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ABSTRACT: Despite recent scholarship that has suggested that most if not all Athenian vases were created primarily for the symposium, vases associated with weddings constitute a distinct range of Athenian products that were used at Athens in the period of the Peloponnesian War and its immediate aftermath (430-390 BCE). Just as the subject matter of sympotic vases suggested stories or other messages to the hetaireia among whom they were used, so the wedding vases may have conveyed messages to audiences at weddings. This paper is an assessment of these wedding vases with particular attention to function: how the images reflect the use of vases in wedding rituals (as containers and/or gifts); how the images themselves were understood and interpreted in the context of weddings; and the post-nuptial uses to which the vases were put. The first part is an iconographic overview of how the Athenian painters depicted weddings, with an emphasis on the display of pottery to onlookers and guests during the public parts of weddings, important events in the life of the polis. The second part focuses on a large group of late fifth century vases that depict personifications of civic virtues, normally in the retinue of Aphrodite (Pandemos). The images would reinforce social expectations, as they advertised the virtues that would create a happy marriage—Peitho, Harmonia (Harmony), and Eukleia (Good Repute)—and promise the benefits that might result from adherence to these values—Eudaimonia and Eutychia (Prosperity), Hygieia (Health), and Paidia (Play or Childrearing). Civic personifications could be interpreted on the private level—as personal virtues—and on the public level—as civic virtues—especially when they appeared on vases that functioned both in public and private, at weddings, which were public acknowledgments of private changes in the lives of individuals within the demos.

On the shield of Achilles, Hephaistos ‘wrought in all their beauty two cities of mortal men. And there were marriages (gamoi) in one, and festivals. They were leading the brides along the city from their maiden chambers under the flaring of torches and the loud bride song was arising.’

1 Homer. Iliad 18.490-93 (trans. R. Lattimore). Abbreviations for standard sources follow those observed by the editors of the Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford 1996) (for ancient sources) and the American Journal of Archaeology (for journals and reference works). Other frequently used sources are noted, with abbreviations, here:

Burn 1987 L. Burn, The Meidias Painter (Oxford 1987)
Buxton 1985 R.G.A. Buxton, Persuasion in Greek Tragedy (Cambridge 1985)
us that festivals and/or marriages were considered both public and decorative at all times in ancient Greece, yet in consideration of the political aspects of weddings a focus on Athens is warranted because we know something of her politics and iconography, especially in the second half of the fifth century BCE. As Rebecca Sinos and John Oakley note, the wedding is one of the best attested rituals in ancient Greece and wedding scenes decorate many Greek vases from the sixth to the fourth centuries. The majority of these Greek vases decorated with wedding scenes are Athenian. This paper is an analysis of these nuptial scenes in connection with other decorative scenes on vases associated with weddings at ancient Athens, with a particular focus on politics: might this lovely wedding crockery have actually communicated a meaning, perhaps even a political message, to its audience, i.e. the couple, their families, and other guests who represented the community at large? This paper comes in two parts. First I will provide an iconographic overview of how the Athenian painters depicted weddings, with an emphasis on the overwhelming display of pottery to onlookers and guests during the public parts of the wedding, by way of explaining the public role of these vases, which is too often overlooked. As Sian Lewis has recently stated, these wedding images are ‘... not unlike the modern wedding photograph which has much to say about conspicuous consumption and little about the individuality of the participants.’ Then I will examine the large numbers of wedding vases from the period of the Peloponnesian War, after 431, that seem to have depicted political imagery, particularly through the use of personifications. I will also consider whether the shapes and findspots of this latter group of vases might help us understand something about their audiences.

Shapiro 1993  H.A. Shapiro, Personifications in Greek Art. The Representation of Abstract Concepts 600-400 B.C. (Zurich 1993)
Smith 1997  A.C. Smith, Political Personifications in Classical Athenian Art (Diss. New Haven 1997)
UHK  K. Schefold, Untersuchungen zu den kertscher Vasen (Berlin 1934)

2 Hereafter all dates are BCE unless otherwise noted.
3 Oakley and Sinos 1993, 3.
4 The tendency to restrict consideration of public uses of vases to contexts paid for or regulated by the state persists even among contemporary scholars, e.g. E. Mango, ‘La céramique en contexte public: des vases pour mesurer et des fragments de vases pour envoyer en exil,’ in P. Rouillard and A. Verbanck-Piérard, Le vase grec et ses destins (Munich 2003) 75-78.
5 Lewis 2002, 176.
1. The use of vases in Athenian weddings

A marriage began with the engye (ἐγγύη) a pledge between the prospective bridgroom and bride’s father (or legal guardian). It was sealed by a handshake, as on a loutrophoros in Boston (figure 1); the wedding scenes on the other side of the vase give us a clearer idea that this is a step in the wedding process. Although the betrothal, the engye itself, was usually publicly known, it had nothing to do with processions or ceramic vessels, so this scene is rarely found as a decoration on Athenian vessels. The Boston loutrophoros as well as literary sources suggest that it had nothing to do with the women—the father could promise his daughter in marriage without consulting her—yet a wealth of gift-giving scenes might be associated with courtship. The evidence of vases suggests, rather, that ‘a bridegroom does not simply come and announce a father’s decision: he woos the bride with gifts, and there is implicit in the act the possibility that power can shift the woman’s way and she may refuse.’

At age 14 or later, whenever the bride had reached sexual maturity, the gamos (ὅ γάμος), or sexual union of the couple, could be accomplished. The gamos took place over a three-day period. First the prenuptial sacrifices, or

---

6 Oakley and Sinos 1993, 3. L. Gernet, ‘Hypothèses sur le contrat primitif in Grèce,’ REG 30 (1917) 249-93, 368-83. An alternative interpretation (that engye is the giving of the bride) is suggested by H.J. Wolff, ‘Marriage law and family organization in ancient Athens,’ Tradition 2 (1944) 43-94.

7 As in Herodotos’ description of the marriage of Megakles of Athens to Agariste, daughter of the tyrant of Sikyon, Kleisthenes (Hdt. 6.130).

8 This scene is identified by R.F. Sutton, Jr., ‘On the classical Athenian wedding: two red-figure loutrophoroi in Boston,’ in Daidalikon. Studies in Memory of Raymond V. Schoder, S.J. (Wauconda, Ill. 1989) 347-51.

9 Ps.-Dem. 44.49; Dem 40.57 and 59.65 ff.

10 See H.A. Shapiro, ‘Courtship scenes in Attic vase-painting,’ AJA 85 (1981) 133-43; R.F. Sutton, Jr., ‘Pornography and persuasion on Attic pottery,’ in A. Richlin (ed.), Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome (New York 1992) 1-33; and, more recently, Lewis 2002, 186-94. Some of these vases have been taken as images of prostitution, while others might be confused with gifts given on the culmination of the wedding ceremony: see a sixth-century fragment of Pherekydes of Syros (7 [B] 2 DK) that describes the wedding of Zeus and Chthonie, and indicates that the anakalypteria was a gift given from the groom to the bride and ritually accepted by her on acceptance of his offer of marriage. Another name for these gifts is τὰ διασπαρθένα which, as Pollux explains, were the gifts exchanged for the bride’s virginity (Pollux 3.3). For more on anakalypteria see infra 6-7.


