifice was to be admired.¹⁴ The fragment preserves lines 1500(?)–09, one of Iphigeneia’s speeches, and 784–94(?), a choral interlude, in that order. The inverted order of the excerpts suggests that it was from “some sort of concert performance of musical highlights,” rather than a performance of Euripides’ play.¹⁵ Pöhlmann and West note that the excerpts would have been performed by a solo male singer since the vocal register was for a tenor. Removed from the narrative context of the entire play, when Iphigeneia declares, “you raised me as a light of salvation to Greece. I do not regret my death,” (lines 1502–3) her situation elevates rather than demeans women. She dies in war, like a man. Cast in heroic terms, she becomes a figure with whom a man could identify.

The representations in art present us with obstacles regarding men’s reception and interpretation of the sacrificial virgin. The Attic red-figure volutekrater in Taranto with an uncertain depiction of Iphigeneia is a good example because it was found in a man’s grave in Gravina, Italy. If this vase, the largest

¹³Hughes 1991, 76. He further explains that the maidens who voluntarily offered their lives “would pose a direct challenge to the male warrior” that “served to inspire the army to courage and patriotism in the face of the enemy” (1991, 76).

¹⁴Pap. Leiden Inv. P. 510. Published in Pöhlmann and West 2001, 18–21.

¹⁵Pöhlmann and West 2001, 20.

and best in the tomb, was chosen because of its subject and meaning for the deceased, how are we to interpret its imagery? Was the deceased man to be associated with the woman being attacked on the altar, or with the man attacking her? Was her death heroic, or was the warrior performing the act the one to be admired?

In discussing the role of women as internal spectators in Greek art and literature, Blundell and Rabinowitz have observed that “in epic, in tragedy (especially those plays that take the Trojan War as their theme), and in vase-painting, it is the men who fight and the women who reflect the suffering of war.”¹⁶ This is what I believe sets Iphigeneia and Polyxena apart from other female figures in the Trojan cycle. Both do not just reflect the suffering of war, but die in it. Like male warriors, their battle scars are physical, they are part of the action, not just observers of it. As Nicole Loraux has argued, the sacrificed virgins who die by the sword appropriate the masculine death of the warrior.¹⁷ The figure of the sacrificial virgin then does not fit neatly into the category of the “feminine.” Iphigeneia and Polyxena thus join other figures, like the pestle-wielding Andromache, the defiant Antigone, and the warlike Amazons, who take on various male characteristics for complex and different reasons. These figures blur the boundaries between the masculine and the feminine, and were a way for the Greeks to think about identity. Greek constructions of gender and sexuality

¹⁶Blundell and Rabinowitz 2005.

¹⁷Loraux 1987, 58-60; Scodel 1996, 122.

are often thought of as firmly inscribed and intransigent, but a figure like the sacrificial virgin suggests that these may have been more fluid.¹⁸

Iphigeneia and Polyxena are active participants in the Trojan War, the domain traditionally associated with men. They emerge as figures of great value in the political and military world of men, and their participation in these so-called “masculine” arenas reveals manifestations of female power previously underestimated. At the same time, the sacrificial virgin reflects women’s traditions, by allowing historical women to think about their lives and fates in comparison to those of their mythological counterparts. The myths of the sacrificial virgins were more than just stories because they had the power to shape ideas, behaviors, and ways of thinking about the role and place of women in society. The image of the sacrificial virgins in art represents an embodiment of female power and agency, even in the face of death.

¹⁸An exception is Loraux’s *The Experiences of Tiresias: The Feminine and the Greek Man* (1995), which examines how Greek men drew on the feminine in the construction of male identities.

Catalogue

Images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Art

The catalogue compiles, describes, and illustrates the approximately 148 representations, both certain and uncertain, of Iphigeneia and Polyxena as sacrificial virgins in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman art. The catalogue reorganizes, and, when possible, updates the lists found in *LIMC*, adding about 50 works not in the lexicon.¹ Whereas the lists in *LIMC* are arranged by subject according to episode or moment in the myth depicted, I organize my catalogue by artistic medium in order to draw out iconographic trends and developments within each medium, with the goal of then looking across mediums in order to analyze how the maidens are represented in various art forms. My main interest in this dissertation is not in establishing a strict chronology of works, but in exploring their interpretation and meaning.²

¹In *LIMC*, Touchefeu-Meynier (1994) catalogues 43 representations of Polyxena in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman art, but she is clear that the list does not include every depiction of the maiden at the fountain-house in vase-painting, nor does it give every uncertain identification. My total of 158 images of Iphigeneia and Polyxena, does not include the representations of Polyxena at the fountain-house catalogued by Touchefeu-Meynier. Touchefeu-Meynier's list of "La mort de Polyxène" includes cat. nos. 21-42, and cat. no. 43 is the marriage of Polyxena on the Roman sarcophagus in Madrid. My catalogue does not include depictions (certain or uncertain) of Polyxena at the fountain-house.

²For a recent catalogue in the field of ancient art that eschews approaching works in terms of stylistic developments with the sole goal of establishing a chronology, see R.R.R. Smith's *Roman Portrait Statuary from Aphrodisias* (2006), which seeks instead attempts to discern "two kinds of change: one more archaeological and technical, to do with slow broad adjustments of manufacture and format (surface finishing, piecing, plinth and support morphology) that carried at the time no social significance; and one more historical to do with real life changes in self-representation, broad costume preferences, and the meaning and effect of images" (p. 7-8). For a critique of Smith's approach, and a more general consideration of the methodologies of catalogues, see J. Tanner's review of Smith's book, *BMC* 2007.04.70.

Throughout, I argue that the context of works of art is integral to their meaning, so it makes sense to arrange works by medium, which allows me to keep bodies of material with a similar context together, such as vase-paintings or reliefs decorating sarcophagi. The distinction between what has often been characterized as the public and private contexts of works of art plays a major role in my interpretation of the sacrificial virgin in Chapter Five.

I follow the conventions of *LIMC* in listing the representations of each maiden separately and in organizing the catalogue chronologically so that Greek, Etruscan, and Roman depictions are clearly indicated. My debt to the excellent entries on Iphigeneia and Polyxena in *LIMC* is immense, and the works collected there are the core of this study.³

While a careful consideration of style and date is certainly important for my analysis, I prefer to think of the catalogue not as a list of works set firmly in a rigid chronology, but as a more fluid collection of images, as did the art historian Aby Warburg (1866-1929), who created an image “atlas” called *Mnemosyne, A Picture Series Examining the Function of Preconditioned Antiquity-Related Expressive Values for the Presentation of Eventful Life in the Art of the European Renaissance*.⁴ Warburg’s Mnemosyne-Atlas consisted of wooden boards covered with black cloth on which were attached images—reproductions of works of art, photographs, pictures from newspapers, and other visual

³Iphigeneia: Lilly Kahil (Greek); Ingrid Krauskopf (Etruscan); Pascale Linant de Bellefonds (Roman). Polyxena: Odette Touchefeu-Meynier.

⁴Aby Warburg. *Der Bilderatlas MNEMOSYNE*, Martin Warnke (ed.), Berlin 2003, 2nd printing.

materials—juxtaposed with one another in order to graphically map how the images relate to one another under the rubric of a theme.

One of Warburg's tableaux was on "sacrificial rapture" and it focused on the human victim, including two depictions of Polyxena (Fig. 138).⁵ On this board, an image of Polyxena's sacrifice on the Tyrrhenian amphora in London appears above a reproduction of the same subject depicted on the Etruscan sarcophagus in the Museo Claudio Faina in Orvieto (POL 1 and 19). Other subjects on this tableau included images of Laocoon, dancing maenads, Achilles and Deidamia, the vestal Claudia Quinta, and scenes from the cult of Isis. The inclusion of a Hellenistic bas relief of the fourth century BC depicting Ajax and Cassandra is interesting because the relationship between Polyxena and Cassandra has not often been appreciated; I take up this subject in Chapter Four.

Warburg's Mnemosyne-atlas reveals his interest in the role of memory in art, and the idea of memory is an important concept in understanding virgin sacrifice in the ancient world.⁶ The role of memory, in part, constructs meaning for and endows the idea of virgin sacrifice with an assortment of meanings. For the Archaic and Classical Greeks, virgin sacrifice was remembered as an alleged historical practice of Bronze age ancestors with an aetiological function, shrouded in unknown origins. For the Hellenistic Greeks, the performance of "classical" plays perpetuated the idea of virgin sacrifice and for the Romans, Greek objects

⁵This panel formed part of the 2004 exhibition *Mnemosyne: iter per labyrinthum*, held at the Palazzo of the Levi Foundation in Venice, organized by the seminary class of the Classical Tradition at IUAV Venice University, with the Associazione Mnemosyne in Rome, the Centro Warburg Italia, and the Villard d'Honnecourt International Doctorate in Architecture. *La rivista di Engramma* maintains a digital archive of the materials at www.engramma.it/engramma_v4/homepage/35/035_english.htm, as of 9/15/2007.

⁶On the "role of memory in the transmission of culture," see Rowlands 1993.

and plays served a similar function in inscribing the memory of the sacrificial virgin. My catalogue forms a type of memory collection that helps to capture manifestations of how the figure of the sacrificial virgin was employed in the visual arts.

Each work is given a catalogue number which consists of two parts, a three letter prefix and a number. Depictions of Iphigeneia are given the prefix IPH and those of Polyxena are given the prefix POL. The prefixes are followed by numbers, which run consecutively, with each maiden beginning with the number one. Each entry identifies the work by its location and accession number (when appropriate) and provides the following information: figure numbers that refer to the list of illustrations in this dissertation, brief identifications of the type of object or monument, names of artists or attributions if available, dates, references, and a brief description of the subject depicted.

For the list of references, the catalogue number in the appropriate *LIMC* entry is always given first. If no cross-reference to *LIMC* is given in my catalogue entry, then the work does not appear in *LIMC*. To avoid duplicating the bibliographic citations for each entry found in *LIMC*, I provide only references for sources that appear after the publication of *LIMC*.⁷ For vases, however, I provide the standard Beazley references of *ABV*, *ARV²*, *Paralipomena*, and *Addenda²*, (or the Trendall references for south Italian works) for convenience. For help in updating some of the references for vases, I have drawn on the information in the

⁷Vol. V (Iphigeneia) was published in 1990; vol. VII (Polyxena) was published in 1994. I include articles from the late 1980s and later that were not able to be included.

online Beazley Archive Extensible Database.⁸ The vase number in the Beazley Archive Database is given in the list of references preceded by the abbreviation *BAD*.

Of the 148 works in this catalogue, only two are not illustrated: IPH 19, and IPH 57. I have often included multiple illustrations of works, as it is difficult to capture some vase-paintings and sculptures with only one image. When I provide more than one illustration of a work, the figure number remains the same followed by a lower case letter, for example, 1a, 1b, 1c, etc.

Works in my catalogue that do not appear in *LIMC* have the first line of their entry highlighted in grey. A concordance between catalogue numbers in *LIMC* and those in this dissertation, and between the catalogue numbers and museum accession numbers is given after the catalogue. Throughout, all data given for numbers of preserved or known works are approximations. Numbers are not absolute, but given to convey the range and distribution of known works. The discovery of the Polyxena Sarcophagus, for instance, proves how the discovery of even one new work can challenge our assumptions about the significance of a subject.

Appendix A includes a catalogue of the representations of Iphigeneia in Tauris in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman art. The catalogue numbers for these works are given the prefix TAU.

⁸<https://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/XDB/ASP/default.asp>. Database Director, Thomas Mannack.

Organization of the Catalogue

I. Iphigeneia

- Greek Depictions (certain)
 - Vase-paintings
 - Lost wall paintings
 - Relief bowls
 - Architectural sculpture
 - Free-standing sculpture
 - Gems
- Etruscan Depictions (certain)
 - Urns
 - Cistae
 - Sarcophagi
- Roman Depictions (certain)
 - Wall paintings
 - Sarcophagi
 - Reliefs
 - Free-standing sculpture
 - Relief vases
 - Mosaics
 - Gems
 - Textile
- Uncertain Depictions
 - Greek
 - Etruscan
 - Roman

II. Polyxena

- Greek Depictions (certain)
 - Vase-paintings
 - Lost wall paintings
 - Relief bowls
 - Sarcophagi
 - Free-standing sculpture
- Etruscan Depictions (certain)
- Roman Depictions (certain)
 - Reliefs
 - Sarcophagus
 - Gems
- Uncertain Depictions
 - Greek
 - Etruscan
 - Roman

CATALOGUE

I. Iphigeneia at Aulis

IPHIGENEIA—GREEK DEPICTIONS (CERTAIN)

VASE-PAINTINGS:

IPH 1. Palermo, Museo Archeologico Regionale di Palermo NI 1886 (Figs. 1a-i)

Attic white ground lekythos. From the Sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinus.

Attributed to Douris.

c. 500-490 BC (Reeder); c. 470 BC (*LIMC*).

References: *LIMC* 3; *ARV²* 446.226; *Paralipomena* 375; *Add²* 241; *ThesCRA* 1, Sacrifices 586; Schefold and Jung 1989, 150, fig. 132; Carpenter 1991, fig. 299; *Prospettiva* 75-76 (1994), 50, fig. 1; Carter and Morris 1995, 438-439, figs. 27.1-4; Buitron-Oliver 1995, pl. 30, no. 46; Reeder 1995, 330-332, cat. no. 101; *RÉA* 99 (1997), 2, 86, fig. 8; Hedreen 2001, fig. 12.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Iphigeneia (inscribed) led to sacrifice between two warriors holding swords. She wears a short veil, chiton, and himation. Her diadem is decorated with a meander pattern, and for jewelry she wears an earring, necklace, and bracelet on each wrist. Her mantle is decorated with a pattern of stars. Traces of yellow are preserved on her chiton. Iphigeneia moves to right, left leg in front of right, the outlines of both visible. Her head is inclined downward, face seen in profile to right. Her left hand adjusts her veil in a bridal gesture, and her right hand lifts up her chiton. In front of Iphigeneia is a bearded warrior, name inscribed Teukros, moving to right, whose face is seen in three-quarter view as he turns his head to look at Iphigeneia. He holds a sword in his left hand and grasps Iphigeneia's mantle with his right. Teukros wears a crested helmet of Attic or Chalcidian type its cheekpieces raised, cuirass with pteryges, short chiton, scabbard, a mantle, and greaves. He leads Iphigeneia to an altar topped by a volute, probably an altar of Artemis, beyond which is a palm tree. The warrior behind Iphigeneia is similarly dressed as Teukros, with cuirass, short chiton, scabbard, and greaves. His upper body and head is missing, but he held a sword in his right hand, the blade of which passes below his waist. Inscriptions: ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ, [Τ]ΕΥΚΡΟ[Σ] (warrior in front of Iphigeneia, for Teukros), ΑΡ (above altar, most likely for Artemis).

IPH 2. London, British Museum E773 (Figs. 2a-f)

Attic red-figure pyxis. From Athens.

Attributed to a follower of Douris.

c. 475-470 BC.

References: *LIMC* 32; *ARV²* 805, 89; 1670; *Paralipomena* 420; *Add²* 291; *LIMC*, *Kassandra* I 205, *Helene* 380; Duby and Perrot 1991, 216, fig. 35; Reeder 1995, 98 figs. 9-12; Lyons 1997, 41, fig. 3; Cavalier 1997, 263, fig. 100; Oakley 1997, 329, fig. 12; Lissarrague 2002, 264; Ferrari 2002, fig. 2; Woodford 2003, fig. 113; Cohen 2006, frontispiece (color illustration).

Scene other than at Aulis or in Tauris: Iphigeneia stands in a doorway, the right side of her body hidden, adjusting a red fillet around her head in a scene with five other female figures. The women are divided into pairs facing one another by architectural elements. All are named by inscriptions except for one. Iphigeneia stands frontally, her head turned in profile to right as she looks at Danae, who approaches her. Danae holds a chest in her left hand, and selects a necklace with her right. Only Iphigeneia and Danae wear chiton without himation; the other four women are dressed in both. To left of the doorway is the only unnamed figure. She stands to left, and wears a sakkos in addition to her chiton and himation. This figure holds out her mantle in a bridal gesture with her right hand, her left hand hidden in the folds of her garment. Facing the unnamed woman is *Kassandra*, holding a basket in her right hand. Behind *Kassandra* is a Doric column set on a base, supporting an entablature. *Klytaimnestra* stands in profile to left on the other side of the column. She holds an alabastron in her outstretched right hand. Facing *Klytaimnestra* is *Helen*, who is seated on a stool with a basket in front of her carding wool. A mirror hangs in the background between *Klytaimnestra* and *Helen*. Inscriptions: ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ, ΔΑΝΑΕ, [Η]ΕΛΕΝΕ, ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΕ[ΣΤ]ΡΑ, ΚΑΣΣΑΝΔΡΑ.

IPH 3. Kiel, Antikensammlung Kunsthalle zu Kiel B 538 (Figs. 3a-j)

Attic red-figure oinochoe.

Probably by the Shuvalov Painter.

c. 430-420 BC.

References: *LIMC* 1; *ThesCRA* 1, *Sacrifices* 587; *CVA* I, 80-83, pl. 39 (2704) 1-4, pl. 40 (2705) 1-4; Lezzi-Hafter 1986; Jentel and Deschenes-Wagner 1994, 288, fig. 2; Kuhnen 2000, 52, fig. 1.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Iphigeneia faints as she is led to sacrifice. She wears a chiton and stephane. An unbearded warrior catches Iphigeneia from behind, and directs her towards a stone altar, upon which logs have been laid. On the other side of the altar, a bearded man stands frontally, with his head turned in profile to left as he looks at the maiden. The bearded man wears a short chiton and mantle worn around his shoulders, the ends of which are tucked into the belt of his chiton. He holds a sword in his left hand, and his right hand is extended over the altar. To right of the bearded man stands *Artemis* in profile to left watching

the scene. Artemis, dressed in a chiton and himation, and with her bow on her back, holds a small deer in her hands.

IPH 4. London, British Museum F 159 (Figs. 4a-h)

Apulian volute-krater. From Basilicate.

Associated with the work of the Iliupersis Painter.

c. 370-355 BC.

References: *LIMC* 11; *LIMC* Agamemnon 30, Artemis 1373, Kalchas 23; *RVAp* I 204, 104; *RVAp Suppl.* 1, 25; Green-Handley 1995, fig. 22; *ThesCRA* 1, Sacrifices 588; Woodford 2003, fig. 26; *CFST* Ap79; Taplin 2007, 159-60 cat. no. 52.

A.) Iphigeneia at Aulis: Substitution of the deer for Iphigeneia. At lower center, three figures around an altar. At right, Iphigeneia stands in profile to left, head downturned. She wears peplos and jewelry. Her body is superimposed over that of a deer standing on its hind legs. Behind the altar is a man (probably Agamemnon) holding a scepter in his left hand and a knife in his right, which he raises above the head of Iphigeneia and the deer. To left of the altar is a youth, naked except for a mantle worn around his waist. One foot rests on a rock; he holds a tray of offerings in his left hand. Behind the youth, a female figure stands to right with her left hand raised and her right hand on her hip. Jouan (1984, 67) has suggested that the youth and woman might be Achilles and Klytaimnestra. Behind Iphigeneia on a higher level, Artemis watches the scene, holding a bow in her right hand and two spears in her left. On a higher level above the youth, Apollo sits on a hill, looking over his shoulder to watch the scene. He sits on his drapery, and holds a laurel branch in his right hand. Two boucrania hang in the background above the man with the knife. Noting differences between the vase-painting and the messenger speech in the *IA* (like the youth and woman on the left watching the scene and the likely figure of Agamemnon about to deliver the final blow), Taplin (2007, 160) comments that the scene does not reflect the version of the *IA* that we know. He goes on to argue, "In fact, as far as I can see, we cannot even say confidently that it reflects a tragedy at all, since there are none of the standard indicators. But, given the pathos of the story, it is quite probable that the viewer is being encouraged to recall a tragic messenger speech."

B.) Two youths and two women.

Neck: Palmette between two confronting griffins.

Mascaroons: Female heads.

LOST WALL PAINTINGS:

IPH 5. Lost painting by Timanthes of Kythnos (Fig. 5, reconstruction by Hafner)

Middle of the fourth-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 4.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Iphigeneia about to be sacrificed. Scene included Kalchas, Ulysses, Menelaos, and Agamemnon, whose face the artist veiled in order to convey the indescribably profound grief of the father.

Known from literary descriptions:

a. Pliny, *Natural History* 35, 73:

Nam Timanthis vel plurimum adfuit ingenii. eius enim est Iphigeneia oratorum laudibus celebrata, qua stante ad aras peritura cum maestos pinxisset omnes praecipueque patrum et tristitiae omnem imaginem consumpsisset, patris ipsius voltum velavit, quem digne non poterat ostendere.

To return to Timanthes—he had a very high degree of genius. Orators have sung the praises of his Iphigeneia, who stands at the altar awaiting her doom; the artist has shown all present full of sorrow, and especially her uncle, and has exhausted all the indications of grief, yet has veiled the countenance of her father himself whom he was unable adequately to portray.

b. Cicero, *Orator* 22, 74:

. . . quod si poeta fugit ut maximum vitium qui peccat etiam, cum probam orationem affingit improbo stultove sapientis; si denique pictor ille vidit, cum immolanda Iphigenia tristis Kalchas esset, tristior Ulixes, maereret Menelaus, obvolvendum caput Agamemnonis esse, quoniam summum illum luctum penicillo non posset imitari; si denique histrio quid deceat quaerit: quid faciendum oratori putemus?

. . . the poet avoids impropriety as the greatest fault which he can commit; he errs also if he puts the speech of a good man in the mouth of a villain, or that of a wise man in the mouth of a fool; so also the painter in portraying the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, after representing Kalchas as sad, Ulysses as still more so, Menelaus as in grief, felt that Agamemnon's head must be veiled, because the supreme sorrow could not be portrayed by his brush; even the actor seeks for propriety; what, then, think you, should the orator do?

c. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 2, 13, 13:

Ut fecit Timanthes, opinor, Cythnius in ea tabula, qua Coloten Teium vicit. Nam cum in Iphigeniae immolatione pinxisset tristem Calchantem, tristiozem Ulixem, addidisset Menelao, quem summum poterat ars efficere, maerorem, consumptis adfectibus, non reperiens, quo digne modo patris vultum posset exprimere, velavit eius caput et suo cuique animo dedit aestimandum.

Timanthes, who was, I think, a native of Cynthus, provides an example of this in the picture with which he won the victory over Colotes of Teos. It represented the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, and the artist had depicted an expression of grief on the face of Kalchas and of still greater grief on that of Ulysses, while he had given Menelaus an agony of sorrow beyond which his art could not go. Having exhausted his powers of emotional expression he was at a loss to portray the father's face as it deserved, and solved the problem by veiling his head and leaving his sorrow to the imagination of the spectator.

RELIEF BOWLS:

IPH 6. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 31.11.2 (Figs. 6a-g)
Terracotta relief bowl. From Greece.

First half of the second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 6; Schefold and Jung 1989, 152 fig. 135; Small 2003, 87-90, 88 fig. 44.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Five scenes from Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*:

A.) Agamemnon gives a servant a letter for Klytaimnestra instructing her not to send Iphigeneia to Aulis (lines 111 ff.). Inscriptions:

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ; ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΟ | ΦΟΡΟΣ ΠΡΟΣ | ΚΛΥΤΑΙ | ΜΗΣΤΡΑΝ (∀letter bearer to Klytaimnestra”).

B.) Menelaos intercepts the letter from an unnamed messenger (lines 303-313).

Inscriptions: ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ.

C.) Menelaos, holding the letter in his right hand, berates Agamemnon for changing his mind about the decision to sacrifice Iphigeneia (lines 320-326).

Inscriptions: ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ; ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

D.) A messenger announces Iphigeneia's arrival to Agamemnon (lines 414-441).

Inscriptions: ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΠΕ | ΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙ | ΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΙΦΙ | ΓΕΝΕΙΑΣ

(∀messenger about the arrival of Iphigeneia”); ΑΓΑΜΕ | ΜΝΩΝ.

E.) Arrival of Iphigeneia, Orestes, and Electra in a cart. A groom leads the horses. Electra has already descended from the cart and seems to help the other two, still seated in it (lines 613-630). Inscriptions: ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ; ΗΛΕΚΤΡΑ;

ΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ.

IPH 7. Athens, National Museum 22633 (Figs. 7a-i)

Terracotta relief bowl. From Piraeus.

First half of the second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 7.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Five scenes from Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. Same scenes as IPH 4. Variations in the inscriptions, due to preservation, spelling, and

line breaks, are given below. The greatest difference between this bowl and IPH 4 is that on this bowl Iphigeneia's name is twice spelled as ΕΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ in scenes D and E.

A.) [ΑΓΑΜΕΜ]ΝΩΝ.

B.) No inscriptions preserved.

C.) ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ; ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

D.) ΑΝΓΕΛΟΣ | ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΠΑ | ΡΟΥΣΙΑΣ ΤΗΣ | ΕΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑΣ | ΠΡΟΣ
ΑΓΑΜΕ | ΜΝΟΟ | ΝΑ; ΑΠΙΣΤΟΛΕΙΣ .

E.) ΕΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ; ΗΛΕΚΤΡΑ; ΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ.

IPH 8. Berlin, Staatliche Museen 3161 q (Fig. 8)

Terracotta relief bowl. From Antheson.

First half of the second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 8; Schefold and Jung 1989, 152 fig. 136; Small 2003, 83 fig. 43.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Five scenes from Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. An inscription gives the source of the images: ΕΥΡ[ΙΠΙΔΟΥ] ΙΦΙ | ΓΕΝΕΙΑΣ, or "the Iphigeneia of Euripides."

A.) Arrival of Iphigeneia, Klytaimnestra, and Orestes to Aulis. Agamemnon enthroned, right hand to his face. Iphigeneia extends both hands to him, not yet aware of her fate (lines 623-680). Inscriptions:

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ; ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ; ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗΣΤ | ΡΑ; ΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ.

Inscription naming the source of the images, as cited above, in between scenes A and B.

B.) Klytaimnestra telling Achilles that he is to marry Iphigeneia (lines 819-854).

Inscriptions: ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗ | ΣΤΡΑ; ΑΞΙΛΛΕΥΣ.

C.) An old servant tells Klytaimnestra the truth about what is planned for Iphigeneia (lines 866-895). Inscriptions: ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗΣΤ | ΡΑ; ΠΡ[ΕΣ]Σ[ΒΥΣ].

D.) Achilles, Klytaimnestra, and Iphigeneia stand to right, the maiden makes a veiling gesture as she willingly accepts her death (lines 1338-1344). Inscriptions: ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ; ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗ | ΣΤΡΑ; ΑΞΙΛΛΕΥΣ.

E.) Iphigeneia begs her father for her life, and Orestes is on his knees pleading. Klytaimnestra has turned her back on the scene (lines 1211-1252). Inscriptions: ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ; ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝ | ΩΝ; ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗΣΤ | ΡΑ.

IPH 9. Athens, National Museum 2114 (Fig. 9)

Terracotta relief bowl. From Boeotia.

First half of the second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 9.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Five scenes from Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. Same scenes as IPH 8. Variations in the inscriptions, due to preservation, spelling, and line breaks, are given below:

- A.) ΑΓΑΜΕΝΩΝ; ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ; ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗΣΤ | ΡΑ; ΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ.
Inscription naming the source of the images in between scenes A and B:
ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΙΦΙ | ΓΕΝΕΙΑΣ.
- B.) same as IPH 8.
- C.) ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗΣΤ | ΡΑ; ΠΡΕΣΣΒΥΣ.
- D.) same as IPH 8.
- E.) ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ; ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝ | ΩΝ; ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗΣΤ | [ΡΑ].

IPH 10. Brussels, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire A893 (Figs. 10a-b)

Terracotta relief bowl.

First half of the second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 10.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Five scenes from Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. Same scenes as IPH 8 and IPH 9. Variations in the inscriptions, due to preservation, spelling, and line breaks, are given below:

- A.) ΑΓΑΜΕΝΩΝ; ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ; ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗΣΤ | ΡΑ; ΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ.
Inscription naming the source of the images in between scenes A and B:
ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΙΦΙ | ΓΕΝΕΙΑΣ.
- B.) ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗΣΤ | ΡΑ; ΑΞΙΛΛΕΥΣ.
- C.) ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗ | ΣΤΡΑ; ΠΡΕΣΣΒΥΣ.
- D.) and E.) same as IPH 8.

ARCHITECTURAL SCULPTURE:

IPH 11. Termessos (Pisidia), two stone relief plaques (Fig. 11)

Temple decoration (?)

c. 120 BC.

References: *LIMC* 5 = *LIMC* 26; Ridgway 2000, 85-6.

Iphigeneia at Aulis (and at Tauris?): Two non-joining relief plaques depicting scenes in the life of Iphigeneia.

Left slab: Three-figure group with a female figure wearing a chiton and himation in the center, on a base, facing left. She faces another female figure also dressed in chiton and himation who may hold an object in one of her hands. To the right of the central figure is a youth who stands in three-quarter view to left. He is naked except for a chlamys worn around his neck. He holds a spear in his right hand, which he leans on, and his left hand is on his hip. Weitzmann (1949, 184-5) interpreted the figures as: Iphigeneia—Klytaimnestra—Achilles, in a scene of Iphigeneia at Aulis. Staehler (1968, 280-9) identified the figures as: Servant—Iphigeneia—Pylades, in a scene of Iphigeneia in Tauris. Ridgway (2000, 85-6) follows Staehler's identifications.

Right slab: Iphigeneia's sacrifice and the substitution of the hind. Iphigeneia, wearing a girded chiton, stands in profile to left on the right side of an altar,

which is in the center of the scene. Her head is inclined downward, with her right hand raised to her head and her left arm crossed in front of her body. On the left side of the altar are Artemis and the deer. Artemis, dressed in a short chiton, appears to leap into the scene with the deer, holding the animal's horns in her left hand. She leads the animal to the altar, over which the animal seems to leap with its front legs and part of its torso already over the altar. Traces of a male figure (Kalchas or Agamemnon) at far left.

FREE-STANDING SCULPTURE:

IPH 12 (= IPH 54). Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 481, 482, 482a (Figs. 12a-d)

Fragments of a marble sculptural group. From the Villa Spithoever (Gardens of Sallust).

Fourth-century BC (Studniczka); beginning of the third century BC (Bieber); middle of the third-century BC (Kjellberg); c. 150 BC (Lippold); c. 50 BC (Simon); early imperial (Poulsen); imperial, maybe even Hadrianic (Ridgway).

References: *LIMC* 12 = *LIMC* 50; Kjellberg 1916; Studniczka 1926; Hartswick 2004, 83ff, figs. 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4. See below IPH 111.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Artemis' substitution of the hind for Iphigeneia. Three-figure group with Artemis as the central figure, moving to right. She wears a belted peplos and a quiver on her back. In her extended right hand, she would have held the horns of a deer, leaping at her side. Iphigeneia is in front of Artemis at her feet, her left knee bent, as if about to collapse. She looks up towards Artemis, and the goddess would have grabbed Iphigeneia with her left hand. Iphigeneia's chiton has fallen, exposing her right breast and the entire right side of her body. All that is preserved are the torsos and part of the limbs of Artemis and Iphigeneia, and part of the animal.

When the torso of Iphigeneia was first discovered in 1886, Visconti identified her as a "Running Girl" and Lanciani called her a "Niobide."⁹ Studniczka, in 1898, noticed that the girl was falling, which was confirmed by fragments of Artemis' left leg where the two figures touched. In 1901, fragments of the strut joining Artemis and the hind, and a fragment of Artemis' thumb on the deer's left antler allowed for a reconstruction of the group.

⁹Nearby in the garden, there was also a group sculpture of the slaughter of the Niobids, and as Hartswick (2004, 93) has pointed out, the "appropriateness" of pairing Iphigeneia's sacrifice with Artemis' killing of the Niobids is both "apparent and enticing."

IPHIGENEIA—ETRUSCAN DEPICTIONS (CERTAIN)¹⁰

URNS:***From Chiusi:*****IPH 13. Chiusi, Museo Nazionale 955 (ex Paolozzi) (Figs. 13a-c)**

Alabaster urn. From Chiusi.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 16; Steuernagel 1998, 193, cat. no. 44, pl. 9 fig. 1.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: A man holds a phiale over an altar, upon which a woman lifts the forelegs of an animal, probably a calf, fawn, or pig. Behind them, Iphigeneia is carried off by Artumes. To the left of the main group, a woman sits on the ground and a warrior stands behind her. To the right of the main group, a bearded man sits on the ground, behind whom stands a woman; further to the right is a warrior.

From Perugia:**IPH 14. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 18 (Figs. 14a-b)**

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 3; Steuernagel 1998, 191, cat. no. 15.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Iphigeneia, naked to the waist, is held over an altar by a man wearing a pilos, who might be Odysseus. She is facing down with her left hand stretched out in front of her, and her right touching the altar. The bearded warrior holding a phiale over Iphigeneia's head is Agamemnon. The central scene is flanked on each side by a woman in the dress of a Fury on either side. The woman to the left of the central scene who holds a calf or deer, might be Artumes.

IPH 15. Perugia, Museo Nazionale (Ex. Ipogeo dei Volumni) (Fig. 15)

Limestone urn from Perugia, Necropolis of Palazzone.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 3a = *LIMC*, Agamemnon 36; Brunn 1870, 42, pl. 36, 4;

Steuernagel 1998, 191, cat. no. 17.

¹⁰References to *LIMC* refer to the catalogue numbers in Ingrid Krauskopf's entry on Iphigeneia in Etruria, *LIMCV*, p. 729-34.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Similar to IPH 14. The warrior holding Iphigeneia, who is draped, is seen in three-quarter view frontally rather than from behind as on IPH 14. Iphigeneia does not gesticulate. The sword held by the man about to sacrifice the maiden is preserved.

IPH 16. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 46 (Figs. 16a-b)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 3b; Steuernagel 1998, 190-1, cat. no. 13, pl. 5 fig. 4.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant I of IPH 14.¹¹ The woman to the right of Agamemnon does not touch his shoulder as on IPH 14-15, but raises her right hand.

IPH 17. Perugia, Museo Archeologico 236 (Fig. 17)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 3c; Steuernagel 1998, 191, cat. no. 21, pl. 6 fig. 2.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant I of IPH 14. Similar to IPH 16.

IPH 18. Perugia, Museo Archeologico 343 (Fig. 18)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 3d; Steuernagel 1998, 191, cat. no. 20.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant I of IPH 14. Similar to IPH 16 and 17.

IPH 19. Papiano, private collection (Not illustrated)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 3e; Steuernagel 1998, 191, cat. no. 18.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant I of IPH 14. Similar to IPH 16-18.

IPH 20. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 16 (ex San Pietro) (Figs. 19a-b)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 3f; Steuernagel 1998, 191, cat. no. 16.

¹¹I follow Krauskopf's organization and typology of the urns in *LIMC*.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant II of IPH 14. The woman to the right of Agamemnon holds a torch in her right hand.

IPH 21. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 281 (Figs. 20a-b)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 3g; Steuernagel 1998, 191, cat. no. 19, pl. 5 fig. 5.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant III of IPH 14. Two youths with spears replace the two daimones flanking the central scene of Iphigeneia, the warrior holding her and Agamemnon. They hold their spears diagonally pointing down towards the center.

IPH 22. Rome, Villa Giulia 50313 (Fig. 23)

Travertine urn from Perugia, Nekropolis of Palazzone.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 4; Steuernagel 1998, 192, cat. no. 30.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Central scene consists of Iphigeneia held over the altar by a warrior, with Agamemnon holding in his right hand a phiale over her head and in his left a sword. On the left is a woman (Artumes?) holding a calf. To the right of Agamemnon is a youth who has collapsed and holds his right hand to his head. Another, standing, man appears behind him.

IPH 23. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 43 (139) (Figs. 24a-b)

Travertine urn from Perugia. Ex. Giardino Meniconi.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 5; Steuernagel 1998, 191-2, cat. no. 23/26?: Steuernagel gives his cat. no. 23 as Perugia, Villa Braccasca (Brunn 1870, pl. 42.14), and gives cross-reference as *LIMC* cat. no. 5; however, in *LIMC*, Krauskopf gives her cat. no. 5 as Perugia, Museo Nazionale 43 (Brunn 1870, pl. 42.14), which Steuernagel catalogues separately as his no. 26 (Brunn 1870, no. 42, 13b).

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Two rows of figures. Front row is similar to IPH 14, except the woman to the right of Agamemnon touches his head. In the center of the back row is a mourning woman, who is seen frontally, holding out her hair with both hands. To her left is a servant attending her and a man holding an axe. To the mourning woman's right are two musicians, a flutist and a tympanum player.

IPH 24. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 34 (114) (Fig. 25)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 5a; Steuernagel 1998, 191, cat. no. 24, pl. 6 fig. 3.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Similar to IPH 23, but with different figures in the back row. The mourning woman, her servant, and the flutist are the same. The youth with the axe is missing, and instead of a tympanum player, there is a kitharist.

IPH 25. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 344 (101) (Fig. 26)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Fourth quarter of the second century—first quarter of the first century BC.

References: Steuernagel 1998, 192, cat. no. 25, pl. 6 fig. 4.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Similar to IPH 24, except the mourning woman's attendant is replaced by a youth holding a phiale, and the flutist faces the woman, rather than having his back to her.

IPH 26. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 329 (123) (Fig. 27)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 5b; Steuernagel 1998, 191, cat. no. 22.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant on IPH 23 and 24. An extra figure appears in the front row to the left of the woman holding the deer. In the back row, the mourning woman is missing, and is replaced by three servants and two musicians. The servants are to left of center and each carries (from right to left) a towel, a tray with cakes on it, a jug. A flutist and kitharist are to right of center.

IPH 27. Rome, Villa Giulia 50311 (Figs. 28a-c)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Middle of the second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 6; Steuernagel 1998, 192, cat. no. 35, pl. 8.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Two rows of figures. Front row consists of a central group with Iphigeneia held over an altar by a warrior, and Agamemnon holding the phiale over her head with a sword in his left hand. To the left of the central group is a naked youth collapsing to the ground, and behind him, an attendant who is helping him up. To the right of the central group is a woman, Klytaimnestra, on her knees beseeching Agamemnon. Behind her is a youth in a cloak and pilos fleeing. In the back row, from left to right, is the woman holding the deer, servant holding a tray, another youth, a daimon holding a torch in her right hand, a youth and a veiled woman behind him, another woman dressed as a Fury.

IPH 28. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 49 (Figs. 27a-b)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 6a; Steuernagel 1998, 192, cat. no. 33.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Similar to IPH 27, but with fewer figures.

IPH 29. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 330 (ex. 127) (Fig. 30)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second half of the second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 7; Steuernagel 1998, 192, cat. no. 27, pl. 6 fig. 5.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Similar to IPH 28, but without the servant assisting the collapsing youth in the front row.

IPH 30. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 394 (Fig. 31)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 7a; Steuernagel 1998, 192, cat. no. 28.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Similar to IPH 29, except the youth who has collapsed to the ground in the front row reaches out and touches the warrior holding Iphigeneia. Iphigeneia's arms are also not extended out in front of her, as on many of the previous urns. She has her right hand on the shoulder of the warrior who holds her, and her left hand is bent at the elbow, palm open.

IPH 31. Rome, Villa Giulia 50312 (Figs. 30)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 7b; Steuernagel 1998, 193, cat. no. 39.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant I of IPH 29 and 30. Similar to IPH 29 and 30, except there is a servant behind the fallen youth in the front row who tries to help him. In the back row, a winged figure holds the deer. There is also a man holding an axe.

IPH 32. Perugia, Museo Nazionale (Fig. 31a-b)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 7c; Steuernagel 1998, 193, cat. no. 41, pl. 9 fig. 3.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant II of IPH 29 and 30. The fallen youth in the front row is not assisted by a servant. The woman holding the animal in the back row is not winged. There appears to be a fire on the altar. Iphigeneia grasps the

upper arm of the warrior holding her with her right hand, and she raises her left arm in the air.

IPH 33. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 38 (Fig. 32)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 7d; Steuernagel 1998, 192, cat. no. 29.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant III of IPH 29 and 30. Instead of Klytaimnestra kneeling in the front row to the right of Agamemnon, there is a kneeling youth wearing a short chiton and cloak. In the back row to the right of Agamemnon, a woman raises her right hand in the air in a gesture of alarm.

