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The civilization of ancient Greece is commonly equated with the High Classical period of the fifth century в.с. The achievements of this period include the building of the Parthenon, which displayed some of the most famous sculpture in the world. It was the era in which the tragedies of Aischylos, Sophokles, and Euripides, as well as the comedies of Aristophanes, were written. Music and poetry flourished. It was truly a golden age. But it was not the first golden age in the ancient Greek world. Much earlier, there was another. It is called the Geometric period.
The Geometric period is the earliest phase of the ancient Greek civilization and is named for the abstract patterns that decorate many objects, especially pottery. The era begins around the middle of the tenth century and lasts to about $700 \mathrm{~b} . \mathrm{C}$. It witnessed the beginning of alphabetic writing and ambitious figural compositions appear for the first time since the end of the Mycenaean era (i.e., ca. 1100 в.c.). ${ }^{1}$ The main artifacts are mostly small and made of various materials, including bronze, gold, silver, ivory, and clay. Their use is primarily funerary and dedicatory.

The Geometric material preserved in greatest abundance consists of vases that were used as tomb offerings or, in the case of very large vessels, as grave markers. Many of these vases can be grouped stylistically into workshops and sometimes even combined to establish a single painter, but the artists' identities are unknown. Geometric pottery was produced all over the Greek world, and various local styles have been recognized. ${ }^{2}$ The best, however, was made in Athens, where it is most readily visible in the National Archaeological Museum, the Kerameikos Museum, and the museum of the Agora, the ancient city's commercial and civic center. Among other European museums, the Louvre, the British Museum, and the Antikensammlung in Munich have important collections of Geometric pottery. On this side of the Atlantic,
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only the Metropolitan Museum has a large collection, demonstrating the variety and character of this sophisticated pottery. ${ }^{3}$ Particularly notable are three monumental, well-preserved pedestaled kraters. The earliest of the three, New York MMA 34.11.2, is the subject of this article (Figures 1-14). ${ }^{4}$ The figured scenes on MMA 34.11.2 are very special within the context of narrative in Greek Geometric art, and this krater is the nucleus around which five more pedestaled kraters and one stand, all fragmentary, may be grouped to form a workshop. This workshop, which I propose to call the Workshop of New York MMA 34.11.2 after our krater, may be the earliest known thus far in Greek pottery.

The pedestaled krater has a high, slightly offset rim and an ovoid body that tapers to join a flaring base or pedestal, the feature that gives the shape its name. It has two bull's-head handles joined to the body at its widest point. ${ }^{5}$ Often, as on MMA 34.11.2, there is a hole in the bottom through which libations were poured. The decoration of the vase consists of both figural and non-representational motifs.

The invention of the high pedestaled krater was one of the great triumphs of Attic Geometric potters. For a long time, we have known that it served as a grave marker, for one of them was found in situ during the excavations of the Dipylon cemetery in Athens in the late nineteenth century. ${ }^{6}$ Almost all of the known examples of this specific shape come from Attica, particularly Athens. The only exception known to me is the very fragmentary piece found in the excavations at Agrapidochori in Elis, near the west coast of the Peloponnesos. ${ }^{7}$ The high pedestaled krater in monumental form appears as early as 800 b.c. (the Middle Geometric period) and lasts through the third quarter of the eighth century (the Late Geometric I period), when the shape flourished. Thereafter, production on a monumental scale ceases. ${ }^{8}$

## The New York Krater

MMA 34.11 .2 is datable to the Middle Geometric period, probably late in the first quarter of the eighth


Figure 1. Side A of a Middle Geometric pedestaled krater, ca. 760 b.c. $\mathrm{H} .97 .8-99 \mathrm{~cm}$. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1934 (34.11.2)
century b.c. (see below, pp. 18-20). Like other pedestaled kraters of this time, the decoration on the body in the handle zone consists of a metope-triglyph band with a fringed starburst between battlements in the lateral metopes and vertical hatched meander patterns in the triglyphs. The central metope on each side contains figures. Below the handle zone there is
a frieze of figures that continues around the vase without interruption. In addition, there were figures in the panels and spandrels of the handles. There is no filling ornament between the figures.

Each figural metope depicts a prothesis, the deceased lying-in-state with mourners, in this case women. A horizontal line divides the space so that the


Figure 2. Side A/B of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1
deceased appears in the upper zone and the women mourning him in the lower one. On Side A (Figure 5), all that remains of the deceased are his lower extremities. ${ }^{9} \mathrm{He}$ lies on a bier with a thick mattress and heavy legs, both crosshatched. A diminutive mourner with both hands to her head kneels at the foot of the bier. ${ }^{10}$ Below the bier, there are three geese, the body of each outlined and crosshatched, the rest in silhouette except for its reserved eye (the third goose is very faint). Each stands to left, its head and neck turned back, preening itself. In a zone below, mourners stand to right: all of three remain as well as the legs of a fourth and a fifth. They are in silhouette, both arms above their heads forming a semicircle. Each has an inverted-triangle shaped torso with slightly concave sides, rounded buttocks and thighs, strong calves, and short feet. A breast (sometimes very faint) descends from each armpit. On Side B (Figure 3), little remains of the prothesis: the lower legs of the deceased on a crosshatched mattress and part of three mourners in the frieze below the bier. The leg at the foot of the bier seems to have been omitted. The glaze at the break below the mattress belongs to the arched neck of a bird similar to those on Side A.

The handle panels and spandrels contained figures. In the lower right of the panel of handle $A / B$ are the calves and feet of a mourner (Figure 2) to right (there was enough room for four mourners in all). In the right spandrel of handle $B / A$ (Figure 6), a female


Figure 3. Side B of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1


Figure 4. Side B/A of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1
mourner in silhouette stands to right with both hands to her head. Only her left breast is included; the right was omitted.


Figure 5. Side A of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1 showing the prothesis


Figure 6. Side B/A of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1 showing the figure in the spandrel of the handle (photo: the author)

Below the handle zone, a frieze of two warships alternates with two processions of warriors (Figures 1-4, 7, $8,13,14$ ). On each side, the warship appears in the area below the left group of patterns with its ram below the prothesis scene, and each ship is similar except for details. ${ }^{11}$ The ram is thin and pointed, the hull black and sleek. ${ }^{12}$ A star-shaped "eye" within a reserved rectangle decorates the bow screens, and the horn piece of the bow curves gracefully upward and back. ${ }^{13}$ The stern compartment has a balustrade, its rail extending beyond the stern post, and the blade of one steering oar appears below the solid black of the hull. ${ }^{14} \mathrm{~A}$ bird with crosshatched body, perhaps a gull, ${ }^{15}$ perches on the stern post, from which there are two projections near its pointed tip. Above the hull of each ship two horizontal lines stretch from the bow to slightly past the stern, intersected by verticals of which every other one reaches the top horizontal, but only as far as the stern; beyond, each vertical reaches to the top. The lower horizontal line may represent the longitudinal beam, while the shorter vertical lines that extend above it may indicate the tholepins for the oars. ${ }^{16}$ The verticals that reach to the top horizontal may be understood as supporting the deck or a rail, in this case, probably the deck (Figures 7, 8, 13, 14). ${ }^{17}$

Lively combats take place on each ship. On Side A (Figure 9), an attacker, armed with a spear, steps onto the ram and helps himself to a stash of four pikes or ship's spears in the bow. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{He}$ is met by an archer who takes aim with his arrow. Behind the archer, a warrior, probably an opponent who has gained access to the ship, hurls his spear at an enemy no longer preserved. In the stern, two warriors attack one another at close range with their swords, the left tugging at the crest of his opponent's helmet (Figure 10). ${ }^{19}$ Traces of another fighter (lower leg, ends of two spears) appear at the break. I think he carries a Dipylon shield because of the nearly vertical position of the ends of his spears, and he probably resembled his counterparts elsewhere in this frieze.

On Side B (Figures 8, 11, 14), a warrior identified by his helmet crest sits in the stern watching the duel taking place before him. The duelists wear helmets, are armed with swords, and appear evenly matched. Behind them, a warrior (head, part of torso lost) armed with a Dipylon shield and two spears moves to right. In front of him at the break, part of a Dipylon shield lies on the deck (Figure 8). ${ }^{20}$ The next element is a crosshatched sail suspended from a yard that is supported by a mast topped by a finial and anchored to the deck by the sail-yard braces. ${ }^{21}$ At the right break is a little of a second Dipylon shield also lying on the deck. The sail extended to the left beyond the mast, as shown by a bit of glaze indicating more crosshatching.


Figure 7. Side A of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1 showing the ship


Figure 8. Side B of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1 showing the ship


Figure 10. Side A of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1 showing the fight in the stern and a warrior


Figure 11. Side B of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1 showing the helmsman and warriors

Beneath the sail, a woman sits on the deck, her arms outstretched, and the line of glaze extending from each hand to the base of the mast or to the sail-yard brace suggests that she is fettered (Figure 12). Hair on her head identifies her as female and she may be a captive (see p. 24 below). Her right breast is not indicated and there is modern fill in plaster where the left would have been. After a gap and at the next break there is the leg of a warrior to left as well as a line of glaze that is the leg of another. They are probably allies (see p. 25 below). The glaze at the break above the horn piece may be an eight-pointed star like the one behind the bird perched on the stern post. I am not certain what the horizontal line to the left of it represents; perhaps it is the end of the horn but, if so, it would have an odd shape (Figure 8).


Figure 12. Side B of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1 showing the captive woman

Between the two ships are files of warriors to right (Figures 1-4): from Side A to Side B and below handle $A / B$ all thirteen remain; from Side $B$ to Side $A$ and below handle $B / A$, eight are fully preserved, the lower legs and feet of three more remain, with room for another, totaling twelve. Each warrior wears a helmet that has a long crest, with projections along its upper edge; each carries two spears and a Dipylon shield drawn to resemble wickerwork. None of these warriors has arms, nor does the Dipylon warrior standing on the deck on Side B. In front of the head of each warrior there is an eight-pointed star.