12 C. Sourvinou-Inwood, Studies in Girls’ Transitions (Athens 1988) 26-28. Fourteen is generally taken to have been the age of puberty in ancient Greece, as indicated by Aristotle at HA 581a. For the onset of menarche at 13 in antiquity, see H. King, From Parthenos to Gyne: The Dynamics of Category (Diss. London 1985) 180-86 and, more recently, H. King, Hippocrates’ Woman. Reading the Female Body in Ancient Greece (London 1998) 23, where (on 77) he contends that Greek women would marry as young as the age of 14.

13 Perhaps the ancient literary sources suggest the optimal rather than actual age of marriage: they tend to agree with Hesiod, at Op. 695-97, that four years after the onset of puberty would be an appropriate age. Aristotle suggests, at Pol. 1335a, marriage at the age of 18. Plato recommends, in Laws 785b, that girls marry between the ages of 16 and 20. I thank Malcolm Heath for guidance on this point.
proteleia (ἡ προτέλεια), were performed. The bride would sacrifice to Artemis, the virgin goddess, protector of animals and children, but also to Aphrodite, who is associated with sex and thus marriage, and to other deities, as local customs dictated. As with most sacrifices, these were performed outdoors, in prominent sanctuaries, and certainly served, among other things, to advertise that a wedding was about to take place. The bride was required to make offerings as well as sacrifices. The offerings, toys and childhood clothing, would symbolise her transition between stages of life and between homes. Although vase illustrations that show such offerings are not always distinguishable as specific wedding scenes, their nuptial significance is likely, because the goddesses associated with marriage are shown to be the recipients of the gifts. The scene depicted on a lekythos in Syracuse (figure 2), for example, shows the bride loosening her belt in front of Artemis (who is signified by her torch); the belt used in maidenhood was supposed to be dedicated to Artemis before marriage. Sometimes vessels were included among these dedications: a pyxis in Mainz (figure 3), for example, shows a mother and her daughter bringing offerings to the temple of Artemis (Artemis is shown seated within the temple, on the right).

Ritual bathing, for the purposes of purification, occurred in connection with perhaps every religious event, and was conducted by both bride and groom in preparation for the wedding. The marriage bath, however, was distinguished beyond all other bathing events by the elaborate ceremony with which it was accomplished. The water came only from a certain spring or river (according to local custom): at Athens the water was fetched, usually in a loutrophoros (ἡ λουτροφόρος, lit. ‘bath carrier’) from the Enneakrounos. Another loutrophoros-amphora (figure 4) illustrates the processing to the Enneakrounos, in a scene that stretches from one handle to the next. The loutrophoros itself was entrusted to a female child, also called the loutrophoros, who comes next. Eros attends her. Next comes the bride, who is signified by the modest tilt of her head as well as the

---

14 For the proteleia see Suda s.v. proteleia; and Plutarch’s description of processions in relation to wedding sacrifices at Thespiae (Plut. Amiat. 771d).
15 Eur. IA 433-34, 718-19; Poll. 3.38; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.8.1; Plut. Aristides 20.6; see also SEG IX, 72.84-85 (a fourth-century inscription from Cyrene).
16 Anth. Pal. 6.318; Paus. 2.34.12, 3.13.9; Diod. Sic. 5.73.2.
18 See also Oakley and Sinos 1993, fig. 9; Reilly 1989, 419 n.45.
19 Suda s.v. lysisiones gyne. See Paus. 2.33.1 regarding this ritual at Troezen, and M. Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion (London 2002) 210 for a survey of other sources. L. Kahil in LIMC 2 (1984) 676.721a, suggests that the woman on the Syracuse lekythos is dedicating her belt to Artemis in anticipation of childbirth.
20 There were two types of loutrophoroi: the loutrophoros-amphora, with long handles between rim and shoulder, and the loutrophoros-hydria, with one long handle in the back, stretching from rim to shoulder, as well as shorter handles on either side of the neck, resting on the shoulder. Loutrophoroi decorated with this scene appear as early as the third quarter of the seventh century (e.g. a Protoattic loutrophoros dedicated at the Nympe sanctuary, now in the Akropolis Museum, 1957.Aa.189) and become even more popular after 480. For the dedication of these vessels after the wedding, see infra 8; see also Dillon 2002 (supra n.19) 219-20.
21 Menand. Samia 729-30; Pollux 3.43; Harpocrates s.v. loutrophoros kai loutophorein; Hesychius s.v. loutophora ange, loutrophoros; Photius s.v. loutophoros.
wreath hovering before her; two more attendants, one with a torch, follow her. Like the proteleia, or marriage sacrifice, this procession took place in the outdoors, accompanied by ritual songs, and was thus a conspicuous sign of the approach of the wedding. While the image on the Athens loutrophoros does not indicate whether this procession heads toward the spring or back home again, the latter journey is clearly indicated on a contemporary loutrophoros in Jerusalem.²² By the doorway to the home, at the far right of the scene, stands a herm, behind an altar. The building indicated at the far left is clearly the fountain house. A pyxis in New York (figure 5) shows a mythically tinged bathing scene but also seems to illustrate the next stage after the bath, that is, the adornment of the bride.

The actual adornment of the bride, like the bath, was a private matter, but because this was the time for the woman’s most elaborate preparations, the process is lavishly illustrated on relevant vases. A nympheutria (Ἀμφιπόρτρια, a challenging combination of today’s maid of honor and wedding planner) supervised the whole process, while a nymphokomos (Ἀμφιφόρκόμος, bridesmaid) was specifically assigned the task of adorning the bride.²³ In the scenes that depict the adornment, such as the New York pyxis (figure 5), it is sometimes unclear whether successive events or a single moment are depicted.²⁴ The name vase of the Painter of Athens 1454, a lebes gamikos (figure 6), shows the culmination of the bridal preparations, the crowning of the bride with her stephane, while from the left comes another procession of women with containers, some holding perfume, others holding garments and jewelry; not surprisingly, such scenes frequently decorate the ointment and perfume containers—alabastra, lekythoi, and plemochoai—and jewelry boxes—pyxides and lekanides—that were used for this part of the wedding.

The wedding feast was much like our modern wedding reception: friends and relatives of the bride and groom assembled to celebrate by feasting and drinking together, usually at the house of the bride or groom, but the event might even have taken place at a sanctuary.²⁵ The number of guests would of course vary, but Classical Athenians had historically used the wedding feast for the sake of conspicuous consumption: sumptuary legislation, enacted in the sixth century, for example, aimed at limiting the number of guests to thirty;²⁶ it is not clear whether these rules were enforced or even remembered by the fifth century, but for our

---

²³ For nympheutria see Ar. Acharn. 1056; Plut. Lyc. 15; Poll. 3.41; Paus. 9.3.7. According to Hesychius, the nymphophoson had a similar job to the nymphokomos.
²⁴ I would agree with Sabetai 1997, 319-20 that ‘the panel should be understood as a selective depiction of characteristic aspects referring to the wedding by means of emblematic motifs conveying nuptial connotations.’
²⁵ Oakley and Sinos 1993, 22.
purposes it suffices to say that—with the exception of mythical weddings such as the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (parents of Achilles)—the feast is rarely depicted on Attic vases. While the mythical weddings appropriately decorated the liquid container, *hydria* (water jars) and *krateres* (mixing bowls for mixing wine and water, such as the François Vase\(^ {27} \)), that would have been focal points at any ‘well watered’ feast, it is more often the procession rather than the feast that is illustrated.