IPH 34. Perugia, Casa del S. Cuore (Villa Monti) (Fig. 33)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second half of the second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 8; Steuernagel 1998, 193, cat. no. 42.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Two rows of figures. Front row with central group of Agamemnon and Iphigeneia held by Odysseus. On the left, woman holding deer, and collapsing man with servant. On the right, Klytaimnestra kneels on the ground. Behind her a warrior holding a spear. In the back row, from left to right, a kitharist, three men (middle one holds a jug, the right one holds a tablet or tray), flutist.

IPH 35. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 279 (Fig. 34)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 8a; Steuernagel 1998, 193, cat. no. 40.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Similar to IPH 34, but the youth on the ground in the front row is not assisted by a servant.

IPH 36. Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco 13902 (Figs. 35a-c)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 8b; Sannibale 1994, 171 cat no. 29.3; Steuernagel 1998, 193, cat. no. 37; de Angelis 1999, 62, fig. 11.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant of IPH 34 and 35. In the back row, three servants are flanked by musicians. The servants hold, from left to right, an axe, a jug and a tray.

IPH 37. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 50006 (Ex. Villa di Compresso)
(Fig. 36)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 10; Steuernagel 1998, 192, cat. no. 31, pl. 7 fig. 5.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Central group with Agamemnon and Iphigeneia held by Odysseus. To left of this group is a figure holding the deer, and behind her, a figure with wind-blown drapery. To right of the central group is Klytaimnestra kneeling on the ground beseeching Agamemnon and behind her a musician playing the pipes. The woman with wind-blown drapery recalls the figure of Aura, named by an inscription, on a Lucanian skyphos from the end of the fifth-century BC attributed to the Schwerin Group in Sydney, Nicholson Museum 53.30 (*LCS* 70, 352 pl. 33, I).

IPH 38. Perugia, Museo Nazionale inv. Palazzone 55 (Fig. 37)

Travertine urn from Perugia, Nekropolis of Palazzone. Ex. Ipogeo dei Volumni 55.

Second half of the second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 11; Steuernagel 1998, 193, cat. no. 43.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Two rows of figures. In the front row, Iphigeneia is held by two men over the altar as Agamemnon raises the phiale over her head. To the right of the central group, Klytaimnestra stands, with a servant behind her. A youth holding the deer stands to the left of the central group. In the back row, a mourning woman pulls at her hair with her right hand. She is attended by a servant on either side. Three other figures fill out the row, including a servant holding a tray, a kitharist, and a flutist.

IPH 39. Perugia, (ex. ?) Villa Antinori (Monte Vile) (Figs. 38)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 12; Steuernagel 1998, 192, cat. no. 34.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Two rows of figures. Iphigeneia held over the altar by two men in the front row. One of the men stands behind her and holds her under her arms. Collapsing naked man to left of central group in front row, who is assisted. On the right, Klytaimnestra kneels in supplication. A standing nude male figure behind her. Above him is the figure holding the deer in the back row.

IPH 40. Perugia, Museo Nazionale 348 (Fig. 39)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

First half of the first-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 9; Steuernagel 1998, 193, cat. no. 36, pl. 9 fig. 2.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Two rows of figures. In the front row, central group with Agamemnon and Iphigeneia held by Odysseus. These are framed by kneeling figures. In the back row, from left to right, is the woman holding the deer, mourning woman holding her hair out with both hands, a servant, and a musician playing the pipes.

IPH 41. Pischello, Villa Sorbello (Figs. 42)

Travertine urn from Perugia.

First-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 9a; Steuernagel 1998, 193, cat. no. 38.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant of IPH 40. Similar to IPH 40, except the man to the left in the front row is standing rather than kneeling. The mourning woman holding out her hair is missing.

From Volterra:

IPH 42. Ex. Mannheim, Reiss-Museum (destroyed in War) (Figs. 41a-b)

Alabaster urn from Volterra.

Second half of the second—beginning of the first-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 13; Steuernagel 1998, 190, cat. no. 11, pl. 5 fig. 1.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Three men carry Iphigeneia to the altar. Agamemnon stands on the other side of the altar holding a phiale over her head and holding the knife in his left hand. To the left of the central group, Klytaimnestra is being restrained by two men, as she extends her arms out in supplication. To the right of the central group is a warrior holding a shield and spear, and next to him, a winged daimon dressed as a Fury holding the deer.

IPH 43. Volterra, Museo Guarnacci 457 (Fig. 42)

Alabaster urn. From Volterra, Nekropolis of Portone.

Second half of the second—beginning of the first-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 13a; Steuernagel 1998, 190, cat. no. 8.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Similar to IPH 42.

IPH 44. Volterra, Museo Guarnacci 512 (Fig. 43)

Alabaster urn from Volterra, Nekropolis of Portone, grave XI (E).

Second half of the second—beginning of the first-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 13b; Steuernagel 1998, 190, cat. no. 9.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Variant of IPH 42. Instead of being held by three men, however, Iphigeneia is only held by two. The warrior with shield and spear is missing. There are two jugs and a bowl set on top of the altar.

IPH 45. Florence, Museo Archeologico 5754 (Fig. 44a-b)

Alabaster urn from Volterra.

Second half of the second—beginning of the first-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 14; Steuernagel 1998, 190, cat. no. 10.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Fragmentary, with left side and top broken away. Two men hold Iphigeneia over an altar. At left, the feet of Klytaimnestra (?). Agamemnon stands on the other side of the altar. Behind Agamemnon is another altar, upon which is an omphalos with a snake wrapped around it. On the right side of the second altar is the winged daimon holding the deer.

IPH 46. Lost. Ex. “piccola tomba Inghirami” (Figs. 45)

Alabaster urn from Volterra.

Late second—beginning of the first-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 15; Steuernagel 1998, 190, cat. no. 12.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Two men hold Iphigeneia over the altar. To right of the altar is Agamemnon with his right hand (missing) raised over her head as on the other urns, but holding a staff in his left hand. Behind Agamemnon is a horse. To the left of the Iphigeneia group is Klytaimnestra being restrained by two men, her arms outstretched in supplication.

CISTAE:

IPH 47. Rome, Villa Giulia 13141 (Fig. 48a-c)

Praenestian cista. From Praeneste.

Fourth quarter of the fourth-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 1; Schefold and Jung 1989, 151, fig. 134.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: Iphigeneia stands frontally, weight on her left leg. She is naked, except for earrings, a necklace, and a piece of drapery that she holds in both hands behind her back that forms a backdrop. To her left is a deer, partly overlapped by Kalchas, who holds the sacrificial knife in his right hand raised over his head. Behind Kalchas is Artemis holding an axe in her right hand and two spears in her left, accompanied by a dog. Next, is Klytaimnestra, whose head and chest is glimpsed through a small square window, and Agamemnon, who stands hunched over in profile to left with one foot on a rock. Behind Agamemnon is a naked warrior with a spear. To Iphigeneia's right is a youth standing hunched over with a sword and two spears, and a warrior with a horse.

IPHIGENEIA—ROMAN DEPICTIONS (CERTAIN)

WALL PAINTINGS:

IPH 48. Pompeii VI 5, 2 (Casa del Vicolo di Modesto), destroyed (Fig. 47)

Mural painting.

Vespasian (AD 69-79).

References: *LIMC* 40.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair. Iphigeneia stands in profile to right, head slightly inclined down, before a low altar. She wears a long tunic and laurel wreath, her left hand raised to her chin, her right arm held across her waist. Kalchas, facing her, holds out one of her long locks of hair. He wears a short girded chiton and holds his knife in his right hand. Behind Iphigeneia, a draped and veiled figure sits on a stool in profile to left in front of a monument. The figure (Agamemnon? Achilles?) is hunched over with his right hand to his head in a gesture of mourning, cradling a spear in his left hand. Above him, an altar with a winged figure (Eros? Nike?).

IPH 49. Naples, Museo Nazionale 9112 (Figs. 48a-g)

Mural painting. From Pompeii VI 8, 13, the House of the Tragic Poet.

Vespasian (AD 69-79).

References: *LIMC* 38; Bergmann 1994; Sharrock 2002, 281, fig. 9.5; Perry 2002, 154-7, fig. 7.1.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Iphigeneia led to sacrifice. Iphigeneia is carried by two men: one holds her from behind, and the other stands in front. She extends her arms, gesturing wildly, looking towards the sky. Kalchas stands to right of Iphigeneia looking towards the sky. He raises his right hand, which holds the knife, to his chin, and he holds the scabbard in his left hand. At left, the draped and veiled figure of Agamemnon stands with his back to Iphigeneia. His right hand is raised to his face in grief, also concealing it. His right foot rests on a low pedestal. Behind Agamemnon is a tall cylindrical pedestal topped by a statuette of Artemis holding a torch in each hand accompanied by two animals. In the sky, on the right, is the upper body and head of Artemis in left profile. She holds a bow and arrow in her left hand, and her right hand is raised to her chin. She wears a diadem and a billowing peplos. She looks over on the left side at a female figure holding onto a deer that leaps through the sky. The female figure, only the upper part of her body visible, looks out at the viewer, her garment billowing in the air behind her. She is sometimes identified as an attendant of Artemis, or as Iphigeneia herself being rescued.

RELIEFS:**IPH 50. Florence, Uffizi 612. Altar of Kleomenes** (Figs. 49a-h)

Marble relief altar. Signed by Kleomenes.

Second half of the first-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 42; Schefold and Jung 1989, 150 fig. 133; Kuhnen 2000, 56, fig. 4.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair. Central group consists of Iphigeneia between Kalchas and a naked man. Iphigeneia stands to left with her right hand to her chin and her right arm folded across her chest. She wears a peplos and a long veil that falls down her back. He adjusts her veil with his left hand and cuts a lock of hair with his right. The naked man behind the maiden, perhaps Achilles, touches her left elbow, directing her to Kalchas. Behind Kalchas is a youth holding a tray of fruits in his left hand and his left foot is raised on a rock. Behind the naked man is Agamemnon, whose back is turned on the scene. A tree stands in front of him. Agamemnon is veiled, his face concealed, with his right hand raised to his head in a gesture of mourning.

IPH 51. Oscillum from Bolsena (Fig. 50a-b)

Fragment of a marble oscillum. From Bolsena.

Augustan (27 BC-AD 14).

References: *LIMC* 43.

Front: Iphigeneia at Aulis: Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair. Iphigeneia, wearing a peplos and veil, stands to left, with her right hand raised to her face, her left arm drawn across her chest. Only Kalchas' two arms are preserved, holding the knife in his right hand and grabbing a lock of Iphigeneia's hair with his left. There is an altar between the two figures.

Back: Sexual scene: male-female intercourse on a couch.

IPH 52. Rome, "Underground Basilica" of Porta Maggiore, *in situ* (Fig. 51)

Stucco ceiling relief.

c. AD 40.

References: *LIMC* 41.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair. Iphigeneia stands to right, raising her left hand to her chest, and holding a spray of plants in her right. She wears a peplos, and her hair is worn down, long strands falling down her back. Kalchas faces her, holding a long lock of Iphigeneia's hair out in front of her with his left hand, and holding a knife in his right. Kalchas' head is not preserved.

IPH 53. The Veroli Casket. London, Victoria and Albert Museum 216-1885 (Figs. 52a-c)

Ivory box (figural ivory panels and bone rosette strips on a wooden core; metal hinge and handle).

Byzantine. Mid 10th-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 47; Althaus and Sutcliffe 2006, 165 cat. no. 103.

Side panel 1, right side: Sacrifice of Iphigeneia. Central group with Iphigeneia, in profile to left, led by a youth before Kalchas, who holds a knife in his right hand and adjusts her veil to grab a lock of hair with his left. This group is framed on either side by a servant. Behind the servant on the left side is a bearded male figure sitting with his right hand to his chin. He has been identified alternately as Agamemnon (Jouan 1984), Asklepios (Weitzmann 1951; Beckwith 1962) or Zeus (Simon 1964). Behind the servant on the right side is a seated female figure feeding a serpent, who has been interpreted as Hygieia (Weitzmann 1951; Jouan 1984) or Persephone (Simon 1964).

Side panel 1, left side: Eroses, Helen and Castor (or Phaedra and Hippolytus), Bellerophon and Pegasus drinking at spring, nymph Peirene.

Side panel 2, right side: Aphrodite and Ares, Rape of Europa, horse with Eroses.

Side panel 2, left side: Lioness, dog, stag and eagle accompanied by Eroses.

Lid: Rape of Europa, Herakles playing the lyre, Eroses, centaurs, and dancing maenads.

End panel 1: Nereid on a sea-horse and another Nereid seated on an altar of Asklepius.

End panel 2: Dionysos on a chariot drawn by lions, with an Eros flying into a basket.

FREE-STANDING SCULPTURE:

IPH 54 (= IPH 12). Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek I.N. 481, 482, 482a (Figs. 12a-d)

Fragments of a marble group sculpture. From the Villa Spithoever (Gardens of Sallust).

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Artemis' substitution of the hind for Iphigeneia. Described above under IPH 26.

IPH 55. Rome, Museo Capitolino 9778 (Fig. 53)

Marble group sculpture. From the sanctuary of Jupiter Dolichenus on the Aventine.

Middle of the second-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 51; Hartswick 2004, 92 fig. 3.6.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Artemis' substitution of the hind for Iphigeneia. Three-figure group with Artemis, Iphigeneia, and an animal, probably a deer. Artemis,

the central figure, dominates the group. She moves vigorously to right, holding a lighted torch in her left hand and the horns of the deer in her right. Iphigeneia is on the ground beside Artemis' left leg, and looks up at her. Her peplos has fallen, exposing her right breast. She is rendered at a much smaller scale than Artemis, unlike the Iphigeneia from the Copenhagen group.

IPH 56. Samos, Archaeological Collection of Pythagoreion (Fig. 54)

Ten fragments of an over life sized marble sculpture. Found in a Roman bath on Samos.

Antonine period.

References: Martini 1984; Freyer-Schauenburg 1988, 1984/1997; Hartswick 2004, 91 fig. 3.5.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Torso of Iphigeneia. She is dressed in a high belted peplos, which has fallen off her right shoulder exposing her breast. The peplos is carved in dark grey marble, while the figure's flesh is in white marble. Freyer-Schauenburg has seen this torso as belonging to a replica of the statue group in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek (IPH 12 / 54).

IPH 57. Bulgaria.

Fragments of a statue group. Found near Muletarevo, Bulgaria.

Roman.

References: Stoyanov 1988; Ridgway 2002; Hartswick 2004, 90 and 182 note 40.

Replica of the statue group in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek (IPH 12 / 54).

RELIEF VASES:

IPH 58. New York Market, Christie's (Figs. 55a-c)

Silver relief skyphos.

c. late first century BC—early first century AD.

References: Christie's, Thursday 6 December 2007, lot # 158, p. 124-6.

A.) Iphigeneia at Aulis: Kalchas about to cut Iphigeneia's hair. At center, Iphigeneia faces Kalchas with her veiled head lowered, her right arm across her chest, and holding a branch in her lowered left hand. He holds a lock of her hair with his left hand and raises the sacrificial sword in his right. Behind him, Artemis flies in the sky, about to descend, holding the antlers of a stag in her right hand and a torch in her right. Beneath her is a table on top of which is a ewer and lidded pyxis. At far right, a bearded warrior watches. Behind Iphigeneia, a flaming altar, on the other side of which is a youth holding a pitcher in his right hand and a tray of offerings in his left.

B.) Philoktetes on Lemnos?

IPH 59. Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Zv 679.94 (Figs. 56a-b)

Fragment of Arretine pottery.

Beginning of the Imperial period (c. 27 BC--)

References: *LIMC* 44.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Kalchas about to cut Iphigeneia's hair. Iphigeneia stands in three-quarter view to left. She is draped and veiled, with her right hand raised to her chin, and her left arm drawn into her body under her breasts. There is an altar between Iphigeneia and Kalchas, set on a higher ground line than that on which Iphigeneia stands. All that is preserved of Kalchas are his arms and hands. He holds the knife in his right, and his left hand is raised as if to hold the lock of her hair.

IPH 60. Pompeii, deposit of the excavations 10901 (Figs. 57a-g)

Terracotta relief oinochoe. From Pompeii II 8, 2.

Beginning of the Imperial period (c. 27 BC--)

References: *LIMC* 46.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Kalchas about to cut Iphigeneia's hair. Central group consists of Iphigeneia directed by a nude youth to the altar where Kalchas will cut her hair. Iphigeneia stands in profile to left with her head inclined downward, her left arm down at her side. The nude youth clasps her around her breasts. Kalchas stands in front of a flaming altar facing Iphigeneia. Behind Iphigeneia and the youth is the draped and veiled Agamemnon. He leans on a staff with his left hand, and raises his right hand to his face in a gesture of mourning. Flanking the scene at both sides before the altar is a youth standing in profile to right, with his right hand leaning on a staff and his left hand raised to his head in a gesture of grief.

IPH 61. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 17.194.2012

(Figs. 58a-b)

Fragment of Arretine pottery.

Augustan (27 BC-AD 14).

References: *LIMC* 45.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair. Similar to the Arretine fragment in Dresden, with Iphigeneia in profile to left with her right hand raised to her chin, and her left arm drawn under her breasts. Fragment preserves all of Iphigeneia except her legs, and only part of Kalchas' right wrist and hand, which held the knife.

MOSAICS:

IPH 62. Ampurias, Museo Monográfico de las Excavaciones (Figs. 59a-b)

Mosaic. From Ampurias.

First-century AD or end of the Imperial period (?)

References: *LIMC* 39.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Iphigeneia led to sacrifice. Draped and veiled in white, her head inclined down, she is led to an altar by a man (Ulysses?) who grasps her wrist with his right hand and holds a spear in his left. The altar is in the foreground, to right of which is a young boy holding a plate and a piece of cloth. To right of Ulysses (?) are two men: a bearded man, probably Kalchas, hiding a spear in the folds of his garment, and Agamemnon, holding a spear diagonally across his body in his left hand, who turns his back on the scene. Beyond is a tree with a soldier behind it. To left of Iphigeneia is a bearded man (Menelaos or Diomedes?) moving to right, with his right hand raised to his face. Behind this figure is a column, around which a youth peers. Behind Iphigeneia is the opening of a tent, in front of which can be seen the heads of four figures. In the background, at the top right, Artemis holds the horns of a deer, indicating the substitution of the hind for the maiden.

IPH 63. Antakya, Hatay Archaeological Museum 961 (Figs. 60a-e)

Mosaic. From the House of Iphigeneia, Antioch.

Severan (AD 193-235).

References: *LIMC* 37; Cimok 2005, 19.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Before the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. Three-figure composition with Klytaimnestra in the center. Iphigeneia stands at left veiled in white. The girl's hands are hidden in her garments, but she raises her left hand to her face, and her right clutches at folds of drapery. Klytaimnestra's right hand rests on her daughters' right shoulder. Agamemnon stands in front of a temple. He holds a scepter in his left hand and extends his right hand out towards his daughter.

GEMS**IPH 64. Berlin, Ex. Berlin Museum 790** (Fig. 61)

Intaglio.

Second-century BC.

References: Croisille 1963, 214, pl. XXVIII fig 5.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair. Iphigeneia stands in profile to right facing Kalchas.

IPH 65. Berlin, Ex. Berlin Museum 788 (Fig. 62)

Intaglio.

Roman period.

References: Croisille 1963, 215, pl. XXVIII fig. 6.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Kalchas cutting Iphigeneia's hair, with Agamemnon watching. Similar to IPH 60, except Agamemnon stands behind Iphigeneia.

IPHIGENEIA—UNCERTAIN DEPICTIONS

GREEK***Vases:***

IPH 66 (=POL 24). Basel, Loan (formerly lent to Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 6.67) (Figs. 63a-d)

Fragments of a Proto-attic krater.

Attributed to the New York Nessos Painter.

c. 650-630 BC.

References: *LIMC* 2; Love 1986; Schwarz 2001, pl. 9 fig. 2.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia? Four bands of decoration are preserved. In the main figural zone, which is beside a handle, a woman is being carried horizontally to right by at least three men. Only the woman's lower legs and feet are preserved. She wears a long robe with two ornamental borders at the lower hem and her feet point upwards. Parts of three men can be seen. The man at the woman's feet is almost fully preserved: he wears a short tunic and boots. In front of him, at the break, are parts of the hair, left shoulder and legs of a second man. All that is seen of the third is part of his leg and foot. To right of the central group another fragment from the next lower band of decoration preserves the head and torso of a bearded man who seems to watch the main scene. His head is in profile to left, and he has a large eye. He raises his right hand to the back of his head, and his right arm is bent out in front of him. The lowest preserved band of decoration consists of confronting sea monsters each with three lion-dog heads and a fishtail.

IPH 67. Taranto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 76127 (Figs 64a-k)

Attic red-figure volute-krater (restored). From Gravina, Italy (Tomb 3/1994, Site 14).

Attributed to the Boreas Painter (by Ciancio).

c. 450 BC.

References: Ciancio, *Silbion: Una città tra Greci e Indigeni*, 79, 81-6, figs. 103-111, 216, cat. no. 266; *BAD* 29319.

A.) Sacrifice of Iphigeneia? A woman is attacked on an altar by a youth. She wears a headband, necklace and embroidered peplos, which is transparent. Fallen back on the altar, she is in left profile, except for her torso which is seen frontally. She holds onto the volute of the altar with her left hand, and extends her right hand out, palm open, in a gesture of supplication or in a plea of help. Her attacker wears a petasos that has fallen down his back and chitoniskos. He draws back his sword in his right hand while reaching for her neck with his

extended left hand. A bearded man wearing a petasos and chlamys tries to restrain the youth by grabbing his right sword-wielding arm. Behind them is another bearded man who holds a scepter in his left hand and raises his right hand up in front of his face. To left of him, beneath the handle, a woman flees, her arms raised in a gesture of alarm. To left of her, a bearded man with staff watches the scene. Standing behind the maiden on the altar is a female figure wearing a diadem and peplos who raises her left arm up behind her head and extends her right hand towards the youth in a gesture of alarm, mourning and supplication. To right of this woman is a bearded man in chiton and himation who stands to right, but whose head is in profile to left as he looks over his shoulder to watch the scene. He holds a banded scepter in his left hand and has his right hand on his hip. A

B.) Bearded man wearing a petasos down his back, chlamys, and holding spears pursues a woman. Two fleeing women and a man dressed in a chiton and himation and holding a scepter complete the scene.

NA1.) Animal frieze: boar-deer-(tree); lion-bull; boar-lion.

NA2.) Boreas and Oreithyia, including four fleeing women, and three draped men with scepters.

NB1.) Ivy wreath.

NB2.) Youth (Theseus?) with petasos worn down his back, chlamys and spears pursuing a woman. Scene includes five fleeing women and two draped men with scepters.

IPH 68. Paris, Louvre CA 2193 (Fig. 65)

Campanian krater.

Attributed to the Dolon Painter.

390-365 BC.

References: *CFSTL*30.

A.) Iphigeneia at Aulis? Iphigeneia standing before Agamemnon? She wears a crown from which hangs a veil, chiton, and himation. He holds a scepter in his right hand and extends his left hand towards her. Behind her is a woman carrying a box in one hand and a mantle in the other. At far right, a standing man.

B.) Four armed men.

Rather than Iphigeneia and Agamemnon, these figures have also been identified as Kreusa and Kreon, or Prokne and Tereus.

IPH 69. Matera, Museo Nazionale Ridola 11013 (Fig. 66)

Plastic head vase. From Timmari.

Associated with the work of the Darius Painter and the Underworld Painter.

c. 330-320 BC.

References: *LIMC* 13; *RVAp* II 616, 92.

Iphigeneia at Aulis, substitution of the deer? Human head with a pair of horns coming out from the front above the hair line. On the body of the vessel, an Amazon is seated to left holding a phiale above which is a piece of ivy in her right hand.

Lattanzi (1976, 123) thought it was a man's head and saw him as Actaeon being changed into a stag. Trendall suggested the head was that of Iphigeneia, with the antlers referencing the substitution of the hind at Aulis.

Lost Wall Painting:

IPH 70. Lost painting by Kolotes of Teos

Middle of the fourth-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 4 bis.

Iphigeneia at Aulis: Sacrifice of Iphigeneia?

Known only from Quintillian, *Institutio Oratoria* 2, 13, 13: see above IPH 5.

Relief Bowl:

IPH 71. Volos Museum DP71-34, 86 (Fig. 67)

Fragment of a terracotta relief bowl. From the Anaktoron at Demetrias.

First half of the second-century BC.

References: Not listed separately by Kahil (1990) in *LIMC*, but it is noted below the entry for cat. no. 10; Sinn 1979, 111 (MB 54), pl. 23.4.

Iphigeneia at Aulis? The fragment preserves part of a man's body holding a letter in his right hand. The figure is very similar to the figure of Menelaos on relief bowls in New York and Athens (IPH. 6 and 7, scene C).

Reliefs:

IPH 72. London, British Museum 1206 (Fig. 68a-c)

Columna caelata from the Temple of Artemis at Ephesos.

c. 330-310 BC.

References: Lethaby 1913; Rügler 1988; Stewart 1990, 195, figs. 595-6; Ridgway 1990, 28ff; Wesenberg 2001, 297-314 (on reconstruction at bottom of column drum); Jenkins 2006, 66-8, figs. 54-6; Spawforth 2006, 200-1.

Iphigeneia at Aulis? The headless female figure between the winged figure (Thanatos ?) and Hermes Psychopompos has been identified as either Iphigeneia, Alkestis or Persephone. Possible identifications of the figures as follows:
 A.) man leaning on a staff (Kalchas?)—Thanatos—Iphigeneia—Hermes—Klytaimnestra (?)—Agamemnon (?)—figure too damaged for identification
 B.) man leaning on staff—Thanatos—Persephone (?)—Hermes—Demeter (?)—Hades (?)—figure too damaged for identification.

C.) A. Stewart (1990, 195): Kalchas—Thanatos—Iphigeneia—Hermes—female acolyte—Agamemnon—figure too damaged for identification. Stewart argues “of the three possible victims, Iphigeneia, Alkestis, and Persephone, only the first both fits the iconography and is relevant to Artemis.”

D.) Jenkins (2006, 66-8): Thanatos—Alkestis—Hermes—Persephone. Jenkins suggests Persephone as the figure behind Hermes based on her “dress and demeanor and the wedding wreath she holds.” C. Robert (1879) first identified the female figure between the winged figure and Hermes as Alkestis.

ETRUSCAN

Vases:

IPH 73 (= POL 37). Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale (ex. Rome, Villa Giulia 19539). So-called Vaso dei Gobbi (Figs. 114a-b)

Etrusco-Corinthian column-krater. From Cerveteri.

580/570 BC.

References: *LIMC* 17.

I include this vase as an uncertain depiction of Polyxena rather than Iphigeneia. See POL 37.

Paintings:

IPH 74. Paris, Louvre S 4033 (Fig. 69a-e)

Painted terracotta pinakes. Campana panel from Cerveteri.

530-520 BC.

References: *LIMC* 18; Roncalli 1965, 84-93; pls. 1-5, (especially 85-6 with summary of previous interpretations); Brendel 1995, 174-5.

Iphigeneia at Aulis? Five panels that may tell her story at Aulis. They were found inside a tomb, however, it is unclear whether or not this was their original or intended context.

- 1.) The most fragmentary: man and woman stand to right.
- 2.) A woman stands between two men, all in profile to right. She has long hair, and wears an earring, chiton, himation, mantle, and pointed shoes. She holds a flower in her right hand and holds her left hand up, palm open. The man in front of her holds a bow and arrow in his left hand. The man behind her holds a spear in his left hand.
- 3.) A man stands before a large flaming altar, with a column either on top of or behind the altar. He touches the altar with his left hand, and his right hand is raised to his face.
- 4.) A winged figure carries a woman, accompanied by a bearded man in front of her. The woman who is being carried or abducted is probably the same figure as in slab 2. Both have long hair and are similarly dressed, except that the patterned

border at the neckline of their garments is different. The man in front holds a bow and arrow in his left hand. He and the winged figure raise a foot off the ground, as if moving quickly or in flight.

5.) Two old men seated on stools face one another. The man on the left holds a scepter in his left hand, and with his right he gestures towards the face of the man opposite him. The man on the right is slightly hunched over, his head tilted downward. He has his left hand in his lap, and his right hand is closed in a fist holding up his chin.

Different interpretations have been proposed. A. Michaelis saw Herakles in slab 2. Others have interpreted the scene as a funeral procession. E. Petersen (and M. Pallottino) identified the subject as the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. In this interpretation, Iphigeneia is being led to sacrifice in slab 2, and then rescued by Apollo and a winged Artemis in slab 4; slab 5 might then be Kalchas and Agamemnon.

Sarcophagi:

IPH 75. Tuscania, Museo Nazionale (ex Rome, Villa Giulia 15531) (Fig. 70a-d)

Nenfro sarcophagus. From Tuscania, grave of Vipinana.

325-275 BC.

References: *LIMC* 2; Steuernagel 1998, 190, cat. no. 7, pls. 4.2-3 and 5.3.

Short side: Sacrifice of Iphigeneia? She sits on an altar to left with her right hand to her chin. In front of her is a bearded man in a himation standing frontally, with his left hand on her shoulder and holding a knife in his right hand, no longer preserved, which he raises over his head. The bearded man with the knife could be Agamemnon or Kalchas. To left of this figure is a bearded man hunched over on the floor with his left hand to his head in mourning.

Long side: sacrifice of barbarians / human sacrifice?

Long side: Danaides?

Mirrors:

IPH 76. Tübingen, Sammlung des Archäologischen Instituts W.61a
(Figs. 71a-b)

Bronze mirror with figures in relief.

Uncertain date.

References: *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum*, Deutschland 3 (1990), cat. no. 13, p. 31-4, pl. 13a-b.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia? A warrior at an altar is attacked by another warrior in the presence of a woman holding an axe. In the center of the composition is a youth, naked except for a mantle, who is at an altar. His body is frontal, but he turns his head to left to face his attacker. The assailant wears a helmet and armor and

holds a sword in his right hand. At the far right is a woman holding a double axe as if about to swing it.

Falconi Amorelli (1976, 237) suggested that the subject of this scene might be the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. More likely, this scene depicts a story known from Hyginus (*Fab* 91) of how Paris fled to an altar of Zeus when Deiphobos drew his sword against him. The female figure with the axe would be Cassandra, also wishing to kill Paris because through her prophesy she knows that he will bring about the fall of Troy. This subject also appears on Etruscan urns, with Paris on an altar and with Cassandra holding an axe (see Gantz 1993, 562-3).

Gems:

IPH 77. Berlin, Altes Museen (Once Berlin 379) (Fig. 72a-d)

Carnelian scarab.

Third-century BC.

References: *LIMC*, Artemis/Diana 216 (Simon); Furtwängler 1900, pl. XXII no. 18; Croisille 1963, 216, pl. XXVIII fig. 7; Maaskant-Kleibrink 1997, 25 fig. 4; Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 397 and fig. 374.

Iphigeneia at Aulis? Female figure (Iphigeneia?) standing at an altar with a deer. She wears a chiton and himation, and holds a spray of plants in her left hand and a patera with offerings in her right. In front of her is a garlanded altar, which partly overlaps a deer. Furtwängler (*AG III* 225, 231) identified the figure as Diana Nemorensis, in which he was followed by Simon (*LIMC*, Artemis/Diana 216-21). M. Henig (1994) suggests Diana Nemorensis or Iphigeneia. Zwierlein-Diehl (2007) suggests Iphigeneia as priestess of Diana Nemorensis.

IPH 78. Unknown (Fig. 73a-b)

Engraved gemstone.

Fourth-century BC?

References: Furtwängler 1900, pl. XXII no. 26; Croisille 1963, 216, pl. XXVIII fig. 8.

Iphigeneia at Aulis? Female figure stands at an altar with a deer. She holds plants to her face. Similar to Berlin, Altes Museen 379, the main difference being the angle at which the woman holds the spray of plants. Furtwängler (1900, 108 no. 26) suggested she may be Iphigeneia or Nemesis.

IPH 79. Berlin, Berlin 859 (Fig. 74a-b)

Banded sardonyx.

Fourth-century BC?

References: Furtwängler 1900, pl. XXII no. 30; Croisille 1963, 216, pl. XXVIII fig. 9; Maaskant-Kleibrink 1997, 24 fig. 1.

Iphigeneia at an altar with a deer? A female figure (Iphigeneia?) stands to right in front of a circular altar or column. She wears a high-girded chiton and himation, and her hands are folded in her lap in front of her. A deer standing to right is visible behind the woman and the altar.

IPH 80. Copenhagen, Sammlungen Thorwaldsen (L. Müller no. 877)
(Fig. 75a-b)

Horizontally striped sardonix.

Fourth-century BC?

References: Müller 1877-81; Furtwängler 1900, pl. XXIV no. 2; Croisille 1963, 211, pl. XXVIII fig. 10.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia (Müller)? A woman kneels on the ground with her hands tied behind her back, head turned to expose her neck. Behind and to her right stands a bearded man in a corselet plunging a sword above her breasts. A tree and altar appear in the scene. To right, is the upper body of a female figure watching the scene. Müller saw her as Artemis, holding a bow in her hand. Furtwängler, not convinced that the subject was the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, believed the female figure held a sword.

ROMAN

Vases:

IPH 81. The Portland Vase. London, British Museum (Figs. 76a-b)

Blue and white cameo glass.

Early first-century AD.

References: Smart 1984, 186; discussed in Sharrock 2002, 281-2; Walker 2006.

Iphigeneia at Aulis? Smart identifies the reclining female figure holding the lowered torch in her left hand as Iphigeneia, with Achilles to her right, and Artemis to her left. By combining Iphigeneia on one side with the wedding of Peleus and Thetis on the other, Smart suggests that his identification “would give a simpler thematic unity to the vase’s decoration [than Hind’s identification of the reclining figure as Dido flanked by Aeneas and Venus or Juno] and restore its character as a private object.”

Paintings:

IPH 82. Naples, Museo Nazionale 9022 (Fig. 77a-b)

Painting on stucco. From Herculaneum.

c. 25 BC.

References: *LIMC* 36; D’Ambra 2007, 5 fig. 1.

Iphigeneia in Argos? Preparations for Iphigeneia's wedding before Klytaimnestra (Bendinelli 1941-2). Iphigeneia (?) stands to right of the pilaster in the center of the scene, looking out at the viewer. She wears a long chiton with a patterned border at the bottom hem, himation, earrings and bracelet. A taller girl behind her arranges her hair. At right is a table, on top of which is a box and a spray of plants, below which is an oinochoe. To left of the pilaster is a female figure (Klytaimnestra?) seated on a throne observing the scene in front of her. She holds out her veil with her left hand and places her right hand on the back of a young girl, who is leaning on the right arm of the throne and watches intently. An adjacent painting depicted Achilles.

Reliefs:

IPH 83. Šempeter-Celeia, Tomb of the Prisciani, inv. 2, *in situ* (Fig. 78) [same monument as TAU 53]

Marble relief. In Slovenia.

Between the beginning of the second-century and the mid-third century AD.

References: *LIMC* 86.

Iphigeneia (?) at Aulis or in Tauris (?). At center, a draped and veiled female figure stands frontally with her head turned to left. She holds an olive branch in her right hand, which is raised and extended out in front of her over a flaming altar. There is an archaistic cult statue to right of the woman. To left, a bearded man stokes the flames or lights a torch on the altar. To right, a man kneels to left, head raised looking up at her, pulling back the head of a deer in his left hand and holding a fillet in his right. Toynbee (1977, 388-9) identifies the female figure as Artemis, possibly Iphigeneia, the scene being a "free illustration of the messenger's speech in Euripides' play [*IA*]." Klemenc (1972) also places the scene at Aulis. Linant de Bellefonds (1990, 726) places the scene at Tauris, where the subjects of the other two reliefs of the tomb took place, Iphigeneia's escape to the boat, and a scene of Orestes and Pylades flanking a flaming altar, one of them writing a letter. He observes that the female figure resembles the figure of Iphigeneia on the relief in Sens and on the painting from Ephesus. The inclusion of the deer makes it difficult to discern whether the scene takes place at Aulis or Tauris. Typically, the deer would place the scene at Aulis, however, Linant de Bellefonds comments that the deer is sometimes included in scenes clearly in Tauris, such as on the pediment from Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmuseum U 194, and on an Apulian amphora in Leningrad, Hermitage B1715A.

Mosaics:

IPH 84. Verona, Negrar di Valpolicella, *in situ* (Fig. 79)

Floor mosaic.

First—second century AD ?

References: Levi 1947, 126.

Iphigeneia supplicating Menelaos? At center, a woman looks into the eyes of a man in supplication. Wearing a crown and robes, he stands frontally. He holds a scepter in his left hand and touches the woman's shoulder with his right. Behind her is a veiled woman. Levi describes this scene as either Iphigeneia supplicating Menelaos or Klytaimnestra supplicating Achilles. He seems to favor Klytaimnestra's supplication of Achilles because of the "matronly aspect" of the supplicating figure and the "virginal aspect" of the maiden dressed in white at left, and he finds this scene as related to the Iphigeneia mosaic at Antioch. Levi identifies a cake mold from Ostia as a parallel for the royal dress of Achilles as a warrior-king, which also depicts Klytaimnestra's supplication of Achilles.

Gems:**IPH 85. Berlin, Staatliche Museen FG 488 (Fig. 80)**

Sard.

Republican.

References: *LIMC* 48; Martini 1971, 142, cat. no. 120, pl. 24.1 (subject given as “Menschenopfer”).

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia? A bearded man (Kalchas or Agamemnon?) wearing a corselet and mantle down his back stands to left before a circular garlanded altar holding a knife in his raised left hand and a plate with offerings in his right. Behind this is the upper body of a female figure (Iphigeneia?) She appears to be kneeling behind the altar, and she faces away from the male figure, staring straight ahead, her hands tied in front of her.

IPH 86. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum XI B 291 (Fig. 81a-b)

Brown glass paste.

Mid first-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 49; Zwierlein-Diehl, 1979, vol. 2, 40, cat. no. 667, pl. 16.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia? A bearded man in exomis (Agamemnon or Kalchas?) stands before a square altar, a knife in his right hand held across his body, and raising a patera filled with round offerings up to his face. On top of the altar or standing behind it is a veiled female figure facing him, on a smaller scale.

II. Polyxena

POLYXENA—GREEK DEPICTIONS (CERTAIN)

VASE-PAINTINGS:

POL 1. London, British Museum 1897.7-27.2 (Figs. 82a-l)

Tyrrhenian black-figure neck-amphora.

Attributed to the Tyrrhenian Group by Walters; attributed to the Timiades Painter by Bothmer.

c. 570-560 BC.

References: *LIMC* 26; *ABV* 97.27; *Para* 37; *Add²* 26; *LIMC*, Nestor 34; *ThesCRA* 1, Sacrifices 595; Sweet 1987, 190 pl. 6.8; *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* 64, 1989, 46 fig. 46; Carpenter 1991, fig. 23; Spivey and Rasmussen 1991, 140 fig. 58; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992, 303 fig. 74; *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* 68, 1993, 192 fig. 3C; van Straten 1995, fig. 118; Connelly 1996, 62 fig. 5; Schafer 1997, pl. 13.2; Grmek and Gourevitch 1998, 75 fig. 38; Boardman 2001, 240 fig. 263; Schwarz 2001, pl. 9, fig. 1.

A1.) Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment of slaughter. Neoptolemos sacrifices her over an omphalos-shaped altar topped by a flame. Three warriors facing left (Amphilochos, Antiphates, and Ajax Oiliades) hold her horizontally. Neoptolemos holds Polyxena's head down with his left hand and plunges his sword into her neck with his right. Blood gushes out of her neck wetting the altar. Nestor and Diomedes stand behind Neoptolemos watching the scene. Turning away from the scene at far right is Phoinix, standing in front of a stool. All of the figures are named by inscriptions, from left to right:

ΝΕΣΤΟΡ ΠΥΛΙΟΣ; ΔΙΟΜΕΔΕΣ; ΝΕΟΠΤΟΛΕΜΟΣ (retrograde);

ΠΟΛΥΞΕΝΕ (retrograde); ΑΝΦΙΛΟΞΟΣ (retrograde); ΑΜΤΙΦΑΤΕΣ

(retrograde); ΑΙΑΣ ΙΛΙΑΔΕΣ; ΦΟΙΝΙΞ (retrograde).

B1.) Komos. A bearded man and three youths dancing between two large cocks.

A2.) Confronting sirens flanking a lotus-palmette chain.

B2.) Animal frieze, including swan, rams, and panther.

AB3.) Animal frieze, including ram and panthers.

POL 2. Berlin, Staatliche Museen F 1698 (Figs. 83a-d)

Attic black-figure amphora (Type A). From Vulci.