## The Shape and Date

MMA 34.11 .2 is the only Middle Geometric monumental pedestaled krater in which the entire shape and system of decoration may be fully understood. The remaining examples are fragmentary. Our krater predates the Late Geometric pieces, for its proportions are rather squat, its contour a bit slack, and the figures occupy less of the surface than they do later (see below, p. 20 and Figure 20). An incomplete, early Middle Geometric krater is the fragmentary one found in Grave 43 of the Kerameikos in Athens, inv. 1254 (Figure 15), ${ }^{22}$ already compared with MMA 34.11 .2 by Marwitz. ${ }^{23}$ The earliest preserved occurrence of a human figure on an Attic Greek vase appears on this krater: in the handle spandrel there is a female mourner, a rare feature that recurs on MMA 34.11.2; in what is left of the handle panel are the hindquarters of a horse and part of its head and neck (our panels had mourners). ${ }^{24}$ The remaining decoration on the Kerameikos krater is ornamental, but on the body in the handle zone it probably had a central panel with figures. It would be most unusual for the spandrels and panels of the handles to have figures and the body only ornamental patterns. ${ }^{25}$


Figure 13. Drawing of the ship on Side A of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1 (drawing: the author)


Figure 14. Drawing of the ship on Side B of the Middle Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 1 (drawing: the author)

The mourner in the handle spandrel on MMA 34.11.2 has an even closer counterpart. It occurs on a fragmentary pedestaled krater, Trachones Tr. 37, found in an unstratified context in the ancient cemetery on the Geroulanos property at Trachones, a suburb of modern Athens near the airport (Figure 16). ${ }^{26}$ In the spandrel, there is a female mourner, identified not only by the position of her arms, but also by her breasts, both on one side. In the small remaining part of the handle panel there is the bent arm of a mourner. To the left of the handle, the preserved decoration indicates that the ornaments were set in metopes and triglyphs with fringed starbursts in the metopes and meanders in the triglyphs. Nothing of a figural central metope remains, but I believe that there was one, for the same reason as for Kerameikos inv. 1254.

Also close to MMA 34.11 .2 is the fragmentary krater found in an unstratified context at Thorikos, TC 65.666 (Figures 17 and 21 ). ${ }^{27}$ Like ours, it has figures in the spandrels and panels of the handles and a prothesis in the central metope on each side. ${ }^{28} \mathrm{~A}$ ground line
for the bier separates it from the mourners below and another line from the mourners above, thus dividing the space into three separate but related zones. The excavators date this krater shortly after the middle of the eighth century b.c. (i.e., in the Late Geometric I period). They draw attention to the many features it shares with MMA 34.11 .2 and seem to accept the Middle Geometric II dating for it. However, they justify the discrepancy in date of ten to fifteen years by suggesting that the Thorikos krater was made locally by artists who were still working in the more conservative Middle Geometric style rather than in the progressive Late Geometric one that had taken root in Athens by the middle of the century. This explanation seems forced. As far as I know, these two kraters are the only Middle Geometric ones that have both a figural metope on each side and the composition divided horizontally into thematically related zones.

Two non-joining fragments of a Middle Geometric pedestaled krater found in a well in the Athenian Agora, P 8357, preserve only ornament, a hatched


Figure 15 . Fragment of a Middle Geometric pedestaled krater, ca. 800 b.c. Kerameikos Museum, Athens, inv. 1254 (photo: DAI, Athens)
battlement pattern above a zone each of zigzags and upright triangles (Figure 18). Above the battlement is another zone of zigzags, then what looks like a little bit of an area of metopes and triglyphs. ${ }^{29}$ Louvre CA 4606 preserves the start of one bull's-head handle decorated with horizontal chevrons between lines, then a zigzag pattern above a hatched battlement and a zone of multiple zigzags (Figure 19). ${ }^{30}$

These five kraters, Kerameikos inv. 1254, Trachones Tr. 37, Thorikos TC 65.666, Agora P 8357, and Louvre CA 4606 , represent the Attic Middle Geometric monumental high pedestaled kraters known to me that are relevant to MMA 34.11.2. Where preserved, the figures appear in a metope in the center of each side in the handle zone, as well as in the spandrels and panel of each handle. Between the handle and the figural panel, the ornament is arranged in a metopetriglyph configuration. In a frieze below the handle zone, the artist of MMA 34.11 .2 added a depiction of two splendid ship fights alternating with files of marching warriors. The effect of these kraters is restrained and elegant, with a thoughtful balance between the figural and ornamental areas. In Late Geometric, beginning with the Dipylon and Hirschfeld Workshops, ${ }^{31}$ additional figures are introduced and gradually, as on other shapes, they take up more and more of the surface of the vase and are set in a frieze rather than a metope. New York MMA 14.130 .14 (Figure 20), from the Hirschfeld Workshop, and MMA 14.130 .15 are good examples. ${ }^{32}$ The overall effect is very different. ${ }^{33}$

The majority of scholars who have dealt with MMA 34.11.2 accept the Middle Geometric II dating, placing it in the second quarter of the eighth century b.c., just before the Late Geometric series begins. But a few dissent, and it is worth reviewing their reasons, when


Figure 16. Fragment of a Middle Geometric pedestaled krater, showing a mourner in a handle spandrel, ca. first quarter of the 8th century b.c. Trachones, Geroulanos Collection, Tr. 37; now Piraeus Archaeological Museum (photo: after Johannes M . Geroulanos, "Grabsitten des ausgehenden geometrischen Stils im Bereich des Gutes Trachones bei Athen," AM 88 [1973], pl. 52, 5)
given, for a later date. Young was the first to state a preference for a late eighth-century date when he compared MMA 34.11.2 with Agora P 8357, which he said has a similar meander (battlement) and key pattern (Figures 1, 3, 18). ${ }^{34}$ Marwitz observed quite a few peculiarities of potting as well as decoration and thought that they warranted a late date for the krater, ${ }^{35}$ an opinion accepted by Morrison and Williams, whose focus was on ships, not chronology. ${ }^{36}$ Arias placed MMA 34.11.2 in the third quarter of the eighth century. ${ }^{37}$ Finally, Dörig considered MMA 34.11.2 late for rather strange reasons: all the units and symmetrical articulation of parts are molded into a freer ensemble; the contour begins to waver; the fields lose their regularity and the prothesis is "reduced to small metopes. ${ }^{n 3}{ }^{8}$ The date I prefer is Middle Geometric II (i.e., ca. 8oo-76о в.c.) because of the shape and system of decoration described above and for reasons given below in the discussion of the figural scenes. Furthermore, on none of our human figures is the eye indicated, which is standard later on carefully painted vases such as MMA 14.130 .14 (Figure 20); each figure on our krater is rendered in pure silhouette, with hatching or crosshatching reserved for the birds and inanimate objects. Also, there is no filling ornament between the figures. It seems much more likely that MMA 34.11 .2 stands at the beginning of a complex, energetic figural style rather than at the end. As Kirk put it: "The fighting on the deck . . . is animated, and the figures do not yet have the stiffness of the Late Geometric period. ${ }^{39}$


Figure ${ }^{17}$. Fragment of a Middle Geometric pedestaled krater showing part of a prothesis, ca. 76 о в.с. Max. 17.9 cm . Thorikos, TC 65.666 (photo: after Herman Mussche et al., Thorikos 1965: Rapport préliminaire sur la troisième campagne de fouilles [Brussels, 1967], p. 43, fig. 49)

## The Subjects

In the Geometric period, pictures of various subjects painted on vases were the principal form of artistic expression, the most viable means of visually describing human deeds and conveying human feelings. For a long time, the Late Geometric period monopolized the attention of scholars seeking to identify workshops and individual painters or studying scenes for their narrative content and ability to communicate directly with the viewer. But picture-making in Attic pottery really begins in the Middle Geometric period, which was the first to depict the prothesis with the deceased and mourners and to represent combats-whether duels or battles, on land or at sea. Middle Geometric artists also are the first to differentiate between the sexes. For the prothesis, the basic study is by Gudrun Ahlberg, who analyzed the components of the two parts of the Attic funeral in the eighth century b.c. ${ }^{40}$ The prothesis scenes on MMA 34.11.2 are among the earliest preserved, and they are the only Middle Geometric protheses in Ahlberg's catalogue. ${ }^{41}$ The early date of MMA 34.11.2 may account for the unusual feature of having the bier with the corpse occupy the upper half of each panel, while the mourners appear in the lower half, the two zones separated by a ground line for the bier. In later examples, mourners may occupy two friezes, one above the other, but the bier always shares the ground line with the group of mourners who surround it. Good examples are Athens N.M.


Figure 18. Fragment of a Middle Geometric pedestaled krater, ca. first quarter of the 8 th century в.с. H. 16.5 cm . The Athenian Agora, Athens, P 8357 (photo: American School of Classical Studies, Agora Excavations)

804 by the Dipylon Master or MMA 14.130 .14 by a painter of the Hirschfeld Workshop (Figure 20). ${ }^{42}$
The only other Middle Geometric exception to this arrangement known to me, and hence the best parallel with MMA 34.11 .2 , is the fragmentary pedestaled krater found at Thorikos dated by the excavators shortly after the middle of the eighth century (i.e., Late Geometric) and by Ahlberg to Late Geometric II a, or about 730 b.c. (Figure 17). ${ }^{43}$ Ahlberg, however, knew only the main fragment with part of the prothesis, ${ }^{44}$ and not the fragments found in 1975 and 1979, well after her study appeared. These fragments established


Figure 19. Fragment of a Middle Geometric pedestaled krater, ca. first quarter of the 8th century b.c. H. 14 cm . Musée du Louvre, Paris, CA 4606 (photo: Louvre)


Figure 20. Side A of a Late Geometric pedestaled krater, ca. 725 в.c. H. 108.3 cm . The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1914 (14.130.14)
that the system of decoration between the central figural panel and the handles consisted of metopes and triglyphs with concentric circles in the metopes and meanders or starbursts in the triglyphs (Figure 21 ). Part of the prothesis on each side remains, that on the reverse merely a small non-joining fragment. ${ }^{45}$ The better-preserved scene on the obverse shows a row of standing mourners above and below the bier, each separated by a ground line. That on the reverse preserves a little bit of the bier with the legs of the deceased and part of four mourners in the lower frieze, but presumably there was a row of them above as well. The panel was probably a metope, as on MMA 34.11 .2 , and the scene is very compartmentalized, even more so than on our krater.

Louvre A 517, a Late Geometric example from the Dipylon Workshop, has a row of seated figures above the bier and a standing row of them below it, as well as mourners standing at each side, but there the composition reads as a unit. ${ }^{46}$ If the reconstruction of a further vase, Athens N.M. 8o6 (incorporating four fragments in the Louvre, CA 3272 a-d, and one fragment of Athens N.M. 802) is correct, ${ }^{47}$ it shows the prothesis framed by two chariot teams with a row of mourners above and below, each in a long narrow frieze. ${ }^{48}$ Below this ensemble comes a zone of chariots each drawn by a single galloping horse. The effect is quite different from that of MMA 34.11.2, for the figures occupy a very large proportion of the krater's surface. Athens N.M. 806 is dated Late Geometric I a. ${ }^{49}$

In figural composition and the amount of ornament, the Thorikos krater is closer to MMA 34.11.2 and other Middle Geometric pedestaled kraters than it is to any of the Late Geometric examples; it ought, therefore, to be dated to the Middle Geometric period.