The culminating event of the wedding day, and indeed the most publicised one, was the *anakalypteria* (τὰ ἀνακαλυπτήρια) or unveiling of the bride, in which the bride’s father gave her away to the groom in full view of the guests, as suggested by the name of the occasion as well as gifts given thereon.\(^ {28} \) Gifts were alternatively known as *opteria* and *theoretrea* (as well as *anakalypteria*); it is instructive that both of these names derive from words for seeing, stressing perhaps the importance not only of the groom finally seeing the bride’s face, but also the entire community serving witness to the scene and the gifts.\(^ {29} \)

The *anakalypteria* is thought to have concluded in the *katachysmata* (τὰ καταχύσματα), the pouring of a medley of dried fruit and nuts over the couple. Of course special food containers might be used in the *katachysmata*. An abbreviated version of the *anakalypteria* is thought to be represented on a *loutrophoros* in Boston (figure 7). In this scene the basket containing the *katachysmata* is poured over the groom while the bride is unveiled; meanwhile another procession of women, with containers and vases, probably the *anakalypteria dora* (or gifts for the unveiling) ensues. In this procession the bride herself would carry household vessels to symbolise or advertise her domestic skills. According to Pollux, Solon even instructed brides to carry roasting pans!\(^ {30} \) The event proceeded from the bride’s home to the groom’s.\(^ {31} \) This was by far the most public and elaborate part of the three-day event, with the usual torches, dances, and musical accompaniment, as well as the vases. Not surprisingly this procession of the newly married couple from one house to the next was the most popularly represented scene on Athenian vases.\(^ {32} \) The entire procession is shown on a frieze encircling a *pyxis* attributed to the Marlay Painter, now in London (figure 8). The procession approaches the groom’s house, which is indicated by the door on the far right, to which the *proegetes* (ὁ προηγητής), or usher, leads. The bride’s mother holds torches and walks alongside the chariot in which the couple travels (the groom just ascending) followed by the *parochos* (ὁ παροχος), the best man, who was entrusted with the bride’s safety during this journey. He also holds this torch and is followed by several women carrying containers, which probably held the bride’s trousseau. Behind the procession is the opened door of the bride’s family’s house, which they have left. The full procession is also shown

\(^ {27} \) Florence, Museo Archeologico 4209: *ABV* 76.1; *Para* 29; *Add* 21.

\(^ {28} \) Pherekydes of Syros, ca. sixth century, is the earliest source (*supra* n.10). This event is also known as the *ekdosis*.


\(^ {30} \) Pollux 1.246; 3.37.

\(^ {31} \) Oakley and Sinos 1993, 26.

\(^ {32} \) Oakley and Sinos 1993, 27.
on the rest of the Boston loutrophoros, the other side of which illustrated the engye or betrothal (figure 1). Here the anakalypteria dora or gifts take up the rear, while ahead of them the nymphaetria, assisted by Erotes, adjusts the bride’s veil; on the far right is the house of the groom, to which Eros and the mother-in-law welcome the new couple; a glimpse of the thalamos (ὁ θαλάμος), or room with the bridal bed, is revealed within the partially opened door. Finally the couple got some time to themselves.33

But at dawn the newlyweds were awakened for another day of festivity, the epaulia (τὰ ἐπαυλία), with more food, songs, and dances. This was the big day for the presentation of the gifts. Most descriptions and images indicate that the focus of attention was the bride and the gifts that she received. In quoting the second-century lexicographer Pausanias, Eustathius gives a full description of the epaulia, which suggests that it was an even more elaborate procession than that which had taken place the night before:

... the day of epaulia is that after the bride is first quartered [epaulistai] in the groom’s house, and epaulia are also the gifts brought by the bride’s father to the bride and groom in the form of a parade, on the day following the wedding. He [Pausanias] says that a child led it, wearing a white cloak and carrying a flaming torch, and then came another child, a girl, carrying a basket [kanephoros], and then the rest, bringing lekanides, unguents, clothing, combs, chests, bottles, sandals, boxes, myrrh, soap and sometimes, he says, the dowry.34

The scene wrapped around another pyxis in Berlin (figure 9) shows a longer procession than those on the loutrophoroi, again sandwiched between the bride’s adornment and the arrival at the groom’s house. This scene corresponds closely to Pausanias’ description of the epaulia;35 first comes the youth carrying a torch; then the kanephoros (ἡ κανηφόρος), a young girl with a basket; then other women carrying gifts, including a lekanis, a lebes gamikos, and two loutrophoros-hydriai. Lest the nuptial significance be lost on the audience, Eros, carrying a ribbon and a loutrophoros-amphora, hovers above.

It is hard to distinguish images of the anakalypteria dora from those of the epaulia as the gifts, in both cases, are held by female companions, and are similar if not identical to those used in preparations. The gifts shown on the Berlin pyxis (figure 9) serve several purposes. Foremost are the beautification tools that will sustain the bride’s beauty and keep her husband as attracted to her as he is on the wedding night. The lekanis, like the pyxis, held jewelry and cosmetics (a pyxis in the British Museum was found intact, containing a white powder, a natural lead

33 Like most rooms in Greek houses (see L.C. Nevet, House and Society in the Ancient Greek World [Cambridge 1999] 37) the thalamos seems to have been a multipurpose room that served, inter alia, as bedroom, storage space, and treasury.

34 Eust. Commentary on Iliad 24.29; this is also in Suda and Etym. Magn. s.v. epaulia.

35 It is also possible that this is the anakalypteria procession, terminating as it does in the arrival at the groom’s home, as argued by Oakley and Sinos 1993, 38, following L. Deubner, ‘ΕΠΑΥΛΙΑ,’ Jdt 15 (1900) 144-54, contra E. Zevi, ‘Scene di gineceo e scene di idilio nei vasi greci della seconda metà del secolo quinto,’ Memorie della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei 6 (1938) 366.
oxide that has long been used in cosmetics). The small chest held by the kanephoros might also have held jewelry. The basket that the bride herself holds, a kalathos, is a container for wool, the working of which was to be one of her primary household responsibilities.

More feasting at the home and expense of the groom’s family occurred even after the epaulia, and until the bride would conclude with a dedication of her wedding pottery—some of the actual vessels used during the three days of events—at the sanctuary of the Nymphé (the bride), a minor deity worshipped on the south slope of the Akropolis at Athens. Indeed the excavations at the sanctuary (which have yet to be published) have yielded rich deposits of lebetes gamikoí, lekanides, and the like, from the seventh through the third centuries. Surely the bride needed her retinue of assistants to carry the vases in this last of four major nuptial processions at Athens.