Attributed to Group E.

c. 550 BC

References: *LIMC* 18; *ABV* 136, 54, 674; *Add²* 37; *MeditArch* 9/10 (1996/1997), pl. 18.1; Hedreen 2001, fig. 4.

A.) Iliupersis: Rape of Cassandra, who seeks sanctuary at a statue of Athena. She has fallen down on her right knee and raises her hands to protect herself. On the left, Polyxena watches. A youth named Skamandrophilos stands in front of her. Fleeing warrior to right behind statue of Athena. All named by inscriptions: Πολυξσενε; Αι[αω]; Κατ<τ> ανδρ(?) α(?) Αψεναι(?) γλαυξω (retrograde); Σκαμανδροφιλω; Ανψιλοξω; Στεσιασ κα[λω].

B.) Theseus and the Minotaur. Youth and maiden on left. Athena and youth on right. Nonsense inscriptions ?¹²

POL 3. Berlin, Altes Museum F 1902 (Figs. 84a-i)

Attic black-figure hydria.

Attributed to the Leagros Group.

c. 500 BC.

References: *LIMC* 22; *ABV* 363, 37; *Para* 161; *Add²* 96; Carpenter 1991, fig. 24; *REÁ* 99 (1997), 2, 87, fig. 11; *ThesCRA* 1, Sacrifices cat. no. 598.

Body: Sacrifice of Polyxena, Polyxena led to sacrifice. A warrior (probably Neoptolemos) leads Polyxena to the tomb of Achilles. Achilles' funeral mound is painted white and stands in front of the figures. The soul of the hero leaps to left at the top of the mound. A snake and dog appear in front of the tomb. Chariot and three warriors on left behind Polyxena and Neoptolemos.

Shoulder: Chariot race, funeral games?

POL 4. New York Private, Collection of Gregory Callimanopulos (The Metropolitan Museum of Art L.1983.71.4) (Fig. 85)

Attic black-figure lekythos.

Attributed to the Acheloos Painter

c. 500 BC.

References: Mertens 2002, pl. 56b.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, Polyxena led to sacrifice. Neoptolemos leads her to the tomb of Achilles, painted in white in front of the figures. He grasps her left wrist with his right hand. She moves to right, but looks back, her right hand raised to her head in a gesture of despair. The eidolon of Achilles leaps to right above mound. There is a snake in front of the mound. A vine passes behind the figures.

POL 5. Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia 121110 (Figs. 86a-l)

Ex. Malibu, The J. Paul Getty Museum 83.AE.362 + 84.AE.80 + 85.AE.385.1.2. Fragments of an Attic red-figure kylix (Type C).

Signed by Euphronios as potter: E]VΦ [PONIOΣ EΠIOIE] ΣΕ [N .

Attributed to Onesimos as painter:

¹²Beazley 1931-32, 7, 32 recorded Αριαγνε on side B.

c. 500-490 BC.

References: *LIMC* 19; *LIMC*, Patroklos 7, Helen 277, Ilioupersis 7, Theano I 10, Cassandra I 104; *J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 12 (1984), 246, no. 73; *Getty Vases* 3 (1986), 106, fig. 4; Bulletin of the J. Paul Getty Trust 2 (1987), 1, 10, 13; *Getty Vases* 4 (1989), 182-184, figs. 1, 3, 4; *J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 18 (1990), 54-55, figs. 1-4; Williams 1991, 41-64; Robertson 1992, 47, fig. 33; Boardman 1993, 78, fig. 76; Holliday 1993, 105, fig. 42; Carter and Morris 1995, 229, fig. 15.9; Reeder 1995, 82, fig. 8; *CA* 15 (1996), 184 fig. 4; *ZPE* 111 (1996), pl. 9; Cristofani 1996, 56-57, figs. 30-33; Anderson 1997, 234-245; Oenbrink 1997, 415, pl. 3; Pelagatti and Guzzo 1997, 71-82, figs. 1-22; Stewart 1997, 22, fig. 12; Gilman 1997, 38-39; Oakley 1997, 303, fig. 6; Deacy and Pierce 1997, 139, fig. 11; Spivey 1998, 85, fig. 67; *Archeo, Attualita di Passato* 176 (Oct. 1999), 14; Sgubini and Rizzo 1999; Torelli 2000, 623, no. 282; Hedreen 2001, fig. 6a-c.

Iliupersis.

Tondo: Death of Priam. Priam falls back on altar as he is attacked by Neoptolemos wielding the body of Astyanax. Polyxena stands behind altar with both hands tearing at her hair. Dead warrior lying on the ground. Inscriptions: ΠΟΛΥΞΕΝΕ; ΝΕΟΠΤΟΛΕΜΟΣ; ΑΣΤΥΑΝΑΞΣ;]ΑΙΦΟΝΟΣ (fallen warrior); ΗΡΚΕΙΩ (on altar).

Interior zone around tondo, starting from left handle going clockwise:

- a.) Rescue of Aithra by Akamas and Demophon. Inscription: ..] ΜΟΦΟΝ.
- b.) Fight between a Trojan woman wielding a pestle and the Greek warrior Sthenelos. Inscriptions: ΣΨΕΛΕΛΟ[Σ] (retrograde); Η [.....] Ε (woman's name, with space for four or five letters between the two preserved ones).
- c.) Rape of Cassandra. Inscription: ΚΑΤΤΑΝΔΡΑ (retrograde).
- d.) Fight between a Greek and two Trojans. The Trojan warrior who has not yet fallen is named by an inscription: ΟΦΡ[. .]Σ (retrograde).
- e.) Antenor and Theano appealing to Odysseus. Inscriptions: . . .]Ε[Σ;
. . .]Ο (retrograde, for Theano);
- f.) Missing section: fight scene?
- g.) Recovery of Helen. Menelaos drops his sword, as Aphrodite grasps Helen's chiton. Eros between Helen and Menelaos. Inscriptions: ΜΕΝΕΛΕΟΣ (retrograde); ΗΕΛΕΝΕ; ΕΡΟΣ.
- h.) Fragmentary scene preserving legs of two different men, and part of Andromache wielding a double axe. Inscriptions: ΑΝ (retrograde, for Andromache); . . .]Σ (for one of the warriors).

Exterior:

- A.) Patroklos leading Briseis from Achilles to Agamemnon. Achilles reaches to draw his sword and Thetis intervenes. Inscriptions: . . .]ΤΡΟΚΛΟΣ (retrograde); Α[. . . (for Achilles); ΨΕ[.]Ι[Σ].
- B.) Battle between Ajax and Hektor, flanked by Athena on the left and Apollo on the right. Trojan archer in Eastern dress on the far right. Inscriptions: [ΑΨΕ]ΝΑΙΑ (retrograde); ΑΙΑΣ; ΑΠΟΛΛΟΝ (retrograde).
Under handles: A/B.) stool; B/A.) goose.

POL 6. Paris, Musée du Louvre G153 (Figs. 87a-e)

Fragments of an Attic red-figure kylix (Type B). From Italy.

Signed by Hieron as potter: ΗΙΕΡΟΝ ΕΠΙΟΙΗΣΕΝ.

Attributed to Makron as painter.

c. 490-480 BC.

References: *LIMC* 24; *ARV²* 460.14, 481; *Add²* 244; Kurtz 1989, 69.1-2, 70.1; *NumAntCl* 23 (1994), 42, fig. 7; Kunisch 1997, 178 cat. no. 169, pl. 61 (with bibliography); *REA* 99 (1997), 2, 87, fig. 10; Hedreen 2001, fig. 11.

A.) Sacrifice of Polyxena, Polyxena led to sacrifice. She is led to the tomb of Achilles between two men. The warrior in front holding the sword and grasping her wrist is named by an inscription as Neoptolemos. The bearded man behind her directs her to left. Polyxena's head is in profile to right as she turns her head to look over her shoulder. The grave of Achilles appears under the handle of side B/A. Behind Polyxena and her escorts are four men to left. Inscriptions:

[Π]ΟΛΟΞΕΝ[Ε] (retrograde); . . .] ΜΟΣ (for Neoptolemos).

B.) Six men to left. The third man from the left holds a scepter, the others hold spears.

Tondo: Ransom of Hektor. Achilles reclining on kline with dead body of Hektor at his feet.

POL 6 bis. Tekirdağ, Museum of Tekirdağ 1855 (Figs. 87 bis. a-h)

Fragments of an Attic red-figure column-krater. From Tekirdağ (ancient Rhaidestos Bisanthe).

Attributed to an early painter of the Syleus Sequence or to an early phase of the Syleus Painter.

c. 500-450 BC.

References: Tuna-Nörbling 1999 and 2001, figs. 1-15.

A.) Ransom of Hektor: Achilles reclines on a cushioned couch beneath which is the dead body of Hektor. Achilles holds a sword in his right hand, and its scabbard in his left. Priam, wearing a chiton and himation, approaches him with both arms extended, reaching for his chin in a gesture of supplication with one hand and touching Achilles' right forearm with his other. At left, Hermes leads a woman (probably Polyxena) by the wrist. Hermes wears a petasos, mantle and boots, and he raises his left hand in a gesture of greeting, and his right grasps the maiden's wrist, *cheir epi karpō*. Polyxena stands in profile to right, her head inclined downward, long locks of hair falling on her shoulders. She wears a chiton and himation with a thick band at the bottom hem. Polyxena raises her right hand out in front of her, as if she is about to speak or interrupt the scene. Tuna-Nörbling has identified the scene as Polyxena offering herself as a slave or wife to Achilles as ransom for her brother Hektor's body, known from Diktys Cretensis' *Ephemeris tou Troikou polemou*, of AD 66-200. Inscriptions: Ο ΚΑΛ[ΟΣ] (by Polyxena's head); ΔΙΟΣΕΣΕΝΙΟ (plea to Zeus Xenios, protector of foreigners; by Priam's head); ΑΝΤΙΠΟΛΟΣΕ[] (behind Achilles).

B.) Fragments preserve parts of two warriors fighting one another with a fallen warrior in between them.

POL 7. Paris, Musée du Louvre G152 (Figs. 88a-o)

Attic red-figure kylix. From Vulci.

Signed by Brygos as potter: ΒΡΥΓΟΣΕΠΟΙΕΣΕΝ.

Attributed to the Brygos Painter.

c. 480 BC.

References: *LIMC* 23; *ARV²* 369.1, 398, 1649; *Para* 365; *Add²* 224; *LIMC*, Akamas et Demophon 11, Andromache I 46, Astyanax I 18, Briseis 52, Iliupersis 8, Opsimedon 1, Priamos 124; Ruhfel 1984, 55, fig. 20; Keuls 1985, 401, fig. 337; Seki 1985, pls. 44.4, 45.4; Boulter 1985, pl. 55; *Hephaistos* 7-8 (1985-86), 168 pl. 2, fig. 3; Bérard 1987, 208, fig. 13; *JdI* 103 (1988), 196, figs. 25-26; Schefold 1989, 286-287, figs. 250-251; Francis and Vickers 1990, fig. 14; Cambiano 1992, pl. 10; Martens 1992, 16, fig. 2; Robertson 1992, 94, fig. 87; Denoyelle 1994, 122-3 cat. no. 56; Muller 1994, II, fig. 29; Tiverios 1996, 148, 150, figs. 124, 126; Sparkes 1996, 42, fig. II.6; Dalby 1996, 151, fig. 28; Anderson 1997, 228-231, fig. 7a and 7b; Knittlmayer 1997, pl. 6.2; Schwarz 2001, pl. 11; Seki 2006, 63 fig. 3.

A.) Iliupersis. Greek attacking a fallen Trojan in center. Flanked on the left by a woman fleeing and on the right by Andromache wielding a pestle over her head. Behind Andromache, Astyanax flees to right just before the handle. At the far left, another Greek attacks a fallen Trojan, whose body extends under the handle of side B/A. Inscriptions: ΗΥΠΕΡ[Ο]Σ (retrograde, to left of face of the Greek fighting the Trojan who falls under the handle); ΟΡΣΙΜΕ<ΝΕ>Σ (to right of thigh of Greek warrior in center); (Ι)Μ(Ο)ΜΥ (above face of fallen Trojan in center); ΑΝ<Δ>ΡΟΜΑΞΕ (retrograde); ΑΣΤΥΑΝΑΞΣ.

B.) Sacrifice of Polyxena, Polyxena led to sacrifice. Death of Priam in center. Priam falls back on altar as he is attacked by Neoptolemos wielding the body of Astyanax. Tripod behind altar. To left of main scene, Polyxena led to sacrifice by Akamas. Inscriptions: ΑΚΑΜΑ[Σ] (retrograde); ΠΟΛΥΞΕΣΕΝΕ (retrograde); ΠΡΙΑΜΟ[Σ]; ΝΕΟΠΤ(Ο)ΛΕ? [ΜΟΣ].

Tondo: Phoinix and Briseis. A seated Phoinix holds a phiale in his right hand and a scepter in his left. Briseis stands holding an oinochoe in her right hand. Inscriptions: ΒΡΙΣΕΕΣ; ΦΟΙΝΙΞ.

POL 7 bis. London, British Museum B 70 (Fig. 89a-b)

Etrusco-Campanian black-figure amphora.

c. 470-450 BC.

References: *LIMC* 37; *LIMC*, Hekabe 57; Woodford 2003, 9, fig. 5.

A.) Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A warrior carries a woman horizontally to an altar. On the other side of this, another warrior holds a sword in his right hand, and extends his left hand out as if to grab the woman's head. An incised line around the crown of her head may indicate a fillet. She is held face down, so her head is in profile to left, but her body is depicted frontally, her body twisting, and her toes pointing up to the sky.

B.) Mourning woman. A female figure (Hecuba ?) kneeling to left tears at her hair, watching the scene of sacrifice on the other side.

The inclusion of the mourning woman on the reverse, who might be Hecuba, as she is depicted on one of the short sides of the Polyxena Sarcophagus, argues for the subject of this vase as the sacrifice of Polyxena.

LOST WALL PAINTINGS:**POL 8. Lost monumental wall painting once in the Pinakothek, Athens**

Attributed to Polygnotos of Thasos

475-450 BC

References: *LIMC* 25.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter.

Described by Pausanias (1.22.6):

το δ' Ἀξιλλῆος τῆρου πλησθον μῦλλουσ/στι σφῆζεσσαι
Πολυφῶνη. Ὀμ→ρ⊗ δ' ε| μ'ν παρεψη τῶδε τ| ὤμ|ν ο|τῶ
φργον.

And there is Polyxena about to be sacrificed near the grave of Achilles. Homer did well in passing by this barbarous act.

POL 9. Lost monumental wall painting once in the Lesche of the Knidians, Delphi (Figs. 90, for Stansbury-O'Donnell's reconstruction)

Attributed to Polygnotos of Thasos.

475-450 BC.

References: *LIMC* 17; Stansbury-O'Donnell 1989 and 1999; Anderson 1997, 246-55.

Iliupersis scene. Polyxena depicted among the Trojan women in a painting of the Sack of Troy. According to Pausanias (10.25.9), the Trojan women "are represented as already captives and lamenting." In 10.25.10, Pausanias wrote:

" μ'ν δ' εἰς Ἀνδρομάχην καὶ Μήδεσιν ἐστὶν ἡ κάλυμματ' ἐστὶν
 /πικρὰ μέλαινα, Πολυφύνη δ' κατὰ τὴν ἐπισημίαν παρφυνοῖω
 ἡ νὰ πύπλεκται τὸ σῶμα τῆς κεφαλῆς τρέξασα: ἡ ποικίλη δ'
 ἀτὰρ τὴν /πικρὰ τὴν ἑξίλλυτον μὲν ἔματι ποιητὰς τε ἡδοῦσι καὶ
 γραφῆναι τὴν ἑξίλλυτον καὶ Περγῆ μὲν τὴν πρὸ Καίκου
 ψεῦδος ἡδοῦσι τὴν δὲ ἑξίλλυτον τὴν Πολυφύνηω τὴν παρφυνοῖω.

Andromache and Medesicaste are wearing hoods, but the hair of Polyxena is braided after the custom of maidens. Poets sing of her death at the tomb of Achilles, and both at Athens and at Pergamus on the Caïcus I have seen the tragedy of Polyxena depicted in paintings.

An epigram of Pollianus (*Greek Anthology* 16.150) describes either the figure of Polyxena depicted in the Pinakothekē or in the Lesche of the Knidians, Delphi:

ἡ Ἀδὲ Πολυκλείτου Πολυφύνη, οἷον δὲ τι ἡ ἄλλα
 ἕξερ' ἡψιγεν τοῦ δαιμονίου πικρὰ κοῦ.
 ἡ Ἡρᾶω φρυγὸν ἡδὲ φων. ἡδὲ πω, πύπλοιο ραγύντω,
 τὴν ἄσδον γυμνὴν σφρόνοι κρῖπτε πύπλοιο.
 ἡδὲ σσεταὶ ἡ τλῆμων χυξίος κπερ: ἡ Βλεφῶροις δ'
 παρψενικῶν ἡ Φρυγὸν κείτται ἡλω πύπλοιο.

This is the Polyxena of Polykleitos, and no other hand touched this divine picture. It is a twin sister of his Hera. See how, her robe being torn, she covers her nakedness with her modest hand. The unhappy maiden is supplicating for her life, and in her eyes lies all the Trojan war.

POL 10. Lost monumental wall painting, from Pergamon on the Caïcus

Uncertain date.

References: not listed separately in *LIMC*. See *LIMC* 25, where the Pergamon painting is discussed along with the lost painting by Polygnotos once in the Pinakothekē, Athens.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter (?)

Known from Pausanias' description (10.25.10): cited above, POL 9.

RELIEF BOWLS

POL 11. Athens, National Museum 14.624 (Fig. 91a-c)

Relief bowl. From Cephalonia.

c. 150 BC.

References: *LIMC* 27.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment of slaughter (scene C).

Caricatured scenes from the Trojan War:

A.) Menelaos attacking Paris. To right of the duel, Aphrodite has her arms outstretched to help. Diomedes, Odysseus, and Agamemnon rush into battle.

Inscriptions: ΔΙΟΜΗΔΗ; ΟΔΥΣΣΕΥΣ; ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ; ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ; ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ; ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΗ.

B.) Pandaros about to shoot his bow and arrow. Athena stands behind him to lead his shot astray. Inscriptions: ΠΑΝΔΑΡΟΣ; ΑΨΗΝΑ.

C.) Neoptolemos sacrificing Polyxena on the grave of Achilles. Achilles sits to left of the scene watching the sacrifice. Inscriptions: ΑΞΙΛΕΥΣ; ΝΕΟΠΤΟΛΕΜΟΣ; ΠΟΛΥΞΕΝΑ.

POL 12. Athens, National Museum (Fig. 92)

Fragment of a relief bowl. From Cephalonia.

c. 150 BC

References: Sinn 1979, 117 cat. no. MB 63, pl. 25, 3.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment of slaughter.

Composition very similar to POL. 11, scene C.

The inscriptions read: [ΝΕΟΠΤΟΛ] ΕΜΟΣ
[ΠΟΛΥΞΕ] ΝΑ

POL 13. Once Berlin, Staatliche Museen 3161 p (destroyed WWII)

(Fig. 93)

Relief bowl. From Thebes.

Second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 28.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter. She kneels before the grave of Achilles with both arms raised in the air in a gesture of alarm as Neoptolemos approaches her. Achilles' tomb is represented by a funerary stele with a fillet wrapped around it. To left, the eidolon of Achilles is seated. Other figures of uncertain identity decorate the exterior of the bowl. Dolphins and birds appear as filling ornament.

SARCOPHAGI:

POL 14. Çanakkale, Archaeological Museum. Polyxena Sarcophagus (Figs. 94a-l)

Marble relief sarcophagus found at Gümüşçay.

c. 520-500 BC.

References: Sevinç 1996; Sevinç et al. 1998; *ThesCRA* 1, Sacrifices 596; Draycott 2001, and forthcoming; Schwarz 2001, pl. 8, fig. 1-2; Pedley 2002, 192 fig. 6.63; Hedreen 2001, figs. 37a-b.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment of slaughter.

Long side: Sacrifice of Polyxena. Polyxena is held horizontally to right by three unarmed men. She is face up, toes pointing towards the sky, and her hands are bound. Neoptolemos stands by her head. He pulls her hair down with one hand to expose her neck, and he thrusts his sword into her neck with the other. To left of the scene, six mourning women and an elderly man (Nestor?) watch the sacrifice. Behind Neoptolemos is the the tumulus of Achilles in front of which is set a tripod.

Long side: Funerary celebration. The composition is divided into two parts. The scene on the left focuses on a woman seated on a throne. She holds a flower, which she smells, in her left hand, and an egg in her right. Six women attend her, two in front, and four behind. Of the four women behind the throne, one holds a lyre, one a fillet, and one a fan. Of the two figures in front of the seated woman, one brings her a mirror and a bowl of eggs, and the other carries two alabaster. The scene on the right represents six women and four men dancing and playing music. The four armed men are in the center of the scene facing left. Wearing helmets and carrying shields, they stand on their tiptoes, performing a pyrrhic dance. A woman playing the double flutes and another holding a kithara stand to left of the men and face them. Behind the dancers are four more women. The closest to them is dancing and holding a pair of castanets. Three others watch.

Short side, right of the Polyxena scene: Hecuba (?) and two women mourning? A woman crouches to left in front of a tree. She holds a staff in her left hand and raises her right hand to her head. Crows feet at the outer edge of her eye indicate her advanced age. Behind her stand two women to left with their hands raised to their head in a gesture of mourning. The tree is bare of foliage.

Short side, right of the funerary celebration: Symposium of women. Two women sit facing one another on a kline, and move their hands as if in conversation with one another. A woman in a transparent chiton stands on the left side of the kline. On the other side stands two women, one holding an egg and a plate of food, the other an oinochoe and a mirror.

POL 15. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden I.1896-12.1 (Fig. 95)

Once Izmir market. Fragments of face of a painted Clazomenian sarcophagus.

Said to be from Clazomenae.

Attributed to the Albertinum Group.

c. 500-470 BC

References: *LIMC* 21; *ThesCRA* 1, Sacrifices 597.

Headpiece (in black-figure): Sacrifice of Polyxena, Polyxena led to sacrifice. A warrior grasps her right wrist with one hand and menaces her with a sword in the other. He leads her to the tomb of Achilles, an omphalos-shaped mound set on two steps. The foot and greave of another warrior is preserved behind Polyxena.

To the left of the tomb are four warriors: One mounting the steps wears armor, two hold shields. All that remains of the fourth figure at far left is part of an arm and shoulder with cuirass.

FREE-STANDING SCULPTURE:

POL 16. Lost bronze statue once in the Baths of Zeuxippos, Constantinople

The baths were completed and decorated by Constantine. (Traditionally attributed in Byzantine sources to Septimius Severus, who had begun the Baths). AD 330; destroyed by fire in AD 532
References: *LIMC* 29; Bassett 1996.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter.
Described by Christodoros of Koptos:

Π(ρροω δα □λλοω fην πτολιπ)ρψιο]: ο[κ/π← ξα↔τη] ↓ππ)κομον
τρυφ□λειαν fξπν, ο[κ fγξοσ ωλ↔σσων, □λλε □ρα γυμν]] fλαμπε,
κα← □ξνοον ε™ξεν | π→νην: δεφιτερ↓ν δα □νΥτεινεν ∞→ν, /πιμ□ρτυ
ρα
ν↔κη], λοφ□ Πολυφε↔νην βαρυδ□κρυον)μματι λε(σσων. ε⇒πΥ,
Πολυφε↔νη δυσπ□ρψενε, τ↔] τοι □ν□γκη ξαλκ®/ν □ψ)γγ®
κεκρυμμΥνα δ□κρυα λε↔βειν; π\] δ' τε® κρ→δεμονον/πειρ(σασα
προσ⊕π⊗ (στασαι, α⇒δομΥν | μ'ν □λ↔γκιο], □λλε/ν← ψυμ® πΥνψ
ο]
fξει]; μ↓ δ→ σε τε[ν πτολ↔εψρον | λΥσσα] λη}δα Π(ρρο] fξοι
Φσι⊕τιο]; ο[δΥ σε μορφ↓ □ρ(σατο τοφε(σασα ΝεοπτολΥμοιο
μενοιν→ν, × ποτε ψηρε(σασα τεο\ γενετ°ρα φον°ο] ε⇒] λ↔νον
α[τοκΥλευστον □ελπΥο] •γεν | λΥψρου. να← μ□ τ[ν/ν ξαλκ®
νοερ[ν τ(πον, εδ ν(τε το↔ην fδρακε Π(ρρο] □ναφ, τ□ξα κεν
φυν→ονα λΥκτρων ≥γετο, πατρ<η] προλιπθον μνημ→ (α μο↔ρηω.

Here was another Pyrrhus, sacker of cities, not wearing on his locks a plumed helmet or shaking a spear, but naked he glittered, his face beardless, and raising his right hand in testimony of victory he looked askance on weeping Polyxena. Tell me, Polyxena, unhappy virgin, what forces thee to shed hidden tears now thou art of mute bronze, why dost thou draw thy veil over thy face, and stand like one ashamed, but sorry at heart? Is it for fear lest Pyrrhus of Phthia win thee for his spoil after destroying thy city? Nor did the arrows of thy beauty save thee—they beauty which once entrapped his father, leading him of his own will into the net of unexpected death. Yeah, by thy brazen image I swear had prince Pyrrhus seen thee as thou here art, he would have taken thee to wife and abandoned the memory of his father's fate.

(*Greek Anthology* 2.197-208)

POL 17. Lost statue group

References: *LIMC* 30.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment of slaughter.

Known from fourth-century AD description by Libanius, *Descriptiones* (in *Progymnasmata*) 18:

Πολυφύνη] σφαττομύνη] | π] το\ Νεοπτολύμου.

1. Τ] δ' Πολυφύνη] π] ψωω τεψΥαται μ'ν γεγενημύνον "

Τρο↔α, παρΥσξε δ' " σκην↓ μετ] τ↓ν Τρο↔αν ⇒δειί]ν, κα↔ λαπειί]ν
/π↔ το(τοι] ο] κ/σιν ο↓ πλ]ττοντε] ξαλκ® τ] πραξψ'ν
π]πεικ]ζοντε].

2. ε]ν περιφανεί] το↔νν ξθρ® το\ σ]τεο] π]κ]κεϊτα↔ τι]
Πολυφύνη] ε]κθον παρ] α] τ]ν ο] σα τ]ν Νεοπτ]λεμον.] μ'ν
γ]ρ ♣στηκε παρ] τα(την γυμν] κρ]νο] μ]νον λαβθον

περικε↔μενον κα↔ κρ]νο] ο] ξ]λον, π]λλε ο]σον π]κραισ/πιχα]σαι
ταί] κ]μαι] ε]σπερ ο] κ]νεξομύνου το\ τα(τα δημιουργ]σαντο]
Νεοπτολύμ® περιψεί]ναι σκευ↓ν/πειγομύνον® πρ]] γυνα↔ου
σφαγ]ν. (Foerster vol. VIII, p. 508-511)

POL 18. Lost (statue?) group

References: *LIMC* 31

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter.

Described in an epigram of Cosmas (*Greek Anthology* 16.114):

Ε]ω Π]ρρον μ]λλοντα σφ]φαι τ↓ν Πολυφύνην

Π]ρρο] γ]θ: σπε]δω δ' πατρ]ω ξ]ριν: " δ' κυν]πιω Παλλ]δα
κικλ]σκει, γ]νπτ]ν fξουσα Π]ριν.

On Pyrrhus about to butcher Polyxena

I am Pyrrhus, and am urgent for my father's sake; but she, the
shameless girl, calls on Pallas, though her brother be Paris.

POLYXENA—ETRUSCAN DEPICTIONS (CERTAIN)

POL 19. Orvieto, Museo Claudio Faina (Ex. Museo dell'Opera del Duomo)
(Fig. 96a-c)

Sarcophagus. From Torre San Severo.

Mid fourth century--end of the fourth-century BC?

References: *LIMC* 32; Steuernagel 1998, 189, cat. no. 3, pl. 1 fig. 2-3 and pl. 3 fig. 2-4; Colonna 2006, 137, fig. VIII.9. Authenticity called into question by M. Cagiano de Azevedo, *RM* 77 (1970), 10-18.

Long side: Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter. Central group consisting of Neoptolemos, Polyxena, and the shade of Achilles in front of the hero's tomb. Polyxena, collapsed on the ground on one knee, raises her arms to try to protect herself. Her garment has fallen around her thighs exposing her body. Neoptolemos holds Polyxena down by stepping on her leg. He grabs her hair with one hand and is about to deliver the death blow. The ghost of Achilles stands to right of Polyxena, watching the sacrifice. Groups of three men flank the central group on either side. Winged daimones decorate the corners of the sarcophagus.

Long side: Achilles' slaughter of the Trojan captives at the tomb of Patroklos. Similar composition as the other long side, with Achilles sacrificing a Trojan in front of the grave of Patroklos in the center of the scene. The Trojan captive sits on the ground, hands tied behind his back, as Achilles cuts his throat from behind. To left of the central group are some standing Greeks and a dead Trojan lying on the ground. To right of the central group, two more Trojans with their hands tied behind their backs are being led by warriors to the tomb of Patroklos, to be the next victims. Winged daimones on the corners of the sarcophagus.

POLYXENA—ROMAN DEPICTIONS (CERTAIN)

RELIEFS:

POL 20. Rome, Museo Capitolino. Capitoline Tabula Iliaca (Figs. 97a-h)

“Iliac” Tablet.

Late first century BC to early first-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 20 and 33; Brilliant 1984, 57; Rouveret 1989, 354-369 (as mnemonic devices); Small 2003, 93-98; Petrain, forthcoming; Heuser, forthcoming.

An inscription dividing the main scene in the central panel from the two friezes at the bottom provides information about the purpose of the tablet and possibly who made it: ΤΕΞΝΗΝ ΤΗΝ ΨΕΟΔ] ϚΡΗΟΝ ΜΑΨΕ ΤΑΞΙΝ ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΟΦΡΑ ΔΑΕΙΣ ΠΑΣΗΣ ΜΕΤΡΟΝ ΕΞΗΣ ΣΟΦΙΑΣ¹³ (learned in skill or art of Theodoros in order to learn all of the skill that it is possible by which anything is measured in the arrangement or order of the Homeric poems.)

Main scene in center of the tablet: scenes from the *Iliou Persis* of Stesichoros.

Top frieze of tablet to left: scenes from first book of the *Iliad*.

Twelve friezes on right hand side of tablet: scenes from books *nu* through *omega* of the *Iliad*.

Inscriptions on stele-like panel: list of episodes from books *eta* through *omega* of the *Iliad*, with some omissions.

Two friezes at bottom: scenes from the *Aethiopis* of Arktinos and the *Little Iliad* of Lesches.

Polyxena appears twice on the tablet (name inscribed twice), both times in the central panel depicting scenes from Stesichoros’ *Iliou Persis*. She appears as a young girl standing in front of her mother Hecuba on the steps of Hektor’s tomb on the left below the walls of Troy. To the right below the walls of Troy, Polyxena is on her knees on the stepped base of Achilles’ tomb as Neoptolemos grabs her hair and is about to plunge a sword into her neck.

POL 21. London, British Museum 1865.1220.103 (ex 1427) (Fig. 98)

Romano-British fragment of the base and body of a decorated Samian relief bowl (*sigillata* relief bowl).

References: *LIMC* 34; Lezoux 37.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter. Fragment preserves Polyxena kneeling on the ground to right facing Neoptolemos. He stands frontally and threatens her with a dagger held in his right hand. Polyxena’s garment has fallen

¹³Sadurska 1964, 29 for missing letters at beginning of the inscription.

around her legs exposing her chest, and she seems to extend her right hand in supplication.

SARCOPHAGUS:

POL 22. Madrid, Prado (Figs. 99a-g)

Fragments of an Attic marble sarcophagus.

Middle of the third-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 43; Schröder 1991, 158-69; Schröder 2004, 503-507, cat. no. 216, and color pl. 28.

Left short side: Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before sacrifice. A man and woman stand frontally next to one another in the center of the preserved panel. The woman, on the left side, is draped and veiled. The man wears a short chiton, chlamys and boots. He once held something, now broken off, in his left hand, and he points towards the ground with his right hand. Both turn their heads as if to look at one another. To right of the man stands another man of similar appearance who looks over at the couple. Several other figures appear in the background. The subject has most often been described as the marriage of Polyxena and Achilles (as in Touchefeu-Meynier 1994, 434 with bibliography). Schröder (2004, 504-6), however, interprets the scene not as the wedding of Polyxena and Achilles, but rather as the sacrifice of Polyxena by Neoptolemos, described in Seneca's *Troades* (lines 1132ff) and elsewhere. Arguing against a scene of marriage is the lack of the *dextrarum iunctio*, the Roman ritual hand-clasping between man and woman in images of marriage. Schröder believes the man, whom he identifies as Neoptolemos, held a sword in his left hand, not the marriage contract, as has been previously thought. With his right hand pointing towards the ground, Neoptolemos gestures to where is sacrifice is intended to go, to his dead father, Achilles, who can then be identified as the man to right of Neoptolemos watching the scene.

Front, long side: Sacrifice by the Greeks and Trojans to end the war. The Greeks stand on the left hand side, dressed as warriors with helmets, breastplates, and corselets. The Trojans stand on the right side, most wearing Phrygian caps and long sleeved tunics. In the center of the scene is the leader of the Greeks, most likely Agamemnon. He looks up towards the heavens with a sword in his right hand raised over his head and a small vessel in his left hand. Behind him is a small round altar. To left of Agamemnon is Odysseus, bearded, wearing a pilos, and giving the *spondai*, the ritual treaty to stop the fighting. To right of Agamemnon is an unbearded man, the only Trojan to wear a chlamys, who might be Paris, contributing an offering.

Right short side: Murder of Achilles by Paris and Deiphobos. Paris stands to right at the left break of the relief. He turns his head to look over his shoulder at Deiphobos. Paris, wearing a Phrygian cap, long sleeved tunic and boots, holds a bow in his left hand and points towards Achilles's ankle with his right hand. Achilles stands in three-quarter view on the right side of the relief. Achilles' holds his left leg straight out in front of him, an arrow just having pierced his

heel. The hero's left arm falls limply at his side, his right hand raised to his head, which is tilted downward. He seems to almost fall backwards, but is being supported by a Greek behind him and others in front of him.

Back: Recovery of Achilles' dead body by Ajax. Fragmentary scene with a man wearing a helmet and breastplate lifting a fallen naked man. A fragment in Paris adds two fleeing Trojans on right corner.

POLYXENA—UNCERTAIN DEPICTIONS

GREEK***Vases:*****POL 23. Mykonos, Mykonos Museum 2240** (Figs. 100a-r)

Terracotta relief pithos. From Mykonos.

c. 675 BC.

References: M. Ervin 1963; M. Ervin Caskey 1976; Ahlberg-Cornell 1982, 77-85, figs. 117, 120; 123-124, 126-38; Anderson 1997, 182-91, fig. 2a and 2b; Osborne 1998, 53-7, fig. 25; Schwarz 2001, especially p. 42-3, pl. 10 figs. 1-3.

Neck: Trojan horse.

Body: Three rows of metopes, most depicting a warrior attacking or killing women and children. Polyxena has been suggested as the identity of the woman in metope 7 and 13.

Metope 7: Sacrifice of Polyxena, Polyxena led to sacrifice? A woman with an elaborate veil is threatened by a bearded warrior wielding a sword. Ervin (1963, 61) has offered that this metope might depict Neoptolemos about to lead Polyxena to sacrifice, but she concludes that the scene is probably the recovery of Helen by Menelaos.

Metope 13: Single female figure standing to left, her hands bound in front of her chest. She is probably connected in a narrative context with the single unbearded warrior in metope 12, who is about to remove his sword from its scabbard. The bound hands led Schwarz (2001, 42-3) to suggest that she might be Polyxena.

POL 24 (= IPH 66). Basel, Loan (formerly lent to Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 6.67) (Figs. 63a-d)

Fragments of a Proto-attic krater.

Attributed to the New York Nessos Painter.

c. 650-630 BC.

References: *LIMC* Iphigeneia 2; Love 1986; Schwarz 2001, pl. 9 fig. 2.

Discussed under IPH 66.

POL 25. Paris, Musée du Louvre F29 (Figs. 101a-c)

Fragments of an Attic black-figure amphora (type B).

Signed by Lydos as painter: $\text{H}\text{O}\text{Λ}\text{Y}\text{Δ}\text{O}\text{Σ} : \text{E}\text{Γ}\text{P}[\text{A}\text{Φ}]\text{Σ}\text{E}\text{N}$.

c. 560-550 BC ("Early" according to Beazley).

References: *ABV* 109.21, 685; *Paralipomena* 44; *Addenda*² 30; *CVA*, Paris, Louvre 11 pl. 798, 125.1-4; *LIMC*, Priamos 136; *LIMC*, Kyknos I 148; *LIMC*,

Astyanax 18; *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum* vol. 4, 20 fig. 10; Holliday 1993, 91 fig. 34; Anderson 1997, 210-11, fig. 3a and 3b.

A1.) Iliupersis, Polyxena as bystander of death of Priam? Left, rape of Cassandra. Right, murder of Priam by Neoptolemos with the body of Astyanax. Two female figures watch the scene of Priam's murder. Schefold (1992, 286) suggested Hecuba as the woman holding Priam's head, and Polyxena behind altar, arms outstretched in supplication towards Neoptolemos.

B1.) Herakles and Kyknos, with Athena and Ares (?).

AB2.) Animal frieze, preserving siren, panther, and lion.

POL 26. Berlin, Pergamon Museum F1685 (Figs. 102a-b)

Attic black-figure amphora. From Vulci.

Attributed to Lydos by Zahn. Potter-work by Amasis, according to Bloesch.

c. 550-540 BC.

References: *ABV* 109.24, 685; *Addenda*² 30; Carpenter 1991, fig. 36; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992, 329, fig. 125; Castriota 1992, 98, fig. 8; *Hephaistos* 11/12, 1992/93, 16, fig. 5; Shapiro 1994, 164, fig. 116; *CA* 14, 1995, 191 figs. 9-10; Oakley 1997, 26, figs. 22-23; Stansbury-O'Donnell 1999, 167, fig. 71.

A.) Iliupersis scene, Polyxena as bystander of death of Priam? Left, recovery of Helen by Menelaos. Right, Neoptolemos murdering Priam with the body of Astyanax. Two female figures behind altar. Schefold (1992, 286) suggests that the woman with both arms outstretched might be Hecuba, and that the woman touching Priam with her right hand and tearing at her hair with her left might be Polyxena. Shapiro (1994, 164) suggests that the two woman watching the scene are Hecuba and Andromache.

B.) Achilles pursuing Troilos. Polyxena fleeing to right in front of Troilos, her hydria fallen on the ground behind her. Another woman appears behind Achilles, and there is a dog behind the horse.

POL 27. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 80.AE.154 (Fig. 103a-e)

Attic red-figure kylix.

Attributed to Oltos (by Frel).

c. 520-510 BC.

References: Wescoat 1987, 58-61, cat. no. 15 (with bibliography); Harnecker 1992, pl. 11-12, no. 106; *LIMC*, Cassandra 106; *LIMC*, Helene 36bis; *LIMC*, Iliupersis 4; *CA* 15, 1996, 184 fig. 3; *Mediterranean Archaeology* 9/10, 1996/97, pl. 19.2; Hedreen 2001, fig. 5a-b.

A.) Left, recovery of Helen by Menelaos. Right, murder of Priam by Neoptolemos with the dead body of Astyanax; fleeing Trojan woman.

Inscriptions: M[E]NIAAOΣ (to right of Menelaos); NEO[ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜ]ΙΟΣ (to right of Neoptolemos); ONEI (in front of Priam, retrograde).

B.) Rape of Cassandra between two palm trees. Woman with himation pulled over her head at far left and a trumpeting warrior at far left watch the scene. Inscriptions: ΑΙΑΣ (between woman and palm tree); ΑΝΤΑ ? (above Cassandra's head); ΚΑΛΟΣ (behind the trumpeter).

Tondo: Running female figure holding a hydria in her right hand and a wreath in her left. Inscriptions: ΜΕΜΝΟΝ [ΚΑ]ΛΟΣ (behind woman, retrograde). I add the running female figure as a possible depiction of Polyxena. See my discussion in Chapter Four.

POL 28. Berlin, Antikensammlung F 2280 and 2281 and Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Vaticano (Fig. 104a-g)

Fragments of an Attic red-figure kylix.

Signed by Euphronios (verb missing). Attributed to Onesimos as painter. c. 520-500 BC.