Of note also in the prothesis scenes of MMA 34.11.2 is the bier. Kyrieleis lists it among his five examples of Type II: club-shaped legs thickening toward the top..$^{\circ}$ But actually, this is the only feature our krater shares with Kyrieleis's four other examples. These have legs in pure silhouette to distinguish them from the crosshatched mattress, whereas the bier on MMA 34.11 .2 is completely crosshatched without a distinction between legs and mattress. According to Ahlberg there is no parallel for our bier, and in Prothesis and Ekphora she says that it "seems to be a more substantial bier, i.e. a sort of catafalque without the bier legs rendered. ${ }^{51}$ This may be another argument in favor of a Middle Geometric date for our krater.

The location of the prothesis in real life has provoked interest, but the problem is probably insoluble. Marwitz offers suggestions in favor of both indoors and outdoors. ${ }^{5^{2}}$ Ahlberg discusses the problem of setting at some length and suggests that the prothesis took place either inside the house or outside in a protected area, perhaps a courtyard. ${ }^{53}$ She thinks that weapons or other objects above or below the bier and certain kinds of furniture indicate an indoor setting; that the presence of tripods, baldachins, and other structures suggests a courtyard. Perhaps if birds and animals are included, an outdoor venue is intended, but even this cannot be proven. The best advice may be Ahlberg's: "I do not think it is advisable to strain the iconographic information of the setting of the prothesis scenes more than has been done here. ${ }^{5} 4$

Of all the features on MMA 34.11.2, the ship scenes have provoked the most interest. ${ }^{55}$ Kirk noted that in Attic Geometric painting a surprisingly large number of ship scenes occur, and he suggested that this fact could hardly be coincidental, especially because so many of them appear on pedestaled kraters. ${ }^{5}{ }^{6} \mathrm{He}$ summarized earlier explanations for the phenomenon: (1) the kraters marked graves of those who belonged to Athenian naucraries; ${ }^{57}$ (2) the deceased lost his life in a naval battle; (3) the naval scenes were inspired by heroic saga and represent either specific or generalized legendary engagements. None of these explanations is without problems, according to Kirk, who further remarked that not all of the ships appear in battle scenes and sometimes the ship itself is the focus. While he more or less agreed ship combats on the big kraters could suggest how the deceased lost his life, Kirk also proposed that the appearance of so many ships might


Figure 21. Reconstruction drawing of the pedestaled krater in Figure 17 incorporating the fragments found in 1975 and 1979 (photo: after Marthe and Jean Bingen, "Le cratère 'géométrique récent' de Thorikos," in Rayonnement Grec: Hommages à Charles Delvoye [Brussels, 1982], p. 8o)
indicate the Athenians began to assemble a defensive naval force as early as the eighth century b.c. ${ }^{58}$

Nearly all of the Attic ship scenes belong to the Late Geometric period. A brief discussion of the exceptions reveals how striking the ship scenes are on MMA 34.11.2 and how they stand at the head of a significant pictorial tradition. The earliest ships on Attic vases seem to be the following, all Middle Geometric: a one-handled cup in Athens N.M. 1847 1; a hydriskos in Athens (no no.), said to be from the same tomb as the cup; an oinochoe found in a tomb at Agioi Theodoroi in the Corinthia; and an Attic pyxis found at Lefkandi. ${ }^{59}$ Each of these shows only the ship. There are no human figures, although the ship on the Lefkandi pyxis has two birds standing on the deck. The elegant vessels have a slender hull, curved stern, steering oars, and a large stem with horn. The ship on the oinochoe has a sail, that on the pyxis a mast and sail-yard brace, but no sail. The hydriskos ship has a mast, a yard, and two braces, but no sail, unless it is furled at the top of the yard.

The famous Middle Geometric II skyphos, Eleusis 910 (741) (Figure 22), ${ }^{60}$ shows, on one side, a diminutive archer taking aim to left at a warrior armed with three spears and a Dipylon shield; a similar warrior with a Dipylon shield appears next to the stern. Neither looks particularly threatening. A bird perches on the stern. On the other side is a lively fight with six warriors, none armed with shields. Ahlberg considers the two sides to be linked thematically. ${ }^{61}$

The ship scenes on MMA 34.11.2 are not much later, but the progress over the earlier works is enormous. On the Eleusis skyphos the figures do not directly engage one another. The warriors with Dipylon shields
frame the ship instead of participating in the combat. In the conflict on the other side, the arrangement and effect are similar. ${ }^{62}$ On the New York vase, the opposing sides in each combat are clearly drawn and each scene reads as a true narrative. Much scholarly attention has focused on these two scenes, beginning with Miss Richter's publication in $1934 .{ }^{6}$ Following Pernice's observations of ships on Geometric vases, Miss Richter saw that the poles in the bow of the ship on Side A are the pikes or ship's spears referred to by Homer, ${ }^{64}$ and then suggested that the protruding rods at the stern represent the horizontal beams.

Grunwald suggested that the figure behind the archer on Side A is not Greek because she thinks he wears a kind of jacket or tunic; ${ }^{65}$ she has misread the surface, for the warrior is nude just like the others (Figure 9). Grunwald also argues that the Dipylon shields lying on the deck on Side B are not booty, but stand ready for the ship's crew to use, just as the pikes do in the ship on the other side. ${ }^{66}$ This is an important observation. Coldstream, in his review of Ahlberg, Fighting on Land and Sea, observed that "there is no Geometric battle scene where men wearing the same type of shield are fighting each other." ${ }^{67}$ Grunwald went one step further. She thinks that in scenes of the prothesis, warriors with Dipylon shields always belong to the same side as the deceased and that the Dipylon shield is reserved for one side only. ${ }^{68}$ This observation seems to be correct for Middle Geometric and Late Geometric I representations, as perusal of the illustrations in Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, reveals. ${ }^{69}$ By Late Geometric II, hoplite warriors with round shields are more frequent, Dipylon warriors much less so. ${ }^{70} \mathrm{By}$ analogy, Grunwald also draws similar conclusions for land and sea battles in Middle Geometric and Late Geometric I, only here the evidence is meager, because battle scenes are rarely combined with the prothesis. In fact, our krater seems to be the only certain example. The dearth of comparable material among the combats may be due to the very fragmentary condition of the preserved vases, and future excavations may contribute positive evidence. At present, I subscribe to Grunwald's idea that the Dipylon warriors on the New York krater belong to the side of the deceased.

Of considerable interest and importance is the figure sitting on the deck on Side B (Figure 12). Marwitz was the first to identify, somewhat tentatively, this figure as a woman, ${ }^{71}$ and he remarked that women and booty were already in the ship when the Kikones seized the companions of Odysseus. ${ }^{72}$ He did not, however, assign our scene a mythological subject. While there is certainly a heroic flavor to this scene, more evidence is needed to interpret it as an illustration of a specific moment in


Figure 22. Middle Geometric skyphos showing a ship battle, ca. 80 в.c. H. 6.4 cm. Archaeological Museum, Eleusis, 910 (741) (photo: DAI, Athens)
myth. ${ }^{73}$ Ahlberg also considers the figure a woman and notes that her position is unique; figures tend to be placed to one side of the sail, not beneath it. ${ }^{74}$ She does not believe that the woman handles the sail but instead that she is tied to the brace as a captive; she also thinks that the Dipylon shields to either side of the sail yard are the spoils of war carried from the battlefield. ${ }^{75}$ I do not share the latter view. Grunwald agrees that the figure is a woman, because of the hair, and thinks that she holds a spear, ${ }^{76}$ a suggestion difficult to support by analogy with other female figures.

A brief digression will demonstrate how remarkable the figure of our woman is within the context of Geometric narrative. First of all, in Middle Geometric and Late Geometric I scenes, the roles of women are much more limited than those of men, which increases the importance of our woman many times over. Women appear only as corpses or mourners. Men may assume these roles, but they also fight each other with swords, spears, or bows and arrows, they sail ships and drive chariots, just to name some of the well-attested pursuits. By the Late Geometric II period, men ride horses, and both men and women appear as dancers. ${ }^{77}$

Grunwald singles out two Geometric vase fragments on which she thinks a woman appears in a combat scene. Both are Late Geometric, thus later than our krater. Neither shows a captive and each presents problems of interpretation.

The first fragment, Louvre CA 3370, depicts parts of three, perhaps four, corpses (Figures 23, 24)..$^{8}$ The corpse in question appears at the left: the head faces down; the torso is an inverted triangle; a bit of each arm remains. On the chest is a row of three reserved dots. Quite a discrepancy exists between the photograph (Figure 23) and Grunwald's drawing (Figure 24). The faint traces of glaze she believes are two breasts descending from one side of the chest are prob-


Figure 23. Fragment of a Late Geometric pedestaled krater showing part of a fight at sea, ca. $740-730$ в.c. H. 5.5 cm . Musée du Louvre, Paris, CA 3370 (photo: Louvre)
ably placed too low to justify the interpretation; Grunwald's desire for the bits of glaze above the head to be long locks of hair may be wishful thinking. Problematic is the shaft (very faint) of a spear near the top of the fragment, which the figure could have held. Thus, the gender is not as certain as Grunwald would have us believe, and I am inclined to think the figure is male.

The second fragment on which a woman may appear in a combat, without actually fighting, occurs in a ship scene on Louvre A 530 , which is by a painter from the Dipylon Workshop (Figures 25, 26). ${ }^{79}$ The horizontal legs and vertical feet of a corpse at the right attest to a violent episode, which may still be going on in a part of the composition no longer preserved. At the left, a warrior armed with a spear tugs at a sail yard (the sail would have been to the right of the right break) while, in front of him, a figure seated on the deck also holds a sail yard, but not as tightly. ${ }^{80}$ Grunwald identifies this figure as a woman and interprets the projection above the shoulders as hair. Again, there is a discrepancy between the photograph (Figure 25) and the drawing (Figure 26): the surface is abraded in the area where Grunwald restores hair. The main indication that this figure is a woman is the skirt she appears to wear; the legs of an oarsman seated in the galley below her are clearly separated.