The processions are abbreviated in many of these scenes on vases, and most of the scenes on the loutrophoroi, lebetes gamikoi, and pyxides emphasise the adornment of the bride, as part of her passage to womanhood. A wealth of other vases that would have been useful and likely wedding gifts also exhibit wedding scenes, particularly mythological weddings; such nuptial iconography would have added to the appropriateness of these gifts. The Eretria Painter’s epinetron in Athens (figure 10) is a prime example of such a vase that undoubtedly served as a wedding gift (the actual vessel served as sort of a knee thimble: an object placed over the knee and thigh during wool working). This particular epinetron illustrates scenes associated with three mythical weddings with labelled characters: Harmonia to Kadmos of Thebes (left, designated ‘side A’), Peleus and Thetis (front, designated ‘side B’), and Herakles and Alkestis (on the right, designated ‘side C’; this is illustrated in figure 10). Different stages of marriage are easily identifiable: whereas B illustrates Peleus’ (eventually successful) attempt to capture Thetis, and A illustrates preparations for Harmony’s wedding, C shows Alkestis’ epaulia: the latter is indicated not only by the abundance of the gifts, but also by Alkestis’ relaxed pose (leaning against the bridal bed). The epaulia is thus shown here, appropriately, as the third and final scene of a unified program that leads us through three stages of marriage: preparation, union, and the epaulia.

It is clear that many vessels were involved throughout the wedding processions: the proteleia with dedications to Artemis and others; the loutrophoros, a procession to fetch the bath water; the procession with gifts to the groom’s home after the anakalypteria; the presentation of gifts the day after the epaulia; and the dedication of the nuptial vases at the bride’s sanctuary. All of these processions were conducted in public, and all involved elaborate ceramic vessels, as did the wedding feast itself. Of course the gifts bestowed on the couple at the anakalypteria dora, the night of the wedding, and the epaulia, the day after, were retained. Perhaps the feasting vessels were also retained. It is clear that the gifts, whether from the bride’s family or from other friends and relatives, were

36 London, BM 1893.11-3.2 (E 775), ca. 410-400 (ARV2 1328.92); BM research lab report 2664, 4 December 1968 provides the chemical analysis.
37 For the symbolic use of nuptial iconography see Sabetai 1997.
intended to serve the couple and their household throughout their lives.\textsuperscript{38} According to Jan Bazant’s analysis these painted vases, and especially wedding vessels, served a primary need as functional objects, during the event and/or at successive parties; a secondary need as beautiful objects (at these events or just in storage cabinets); and a tertiary need as elements of conspicuous consumption—things by which Athenians could arouse the envy of others and indicate (or falsely suggest) their high position in society.\textsuperscript{39} Many of the durable ancient vases stayed in the family for years, and eventually came to be used as grave offerings, where so many were found.\textsuperscript{40} But some that have been found in rare excavations of houses, e.g. Olynthos, indicate that they were indeed used by real Greeks in real life, and stored in the \textit{thalamos} or bridal chamber, which also served as a storage room or treasury, as attested in Xenophon’s \textit{Oikonomikos} 9.3.\textsuperscript{41}

While many of these nuptial vases were decorated with obvious wedding iconography, a direct association of image and vase function was clearly not necessary. Oakley and Sinos have postulated that the growth in the number of nuptial vessels, and the increasing emphasis on the bridal preparations in wedding iconography, might be connected with the development of democracy at Athens, which brought about legislation and general social concern regarding what constituted legitimate citizenship—which came to be restricted to children born to two Athenians.\textsuperscript{42} Inevitably this bolstered the importance of marriage at Athens in the later fifth century, and thus the increasing elaboration of the visible manifestations of the marriage, i.e. the processions and the relevant vases. Yet artists and donors of wedding vessels and gifts were clearly at liberty to choose decorations with subjects pertaining to other matters besides wedding processions, even politics.

\textsuperscript{38} Suda s.v. \textit{epaulia} and Etym. Magn s.v. \textit{epaulia}. There is a relative lack of primary textual evidence with regard to the types of wedding gifts given, received, and valued. Certainly legal complications reported, \textit{inter alia}, in Dem. 41.27, 45.28, and 59.46, would suggest that gifts of jewelry and metal plate (often part of the dowry) were the only household valuables that came into dispute in broken marriages/remarriages. Isaeus 2.9 adds a reference also to the value of a woman’s clothes. For more on this see V.J. Hunter, \textit{Policing Athens. Social Control in the Attic Lawsuits 420-320 BC} (Princeton 1994) and, more generally, C.A. Cox, \textit{Household Interests. Property, Marriage Strategies and Family Dynamics in Ancient Athens} (Princeton 1998), especially 115-20.


\textsuperscript{40} T.B.L. Webster, \textit{Potter and Patron in Classical Athens} (London 1972) 282-84. On the use of marriage iconography on funerary vases see J. Reilly, ‘Many brides: ‘Mistress and Maid’ on Athenian lekythoi,’ \textit{Hesperia} 58 (1989) 41-44.

\textsuperscript{41} For the \textit{thalamos} see \textit{supra} n. 32. For a survey of the use of red figure in Greek homes, as attested by excavation, see Pritchard 1999, 12-17. See also A. Schnapp, ‘Représentations du territoire de guerre et du territoire de chasse dans l’oeuvre de Xénophon,’ \textit{Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne} (Paris 1973) 307-21.

\textsuperscript{42} The primary sources for Perikles’ citizenship law of 451 are \textit{Ath. Pol.} 26.4 and Plut. \textit{Per}. 37.2-5. For a recent survey see D. Ogden, \textit{Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods} (Oxford 1996) 59-62.
2. Personifications in the ‘Gardens of Aphrodite’

The first part of this study takes a rather literal reading of the wedding vases, yet we should remind ourselves that ancient imagery was selective, formulaic, and did not usually (or ever?) represent exactly what happened in reality. Many of the wedding vases from the later fifth century that were decorated with scenes of marriage, childbirth, and childrearing, as well as abundant floral decoration, were peopled with women whose labelled names reveal that they were intended as personifications, or anthropomorphic representations of things, places, and ideas. Most of these vases are attributed to the circle of the Meidias Painter, who worked ca. 420. Many of these personifications, who are frequently shown in the presence of Aphrodite (Pandemos), were also minor deities, as Greeks regarded entities both tangible and intangible as possessed with spirits, whether good or bad. The fact that the painters named the women tells us that they were not merely decorative. These personifications represent beneficent concepts and other aspects of civilised life that may be taken as personal as well as public, or civic, virtues (some of which may have been coincidentally favoured by particular political parties). Some personifications that are explicitly political—such as Peitho (Persuasion) and Harmonia (Harmony)—often appear in mythical scenes that are indirectly or allusively political; for example, Peitho accompanies Aphrodite in the abduction (or marriage through persuasion) of Helen (shown on Makron’s sklyhos in Boston, figure 11), which also refers to the fall of Troy, and in turn alludes to the defeat of the Persians. And Harmonia—the daughter of Ares, the war god, and Aphrodite, the love goddess—is not merely political, but also an ideal compromise bride, in her (politically motivated) marriage to Kadmos. So, these two mythical tales are simultaneously relevant to politics and weddings. The same political personifications, and others—such as Euromia (Good Laws) and Eirene (Peace)—also appear in scenes that cannot be related to known mythical stories. The most common use of personifications during the Peloponnessian War, in fact, is on scenes that decorate vessels whose shapes were popular at weddings, or as wedding gifts.