References: *ARV*² 19.1; *Addenda*² 153; *CVA* Berlin, Antikensammlung-Pergamonmuseum 1, 87, figs. 9-10; Ferrari 2000; Williams 1976, 9-23, figs. 1-7; Anderson 1997, 234-45, figs. 8a-c.

A.) Warriors fighting.

B.) Warriors pursuing women.

Interior: Neoptolemos attacks Priam on an altar with the body of Astyanax. Female (?) figure behind Priam. Inscriptions: ΔΙΟΣ ΗΙΕΠΟ[Ν] (on altar); ΕΥ[Φ]ΡΟΝΙ[ΟΣ...] (below Astyanax's head); [ΤΕΜΕ]Ν[ΟΣ] (retrograde, on groundline).

A fragment preserves just part of the nose, mouth and chin of a figure in profile to right, above Neoptolemos' shield. No inscription appears to identify this figure, however, the composition of the scene is very close to that of the tondo of a red-figure cup in Rome, Villa Giulia 121110, also attributed to Onesimos as painter (POL. 5). On the Rome cup, the female figure included in the scene is named as Polyxena by an inscription.

POL 29. Athens, National Akropolis Museum 212 (Fig. 105)

Fragments of an Attic red-figure cup.

c. 500 BC.

References: *LIMC*, Helen 228; Hedreen 2001, 43 note 69.

Recovery of Helen or Polyxena being led to sacrifice? Female figure with her arms extended towards a warrior in front of her. The final preserved letter of the inscription could belong to the name of Helen or Polyxena. Inscription: . . .] E. See discussion in Chapter Four.

POL 30. Paris, Louvre CA 1743 (Figs. 106a-c)

Attic black-figure lekythos.

Attributed to the Group of the Haimon Painter.

c. 480 BC.

References: *LIMC* 36; *ABL* 135, 1.

Funeral games for Achilles and Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment of slaughter? Two chariots race around a tomb, from which projects a tripod. Towards the back, two figures face one another, an armed warrior (Neoptolemos?) on the right and a female figure on the left, who hunches over as if to offer her neck to him.

POL 31. Ruvo 901 (Fig. 107a-b)

Apulian bell-krater. From Ruvo.

Attributed to the Reckoning Painter (follower of the Tarporley Painter).

c. 380-370 BC.

References: *RVAp* I 70, 46, pl. 24, 3-4.

A.) Phlyax scene, Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? Two men holding swords attack a woman, who has fallen to her knees in between them. The man on the left grasps the woman's right wrist and steps on her ankle to pin her to the ground; the man on the right grabs her mantle. A fillet hangs in the background. The scene is set on a platform supported by posts denoting the stage.

B.) Two confronting youths. Both draped, with the youth on the left holding a stick, and the one on the right a strigil.

POL 32. London, British Museum F 160 (Figs. 108a-l)

Apulian volute-krater.

Attributed to the Iliupersis Painter.

c. 350 BC.

References: *LIMC* 38; *RVAp* I 193, 8; Moret 1975, 63-7; Schefold and Jung 1989, 293 fig. 255.

A.) Iliupersis. Two women seek sanctuary at the Palladium. The woman on the left is seen in profile to right as she lunges for the statue. She is pursued by a youth wearing a pilos, chlamys and armed with a spear and sword in its scabbard. The woman on the right sits on the base on which the statue is set and wraps her arms around it. Her face is seen in three-quarter profile to right. She is confronted by a warrior wearing a helmet, short chiton, and armed with a spear, shield, and sword in its scabbard. Behind the warrior is a woman fleeing to right (Aithra?) Above the scene on the left is a seated Athena watching the scene. Behind her is an ionic column with a fillet tied around it. Above the scene on the right is a tree, to right of which is an elderly man and a young boy flee to right (Anchises and Ascanius?). The women at the statue have been variously identified as Polyxena and Cassandra, Helen and Cassandra, or Cassandra and an anonymous Trojan woman. (See discussion in Chapter Four)

B.) Three warriors between two women. In the background is an open window, to left of which hangs a shield.

Neck: A.) Dionysos and two maenads. B.) palmettes.

POL 33. Delphi, Archaeological Museum (Figs 109a-d)

Polychrome relief lekythos. Probably Attic.

After 425 BC.

References: Perdrizet 1908, 166 cat. no. 365, pl. XXVI, 3-5; Courby 1922, 138 cat. no. 7, pl. IV, a.

Iliupersis. Two groups of figures flank the central Palladium. At left, a Greek warrior (head missing), nude except for a cloak that flutters behind him, wraps his arms around the waist of a woman. At right, a Greek warrior with a shield on his left arm grabs a woman by her hair with his right hand, causing her knees to bend. In front, a woman kneels on the ground, head bent down and right arm to her chest. Perdrizet (1908, 166) suggests that the Trojan woman on the ground in front of the Palladium, whom he describes as disheveled and in a desperate attitude, might be Cassandra; and he suggests that the woman who seems to be struggling in vain against the Greek who has his arms around her might be Polyxena. He also suggests Ajax might be the warrior grabbing the woman's hair and leaning on her knees.

POL 34. Naples, Museo Nazionale (Figs. 110a-b)

Campanian hydria.

Attributed to the Cavaino Painter.

c. 340-320 BC.

References: *LIMC* 39; *LCS* 308, 572.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A woman sits on the ground with her hands tied behind her back at a stake in front of an ionic column with a fillet tied around it. She is dressed, and looks up to right. A youth, naked except for a pilos, chlamys and boots, approaches her from behind. He holds a sword in its scabbard. Fillets hang in the background.

POL 35. Naples, Museo Nazionale 81733 (H1779) (Figs. 111a-b)

Amphora from Paestum.

Attributed to the Painter of Naples 1778.

c. 325-300 BC.

References: *LIMC* 40; *RVP* 272, 6.

A.) Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A woman sits to left on a two-stepped base on which is set an ionic column. She clings to the column, faced by a youth holding a sword in his right hand. He is naked except for a chlamys draped around his arms and wrapping around his back.

B.) Two confronting youths.

Sarcophagus:

POL 36. Berlin, Staatliche Museen 3348 (Fig. 112)

Painted Clazomenian sarcophagus.

c. 490 BC.

References: *LIMC* 35.

Headpiece: Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment of slaughter. In the center of the scene, a woman is attacked by two warriors wielding swords, one on either side of her. She stands to right, with her head in profile to left, and she raises her arms to protect herself. Her knees are bent as if she is about to fall or collapse. Behind each warrior is a standing figure watching the scene, and behind each of them is a youth on horseback accompanied by a dog.

Architectural Sculpture:

POL 36 bis. Athens, North metopes of the Parthenon, metope D, metope 27, or the subject of a lost metope (Fig.113).

Marble metopes.

440s BC.

References: Schwab 1999.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, Polyxena led to sacrifice? Only 13 of the original 32 metopes from the north side of the Parthenon have survived, which depict the Sack of Troy. Although poorly preserved, metope D (no. 23?) and metope 27 represent a man leading a woman, one of which is often thought to be the rescue of Aithra by one of her grandsons. In light of the Brygos Painter's Louvre Iliupersis cup, with Akamas leading Polyxena to sacrifice, the iconography of these two metopes would also be appropriate for Polyxena. Polyxena led to sacrifice could also have been the subject of one of the nineteen lost metopes.

ETRUSCAN

Vase-paintings:

POL 37 (= IPH 73). Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale (ex. Rome, Villa Giulia 19539). So-called Vaso dei Gobbi (Figs. 114a-b)

Etrusco-Corinthian column-krater. From Cerveteri, Banditaccia necropolis, zone A, tumolo I. tomba 2.

c. 580/570 BC (Krauskopf); 550-525 BC (Fischer-Hansen).

References: *LIMC*, Iphigeneia in Etruria 17. Fischer-Hansen 1976, 20-6, figs. 1-2.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, Polyxena led to sacrifice?

Body: Herakles and Geryon (with certainty), and a man carrying a woman horizontally onto a stepped construction. The woman's head and most of her body are missing, but her toes are pointing down to the ground, indicating that she is being carried face down. The man carrying her already has one foot on the steps of the stepped platform. The head of a bearded man, a pair of arms, and a snake rise out of the top of the altar-tomb. To right of this scene, a woman holds a phiale.

Shoulders: animal frieze; woman seated on a stepped construction.

Handles: animal decoration.

POL 38. Paris, Louvre E 703 (Figs. 115a-b)

Black-figure Pontic amphora.

Attributed to the Silenos Painter.

c. 540 BC.

References: *LIMC* 16; Robertson 1990, 64-5.

Polyxena wounded by Diomedes and Odysseus?

Top zone: A woman running to right is pursued by two warriors. She seeks sanctuary at an altar, which has steps in front of it. Her left foot is already on the top step, and she turns her head to look over her shoulder at the men. The warrior directly behind the woman unsheathes his sword. The man behind him carries a shield on his left arm and holds a sword in his raised right hand. There is a bird and flower on top of the altar.

Bottom zone: Maenads and satyrs dancing.

M. Robertson (1990) interprets the scene as the death of Polyxena, known from the *Kypria*, where she is wounded by Diomedes and Odysseus. Hedreen (2001, 133, note 40) believes "the scene makes more sense, typologically, as a representation of the flight of Helen."

Urns:

POL 39. Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco 13901 (Fig. 116)

Travertine urn. From Perugia.

Second to third quarter of the second-century BC.

References: Steuernagel 1998, 196, cat. no. 70, pl. 15.3.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A woman collapsed on the ground between two standing men. Her garment has fallen around her legs, exposing her body. Both men are unbearded and wear chlamys. The man on her left grabs her hair with his left hand and threatens her with something held in his right hand that is now lost. He looks down at her intently. The woman raises her right hand to her head as if to protect herself. The man to right of her stretches his arms out and looks off to right. A tree at each corner frames the scene.

Cistae:**POL 40. London, British Museum 743** (Figs. 117a-b)

Cista. From Palestrina. Contested authenticity.

References: *LIMC* 41.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before or after slaughter? The composition is divided into three scenes, which are divided by ionic columns:

- 1.) Preparations for the sacrifice? A youth and woman face a goddess holding a bow in her left hand and an animal in her right.
- 2.) Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? Three youths and a maiden. One youth holds a nude woman before two other youths. She is kneeling on the ground to left, her chest frontal, head in profile to left. The youth behind her grabs her head with his right hand and grabs her left arm, as if pulling her up. The youths are naked except for a chlamys, and the two facing the woman hold spears, and one of them also holds a shield. A lustral basin and a lion-headed spout at left.
- 3.) Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment after sacrifice? The nude woman from the previous scene lies dead on the ground in front of a square altar on either side of which is a mourning woman. On the left are the three youths looking at the dead body. Two of them hold spears, and the youth closest to the woman also holds a sword in his right hand.

Sarcophagi:**POL 41. Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco 14561 (74)** (Figs. 118a-f)

Nenfro sarcophagus. From Tarquinia.

Fourth quarter of the fourth-century—first quarter of the third-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 42; Penny Small 1981, 14, cat. no. 7, pl. 4b; Steuernagel 1998, 196, cat. no. 69, pl. 14, figs. 2-4.

Short side: Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A woman between two men at an altar. Her garment has galled around her thighs, exposing her body, which is depicted frontally; her face is also frontal. The woman's body is at a diagonal from right to left as if she is being dragged or in the process of collapsing. The men are unbearded and wear short chitons. The man on the left grabs the woman's hair with his left hand, and holds his right hand before her neck, perhaps threatening her with a knife. The man on the right grabs the woman's left arm.

Short side: Telephus threatening Orestes.

Long side: Eteocles and Polyneices, duel, moment of death.

Long side: Orestes' matricide and flight from the Erinyes. Electra on the floor in front of the altar. Polyxena is also sometimes suggested as the identity of the dead, half-naked female figure on the altar.

POL 42. London, British Museum D 21 (Fig. 119a-c)

Nenfro sarcophagus. From Tarquinia.

Beginning of the third-century BC.

References: Small 1981, 13 no. 6, pls. 3b and 4a; Steuernagel 1998, 190, cat. no. 5, pls. 4, fig. 1 and pl. 5 fig. 2.

Short side: Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment of slaughter? A man impales a woman through the chest by his sword. Her garment has slipped, exposing her body. She extends her right hand towards the man's chin in a gesture of supplication, and her knees appear to buckle, as if she is about to collapse. A youth wearing a chlamys stands behind the woman. Behind the man with the sword, a figure turns away from the scene.

Short side: Ajax and Odysseus.

Long side: Left, Rape of Cassandra; Right, sacrifice of a Trojan (Steuernagel) / Eteocles and Polyneices, moment of death (Small 1981, 13-14, cat. no. 6). The two scenes are separated by a winged female figure leaning on a column in the center of the composition.

Long side: Greeks and Trojans.

Architectural Sculpture:

POL 43. Orvieto, akroterion from shrine at Cannicella cemetery (Fig. 120a-k)

Terracotta akroterion. From a large shrine, Cannicella cemetery, Orvieto.

First decades of fifth-century BC.

References: Stopponi 1991; Colonna 2006, 150.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter or moment of slaughter?

Fragmentary group preserving part of a youth and a woman. His body is shown frontally, and he wears a cuirass and chlamys. He strides to right, looming over the woman, who must be partly collapsed on the ground. All that remains of her is part of her left arm, which leans on a volute, and some of the lower folds of her garment. It looks as if he grabbed her hair with his left hand, and threatened her with a knife probably held in his right.

Reliefs:

POL 44. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 03.23.1 (Figs. 121a-g)

Relief decoration of a chariot. Bronze inlaid with ivory. Found near Monteleone di Spoleto, Umbria.

Second quarter of the sixth-century BC.

References: Hampe and Simon 1964, 53-67, pls. 22-5 (especially p. 60 for summary of previous interpretations); Briguet 1986, 144, fig. IV-69; Brendel 1995, 146-151, figs. 97-9; Picón et al. 2007, figs. 323a-c.

Scenes in the life of a hero, perhaps Achilles.

Center: Achilles receiving his armor from Thetis.

Left side: Battle between Achilles and a warrior (Memnon?) over a fallen warrior.

Right side: Apotheosis of Achilles. Polyxena under the horse? Furtwängler interpreted the woman as a personification of earth. E. Strong identified her as “Mother Earth.” Hampe and Simon (1964, 60-3) identify the woman on the chariot as Polyxena. The reclining female figure is also related in position and pose to the fallen Amazon on a bronze sheet from Perugia that depicts the battle between Herakles and the Amazons (Hampe and Simon 1964 pls. 20-21) and to a reclining youth who raises his hand up to protect himself as two unarmed youths on horseback jump over their recumbent companion on a silver relief fragment from Castel San Mariano of 530-20 BC in London, British Museum (Brendel 1995, 160 fig. 106).

Bottom frieze: Animal fights. Chiron, Iris, and Achilles?

Mirrors:

POL 45. Lyon, Musée Beaux-Arts (ex. Vermiglioli, Herrn Degerando) (Fig. 122)

Bronze mirror.

Third-century BC.

References: Gerhard 1863/1974, vol. 4, pg. 56-7; pl. CDI; *LIMC*, Hekabe 58.

Polyxena sitting on Hecuba’s lap? A girl, nude except for a piece of drapery wrapped around her left leg, sits to right on the lap of an older woman and rests her head on the matron’s shoulder. Behind them is a winged female figure in profile to right (Iris?). A nude youth flanks the central group of figures on either side.

POL 46. London, British Museum (Fig. 123)

Bronze mirror. From Cerveteri.

330-300 BC.

References: Gerhard 1863, vol. 4, cat. no. 398; de Grummond 2006, 93, 97, fig. V.27; Bonfante and Swadling 2006, 20, fig. 8.

An armed Polyxena as an onlooker in a scene of Helen’s recovery? A nude female figure holding two spears in her right hand at the far right of the scene is named by an inscription as ΦΥΛΦΣΝΑ. The closeness of the name *Phulphsna* to *Polyxena* leads us to think that she is the Trojan princess. The subject depicts the recovery of Elinai (Helen), and all of the figures are named by inscriptions, all retrograde, from left to right: ΨΕΨΙΣ (Thetis=Thetis), ΜΕΝΑΕ (Menle=Menelaos), ΤΥΡΑΝ (Turan=Aphrodite), ΑΙΝΑΣ (Ainas=Aias). Elinai seeks sanctuary at a statue of Menrva (Athena). Chariot of dawn in upper exergue. Heracle (Herakles) as a boy in the lower exergue.

Gems:**POL 47. Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung A. 1607 (Fig. 124a-b)**

Scarab. Brownish-orange colored carnelian.

Middle of the fifth-century BC.

References: Brandt 1970, *AGD*, vol. 1.2, 13, cat. no. 633, pl. 69.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A nude youth (Neoptolemos?) stands to right before a thymiaterion, holding in his left hand a knife, which he raises in front of him. Behind him is a smaller, draped female figure (Polyxena?) standing to right. It is unclear whether she stands on a rocky projection, or above an inscription (see *AGD* 13, no. 633).

POL 48. Berlin 484 (Fig. 125)

Sardonyx.

Etruscan.

References: Martini 1971, 136, cat. no. 54, pl. 12.5.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? Female figure (Polyxena?) on her knees, hands tied behind her back, neck exposed. A naked youth leans over her, holding a knife beside her exposed neck. The woman looks up, and it appears as if the figures make eye contact. Martini describes the scene as “Menschenopfer(?)” rather than giving it as a possible depiction of Polyxena.

POL 49. Gotha, Schlossmuseum (Fig. 126a-b)

Brown Sardonyx.

Etruscan.

References: Furtwängler 1900, 105 no. 51, pl. XXI no. 51; Martini 1971, 141, cat. no. 110, pl. 22.2.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A female figure (Polyxena?) kneeling on the ground to left before a man (Neoptolemos?) with a knife. The girl's head is down-turned to expose the back of her neck, but her hands are not bound. The man is naked except for a mantle worn down his back and a scabbard. He grabs the girl's hair with his left hand, and he holds a knife in his right, which he raises in the air, about to cut her.

POL 50. Berlin, Berlin no. 6889 (Figs. 127a-b)

Light brown sard.

Etruscan.

References: Furtwängler 1900, 118 no. 3, pl. XXIV no. 3.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A male figure (Neoptolemos?) stands behind a female figure (Polyxena?), grabbing her hair with his left hand, and holding a knife in his right. The woman's back is to the man, as if she is falling against him. She grasps his wrist with her right hand to defend herself. Her garment has fallen in the struggle, exposing her upper body. In the background is a garlanded monument with a base supporting columns surmounted by an entablature (tomb of Achilles?). A sword hangs from the end column. Behind the monument (or on top of it), the top of an ionic column can be seen, upon which a winged figure (eidolon of Achilles?) crouches on a wide-bellied vase.

POL 51. Berlin, Altes Museen 489 (Figs. 128a-d)

Carnelian (edge partly worn off).

References: Furtwängler 1900, 119 no. 8, pl. XXIV no. 8; Martini 1971, 142, cat. no. 123, pl. 24.4).

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A veiled female figure (Polyxena?) sits on an altar to right, holding her head in her hands in a gesture of mourning. Facing her is a youth (Neoptolemos?), naked except for a mantle worn down his back and a scabbard. He holds a sword in his right hand, which he raises in the air over the woman's head. Behind the woman is a column, upon which is a squat, wide-bellied vase.

ROMAN

Painting:

POL 52. Pompeii, Casa degli Amorini Dorati, VI 16, 7.38 (*in situ*)
(Figs. 129a-b)

Wall painting. Atrium B.

Third style.

References: Seiler 1992, 109-10, fig. 111 and 117.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? All that remains of this fragmentary painting is a female figure and parts of two men. A woman sits on the ground with her right hand to her chin holding up her head. She looks up and towards the right. To left of her, the legs of two men can be seen.

Reliefs:

POL 53. Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmuseum Trier 18 271 (Fig. 130)

So-called "Iphigeneia-Pillar." Grave monument from Neumagen.

c. AD 160.

References: von Massow 1932, 52 and 54, cat. no. 8a4, fig. 33 and pl. 7 u 6;

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? The fragmentary relief preserves only the upper body of a man grabbing the hair of a woman with his left hand. The man is naked, his chest seen frontally. He must have once held a weapon in his right hand, which he would have used to threaten the woman, who must have collapsed because her head (all that survives) is at a lower level. This relief appears between the pilasters of the “Iphigeneia-Pillar,” the same monument that includes a relief of the flight of Iphigeneia. See IPH 52 bis.

Gems:

POL 54. Paris, Cabinet des Médailles (Fig. 206)

Sardonyx cameo, of three layers. Set in an enameled frame. Gold mount from the end of the 17th century AD, attributed to Josias Belle.

Imperial.

References: Furtwängler 1900, 264 no. 7, pl. LVIII no. 7; Richter 1971, 66 no. 307, fig. 307 (with bibliography).

Troilos and Polyxena at a trough with horses? Four horses drinking at a water-trough decorated with bucrania and garland. A youth (Troilos ?) stands to left of the trough, with his right foot upon it, holding the rein of one of the horses in his hands. He is naked except for a mantle over his right thigh. A female figure (Polyxena ?) in Phrygian costume crouches down in front of the horses, lifting an amphora to her lips. Behind the horses is a bearded, filleted herm.

Richter (1971, 66) reviews previous identifications of the figures: Pelops giving water to the horses of Poseidon after defeating Oinomaos (Millin); Troilos and a kneeling Trojan (Heydemann); Troilos and Polyxena (Furtwängler; Babelon first saw the figure in Phrygian dress as female).

POL 55. Rome, market (Fig. 132)

Carnelian.

First-century BC.

References: Furtwängler 1900, 286 no. 44, pl. LXIII no. 44.

Troilos and Polyxena at a trough with horses? Similar to POL 54, but less intricate. There is no herm behind the horses as on the Paris cameo.

POL 56. Vienna, Kunsthistorischen Museums IX 1922 (Fig. 133a-b)

Light orange-colored carnelian.

50-25 BC.

References: Brommer 1971-6, 2, 86; Zwierlein-Diehl 1973-9, no. 278 pl. 48; *LIMC*, Achilleus, no. 281; Schefold and Jung 1989, fig. 147.

Troilos and Polyxena at a trough with horses? Similar to POL 54-55, but the composition is reversed with the horses and crouching figure facing to right, rather than to left. The youth (Troilos?) holds a spear in his left hand. Behind the horses is a bearded, helmeted warrior, who wears a shield on his extended right arm. Behind Troilos is an inscription: ΠΕΡΓΑΜΟΥ (of Pergamon, first and last letter are cut off).

POL 57. Clusium, Collection E. Bonci Casuccini (Fig. 134)

Gem.

First-century BC.

References: Bianchi Bandinelli, *MonAnt.* 30 (1925), 539 fig. 7 left; cited in Zwierlein-Diehl 1973, 104 under cat. no. 278, comparanda # 3.

Troilos and Polyxena at a trough with a horse? Similar to POL 54-56, but a simpler composition with only one horse and no background.

POL 58. Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung A.919 (Fig. 135)

Glass paste.

First-century BC.

References: Schmidt, *AGD* (Munich), vol. 1.2, Nr. 1333, pl. 135; cited in Zwierlein-Diehl 1973 (vol. 1), 104 under cat. no. 278, comparanda # 4.

Polyxena (?) in Phrygian dress with four horses at a trough. Similar to POL 54-57.

POL 59. Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung A. 880 (Fig. 136)

Opaque black glass paste with blue-grey diagonal lines on the top.

Imperial.

References: *AGD*, Munich, vol. 1.3, p. 173, cat. no. 3238, pl. 311.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A female figure (Polyxena?) on her knees is about to be killed by a youth (Neoptolemos?). The youth is naked, except for a helmet and he holds a sword in his right hand, grasping at the woman's hair with his left. There is a column(?) and/or a robe(?) between the figures, and Polyxena seems to grab part of one of these.

POL 60. London, British Museum 3206 (Fig. 137)

Glass paste imitating sard.

Graeco-Roman.

References: Walters 1926, 305, cat. no. 3206.

Sacrifice of Polyxena, moment before slaughter? A nude woman kneels on the ground to right. Her head is downturned, exposing the back of her neck. Her

right arm is behind her back, possibly bound. She is faced by a man who looms over her. He holds a knife in his left hand directly over her neck, preparing to make the death blow. Similar to POL 49.

CONCORDANCE

<u>Catalogue Number</u>	<u>Accession Number</u>	<u>LIMC Number</u>
IPH 1	Palermo NI 1886	3
IPH 2	London E 773	32
IPH 3	Kiel B 538	1
IPH 4	London F 159	11
IPH 5	Reconstruction of lost Painting by Timanthes	4
IPH 6	New York 31.11.2	6
IPH 7	Athens 22633	7
IPH 8	Berlin 3161 q	8
IPH 9	Athens 2114	9
IPH 10	Brussels A893	10
IPH 11	Termessos (Pisidia)	5
IPH 12	Copenhagen 481, 482, 482a	12
IPH 13	Chiusi 955 (ex Paolozzi)	16
IPH 14	Perugia 18	3
IPH 15	Perugia	3a
IPH 16	Perugia 46	3b
IPH 17	Perugia 236	3c
IPH 18	Perugia 343	3d
IPH 19	Papiano	3e
IPH 20	Perugia 16 (ex San Pietro)	3f
IPH 21	Perugia 281	3g

IPH 22	Rome 50313	4
IPH 23	Perugia 43 (139)	5
IPH 24	Perugia 34 (114)	5a
IPH 25	Perugia 344 (101)	—
IPH 26	Perugia 329 (123)	5b
IPH 27	Rome 50311	6
IPH 28	Perugia 49	6a
IPH 29	Perugia 330 (ex 127)	7
IPH 30	Perugia 394	7a
IPH 31	Rome 50312	7b
IPH 32	Perugia	7c
IPH 33	Perugia 38	7d
IPH 34	Perugia	8
IPH 35	Perugia 279	8a
IPH 36	Vatican 13902	8b
IPH 37	Perugia 50006	10
IPH 38	Perugia 55	11
IPH 39	Perugia	12
IPH 40	Perugia 348	9
IPH 41	Pischiello	9a
IPH 42	ex Mannheim	13
IPH 43	Volterra 457	13a
IPH 44	Volterra 512	13b
IPH 45	Florence 5754	14

IPH 46	Lost. ex “piccolo tomba Inghirami.”	15
IPH 47	Rome 13141	1
IPH 48	Pompeii VI 5, 2	40
IPH 49	Naples 9112	38
IPH 50	Florence 612	42
IPH 51	Bolsena	43
IPH 52	Rome Porta Maggiore	41
IPH 53	London 216-1885	47
IPH 54	Copenhagen 481, 482, 482a	12
IPH 55	Rome 9778	51
IPH 56	Samos	—
IPH 57	Bulgaria	—
IPH 58	New York market	—
IPH 59	Dresden 679.94	44
IPH 60	Pompeii 10901	46
IPH 61	New York 17.194-2012	45
IPH 62	Ampurias	39
IPH 63	Antakya 961	37
IPH 64	ex Berlin Museum 790	—
IPH 65	ex Berlin Museum 788	—
IPH 66	Boston 6.67	2
IPH 67	Taranto 76127	—
IPH 68	Paris CA 2193	—
IPH 69	Matera 11013	13

IPH 70	Lost painting by Kolotes of Teos	4 bis.
IPH 71	Volos DP7134,86	—
IPH 72	London 1206	—
IPH 73	Cerverteri	17
IPH 74	Paris S 4033	18
IPH 75	Tuscania	2
IPH 76	Tübingen W. 61a	—
IPH 77	Berlin	
IPH 78	Unknown	—
IPH 79	Berlin 859	—
IPH 80	Copenhagen 877	—
IPH 81	London	—
IPH 82	Naples 9022	36
IPH 83	Šempeter-Celeia inv. 2	86
IPH 84	Verona	—
IPH 85	Berlin FG 488	48
IPH 86	Vienna XI B 291	49
POL 1	London 1897.7-27.2	26
POL 2	Berlin F 1698	18
POL 3	Berlin F 1902	22
POL 4	New York L.1983.71.4	—
POL 5	Rome 12110	19
POL 6	Paris G153	24
POL 6 bis.	Tekirdağ 1855	—

POL 7	Paris G152	23
POL 7 bis.	London B 70	37
POL 8	Athens, Pinakothek, lost painting,	25
POL 9	Delphi, lost painting from the Lesche of the Knidians	17
POL 10	Lost painting from Pergamon	25
POL 11	Athens 14.624	27
POL 12	Athens	—
POL 13	Once Berlin 3161 p	28
POL 14	Polyxena Sarcophagus	—
POL 15	Leiden I. 1896-12.1	21
POL 16	Constantinople, lost statue	29
POL 17	Lost statue group	30
POL 18	Lost (statue ?) group	31
POL 19	Orvieto	32
POL 20	Capitoline Tabula Iliaca.	20 and 33
POL 21	London 1865.1220.103	34
POL 22	Madrid	43
POL 23	Mykonos 2240	—
POL 24	Boston 6.67	—
POL 25	Paris F29	—
POL 26	Berlin F1685	—
POL 27	Malibu 80.AE.154	—

POL 28	Berlin F 2280 and Vatican	—
POL 29	Athens 212	
POL 30	Paris CA 1743	36
POL 31	Ruvo 901	—
POL 32	London F 160	38
POL 33	Delphi	—
POL 34	Naples	39
POL 35	Naples 81733 (H1779)	40
POL 36	Berlin 3348	35
POL 36 bis.	Athens metope D	—
POL 37	Vaso dei Gobbi	Iphigeneia in Etruria 17
POL 38	Paris E 703	16
POL 39	Vatican 13901	—
POL 40	London 743	—
POL 41	Vatican 14561 (74)	42
POL 42	London D 21	—
POL 43	Orvieto	—
POL 44	New York 03.23.1	—
POL 45	Lyon	—
POL 46	London	—
POL 47	Munich A. 1607	—
POL 48	Berlin 484	—
POL 49	Gotha	—
POL 50	Berlin no. 6889	—

POL 51	Berlin 489	—
POL 52	Pompeii VI 16, 7.38	—
POL 53	Bonn 18 271.	—
POL 54	Paris	—
POL 55	Rome	—
POL 56	Vienna IX 1922	—
POL 57	Clusium	—
POL 58	Munich A.919	—
POL 59	Munich A. 880	—
POL 60	London 3206	—

Appendix

Representations of Iphigeneia in Tauris

IPHIGENEIA IN TAURIS GREEK DEPICTIONS (CERTAIN)

VASE-PAINTINGS:

TAU 1. Ferrara, Museo Nazionale di Spina T 1145 (3032) (Figs. 184a-c)

Attic red-figure calyx-krater. From Comacchio.

Attributed to the Iphigeneia Painter.

c. 390-380 BC.

References: *LIMC* 19; *ARV*² 1440.1; *Paralipomena* 492; *Add*² 377; Boardman 1989, fig. 350; Robertson 1992, 279, fig. 281; Berti and Guzzo 1993, 133, fig. 108; Shapiro 1994, 169-170, figs. 118-120; Oenbrink 1997, 438, pl. 26; de Cesare 1997, 101, fig. 49; Easterling 1997, 77, fig. 10; Taplin 2007, 152-3 cat. no. 48.

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia handing over the letter to Pylades. Iphigeneia stands to left of the naiskos. She wears a chiton, himation, and diadem, and holds the temple key in her left hand and the letter in her right. She hands the letter to Pylades, who seated on a rock below, extends his right hand to take the letter. At the top left, at a level above Pylades, Artemis (or an attendant?) sits watching the scene. In front of the naiskos in the foreground is Orestes reclining on the ground, naked except for a cape. He turns his head to look behind him, holding two spears in his right hand. Facing Orestes is the seated figure of Thoas, holding a scepter in his left hand, and extending his right hand out in front of him. Behind Thoas on a higher level is a servant in eastern dress holding a fan. At the extreme right at top is a seated naked youth holding a fillet and making a gesture of surprise. Standing in the same place as Iphigeneia on the right side of the naiskos is a servant holding a phiale in her right hand and a basket of offerings in her left. Two boucrania hang in the background.

B.) Three satyrs.

TAU 2. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 82113 (H3223) (Figs. 185a-m)

Apulian volute-krater. From Ruvo.

Attributed to the Iliupersis Painter.

c. 370-360 BC.

References: *LIMC* 18; *RVAp* I 193, 3; *CFSTAp* 73; Bielfeldt 2005, 201, fig. 64; Taplin 2007, 150-1 cat. no. 47.

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris: First meeting between Iphigeneia, Orestes, and Pylades. Orestes (name inscribed) sits on an altar facing right with his head inclined down. He is naked except for a mantle that falls in his lap, and a sword in scabbard. Both hands grasp a stick. Facing Orestes is Iphigeneia (name inscribed), wearing a chiton, himation, diadem and jewelry. She holds the temple key in her left hand, and extends her right hand. Behind Iphigeneia is a servant, holding an oinochoe in her right hand, and balancing a tray of branches on her head with her left hand. On the other side of Orestes stands Pylades (name inscribed), leaning on a stick with his left hand, and raising his right hand to his head. Behind the altar is a laurel tree separates the figures of Apollo and Artemis who appear to be in conversation in the upper level. Apollo sits on a hill above Pylades, and Artemis, holding two spears in her left hand, sits on a hill in the space between Orestes and Iphigeneia in the background. Artemis sits in front of her temple, which is partly obscured by the hill behind which it is hidden. The temple consists of four ionic columns supporting an entablature with triglyphs and metopes, surmounted by a pediment and akroteria. The doors of the temple are open, with an attempt made at rendering their recession in space.

Inscriptions: ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ, ΟΡΕΣΤΑΣ, ΠΥΛΛΑΔΗΣ.

B.) Two youths and two women.

Neck: Deer between two lions.

TAU 3. Pavia, Museo Civico (Fig. 186a-b)

Apulian bell krater.

Attributed to the Iris Painter.

c. 370-350 BC.

References: *LIMC* 14; *RVAp* I 130, 265; *CFSTAp* 53.

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes led as a prisoner before Iphigeneia. Three figure composition with Iphigeneia on the far right, the guard on the left, and Orestes in the middle. Iphigeneia, her face in three-quarter view, stands before a low altar, holding the temple key in her left hand and extending her right hand out in front of her, palm open. She wears a veil, chiton, himation, jewelry, and a crown. Orestes' hands are tied behind his back, and he wears a pilos, chlamys and sandals. The guard holds a spear in his left hand, and in his right the rope that binds Orestes' hands and a key.

B.) Three draped youths.

TAU 4. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 80914 (Stg 24) (lost?) (Fig. 187a-b)

Apulian amphora (?). From Basilicate. Modern restorations and repainting.

c. 370-350 BC ?

References: *LIMC* 15; *CFST* Ap 241.

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes and Pylades led as prisoners before Iphigeneia. Iphigeneia sits on the far left holding a scepter in her left hand. To right of Iphigeneia stands a bearded warrior holding a spear in his left hand and extending his right hand out towards the maiden. Behind the bearded warrior are Orestes and Pylades, naked, with their hands tied behind their backs. The youths are led before Iphigeneia by three guards who are behind the youths, holding the ropes that bind the youths' hands.

B.) Andromeda and Perseus. Kepheus and Kassiopeia.

TAU 5. Virginia, private collection 22 (V9105) (ex New York, Atlantis Antiquities) (Figs. 188a-b)

Apulian bell krater.

Attributed to the Painter of Boston 00.348.

c. 350 BC.

References: *LIMC* 21; *RVAp I Suppl 2*, 10/48a; Taplin 2007, 154 cat. no. 49.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia handing over the letter to Pylades. Iphigeneia stands in front of the temple of Artemis, which is denoted by a post and lintel supported by a diagonal brace, set upon a base. The structure is garlanded, and partly obscures the statue of Artemis, as if half hidden within the temple. Iphigeneia, her face in three-quarter view, wears a chiton and a polos decorated with palmettes from which a veil falls down her back and wraps around her right arm. She holds the temple key in her left hand, and the letter in her right. Facing Iphigeneia is Pylades, wearing a petasos, chlamys and boots. He holds two spears in his left hand, and extends his right hand towards Iphigeneia to take the letter. Above the youth, Artemis, wearing an animal skin, rides in a chariot drawn by two panthers. On a level below Pylades, in the center of the composition, Orestes sits to left on a rock. He is naked except for a pilos and chlamys, and holds a spear in his right hand. A dog which lies on the ground in front of him looks up. Behind Orestes, a naked youth in profile to right holds a cat over a louterion.

TAU 6. Ex. Buckingham ancient collection, lost (Fig. 189)

Apulian (?) amphora.

Middle of the fourth-century BC (?)

References: *LIMC* 20; Cambitoglou (1975) thought the drawing of this work was suspect.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia handing over the letter to Pylades. Iphigeneia and Pylades stand in front of the temple of Artemis. Iphigeneia wears a diadem decorated with palmettes from which falls a veil, a richly decorated chiton, and sandals. She holds the temple key in her left hand and the letter in her right. A servant holding a tray stands to her right. Pylades is naked, except for a pilos,

chlamys, and boots. He holds two spears in his left hand and takes the letter from Iphigeneia with his right. Behind Pylades, Orestes stands frontally leaning on a louterion, his face in profile to right as he looks over at his companion and Iphigeneia. Orestes is naked except for a wreath on his head, chlamys, and scabbard. He holds two spears in his left hand. On a higher level, above Orestes, a satyr is partly hidden behind a hill and looks down on the scene. At the top right, Artemis also looks down on the scene, holding a flaming torch in her right hand, and two spears in her left.

TAU 7. Sydney, Nicholson Museum 51.17 (Figs. 190a-c)

Campanian neck-amphora.

Attributed to the Libation Painter.

Third quarter of the fourth-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 25; *LCS* 406, 305 pl. 160, 4-5; *LCS Suppl.* 2, 220; *CFSTC* 23.

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia handing over the letter to Pylades. Two-figure composition with Pylades and Iphigeneia (right side) facing one another at an altar. Iphigeneia wears a diadem, a red veil that covers her head and falls over her shoulders, and a belted chiton. She holds the temple key in her left hand, and the letter in her right hand, which she extends towards Pylades. He is naked except for a pilos and chlamys buttoned at the neck. He holds a spear in his left hand, and reaches for the letter with his right. There are flames on top of the altar, which has a garland around it. The white of the altar is also stained with blood of previous victims. The figures stand between two ionic columns, which represent the temple of Artemis. A shield hangs as a votive decoration over their heads.

B.) A man and woman facing one another.

Neck (both sides): Woman standing in profile to left.

TAU 8. Moscow, Pushkin Museum 504 (Fig. 191)

Apulian calyx-krater.

Attributed to the Group of the Moscow Iphigeneia.

c. 345-340 BC.

References: *LIMC* 22; *RVAp* II 478, 8; *CFSTAp* 192;

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia handing over the letter to Pylades. Iphigeneia stands in the temple of Artemis, which consists of four ionic columns set on a stepped base, and supporting an entablature, pediment and palmette akroteria. She wears a chiton and himation, but no headdress, her hair worn long, with a chignon in back. Her head is tilted to left, and she leans on the statue of Artemis with her left arm, her legs crossed with the left over the right. She holds the temple key in her left hand and the letter in her right. Pylades stands on a slightly higher level to left of the temple. He is naked except for a chlamys and petasos worn down his back. He leans on a stick, holding his sword in its scabbard in his left hand and extending his right, to take the letter. To the right

of the temple, Artemis sits on an altar set on the steps of the temple. Artemis wears peplos, hunting boots, and jewelry. She holds two spears, and looks over her shoulder at Apollo who stands behind her on a slightly higher level. Apollo is naked except for a laurel wreath, mantle worn around his shoulders, and boots. He holds a laurel branch in his left hand, and touches Artemis' shoulder with his right. In the background on either side of the temple hang boucrania. On the rocky ground in front of the temple are three vases and a quiver.

B.) Youth with branch and phiale seated between woman with branch and torch, and young satyr with wreath and thyrsos.

TAU 9. Matera, Museo Archeologico (Ex. Bari market) (Figs. 192a-c)
Apulian volute-krater.

Attributed to the Darius Painter (by Trendall).

c. 340-330 BC.