The figure on the New York krater is undeniably a woman because of her short spiky hair. Long hair becomes standard for women only in Late Geometric II; ${ }^{81}$ prior to that, if hair is shown, it is spiky, the corpse on Athens N.M. 804 being a good Late Geometric I example. ${ }^{82}$ As mentioned above, there may have been a breast in the area now filled in with plaster. As for the woman's role on the New York vase, I think that she is a captive, for she really does seem to be fettered (Figure 12). In any case, she is markedly different from


Figure 24. Drawing of the fragment of a Late Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 23 (photo: after Christiane Grunwald, "Frühe attische Kampfdarstellungen," Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica 15 [1983], p. 167, fig. 21)
other women in Middle and Late Geometric I painting who are corpses or mourners.

Examination of the two ship scenes reveals considerable differences between them. On Side A, the fight is in full swing and there is no helmsman; one assumes he fights along with his companions. Thucydides, writing in the fifth century b.c., tells us that in early times all men on board were both crew and fighters. ${ }^{89}$ There seem to be four distinct parts to this battle (Figures 7, 13): (1) the fight in the prow with the enemy stepping on the ram and about to attack the archer; (2) the enemy spearman behind the archer whose opponent is lost; (3) the calf of one leg of a fighter to right and the ends of his two spears; (4) the fight in the stern. On Side B, the fighting seems almost at an end, and perhaps the ship is about to set off, which would explain the unfurled sail (Figures 8, 14). ${ }^{84}$ That the ship on Side A is beached is clear, because the warrior standing on the prow seizing a ship's spear has presumably just leaped onto the ship from dry land. Whether the ship on Side B is sailing or beached and about to set sail (as I am inclined to think) is not as clear. The helmsman is situated in the stern and a duel takes place before him, perhaps one of the last skirmishes (Figure 11). ${ }^{85}$ Next comes the fighter with the Dipylon shield who seems to have no opponent. Perhaps he guards the captive woman. ${ }^{86}$ Near the prow are traces of warriors (just the lower legs of two to left remain). I think they may be allies not opponents, even though they move from right to left as the enemy does on Side A. The spear held by one of them was carried at waist level, not held poised for throwing (Figures 8, 14 ; compare the warrior behind the archer on Side A: Figures 9, 13). Also, since the battle seems to be winding down on this side, these men may be about to change from fighters to rowers. There are no pikes in the prow and there was no enemy standing


Figure ${ }^{25}$. Fragment of a Late Geometric pedestaled krater showing part of a ship and its crew, ca. 730 в.c. H. 10.6 cm . Musée du Louvre, Paris, A 530 (photo: Louvre)
on the ram, for what remains of the area above it is unglazed.

The sail was about double its preserved width as indicated by the start of more crosshatching to the left of the mast and the diagonal line attached to the deck which is the end of the sail-yard brace. It would take a big sail as well as many oarsmen to power a ship this long. ${ }^{87}$ Every author who has dealt with the ship on Side B of our krater has called the object above the woman a sail. However, there has been some oral discussion that instead of a sail, it might be a kind of


Figure 26. Drawing of the fragment of a Late Geometric pedestaled krater in Figure 25 (photo: after Grunwald, "Frühe attische Kampfdarstellungen," p. 164, fig. 20).
baldachin or canopy intended to shelter the captive woman from the intensely hot Mediterranean sun. I believe the object is a sail, but perhaps a short discussion would help to clarify the matter.

First of all, a baldachin or canopy is supported by poles attached to its four corners. A sail requires a central vertical mast and diagonal yards, stays, and braces that allow it to be maneuvered so it can catch favorable winds for propelling the ship. Flexibility of the sail also helps to steer the vessel. A canopy is stationary and requires none of the rigging a sail does. While there are quite a few ships in Geometric painting, there are not many with sails, a situation that perhaps reflects the fragmentary condition of so many of the
ship representations. So far, all of the Geometric ships with sails that I have been able to find have an arrangement similar to that of the sail on our ship. The mast is centered amidship and the yard is attached to it. The sail is horizontal, rectangular, stiff, and hatched. Sail-yard braces are in place. ${ }^{88}$

One further point concerning the ship scenes. Almost thirty years ago, J. L. Benson published his study of Greek Geometric figural art and its possible Bronze Age antecedents. In it he pointed to many similarities between the birds, as well as some of the warriors on MMA 34.11.2, and specific Mycenaean and Minoan representations. ${ }^{89}$ Later, he remarked somewhat plaintively, "that shipboard battles are not known to be a theme of Mycenaean visual art suggests that the Geometric painter was left on his own. . . ."90 Now, literally, Benson's ship has come in. An excavation at the coastal site of ancient Kynos (modern Pyrgos Livanaton), about sixty miles north of Athens, has radically changed the picture, for about a dozen fragments of Late Mycenaean III C (i.e., ca. 1200 b.c.) kraters were found that depict scenes of warriors at sea and on ships. ${ }^{91}$ They are not actually in combat, but one fragment depicts three warriors, one behind the other, facing the prow. The first seems to be armed with a bow and arrow; the second has a rectangular shield with incurving sides and holds his spear poised; the third wields a similar spear and has a round shield. A helmsman sits in the stern manning the steering oar. There is no sail. ${ }^{92}$

The files of warriors between each ship on our krater do not take part in the combats, which are completely contained within the parameters of the ships (Figures $1-4,10,11$ ). The warriors are schematic, stiff, and formal, especially with the star in front of the head of each, an observation already made by Marwitz. ${ }^{93}$ Furthermore, the warriors are somewhat larger than the participants in the fights, a consideration very likely prompted by the height of the frieze. These Dipylon warriors represent a type, almost a symbol, which may account for why they are so different from the lively, individualized, energetic fighters on the ships. In many ways the two files of Dipylon warriors foreshadow Late Geometric rows of figures (Figure 20). ${ }^{94}$

And, finally, the Dipylon shield. The literature on the Dipylon shield is vast and far-ranging, with quite differing thoughts about its relation to reality and to heroic representations. This is not the place to rehearse all of the opinions but merely to discuss the problem in general and to cite the more recent bibliography. Hurwit and Langdon have summarized the problem and cited the most pertinent discussions. ${ }^{95}$ The basic questions are these: is the Dipylon shield an
artistic recollection of the old Mycenaean figure-ofeight shield; did the Dipylon shield exist in real life; or was the Dipylon shield invented by the Greek Geometric artist as an attribute of heroes? Since these shields, if they did exist, would very likely have been made of perishable materials-wood and hide-the answers to these questions may never be known. With regard to the Mycenaean figure-of-eight shield, it does not seem to me to be a precursor of the Dipylon shield because the configuration of each is quite different. The Mycenaean shield is basically two circles that overlap slightly, and it protected the warrior from shoulders to ankles; the Dipylon shield is a circle or an oval with two rather large incurving sections removed, and it extends only from shoulders to midthigh. ${ }^{66}$ While it cannot be proven conclusively that the Dipylon shield did exist, the fact that it appears in scenes in which other warriors carry round and rectangular shields seems to support the opinion that such a shield was in use during the Geometric period. ${ }^{97}$

## The Workshop and the Painters

In the scholarship of Geometric vase painting, the workshops and painters that have been distinguished thus far are all Late Geometric. In 1943, Gerda Nottbohm published a pioneering article on the Dipylon and, to a lesser extent, the Hirschfeld Workshops. ${ }^{98}$ Two decades later, Davison concentrated on Late Geometric and Early Protoattic workshops and painters. ${ }^{99}$ Coldstream identified new Late Geometric workshops and extended his study to include other geographical regions of Greece and to define local styles that are distinct from Attic. ${ }^{100}$ For the Early and Middle Geometric periods in Attica, he enumerated significant well deposits and grave groups, ${ }^{101}$ and in his text he discussed the shapes and patterns important for each phase.

The general absence of figures in Early Geometric vase painting may account for the lack of attempts by scholars to try to identify workshops. In Middle Geometric, especially in the second phase, figures become not only more numerous but also quite individualized. The New York krater is the nucleus around which six more pieces, all fragments, may be grouped to establish a workshop.

We will never know or even be able to guess how many artists were active in the first half of the eighth century. Brann thought that Middle Geometric vases were decorated "by only a few painters, perhaps even by a single artisan," and on the basis of "settings and make-up," she grouped our krater with the following


Figure 27. Leg of a Middle Geometric fragmentary stand showing two warriors, ca. 760 b.c. National Archaeological Museum, Athens, N.M. ${ }^{1} 7384$ (photo: TAP Service, Athens)
four pieces: ${ }^{102}$ Eleusis 910 (741), the skyphos with a ship fight (Figure 22); Athens N.M. 17384 and Toronto $957 \times 245$, two leg fragments that belong to the same stand and on each leg there is a duel (Figures 27, 28); Copenhagen N.M. inv. 1628, an oinochoe with a ship fight on its body; and Athens N.M. 194, an oinochoe with warriors on its body. ${ }^{103}$ Brann based this grouping chiefly on the "the hose-like arms of some of the figures, ${ }^{1104}$ but she stopped well short of attributing all four vases to a single hand or even to a workshop. In 1961, Marwitz saw that Kerameikos inv. 1254 (Figure 15) was closest in shape and decoration to MMA 34.11.2, but added Athens N.M. 8o6, which is probably transitional from Late Geometric I a to Late Geometric I b, thus later. ${ }^{105}$ Coldstream attributed MMA 34.11.2 to the same hand as the Athens-Toronto stand, ${ }^{106}$ and Ahlberg also linked our krater with this


Figure 28. Leg of a Middle Geometric fragmentary stand showing two warriors, from the same stand as the one in Figure 27, ca. 760 b.c. Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, $957 \times 245$ (photo: courtesy of the Royal Ontario Museum)
stand on the basis of the similarity between the dueling warriors on each piece. ${ }^{107}$ This attribution was accepted by Langdon, who judged the figures "ancestral to the great Dipylon workshop" for they "belong to a still exclusive club of Middle Geometric human figures. ${ }^{\text {"108 }}$

Of the vases mentioned above, four may be dissociated from the New York krater: Athens N.M. 194 and Copenhagen N.M. inv. 1628 because they are considerably later than MMA 34.11.2; the Eleusis skyphos; and Athens N.M. 8o6. Athens N.M. 194 is dated to Late Geometric II a by Coldstream and Ahlberg and the shapes of the figures are very different from those on MMA 34.11.2; Copenhagen N.M. inv. 1628 is also dated to Late Geometric II by these two scholars and the figures are much sketchier than they are on our krater. ${ }^{109}$ The compositions on the Eleusis skyphos, although Middle Geometric, lack the true integration
of the figures, and the drawing is by a different hand. The fourth, Athens N.M. 8o6, a Late Geometric high pedestaled krater, is by another artist. ${ }^{110}$

Out of the group of vases linked with MMA 34.11.2 (Figures 1-14), there remain Kerameikos inv. 1254 (Figure 15) and the Athens-Toronto stand (Figures 27, 28). Kerameikos inv. 1254 shares the same precise, elegant ornamental patterns as well as the female mourner in the handle spandrel (Figure 6). Our woman is perhaps a little more robust, but this is not a significant difference. Each has a similar triangular torso, well-rounded thighs, and strong calves. The arms of the Kerameikos woman are bent sharply at the elbow instead of forming a continuous curve, and she has two breasts on one side of her chest instead of one on each side. These differences do not justify assigning the Kerameikos krater to a different workshop, just to a different painter within it. The dueling warriors on each leg of the stand look as if they might have stepped off one of the ships on our krater in order to fight somewhere on land: each has a triangular torso with slightly concave sides, curved arms without pronounced elbows, large buttocks, and strong calves; also a helmet with projections along the outer edge of the long crest and a sword with two crosspieces at the hilt; each grapples with his opponent.