As the Peloponnesian War witnessed Athens’ decline in population, as well as wealth, it is not surprising that the arts of Athens at this time, both literary and visual, are suffused with images of the fertility for which Athenians fervently hoped. A few personifications that signify this fertility are Eirene (Peace), the mother of Ploutos (Wealth); Opora (Harvest); Paidia (Play); Eudaimonia

44 Hes. Theog. 937. For the mythological heroine see M. Rocchi, Kadmos e Harmonia (Rome 1989).
45 See infra 25.
46 The civic importance of lawful marriage for the sake of giving birth to future citizens, which is vitally important in times of war, was publicly acknowledged at Athens by Pericles in his famous funeral oration (430): Thuc 2.44. The population may have grown again during the Corinthian Wars. For a succinct review of the population estimates and the sources see S. Hornblower, The Greek World 479-323 B.C. (London 1983) 172.
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(Happiness, Prosperity); even festivals such as Pannychis (the all-night festival); and of course virtues such as Peitho (Persuasion) who were traditionally associated with Aphrodite Pandemos (Aphrodite of all the people), the goddess of love, but also an important civic goddess at Athens. When these personifications are political—as most of them are, especially in association with Aphrodite Pandemos—scholars have traditionally dismissed them as meaningless because they occur in the so-called private arts. But as I have argued, these nuptial vases were hardly private!

Particularly in representations on painted vases—which comprise most of the extant art works made during the Peloponnesian War—personifications occupy both genre and mythical scenes. The ease with which they could be transported between the mythical and the contemporary is surely related to their intermediate place on the continuum from mortal to divine: their roles in visual representations associate them with divinities such as Aphrodite and Dionysos, or as attributes of divinities. Two of these political personifications—Peitho and Hygieia—are known to have received worship in Attika well before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War in 431. Here I will touch on those cults lightly, only insofar as they reflect on the representations of these personifications on wedding vases.

Peitho (Persuasion) was worshipped with Aphrodite Pandemos at Athens from the sixth century. Peitho's name was never joined as an epithet to that of Aphrodite at Athens, but she was rather an attendant to Aphrodite, in cult and in art. Pausanias reports that, after the synoikismos of Athens, Theseus set up a cult of Aphrodite Pandemos (Aphrodite of all the People) and Peitho on the South(west) slope of the Athenian Akropolis. This foundation story of course emphasises the role of these goddesses in civic cooperation and the democratic spirit on which their polis was supposed to have been founded. An alternative explanation for the origin of this cult is equally political: that the demos
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47 See Smith 1997, 67-89; and Stafford 2000, chs. 4-5.
48 Aphrodite Peitho occurs elsewhere in the Greek world: IG XII 2.73, a stele found at Mytilene on Lesbos, however, mentions the altar of ‘Aphrodite Peitho’; a relief (late fourth-early third century), formerly in a school at Reşadiye, Turkey (SEG 12.42; see G.E. Bean and J.M. Cook, ‘The Cnidia,’ BSA 47 [1952] 189-90, pl. 40c) is dedicated ‘to Aphrodite Peitho’; and IG IX 2.236 records ‘a torch for Aphrodite Peitho’ (perhaps Archaic; for a variety of opinions on the date see Stafford 2000, 116).

Peitho is worshipped with Aphrodite in cults throughout the Greek world. Paus. 1.43.6 attests a Praxitelean cult statue group in the temple of Aphrodite Praxis (Aphrodite of [sexual?] Action) at Megara, in which Peitho and Paregoros (Comforter) attended Aphrodite. (This is the only known personification of Paregoros. Other supposed representations have been rejected in LIMC 7 [1994] 175 s.v. Paregoros [B. Magri]). According to Paus. 2.21.1, Peitho was also worshipped at Argos as an aspect of Artemis, who was important regarding marriage and childbirth.
49 Paus. 1.22.3. For the location of the sanctuary, on a terrace beneath the Nike bastion, and inscribed (and relief decorated) architrave blocks (IG II’ 4596) that seem to belong to a fourth-century building associated with cult, see L. Beschi, ‘Contributi di topografia ateniese,’ ASAtene n.s. 29-30 (1967-1968) 517-26, figs. 3-10. For Aphrodite’s other sanctuaries around Athens, including the Sanctuary of Aphrodite and Eros on the north slope of the Acropolis, see O. Dally, ‘Kulte und Kultbilder der Aphrodite in Attika im späteren 5. Jahrhundert vor Christus. Zu einem Fragment im Athener Akropolismuseum,’ JdI 112 (1997) 1-20.
traditionally assembled by this sanctuary. Physical evidence does not attest Peitho’s presence there. The popularity of Peitho’s cult at Athens by the fourth century is attested definitively by Isokrates, in his Antidosis (354/53). In condemning the worship of Peitho as a sign of the negative influence of the sophists, he asserts that she receives annual sacrifices. Regardless, by the end of the fifth century Peitho had acquired a political meaning and was also popular in Athenian arts, in which she mingled with other personifications in the circle of Aphrodite. Peitho is principally the personification of erotic Persuasion, but also came to represent rhetorical Persuasion, and she is implicated as a civic divinity in both of these aspects.

Unlike most personifications, Peitho appeared as a goddess (she is first mentioned by Hesiod) before the noun peitho was used in Greek literature. Peitho (πειθω) is a multifaceted word which derives from the verb πειθεῖν, to persuade, and is etymologically related to the Latin fido, to trust, have faith; persuasion and faith are thus modes of the same concept to the Greeks. With this in mind it is possible to understand peitho as it was regarded by the ancient Greeks, as a civic as well as personal virtue. It was the consensual force that joined people together in civilised society, through trust and faith in each other, as well as the persuasiveness, inducement, and obedience of individuals.

In fifth-century literary circles there is something of a debate about the embodiment of Peitho. Despite Isokrates’ complaint (see supra n.53) Peitho is neither personified nor divinised in extant sophistic fragments. Yet she was often
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52 For more on evidence for the cult of Peitho at Athens see Smith 1997, 82-89. The earliest evidence for Peitho’s presence at Daphni, another Athenian sanctuary to Aphrodite, comes in the form of an inscribed statue base that mentions a dedication to Peitho: IG II² 4583 (SEG 41.1848). Simon has suggested that the cult existed by the end of the sixth century (when Kleisthenes’ tribal organizations recalled Theseus’ synoikismos), on the grounds that Aphrodite Pandemos and Peitho may have appeared as Janus-headed goddesses on Athenian coins. E. Simon. ‘Aphrodite Pandemos auf attischen Munzen,’ SNR 49 (1970) 12-13, pls. 2.4.
54 Peitho in art and literature has received a fair amount of attention. For a survey of modern as well as ancient sources, see LIMC 7 (1994) 242-50 s.v. Peitho (N. Icard-Gianolio). For a more theoretical study see Borg 2002, 58-71
56 Hes. Op. 73 and Theog. 349.
57 OLD s.v. fido. From fido derives fides, faith: the meaning of peitho seems akin to faith, in a fragment of Euripides’ Hypsipyle fr. 759 N².
58 For a comprehensive study of the cult and mythology of Peitho, which includes a semantic history of the word, see George M. Pepe, Studies in Peitho (Diss. Princeton 1966).
59 LSJ s.v. Peithō. For peitho as inducement see Eur. IA 104 (produced in 405). For obedience see Smith 1997, 10, 84.
personified by Attic tragedians. In Aischylos’ *Eumenides* (produced in 458), Athena lauds the worship of Peitho, on behalf of the city of Athens, in her successful attempt to persuade the chorus to accept the jury’s decision regarding Orestes:

But if you recognise that Peitho receives worship, in the appeasement and charm of my voice, then you might stay with us. But if you wish to stay then it would not be right to inflict your rage upon this city, nor your ill-will or harm to armies. For yours is the wealthy landowners share of this land, in all justice, with full privilege.