References: *LIMC* 24; RVAp supp 2, 14/126b and pl. 19.2; Taplin 2007, 282 note 99.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia handing over the letter to Pylades. Iphigeneia stands in a naiskos, constructed of four ionic columns supporting an entablature and pediment, and set on a stepped base. Votive armor hang down from the ceiling of the structure. To the right of Iphigeneia is a statue of Artemis holding a torch, which is set on a pedestal. Iphigeneia, wearing a veil, diadem, chiton, himation, and slippers, holds the letter in her right hand and the temple key in her left. Pylades stands to left of the temple on a lower level. He is naked except for a chlamys and petasos worn down his back. He holds two spears in his left hand, which he leans on, his left leg crossed over his right. Orestes stands in about the same place as his companion, but on the right side of the temple. He wears a chlamys and boots, and stands with his right leg raised on a higher level. He holds two spears and a sword in its scabbard in his left hand, and his pilos in his right. Above Orestes, on the top right, is Artemis seated to right and a standing youth who faces her. Artemis holds two spears in her right hand and a bow in her left. She turns her head to look at the youth, with whom she seems to be in conversation. The youth is naked except for a mantle worn around his arms. He leans on a stick that he holds in his left hand, and his right hand is on his hip. Below him, on a lower level is a large overturned cup. Occupying the same space but on the left side of the temple, is Apollo and a woman. Apollo is seated to left facing the woman, and he holds a laurel branch in his right hand. The woman makes a gesture towards the god with her left hand. In front of the naiskos is a small tripod set on a pedestal, flanked on either side by a seated youth. The youths are naked except for a mantle upon which each is seated, and for the pair of boots worn by the youth on the left side. They sit with their back towards the tripod, but turn their heads to look over their shoulders at one another. The youth on the left holds two spears in his right hand, and the youth on the right plays with a dog.

TAU 10. Saint Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum B1715A (St420)

(Figs. 193a-d)

Apulian volute-krater.

Attributed to the Baltimore Painter.

c. 330-320 BC.

References: *LIMC* 23; *RVAp* II 863, 18; *CFSTAp* 208; Bielfeldt 2005, 203, fig. 65.

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia handing over the letter to Pylades. In the center is Iphigeneia standing in a naiskos, her face in three-quarter view. The structure consists of four ionic columns on a base, and supporting an entablature and pediment with palmette akroteria. She stands frontally, head inclined to left, and she wears a diadem, chiton, himation, and veil. She holds the temple key in her left hand, and the letter in her right hand, with which she also holds out her veil. To right of Iphigeneia is the statue of Artemis set on an altar. The statue of Artemis holds a spear in her left hand and a flaming torch in her right. Pylades stands to left of the naiskos. He is naked except for mantle, petasos worn down his back and boots. He leans on a stick, and rests his right hand on his hip. Behind Pylades, but on a lower level, is Orestes, leaning on a lustral basin with his left leg crossed over his right. Orestes is also naked except for a mantle and petasos worn down his back. The youth has long hair, and raises his left hand to his head. At the top left are Athena and Iris. Athena wears her snake-fringed aegis, and is seated to left, holding a spear in her right hand. Facing the goddess is Iris, standing with her left foot raised up on a higher level. She can be identified by her wings and kerykeion, which she holds in her right hand. At the top right are Artemis and Hermes, both seated to left. Artemis inclines her head to right, and Hermes gestures with his right hand as if they are in conversation. Artemis holds a spear in her right hand and a bow in her left; she wears her quiver on her back. Hermes wears his traveling garb of chlamys, petasos worn around his neck, and boots. He holds his kerykeion in his left hand. An oinochoe is tipped over on the ground in front of him. Beneath Artemis and Hermes is a Scythian warrior and a woman facing one another. The Scythian is seated beside a hydria to right, holding a phiale in his left hand. The woman leans on a lustral basin, holding a wreath over the warrior's phiale. In front of the naiskos are two groups of figures. On the left side is a Scythian warrior and a female figure. They are seated back to back, but turn their heads to look at one another. The warrior holds a spear in his right hand, and touches his shield with his left. The woman is seated beside a hydria, and holds up a chest in her right hand and a wreath and parasol in her left. The group on the right consists of a seated Scythian facing a large deer. The warrior holds a shield in his left hand, and a wreath in his right, which he holds out towards the deer.

Descriptions below as given in *RVAp* II 863, 18:

B.) Right facing youth beside horse in naiskos on each side of which is a youth and a woman with offerings.

Neck: A.) Amazonomachy; B.) Dionysos seated between satyr and maenad.

Foot: A.) Right facing head in profile to left; B.) Right facing head in three-quarter view to right, between tendrils and flowers.

Mascaroons: female heads with white flesh.

TAU 11. Paris, Louvre K404 (L112) (Figs. 194a-f)

Campanian bell krater.

Attributed to the Caivano Painter (Attributed to Painter of B.M. F 63 in Todisco 2003).

c. 330-320 BC.

References: *LIMC* 27; *LCS* 321, 702; *CFSTC* 51; Boardman 2001, fig. 230; Todisco 2003.

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris: First or second meeting between Orestes and Iphigeneia in presence of Pylades (Euripides, *IT* 989-1055). The figures are set against the elaborate structure of the sanctuary of Artemis, which reflects stage designs with two projecting wings connected by a central corridor. Each wing consists of a set of doors on a base, supporting an entablature and pediment with akroteria. On each side, the left leaf is closed, and the right one ajar, opening inwards. Iphigeneia stands in front of the doors on the right side. She stands in profile to left, wearing a veil, chiton, and himation; she also wears a necklace, bracelets, and boat earring. Her right hand is raised to her shoulder holding out her veil, and her left hand is hidden in the folds of her garments. Standing in front of the doors on the left side is the statue of Artemis, wearing boots, cap, and drapery, set on a base. She holds a spear in her right hand and a bow in her left. Orestes and Pylades stand on a rocky ground line in the middle between the two lateral wings. Orestes is on the right side, facing Iphigeneia and in conversation with his sister. He holds a spear and scabbard in his left hand, and gestures with his right. Pylades is seen in three-quarter view from behind, his head in profile to right. He also holds a spear and scabbard in his left hand and gestures towards Iphigeneia with his right. Both youths are naked except for a crown, crossed bands over their chests and mantle hanging on their left arms.

B.) Three satyrs.

TAU 12. Saint Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum B2080 (W1033)
(Figs. 195a-c)

Campanian neck-amphora. From Capua.

Attributed to the Ixion Painter.

c. 330-320 BC.

References: *LIMC* 29; *LCS* 338, 790, pl. 131, 6; *CFSTC* 39; Taplin 2007, 155-6 cat. no. 50.

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris: Escape of Iphigeneia, Orestes, and Pylades from Tauris. The three figures, with Iphigeneia in the middle, are in front of the temple of Artemis and run vigorously to right. The doors are open as if the

figures just fled from the temple. The temple is large, represented by three ionic columns supporting an entablature that includes a frieze of alternating triglyphs and metopes, surmounted by a pediment and akroteria. Iphigeneia wears a fillet of beads in her hair, chiton, and himation, her hands hidden in the folds of her garment. She clasps the statue of Artemis against her body in the crook of her left arm. Her head is in profile to left as she looks over her shoulder. The youth to left of Iphigeneia also looks over his shoulder, and he holds a sword in his right hand. The youth to right of Iphigeneia also holds a sword in his right hand and raises his left hand high up in the air. His face is seen in profile to right, head tilted up, as if he is looking into the distance. Both youths are naked except for chlamys and petasos. A swag of drapery and a severed head hangs to right of the temple above the figures' heads.

B.) Two draped youths.

TAU 13. New York Market, Christie's (Fig. 196a-c)

Apulian red-figure calyx-krater.

Attributed to the Hippolyte Painter

c. 345-335 BC.

References: *CFST* Ap134; Taplin 2007, 282 note 99; Christie's, New York, June 10, 1994, p. 68-9, lot 147.

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia handing over the letter to Pylades. At center, Iphigeneia (name inscribed) stands before an altar, on top of which is a branch, holding the letter in her right hand. She wears peplos, himation, and slippers, and for jewelry two necklaces, earrings, and bracelet. Pylades faces her leaning on a stick, with his right hand raised to his chin. Above in the space between them, a Nike is about to wreath Iphigeneia's head with a garland. Behind Iphigeneia is a column topped by a statue of Artemis. Orestes sits on the other side of it, glancing over at his companion and sister. At right on a higher level, Artemis with a fawn observes the scene. Inscriptions: ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ; ΠΥΛΛΑΔΕΣ; ΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ.

B.) Seated woman holding a phiale in her right hand flanked by a naked male (Dionysos?) on the left and a satyr on the right.

LOST WALL PAINTINGS:

TAU 14. Lost painting by Timomachus of Byzantium

First-century BC (?)

References: *LIMC* 30.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia and Orestes in Tauris. Uncertain episode: first meeting between Iphigeneia and prisoners (Robert 1875)? Or preparations for the escape (Pfuhl and Rizzo)?

Known only from Pliny, *Natural History* 35.136:

Timomachi aequae laudantur Orestes, Iphigenia in Tauris et
Lecythion, agilitatis exercitator. . . .

Equal praise is given to Timomachus's Orestes, his Iphigeneia
among the Tauri and his Gymnastic-Master Lecythion. . . .

TAU 15. Termessos (Pisidia), two stone relief plaques (Fig. 197)

Temple decoration (?)

c. 120 BC.

References: *LIMC* 5 = *LIMC* 26; Ridgway 2000, 85-6.

Iphigeneia at Aulis (and at Tauris?) Two non-joining relief plaques depicting scenes in the life of Iphigeneia.

Left slab: Three figure group with a female figure wearing a chiton and himation in the center, on a base, facing left. She faces another female figure also dressed in chiton and himation who may hold an object in one of her hands. To the right of the central figure is a youth who stands in three-quarter view to left. He is naked except for a chlamys worn around his neck. He holds a spear in his right hand, which he leans on, and his left hand is on his hip. Weitzmann (1949, 184-5) interpreted the figures as: Iphigeneia—Klytaimnestra—Achilles, in a scene of Iphigeneia at Aulis. Staehler (1968, 280-9) identified the figures as: Servant—Iphigeneia—Pylades, in a scene of Iphigeneia in Tauris. Ridgway (2000, 85-6) follows Staehler's identifications.

Right slab: Iphigeneia's sacrifice and the substitution of the hind. See IPH 11.

GEMS:

TAU 16. Berlin, Staatliche Museen FG 792 (Fig. 198)

Black glass paste. From Italy.

Fifth—fourth century BC.

References: *LIMC* 16.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes and Pylades as prisoners before Iphigeneia. The youths stand to left of the altar, hands are tied behind their backs. Iphigeneia stands to right of the altar, raising her right hand to her face.

TAU 17. Berlin, Staatliche Museen FG 792 (Not published)

Fragment of a brown glass paste. From Italy.

Fifth—fourth century BC.

References: *LIMC* 17.

Bottom middle half missing.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes and Pylades as prisoners before Iphigeneia.

**TAU 18. Intaglio known only from an impression at the Deutches
Archaeological Institute (Fig. 199)**

Fifth—fourth century BC.

References: Philippart 1925, 14 no. 13; Robert 1876, 146, pl. 13.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes and Pylades as prisoners before Iphigeneia. The youths stand to left of the altar, hands tied behind their backs. Iphigeneia stands in profile to left looking at the youths. Her left hand is behind her back.

IPHIGENEIA IN TAURIS

ETRUSCAN DEPICTIONS (CERTAIN)¹

URNS:

TAU 19. Florence, Museo Archeologico 5777 (Figs. 200a-b)

Alabaster urn. From Chiusi.

End of the third-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 20; Steuernagel 1998, 194, cat. no. 46.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Preparation for the sacrifice of Orestes and Pylades. Orestes (left) and Pylades sit back to back on an altar. Orestes cradles his head in his left hand. Pylades holds a letter or tablet in his left hand. To left of Orestes is Iphigeneia, who stands leaning on her brother, with her left leg crossed in front of her right. She is naked except for a mantle worn down her back and which wraps around the front to cover her right leg. A Fury behind Iphigeneia. To the right of Pylades is a winged Fury or Vanth with a torch, and a warrior. Column with cauldron in background.

TAU 20. Siena, Museo Archeologico 730 (Figs. 201a-b)

Alabaster urn. From Sarteano.

End of the third—beginning of the second century BC.

References: *LIMC* 19; Steuernagel 1998, 194, cat. no. 47, pl. 10 fig. 2.

Iphigeneia in Tauris. Preparation for the sacrifice of Orestes and Pylades. Similar to IPH 30. Iphigeneia holds a letter in her right hand and is naked except for a diadem, harness and the garment draped down her back. Behind Iphigeneia is a Fury holding a sword in her right hand and a bowl in her left. Another Fury is asleep on the ground in front of Orestes. Pylades has his back to his companion. He is being led away by a naked man who has bound his hands, behind whom is another soldier. In the background between Orestes and Pylades is the head of a horse.

TAU 21. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek H 298 (Fig. 202)

Alabaster urn. From Città della Pieve (Chiusi).

End of the third—beginning of the second century BC.

References: *LIMC* 21; Steuernagel 1998, 193, cat. no. 45, pl. 10 fig. 1.

¹The cross references to *LIMC* refer to the catalogue numbers in Ingrid Krauskopf's entry on Iphigeneia in Etruria, vol. VII, p. 729-34.

Iphigeneia in Tauris. Preparation for the sacrifice of Orestes and Pylades. The figures of Iphigeneia and Orestes are similar to IPH 31. Orestes and Pylades sit back to back. There are two horses in the background, the heads of which are visible on either side of Pylades. To the right of Pylades are three figures: a man falling to the ground, a groom leading one of the horses, and a soldier moving to right. Orestes rests his foot on a chest, a bronze amphora before him.

TAU 22. New York, New York University Collection (Fig. 203)

Alabaster urn. From Chiusi.

Beginning of the second century BC.

References: *LIMC* 22; Bonfante 1986, 273, fig. VIII-58; Steuernagel 1998, 194, cat. no. 49, pl. 10 fig. 3.

Iphigeneia in Tauris. Preparation for the sacrifice of Orestes and Pylades. Orestes sits on an altar with his right hand to his head. In front of him stands Iphigeneia, wearing a chiton and himation and holding a tablet in her right hand. Pylades stands behind Orestes, holding a tablet in his right hand. To the right of Pylades are the legs of another draped figure, perhaps Artemis. Placed on a higher altar behind Orestes is a small table and two severed heads.

IPHIGENEIA IN TAURIS

ROMAN DEPICTIONS (CERTAIN)

WALL PAINTINGS:

TAU 23. Klagenfurt, Landesmuseen für Kärnten (Fig. 204a-i)

Mural painting. From Magdalensberg.

First-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 34; Bielfeldt 2005, 244, fig. 78 (misabeled in book as fig. 79).

Iphigeneia depicted alone, probably as a priestess in Tauris. She stands frontally wearing a long chiton, veil, and laurel wreath with pearls extending from it down to her shoulders. She holds the cult statue of Artemis in her left arm and a branch in her right hand. The other subjects depicted in the same room include fragments of six other figures, including Cassandra, Io, Dionysos and two dancers (Figs. 204c-i).

TAU 24. Naples, Museo Nazionale 111439 (Figs. 205a-c)

Fragment of a mural painting. Third Style. From Pompeii V 1, 26 (Casa di L. Cec. Giocondo).

c. AD 40-50.

References: *LIMC* 52.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes and Pylades led before Iphigeneia. Iphigeneia stands between the two corner columns of the temple of Artemis, which has a coffered ceiling. She wears a long garment and veil, which she holds out with her right hand, her left hand placed in the folds of her garment. She also wears a laurel wreath with pearls, and sandals. The servant to right of Iphigeneia holds a sword in her right hand and a hydria in her left. Behind Iphigeneia there are three additional servants, peering out from behind one of the columns. In the lower left of the composition, although fragmentary, parts of Orestes and Pylades can be discerned standing near a lustral basin. All of the figures have frontal or three-quarter view faces.

TAU 25. Pompeii III 4, 4 (Casa di Pinarius Cerealis), *in situ* (Figs. 206a-d)

Mural painting. Fourth style.

Neronian (AD 54-68).

References: *LIMC* 58; Moorman 1983, 77, fig. 1; Schefold and Jung 1989, 312 fig. 269; Leach 2004, 118, fig. 78.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia holding the cult statue requesting permission from Thoas to purify it. The figures are set against an elaborate architectural façade, the *scaenae frons*, denoting the Temple of Artemis. Iphigeneia stands frontally in the central aedicule, holding the statue of Artemis in her left hand and a branch in her right. Two servants flank her. At the bottom left, Thoas, accompanied by an assistant who stands behind him, is seated, facing inwards. On the other side, Orestes and Pylades are standing with their hands tied behind their backs.

TAU 26. Stabiae, Villa San Marco, no. 30 (Figs. 207a-d)

Mural painting. Fourth style.

After AD 62.

References: *LIMC* 35; Bielfeldt 2005, 244, fig. 79 (mislabeled in book as fig. 78).

Iphigeneia depicted alone, probably as a priestess in Tauris. Iphigeneia stands frontally, looking out at the viewer, wearing a chiton, himation, earrings, and a crown of leaves and pearls. She holds the Palladium (rather than a statue of Artemis) in her left hand, and an inverted flaming torch in her right. Other figures from the same room include Perseus and a musician (Figs. 207c-d).

TAU 27. Naples, Museo Nazionale 9111 (Figs. 208a-b)

Mural painting. Fourth style. From Pompeii I 4, 25 (35) (Casa del Citarista) c. AD 65.

References: *LIMC* 59; Schefold and Jung 1989, 309 fig. 265 detail; Leach 2004, 119.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia with the cult statue requesting permission from Thoas to purify it. Iphigeneia stands at the top of the steps of the temple of Artemis. She holds the statue of Artemis in her left hand and her right grasps at folds of her long tunic and veil (of which scraps remain). Behind her, at right, is a garlanded altar with flames. In the foreground at left Orestes and Pylades stand with their hands tied behind their backs, guarded by a warrior holding two spears. Across from them at right is Thoas, seated in profile to left, accompanied by a warrior standing behind him with a spear and shield. Between the two groups of figures in the foreground is a flaming altar, with a torch leaning on its base, and a hydria.

TAU 28. Naples, Museo Nazionale 9538 (Figs. 209a-b)

Mural painting. From Herculaneum.

Before AD 79.

References: *LIMC* 53.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes and Pylades led before Iphigeneia. Orestes and Pylades stand on the left side, their hands bound behind their backs by a rope that is held by a Taurian soldier standing behind them. In the center of the scene, to right of the youths, is a garlanded table on which is placed an oinochoe and a statuette. Iphigeneia stands in profile to left opposite the youths, her mantle billowing out behind her. She holds her right hand up to her chin and her left arm is held across her body. There are two servants behind Iphigeneia who make preparations at an altar.

TAU 29. Pompeii IX 8, 3 and 6 (Casa del Centenario), in situ (Fig. 210)
Mural painting. Fourth style.
Before AD 79.
References: *LIMC* 60.

Iphigeneia in Tauris. Iphigeneia holding the statuette of Artemis, with Orestes and Pylades. She stands at the top of the steps of the Temple of Artemis looking out past Orestes and Pylades in the foreground. She is draped and veiled, holding the statue of Artemis in her left hand, enveloped in the folds of her garment. The youths look to the right, one sitting on an altar and the other leaning on it.

TAU 30. Pompeii VI 15, 1 (Casa dei Vettii), in situ (Figs. 211a-b)
Mural painting. Fourth style.
Before AD 79.
References: *LIMC* 61; Leach 2004, 119; Bielfeldt 2005, 243, fig. 77.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia with the cult statue requesting permission from Thoas to purify it. Iphigeneia is in the center of the composition, standing in a frontal pose but with her head turned in three-quarter view to right. She holds the statue of Artemis in her left hand, and a long thin torch in her right, with which she is either stoking the flames on a low altar or trying to light her torch from its flames. A small servant stands to Iphigeneia's left. At far right, Thoas is seated on a folding. Orestes and Pylades are at the far left, one sitting on an altar, and the other standing. The face of the seated youth is missing.

TAU 31. Pompeii IX 5, 14-16, partially destroyed (Fig. 212)
Mural painting.
Before AD 79.
References: *LIMC* 62.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes and Pylades as prisoners before Iphigeneia.² Iphigeneia stands to left of the altar, which is in the center of the scene. She stands in three-quarter view to right, draped with a wreath in her hair. She holds the statue of Artemis in her left hand, and a torch (?) in her right which she touches to the flames on the altar. Orestes and Pylades approach the altar on the side opposite Iphigeneia, their hands tied behind their backs. They wear wreaths in their hair and mantles around their necks covering their bodies.

SARCOPHAGI:

TAU 32. Marseille, Académie des Sciences, Arts et Lettres 34 (Fig. 213a-b)

Fragment of a provincial marble sarcophagus. Found at Jonquières. Between the beginning of the second century and the mid-third century AD. References: *LIMC* 70; Bielfeldt 2005, 346, cat. no. II.11, pl. 26.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes or Pylades helping Iphigeneia onto the boat. Statue of Artemis over her shoulder. Behind Iphigeneia, is a tree and the head of a Taurian on ground.

TAU 33. Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptotek GL 363 (Fig. 214a-e)

Roman marble sarcophagus, type A. AD 140-150.

References: *LIMC* 56 (short sides, left and right) and 75 (principal face); Bielfeldt 2005, 340, cat. no. II.1, pls. 18-20, fig. 60.

Principal Face: Four episodes from Iphigeneia in Tauris. From left to right: 1.) Orestes and Pylades, hands bound, led before Iphigeneia by a Taurian. 2.) Orestes struck with madness, helped to ground by Pylades. To right is an Erinyes. 3.) Fight on the river. Iphigeneia stands at left with the statue of Artemis cradled in her arms as Orestes or Pylades fights two Taurians. 4.) Orestes or Pylades jumping into the boat. Iphigeneia is already in the boat with a companion, a veil over her head.

Left short side: Iphigeneia in Tauris: recognition between Iphigeneia and Orestes.

²Linant de Bellefonds (1990, 723) catalogues this painting under the subject of "Iphigénie emporte la statuette d'Artémis et/ou demande à Thoas la permission de la purifier dans la mer" rather than under the subject of "Oreste et Pylade sont conduits devant Iphigénie." I give the subject as Orestes and Pylades as prisoners before Iphigeneia, because the youths' hands are tied behind their backs, they wear wreaths on top of their heads, and they approach Iphigeneia who is on the opposite side of the altar. The subject could also be identified as the preparations for the sacrifice of the youths.

Right short side: same as left short side, but inverted.

TAU 34. Paris, Musée du Louvre Ma 1607 (1610) (Fig. 215a-b)

Fragment of a Roman marble sarcophagus, type A.

AD 140-150.

References: *LIMC* 76; Bielfeldt 2005, 340, cat. no. II.2, pl. 21.

Similar to scenes 2 and 3 on the principal face of IPH 80. On the left side, the madness of Orestes with an Erinys. On the right side, Iphigeneia watches the fight on the river between Orestes/Pylades and two Taurians.

TAU 35. Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Profano 10450 (Fig. 216a-d)

Cover of a Roman marble sarcophagus, type A. From Rome, Porta Viminalis.

AD 140-150.

References: *LIMC* 77; Schefold and Jung 1989, 307 fig. 263; Bielfeldt 2005, 334, cat. no. I.2, pl. 2-6; 343, cat. no. II.6, pl. 5.

Four episodes from Iphigeneia in Tauris. From left to right: 1.) Recognition between Iphigeneia and Orestes. 2.) Orestes and Pylades led before Iphigeneia. 3.) Fight on the river. Iphigeneia is not present in this scene. 4.) Boarding the boat.

TAU 36. St. Petersburg, Hermitage A 259 and Rome, Museo Capitolino 1049 (Fig. 217a-c)

Two fragments of the cover of a Roman marble sarcophagus, type A.

c. AD 150.

References: *LIMC* 78; Bielfeldt 2005, 342, cat. no. II.4a and II.4b, pl. 23.1-2, fig. 58.

Leningrad fragment preserves, on the left, the fight on the river between Orestes/Pylades and two Taurians. On the right, Orestes/Pylades climbs the footbridge to board the boat.

Rome fragment preserves Iphigeneia in the boat with a companion.

TAU 37. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 28.57.8a-d (Figs. 218a-c)

Fragments of a Roman marble sarcophagus.

AD 150-160.

References: *LIMC* 57 (short left side) and 68 (cover); Bielfeldt 2005, 337, cat. no. I.8, pl. 13.2-3; 344, cat. no. II.8.

Fragment of short left side: Recognition between Iphigeneia and Orestes. Part of Pylades' leg is preserved.

Fragments of right side of cover: Iphigeneia, veiled, in boat with companion and boatman. Orestes or Pylades on footbridge about to board boat. Behind the figure mounting the footbridge is either the shield of Orestes or Pylades who probably fought a Taurian.

TAU 38. Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano 106467 (Fig. 219a-c)

Cover of a Roman marble sarcophagus, type A. From Rome, Via Salaria.

AD 150-160.

References: *LIMC* 79; Schefold and Jung 1989, 308 fig. 264; Bielfeldt 2005, 343, cat. no. II.5, pl. 24.

Three episodes of Iphigeneia in Tauris. From left to right: 1.) Orestes and Pylades led before Iphigeneia by two Taurians. 2.) Madness of Orestes. 3.) Fight on the river.

TAU 39. Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti 614-X4 (Fig. 220)

Corner fragment of a marble sarcophagus.

AD 150-160.

References: Bielfeldt 2005, 345, cat. no. II.10, fig. 67b.

Recognition between Iphigeneia and Orestes. Fragment preserves figure of Iphigeneia at right break, seen from behind, head turned to right. To her left is a Taurian holding up the armor of the Greeks. Orestes and Pylades are not preserved. Similar to scene 1 on IPH 96.

TAU 40. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 71.AA.266 (Fig. 221)

Fragment of a cover of a Roman marble sarcophagus, type A.

c. AD 160.

References: *LIMC* 80; Bielfeldt 2005, 343, cat. no. II.7, fig. 63a.

Three episodes of Iphigeneia in Tauris. From left to right: 1.) Orestes and Pylades, chained, led by a Taurian before Iphigeneia, who is not preserved. 2.) Recognition between Iphigeneia and Orestes. Pylades behind his companion. 3.) Madness of Orestes.

TAU 41. Rome, Palazzo Giustiniani (Fig. 222)

Marble sarcophagus.

c. AD 160.

References: Bielfeldt 2005, 334, cat. no. I.3, pl. 7, figs. 47 and 63b.

Front: Death of Aigisthos and Klytaimnestra, sleeping furies, departure from Delphi.

Short left side: Recognition between Iphigeneia and Orestes. Pylades present behind Orestes.

Short right side: Iudicium.

TAU 42. Rome, Museo Capitolino 3328 (Ex. Villa Pamphili) (Fig. 223)

Fragment of a marble sarcophagus.

c. AD 170.

References: Bielfeldt 2005, 348, cat. no. II.15, pl. 30.

Recognition between Iphigeneia and Orestes. All that is preserved of the scene is the figure of Iphigeneia standing in three-quarter view from behind facing to right. Her right arm is broken off above the elbow. A volute krater on the ground in front of her.

TAU 43. Venice, Museo Archeologico 92 (Fig. 224)

Fragment of short side of a marble sarcophagus. Sarcophagus front is not known.

AD 170-180.

References: Bielfeldt 2005, 346, cat. no. II.12, pl. 27.

Iphigeneia on footbridge boarding the boat, assisted by Orestes or Pylades who grabs her by the wrist. Iphigeneia turns her head to look out at the viewer, her mantle blowing in the air behind her. Orestes or Pylades holds the statue in his left hand. Two other figures already in boat.

TAU 44. Weimar, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Schlossmuseum G 1745 (Fig. 225a-b)

Roman marble sarcophagus, type C.

Second-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 84; Bielfeldt 2005, 347, cat. no. II.14, pl. 29, figs. 66, 73-4, and 76.

Three episodes of Iphigeneia in Tauris: 1.) Recognition between Iphigeneia and Orestes. Pylades behind Orestes, accompanied by two guards. 2.) Farewell of Orestes and Pylades. Orestes is seated on a rock with his right hand to his head, mantle drawn over his head. Pylades stands in front of him. They are accompanied by two Taurians. 3.) Iphigeneia asks King Thoas' permission to purify the statue of Artemis. Iphigeneia holds a flaming torch in her right hand and the statue in her left. To the left of Iphigeneia, Orestes and Pylades are led as prisoners before the maiden. To the right of Iphigeneia, is King Thoas, seated, with two guards. Behind the figures is the altar and the Temple of Artemis.

TAU 45. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 105 and 117 (Fig. 226)

Two fragments of an Attic marble sarcophagus.

Beginning of the third-quarter of the second-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 67.

Iphigenia in Tauris: Iphigeneia asking King Thoas' permission to purify the statue of Artemis. Iphigeneia at right cradles the statue in her left arm, and holds a branch in her outstretched right hand. The temple of Artemis is depicted behind her. In front of Iphigeneia is a servant holding a basket of fruits. To the left of the servant is King Thoas seated to right accompanied by two Taurians.

TAU 46. Budapest, Musée National Hongrois 62.84.2 (Figs. 227)

Fragment of a stone sarcophagus. From Aquincum.

Second-century AD (?)

References: *LIMC* 69; Bielfeldt 2005, 219, fig. 71.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Boarding the boat. Orestes or Pylades already in the boat grabbing Iphigeneia by the arms to help her up the footbridge and onto the boat. To the left, Orestes or Pylades stands in front of the temple of Artemis in the background holding a sword upright in his right hand, a dead Taurian at his feet.

TAU 47. Berlin, Pergamon Museum. (Ex. Berlin-DDR, Staatliche Museen SK 845) (Figs. 228a-g)

Roman marble sarcophagus, type C.

Second-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 83; Bielfeldt 2005, 346, cat. no. II.13, pl. 28.

Similar to IPH 91. Three episodes of Iphigeneia in Tauris. From left to right: 1.) Recognition between Iphigeneia and Orestes. Pylades behind his companion. A servant behind Iphigeneia. 2.) Farewell of Orestes and Pylades. Orestes seated on a rock, mantle pulled over his head with his right hand raised to his head. Pylades stands in front of him. Two Taurians guard Orestes and Pylades. 3.) Iphigeneia asks Thoas' permission to purify the statue. From left to right, a Taurian leads Orestes and Pylades, both bound, to Iphigeneia, to right of whom is Thoas and a servant. Iphigeneia stands frontally cradling a flaming torch in her right arm, and holding the statue of Artemis in her left hand.

TAU 48. Rome, Villa Albani and Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti (Fig. 229a-c)

Two fragments of a Roman marble sarcophagus, type A.

Second-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 81; Bielfeldt 2005, 341, cat. no. II.3a and II.3b, pl. 22.1-2, fig. 55.

Two episodes of Iphigeneia in Tauris: Left, Orestes and Pylades both bound are led before Iphigeneia by three Taurians. Right, Madness of Orestes.

TAU 49. Weimar, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Schlossmuseum G 1744 (Fig. 230a-b)

Roman marble sarcophagus, type B. From Thespies.

Second half of the second-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 82; Bielfeldt 2005, 344, cat. no. II.9, pl. 25, figs. 67a and 68-70.

Four episodes of Iphigeneia in Tauris. From left to right: 1.) Recognition between Iphigeneia and Orestes. Pylades behind his companion. A servant behind Iphigeneia. 2.) Orestes and Pylades, hands bound, are led before Iphigeneia by a soldier. Iphigeneia stands to left grasping her hands in front of her body. The altar, the statue of Artemis on a base, and a tree with the severed head of a Taurian are visible between Iphigeneia and Orestes, just behind them. 3.) Fight on the river. Orestes or Pylades stands to left holding a sword upright in his right hand. Two Taurians, one in front of the youth and one dead on the ground in front him. 4.) Iphigeneia boarding the boat. Orestes or Pylades is already in the boat, grabbing Iphigeneia's arms to help her up the footbridge. She has the statue of Artemis over her left shoulder.

TAU 50. Thebes, Archaeological Museum 109 (?) (Figs. 231a-e)

Four fragments of an Attic marble sarcophagus.

Beginning of the third-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 74; Bonanno Aravantinos 1993 (reconstruction).

Two scenes of Iphigeneia in Tauris. One fragment preserves a soldier (Thoas?) standing in front of the temple of Artemis, trying to light a torch on the altar before him. The other fragment depicts the boarding of the boat, with Orestes or Pylades assisting Iphigeneia up the footbridge onto the boat.

TAU 51. Present location unknown. Ex. England, Windsor Castle 871 (= Dal Pozzo VIII fol. 11). (Fig. 232)

Sarcophagus front.

Second-century AD.

References: Vermeule 1966, 49, fol. 11, no. 8712; Froning 1980, 336, fig. 12.

Two scenes of Iphigeneia in Tauris:

1.) (On right) Orestes and Pylades led as prisoners before Iphigeneia. She stands at an altar, holding an inverted torch (?) in her right hand and a patera with offerings in her left. Behind the altar is a rocky crag and tree.

2.) The boarding of the boat, with either Orestes or Pylades assisting Iphigeneia up the gangplank.

Known from a 17th century AD drawing, which transposes the two fragments. In the drawing, the escape to the boat is on the left and the preparations for the sacrifice of youths is on the right, but this arrangement is reversed (see Vermeule 1966 and Froning 1980).

RELIEFS:

TAU 52. Sens, Musée Municipal 98-99-100 (Fig. 233a-b)

Stone relief. From Agedincum (Sens).

End of the first-century AD—first half of the second-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 54; Bielfeldt 2005, 182, fig. 56.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes led before Iphigeneia. Iphigeneia, draped and veiled, stands beside an altar over which she holds a laurel branch in her outstretched right arm. Orestes is led before her by a warrior (or Thoas), who stands behind the youth holding a spear in his left hand. Orestes' hands are tied behind his back, and his body is in three-quarter view, his head in profile, to right. Traces of a fourth figure at right.

TAU 53. Šempeter-Celeia, Tomb of the Prisciani, inv. 601, *in situ*

(Figs. 234a-g; inv. 601 is fig. 234f)

Marble relief. In Slovenia.

Between the beginning of the second century and the mid-third century AD.

References: *LIMC* 71.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Boarding of the boat. Iphigeneia moves to right up the gangplank of the boat, and looks back over her shoulder. Orestes or Pylades is already in the boat assisting her; he is rendered on a slightly smaller scale than the other figures. To left of Iphigeneia, Orestes or Pylades is killing a Taurian. The youth stands frontally, head turned to right. He is naked except for a mantle that wraps around his left arm and flutters in the air. He holds a sword in his right hand and grabs the hair of the Taurian with his left. The fallen Taurian is already on the ground, arms gesturing wildly for mercy.

TAU 54. Croatia, Relief from Bjelovar Parish Church. No longer visible (Fig. 235a-b)

Stone relief, integrated into the portal of the Bjelovar Parish Church. No longer visible today, known only from a photograph. From Pannonia.

Between the second half of the second-century and beginning of the third-century AD.

References: Erdélyi 1950, 73, cat. no. 22, pl. 16, 3; Toynbee 1977, 389, cat. no. b.(ii); Cambi 2003.

Iphigeneia in Tauris. Boarding of the boat. Fragment preserves Orestes or Pylades helping Iphigeneia up the gangplank onto the boat. The youth holds both her hands. Iphigeneia is draped and in profile to right. Behind her is the crenellated wall and gate of the city of Tauris. Four armed men already in the boat (in addition to the youth) help Iphigeneia. Small figures on the sea representing sea deities ?

TAU 55. Slovenia, Relief in the St. Janez Church on Dravinjski Vrh, near Ptuj (Fig. 236)

Tomb relief. From Noricum.

Between the second half of the second-century and beginning of the third-century AD.

References: Stanko Pahič, *Arkeološki vestnik* 28, 1977, 47, fig. 9; Cambi 2003, 25; Bielfeldt 2005, 219 note 591, 220 fig. 72.

Iphigeneia in Tauris. Boarding the boat. At the break at right, Iphigeneia advances on the footbridge to board the boat, but the figure helping her onboard is not preserved. Iphigeneia is draped, and her mantle flutters in the air behind her. Behind her, Orestes or Pylades stands in three-quarter view to left, holding a knife in his right hand. A dead Taurian at his feet. In the background behind the fallen Taurian, on a rocky acropolis is the temple of Artemis. Similar to Budapest, Musée National Hongrois 62.84.2.

TAU 56. Hungary, Stuhlweissenburg (Székesfehérvár) Museum (Fig. 237)

Fragmentary stone relief from Gorsium (ancient Pannonia).

Between the second half of the second-century and beginning of the third-century AD.

References: F. Miltner, *Mitteilungen des Vereines klassischer Philologen in Wien* VII (1930), p. 61-8, pl. 1; *ArchErt* LXXVII (1950), p. 74, 83, no. 41; F. Jenö, *Gorsium* (1976), p. 71, no. 27; Toynbee 1977, 390, cat. no. iv; Cambi 2003, 25.

Iphigeneia in Tauris. Boarding the boat. Iphigeneia in profile to right advancing up the footbridge to board the boat, assisted by Orestes or Pylades whose arms are extended to assist her. Behind Iphigeneia is Orestes or Pylades.

TAU 57. Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmuseum Trier U 194 (Fig. 238)

Sandstone pediment of a funerary monument. From Freinz-Lamersdorf.

Between the beginning of the second century and the mid-third century AD.
References: *LIMC* 73; Kuhnen 2000, 57.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Flight from Tauris. In the center, at the apex, is Iphigeneia, draped and veiled, holding the Palladium in her left hand. Her upper body and head is seen frontally, her right leg is crossed over her left as she moves to right. Iphigeneia's head is framed within the pediment and columns of the Temple of Artemis in the background. She is flanked on either side by Orestes and Pylades, both holding knives in their right hands. The youth on the right also holds spears in his left. The figures move to right towards the boat, the prow of which can be seen at far right. To left of the figures is an altar and a deer.

TAU 58. Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmuseum Trier 9937. So-called "Iphigeneia Pillar" (Fig. 239a-e)

Grabpfeiler ("grave-pilaster") 8. Funerary monument. From Neumagen (Germany).

c. AD 160.

References: von Massow 1932, 54, cat. no. 8a2, fig. 33, pl. 7 u. 6; Numrich 1997, 82ff; Kuhnen 2000, 57, fig. 5.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Flight of Iphigeneia? The large fragment preserves the upper body and head of Iphigeneia holding the statue of Artemis in her left hand. Her mantle flutters in the air behind her. Another fragment preserves her lower legs, which were moving to right. Behind Iphigeneia is a column. A possible depiction of Polyxena appears between the pilasters on this monument, see POL. 52.

TAU 59. Szombathely (Hungary), Savaria Museum (Figs. 240a-b)

Fragment of a marble funerary stele. From Ják (Hungary).

Second-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 72.

Iphigeneia in Tauris. Boarding the boat. All that is preserved is the fragment with Iphigeneia boarding the boat. She moves to left, instead of the usual to right, with her arms extended out in front of her. Her right foot steps not on the footbridge, but on the body of a Taurian. She is partly draped, the garment falling down exposing her body.

RELIEF VASES:

TAU 60. Varna, Archaeological Museum (Figs. 241a-i)

Bronze krateriskos. From Balčik (Dionysopolis).

23-12 BC (Schindler); end of the Tiberian-beginning of the Claudian period (Curtius).

References: *LIMC* 85; W. Schindler, *Klio* 62, 1980, 99-109 [cited in *LIMC* as *Klio* 622, 1982]; Bielfeldt 2005, 183, fig. 57.

Three scenes of Iphigeneia in Tauris. From left to right: 1.) Iphigeneia dictating the letter to Pylades. Iphigeneia stands in profile to right before the altar with her right hand extended over it. On the other side of the altar is Pylades, bent over as he writes the letter Iphigeneia dictates to him. Behind Iphigeneia is the garlanded temple of Artemis in the background. Beyond the temple is Orestes in three-quarter view from behind with his hands tied behind his back, standing next to a tree. Two young servants are included, one leaning on a column in front of the temple, and one with a vase beside the altar opposite Iphigeneia. 2.) All that is preserved of this scene is either Orestes or Pylades being led as a prisoner by a Taurian soldier. The youth is naked except for a mantle over his left shoulder and a scabbard on his left side. His hands are tied behind his back, and the Taurian holds in his left hand the rope that is attached to the cuffs. The warrior is also equipped with a spear in his left hand and a sickle or curved knife in his right. 3.) Fight on the river and escape from Tauris. Orestes, Pylades, and Iphigeneia are already in the boat. The youths face left, poised to fight off the advancing Taurians. Iphigeneia sits in the boat behind them with her back to them, completely veiled. King Thoas advances towards the boat, holding a spear in his left hand and raising his right hand up in the air. Between the boat and Thoas is Apollo, standing frontally, but with his head in profile to right. Apollo is nude, except for a mantle around his neck and falling on his shoulder and a bow in his left hand. Behind Thoas are two Taurians advancing to right, and behind them are two other Taurian soldiers moving to left, but turning their heads to look over their shoulders behind them.