Four more pieces may be added, each a high pedestaled krater. The first is Thorikos TC 65.666 discussed above (p. 19). On the body, in the handle zone, it has a metope-triglyph arrangement of the ornament and a figural metope (Figure 21 ), not a frieze as will be the case later (Figure 20). It also shares two very rare features with MMA 34.11.2: it depicts a prothesis on each side, not on just one, and the composition within the metope is set in friezes, one above the other, a row of mourners above and below the bier, each separated by a ground line. That our krater has two, not three, zones is a marginal difference. The idea is the same. Furthermore, the arms of these mourners form a semicircle above their heads and the position of the feet of each is slightly ahead of the figure's center of gravity, other features the Thorikos krater shares with our mourners. A further link with the workshop is the presence of a horse in the partially preserved handle panel; a similar horse appears on Kerameikos inv. 1254 (Figure ${ }_{15}$ ). The second vase is the fragmentary krater found at Trachones Tr. 37 (Figure 16). It has an elegant metope-triglyph configuration in the handle zone and mourners in both the spandrel and the panel of the handle. The preserved mourner is similar to the one on Kerameikos inv. 1254 , for her arms are bent at the elbows and both breasts are on the right side. ${ }^{111}$ The next piece that belongs to this workshop
is Agora P 8357, two non-joining fragments of a pedestaled krater (Figure 18). Here, there is less to go on because all that remains is part of the ornamental patterns. Yet, the hatched battlement, a rare ornament, finds a good parallel above and below the sunbursts in the lateral metopes of our krater and on the Kerameikos krater (Figures 1, 15). What remains of the other patterns on the Agora fragments are similar enough to the comparable ones on our krater to justify a workshop attribution. The last piece is Louvre CA 4606 (Figure 19). It shares the hatched battlement pattern with the three kraters just mentioned, and it has a multiple zigzag similar to the one below the hatched orthodox meander on Kerameikos inv. 1254.

If these six pedestaled kraters and one stand come from a single workshop, is it possible to discern the hands of individual artists? I think it is. In Attic blackfigured and Attic red-figured vase painting, establishing hands within a single workshop is often not too difficult because the various personalities are quite distinct and the styles of drawing offer many criteria. In Geometric vase painting, detecting artists also ought to be possible, if one knows what to look for. The seven pieces discussed here are products of a Middle Geometric workshop active in the first four decades of the eighth century b.c. and perhaps slightly earlier, given the date preferred for Kerameikos inv. $1254 .{ }^{112}$ They may be only a fraction of the workshop's total output during its floruit, and perhaps more vases may be added as time progresses. I believe MMA 34.11.2, the Thorikos krater, and the Athens-Toronto stand are by the same painter. Not only are the details of drawing alike, but they reveal a personality interested in human narrative in which the figures actively interact with one another. This painter stands at the threshold of the extended narratives produced by artists of the Dipylon and Hirschfeld Workshops. Of the four remaining kraters, Kerameikos inv. 1254 and the Trachones krater seem to have enough in common to be by the same hand. The Agora fragments do not yield enough criteria to place them in either group. Perhaps the presence of the hatched battlement indicates that it is a transitional piece from one to the other. The same probably holds true for Louvre CA $4606 .{ }^{113}$

In Greek vase studies, it is customary to give a name to pieces that may be grouped together as products of a workshop composed of several painters or produced by a single artist. In the archaic and classical periods, when potters and painters often signed their vases, the designated name is obvious. But when there is no signature, the choice of name has broader implications. For the Geometric period, the following examples indicate the options. The Dipylon Workshop gets its name from the cemetery discovered in

1871 near the Dipylon Gate in Athens that yielded the best vases. The Hirschfeld Workshop is called after Gustav Hirschfeld, who excavated the Dipylon cemetery in 1871-72. And the Workshop of Athens 894 owes its name to its eponymous vase, a Late Geometric II neck-amphora in the National Archaeological Museum. I should like to name this new workshop the Workshop of New York MMA 34.11 .2 after our krater, which is the best-preserved piece. If the association of these vases is correct, this would be the earliest workshop yet recognized in Greek pottery.
The painters of the workshop were keen observers of life and very successful in representing it. The prothesis scenes on our krater and on the Thorikos fragments provide eloquent evidence. Not only do they stand at the head of a long and important series of funerary depictions, but also, even in this nascent stage of Greek picture-making, they contain all of the essential ingredients that will make up the prothesis for as long as it is represented in Greek art. The fierce duels on the Athens-Toronto stand and on our krater will not cease until the life of one participant ends. But it is the two ship scenes on our krater that sets the workshop apart from attempts at narrative by other Middle Geometric artists. These scenes are the earliest to offer a true pictorial context, and both ships have a fully integrated cast of characters. Details like the pikes in the prow of the ship on Side A and the Dipylon shields lying on the deck of the ship on Side B, as this ship gets ready to set sail, are remarkable observations. No less extraordinary is the figure of the captive woman sitting on the deck fettered to a sail-yard brace.
The Middle Geometric period is the true beginning of visual narrative in Greek art. While the number of different subjects is limited, the depictions display genuine spontaneity and bold expressiveness. The liveliness of these representations was quickly superseded by the restrictions of Late Geometric I, the phase dominated by the painters from the Dipylon and Hirschfeld Workshops. Elegance, restraint, and understatement characterize their notable achievements. It would be nearly a century before we see again in Greek art such innovative enthusiasm for depicting human narrative as we see in the Middle Geometric period. Painters of Protoattic pottery would take up the challenge, but that is another story.
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## NOTES

1. The comprehensive references for this period are: Bernhard Schweitzer, Greek Geometric Art, trans. Peter and Cornelia Usborne (London, 1969); J. Nicholas Coldstream, Geometric Greece (London, 1977); Pasture to Polis; and Hurwit, Art and Culture, chaps. 2 and 3.
2. The basic reference is Coldstream, Greek Geometric Pottery. Peter Kahane ("Die Entwicklungsphasen der attisch-geometrischen Keramik," AJA 44 [1940], pp. $4^{64-82 \text { ) was the first to divide }}$ Geometric pottery into chronological phases that today correspond to the terms: Early, Middle, and Late. Kahane's phases were: "früh" (ca. 9оо-85о в.c.); "streng" (ca. 850-8оо в.c.); "reif" (80о to before $75^{\circ}$ b.c.) ; and "spät" (before $75^{\circ}$ and extending to ca. 700 b.c.). He subdivided "streng," "reif," and "spät" into two phases each. On pp. 481-82, Kahane gives a summary of his divisions and in each section includes a list of the vases mentioned or discussed in his text that come from known grave contexts.

Coldstream, in his monumental study Greek Geometric Pottery, refined these divisions (see p. 330 for his chart of absolute chronology and pp. 302-29 for the presentation of the evidence). The dates pertinent to this article are: Middle Geometric $\mathrm{I}=$ $850-8$ оо в.с.; Middle Geometric II $=800-76$ о в.с.; Late Geometric $\mathrm{I}=760-75^{\circ}$ в.C.; Late Geometric $\mathrm{Ib}=75^{\circ}-735$; Late Geometric II =735-70о в.с.
3. All of the Greek Geometric as well as the Protoattic pottery will be published by me in a forthcoming fascicule of the Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, an international publication of Greek and Roman vases in public museums and private collections.
4. MMA 34.11.2: H. 97.8-99 cm; Diam. at rim 80.4-81.5 cm; Diam. of body 85 cm ; Diam. of base $36.3-36.5 \mathrm{~cm}$. Broken and mended with missing pieces restored in plaster and painted, notable among them: much of the prothesis on Side B; part of the figures on each ship; the midsection and ram of the ship on Side A; bow screen on Side B; a few marching warriors; most of each handle and its panel. These are the basic bibliographic references: Gisela M. A. Richter, "A Colossal Dipylon Vase," MMAB 29 (1934), pp. 169-72; Paolo Arias, A History of rooo Years of Greek Vase Painting (London, 1962),
pp. 12, 268-69, pl. 7; Herbert Marwitz, "Ein attisch-geometrischer Krater in New York," $A K_{4}$ (1961), pp. 39-48, pls. 17, 18; Morrison and Williams, Greek Oared Ships, pp. 30-32, pls. 5, 6a-b; Coldstream, Greek Geometric Pottery, p. 23 and n. 7, pp. 26-28, and p. 349, n. 10; Ahlberg, Fighting on Land and Sea, p. 25, cat. no. B 3, pp. 27-29; Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 25, cat. no. 1 and passim; Casson, Ships and Seamanship, figs. 65, 66.
5. For bull's-head handles, see Noel Oakeshott, "Horned-Head Vase Handles," Journal of Hellenic Studies 86 (1966), pp. 114-32, esp. pp. 122-24 for Attic Geometric.
6. This is Athens N.M. 8o6, a Late Geometric krater. See Alfred Brückner and Erich Pernice, "Ein attischer Friedhof," AM 18 (1893), pp. 92-94 for the excavation of it, p. 106 for a description, and p. 92, fig. 4 for a drawing of the krater in situ. This vase has now been augmented by four fragments in the Louvre CA 3272 a-d, and one fragment of Athens N.M. 802 in the National Archaeological Museum. See Aliki Kaufmann-Samaras, "La scène de prothésis 'disparue' sur le cratère 806 du Musée National d'Athènes," 'A $\quad$ Хazolopıкòv $\Delta \varepsilon 1$ itiov 28 (1973), pp. 235-40, and esp. pl. 128, for a reconstruction drawing incorporating these fragments. For the Late Geometric date, see p. 239, n. 24, and note 105 below. See also Barbara Bohen, "Aspects of Athenian Grave Cult in the Age of Homer," in New Light on a Dark Age: Exploring the Culture of Geometric Greece, ed. Susan Langdon (Columbia, Mo., 1997), pp. 49, 50, fig. 4, for a reconstruction drawing of kraters surmounting four graves in the Kerameikos.