Euripides provides a strong indication, in a fragment of *Antigone*, that Peitho was not regarded as a divinity by all Athenians at the end of the fifth century: ‘There is not a sanctuary of Peitho apart from reason, and her altar is in the nature of man.’ And in another fragment, he implies that Peitho (not mentioned) is the pre-eminent virtue of the good statesman, ‘... he who with his speeches [i.e. persuasive speech] delivers (the city) from bad things, relieving her of battles and dissension. For this is good for all the city and for all of Greece.’

By some accounts, Peitho’s existence is made more concrete by her role as Aphrodite’s daughter. This explains in part her worship with Aphrodite, and her involvement in Aphrodite’s sphere of influence—sex, marriage, and childbirth. Her importance as a matrimonial divinity, the force that persuades lovers to marry, is later noted by Plutarch, who lists her as one of five divinities invoked by new couples (along with Zeus Teleios, Hera Teleia, Aphrodite, and Artemis) and one of the divinities invoked by fiancées (along with Aphrodite, Hermes, the Charites, and the Muses). In the latter reference he also connected the erotic aspect of Peitho with her rhetorical and political powers, explaining that the Greeks set up statues of Peitho and the Graces near Aphrodite ‘... so that married people should
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60 For Peitho in Attic tragedy see Buxton 1985, 29-45.
61 Aesch. *Eum.* 885-91; see also 970, where the influence of Peitho is contrasted with dissension (976).
62 Eur. *Antigone* fr. 170 N². Euripides is characterised as saying this to Aeschylus, in their *agon* at the end of *Ar. Ran.* 1391. In Eur. *Hec.* 816, Hecuba notes that Peitho, despite her tyrannical power, is neglected.
63 Eur. *Autolykos* fr. 282 N². In his comedy, *Demoi*, Eupolis suggested that Perikles was just such a statesman, aided by *peitho:* fr. 102 KA. Sch. Ael. Arist. *Or.* 3.51 mentions that these lines referred to Perikles.
64 Peitho is named as the daughter of Aphrodite by Aesch. *Supp.* 1039; Pind. fr. 122.2-5 Snell-Mähl; and Sappho frs. 1, 200 LP. She is also connected to Aphrodite in *Ibyc.* fr. 288 Davies, *PMGF* (= *Ath.* 13.5640). According to other sources she is regarded as a daughter of Okeanos and Tethys and sister of Metis and Tyche (Hes. *Theog.* 349); a daughter of Promatheia and sister of Eunomia (Ael. fr. 64 Davies, *PMGF*). She is connected with Tyche in Aesch. *Supp.* 523, and is a daughter of Ate (Folly) in *Aesch. Ag.* 386. According to Argive tradition, Peitho was married to Phoroneus, the first man in the Argolid; sources for her Argive genealogy are Eur. *Or.* 932; Paus. 2.15.5; Sch. Eur. *Or.* 1239, 1246; and Sch. Eur. *Phoen.* 115, 1123 (or Sch. Eur. *Phoen.* 1116 for the alternate tradition that she was married to Argos).

Regardless of this genealogy, she is a constant companion and aide to Aphrodite, starting with her assistance at the birth of Pandora, according to Hes. *Op.* 73-75.
65 Plut. *Mor.* 264b. Peitho is more commonly associated with Artemis (than with Aphrodite) in the Peloponnesian, as discussed by Stafford 2000, 117-21.
66 Plut. *Mor.* 138c-d.
succeed in attaining their mutual desires by persuasion and not fighting or quarrelling." As Alexander Mourelatos has suggested, the conception of peitho as an agreeable compulsion that was associated with erotic inducement probably underscored the development of rhetorical peitho. Rhetorical Peitho is implicated in personal, erotic matters, as well as civic concerns: here again the abduction of Helen comes to the fore. Gorgias mentions peitho (not personified) as an evil force in his late fifth-century Encomium of Helen, although he suggests that the logoi (arguments) induced Helen to follow her destiny: ‘... these [logoi] bewitched and led her soul to a certain evil persuasion.’

Peitho’s appearances in visual arts—which imply persuasion through non-verbal means—blur the boundaries between Peitho’s rhetorical and erotic spheres. Peitho is present in many visual representations of the Helen myth throughout the late Archaic and Classical periods. On the Heimarmene Painter’s name vase in Berlin (figure 12), for example, Helen, dressed as a bride, sits in the lap of Aphrodite, while Peitho holds a small box (wedding present?), perhaps as an inducement. In earlier representations Peitho also attends Helen: on Euthymides’ fragmentary oinochoe in New York, dating to 510-500; on Makron’s slightly later skyphos in Boston (figure 11); probably on a skyphos in New York by a follower of Douris; on a cup in Naples and New York, attributed to the Kodros Painter; and on the Heimarmene Painter’s oinochoe in the Vatican. In one later representation of Helen’s bridal bath, on a squat lekythos in the manner of the Meidias Painter, formerly in London, Peitho may also be in attendance. In the latest appearance of Peitho at the encounter of Helen and Paris...
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69 82 B 11.14 DK.
71 New York, MMA 1981.11.9, with fragments in a private collection (Add² 405; Shapiro 1993, 187, 258 no. 122, fig. 147).
72 New York, MMA 07.286.51, a type A skyphos, ca. 460-450, attributed to an undetermined follower of Douris, with a representation of Peitho: ARV² 806.1.
73 New York, MMA 1983.101.2-3 (currently in the possession of the Vatican Museums, Museo Etrusco Gregoriano), and Vatican Museums, Museo Etrusco Gregoriano 35082-5 (formerly Naples, Astarita 124-7), ca. 440-430: ARV² 1269.6. J.D. Beazley, ‘Some inscriptions on vases: VII.’ AJA 64 [1960] 219-21) originally proposed that this vase showed the birth of Aphrodite. As Shapiro has noted (1993, 200-201), the presence of Timandra, Helen’s sister, and Leda suggests that the scene represented part of the Helen myth. For a discussion of a similar assemblage of Helen’s family members on a Meidian vase, see A. Schöne, ‘Die hydria des Meidias-Malers im Kerameikos.’ AM 105 (1990) 164-65.
74 Vatican Museums, Museo Etrusco Gregoriano 16535 (H 525), ca. 430-420: ARV² 1173.3; Add² 339; Para 460.
75 Ex Emiricos Col., London, ca. 410-400: ARV² 1326.66ter, 1690, 1705; Add² 364.
(figure 13) she lurks in the background. Is it surely Peitho who is blamed in this instance, for the only other named personification, Habrosyne (Luxuriousness), represents in name and image the luxurious situation in which Helen finds herself as a result of this union. Habrosyne, who appears just this once, in the upper left corner of the hydria, cleverly reflects the figure of Helen herself, both in pose and dress. As if to emphasise this superficiality, Helen, seated in the middle of the scene, looks into a mirror that she holds in front of herself.