TAU 61. London, British Museum 1960.2-1.1 (Figs. 242a-b)

Silver relief kantharos.

Fourth quarter of the first-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 87; Schefold and Jung 1989, 314-15 figs. 271-5; Burrell 2005, 234 and fig. 8.

Iphigeneia, Orestes, and Pylades after having fled Tauris. They seek asylum at the sanctuary of Apollo Smintheus near Troy (omphalos, cult statue, dedications of armor on tree). Iphigeneia sits in front of the tree, face concealed in her veil, holding the cult statue in her lap. They are approached by Thoas and his attendant. In between these groups is Chryseis and the young priest Chryses. This depiction follows the version of the myth preserved in Hyginus, *Fab.* 120-21; was also treated by Sophocles, *TrGF* 4, 494-96, F 726-30; Pacuvius, Klotz *Scaen. Rom.* Frag. 1, 125-31, lines 76-112 (cited in Burrell 2005, 234).

TAU 62. Arezzo, Museo Archeologico (Fig. 243)

Fragment of Arretine pottery. Workshop of Rasinius.

c. 10 BC.

References: *LIMC* 88.

Iphigeneia, Orestes, and Pylades after having fled Tauris. Similar to the silver kantharos in London (TAU 61). Fragment preserves only part of Iphigeneia's body and part of the youth standing in front of her, either Orestes or Pylades. Iphigeneia is seated to right, completely draped and veiled, her face not visible. Both hands are raised to her head. The youth stands frontally, his upper body bare, a mantle covering his lower half and around his left arm. His right arm is extended out at his side over Iphigeneia's head.

MOSAICS:**TAU 63. Rome, Capitoline Museum (once Antiquarium Comunale)**

(Figs. 244a-f)

Mosaic. From Rome.

End of the second—beginning of the third-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 65.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia holding the statue of Artemis. She stands in three-quarter view to left, holding the statuette of Artemis in her right hand. She wears a long tunic belted with a mantle across her waist, veil, laurel wreath and sandals. She faces Orestes, who is seated on an altar in three-quarter view from behind looking at his sister. He is naked except for a mantle over his left shoulder. A letter is leaning up against the altar on the ground. The change in background colors could indicate setting, possibly the Temple of Artemis.

TAU 64. Art Market (Fig. 245)

Mosaic. Uncertain provenance. Signed by the artist at bottom: “%KYΨAI.∇

Uncertain date.

References:

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Fight on the river and escape to the boat. In the foreground at left, Orestes dispatches a Taurian, who is already down on one knee. He grabs the hair with his left hand and holds his sword over his head in his right, about to make the final blow. In the foreground at right, Pylades stands frontally, drawing his sword as he looks off to left. A Taurian is already on the ground behind him, defeated with his right hand raised as if for mercy. Between these two groups in the background is Iphigeneia being helped onto the boat by a helmeted warrior. She looks back; she wears a white veil with laurel in her hair, earrings, bracelet, and armband. Her long garment is white with blue bands at

the breasts, over-fold, hem; dark blue accents for some folds. She holds the cult statue in her left hand, and her right arm is extended for assistance boarding the boat. The boat disappears behind a cliff or rocky outcropping at right. On the left, is the temple of Artemis, the entablature supported by two Corinthian columns. The main figures are named by inscriptions: ΕΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ (on an oval plaque on prow of ship); ΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ (over the door of the cella); ΠΥΛΑΔΗΣ (to right of the youth). There is another inscription on the frieze zone of the temple's entablature: ΥΓΕΙΝΟΝ ΕΧΗΦΟΨΕΤΕΙ.

GEMS:

TAU 65. Florence, Museo Archeologico 14468 (Figs. 246a-b)

Sardonyx cameo.

Imperial (after a Hellenistic composition?); 16th century AD? (according to Tondo and Vanni 1990, 37 no. 43).

References: Furtwängler 1964, pl. LVIII, 6; Richter 1971, 71 no. 334 (with bibliography); Giuliano 1989, 210 no. 121 inv. 14468; Tondo and Vanni 1990, 37 no. 43, inv. 14628; Burrell 2005, 233.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Moment before escape from Tauris? Preparations for sacrifice of Orestes and Pylades? Iphigeneia sits on a throne to left, head turned to look out at the viewer, cradling the state of Artemis in her left arm, and holding a lighted torch in her right. She wears a chiton and himation, pulled up over her head as a veil. Pylades stands behind Iphigeneia, leaning his right arm on a tall stele, his right hand raised to his head. Orestes sits in profile to right facing Iphigeneia, and he holds a spear in his left hand. Between Orestes and Iphigeneia is a youth holding a knife in his right hand. In the background is the temple of Artemis, represented by four Corinthian columns, adorned with a garland, supporting a frieze of triglyphs and metopes, of alternating discs and bucrania.

TEXTILE:

TAU 66. Frankfurt, Museum für Kunsthandwerk 3610 (Figs. 247)

Textile. Fabric of wool, silk, and linen.

Sixth—seventh-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 66; Kuhnen 2000, 55 fig. 3.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Preparations for the sacrifice of Orestes and Pylades. Circular format with Iphigeneia on the left. She is draped and veiled, holding a knife in her right hand, and extending her left hand out in front of her palm up.

Opposite her is a Taurian (Thoas?) with his right hand also extended. Between them at top is Artemis, standing frontally but looking to right. She holds a bow in her left and an arrow in her right hand. Below Artemis' feet is a small altar with flames, on either side of which are Orestes and Pylades, naked, their hands tied behind their backs.

IPHIGENEIA IN TAURIS

UNCERTAIN DEPICTIONS

GREEK

Vases:

TAU 67. Basel, Collection of Herbert A. Cahn, inv. no. HC 503 (Figs. 248a-b)

Three fragments of a red-figure krateriskos. From Brauron.
c. 430-420 BC.

References: Kahil 1983; Reeder 1995, 325, 327, cat. no. 100.

The first fragment preserves parts of three figures. The middle figure is Artemis, recognizable by her hunting garb, quiver, bow and arrow. Artemis is striding to right, in the process of shooting an arrow. Behind Artemis is a draped female figure in profile to right (Leto?). In front of Artemis is a nude youth, probably Apollo. He stands frontally, head turned in profile to left, and he holds a sash in his right hand, which passes behind his back, the other end of which was probably held in his left hand, although no longer preserved. In the second fragment the foreparts of a leaping deer are visible at the left break, and part of a laurel tree appears in the middle of the fragment. On the far right is the frontal torso of a nude man with the head of a bear in profile to right. The third fragment preserves, at the left break, part of a female figure standing frontally, with a frontal face in the form of a bear or wearing a bear mask. She wears a chiton, himation, and necklace, and raises her left arm up in the air as if in alarm. Her right arm is not preserved. To right of the woman is a deer leaping to right.

Kahil (1983, 238) sees these fragments as “the representation of the *mysterion* itself, which the literary texts have never provided so far.” She identifies the bear headed woman “the bear priestess,” of Artemis, who is accompanied possibly by a young priest, also masked. She links this scene with a passage in Hesychius that references “Arktos (the bear), the animal, and the priestess of Artemis.” While Kahil sees the bear-headed woman as a priestess of Artemis, she wonders “for the worshippers was she not Iphigeneia, the first priestess of the sanctuary, the *kleidouchos* of Euripides [*IT* 1463]?”

Reeder (1995, 327-8) prefers to see the bear-headed woman as Kallisto and the youth next to her as Arcas, her son by Zeus. Kallisto was once a virginal nymph in Artemis’ retinue, who angered Artemis by sleeping with Zeus. Kallisto is then changed into a bear, either by Hera or Artemis, and she is ultimately killed by Artemis. I favor Reeder’s interpretation, and I find convincing her suggestion that the necklace and the low-cut neckline of the bear-headed woman’s garment was intended to portray her as the beauty that attracted Zeus’ attention.

TAU 68. Athens, M. Vlasto 216956 (Fig. 249)

Attic red-figure oinochoe. From Kalyvia.

Attributed to the Eretria Painter.

c. 410 BC.

References: *ARV*² 1249.20; *Paralipomena* 469; *LIMC*, Pylades 12 (pl. 487); Dugas 1934, 281-90; Simon 1963, 58 note 74; Lezzi-Hafter 1988, 194 fig. 63b, pl. 139, no. 217; *ArchDelt* 1988 (vol. 43), 1, pl. 4B; Schefold and Jung 1989, 313 fig. 270; *MeditArch* 2004 (vol. 17), pl. 14.1-2; *BAD* 216956.

Youth seated on a stool in three-quarter to right in the center of the scene. He is naked except for a chlamys he sits on and which wraps around his left leg. He holds a spear in his right hand. Flanking him on the right is a female figure and on the left a standing youth.

Beazley described the scene as an “uncertain subject.” C. Dugas (1934) suggested the scene as the embassy to Skyros, with the central youth being Neoptolemos, his mother standing in front of him, and a Greek behind him. E. Simon (1963, 58 note 74) saw the seated youth as Orestes flanked by Iphigeneia and Pylades in Tauris. She supported her identification by arguing that Orestes was linked with the second day of the Anthesteria when choes were used (*IT* 949ff). In reference to the female figure, Schefold and Jung (1989, 314) suggest “eher Elektra als Iphigenie oder Briseis.”

TAU 69. Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 1842 (Fig. 250)

Lucanian nestoris.

Attributed to the Brooklyn-Budapest Painter.

400-375 BC.

References: *CFSTL* 20.

A.) Iphigeneia in Tauris? A woman (Iphigeneia?) stands beneath a structure with Ionic columns in front of a door. She is flanked on either side by a youth. They are naked except for petasos, chlamys, and boots; they carry spears. Behind each youth on a higher level is a woman watching the scene.

B.) Illegible.

TAU 70. Capua, Museo Campano 7559 (P. 14) (Figs. 251a-b)

Campanian column amphora. Attributed to the Painter of Carlsruhe B 2400.

c. 325-300 BC.

References: *LIMC* 31; *LCS* 331, 757.

Recognition of Orestes, Pylades and Iphigeneia (Schauenburg 1956, 86 note 80)? A youth in chiton with long sleeves, himation, and shoes, sits to left on a chair covered with an animal skin. His head is turned downward with his right hand raised to his chin and his left hand holding his scabbard. In front of him stands

another youth, naked except for pilos, chlamys and boots, who gestures towards him with his right hand. A woman stands behind the seated youth, also facing left. She wears a high belted peplos, long veil, bracelets and shoes. The woman places her right hand on the seated youth's left shoulder. In the background, the bust and hands of an Erinyes are visible from behind a hill.

Reliefs:

TAU 71. Brauron, Museum 1180. So-called Götterrelief (Figs. 252a-b)

Fragments of a marble relief. From Brauron.

Follower of Pheidias? (see Neumann, *Probleme* 62; Kahil 1983, 235, 244 note 11).
c. 420 BC

References: *LIMC* 33; Kahil 1983; Venit 2003; Despinis 2005.

“The Relief of the Gods.” Seated on the left side is a bearded male figure draped from the waist. Standing in front of him are three figures: a partially draped youth between two women. The woman to right of the youth appears to be moving to left, her arms outstretched. Holes in her hands reveal that she held objects, now lost. The relief is broken on the right side, at which just the hooves of two animals are visible. The relief has traditionally been seen as representing, from left to right: Zeus—Leto—Apollo—Artemis (Themelis 1971).

Kahil (1990, 114-5) identified the figures as Zeus—Leto—Apollo—Iphigeneia/Hekate. The figure of Iphigeneia/Hekate would probably have held a torch in each hand. A fragment of another head associated with the relief, Brauron Museum 1179, adds the head of another figure, which Kahil identified as Artemis. Kahil has suggested that the figure of Artemis drives the chariot drawn by stags, the front hooves of which are visible at the right break.

Venit (2003) has argued that the relief depicts the founding of the sanctuary. She accepts Kahil's identification of the three standing figures on the relief as Leto, Apollo, and Iphigeneia (rather than Iphigeneia/Hekate), but believes the seated bearded male is the eponymous hero Brauron, a topographical personification. In addition, Venit believes that the figure of Artemis in the chariot represented the “syncretic form of statue and deity.” In Venit's reconstruction, Iphigeneia led the chariot of stags, holding the reins in her hands, while Artemis was passively riding in rather than driving the chariot. The subject would then depict Iphigeneia bringing Artemis, the cult statue and goddess, to Brauron, a tradition recorded by Pausanias (1.33.1).

Despinis (2005) argues that the chariot conveyed Iphigeneia and Orestes bringing the cult statue of Artemis from Tauris to Brauron.

TAU 72. Izmir, Archaeological Museum 1002 (Figs. 253a-c)

Fragment of a relief from Pergamon.

2nd-1st century BC.

References: *LIMC* 28; Ridgway 2000, 85.

Orestes and Pylades as prisoners in Tauris before Iphigeneia (Kleiner 1956)? The fragmentary relief, broken on three sides, preserves parts of five figures. Two youths, nude except for chlamydes worn down their backs, are accompanied by two cuirassed warriors. Each youth stands with his hands tied behind his back, or in the process of having his hands bound or unbound by the warrior behind him. The best preserved figure is the youth standing frontally, who is probably Orestes. Behind him is the cuirass of the warrior standing behind him. To left of these figures are the other prisoner (Pylades?) and a warrior, both in profile to right. On the other side of the frontal youth, at the right break of the relief slab, is part of a female figure wearing a long garment, who might be Iphigeneia. Once thought to be part of the Telephos frieze because of its close stylistic affinities, although not of the right size, Kleiner suggested Orestes, Pylades, and Iphigeneia in Tauris, evoking Euripides' *IT* 1204.

ETRUSCAN

Urns:

TAU 73. Present location unknown (Fig. 254)

Alabaster urn. From Chiusi.

First half of the second-century BC.

References: *LIMC* 23; Steuernagel 1998, 194, cat. no. 51.

Iphigeneia in Tauris. Preparation for the sacrifice of Orestes and Pylades. Similar to IPH 33. Orestes and Pylades sit back to back on an altar festooned with garlands. Orestes (?), on the left, is bearded and sits with his right hand to his head. The two companions are flanked on either side by a draped female figure holding a knife. Iphigeneia is probably the woman on the left side, gesturing to Orestes with her right hand. Behind the figures is a larger altar upon which are two severed heads.

Mirrors:

TAU 74. Berlin. (Fig. 255)

Bronze mirror.

Uncertain date.

References: Gerhard 1862/1974, vol. 2 pl. CCXXXIX; vol. 3, p. 222-3.

Orestes, Pylades, and Iphigeneia in Tauris? Two youths sit back to back on an altar on top of which is a cult statue of a female divinity. The youths are naked except for mantles and shoes. One on the left holds onto his spears with both hands. The one on the right clasps the cult statue, resting his hand on the statue's neck and shoulder. He holds up his mantle with his left hand. On the far right a female figure, face in profile to left, watches the scene. She wears a peplos,

earring and necklace, and raises her right hand in the air, palm open, behind the youth's head, while her left arm hangs at her side. Two lines over her eye denote a furrowed brow, and the outer corner of her lip curves slightly downward. The pediment of a temple is seen in the background behind the figures' heads.

TAU 75. Perugia, Museo Nazionale (Fig. 256)

Bronze mirror with handle.

Uncertain date.

References: Gerhard 1884-1897/1974, vol. 5, p. 154, pl. 117.

Orestes, Pylades and Iphigeneia in Tauris? Similar to IPH 140. Two youths sit back to back on an altar, but there is no cult statue as on IPH 140. Both youths are nude, except for the mantle draped over the arm of the youth on the right. The youth on the left does not hold his spears as on IPH 140, but places his hands on his right knee. Armor hangs in the background, including a scabbard, spears, and a greave. A woman stands on the far right, as on IPH 140, but she is nude except for a mantle pulled around her waist. She holds a scabbard in her right hand. The pediment and part of two columns of the temple can be seen in the background.

Gems:

TAU 76. London, British Museum 950 (Fig. 257a-b)

Sard scarab. Italian.

Late fourth—early third century BC.

References: *LIMC*, Iphigeneia in Etruria 24; Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, fig. 348.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes led as a prisoner before Iphigeneia. A bearded man in a long garment leads Orestes, who is naked, his right hands held by the man behind his back. Iphigeneia touches Orestes' arm with her right hand, and she holds a scourge with a foliate spray in her right.

TAU 77. Unknown (Fig. 258)

Glass paste. Italian.

Fourth century BC?

References: Furtwängler 1965, 105 cat. no. 52, pl. XXI, 52.

Preparations for sacrifice of Orestes and Pylades in Tauris? In the center is an altar, behind which is a woman and a bearded man. On either side of the altar is a kneeling youth. The youths are naked, and they face the altar, their hands tied behind their backs.

Paintings:

TAU 78. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Cubiculum M, Villa of Publius Fannius Synistor, Boscoreale (Figs. 259a-f)

Second Style mural paintings.

c. 50-40 BC.

References: *LIMC*, II, 1, p. 810, no. 45 and pl. 597; Barnabei 1901; Lehmann 1953, Chapter III; Winkes 1973; Andrae 1975; Fittschen 1975; Thompson 1982; Anderson 1987, 17-25; Sauron 1994, 417-430, and pl. XXVIII-XXIX, XXXV, XXXVIII; Leach 2004, 78, fig. 56; Kleiner 2007, 44, fig. 3-22.

E. Simon (*LIMC*) has identified the statue of the goddess in the central panel of the left triptych as Artemis Tauropolos, and the figure facing her in the central panel of the opposite wall as Iphigeneia making a sacrifice to Artemis in the sanctuary at Tauris.

G. Sauron (1994) agrees with Simon's identification of the figures, but suggests that the setting is not Tauris, but Brauron. Furthermore, he identifies the Iphigeneia figure as doubled with an aspect of Artemis Ethiopia. Sauron's interpretation is based on an epigram of Antipater in the *Greek Anthology*, the swags of fabric decorating the piers on either side of the statues, the African facial features of Iphigeneia, and the connection with vase-paintings from Brauron.

TAU 79. Oplontis, Villa of Poppaea, cubiculum 11, *in situ* (Figs. 260a-b)

Second Style mural painting.

c. 50-40 BC.

References: Bergmann 2002; Sauron 1994, 424, pl. XXXIX, XL.

Sauron identifies the figure from the northern alcove as a statue of Iphigeneia-Artemis *Aethopia*. The goddess at Oplontis being the counterpart to the depiction of the same figure from cubiculum M of the Villa of P. Fannius Synistor, Boscoreale (IPH 134 bis), and by the same painter or workshop.

TAU 80. Ephesus, house 2, *in situ* (Fig. 261)

Fragment of a wall painting.

Second half of the second-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 64.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia and Thoas? Ruined. An inscription gives [ΦΙΓΕ] ΝΕΙΑ, which might identify the scene as an illustration of Euripides' *IT*. Parts of two figures are visible. On the left side, the upper part of a draped and veiled figure (Iphigeneia?) is preserved. On the right side, the head and lower legs of a male figure (Thoas?) remain. He wears a tragic mask seen in profile to right. A third figure may have appeared between the two.

TAU 81. Pompeii VI 9, 6-7 (Casa dei Dioscuri), destroyed (Fig. 262)

Lost wall painting.

Neronian (54-68 AD).

References: *LIMC* 63; E. Gerhard, *AZ* (1949), pl. 7; Bielfeldt 2005, 249, fig. 81 (given as XI 9, 6-7).

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Iphigeneia with Orestes and Pylades? Iphigeneia, between Orestes and Pylades, stands frontally, looking out to the right. She holds the cult statue in her left hand, and a piece of drapery of her garments in her left. Both youths are nude except for mantles worn down their backs and boots, and both hold a spear in one hand. The youth at left holds a patera and the youth at right the hilt of his sword in the other hand.

TAU 82. Castellammare di Stabia, Varano hill, Villa Arianna, site (3) (Fig. 263)

Fragments of a wall painting.

Neronian. Second half of the second-century AD.

References: Pesce 2004.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes led as a prisoner before Iphigeneia? Fragments preserve only parts of a standing, bound youth, naked except for a chlamys draped over one shoulder. An adjacent fresco depicted Hippolytus.

Reliefs:**TAU 83. Šempeter-Celeia, Tomb of the Prisciani, inv. 2, in situ** (Fig. 78) [same monument as IPH 83]

Marble relief. In Slovenia.

Between the beginning of the second-century and the mid-third century AD.

References: *LIMC* 86.

SEE IPH 83 . Iphigeneia (?) at Aulis or Tauris (?).

Gems:**TAU 84. Berlin, Antiquarium** (Fig. 264)

Brown glass paste. From Italy.

Third—second century BC.

References: Furtwängler 1896, 83 no. 1395, pl. 15; Philippart 1925, 15 no. 20.

Iphigeneia(?) stands frontally, wearing a girded chiton and himation. She holds a cult statue in her left hand and her right arm is extended out to her side. Behind her to left is an ionic column.

TAU 85. Göttingen, Univ. G 425 (Not published)

Black stone.

Beginning of the first-century AD.

References: *LIMC* 55.

Iphigeneia in Tauris: Orestes and Pylades led as prisoners before Iphigeneia? The youths' hands are tied behind their backs. Iphigeneia points a hand at their faces.

Coins:**TAU 86. Paris 1033** (Fig. 265a-b)

Bronze Roman provincial coin. Issued by Philadelphia in Lydia (modern Alaşehir, Turkey).

AD 249-51 (reign of Trajan Decius).

References: Burrell 2005 (with bibliography; translations below are Burrell's).

Obverse: Bust of Trajan Decius right. Inscription: AYT K Γ KY TPAIANOX ΔEKIOX ("Emperor Caesar Gaius Quintus Trajanus Decius").

Reverse: A woman holding a statue in the center, moving to left towards a distyle temple in three-quarter view. She looks over her shoulder at two youths behind her, both nude except for cloaks. Inscription: ΕΠ ΑΥΡ ΡΟΥΦΕΙΝΟΥ ΑΡΧ: ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΚ ΕΦΕΧΙΩΝ ("Under Aurelius Rufinus, archon; concord of Philadelphians, temple-wardens, of Ephesians").

Burrell identifies the subject on the reverse of this coin as Iphigeneia with Orestes and Pylades bringing the cult statue of Artemis to its new home in Philadelphia after fleeing from Tauris.

Two additional examples of this coin are known: *SNG Righetti* 1065 and Rome 11 2094G (Burrell 2005, 224 a and c).

Selected Bibliography

Ancient Authors and Works

Aelian. *De Natura Animalium*. 3 vols. Translated by A.F. Scholfield. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971-2.

_____. *Varia Historia*. Edited by M.R. Dilts. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1974.

Aeschylus. *Agamemnon*. Translated by Herbert Weir Smyth. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Aithiopsis. Poetae Epici Graeci 1, edited by A. Bernabé. Leipzig, 1987. Corrected edition 1996.

Apollodorus. *The Library*. 2 vols. Translated by Sir James George Frazer. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.

Aristotle. *History of Animals*.

_____. *Peri Gynaikeion*.

Catullus. *Poem 64*. In *Catullus, Poems 61-68*. Translated by John Godwin. Warminster, England: Aris and Phillips, 1995.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Orator*. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

_____. *Tusculan Disputations*. Translated by J.E. King. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Demosthenes. *Funeral Speech*. Translated by Norman W. DeWitt and Norman J. DeWitt. Vol. 7, Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Diodorus Siculus. Books XIX.66-110 and XX. Translated by Russel M. Geer. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Euripides. *Children of Herakles*. Translated by David Kovacs. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

_____. *Erechtheus*. Translated by M. Cropp. In *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays I*, edited by C. Collard et al., 148-94. Warminster, 1995.

_____. *Hecuba*. Translated by David Kovacs. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

_____. *Ion*. Translated by David Kovacs. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

- _____. *Iphigenia at Aulis*. Translated by David Kovacs. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- _____. *Iphigenia Among the Taurians*. Translated by David Kovacs. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Trojan Women*. Translated by David Kovacs. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- The Greek Anthology*. 5 vols. Translated by W. R. Paton. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916-18.
- Herodotus. *The Histories*. 4 vols. Translated by A.D. Godley. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1922-38.
- Hesiod. *Catalogue of Women*. In *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, edited by R. Merkelbach and M.L. West. Fragments 1-245 (p. 1-120). Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
- Hesiod, Homeric Hymns, Epic Cycle, and Homerica*. Translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936.
- Homer. *Iliad*. Translated by Richmond Lattimore. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- _____. *The Odyssey*. Translated by Richmond Lattimore. New York: HarperCollins, 1965. Reprint, Perennial Classics, 1999.
- Hyginus. *Fabulae*. In *The Myths of Hyginus*. Translated by Mary Grant. Lawrence: University of Kansas Publications, 1960.
- Kypria. Poetae Epici Graeci 1*, edited by A. Bernabé. Leipzig, 1987.
- La Vita Homeri et les sommaires du Cycle. Texte et traduction*. Vol. 4, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proklos*, edited by A. Severyns. Paris, 1963.
- Libanius. *Progymnasmata, Argumenta, Orationum Demosthenicarum*. Edited by Richardus Foerster. Vol. VIII. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1963.
- Little Iliad. Poetae Epici Graeci 1*, edited by A. Bernabé. Leipzig, 1987.
- Lycurgus. *Against Leocrates*. Translated by J.O. Burt. In *Minor Attic Orators*. Vol. 2. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941-54.
- Lykophron. *Lykophronis Alexandra*, edited by L. Mascialino. Leipzig, 1964.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. 2 vols. Translated by Frank Justus Miller. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Translated by W.H.S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918-35.

- Petronius. *Satyricon*. Translated by William Arrowsmith. New York: New American Library, 1959.
- Philostratus (Flavius). *Vita Apollonius*. In *Flavii Philostrati Opera* 1, edited by C.L. Kayser. Leipzig, 1870.
- Pliny. *Natural History*. 10 vols. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1938-63.
- Plutarch. "On the Bravery of Women." Translated by F.C. Babbitt. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*. 4 vols. Translated by H.E. Butler. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921-2.
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Troades*. Translated by Elaine Fantham. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Sophocles. *Antigone*. Translated by Robert Fagles. New York: Penguin Books, 1984.
- _____. *Fragments*. Translated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Stesichoros. *Poetae Melici Graeci*, edited by D. L. Page. Oxford, 1962.

Works of Modern Scholarship

- Adolf, Helen. 1951. "The Essence and Origin of Tragedy." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 10, no. 2 (December): 112-25.
- Ahlberg-Cornell, Gudrun. 1992. *Myth and Epos in Early Greek Art, Representation and Interpretation*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology vol. C. Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Akamatis, Ioannis. 1993. Πήλινες μήτρες αγγείων από την Πέλλα. Συμβολή στη μελέτη της ελληνιστικής κεραμικής. "Αρχαιολογικού Δελτίου" 51. Athens: Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.
- Albenda, Pauline. 1987. "Woman, Child, and Family: Their Imagery in Assyrian Art." In *La Femme dans le Proche-Orient Antique: Compte Rendu de la XXXIII Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Paris, 7-10 juillet 1986)*, 17-21. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Albini, U. 1983. "L'Ifigenia in Tauride e la fine del mito." *PP* 38: 105-12.
- Alexiou, M. and P. Dronke. 1971. "The Lament for Jephtha's Daughter: Themes, Traditions and Originality." *Studi Medievali* 12: 819-863.
- Alfieri, Nereo. 1979. *Spina, Museo archeologico nazionale di Ferrara, 1*. Bologna: Calderini.
- Allen, Graham. 2000. *Intertextuality*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Althaus, Frank, and Mark Sutcliffe, eds. 2006. *The Road to Byzantium: Luxury Arts of Antiquity*. Exh. cat. Fontanka Publishers.
- Anderson, Maxwell L. 1987. *Pompeian Frescoes*. Reprinted from *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* (Winter 1987/1988).
- Anderson, Michael J. 1997. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1995. "Onesimos and the Interpretation of the Ilioupersis Iconography." *JHS* 115: 130-5.
- Andreae, B. 1975. "Rekonstruktion des grossen Oecus der Villa des P. Fannius Synistor in Boscoreale." In *Neue Forschungen in Pompeji und den anderen vom Vesuvausbruch 79 n. Chr. verschütteten Städten*, edited by B. Andreae and H. Kyrieleis, 71-92. Recklinghausen.
- Aretz, Susanne. 1999. *Die Opferung der Iphigeneia in Aulis: Die Rezeption des Mythos in antiken und modernen Dramen*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 131. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Armstrong, D., and E.A. Ratchford. 1985. "Iphigeneia's Veil: Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 228-48." *BICS* 32: 1-12.

- Arnheim, M.T.W. 1977. *Aristocracy in Greek Society*. Aspects of Greek and Roman Life. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Ashmole, Bernard. 1964. "Iphigeneia in Tauris." In *Essays in Memory of Karl Lehmann*, edited by Lucy Freeman Sandler, 25-6. New York: Institute of Fine Arts, New York University.
- Asquith, Helen. 2005. "From Genealogy to *Catalogue*: The Hellenistic Adaptation of the Hesiodic Catalogue Form." In *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*, edited by Richard Hunter, 266-286. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Avramidou, Amalia. 2006. "Attic Vases in Etruria: Another View on the Divine Banquet Cup by the Codrus Painter." *AJA* 110: 565-79.
- Bagnall, R. 1995. "Women, Law, and Social Realities in Late Antiquity: A Review Article." *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 32: 81-2.
- Bahrani, Zainab. 2001. *Women of Babylon: Gender and Representation in Mesopotamia*. New York: Routledge.
- Bailie, Gil. 1994. "Sacrificial Violence in Homer's *Iliad*." In *Curing Violence*, edited by M.I. Wallace and T.H. Smith, 45-70. Forum Fascicules 3. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge.
- Baratte, F., and C. Metzger. 1985. *Catalogue des sarcophages en pierre d'époques romaine et paléochrétienne, Musée du Louvre*. Paris: Ministère de la culture, Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux.
- Barbet, Alix. 1985. *La peinture murale romaine: les styles décoratifs pompéiens*. Paris: Picard.
- Barnabei, F. 1901. *La villa pompeiana di P. Fannio Sinistore*. Rome.
- Barriello, M.R., M. Lista, U. Pappalardo, V. Sampaolo, C. Ziviello. 1986. *Le Collezioni del Museo Nazionale di Napoli*.
- Barthes, Roland. 1966. "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives." In *A Barthes Reader* (1982), edited by Susan Sontag, 251-95. New York: Hill and Wang.
- _____. 1956. "Myth Today." In *A Barthes Reader* (1982), edited by Susan Sontag, 93-149. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Baskin, L. 1982. *Leonard Baskin: Sculpture and Watercolors, April 1 to April 23, 1982*. Exh. cat. New York: Kennedy Galleries.
- Bassett, Sarah Guberti. 1996. "*Historiae custos*: Sculpture and Tradition in the Baths of Zeuxippos." *AJA* 100: 491-506.

- Bassi, Karen. 1999. *Acting Like Men: Gender, Drama, and Nostalgia in Ancient Greece*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Battaglia, Gabriella Bordenache. 1979. *Le Ciste Prenestine*. Florence: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche.
- Beazley, J.D. 1971. *Paralipomena: Additions to Attic Black-figure Vase-painters and to Attic Red-figure Vase-painters*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1963. *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1956. *Attic Black-figure Vase-painters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1954. "A Cup by Hieron and Makron." *Bull. Vereen.* 29: 12-15.
- _____. 1943. "Groups of Campanian Red-figure." *JHS* 63: 66-111.
- Beckwith, John. 1962. *The Veroli Casket*. London: Victoria and Albert Museum.
- Behen, J. 1995. "Who Watches the Watchmen? The Spectator's Role in Roman Painting." *AJA* 99: 346.
- Benton, Cindy. 2002. "Split Vision: The Politics of the Gaze in Seneca's *Troades*." In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, edited by David Fredrick, 31-56. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bérard, Claude. 1989. "The Order of Women." In Bérard et al., eds, *City of Images*, 89-108.
- _____. 1983. "Iconographie, iconologie, iconologique." *Etudes de Lettres* 4: 5-37.
- Bérard, Claude, Christiane Bron, Jean-Louis Durand, Françoise Frontisi-Ducroux, François Lissarrague, Alain Schnapp, and Jean-Pierre Vernant. 1989. *A City of Images: Iconography and Society in Ancient Greece*. Translated by Deborah Lyons. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bérard, C., C. Bron, and A. Pomari, eds. 1987. *Images et société en grece ancienne. L'iconographie comme méthode d'analyse*. Actes du Colloque international, Lausanne 8-11 février 1984. Cahiers d'Archeologie Romande 36. Lausanne: Université de Lausanne.
- Bergmann, Bettina. 1999. "Rhythms of Recognition: Mythological Encounters in Roman Landscape Painting". In *Im Spiegel des Mythos. Bilderwelt und Lebenswelt / Lo specchio del mito. Immaginario e realtà*, 81-107. Symposium, Rome 19-20 February 1998. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- _____. 1996. "The Pregnant Moment: Tragic Wives in the Roman Interior." In *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy*, edited by Natalie Boymel Kampen, 199-218. Cambridge Studies in New Art History and Criticism, edited by Norman Bryson. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- _____. 1994. "The Roman House as Memory Theater: The House of the Tragic Poet in Pompeii." *ArtB* 76: 225-56.
- Bergmann, Bettina, and Christine Kondoleon, eds. 1999. *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*. Washington, D.C: National Gallery of Art; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Berti, F., and P.G. Guzzo, eds. 1993. *Spina, Storia di una citta tra Greci ed Etruschi*. Ferrara.
- Bethe, E. 1896. "Der Berliner Andromeda-krater." *JdI* 11: 292-300.
- Bevilacqua, G. 1978-9. *BullCom* 86: 39-46, pl. 16, 18-9.
- Bianchi Bandinelli, Ranuccio. 1971. *Rome the Late Empire. Roman Art A.D. 200-400*. Translated by Peter Green. New York: George Braziller.
- _____. 1925. "Clusium. La Collezione E. Bonci Casuccini." *MonAnt.* 30: 521-552.
- Bielfeldt, Ruth. 2005. *Orestes auf römischen Sarkophagen*. (Diss., University of Munich, 2001). Germany: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Blamires, David. 1971. *David Jones. Artist and Writer*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Blázquez Martínez, J.M., G. Lopez Monteagudo, M.L. Neira Jimenez, and M.P. San Nicolas Pedraz. 1986. "La Mitologia en los Mosaicos Hispano-Romanos." *ArEspArq* 59: 101-34.
- Blok, J., and P. Mason, eds. 1987. *Sexual Asymmetry: Studies in Ancient Society*. Amsterdam.
- Blundell, Sue, and Nancy Rabinowitz. 2005. "Gendered Viewing in Classical Greece." Paper delivered at the conference "Seeing the Past: Building Knowledge of the Past and Present Through Acts of Seeing" (February 4-6, 2005). Archaeology Center at Stanford University.
- Boardman, John. 2001. *The History of Greek Vases. Potters, Painters and Pictures*. Thames and Hudson.
- _____. 1995. *Greek Sculpture. The Late Classical Period*. Thames and Hudson.
- _____. 1993. *The Oxford History of Classical Art*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1990. "The Greek Art of Narrative." In *EYMOYΣΙΑ: Ceramic and Iconographic Studies in Honor of Alexander Cambitoglou*, edited by Jean-Paul Descoedres, 57-62. Sydney: Meditarch.
- _____. 1989. *Athenian Red Figure Vases. The Classical Period. A Handbook*. Thames and Hudson.

- _____. 1989. "Herakles, Peisistratos and the Unconvinced." *JHS* 109: 158-9.
- _____. 1975. "Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis." *JHS* 95: 1-12.
- _____. 1972. "Herakles, Peisistratos and Sons." *RA*: 57-72.
- Boegehold, A.L. 1989. "A Signifying Gesture: Euripides, *Iphigeneia Taurica* 965-66." *AJA* 93: 81-3.
- Bonanno Aravantinos, Margherita. 1993. "Il mito di Ifigenia in Tauride sui sarcofagi attici di età romana." In G. Koch, *Grabeskunst der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, 67-76.
- Bonfante, Larissa. 2006. "Etruscan Inscriptions and Etruscan Religion." In de Grummond and Simon 2006, 9-26.
- _____. 1994. "Etruscan Women." In Fantham, et al. 1994, 243-259.
- _____. 1986. "Daily Life and Afterlife." In Bonfante, ed., 1986, 232-78.
- _____. 1984a. "Human Sacrifice on an Etruscan Urn in New York." *AJA* 88: 531-9.
- _____. 1984b. "Un'urna chiusina con têtes coupées à New York." In *Studi di Antichità in onore di G. Maetzke*. Rome.
- Bonfante, Larissa, ed. 1986. *Etruscan Life and Afterlife. A Handbook of Etruscan Studies*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Bonfante, L., and Judith Swaddling. 2006. *Etruscan Myths*. London: The British Museum Press.
- Bonnechère, P. Forthcoming. *Le système sacrificiel en Grèce ancienne: Le sacrifice humain entre l'imaginaire et la réalité sacrificielle*.
- _____. 1998. "La notion d' 'acte collectif' dans le sacrifice humain grec." *Phoenix* 52: 191-215.
- _____. 1997. "La πομπη sacrificielle des victims humaines en Grèce ancienne." *REA* 99: 63-89.
- _____. 1994. *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne*. Athens: Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique.
- _____. 1993. "Les indices archéologiques du sacrifice humain en question: compléments à une publication récente." *Kernos* 6: 23-55.
- Bonnefoy, Yves, ed. 1992. *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies*. Translated under the direction of Wendy Doniger. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boulter, C., ed. 1985. *Greek Art, Archaic into Classical*. Leiden.

- Bowra, C.M. 1961. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brelich, Angelo. 1969a. "Symbol of a Symbol." In *Myths and Symbols: Studies in Honor of Mircea Eliade*, edited by Joseph M. Kitagawa and Charles H. Long, 195-207. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1969b. *Paidēs e Parthenoi*. Incunabula Graeca, no. 36. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Bremmer, Jan N. 2002. "Sacrificing a Child in Ancient Greece: The Case of Iphigeneia." In *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations*, edited by Ed Noort and Eibert Tigchelaar. Themes in Biblical Narrative, Jewish and Christian Traditions, vol. IV. Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2000. "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece." In *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, edited by Richard Buxton, 271-293. New York: Oxford University Press. Originally published in *HSCP* 87 (1983): 299-320.
- Brendel, Otto J. 1995. *Etruscan Art*. Second edition. Pelican History of Art. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- _____. 1935. "Archäologische Funde." *AA* 50: cols. 552-556.
- Bridges, Emma, Edith Hall, and P.J. Rhodes, eds. 2007. *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Briguet, Marie-Françoise. 1986. "Art." In Bonfante, ed. 1986, 92-173.
- Brilliant, R. 1984. *Visual Narratives: Storytelling in Etruscan and Roman Art*. Ithaca, NY and London.
- Brommer, Frank. 1971-1976. *Denkmälerlisten zur griechischen Heldensage*. Marburg.
- _____. 1960. *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage*. 3rd ed. Marburg/Lahn.
- Broude, Norma, and Mary D. Garrard, eds. 2005. *Reclaiming Female Agency: Feminist Art History After Postmodernism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 2005. Introduction to *Reclaiming Female Agency: Feminist Art History After Postmodernism*, 1-26. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brulé, Pierre. 2003. *Women of Ancient Greece*. Translated by Antonia Nevill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Brunn, Enrico. 1870. *I rilievi delle urne etrusche*. Vol. 1. Rome: Coi Tipi del Salviucci for Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica.
- Bubel, Frank. 1991. *Euripides, Andromeda*. Palingenesia 34. Stuttgart: Steiner.