Vases used as grave markers during the Middle and Late Geometric periods were restricted to two shapes. Belly-handled amphorae, such as Athens N.M. $80_{4}$ by the Dipylon Master, stood above female burials; pedestaled kraters indicated male graves. For Geometric grave markers, see Donna C. Kurtz and John Boardman, Greek Burial Customs (London, 1971), pp. 56-58; also, Coldstream, Greek Geometric Pottery, p. 39. For the Dipylon Master and his workshop, see note 31 below.

For pedestaled kraters as grave markers, see also the remark by Johannes M. Geroulanos, "Grabsitten des ausgehenden geometrischen Stils im Bereich des Gutes Trachones bei Athen," $A M 88$ (1973), p. 14. An undisturbed grave (A 34 ) on his property yielded, among other vases, fragments of a large pedestaled krater. It was not found in situ, like Athens 8o6, because the sides of the grave had collapsed. The collapse caused the krater to roll over on its side and break into fragments, some of which fell into the tomb. Others scattered and were found elsewhere in the excavation. Geroulanos concluded, however, that this krater marked Grave A 34 and thought it was decorated by the same artist who painted the small vases that furnished the tomb. For these and the krater, see $A M 88$ (1973), pp. $3^{8-39}$ and pl. 6. This is a Late Geometric grave (p. 22).

Ahlberg (Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 33) sees things very differently. She admits that there was a clear distinction between the vase shape and the gender of the grave occupant in Protogeometric, Early Geometric, and Middle Geometric, namely that neck-handled amphorae contained the ashes of men and belly-handled amphorae the ashes of women. She also agrees that in these three periods, the grave kraters were always found with neck-handled amphorae. But she concludes that "there seems to be no clear archaeological evidence that this trend continued in the Late Geometric period . . ." and does not "regard the vase types as positive criteria [her italics] in our discussion." She generally refutes Coldstream's belief in this distinction.
7. Agrapidochori, no no.: Arthur H. S. Megaw, "Archaeology in Greece, 1966-67," Archaeological Reports, no. 13 (1967), p. 11 ,
 218 , fig. 4 and pl. 251 y. Coldstream (Greek Geometric Pottery, p. 231, n. 10, and p. 232, n. 1) dates this krater Late Geometric II. It came to his notice after the book went to press, and thus he was unable to include it in his text.
8. For a general discussion of the high pedestaled krater in both its Middle Geometric and Late Geometric phases, especially with regard to its ornamental and figural decoration, see Herbert Marwitz, "Kreis und Figur in der attisch-geometrischen Vasenmalerei," Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 74 (1959), pp. 103-11. For brief discussions of the shape, see Davison, Attic Geometric Workshops, pp. 111-14, and Coldstream, Greek Geometric Pottery, pp. 17-18, 23, 26, who recognized two variants that existed side by side. MMA 34.11 .2 is Type I, the more conservative type. Type II has bull'shead handles, but they are joined to the rim by a vertical member, the rim is very low, and the pedestal more flaring than Type I. For a good example, see Kerameikos inv. 1255 (Kübler, Kerameikos V ${ }^{1}$, pl. 23; Davison, fig. 143).

Ahlberg (Fighting on Land and Sea, p. 67) suggests that the potters of these huge kraters did not stock them in their workshops but made them individually for each funeral. Like modern gravestones, they would be ordered and finished at some time after the burial.
9. Herbert Marwitz ("Das Bahrtuch. Homerischer Totenbrauch auf geometrischen Vasen," Antike und Abendland 10 [1961], p. 11), followed by Ahlberg (Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 4o), thinks that the corpse may be clothed. But this is not the case as recent cleaning and new photography make clear. Furthermore, when a corpse is clothed, the garment extends from shoulders to feet; thus, the corpse here is not clothed. In her discussion of the funeral garment, Ahlberg lists the occurrences of draped and undraped male corpses (pp. $4^{\mathrm{o}-41}$ ). With only one exception, the draped male corpses are dated to Late Geometric II, i.e., between 730 and 700 b.c. The main exception is the deceased on Louvre A 547 (Ahlberg, p. 26, cat. no. 13, fig. 13), a Late Geometric I b krater by a member of the Dipylon Workshop. Also worth mentioning, because it seems to be a rare occurrence, is the shrouded figure on Athens N.M. 812 , a fragment of a Late Geometric I krater by a painter contemporary with those of the Dipylon Workshop (Ahlberg, p. 26, cat. no. 18, fig. 18). That this figure is wrapped, not dressed, is clear because his arms and hands are not visible (compare the female corpse on Athens N.M. 8o4; see note $4{ }^{2}$ below). Ahlberg ( p .55 ) calls this "a sort of blanket." A further peculiarity on Athens N.M. 812 is that the corpse appears in strict profile view, not the composite view that is the customary one. Heide Mommsen (Exekias I. Die Grabtafeln, Kerameus 11 [Mainz, 1997], p. 18) points out that in representations of the prothesis, the feet of the deceased always point to the left, presumably towards the exit or door. This custom goes back to Homer (lliad 19.212 [Loeb Classical Library (1976), p. 353]), Achilles speaking: ". . . my comrade [Patroklos] is dead, who in my hut lieth mangled by the sharp bronze, his feet turned toward the door. . . ."
10. Mourners with both hands to their heads are female; those with one hand are male. The best discussion of this gesture as well as how Geometric painters distinguished males from females in other ways is Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, pp. 32-40 and $7^{2-87}$, esp. 77-78, for the distribution of the two-hand gesture. Ahlberg (pp. $77-78$ ) says that Athens N.M. 812 (her fig. 18), shows male mourners with two hands to their heads, but it is
unclear from her text and the photograph which figures she means. Presumably they are the mourners who do not display breasts, as do two who stand to the right of the bier. But this could have been a detail unintentionally omitted by the artist. Ahlberg concludes (p. 78) that we are "entitled to regard the two-hand mourning gesture as a characteristic female gesture" (her italics). On p. 77, n. 2 , she gives the history of the interpretation of the twohand gesture. In her discussion, Ahlberg restricts herself to Late Geometric representations, even though on $\mathbf{p} .74$ she notes that females with "physical attributes" occur on MMA 34.11.2.

For the Dipylon Workshop, see note 31 below.
11. For ships and the ship terminology used here, see Kirk, "Ships on Geometric Vases"; Morrison and Williams, Greek Oared Ships, pp. 12-42 for ships of the Geometric period, pp. 43-69 for the literary texts, and pp. 31-32 for MMA 34.11.2; TzahouAlexandri, Tropis II, pp. 333-49; Casson, Ships and Seamanship, pp. 43-6o, and 71-74 for the period under discussion in this article; Wachsmann, Seagoing Ships, chaps. 7 and 8, passim.

For some of the problems in determining the terminology for Geometric ships, as well as the interpretation of various parts, see notes 17 and 21 below.
12. Casson (Ships and Seamanship, p. 45 and n. 15) suggests that the hulls were painted or smeared with pitch. The latter would make the craft more seaworthy. Homer mentions ships with black hulls; see the references cited by Casson in his n. 15. Casson (p. 49) also remarks that the invention of the ram had a revolutionary impact on sea warfare. Not only did the ships convey fighters, but the ram was also a powerful weapon used to smash the hull of the enemy's ship.
13. Kirk ("Ships on Geometric Vases," p. 132) remarks that the "eye" or star on the prow usually appears in a circular format. These are the bow patches mentioned by Homer who described them as vermilion, ruddy, or blue. See Casson, Ships and Seamanship, p. 45 and n .18.

Wachsmann (Seagoing Ships, p. 186) thinks the horn piece is the beak and head of a bird shown very abstractly, presumably on the basis of their more realistic forms later on. On p. 188, fig. 8.50 C , he adds a bird's head and beak to a drawing of Side A of our krater. His drawing of our ship, made from the photograph in Casson (Ships and Seamanship, fig. 65) is not very accurate.
14. Ahlberg (Fighting on Land and Sea, p. 27) has misunderstood this part and thinks it "is meant to be the support for the ships beached well upon the shore." The weight of the prow upon the sand would keep the ship beached; in the case of a big storm, different mooring would be required.
15. Wachsmann (Seagoing Ships, pp. 185 and 184 , fig. $8.4^{2}$ D) takes these birds to be ornaments.
16. Sometimes the tholepins are in the form of an upright hook. Here are three examples, all Late Geometric. Two are by close associates of the Dipylon Master: Louvre A $527+$ A 535 (Coldstream, Greek Geometric Pottery, p. 3o, cat. no. 9; Ahlberg, Fighting on Land and Sea, pp. 25, 32-34, cat. no. B 7, figs. 36, 38); Louvre A 528 (Coldstream, p. 31, cat. no. 10; Ahlberg, pp. 25, 31, cat. no. B 5 , fig. 34). A third example occurs on an unattributed fragment, Athens N.M. no no. (Ahlberg, pp. 26, 34, cat. no. B 8, fig. 39).
17. See Kirk ("Ships on Geometric Vases," pp. 127-29) for a discussion of the horizontal line and whether it represents a deck or a rail. He suggests (p. 127) that when no figures are present, a rail is what the artist probably intended (see, for example, his p. 96, fig. 1, Athens N.M. 18471, a Middle Geometric cup). But when
the figures stand or sit on the line, as on our krater, a deck is likely to be what the painter had in mind. Kirk (p. 129) also thinks that Geometric ships had side decks which were mainly used as fighting platforms and that the space between the decks could be used to store the mast and the sail. For this, see note 21 below.