The erotic role of Peitho is emphasised in many other mythological scenes that concern courtship and marriage; the weddings of Alkestis and Admetos, the wedding of Harmonia on the Eretria Painter’s epinetron (figure 10); Aphrodite and Adonis, and Thetis and Peleus. Peitho flees from the ‘scene of the crime,’ the rape of the Leukippidai, on the Hamilton Hydria (figure 14). The implication here may have been that she was guilty of convincing Leukippos’ daughters to elope with the Dioskouroi (the women certainly appear to be happy with the results). Peitho’s dramatic escape also implies that she did not condone this union in accordance with Athenian standards; the scene thus serves as a counterexample of the ideal marriage.

Even in scenes without an identifiable mythic narrative, Peitho was probably meant to be an erotic personification, for she is shown in her generic role, attending Aphrodite and/or brides on vases from the end of the fifth century and the fourth century. Shapiro even proposed that she is the unlabelled attendant on
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76 Habrosyne appears sporadically in Greek literature, but never as a personification: Sappho fr. 79 LP, Eur. Or. 349; Xen. Anab. 3.1. For the significance of this concept in Archaic Greece see, most recently, L. Kurke, ‘The politics of habrosyne in Archaic Greece,’ *ClAnt* 11 (1992) 91-120.

77 In ‘ἈΦΡΩΣΥΝΗ,’ *AA* 2000, 109-15, Elke Böhr mistook the label for Aphrosyne, but intends to correct the identification in a forthcoming publication. In the intriguing article about Aphrosyne Böhr describes her as the personification of the ‘dark side of Aphrodite’s work,’ perhaps because she appears where we would have expected the goddess herself, almost as a stand-in. The juxtaposition most directly reflects Euripides’ word play (in the words of Hekabe) in *Trojan Women* 989-90 (produced in 415): ‘for mortal men blame all stupid things do they on Aphrodite, and rightly does the name of the goddess begin with (aphrosyne).’ She also discusses the contrast of Aphrosyne to Sophrosyne (unattested as a personification in Athens’ visual arts). *Aphrosyne* appears in literature, although never personified, as early as Homer: Hom. *Od.* 16.278, 24.457; *Il.* 7.110.

78 See, e.g., a small *hydria* in London attributed to Polygnotos (440-430), which illustrates Peitho with Himeros (Desire): BM 1867.5-8.1044 (cat. no. E 222) (*ARV*² 1033.66).


80 On a cup attributed to the Kodros Painter: Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum H 4616 (L 491), 440-430 (*ARV*² 1270.17; Add² 356).

81 On a Kerch relief *chous* in St. Petersburg, attributed to the workshop of Xenophonatos: St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 3m.4 (108K): *UKV* 103, 140, figs. 41-42

82 On an *aryballos* once in Cambridge, private collection (Dr. Edward Clarke, according to Walpole), early fourth century: see *LIMC* 2 (1984) 122, 142 s.v. Aphrodite 1279, 1498 (ill.) (A. Delivorrias).

83 Peitho is thought to be the attendant of Aphrodite on the A side of a Kerch pelike attributed to the Eleusinian Painter: St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum IO.0.10 (St. 1793, KAB 43b, 340-330: *ARV*² 1476.2, 1695; Add² 381; *Para* 496; *UKV* 42 no. 369, p1. 32.1-3. This scene shows the gods planning the Trojan War. As Peitho is far removed from the center of the scene, it is doubtful that the artist meant to implicate her in the planning of the war.
contemporary vases illustrating bridal scenes. In labelled representations Peitho prepares a kanoun (sacrificial basket) on a squat lekythos in London (figure 15), arranges fronds on a squat lekythos in New York (figure 16), and holds a footed chest and a sash toward Aphrodite, on a pyxis in New York (figure 17). Her civic importance is implicit in her appearance with other personifications of civic virtues in late fifth-century vase painting, particularly those in the circle of the Meidias Painter: she appears with Eudaimonia (Happiness) on two vases (figures 17 and 19), Eukleia (Good Repute) on three to five (including figures 18-19), Eunomia (Good Order) on three (figures 14, 17, and 19), Hygieia and Paidia each on two (figures 14 and 17, 15 and 17, respectively), and Themis on one (figure 12); and Harmonia two or three times (e.g. figure 10).

Peitho has been interpreted as a democratic prerogative, as she is rooted in the origins of Athenian democracy through her cult association with Aphrodite Pandemos. Her long-standing connection to Aphrodite and brides is so natural, however, that we need not interpret her appearance on Attic vases of the late fifth century as motivated by a certain political faction: Athenian politicians, whether democrats or oligarchs, effected their will through peitho. Her undeniable popularity as a civic and political concept at this time might have encouraged enthusiasm for her cult. This may be reflected, in turn, in an increase in her appearances in Attic arts. But her role as the symbol of the political behavior that enabled the Athenian democracy (persuading the demos of one’s own view) is not explicit in any extant visual representations of the goddess. Peitho is ‘... the patron of civilised life and democratic institutions ... the spirit of agreement, bargain, contract, consensus, exchange, and negotiation in a free polis.’ She could accordingly fit into any political system, and was revered for the various applications, in private and public life, of the virtues that she represented—persuasion, persuasiveness, inducement, faith, trust, and even obedience. Her persistent appearance in the circle of Aphrodite, with other personifications of civic virtues, simply reinforces her cult association with Aphrodite Pandemos, and thus her importance to the whole city.

Peitho is anomalously independent of Aphrodite on the acorn lekythos in Paris, Louvre MNB 1320, 410-400 (ARV² 1326.69; Add² 364) and a small (kalpis) hydria, once in the Hope Collection (now lost), dating to 410-400 (see LIMC 7 (1994) 247 s.v. Peitho no. 52, ill. [N. Icard-Gianolio]). As the labels on the former are thought to be modern (see J.D. Beazley in ARV² 1326.69), and the latter may not be confirmed by inspection, further attention to these two exceptions is unwarranted.

84 Shapiro 1993, 195. This genre of vases is also discussed by P. Connor, ‘Erotes at work: Paris and Helen on a red-figured hydria in Hildesheim (PM 1252),’ Meditarch 2 (1989) 51-65.
85 Also on a tallboy squat lekythos, once in Paris, Bauville Collection, dating to 410-400 (ARV² 1326.67); perhaps also on figure 12 and on a shape 1 oinochoe, attributed to the Heimarmene Painter, in the Vatican (supra n.74).
86 Also a Meidian pelike in New York, MMA 37.11.23, ca. 420-410 (ARV² 1313.7; Add² 362; Para 477); and perhaps the acorn lekythos in Paris (supra n.83).
87 See, most recently, Buxton 1985.
88 Mourelatos (supra n.68) 139.
Hygieia may have taken over the responsibility of civic health (which she personifies) from Athena Hygieia, around 420.\(^89\) Her civic role is, of course, emphasised on Attic vases, where she mingles with other personifications of civic benefits in the circle of Aphrodite. By way of explaining her presence in the ‘Gardens of Aphrodite’ I would agree with Emma Stafford ‘... that Hygieia should be understood as not merely part of this general ‘feel-good’ impression, but ... [also]... that Health is represented as one of life’s major desiderata.’\(^90\) Ariphron’s *Hymn to Hygieia* (ca. 400) suggests Hygieia’s worship with Aphrodite and the Graces:

> Hygieia, most revered of the blessed gods, may I live with you for the rest of my life, and may you be a willing inhabitant of my house. for if there is any joy in wealth or in children, or in royal power which makes men equal to divinities, or in the desires which we hunt with Aphrodite’s hidden nets, or if any other delight or rest from labours has been revealed to mortals by the gods, it is with your help, blessed Hygieia, that all things flourish and shine to the discourse of the Graces.