- Buettner, Brigitte. 1996. *Boccaccio's Des cleres et nobles femmes: Systems of Signification in an Illuminated Manuscript*. Seattle: College Art Association and University of Washington Press.
- Buitron-Oliver, D. 1995. *Douris: A Master-Painter of Athenian Red-Figure Vases*. Mainz.
- Bulas, Kazimiere. 1950. "New Illustrations to the Iliad." *AJA* 54: 112-118.
- Bulloch, Anthony, Erich S. Gruen, A.A. Long, and Andrew Stewart, eds. 1993. *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*. XII, Hellenistic Culture and Society, eds. A. Bulloch, E. Gruen, A. Long, and A. Stewart. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bundrick, Sheramy D. 2005. *Music and Image in Classical Athens*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Burgess, Jonathan S. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Burkert, Walter. 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*. Translated by Margaret E. Pinder and Walter Burkert. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Translated by John Raffan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Reprint, 2001.
- _____. 1983. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. Translated by Peter Bing. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1966. "Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual." *GRBS* 7: 87-121. (Revised as *Savage Energies. Lessons of Myth and Ritual in Ancient Greece*. Translated by P. Bing. Chicago, 2001: 1-21).
- Burrell, Barbara. 2005. "Iphigeneia in Philadelphia." *CA* 24 (October): 223-56.
- Calame, Claude. 2003. *Myth and History in Ancient Greece: The Symbolic Creation of a Colony*. Translated by Daniel W. Berman. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1977. *Les Choeurs de Jeunes Filles en Grèce Archaique*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo & Bizzarri. Translated into English, and revised, 2001, *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: Their Morphology, Religious Role and Social Functions*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

- Cambi, Nenad. 2003. "Stela iz župne crkve u Bjelovaru." *Rad. Inst. Povij. Umjet.* 27: 19-25.
- Cambiano, G., et al. 1992. *Lo spazio letterario della grecia antica*. Salerno.
- Cambitoglou, A. 1988. "Troilos Pursued by Achilles." In *Studies Webster*, edited by J.H. Betts, J.T. Hooker, and J.R. Green, 1-21.
- _____. 1968. *The Brygos Painter*. Sydney: Sydney University Press for the Australian Humanities Research Council.
- Canciani, F. 1984. *Bildkunst*. Archaeologia Homerica II, Kap. N, Teil 2. Göttingen.
- Carpenter, Thomas H. 1991. *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- _____. 1989. *Beazley Addenda: Additional References to ABV, ARV² and Paralipomena*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy.
- Carson, Anne. 1990. "Putting Her in Her Place: Woman, Dirt and Desire." In *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler, and Froma I. Zeitlin, 135-169. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carter, J.B., and S.P. Morris, eds. 1995. *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Castriota, D. 1992. *Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth-Century BC Athens*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Cavalier, O., ed. 1997. *Silence et Fureur: Le femme et le mariage en Grèce, Les antiquities grecques du Musée Calvet*. Avignon.
- CFST. Todisco, L., ed. 2003. *La ceramica figurate a soggetto tragico in Magna Grecia e in Sicilia*. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider.
- Chadwick, J., and M. Ventris. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chamay, Jacques. 1984. *Mythologie Grecque: La guerre de Troie*. Genève: Musée d'art et d'histoire.
- Chartier, Roger. 1997. *On the Edge of the Cliff: History, Language, and Practices*. Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Parallax, Re-visions of Culture and Society, edited by Stephen G. Nichols, Gerald Prince, and Wendy Steiner. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- _____. 1988. *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*. Translated by L. Cochrane. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Ciancio, Angela. n.d. (c. 1997). *Silbion: Una città tra Greci e Indigeni. La documentazione archeologica dal territorio di Gravina in Puglia dall'ottavo al quinto secolo a.C.* Bari: Levante Editori.
- Cimok, Faith, ed. 2005. *Mosaics of Antioch.* Istanbul: A Turizm Yayinlari.
- Clairmont, Christoph W. 1993. *Classical Attic Tombstones.* Kilchberg, Switzerland: Akanthus.
- _____. 1971. "Euripides' *Erechtheus* and the Erechtheum." *GRBS* 12: 485-93.
- _____. 1970. *Gravestone and Epigram: Greek Memorials from the Archaic and Classical Period.* Mainz on Rhine: Verlag P.V. Zabern.
- Clark, Andrew J., and Jasper Gaunt, eds. 2002. *Essays in Honor of Dietrich von Bothmer.* Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Museum.
- Clarke, John R. 2003. *Art in the Lives of Ordinary Romans: Visual Representation and Non-elite Viewers in Italy, 100 B.C.—A.D. 315.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1995. "Viewer and Voyeur in Neronian Painting." *AJA* 99: 332.
- Clement, P. 1958. "The Recovery of Helen." *Hesperia* 27: 47-73.
- _____. 1934. "New Evidence for the Origin of the Iphigeneia Legend." *AntCl* 3: 393-409.
- Clover, Carol J. 1992. *Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cohen, Beth, ed. 2006. *The Colors of Clay: Special Techniques in Athenian Vases.* Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum.
- _____. 2000. *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art.* Boston: Brill.
- Cole, Susan Guettel. 2004. *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space: The Ancient Greek Experience.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coleman, K.M. 1990. "Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments." *JRS* 80: 44-73.
- Collon, Dominique. 1987. *First Impressions: Cylinder Seals in the Ancient Near East.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Colonna, Giovanni. 2006. "Sacred Architecture and the Religion of the Etruscans." In de Grummond and Simon, 132-68.
- Comstock, M., A. Graves, E. Vermeule, and C. Vermeule. n.d. *The Trojan War in Greek Art, A Picture Book.* Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

- Connelly, Joan B. 2007. *Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1996. "Parthenon and Parthenoi: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze." *AJA* 100: 58-80.
- Cook, Elizabeth. 2006. "Iphigeneia's Wedding." In *Laughing With Medusa: Classical Myth and Feminist Thought*, ed. Vanda Zajko and Miriam Leonard, 399-410. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, R.M. 1987. "Pots and Pisistratan Propaganda." *JHS* 107: 167-9.
- _____. 1981. *Clazomenian Sarcophagi*. Forschungen zur Antiken Keramik. Kerameus 3. Mainz.
- Cornell, Tim, and Kathryn Lomas, eds. 1997. *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*. Volume 6. Accordia Specialist Studies on Italy, eds. Edward Herring, Ruth D. Whitehouse, and John B. Wilkins. London: Accordia Research Institute, University of London.
- Courby, Fernand. 1922. *Les vases grecs à reliefs*. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Crapanzano, V. 1986. "Hermes' Dilemma: The Masking of Subversion in Ethnographic Description." In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, edited by J. Clifford and G. Marcus, 51-76. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Cristofani, M. 1996. *Due testi dell'Italia Preromana*. Quaderni di Archeologia Etrusco-Italica 25. Rome.
- Croisille, J.-M. 1963. "Le sacrifice d'Iphigénie dans l'art romain et la littérature latine." *Latomus* 22: 209-225. .
- Cunningham, M.L. 1984. "Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 231-247." *BICS* 31: 9-12.
- Curtius, L. 1934. "Orest und Iphigenie in Tauris." *RM* 49: 247-94.
- Dalby, A. 1996. *Siren Feasts: A History of Food and Gastronomy in Greece*. London.
- D'Ambra, Eve. 2007. *Roman Women*. Cambridge Introduction to Roman Civilization. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1996. "The Calculus of Venus: Nude Portraits of Roman Matrons." In *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy*, edited by Natalie Boymel Kampen, 219-32. Cambridge Studies in New Art History and Criticism, edited by Norman Bryson. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- de Caro, Stefano. 1996. *The National Archaeological Museum of Naples*. Naples: Electa Napoli. Reprint, 2001.

- _____. 1984. "Ifigenia in Aulide su una brocca fittile da Pompei." *BollArte* 69: 39-50.
- Deacy, S. and K.F. Peirce, eds. 1997. *Rape in Antiquity*. London: Swansea; Duckworth: The Classical Press of Wales.
- de Angelis, Francesco. 1999. "Tragedie familiari. Miti greci nell'arte sepolcrale etrusca." In *Im Spiegel des Mythos. Bilderwelt und Lebenswelt / Lo specchio del mito. Immaginario e realtà*, 53-66. Symposium, Rome 19-20 February 1998. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- de Cesare, M. 1997. *Le statue in immagine, Studi sulle raffigurazioni di statue nella pittura vascolare greca*. Rome.
- de Grummond, Nancy Thomson. 2006. *Etruscan Myth, Sacred History, and Legend*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.
- de Grummond, Nancy Thomson, and Erika Simon, eds. 2006. *The Religion of the Etruscans*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- de Laurentis, Theresa. 1984. *Alice Doesn't*. Indiana University Press.
- Delivorrias, Angelos. 1996. "The Sculptures of the Parthenon: Form and Content." In *The Parthenon and its Impact in Modern Times*, edited by Panayotis Tournikiotis, 100-35. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.
- Demakopoulou, Katie and Dora Konsola. 1981. *Archaeological Museum of Thebes*. Athens: Archaeological Receipts Fund.
- Denoyelle, Martine. 1994. *Chefs-d'oeuvre de la céramique grecque dans les collections du Louvre*. Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux.
- Descoedres, Jean-Paul, ed. 1990. *EYMOYΣΙΑ: Ceramic and Iconographic Studies in Honor of Alexander Cambitoglou*. Sydney: Meditarch.
- Despinis, Giorgos I. 2005. "Iphigeneia und Orestes: Vorschläge zur Interpretation zweier Skulpturenfunde aus Brauron." *AM* 120: 241-267.
- Detienne, Marcel, and Jean-Pierre Vernant. 1979. *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*. Gallimard.
- Dillon, Matthew. 2002. *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*. New York: Routledge.
- Docter, Roald F., and Eric M. Moormann. 1999. *Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Amsterdam, July 12-17, 1998. Classical Archaeology towards the Third Millennium: Reflections and Perspectives*. Allard Pierson Series, vol. 12, Studies in Ancient Civilization, edited by H.A.G. Brijder. Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Series.

- Dougherty, Carol and Leslie Kurke, eds. 2003. *The Cultures Within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1993. *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dougherty, Carol and Leslie Kurke. 1993. Introduction to *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Doherty, Lillian. 2006. "Putting the Women Back into the *Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*." In *Laughing With Medusa: Classical Myth and Feminist Thought*, ed. Vanda Zajko and Miriam Leonard, 297-325. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Donlan, Walter. 1980. *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece*. Reprint, Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1999. (references to page numbers in reprint edition)
- Dohrn, T. 1937. *Die schwarzfigurigen etruskischen Vasen*.
- Doty, William G. 1986. *Mythography: The Study of Myths and Rituals*. Birmingham, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Dowden, Ken. 1995. "Approaching Women Through Myth: Vital Tool or Self-Delusion?" In Richard Hawley and Barbara Levick, eds., *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments*. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 1989. *Death and the Maiden: Girls' Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dragendorff, Hans. 1935. "Arretina." *SbHeidelb* 1935/36: 9-16.
- Dräger, P. 1997. *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen Hesiods*. Palingenesia 61. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Draycott, Catherine. Forthcoming. *Images and Identities in the Funerary Art of Western Anatolia, 600-450 BC: Phrygia, Hellespontine Phrygia, Lydia*. D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University (Wolfson College).
- _____. Unpublished. *The Polyxena Sarcophagus, from the Granicus Plain in the Troad*. M.Phil. thesis, Oxford University (Wolfson College), 2001.
- duBois, Paige. 1996. "Archaic Bodies-in-Pieces." In *Sexuality in Ancient Art*, edited by N.B. Kampen, 55-64. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1993. "Sewing the Bodies: Metaphors of the Female Body in Ancient Greece." In *Ritual, Power, and the Body: Historical Perspectives on the Presentation of Greek Women*, edited by C. Nadia Seremetakis. New York: Pella.
- _____. 1988. *Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Duby, G. and M. Perrot, eds. 1991. *Histoire des femmes*. Plon.
- Dué, Casey. 2006. *The Captive Woman's Lament in Greek Tragedy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Dugas, Charles. 1934. "L'ambassade à Skyros: Oenochoé de la collection Vlasto." *BCH* 58: 281-90.
- Duhn, F. von. 1913. "Zur Deutung des klazomenischen Sarkophags in Leiden." *JdI* 28: 272-3.
- Durand, J.-L. 1986. *Sacrifice et labour en Grèce ancienne*. Paris: Découverte; Rome: Ecole française de Rome.
- Durand, Jean-Marie, ed. 1987. *La Femme dans le Proche-Orient Antique: Compte Rendu de la XXXIII Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Paris, 7-10 juillet 1986)*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Easterling, P.A., ed. 1997. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge.
- Eck, Beth A. 2003. "Men are Much Harder: Gendered Viewing of Nude Images." *Gender and Society* 17 (October): 691-710.
- _____. 2001. "Nudity and Framing: Classifying Art, Pornography, Information, and Ambiguity." *Sociological Forum* 16 (4): 603-32.
- Elia, Olga. 1957. *Pitture di Stabia*. Naples: Banco di Napoli.
- Elsner, Jaś. 2007. *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1998. *Imperial Rome and Christian Triumph: The Art of the Roman Empire AD 100-450*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1995. *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Elsner, John. 1996. "Image and Ritual: Reflections on the Religious Appreciation of Classical Art." *The Classical Quarterly* 46: 515-531.
- Erdélyi, Gizella. 1950. "Pannoniai Romai Sirtablak Mitologiai Jelenetekkel." *ArchErt* 77: 72-84. Summary in French (p. 82-4), with title, "Stèles romains Pannoniens ornés de scènes mythologiques."
- Ervin, Miriam. 1963. "A Relief Pithos from Mykonos." *ArchDelt* 18: 37-75.
- Ervin-Caskey, Miriam. 1976. "Notes on Relief Pithoi of the Tenian-Boeotian Group." *AJA* 80: 19-41.
- Espérandieu, E. 1907. *Recueil général des bas-reliefs, etc. de la Gaule romaine*.

- Falconi Amorelli, M.T. 1976. *ArchCl* 28: 237 ff.
- Fantham, Elaine, and Helene Peet Foley, Natalie Boymel Kampen, Sarah B. Pomeroy, and H.A. Shapiro. 1994. *Women in the Classical World. Image and Text*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Faraone, Christopher A. 2003. "Playing the Bear and the Fawn for Artemis: Female Initiation or Substitute Sacrifice?" In *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives*, edited by David B. Dodd and Christopher A. Faraone, 43-68. New York: Routledge.
- Farge, Arlette, and Michelle Perrot. 1992. "Au-delà du regard des hommes," *Le Monde des Débats* 2: 20-1.
- Farnell, L.R. 1921. *Greek Hero Cults and the Idea of Immortality*. Oxford.
- Ferrari, Gloria. 2003. "Myth and Genre on Athenian Vases." *CA* 22: 37-54.
- _____. 2002. *Figures of Speech: Men and Maidens in Ancient Greece*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fischer-Hansen, Tobias. 1976. "Yet Another Human Sacrifice?" In *Studia Romana In Honorem Petri Krarup Septuagenarii*, 20-7. Odense: Odense University Press.
- Fittschen, K. 1969. *Untersuchungen zum Beginn der Sagedarstellungen bei den Griechen*. Berlin.
- Foley, Helene P. 2001. *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1985. *Ritual Irony: Poetry and Sacrifice in Euripides*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 1982. "Marriage and Sacrifice in Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis*." *Arethusa* 15: 159-80.
- Fontenoy, C. 1950. "Le sacrifice nuptial de Polyxène." *AntCl* 19: 383-96.
- Forbes Irving, P.M.C. 1990. *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foxhall, Lin. 1996. "Women's Ritual and Men's Work in Ancient Athens." In *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments*, edited by R. Hawley and B. Levick, 97-110. London: Routledge.
- Francis, E.D., and Vickers M. 1990. *Image and Idea in Fifth Century Greece: Art and Literature after the Persian Wars*. New York and London: Routledge.

- Frankfort, Henri. 1996. *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*. 5th edition. Pelican History of Art. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fraser, P.M. and E. Matthews, eds. 1987-2005. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. 4 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fittschen, K. 1975. "Zum Figurenfries der Villa von Boscoreale." In *Neue Forschungen in Pompeji und den anderen vom Vesuvausbruch 79 n. Chr. verschütteten Städten*, edited by B. Andreae and H. Kyrieleis, 93-100. Recklinghausen.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, Françoise, and Jean-Paul Vernant. 1997. *Dans l'oeil du miroir*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Frankfort, H.. 1939. *Cylinder Seals: A Documentary Essay on the Art and Religion of the Ancient Near East*. London: MacMillan and Company.
- Frazer, Sir James G. 1911-15. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. 12 vols. London: Macmillan and Company.
- Fredrick, David, ed. 2002. *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- _____. 2002. "Introduction: Invisible Rome." In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, 1-30. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- _____. 1995. "Beyond the Atrium to Ariadne: Erotic Painting and Visual Pleasure in the Roman House." *CA* 14: 266-288.
- Freyer-Schauenburg, B. 1988. "Zur Artemis-Iphigenie-Gruppe." In *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für klassische Archäologie*, 382-4. Berlin.
- _____. 1984-1997. "Iphigenie und Artemis." In *Festschrift Akurgal*, edited by C. Bayburtluoğlu. *Anadolu* 23: 37-56.
- Friis Johansen, K. 1967. *The Iliad in Early Greek Art*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Froning, Heide. 1981. *Marmor-Schmuckreliefs mit Griechischen Mythen im 1. Jh. V. Chr.: Untersuchungen zu Chronologie und Funktion*. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- _____. 1980. "Die Ikonographische Tradition der Kaiserzeitlichen Mythologischen Sarkophagreliefs." *JdI* 95: 322-41.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, Françoise, and Jean-Paul Vernant. 1997. *Dans l'oeil du miroir*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Furtwängler, Adolf. 1900. *Die antiken Gemmen*. 3 volumes. Berlin, Reprint, Amsterdam: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert, 1964.
- _____. 1896. *Beschreibung der geschnittenen Steine im Antiquarium*. Berlin: Verlag Von W. Spemann.

- Gantz, Timothy. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. 2 vols. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Garland, Robert. 1989. "The Well-Ordered Corpse: An Investigation into the Motivation Behind Greek Funerary Legislation." *BICS* 36: 1-15.
- _____. 1985. *The Greek Way of Death*. 2nd ed. London: Duckworth. Reprint, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Garrard, Mary D. "Artemisia's Hands." In *Reclaiming Female Agency: Feminist Art History After Postmodernism*, edited by Broude and Garrard, 63-80. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Garrison, Elise P. 2000. "Suicidal Females in Greek and Roman Mythology: A Catalogue." Online. *Διοτῆς μῦθος: Materials for the Study of Women and Gender in the Ancient World*. www.stoa.org/diotima/essays/garrison_catalogue.shtml.
- _____. 1995. *Groaning Tears: Ethical and Dramatic Aspects of Suicide in Greek Tragedy*. New York: Brill.
- _____. 1991. "Attitudes Toward Suicide in Ancient Greece." *TAPA* 121: 1-34.
- Gazda, Elaine K, ed. 2002. *The Ancient Art of Emulation: Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- _____. 1991. *Roman Art in the Private Sphere: New Perspectives on the Architecture and Decor of the Domus, Villa, and Insula*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- v. Geisau, H. 1967. "Iphigeneia." *KlPauly* II: 1447-8.
- Georgoudi, S. 1999. "À propos du sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne: remarques critiques." *Arch. F. Religionsgeschichte* 1: 61-82.
- Gerhard, Eduard. 1862/1974. *Etruskische Spiegel*. Berlin: Reimer.
- German, Senta. 2005. *Performance, Power and the Art of the Aegean Bronze Age*. British Archaeological Reports International Series 1347. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Gernet, Louis. 1951. "Political Symbolism: The Public Hearth." Translated by John Hamilton and Blaise Nagy. (Translation first appeared in *The Anthropology of Ancient Greece*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981. Reprinted in *Antiquities*, edited by Nicole Loraux, Gregory Nagy, and Laura Slatkin. Postwar French Thought, volume III, edited by Ramona Naddaff. New York: The New Press, 2001. First published in *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie* 11 (1951): 22-43.
- Gero, J. 2000. "Troubled Travels in Agency and Feminism." In *Agency in Archaeology*, edited by M.-A. Dobres and J. Robb, 40-50. New York.

- Girard, René. 1977. *Violence and the Sacred*. Translated and edited by P. Gregory. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Giuliano, A. 1989. *I Cammei della Collezione Medicea nel Museo Archeologico di Firenze*. Rome.
- Gliksohn, Jean-Michel. 1985. *Iphigénie: De la Grèce antique à l'Europe des lumières*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Goethe, J.W. 1827. "Nachlese zu Aristoteles' Poetik." *Sämtliche Werke*. Weimarer Ausgabe.
- Goff, Barbara E. 2004. *Citizen Bacchae: Women's Ritual Practice in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1999. "The Violence of Community: Ritual in the Iphigeneia in Tauris." In Padilla 1999: 109-28.
- Goldhill, S. 1994. "Representing Democracy: Women at the Great Dionysia." In *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, ed. R. Osborne and S. Hornblower, 347-69. Oxford.
- Gomme, A.W. 1925. "The Position of Women in Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries." *Classical Philology* 20: 1-25.
- Gordon, R. 1996. "The Moment of Death. Art and the Ritual of Greek Sacrifice." In *Image and Value in the Graeco-Roman World. Studies in Mithraism and Religious Art*, 567-74. Aldershot.
- Gould, John J. 1980. "Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens." *JHS*: 38-59.
- Goyet, Florence. 2006. *Penser sans concepts: fonction de l'épopée guerrière*. Bibliothèque de Littérature Générale et Comparée, 61. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Graf, Fritz. 2000. "The Locrian Maidens." In *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, edited by Richard Buxton, 250-70. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1979. "Das Götterbild aus dem Taurerland." *AntW* 10/4: 33-41.
- _____. 1978. "Die lokrischen Mädchen." *SSR* 2.1: 61-79.
- Green, Alberto Ravinel Whitney. 1973. *The Role of Human Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*. Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan. Revised, 1975, American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation Series 1, edited by David Noel Freedman.
- Green, J.R. 1994. *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society*. New York: Routledge.
- Green, J.R. and E. Handley. 1995. *Images of the Greek Theater*. London: British Museum.

- Green, Peter. 2007. *The Hellenistic Age. A History*. A Modern Library Chronicles Book. New York: the Modern Library.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. 1980. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Reprint, The University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, and Catherine Gallagher. 2000. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Greenhalgh, P.A.L. 1972. "Aristocracy and its Advocates in Archaic Greece." *Greece and Rome* 19 (October): 190-207.
- Griffin, J. 1998. "The Social Function of Greek Tragedy." *CQ* 48: 39-61.
- _____. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford.
- Grmek, M. and D. Gourevitch. 1998. *Les maladies dans l'art antique*.
- Gumpert, Matthew. 2001. *Grafting Helen: The Abduction of the Classical Past*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hägg, Robin, and Gullog C. Nordquist, eds. 1990. *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 11-13 June, 1988*. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Hägg, Robin, Nanno Marinatos, and Gullog C. Nordquist, eds. 1988. *Early Greek Cult Practice: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26-29 June, 1986*. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Hall, Edith. 2006. *The Theatrical Cast of Athens: Interactions between Ancient Greek Drama and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hamburger, Jeffrey F. 1998. *The Visual and the Visionary: Art and Female Spirituality in Late Medieval Germany*. New York: Zone Books.
- Hamerton-Kelly, Robert G., ed. 1987. *Violent Origins: Ritual Killing and Cultural Formation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hampe, Roland, and Erika Simon. 1964. *Griechische Sagen in der frühen etruskischen Kunst*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Hanfmann, George M.A. 1951. *The Sarcophagus in Dumbarton Oaks*. 2 volumes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hanson, Ann Ellis. 1990. "The Medical Writers' Woman." In Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin, eds., *Before Sexuality*, 309-338.

- Harnecker, Joachim. 1991. *Oltos: Untersuchungen zu Themenwahl und Stil eines frührotfigurigen Schalenmalers*. European Universities Studies. Series XXXVIII, Archaeology. P. Lang.
- Harrison, E.B. 1988. "Sculpture in Stone." In *The Human Figure in Early Greek Art*, edited by J. Sweeney, L. Curry, and Y. Tzedakis, 50-4. Exh. cat. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art.
- Harrison, George W.M., ed. 2000. *Seneca in Performance*. London: Duckworth.
- Harrison, Jane. 1927. *Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion*. Cambridge. Reprint, London, 1977.
- _____. 1913. *Ancient Art and Ritual*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- _____. 1903. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. Cambridge University Press. Reprint, Princeton University Press, Mythos Series, 1991.
- Hart, M.L. 1992. *Athens and Troy. The Narrative Treatment of the 'Iliupersis' in Archaic Attic Vase-Painting*. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.
- Hartswick, Kim J. 2004. *The Gardens of Sallust: A Changing Landscape*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Haspels, C.H. Emilie. 1936. *Attic Black-Figured Lekythoi*. École Française d'Athènes. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Haubold, Johannes. 2007. "Xerxes' Homer." In Bridges, Hall, and Rhodes, eds., *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars*.
- Hausmann. 1959. *Hellenistische Reliefbecher aus Attischen und böotischen Werkstätten*. Stuttgart.
- Hecht, Richard David. 1976. *Sacrifice, Comparative Study and Interpretation*. Ph.D. diss., UCLA.
- Hedreen, Guy. 2001. *Capturing Troy: The Narrative Functions of Landscape in Archaic and Early Classical Greek Art*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- _____. 1996. "Image, Text, and Story in the Recovery of Helen." *Classical Antiquity* 15: 152-184.
- Helbig, W. 1868. *Wandgemälde der vom Vesuv verschütteten Städte Campaniens*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.
- Henderson, J. 1991. "Women and the Athenian Dramatic Festivals." *TAPA* 121: 133-47.
- Henig, Martin, Diana Scarisbrick, and Mary Whiting. 1994. *Classical Gems. Ancient and Modern Intaglios and Cameos in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge*.

- Henle, Jane. 1973. *Greek Myths: A Vase Painter's Notebook*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Henrichs, Albert. 1981. "Human Sacrifice in Greek Religion: Three Case Studies." In *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité*, edited by Jean Rudhardt and Olivier Reverdin, 195-242. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique XXVII. Genève: Fondation Hardt.
- Heuser, Jennifer Ledig. Forthcoming. *Visual Epic: Roman Images of the Trojan Cycle*. Ph.D. diss., Harvard University.
- Hirschberger, M. 2004. *Gynaikōn katalogos und Megalai Ēhoiai*. Munich.
- Hitzl, Ingrid. 1991. *Die Griechischen Sarkophage der Archaischen und Klassischen Zeit*. Sweden: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Hoffmann, Herbert. 1977. *Sexual and Asexual Pursuit: A Structuralist Approach to Greek Vase Painting*. Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. Occasional Paper No. 34. London.
- Holliday, J., ed. 1993. *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*. Cambridge Studies in New Art History and Criticism. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hollinshead, Mary B. 1985. "Against Iphigeneia's Adyton in Three Mainland Temples." *AJA* 89: 419-40.
- _____. 1980. *Legend, Cult, and Architecture at Three Sanctuaries of Artemis*. Ph.D. diss., Bryn Mawr College.
- Holmberg Lubeck, Maria. 1993. *Iphigeneia Agamemnon's Daughter: A Study of Ancient Conceptions in Greek Myth and Literature Associated with the Atrides*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Hölscher, Tonio. 2004. *The Language of Images in Roman Art*. Translated by Anthony Snodgrass and Annemarie Künzl-Snodgrass. New York: Cambridge University Press. Originally published in 1987 as *Römische Bildsprache als semantisches System*, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag Heidelberg.
- Huddilston, J.H. 1899. "An Archaeological Study of the Antigone of Euripides." *AJA* 3: 183-201.
- Hughes, Bettany. 2005. *Helen of Troy. Goddess, Princess, Whore*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Hughes, Dennis D. 1991. *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 1986. *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece: The Literary and Archaeological Evidence*. Ph.D. diss., The Ohio State University.
- Hunt, Lynn, ed. 1989. *The New Cultural History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Hunter, Richard, ed. 2005. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, Virginia J. 1994. *Policing Athens: Social Control in the Attic Lawsuits, 420-320 B.C.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hurwit, Jeffrey M. 2007. "The Problem with Dexileos: Heroic and Other Nudities in Greek Art." *AJA* 111: 35-60.
- _____. 1987. "Narrative Resonance in the East Pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia." *The Art Bulletin* 69: 6-15.
- Huys, M. 1986. "Euripide, Iphigénie à Aulis, v. 1284-91 et la montagne où l'enfant exposé devait périr." *EtCl* 54: 135-46.
- Ingalls, Wayne B. 2000. "Ritual Performance as Training for Daughters in Archaic Greece." *Phoenix* 54: 1-20.
- Jahn, Otto. 1873. *Griechische Bilderchroniken*. Bonn.
- Jameson, M. 1991. "Sacrifice Before Battle." In V.D. Hanson, ed., *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience*, London and New York, 197-227.
- Jannot, Jean-René. 2005. *Religion in Ancient Etruria*. Translated by Jane Whitehead. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Jay, Nancy. 1992. *Throughout Your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion, and Paternity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jeanmaire, H. 1939. *Couroi et Courtètes*. Lille.
- Jenkins, I. 2006. *Greek Architecture and its Sculpture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1983. "Is There Life After Marriage? A Study of the Abduction Motif in Vase Paintings of the Athenian Wedding Ceremony." *BICS* 30: 137-45.
- Jentel, M-O, and G. Deschenes-Wagner. 1994. *Tranquilitas, Mélanges en l'honneur de Tran tam Tinh*. Quebec.
- Jones, Henry Stuart. 1969. *A Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures Preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome: The Sculptures of the Museo Capitolino*. 2 vols. Rome: L'Erma'di Bretschneider. (Originally published in one volume, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912).
- Jones, Mark W. 2002. "Tripods, Triglyphs, and the Origin of the Doric Frieze." *AJA* 106: 353-90.
- Jost, M. 1995. "Les sacrifices humains ont-ils existé? *L'Histoire* 191: 12-4.

- Jouan, F. 1984. "Autour du sacrifice d'Iphigénie." In *Texte et Image. Actes du Colloque International de Chantilly 13-15 octobre 1982*, 61-74.
- Kádár, Zoltán. 1965. "Scènes de mythologie grecque sur les reliefs funéraires de Savaria (Pannonie supérieure)." In *Le rayonnement des civilisations grecque et romaine sur les cultures périphériques*, 381-6. Huitième Congrès International d'Archéologie Classique (Paris, 1963). Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.
- Kahil, Lilly. 1990a. "Iphigeneia. Epoque grecque." In *LIMCV*: 706-19.
- _____. 1990b. "Le relief des dieux du sanctuaire d'Artémis à Brauron: essai d'interprétation." In *Eumousia: Ceramic and Iconographic Studies in Honour of Alexander Cambitoglou*, edited by J.-P. Descouedres, 113-117.
- _____. 1983. "Mythological Repertoire of Brauron." In *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*, edited by Warren G. Moon, 231-44. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____. 1955. *Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène: dans les textes et les documents figurés*. 2 volumes. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Kahil, L., Noëlle Icard, Pascale Linant De Bellefonds. 1981-. "Iphigeneia." In *LIMCV*: 706-729.
- Kampen, Natalie Boymel, ed. 1996. *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy*. Cambridge Studies in New Art History and Criticism, edited by Norman Bryson. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Karoglou, Kyriaki. 2005. *Attic Votive Plaques: A Study on Their Iconography and Function*. 2 volumes. Ph.D. diss., Princeton University.
- Keesing, r. 1987. "Anthropology as Interpretive Quest." *Current Anthropology* 28: 161-76.
- Keesling, Catherine M. 2003. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kenner, Hedwig. 1985. *Die römischen Wandmalereien des Magdalensberges*. Archäologische Forschungen zu den Grabungen auf dem Magdalensberg 8. Klagenfurt: Verlag des Landesmuseums für Kärnten.
- Keuls, Eva C. 1985. *The Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1982. "The Hetaera and the Housewife: The Splitting of the Female Psyche in Greek Art." *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Historisch Instituut te Rome*.
- Kleiner, Diana E.E. and Susan B. Matheson, eds. 1996, *I Claudia: Women in Ancient Rome*. New Haven and Austin: Yale University Art Gallery and University of Texas Press.

- Klemenc, Josip, Vera Kolšek, and Peter Petru. 1972. *Antične Grobnice V Šempetru (Antike Grabmonumente in Šempetru)*. Ljubljana: Narodni muzej.
- Knittlmayer, Brigitte. 1997. *Die Attische Aristokratie und Ihre Helden: Darstellungen des Trojanischen Sagenkreises im 6. und Frühen 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Archäologie und Geschichte 7. Heidelberg: Verlag Archäologie und Geschichte.
- Knox, Bernard. 1986. Foreword to *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World* by Pierre Vidal-Naquet. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Koch, Guntram, ed. 1993. *Grabeskunst der Römischen Kaiserzeit*. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Koch, Guntram, and Hellmut Sichtermann. 1982. *Römische Sarkophage*. Munich: C.H. Beck.
- _____. 1975. *Die Mythologischen Sarkophage*. Die Antiken Sarkophagreliefs 12. Berlin: Mann.
- Koch, Guntram, and Karol Wight. 1988. *Roman Funerary Sculpture: Catalogue of the Collections*. Malibu, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Koloski-Ostrow, Ann Olga. 1997. "Violent Stages in Two Pompeian Houses: Imperial Taste, Aristocratic Response, and Messages of Male Control." In *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality, and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology*, edited by Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow and Claire L. Lyons, 243-266. New York: Routledge.
- Koortbojian, Michael. 2005. "Nemesis or Phantasia?: Two Representational Modes in Roman Commemorative Art." *Classical Antiquity* 24: 285-306.
- _____. 1995. *Myth, Meaning, and Memory on Roman Sarcophagi*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kossatz-Deissmann, Anneliese. 1978. *Dramen des Aischylos auf westgriechischen Vasen*. Schriften zur antiken Mythologie 4. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Krauskopf, Ingrid. 1994. "Iphigeneia (in Etruria)." In *LIMCV*: 729-34.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1984. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kuhnen, Hans-Peter, ed. 2000. *Morituri: Menschenopfer, Todgeweihte, Strafgerichte*. Exh. cat. 13 May-5 November 2000. Schriftenreihe des Rheinischen Landesmuseums Trier, nr. 17. Trier: Rheinisches Landesmuseum Trier.
- Kunisch, Norbert. 1997. *Makron*. Mainz/Rhein: P. von Zabern.
- Kurtz, D.C., ed. 1989. *Greek Vases, Lectures by J.D. Beazley*. Oxford University Press.

- Kurtz, Donna C., and John Boardman. 1986. "Booners." In *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, vol. 3, 35-70. Malibu, CA: The J. Paul Getty Museum.
- _____. 1971. *Greek Burial Customs*. Aspects of Greek and Roman Life, edited by H.H. Scullard. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Kyle, Donald G. 1998. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. New York: Routledge.
- Larson, Jennifer. 1995. *Greek Heroine Cults*. Wisconsin Studies in Classics, edited by Richard Daniel De Puma and Barbara Hughes Fowler. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Lattanzi, E. 1976. *Il Museo Nazionale Ridola di Matera*.
- Lattimore, Richmond. 1973. "Introduction" to his translation of Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Tauris*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leach, Eleanor W. 2004. *The Social Life of Painting in Ancient Rome and on the Bay of Naples*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lefkowitz, M.R. 1987. "Was Euripides an Atheist?" *StItal* V/2: 149-65.
- Lehmann, P.W. 1953. *Roman Wall Paintings from Boscoreale in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lethaby, W.R. 1913. "The Sculptures of the Later Temple of Artemis at Ephesus." *JHS* 33: 87-96.
- Levi, Doro. 1947. *Antioch Mosaic Pavements*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1963. *Structural Anthropology*. Translated by C. Jacobson and B.G. Schoepf. New York: Basic Books.
- _____. 1955. "The Structural Study of Myth." In *Structural Anthropology*.
- _____. 1949. *Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Boston.
- Lewis, Brenda Ralph. 2001. *Ritual Sacrifice: An Illustrated History*. England: Sutton Publishing Limited.
- Lewis, Sian. 2002. *The Athenian Woman: An Iconographic Handbook*. London and New York: Routledge.
- _____. 1997. "Shifting Images: Athenian Women in Etruria." In T. Cornell and K. Lomas, eds., *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, 141-154.
- Lezzi-Hafter, A. 1988. *Der Eretria-Maler, Werke und Weggefahrten*. Mainz.
- LIMC. *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. 1981-99. Zurich and Munich: Artemis Verlag.

- Lindauis, Rebecka. Forthcoming. *Artemis and Virginité in Classical Antiquity*. Ph.D. diss., Princeton University.
- Linant de Bellefonds, Pascale. 1990. "Iphigeneia" (Epoque romaine). In *LIMCV*: 719-29.
- Lissarrague, François. 2002. "Femmes au figuré." In *Histoire des femmes en Occident*, vol. 1, L'Antiquité, ed. Georges Duby and Michelle Perrot, 203-301. Paris: Perrin.
- _____. 1990. *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet: Images of Wine and Ritual*. Translated by Andrew Szegedy-Maszak. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lissarrague, François, and Christiane Bron. 1989. "Looking at the Vase," Chapter 1 in *A City of Images*, 11-21.
- Llewellyn-Jones, Lloyd. 2003. *Aphrodite's Tortoise: The Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece*. The Classical Press of Wales.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983. "Artemis and Iphigeneia." *JHS* 103: 87-102.
- _____. 1952. "The Robes of Iphigeneia." *ClRev* 2: 132-5.
- Loraux, Nicole. 1998. *Mothers in Mourning*. Translated by Corinne Pache. Myth and Poetics, edited by Gregory Nagy. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 1995. *The Experiences of Tiresias: The Feminine and the Greek Man*. Translated by Paula Wissing. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1993. *The Children of Athena: Athenian Ideas About Citizenship and the Division Between the Sexes*. Translated by Caroline Levine. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1987. *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman*. Translated by Anthony Forster. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Love, Iris. 1986. "Breakthrough: A Speculation on the Beginnings of Western Painting." *Connoisseur* (August): 31-4.
- Lowenstam, Steven, and Tom Carpenter. Forthcoming. *As Witnessed by Images: The Trojan War Tradition in Greek and Etruscan Art*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Löwy, E. 1929. "Der Schluss der Iphigenie in Aulis." *Jahresh. des Osterr. Arch. Inst.* 24: 1-41.
- Lübeck, Maria Holmberg. 1993. *Iphigeneia, Agamemnon's Daughter. A Study of Ancient Conceptions in Greek Myth and Literature Associated with the Atrides*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

- Lyons, Claire. 2008. "Objects of Affection: Gender and Genre on some Athenian Vases." In Kenneth Lapatin ed., *Colors of Clay Symposium Papers*.
- Lyons, Deborah. 1997. *Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Myth and Cult*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Maaskant-Kleibrink, Marianne. 1997. "Bearers of Idols: Iphigeneia, Cassandra and Aeneas." In *La glyptique des mondes classiques*. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France.
- MacLachlan, Bonnie and Judith Fletcher, eds. 2007. *Virginity Revisited: Configurations of the Unpossessed Body*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mangold, Meret. 2000. *Kassandra in Athen: Die Eroberung Trojas auf attischen Vasenbildern*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Manning, Clarence Augustus. 1920. "The Tauric Maiden and Allied Cults." *TAPA* 51: 40-55.
- Marconi, Clemente. 1994. "Iphigeneia a Selinunte." *Prospettiva* 75-6: 50-4.
- Martens, Didier. 1992. *Une esthétique de la transgression: le vase grec de la fin de l'époque géométrique au début de l'époque classique*. Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique.
- Martini, Wolfram. 1984. *Das Gymnasium von Samos*. Samos 16. Bonn.
- _____. 1971. *Die Etruskische Ringsteinglyptik*. Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts. Roemische Abteilung. Achtzehntes Ergänzungsheft. Heidelberg: F.H. Kerle Verlag.
- Marvin, M. 2002. "The Ludovisi Barbarians: The Grand Manner." In Gazda, ed. *Art of Emulation*, 205-23.
- Masaracchia, E. 1983. Il sacrificio nell'Ifigenia in Aulide. *QuadUrbini* N.S. 14: 43-77.
- Matheson, Susan. 1996, "The Divine Claudia: Women as Goddesses in Roman Art." In *I Claudia: Women in Ancient Rome*, edited by Kleiner and Matheson, 182-193.
- _____. 1986. "Polygnotos: An Iliupersis Scene at the Getty Museum." In *Greek Vases in The J. Paul Getty Museum*, 101-114. Vol. 3. Malibu, CA: The J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Mauss, Marcel. 1967. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Translated by Ian Cunnison. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Mason, P.G. 1959. "Kassandra." *JHS* 79: 80-93.
- McCann, Anna Marguerite. 1978. *Roman Sarcophagi in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

- McGlew, J.F. 1993. *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- McLeod, Glenda. 1991. *Virtue and Venom: Catalogs of Women from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- McNiven, Timothy John. 2000. "Behaving Like an Other: Telltale Gestures in Athenian Vase Painting." In *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*, edited by Beth Cohen, 71-97. Boston: Brill.
- _____. 1982. *Gestures in Attic Vase Painting: Use and Meaning, 550-450 B.C.* Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.
- Meagher, Robert Emmet. 2002. *The Meaning of Helen: In Search of an Ancient Icon*. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc.
- Mellink, Machteld J., ed. 1986. *Troy and the Trojan War: A Symposium Held at Bryn Mawr College, October 1984*. Bryn Mawr, PA: Bryn Mawr College.
- Ménant, J. 1887. "Le sacrifice humain." *Recherches sur la Glyptique orientale*, Vol. I, 150-8.
- Meuli, Karl. 1946. "Griechische Opferbräuche." In *Phyllobolia. Festschrift P. von der Mühl*, 185-288. Basel.
- Meyer, Martina. Forthcoming. *Tragic Imagery in a Domestic Context: Fifth-Century Relief Plaques from Melos*. Ph.D. diss., Toronto.
- Michaelis, A. 1857. "Filottete ferito, aggiunte in margine all'articolo." *AnnInst.* (cited in Roncalli 1965, 9)
- Miltner, Franz. 1930. "Ein Iphigenierelief in Stuhlweissenburg." *Mitteilungen des Vereines klassischer Philologen in Wien VII*: 61-9.
- Minchin, Elizabeth. 1996. "The Performance of Lists and Catalogues in the Homeric Epics." In *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*, edited by Ian Worthington, 3-20. New York: E.J. Brill.
- Minton, William W. 1962. "Invocation and Catalogue in Hesiod and Homer." *TAPA* 93: 188-212.
- Mizera, Suzanne M. 1984. *Unions Holy and Unholy: Fundamental Structures of Myths of Marriage in Early Greek Poetry and Tragedy*. Ph.D. diss., Princeton University.
- Molyneaux, Brian Leigh. 1997. *The Cultural Life of Images: Visual Representation in Archaeology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Monsacré, Hélène. 1984. "The Erotic Images of War." In *Antiquities*, edited by Nicole Loraux, Gregory Nagy, and Laura Slatkin, The New Press, 2001, p. 276-282.