Morrison and Williams (Greek Oared Ships, p. 31) remark that if Kirk is correct in interpreting the upper horizontal as a deck, the next horizontal line as the longitudinal beam, and the top of the thick line as presumably the top of the gunwale, then the superstructure of our ship is about twice as high as the hull. They conclude, somewhat uncharitably, that it will be "a quite unseaworthy ship" (p. 31). They think that the gunwale is the line above the hull, that the shorter vertical lines are for the tholepins, the taller ones supports for the rail, but admit that it is impossible to rule out that the depiction combines a profile and plan view. A few words here. The Greeks do not combine plan and profile views within one and the same figure. In Geometric compositions, some figures may be shown in plan and others in profile. A good example appears on Louvre A $5^{27}+\mathrm{A} 535$, a fragmentary Late Geometric I krater by a close associate of the Dipylon Master (see note 16 above). In this sea battle, the dead float in the water in plan view while the warriors on the ship appear in profile. Furthermore, "profile" and "plan" are not to be confused with the composite view of the figure which shows the head, arms, and legs in profile and the torso in front view. Thus, it would be most unusual if a Greek painter depicted part of a ship in profile view and part of the same ship in plan. For a combination of plan and profile views of the same object, see the chariot and team incised on an 8th-century b.c. Etruscan stele from Ategua now in Cordoba, 24.632 (see Fernando Quesada, in Carri da guerra e principi etruschi, exh. cat., ed. Adriana Emiliozzi [Rome, 1999], p. 54, fig. 1). There the vehicle appears in plan, the wheels and horses in profile.

Morrison and Williams (p. 14, fig. 1) offer a schematic drawing of the Geometric ship and discuss it on pp. 15-17. The only parts which they agree can be identified with certainty are the hull, gunwale, and tholepins. Our ship does not resemble their drawing which, with its thick black band between two lines well above the hull, corresponds to ships by Late Geometric painters (a good example is Louvre A $5{ }^{28}$; Morrison and Williams, pl. 2, a). Thus, their discussion of how to interpret this area is not pertinent to our ships.

Casson (Ships and Seamanship, p. 71) says that "the earliest representations [of ships], dated $85^{\circ}-75^{\circ}$ b.c., show the deck as merely a thin horizontal line resting on slender vertical stanchions." Casson (p. 51) also argues persuasively that the deck ran the length of the ship, but not the full width of the gunwale because it would be necessary for the oarsmen to be able to sit low in the hull along each side. See his suggested reconstruction of a ship (fig. 69), which is based on the Late Geometric I a representation on Louvre A $5{ }^{2} 7^{+A} 535$ (see note 16 above). This reconstruction drawing does not make clear where the mast and sail would be stored if the deck ran the length of the ship down its center. Perhaps it is asking too much of the Geometric pictorial evidence to provide answers to such detailed questions. The essence of Geometric narrative is that everything, whether figure or object, is reduced to its essential ingredients.

For an example of a lowered mast, see the one in Theseus' beached ship on the François Vase by Kleitias (John D. Beazley, Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters [Oxford, 1956], p. 76, no. 1; Paralipomena. Additions to ABV and ARV ${ }^{2}$ [Oxford, 1971], p. 29,
no. 1; Thomas H. Carpenter, Beazley Addenda. Additional References to $A B V, A R V^{2}$ and Paralipomena [Oxford, 1989], p. 21). For an excellent illustration, see Arias, iooo Years of Greek Vase Painting (note 4 above), pl. 43, top.
18. Ahlberg (Fighting on Land and Sea, p. 46) says that in all instances the ship's pikes [vaú $\mu \alpha \chi \alpha \xi v \sigma \sigma^{\prime}$ ] are used by enemies. If this is so, it presents a danger to the crew. This interpretation is all the more unlikely in view of what Homer has to say about them, namely that the Achaeans fought with them from their ships against the Trojans. For a discussion of the ship's pikes and a list of where they occur, see note 64 below.

Richter ("A Colossal Dipylon Vase" [note 4 above], p. 170) thinks this warrior throws a pike. Morrison and Williams (Greek Oared Ships, p. 31) believe he throws his spear and will next throw a pike. They are followed by Ahlberg (p. 46), who suggests that two moments are combined into one: the attacker throwing his spear and taking a vaú $\mu \alpha \chi o v$. This seems to be correct because the object hurled by this warrior has an elongated triangular point and the pikes in the ship merely taper.

For a figure stepping on the ram, but without pikes, see Louvre A $5^{2} 7^{+}$A 535 (above note 16); and the fragment in the Louvre, no no., with the curved sail (see note 88 below). On Athens no no., a warrior seems to be stepping down from the ram onto land (Ahlberg, Fighting on Land and Sea, p. 34, cat. no. B 9, fig. 4o).
19. This action recalls the fight between Menelaos and Paris in book 3 of the Iliad, in which Menelaos, temporarily unarmed at the whim of the gods, springs upon Paris in angry frustration and seizes him by the helmet, presumably by the crest support (3.370-73 [Loeb (1965), p. 145]): ". . . he [Menelaos] sprang upon him [Paris], and seized him by the helmet with the thick crest of horse-hair, and whirling him about began to drag him towards the well-greaved Achaeans. . . ." With help from Aphrodite, Paris was saved, for not only did the goddess cut the chin strap of his helmet, but also she shrouded him in a thick mist and whisked him back to the safety of Troy. Our warrior is probably not destined to be so lucky.
20. Morrison and Williams (Greek Oared Ships, p. 32) have misunderstood this part of the composition. They think that the Dipylon shield lying on the deck belongs to a wounded opponent of the standing warrior with the Dipylon shield. They go on to say that the figure beneath the mast may be this wounded man, though they concede that the presence of hair on the head of this figure may indicate that it is a woman. Morrison and Williams may not have realized that warriors with Dipylon shields never fight opponents who are similarly armed. For this see p. 24 above. Ahlberg (Fighting on Land and Sea, p. 27) thinks that the sail-yard brace is a spear.
21. For mast and sail, see Kirk, "Ships on Geometric Vases," pp. 131-32. He points out that even if the painter did not include a sail in his representation, all Greek ships, whether warships or merchant vessels, were powered by both sail and oar. He goes on to say that the primary power for a warship would be supplied by the oarsmen, though with favorable winds, rowing would be a waste of manpower. Kirk also remarks that the warship of the Geometric period must have had a collapsible mast just as the Homeric ships did. See Iliad 1.432-35 (Loeb [1965], pp. 35, 37): "When they [the Achaeans] were now got within the deep harbour, they furled the sail, and stowed it in the black ship, and the mast they lowered by the forestays and brought it to the crutch with speed, and rowed her with oars to the place of
anchorage." For the raising and lowering of the mast and sail, see Casson, Ships and Seamanship, pp. 47-48 with further references to Homer. For a further discussion of the sail on our ship in relation to other sails, see pp. 26-27 above and note 88 .
22. Kübler, Kerameikos $\mathrm{V}^{1}$, pl. 22; Hurwit, Art and Culture, p. 64, figs. 29, 30. For the contents of this grave, see Kübler, pp. 238-39. For a brief discussion of its Middle Geometric I date, see Coldstream, Greek Geometric Pottery, p. 20, n. 7.
23. Marwitz, "Ein attisch-geometrischer Krater" (note 4 above), pp. $45-46$.
24. This is not the earliest human figure in Greek art. On the shoulder of a Middle Protogeometric Euboean hydria found at Lefkandi, two archers take aim at each other (Hurwit, Art and Culture, p. 55, fig. 23, dated ca. 1000 в.c.). In Attic art, the earliest figure is not human, but equine. It appears on Kerameikos inv. 560, a slightly later Protogeometric amphora with wavy lines on the body in the handle zone and an elegant little horse below one of the waves on the far left. This amphora may be dated in the second quarter of the tenth century b.c. See Karl Kübler, Kerameikos IV. Neufunde aus der Nekropole des 11 . und 10. Jahrhunderts (Berlin, 1943), pl. 27; Christian Zervos, La Civilisation hellénique, vol. 1, XI ${ }^{e}$-VIII ${ }^{e}$ siècle (Paris, 1969), pls. 16, 17; Hurwit, Art and Culture, p. 59, fig. 25, and p. 58, for a brief discussion of the aristocratic symbolism associated with the horse. Hurwit (p. 58) also points out that the Lefkandi archers do not begin a pictorial tradition that may be traced through the centuries; instead, they lead nowhere. The little horse, on the other hand, stands at the head of what will become a long and very important pictorial tradition.
${ }^{25}$. See the reconstruction drawing of Kerameikos inv. 1149, a very fragmentary Middle Geometric I pedestaled krater (Bohen, "Aspects of Athenian Grave Cult" [note 6 above], p. 52, fig. 5). If the positioning of all the fragments in her fig. 5 is correct, the decoration on this krater was without human figures or animals. The small preserved area of one handle spandrel indicates that it too was undecorated.
26. Trachones Tr. 37: Geroulanos, "Grabsitten des ausgehenden geometrischen Stils" (note 6 above), p. 28, cat. no. A 5 , pl. 52, 5 . The material published in this article is now in the Piraeus Museum. I wish to thank Caroline M. Houser for providing me with this information.
27. Thorikos TC 65.666 . See Marthe and Jean Bingen, "Le cratère 'géométrique récent' de Thorikos," in Rayonnement Grec: Hommages à Charles Delvoye (Brussels, 1982), pp. 77-90.
28. Bingen and Bingen, "Le cratère," pp. $85^{-88}$. For a drawing of the prothesis on Side B, see p. 87 , fig. b.
29. For this krater, see note 34 below.
30. CVA, Louvre 18 (France 27), pl. 1 (1180), fig. 6.
31. These are the two most prominent Late Geometric workshops, and their output is consistently of the highest quality. The best discussion of each is still the one by Coldstream in Greek Geometric Pottery, pp. 29-41 for the Dipylon Workshop, and pp. 41-44 for the Hirschfeld, both with bibliography.
32. New York MMA 14.1 30.14: Gisela M. A. Richter, "Department of Classical Art Accessions of 1914: Geometric Vases," MMAB 10 (1915), pp. 70-72, fig. 2; Richter, "Two Colossal Athenian Geometric or 'Dipylon' Vases in The Metropolitan Museum of Art," AJA 19 (1915), pp. 385-94, pls. 17-20 and 23, 1; Davison, Attic Geometric Workshops, p. 36, fig. 26; Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 27, cat. no. 25, fig. 25; The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Greece and Rome (New York, 1987), pp. 22-29, fig. 7. New York

MMA ${ }_{14.130 .15 \text { : Richter, "Department of Classical Art," pp. 70-72, }}$ fig. 1; Richter, "Two Colossal," pp. 385-97, esp. pp. 394-95, pls. 21-23, 2-3; Davison, Attic Geometric Workshops, pp. 111 n. 42, 112, and fig. 139; John Boardman, "Attic Geometric Vase Scenes, Old and New," Journal of Hellenic Studies 86 (1966), pp. 1-5, pls. 1-3; Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 27, cat. no. 22, fig. 22, also pp. $250-5$. Both of these pedestaled kraters will be presented in detail in the next Metropolitan Museum fascicule of the CVA.
33. For a general discussion of the high pedestaled krater, see note 8 above.
34. Rodney S. Young, Late Geometric Graves and a Seventh Century Well in the Agora. Hesperia, Suppl. 2 (Athens, 1939), p. 172 sub cat. no. C 109: P 8357. Young does not really make a case for his late dating, but merely says (p. 207) that the Agora krater is Late Geometric and, thus by implication, so is our krater. The Agora well which produced this krater contained material going down to Early Protocorinthian (i.e., ca. 720-690 b.c.). It was not a stratified context, but was a well filled in at one time with material and debris that could have been lying around for quite a while (pp. 139-40). Eva Brann (The Athenian Agora, VIII: Late Geometric and Protoattic Pottery [Princeton, 1962], p. 63, cat. no. 280 ) accepts the comparison with MMA 34.11.2 and dates the Agora krater fragments Middle Geometric.
35. Marwitz, "Ein attisch-geometrischer Krater" (note 4 above), p. 47. Marwitz avoids assigning a specific date to our krater and generally summarizes the later dates preferred by others (p. 47, n. $4^{6)}$. But he bases his reasons for a later date than the one preferred here because he sees contrasts and oddities throughout, such as the paucity of filling ornament, the lively figures on the ships compared with the stiff files of warriors, the steersman wearing a helmet, the breasts of the mourning women. These reasons serve just as well as an argument for an earlier date when the codified arrangement of figures and compositions that takes place in the Late Geometric I phase was but a few years away.
36. Morrison and Williams, Greek Oared Ships, p. 3o: "The late date is accepted here because the ships show a more natural and developed perspective than those in the Dipylon Group itself. It is assumed that just as there was a development from the distorted perspective of chariots in the Dipylon Group to a more correct form in the latest Geometric and Protoattic, so, in the last half of the century or so of Geometric, ships in more or less correct perspective should follow those in a distorted perspective."
37. Arias, Iooo Years of Greek Vase Painting (note 4 above), p. 268. He goes on to write (pp. 268-69): "It is one of the most notable and successful examples of a picture of human events conceived strictly in accordance with geometric principles and yet rendered with freshness and spontaneity."
38. José Dörig, in John Boardman et al., The Art and Architecture of Ancient Greece (London, 1967), p. 124.
39. Kirk, "Ships on Geometric Vases," p. 99.

4o. Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora. The first day is the prothesis; the second is the ekphora or the journey to the cemetery. Besides the examples of the prothesis illustrated here, MMA 34.11.2 (Figures 3,5) and MMA 14.130 .14 (Figure 20), another good example is Athens N.M. 804 from the Dipylon Workshop (note $4^{2}$ below). The ekphora appears much less frequently and all of the known representations are Late Geometric. These are two good examples: Athens N.M. 803 from the Dipylon Workshop (Ahlberg, fig. 53) and Athens N.M. 990 from the Hirschfeld Workshop (Ahlberg, fig. 54).
41. Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 25, cat. no. 1. The other $4^{8}$ prothesis scenes in her catalogue, with the exception of the Thorikos krater (Figure 17), are Late Geometric. It is very possible that the four other Middle Geometric kraters discussed above (pp. 18-20), Kerameikos inv. 1254 (Figure 15), Trachones Tr. 37 (Figure 16), Agora P 8357 (Figure 18), and Louvre CA $4^{606}$ (Figure 19) depicted the prothesis, but since none of them preserves the central metope, this can only be conjectured.
42. For Athens N.M. 804, see Coldstream, Greek Geometric Pottery, p. 29, cat. no. 1, pl. 6, or Arias, 1000 Years of Greek Vase Painting (note 4 above), pl. 4 . For New York MMA 14.130 .14 , see note 32 above. For the two workshops, see note $3^{1}$ above.

For a much more complicated arrangement of the figures, see Louvre A $5^{17}$, a pedestaled krater by the Dipylon Master (Coldstream, p. 3o, cat. no. 4; Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 25 , cat. no. 4 , fig. $4 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{e}$ ). On this krater, the figures appear in different zones, one above the other, but the largest area and chief focus is the deceased on the bier with mourners, flanked by two large chariots, each drawn by two horses. For a rather lengthy discussion of Geometric pictorial space, see Sture Brunnsåker, "The Pithecusan Shipwreck: A Study of a Late Geometric Picture and Some Basic Aesthetic Concepts of the Geometric Figure-Style," Opuscula Romana 4 (1962), pp. 165-242. In one section of his article (pp. 205-13), he focuses on Louvre A 517 and views the compartmentalized sections of the prothesis as ". . . reality reflected in the fragments of a broken mirror or, a jig-saw of which most of the pieces are missing" (p. 205).
43. Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 27, cat. no. 30. For other bibliography for the krater, see note 27 above.
44. Herman Mussche et al., Thorikos 1965: Rapport préliminaire sur la troisième campagne de fouilles (Brussels, 1967), p. 43, fig. 49; Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 27, cat. no. 30 and fig. 30.
45. Bingen and Bingen, "Le cratère" (note 27 above), p. 87 , fig. b.
46. Coldstream, Greek Geometric Pottery, pl. 7 a; Zervos, La Civilisation hellénique (note 24 above), fig. 57 . See also note 42 above.
47. Kaufmann-Samaras, "La scène de prothésis 'disparue,'" pl. 128. See note 6 above.
48. Ahlberg (Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 174) says that this composition is a rare exception.
49. Coldstream, Greek Geometric Pottery, p. 46. See also note 105 below
50. Helmut Kyrieleis, Throne und Klinen. Studien zur Formgeschichte altorientalischer und griechischer Sitz- und Liegemöbel vorhellenistischer Zeit (Berlin, 1969), p. 100.
51. Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 47.
52. Herbert Marwitz, "Das Bahrtuch" (note 9 above), pp. 13-14 and n. 26, with a brief review of previous opinions. See also George M. A. Hanfmann ("Narrative in Greek Art," AJA 61 [1957], p. 71, n. 4), who draws attention to Demosthenes' quotation of Solon about where the prothesis took place. See Demosthenes, Against Macartatus 62 (Loeb Classical Library, vol. 2 [1939], p. 103): "The deceased shall be laid out in the house in any way one chooses, and they shall carry out the deceased on the day after that on which they lay him out, before the sun rises. And the men shall walk in front, when they carry him out, and the women behind. And no woman less than sixty years of age shall be permitted to enter the chamber of the deceased, or to follow the deceased when he is carried to the tomb, except those who are within the degree of children of cousins; nor shall any woman be permitted to enter the chamber of the deceased when the body is carried out, except those who are within the degree of children of cousins." See also John Boardman, "Painted Funerary Plaques
and Some Remarks on Prothesis," The British School at Athens, Annual 50 (1955), pp. 55-56. He suggests that the prothesis could take place either indoors or outside in a sheltered courtyard. For the Demosthenes reference, see Boardman, p. 55, n. 28, and Mommsen, Exekias $I$ (note 9 above), pp. 25-26, with recent bibliography. (Solon was tyrant of Athens in the first half of the 6th century b.c. His exact dates are not known, but he was chief archon of Athens in 594/93 в.c. The famous orator Demosthenes was born in 384 B.c. and died in 322 , the year after the death of Alexander the Great.)
53. Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, pp. 292-98.
54. Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora, p. 297.
55. For ships of the Geometric period, the most pertinent discussions are by Kirk, by Morrison and Williams, by TzahouAlexandri, and by Casson (see note 11 above). For the ships and participants, see Ahlberg, Fighting on Land and Sea, pp. 42-49 passim; Grunwald, "Frühe attische Kampfdarstellungen."
56. Kirk, "Ships on Geometric Vases," p. 144 .
57. We know very little about the naucraries. See Kirk, "Ships on Geometric Vases," p. 144, with bibliography; also, Anthony Andrewes, in The Cambridge Ancient History, vol. 3, pt. 3, The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries b.c. (Cambridge, 1982), pp. $3^{65} 5^{-66}$. "The root-word vaúk $\rho \alpha \rho o s$ means 'ship-captain' . . ." (Andrewes, p. 366), and in Solon's time (the early 6th century b.c.), they controlled finances generally. It is often conjectured that they laid the foundation for the Athenian navy. According to Herodotus (The Histories 5.71), the naucraries existed in the time of Kylon, a tyrant of the mid-7th century b.c. (Loeb Classical Library, vol. 3 [1982], p. 79): "Then he [Kylon] and his men were brought away by the presidents of the naval boards [v $\alpha v \kappa \rho \alpha \alpha^{\rho} \omega v$ ] (who then ruled Athens), being held liable to any penalty save death. . . ." It is uncertain if the naucraries existed as early as the Geometric period.
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110. See notes 6 and 105 above. The ornament is coarser; the figures are not as surely drawn as they are on MMA 34.11.2.
111. This feature is best observed in Hurwit, Art and Culture, p. 64, fig. 30 (after Benson, Horse, Bird and Man, pl. 32, 4).
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Recently, Nota Kourou assembled several Middle Geometric I vases that she believes come from a single workshop, and she includes Kerameikos inv. 1256 in her group: "A New Geometric Amphora in the Benaki Museum: The Internal Dynamics of an Attic Style," in Greek Offerings: Essays on Greek Art in Honour of John Boardman, ed. Olga Palagia (Oxford, 1997), pp. 43-53. The centerpiece of Kourou's group is a conservatively decorated amphora in the Benaki Museum in Athens, 32937. On the neck is a hatched meander pattern to left. Concentric circles with central crosses and chevrons set in metopes decorate the body. All of the vases Kourou attributed to this workshop, with one exception, are without figured decoration. The exception is Kerameikos inv. 1254 (Figure 15), which Kourou (p. $5^{1}$ ) calls "the masterpiece of the class." It is very possible that the Benaki amphora (Kourou, pp. 44-47, figs. 1-6) and Athens N.M. 816 (Kourou, p. 48 , fig. 7) are by the same hand as Kerameikos inv. 1254, and if so, it would add two more vases, albeit without figures, to our workshop. The other vases Kourou attributed to her workshop do not seem to be of as high quality as these or are very small fragments, and I am inclined to keep them apart.