Translated from “Les images érotiques de la guerre,” in *Les larmes d’Achille* (Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 1984, 63-77)

- Moon, Warren G., ed. 1983. *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Moore, George F. 1897. “The Image of Moloch.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 16: 161-165.
- Moormann, Eric M. 1983. “Rappresentazioni teatrali su scaenae frontes di quarto stile a Pompeii, Herculaneum, Stabiae 1: 73-117.
- Moret, Jean Marc. 1975. *L’Ilioupersis dans la céramique italiote: les mythes et leur expression figurée au IVe siècle*. 2 vols. Rome: Institut suisse de Rome.
- Morris, Ian. 2000. *Archaeology as Cultural History: Words and Things in Iron Age Greece*. Social Archaeology, edited by Ian Hodder. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- _____. 1993. “Poetics of Power. The Interpretation of Ritual Action in Archaic Greece.” In Dougherty and Kurke 1993, 15-45.
- _____. 1992. *Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity*. Key Themes in Ancient History. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, S.P. 1995. “The Sacrifice of Astyanax: Near Eastern Contributions to the Siege of Troy.” In *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, edited by J. Carter and S. Morris, 221-46. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Muller, Frank G.J.M. 1994. *So-Called Peleus and Thetis Sarcophagus in the Villa Albani*. Iconological Studies in Roman Art. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
- Müller, K.O. and Fr. Wieseler. 1877-1881. *Denkmäler der alten Kunst*. Third edition
- Mulvey, Laura. 1975. “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema.” *Screen* 16: 6-18. Reprinted in L. Mulvey, *Visual and Other Pleasures*, 14-26. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989. Citations are to the reprint edition.
- Nagler, Michael N. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nagy, Gregory. 1990. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Myth and Poetics, edited by G. Nagy. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Naiden, F.S. 2007. “The Fallacy of the Willing Victim.” *JHS* 127: 61-73.
- Neer, Richard T. 2002. *Style and Politics in Athenian Vase-Painting: The Craft of Democracy, ca. 530-460 B.C.E.* Cambridge Studies in Classical Art and Iconography. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Neils, Jenifer. 2008. "Rereading the Sarpedon Krater." College Art Association, 96th Annual Conference. Dallas-Fort Worth, February 20-23.
- _____. 1981. "The Loves of Theseus: An Early Cup by Oltos." *AJA* 85: 177-9.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1950. *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*. 2nd ed. Lund.
- _____. 1932. *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*. Sather Classical Lectures 8. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Noort, Ed and Eibert Tigchelaar, eds. 2002. *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations*. Boston: Brill.
- Numrich, B. 1997. *Die Architektur der römischen Grabdenkmäler aus Neumagen*. Trierer Zeitschrift Beiheft 22. Trier.
- Oakley, J.H., et al., eds. 1997. *Athenian Potters and Painters, the Conference Proceedings*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- O'Brien, Michael J. 1988. "Pelopid History and the Plot of Iphigenia in Tauris." *CQ* 38: 98-115.
- O'Connor-Visser, E.A.M.E. 1987. *Aspects of Human Sacrifice in the Tragedies of Euripides*. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner.
- Oenbrink, W. 1997. *Das Bild im Bilde*. Frankfurt.
- Olivia, Leanora. 1994. *Transforming Rhetoric: The Representation of Sacrifice and Martyrdom in Euripides' 'Iphigenia at Aulis' and Prudentius' 'Peristephanon' III and XIV*. Ph.D. diss., Brown University.
- Ormand, Kirk. 1999. *Exchange and the Maiden: Marriage in Sophoclean Tragedy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Osborne, Robin. 2007. "Sex, Agency and History: The Case of Athenian Painted Pottery." In Osborne and Tanner 2007, Chapter 9.
- _____. 2005. "Ordering Women in Hesiod's *Catalogue*." In *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*, edited by Richard Hunter, 5-24. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1998a. "Sculpted Men of Athens: Masculinity and Power in the Field of Vision." In *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*, edited by Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, 23-42. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 1998b. *Archaic and Classical Greek Art*. Oxford History of Art. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1983-4. "The Myth of Propaganda and the Propaganda of Myth." :61-70.

- Osborne, Robin, and Jeremy Tanner, eds. 2007. *Art's Agency and Art History*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Padilla, M., ed. 1999. *Rites of Passage in Ancient Greece: Literature, Religion, Society*. Bucknell Review 43.1. Lewisburg.
- Pairault, Françoise-Hélène. 1972. *Recherches sur quelques séries d'urnes de Volterra à représentations mythologiques*. Collection de l'École Française de Rome. Rome: École Française de Rome.
- Pallottino, M. 1952. *La peinture étrusque*. Geneva.
- Papadakis, M. 1994. *Ilias- und Ilioupersisdarstellungen auf frühen rotfigurigen Vasen*.
- Papalexandrou, Nassos. 2005. *The Visual Poetics of Power: Warriors, Youths, and Tripods in Early Greece*. Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches, edited by Gregory Nagy. Lexington Books.
- Parker, R. 2000. "Sacrifice and Battle." In H. van Wees, ed., *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*, London, 299-314.
- Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Parisi Badoni, Franca. 1968. *Ceramica Campana A Figure Nere*. Florence: G.C. Sansoni.
- Parra, M.C. 1978. "Tre marmi antichi a Livorno (e i sarcofagi di Ifigenia in Tauride)." *Prospettiva* 13: 50-8.
- Pasquier, Alain. 1998. *The Louvre. Greek, Etruscan and Roman Antiquities*. Paris: Éditions Scala.
- Paton, J.M. 1901. "The Antigone of Euripides." *HSCP* 12: 267-276.
- Patterson, Cynthia. 1998. *The Family in Greek History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pearson, A.C. 1925. "Greek Sacrifice." In *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by James Hastings, vol. 6, 847-9. New York: Scribner.
- Pelagatti, P. and P. Guzzo, eds. 1997. *Antichità senza provenienza II, Atti del colloquio internazionale 17-18 ottobre 1997*. *BdA* Supplement 3.
- Penglas, Charles. 1994. *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia: Parallels and Influence in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod*. New York: Routledge.
- Perdrizet, P. 1908. *Monuments Figurés, Petits Bronzes, Terres-Cuites, Antiquités Diverses*. Fouilles de Delphes. 2 volumes. Paris: École Française d'Athènes.

- Perry, Ellen. 2005. *The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Visual Arts of Ancient Rome*. Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2002. "Rhetoric, Literary Criticism, and the Roman Aesthetics of Artistic Imitation." In Gazda, ed., *Art of Emulation*, 153-71.
- Pesce, Angelo, ed. 2004. *In Stabiano: Exploring the Ancient Seaside Villas of the Roman Elite*. Castellammare di Stabia: Nicola Longobardi Editore.
- Petersen, E. 1902. "Über die älteste etruskische Wandmalerei." *RM*.
- Petersen, Lauren. 1997. "Divided Consciousness and Female Companionship: Reconstructing Female Subjectivity on Greek Vases." *Arethusa* 30: 35-74.
- Petrain, David. Forthcoming. *Epic Manipulations: The Tabulae Iliacae in Their Roman Context*. Ph.D. diss., Harvard University.
- Philippart, H. 1925. "Iconographie de l'*Iphigénie en Tauride* d'Euripide." *RBPhil* 4: 5-33.
- Phillips, Jr., Kyle M. 1968. "Perseus and Andromeda." *AJA* 72: 1-23.
- Piccottini, Gernot. 1989. *Die Römer in Kärnten*. Klagenfurt: Carinthia.
- Pipili, Maria. 1987. *Laconian Iconography of the Sixth Century B.C.* Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, Monograph No. 12. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.
- _____. 1981. "Ilioupersis." In *LIMC VIII*: 650-657.
- Pöhlmann, Egert and Martin L. West. 2001. *Documents of Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pollitt, J.J. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Age*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomeroy, Sarah B. 1997. *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: Representations and Realities*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1975. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Porada, Edith. 1948. *Corpus of Ancient Near Eastern Seals: 2 Vols.: The Collection of the Pierpont Morgan Library*. Washington: Bollingen Foundation.
- Porter, James I., ed. 1999. *Constructions of the Classical Body*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Powell, B. 1997. "From Picture to Myth, from Myth to Picture. Prolegomena to the Invention of Mythic Representation in Greek Art." In *New Light on a Dark Age: Exploring the Culture of Geometric Greece*, edited by S. Langdon, 154-193. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

- Puhvel, Jaan. 1978. "Victimal Hierarchies in Indo-European Animal Sacrifice." *AJP* 99: 354-362.
- Quaegebeur, Jan, ed. 1993. *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 55. Leuven: Peeters.
- Rabinowitz, Nancy Sorkin. 2004. "Politics of Inclusion/Exclusion in Attic Tragedy." In *Women's Influence on Culture in Antiquity*, edited by Eireann Marshall and Fiona McHardie, 40-55. London: Routledge.
- _____. 1993. *Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 1992. "Tragedy as a Politics of Containment." In *Pornography and Representation*, edited by Amy Richlin, . New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rabinowitz, Nancy Sorkin, and Lisa Auanger, eds. 2002. *Among Women: From the Homosocial to the Homoerotic in the Ancient World*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ramage, Nancy H., and Andrew Ramage. 2005. *Roman Art: Romulus to Constantine*. Fourth edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Raoul-Rochette, D. 1833. *Monuments inédits*. (cited in Moret 1975, 64).
- Reade, Julian. 1983. *Assyrian Sculpture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Redfield, James M. 2003. *The Locrian Maidens: Love and Death in Greek Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Reeder, Ellen D., ed. 1995. *Pandora: Women in Classical Greece*. Baltimore, MD: The Walters Art Gallery in association with Princeton University Press.
- Rees Clifford, Helen. 1937. "Two Etruscan Funerary Urns in the New York University Archaeological Museum." *American Journal of Archaeology* 41: 300-314.
- Rehm, Rush. 1994. *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Reid, Jane Davidson. 1993. *The Oxford Guide to Classical Mythology in the Arts, 1300-1990s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reilly, Joan. 1997. "Naked and Limbless: Learning About the Feminine Body in Ancient Athens." In *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality, and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology*, 154-173. New York: Routledge.
- Richlin, A, ed. 1992. *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. Oxford.
- Richter, Donald. 1971. "The Position of Women in Classical Athens." *Classical Journal* 67: 1-8.

- Richter, G.M.A. 1971. *Engraved Gems of the Romans*. Part II, The Engraved Gems of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans. A Supplement to the History of Roman Art. London: Phaidon.
- _____. 1968. *Korai, Archaic Greek Maidens: A Study of the Development of the Kore Type in Greek Sculpture*. London: Phaidon.
- _____. 1961. *Archaic Gravestones of Attica*. New York: Phaidon.
- _____. 1954. *Catalogue of Greek Sculptures in the Metropolitan Museum*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1953. *Handbook of the Greek Collection, The Metropolitan Museum of Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press for the Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Ridgway, B.S. 2006. "The Boy Strangling the Goose: Genre Figure or Mythological Symbol?" *AJA* 110: 643-8.
- _____. 2002. *First Century Styles*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____. 2000. *Hellenistic Sculpture II: The Styles of ca. 200-100 BC*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____. 1990. *Hellenistic Sculpture I: The Styles of ca. 331-200 BC*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Rives, J. 1995. "Human Sacrifice Among Pagans and Christians." *JRS* 85: 65-85.
- Robert, Carl. 1890. *Die antiken Sarkophagreliefs*. Vol. II, *Mythologische Cyklen*. Berlin. Revised and enlarged edition: *Die Mythologischen Sarkophage*, by Hellmut Sichtermann and Guntram Koch. Berlin: Mann, 1975.
- _____. 1881. *Bild und Lied: archäologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Heldensage*. Berlin: Weidmann. Reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1975. (Iphigenia, p. 59-79).
- _____. 1875. "Iphigeneia in Tauris." *AZ* 33: 133-48.
- Roberts, Sally Rutherford. 1978. *The Attic Pyxis*. Chicago: Ares Publishers.
- Robertson, Martin. 1992. *The Art of Vase-painting in Classical Athens*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1990. "Troilos and Polyxene: Notes on a Changing Legend." In *EYMOYΣΙΑ: Ceramic and Iconographic Studies in Honor of Alexander Cambitoglou*, edited by Jean-Paul Descoeudres, 63-70. Sydney: Meditarch.
- _____. 1970. *BICS* 17: 11-15.

- Robertson, Noel. 1992. *Festivals and Legends: The Formation of Greek Cities in the Light of Public Ritual*. Phoenix Supplementary Volumes 31. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rogers, Mary, ed. 2000. *Fashioning Identities in Renaissance Art*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate.
- Roncagli, Francesco. 1965. *Le Lastre Dipinte da Cerveteri*. Studi e Materiali dell'Istituto di Etruscologia e Antichità Italiane dell'Università di Roma IV. Florence: Sansoni Editore.
- Roscher, W.H., ed. 1884-1937. *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Rose, H.J. 1964. *A Handbook of Greek Mythology*. 6th ed. London: Routledge. Reprint, 2000.
- Roselli, David. Forthcoming. *Human Sacrifice and Social Identity in Athenian Tragedy*. Diss., University of Toronto.
- _____. 2007. "Gender, Class and Ideology: The Social Function of Virgin Sacrifice in Euripides' *Children of Herakles*." *CA* 26 (April): 81-169.
- Rouveret, A. 1989. *Histoire et imaginaire de la peinture ancienne (Ve siècle av. J.-C.-Ier siècle ap. J.-C)*, BEFAR 274. Rome.
- Rubin, Gayle. 1975. "The Traffic in Women." In *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by R. Reiter, 157-210. New York and London.
- Rudhardt, Jean, and Olivier Reverdin, eds. 1981. *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité*. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique XXVII. Genève: Fondation Hardt.
- Rügler, A. 1988. *Die columnae caelatae des jüngeren Art. Von Eph*.
- Ruhfel, H. 1984. *Das Kind in der Griechischen Kunst*. Mainz.
- Rupp, D.W. 1991. "Blazing Altars—The Depiction of Altars in Attic Vase Painting." In *L'espace sacrificiel dans les civilisations méditerranéennes et l'antiquité*. Actes du colloque, Lyon 4-7 juin 1988, 56-60. Lyon.
- Rutherford, Ian. 2000. "Formulas, Voice, and Death in Ehoie-Poetry, the Hesiodic Gunaikon Katalogos, and the Odysseian Nekuia." In *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, edited by Mary Depew and Dirk Obbink, 81-96. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sadurska, Anna. 1964. *Les tables iliaques*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Sakowski, Anja. 1997. *Darstellungen von Dreifusskesseln in der griechischer Kunst bis zum Beginn der Klassischen Zeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

- Sale, W. 1975. "Tempel-Legends of the Arkteia." *RhM* 118: 265ff.
- Sales, R.H. 1957. "Human Sacrifice in Biblical Thought." *Journal of Bible and Religion* 25: 112-117.
- Sannibale, Maurizio. 1994. *Le urne cinerarie di età ellenistica*. Monumenti Musei e Gallerie Pontificie Museo Gregoriano Etrusco. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Sansone, David. 1975. "The Sacrifice-Motif in Euripides' *IT*." *TAPA* 105: 283-95.
- Sauron, Gilles. 1994. *QVIS DEVM? L'expression plastique des idéologies politiques et religieuses à Rome à la fin de la république et au début du principat*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Fascicule 285. Palais Farnèse: École Française de Rome.
- Saverkina, Irina Igorjevna. 1979. *Römische Sarkophag in der Ermitage*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Schafer, A. 1997. *Unterhaltung beim griechischen Symposium*. Mainz.
- Schäfer, J. 1957. *Studien zu den griechischen Reliefpithoi des 8.-6. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. aus Kreta, Rhodos, Tenos und Boiotien*. Kallmuenz.
- Schauenburg, Konrad. 1960. *Perseus in der Kunst des Altertums*. Bonn: R. Habelt.
- _____. 1956. *JdI* 71: 86ff.
- Schefold, Karl. 1992. *Gods and Heroes in Late Archaic Greek Art*. Translated by Alan Griffiths. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1981. *Die Göttersage in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst*. München: Hirmer.
- _____. 1972. *La peinture pompéienne: essai sur l'évolution de sa signification*. Translated into the French by J.-M. Croisille. Revised and enlarged edition. Bruxelles: Latomus.
- _____. 1966. *Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art*. Translated by Audrey Hicks. London: Thames and Hudson.
- _____. 1962. *Vergessenes Pompeji: unveröffentlichte Bilder römischer Wanddekorationen in geschichtlicher Folge herausgegeben*. Bern: Francke.
- _____. 1957. *Die Wände Pompejis: topographisches Verzeichnis der Bildmotive*. Berlin: DeGruyter.
- Schefold, Karl, and Franz Jung. 1989. *Die Sagen von den Argonauten, von Theben und Troia in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst*. Munich: Hirmer.

- Scheibler, I. 1987. "Bild und Gefäß: Zur ikonographischen und funktionalen Bedeutung der attischen Bildfeldamphoren." *JdI* 102: 57-118.
- Scherer, Margaret R. 1963. *The Legends of Troy in Art and Literature*. New York: Phaidon.
- Schindler, Wolfgang. 1980. "Allegorie der Iulia Augusti als Iphigenie auf dem Bronze-Krater in Varna." *Klio* 62: 99-109.
- Schneider, Arthur. 1886. *Der troische Sagenkreis in der ältesten griechischen Kunst*. Leipzig.
- Schröder, Stephan F. 2004. *Katalog der antiken Skulpturen des Museo del Prado in Madrid*. Vol. 2, Idealplastik. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Madrid. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- _____. 1991. "Der Achill-Polyxena-Sarkophag im Prado: Ein Wenig Bekanntes Meisterwerk." *MM* 32: 158-69.
- Schwab, Katherine A. 2005. "Celebrations of Victory: The Metopes of the Parthenon." In *The Parthenon. From Antiquity to the Present*, edited by Jenifer Neils, 159-197. Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1999. "The Parthenon North Metopes: New Approaches to Reconstructing the Sack of Troy." In Docter and Moormann, 367-9.
- Schwarz, Gerda. 2001. "Der Tod und das Mädchen: Frühe Polyxena-Bilder." *AM* 116: 35-50.
- _____. 1992. "Achill und Polyxena in der römischen Kaiserzeit." *RM* 99: 265-99.
- Schwenn, F. 1915. *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 15.3. Giessen.
- Scodel, Ruth. 1996. "Ἀμυν ἱεροπλάμα: Virgin Sacrifice and Aesthetic Object." *TAPA* 126: 111-128.
- Seaford, Richard. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1989. "Homeric and Tragic Sacrifice." *TAPA* 119: 87-95.
- _____. 1987. "The Tragic Wedding." *JHS* 107: 106-30.
- Séchan, Louis. 1967. *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique*. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion.
- _____. 1931. "Le sacrifice d'Iphigénie." *REG* 44: 392-421.
- Segal, Charles. 1990. "Sacrifice and Violence in the Myth of Meleager and Heracles: Homer, Bacchylides, Sophocles." *Helios* 17: 7-24.

- Seiter, Ellen. 1986. "Feminism and Ideology: The 'Terms' of Women's Stereotypes." *Feminist Review* 22: 58-81.
- Seiler, Florian. 1992. *Casa degli Amorini dorati (VI 16, 7.38)*. Band 5, Häuser in Pompeji. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut. Hirmer Verlag München.
- Seki, T. 1985. *Untersuchung zum Verhältnis von Gefassform und Malerei attischer Schalen*. Berlin.
- Sevinç, Nurten. 1996. "A New Sarcophagus of Polyxena from the Salvage Excavations at Gümüşçay." *Studia Troica* 6: 251-64.
- Sevinç, Nurten, and Charles Brian Rose. 1999. "A Child's Sarcophagus from the Salvage Excavations at Gümüşçay." *Studia Troica* 9: 489-509.
- Sevinç, Nurten, Charles Brian Rose, Billur Tekkök-Biçken, and Donna Strahan. 1998. "The Dedetepe Tumulus." *Studia Troica* 8: 305-27.
- Sgubini Moretti, Anna Maria. 1999. *'Euphronios epoiesen': un dono d'eccezione ad Ercole Cerite*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider: Ingegneria per la Cultura.
- Shanower, Eric. 2004. *The Age of Bronze: The Story of the Trojan War—Sacrifice* (Vol. 2). Orange, CA: Image Comics, Inc.
- Shapiro, H.A. 1995. "The Cult of Heroines: Kekrops' Daughters." In Reeder, *Pandora*, 39-48.
- _____. 1994. *Myth Into Art: Poet and Painter in Classical Greece*. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 1991. "The Iconography of Mourning in Athenian Art." *AJA* 95: 629-656.
- _____. 1981. "Courtship Scenes in Attic Vase-Painting." *AJA* 85: 133-43.
- Sharrock, Alison R. 2002. "Looking at Looking: Can You Resist a Reading?" In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, edited by David Fredrick, 265-295. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Shelton, Jo-Ann. 2000. "The Spectacle of Death in Seneca's Troades." In *Seneca in Performance*, edited by George W.M. Harrison, 87-118.
- Simon, E. 1996. *Schriften zur etruskischen und italischen Kunst und Religion*. Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main. Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe 11. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- _____. 1987. "Kriterien zur Deutung 'Pasitelischer' Gruppen." *AA*: 291-304.
- _____. 1984. "Artemis/Diana." In *LIMC* II.

- _____. 1963. "Polygnotan Painting and the Niobid Painter." *AJA* 67: 43-62.
- Sinn, Ulrich. 1979. *Die Homerischen Becher: Hellenistische Reliefkeramik aus Makedonien*. AM supplement 7. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
- Sissa, Giulia. 1990a. *Greek Virginty*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Originally published in 1987 as *Le corps virginal: La virginité féminine en Grèce ancienne*.
- _____. 1990b. "Maidenhood without Maidenhead: The Female Body in Ancient Greece." In *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler, and Froma I. Zeitlin, 339-364. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Small, Jocelyn Penny. 2003. *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Text*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1981. *Studies Related to the Theban Cycle on Late Etruscan Urns*. *Archaeologica* 20. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider.
- Smart, J.D. 1984. "The Portland Vase Again." *JHS* 104: 186.
- Smet, Robert de. 1982. *Hommes et dieux de la Grèce antique*. Exh. cat. Brussels: Europalia.
- Smith, R.R.R. 2006. *Roman Portrait Statuary from Aphrodisias. Aphrodisias II*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Snodgrass, A.M. 2006. *Archaeology and the Emergence of Greece*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 1982. *Narration and Allusion in Archaic Greek Art*. J.L. Myres Memorial Lecture 11. London: Leopard's Head Press.
- Solmsen, F. 1981. "The Sacrifice of Agamemnon's Daughter in Hesiod's *Ehōeae*." *AJP* 102: 353-8.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. Forthcoming 1. "Iphigeneia and Others: Virgin Sacrifices in Ancient Greece."
- _____. Forthcoming 2. "The Sacrifice of Iphigeneia in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*: Ancient Meanings and Modern Constructs."
- _____. 2003. *Tragedy and Athenian Religion*. Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches, edited by Gregory Nagy. New York: Lexington Books.
- _____. 1995a. *'Reading' Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1995b. "Male and Female, Public and Private, Ancient and Modern." In *Reeder 1995*, 111-20.

- _____. 1988. *Studies in Girls' Transitions: Aspects of the Arkteia and Age Representation in Attic Iconography*. Athens: Kardamitsa.
- _____. 1987. "A Series of Erotic Pursuits: Images and Meanings." *JHS* 107: 131-53.
- Sparkes, Brian A. 1996. *The Red and the Black: Studies in Greek Pottery*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Spawforth, Tony. 2006. *The Complete Greek Temples*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Spivey, N. 1998. *Etruscan Art*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Spivey, N. and T. Rasmussen, eds. 1991. *Looking at Greek Vases*. Cambridge.
- Stahl, M. 1987. *Aristokraten und Tyrannen im archaischen Athens: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung, zur Sozialstruktur und zur Entstehung des Staates*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Stansbury-O'Donnell, Mark D. 2006. *Vase Painting, Gender, and Social Identity in Archaic Athens*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2002. "Spectator Typology in Archaic Greek Art." Paper delivered at the 2002 AIA Conference. Abstract in *AJA* 2002: 116-7.
- _____. 1999. *Pictorial Narrative in Ancient Greek Art*. Cambridge Studies in Classical Art and Iconography, edited by H.A. Shapiro. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1990. "Polygnotos's *Nekyia*. A Reconstruction and Analysis." *AJA* 94: 213-35.
- _____. 1989. "Polygnotos's *Iliupersis*. A New Reconstruction." *AJA* 93: 203-15.
- Starr, Chester G. 1992. *The Aristocratic Temper of Greek Civilization*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1977. *The Economic and Social Growth of Early Greece, 800-500 B.C.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stears, K. 1995. "Dead Women's Society: Constructing Female Gender in Classical Athenian Funerary Sculpture." In *Time, Tradition, and Society in Greek Archaeology: Bridging the 'Great Divide'*, edited by N. Spencer. New York: Routledge.
- Stehle, Eva. 1997. *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in Its Setting*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Stehle, Eva and Amy Day. 1996. "Women Looking at Women: Women's Ritual and Temple Sculpture." In *Sexuality in Ancient Art*, edited by Natalie B. Kampen, 101-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stein-Hölkeskamp, Elke. 1989. *Adelskultur und Polis-gesellschaft: Studien zum griechischen Adel in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Steiner, Ann. 2007. *Reading Greek Vases*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1993. "The Meaning of Repetition: Visual Redundancy on Archaic Athenian Vases." *AM* 108: 197-219.
- Steiner, Wendy. 1985. "Intertextuality in Painting." *American Journal of Semiotics* 3: 57-67.
- Steinhart, Matthias. 2003. "Literate and Wealthy Women in Archaic Greece: Some Thoughts on the 'Telesstas' Hydria." In *Poetry, Theory, Praxis: The Social Life of Myth, Word and Image in Ancient Greece. Essays in Honor of William J. Slater*, edited by Eric Csapo and Margaret C. Miller, 204-231. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Steuernagel, D. 1998. *Menschenopfer und Mord am Altar. Griechische Mythen in etruskischen Gräbern*. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom. Palilia 3. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert.
- Stewart, Andrew. 2004. "Nudity, the Olympics, and Greek Self-Fashioning." Invited paper, International conference on Athletics, Society and Identity, The Foundation for the Ancient World, Athens.
- _____. 1997. *Art, Desire, and the Body in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- _____. 1993. Introduction to Part Three, "Self-definition in Hellenistic Art." In *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, edited by Bulloch, Gruen, Long and Stewart, 199-201. .
- _____. 1990. *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration*. 2 volumes. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stinton, T.W.L. 1976. "Iphigeneia and the Bears of Brauron." *CQ* 70: 11-3.
- Stopponi, S. 1991. "Un acroterio dal santuario di Cannicella a Orvieto." *ArchCl* 43: 110-61.
- Stoyanov, T. 1988. "Artemis and Iphigenia: A Fragmental Part of a Statuary Group from the Strymon Valley. An Attempt at Reconstruction." *Akten*: 384-5.
- Strachan, J.C.G. 1976. "Iphigenia and Human Sacrifice in Euripides' *Iphigenia Taurica*." *CP* 71: 131-40.

- Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. 1898. *The Woman's Bible*. Originally published, New York: European Publishing Company, 1898. Reprint, New York: Prometheus Books, 1999 (Great Minds Series). Page citations to reprint edition.
- Strocka, V.M. 1977. *Die Wandmalerei der Hanghäuser in Ephesos*. 2 vols. Forschungen in Ephesos VIII/1. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Kommission.
- Strömberg, Agneta. 2003. "Private in Life—Public in Death: The Presence of Women on Attic Classical Funerary Monuments." In *Gender, Cult, and Culture in the Ancient World from Mycenae to Byzantium. Proceedings of the Second Nordic Symposium on Gender and Women's History in Antiquity, Helsinki 20-22 October 2000*, edited by Lena Larsson Lovén and Agneta Strömberg, 28-37. Sävedalen: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Studniczka, F. 1926. "Artemis und Iphigenie." *AbhLeipzig* 37, no. 5.
- Sutton, Jr., Robert Franklin. 1992. "Pornography and Persuasion on Attic Pottery." In *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, edited by Amy Richlin, 3-35. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1981. *The Interaction Between Men and Women Portrayed on Attic Red-figure Pottery*. Ph.D. diss., The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Suzuki, Mihoko. 1989. *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Sweet, W.E. 1987. *Sport and Recreation in Ancient Greece, A Source Book with Translations*. Oxford.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51 (3): 273-86.
- Taplin, Oliver. 2007. *Pots and Plays: Interactions Between Tragedy and Greek Vase-painting of the Fourth Century BC*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Themelis, P. 1971. *Brauron: Guide to the Site and the Museum*.
- Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum (ThesCRA)*. 2005-6. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Thompson, D.L. 1982. "The Picture Gallery at Boscoreale." *AJA* 86: 288.
- Tiverios, M.A. 1996. *Elliniki techni, archaia angaia*. Athens.
- Todisco, Luigi. 2003. *La ceramica figurata a soggetto tragico in Magna Grecia e in Sicilia*. *Archaeologica* 140. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider Editore.
- Tondo, L. and F. Vanni. 1990. *Le gemme dei Medici e dei Lorena nel Museo archeologico di Firenze*. Florence.

- Torelli, M. 2000. *The Etruscans*. Milan.
- Tosi, Tito. 1957a. "Rappresentanze del sacrificio d'Iphigeneia." In *Scritti di Filologia e di Archeologia*, 115-48. Florence: Le Monnier.
- Touchefeu-Meynier, Odette. 1994. "Polyxene." In *LIMC VII*: 431-5.
- Toynbee, J.M.C. 1977. "Greek Myth in Roman Stone." *Latomus* 36: 343-412.
- _____. 1971. *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Trendall, A.D. 1967a. *The Red-figured Vases of Lucania, Campania, and Sicily*. 2 vols. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology, edited by J.D. Beazley, Bernard Ashmole, C.M. Robertson. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1967b. *Phlyax Vases*. 2nd edition. *BICS*, Supplement 19.
- Trendall, A.D., and Alexander Cambitoglou. 1978. *The Red-figured Vases of Apulia*. 2 vols. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology, edited by Bernard Ashmole, Martin Robertson, and John Boardman. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Trendall, A.D., and T.B.L. Webster. 1971. *Illustrations of Greek Drama*. London: Phaidon.
- Tuna-Nörling, Yasemin. 2001. "Polyxena bei Hektors Lösung: Zu einem attisch-rotfigurigen Krater aus Tekirdağ (Bisanthe/Rhaidestos)." *AA* 1: 27-44.
- _____. 1999. "Hektor's Ransom on a Krater from Tekirdağ". In Docter and Moormann, 418-20.
- Türk, G. 1902-9. "Polyxena." In Roscher, 3, cols. 2718-2733.
- Tylor, Edward B. 1871. *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art and Culture*. 2 vols. London: John Murray.
- Van Bremen, Riet. 1983. "Women and Wealth." In Cameron and Kuhrt, eds, *Images of Women in Antiquity*, 223-242.
- Van Nijf, Onno. 2001. "Local Heroes: Athletics, Festivals and Elite Self-fashioning in the Roman East." In *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, edited by Simon Goldhill, 306-34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Straten, F.T. 1995. *Ἡερα καλῶν: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, edited by R. van den Broek, H.J.W. Drijvers, and H.S. Versnel. New York: E.J. Brill.
- Van Wees, Hans. 1998. "A Brief History of Tears: Gender Differentiation in Archaic Greece." In *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical*

- Antiquity*, edited by Lynn Foxhall and John Salmon, 10-53. London and New York: Routledge.
- Varner, Eric R. 2000. "Grotesque Vision: Seneca's Tragedies and Neronian Art." In *Seneca in Performance*, edited by Harrison, 119-36.
- Vellay, Charles. 1957. *Les légendes du Cycle Troyen*. Monaco: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Venit, Marjorie Susan. 2003. "A Reconsideration of the 'Relief of the Gods' From Brauron." *AK* 46: 44-55.
- Vermeule, Emily. 1986. "'Priam's Castle Blazing' A Thousand Years of Trojan Memories." In *Troy and the Trojan War: A Symposium Held at Bryn Mawr College, October 1984*, edited by Machteld J. Mellink, 77-92. Bryn Mawr, PA: Bryn Mawr College.
- _____. 1979. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*. Sather Classical Lectures 46. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vermeule, Emily, and Suzanne Chapman. 1971. "A Protoattic Human Sacrifice?" *AJA* 75: 285-93.
- Vernant, J.-P. 1991a. "Beautiful Death and the Mutilated Corpse: Artemis and the Sacrifice that Precedes Combat." In *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*, edited by F. Zeitlin. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1991b. "A General Theory of Sacrifice and the Slaying of Victims in the Greek Thysia." In *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*, edited by F.I. Zeitlin. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1974. *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne*. Paris: Maspero.
- Versnel, H.S. 1987. "Wife and Helpmate: Women of Ancient Athens in Anthropological Perspective." In Blok and Mason, 59-86.
- Veyne, Paul. 1988. *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination*. Translated by Paula Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vidal-Naquet, Pierre. 1986. *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World*. Translated by Andrew Szegedy-Maszak. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Vogel, J. 1886. *Scenen euripideischer Tragödien in griechischen Vasengemälden*.
- von Massow, W. 1932. *Die Grabmäler von Neumagen*. Berlin/Leipzig.
- von der Osten, Hans Henning. 1934. *Ancient Oriental Seals in the Collection of Mr. Edward T. Newell*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Walters, H.B. 1926. *Catalogue of the Engraved Gems and Cameos, Greek, Etruscan and Roman in the British Museum*. Revised and enlarged edition of the 1888 first edition. Oxford University Press.
- Walton, J. Michael. 1987. *Living Greek Theatre: A Handbook of Classical Performance and Modern Production*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Ward, William Hayes. 1910. *The Seal Cylinders of Western Asia*. Washington: Carnegie Institute of Washington.
- _____. 1889. "Human Sacrifices' on Babylonian Cylinders." *American Journal of Archaeology and the History of Fine Arts* 5: 34-43.
- Webster, T.B.L. 1967a. *Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr Plays*. 2nd ed. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- _____. 1967b. *The Tragedies of Euripides*. London: Methuen.
- _____. 1959. Review of Tito Tosi's *Scritti di Filologia e di Archeologia*. *CR* 9: 179-80.
- Weidauer, L. 1963. "Poseidon und Eumolpos auf einer Pelike aus Policoro." *AntK* 12: 91-3.
- Weitzmann, Kurt. 1959. *Ancient Book Illumination*. Martin Classical Lectures, vol. XVI. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press for Oberlin College and the Department of Art and Archaeology of Princeton University.
- _____. 1951. *Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1949. "Euripides Scenes in Byzantine Art." *Hesperia* 18: 177-192.
- Wescoat, Bonna D. 1987. *Poets and Heroes: Scenes of the Trojan War*. Exh. cat. Atlanta, GA: Emory University Museum of Art and Archaeology.
- Wesenberg, B. 2001. "B.M. 1206 und die Rekonstruktion der *columnae caelatae*." In *Der Kosmos der Artemis von Ephesos*, edited by U. Muss, 297-314. Vienna.
- West, Martin Litchfield. 1999. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1985. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Whitley, J. 1995. "Tomb Cult and Hero Cult. The Uses of the Past in Archaic Greece." In *Time, Tradition, and Society in Greek Archaeology: Bridging the 'Great Divide'*, edited by N. Spencer, 43-63. New York: Routledge.
- Wiencke, M.I. 1954. "An Epic Theme in Greek Art." *AJA* 58: 285-306.

- Wildfang, Robin Lorsch. 2006. *Rome's Vestal Virgins: A Study of Rome's Vestal Priestesses in the Late Republic and Early Empire*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Wiles, David. 2000. *Greek Theatre Performance: An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilkins, J. 1990. "The State and the Individual: Euripides' Plays of Voluntary Self Sacrifice." In *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality*, edited by A. Powell. New York: Routledge.
- Williams, Dyfri. 1991. "Onesimos and the Getty Ilioupersis." In *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum* 5, 41-64. Malibu, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum.
- _____. 1983. "Women on Athenian Vases: Problems of Interpretation." In Cameron and Kurht, eds., *Images of Women in Antiquity*, 92-106.
- _____. 1976. "The Ilioupersis Cup in Berlin and the Vatican." *JBerlMus* 18: 9-23.
- Wohl, V. 1998. *Intimate Commerce: Exchange, Gender, and Subjectivity in Greek Tragedy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Wolff, Christopher. 1992. "Euripides' *Iphigeneia Among the Taurians*: Aetiology, Ritual, and Myth." *CA* 11: 308-34.
- Wood, Susan. 1978. "Alcestis on Roman Sarcophagi." *AJA* 82: 499-510.
- Woodford, Susan. 2003. *Images of Myths in Classical Antiquity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2003. *The Trojan War in Ancient Art*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Reprint edition.
- Wrede, Henning and Richard Harprath. 1986. *Der Codex Coburgensis: Das erste systematische Archäologiebuch. Römische Antiken-Nachzeichnungen aus der Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Coburg: Kunstsammlungen der Veste Coburg.
- Wright, M. 2005. *Euripides' Escape-Tragedies. A Study of Helen, Andromeda, and Iphigeneia Among the Taurians*. Oxford University Press.
- Yerkes, Royden Keith. 1952. *Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Younger, John. 2002. "Women in Relief: 'Double Consciousness' in Classical Attic Tombstones." In *Among Women: From the Homosocial to the Homoerotic in the Ancient World*, edited by Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz and Lisa Auanger, 167-210. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Zajko, Vanda, and Miriam Leonard, eds. 2006. *Laughing With Medusa: Classical Myth and Feminist Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Zanker, P. 1995. *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*. Translated by A. Shapiro. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zanker, Paul, and Björn Christian Ewald. 2004. *Mit Mythen leben. Die Bilderwelt der römischen Sarkophage*. Munich: Hirmer.
- Zeitlin, Froma. 1999. "Reflections of Erotic Desire in Archaic and Classical Greece." In *Constructions of the Classical Body*, edited by James I. Porter, 51-. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- _____. 1994. "The Artful Eye: Vision, Ecphrasis and Spectacle in Euripidean Theatre." In *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*, edited by Simon Goldhill and Robin Osborne, 138-97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zindel, C. 1974. *Drei vorhomerische Sagenversionen in der griechischen Kunst*. p. 30-4.
- Zwierlein-Diehl, E. 2007. *Antiken Gemmen und ihr Nachleben*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- _____. 1973-1979. *Die antiken Gemmen des kunsthistorischen Museums in Wien*. 3 volumes. Munich.