> Without you no one is prosperous (εὖδαμον).\(^91\)

Hygieia is also included in the retinue of Aphrodite on a number of vases: the name vase of the Meidias Painter, the Hamilton Hydria (figure 14), as well as the masterpieces in Florence that have been attributed to his hand (figures 18-19). All three are roughly dated to the second decade of the Peloponnesian War (420-410) when health was a lingering problem, after the plague of the early 420s, as well as the rising numbers of injuries and deaths from the War. Alan Shapiro has

\(^89\) Hygieia’s cult was certainly separated (if not separate) from that of Athena by 420/19, when Telemachos of Acharnai brought Hygieia, along with the cult of Asklepios, from Epidaurus to Athens. While Hygieia’s worship at Athens expands considerably after Asklepios’ formal introduction to Athens in 420, scant references to Athena Hygieia are found after this time or ever outside of Athens. At Athens Telemachos recorded a foundation or introduction tale on a double-sided relief-decorated stele: Athens, EM 8821 (*IG II²* 4960a-b, and 4961, fr. A.1-20; *SEG* 46.270). For the text see K. Clinton, ‘The Epidauria and the arrival of Asclepius in Athens,’ in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 17-34. For the introduction of the cult to Athens see also Parker 1996, 175-85 and R. Garland, *Introducing New Gods: The politics of Athenian Religion* (London 1992) 116-35.

The relief, which seems to illustrate Hygieia, Asklepios, perhaps Telemachos, and a dog, suggests that Hygieia and Asklepios were worshipped together on the South Slope of the Akropolis from this time. Athens, NM 2477 and 2491 and other fragments; London, BM 1920.6-161. Fragments of copies are Athens, NM 2490, Padua, Museo Civico (Asklepios) and Verona, Museo Maffaiano. See L. Beschi, ‘Il rilievo di Telemachos ricostruito,’ *AAA* 15 (1982) 31-43 for a reconstruction. K.M. Iliakis has offered a more recent reconstruction: Πρόταση για τη μορφή του αναθιμέτου του Τηλεμάχου Αχαιών, *Horos* 10-12 (1992-1998) 73-76.

Hygieia, separate from Athena, was worshipped in the earlier Archaic period in the Peloponnes: Pausanias noted statues of Hygieia and Asklepios at Olympia among the Mikythos dedications (ca. 460), on the south side of the Temple of Zeus (Paus. 5.26.2) and (perhaps older) statues of the pair in a sanctuary of Asklepios at Titane (Paus. 2.11.6).

\(^90\) Stafford 2000, 163.

interpreted Hygieia’s prominence on the Hamilton Hydria, a patriotic piece that also illustrates the Athenian tribal heroes, as Athenocentric: this vase is roughly contemporary with the introduction of Hygieia’s cult to Athens. When Hygieia supports Paid(e)ia (Childrearing or Play—more likely the latter) in her lap (figure 18), she may advertise the importance of health in bringing up children. On vases related to the Meidian workshop, which seem to have been intended for weddings, this generalised beneficence of Hygieia, always in the company of Eudaimonia (Prosperity), appropriately expresses best wishes for a happy, healthy marriage. She is particularly close to Eudaimonia, who she physically supports, on the other Meidian hydria in Florence (figure 19). This suggests that that civic prosperity (agricultural and otherwise) relies on healthy citizens.

Like Peitho, Harmonia (Harmony) was known in Greek art and literature as a mythological heroine as well as a personification, before the Classical period, although her popularity in Athens grew in the last third of the fifth century. She appears in preparations for her own wedding and perhaps those of others, with other personifications of civic virtues. In Hesiod’s tale of Harmonia’s marriage to Theban Kadmos, Harmonia is already a personification, as she represents the noun for which she is named. She is the product of the union of antithetical forces, war and love, the respective spheres of her parents. It is likely, therefore, that the mythological heroine and personification are the same character, as Shapiro has argued.

Harmonia retained her connection with Aphrodite at Athens, and was commonly shown in her circle, in illustrations on painted vases, seemingly as a personification of marital as well as civic Harmony. Already in the first half of the fifth century, the chorus in Aischylos’ Suppliant Maidens reveres Harmonia as a
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92 Shapiro 1993, 128.
93 See also figures 17 and 20. On a large pelike, in Empúries, ca. 400-390, that seems to have commemorated a dramatic contest (the Thargelia) as originally suggested by August Frickenhaus (‘Griechische Vasen aus Emporion,’ Anuari de l’Institut d’Estudis Catalans 1908, 231-36) Hygieia and Paidia may also advertise the healthy fun that could be enjoyed at such a festival: Museo Arqueológico 1494 (formerly Barcelona, Museo Arqueológico 33, and earlier Palace de la Diputacio, ex Alfars Coll. [before 1908]): see LIMC 7 (1994) 142 s.v. Paidia no. 12, pl. 96 (A. Kossatz-Deissmann).
94 For the different meanings of paideia and paidia, and their possible conflation in Attic imagery, see the discussion infra 22-23. A female labelled Hygieia on an acorn lekythos in Paris is not accompanied by Paidia although, as noted supra n.83, the labels on this vase are probably modern.
95 Figures 17, 20-21.
97 Supra n.44.
98 Plut. Vit. Pel. 19 uses the aitiological aspect of Harmonia’s name to justify the homosexual bond of the ‘Theban Band’ (army), citing the appropriateness of Harmonia’s home among the Thebans, where the young men brought harmony to their city through the combination of warlike nature and the grace of love. The other children of Ares and Aphrodite, according to Hes. Theog. 934—Phobos (Fear) and Deimos (Terror)—are, however, less aitiological.
99 Shapiro 1993, 95; O. Crusius (Roscher 1832 s.v. Harmonia), however, argued that these were two distinct figures bearing the same name.
marital virtue, perhaps an aspect of Aphrodite.  

When Harmonia is shown separately from Kadmos in fifth-century Athens, she appears in bridal scenes, where her primary role must be as the personification of an idealised marriage, i.e. marital Harmony. Fifth-century writers used the verb harmozein, ἀρμόζειν, to mean ‘to become engaged’ or (in the middle voice) ‘to marry’. The bridal preparations of Harmonia constitute one of three bridal scenes shown on the epinetron of the Eretria Painter, side A (Figure 10). In this scene, the bride is accompanied by her mother, Aphrodite, who holds the fateful necklace created for the Harmonia by Hephaistos, and by her attendants, Peitho, Eros (Love), and Himeros (Desire). Harmonia gazes at Kore (Maidenhood) and Hebe (Youth), the two qualities she is about to abandon. The Eretria Painter has represented Harmonia’s many aspects in this composition. She is the heroine who was betrothed to Kadmos and typifies the hesitant bride who is comforted by Aphrodite and Peitho. Simultaneously, as the daughter of Aphrodite and Ares, she personifies the harmonious union of these opposite forces, in a marriage that is influenced by Peitho. The relation of peitho to harmonia (and to eris [discord]) is expressed concisely by Richard Buxton: ‘In the right place—marriage—Peitho brings men and women harmonious delight; in the wrong place—illicit sexual relationships—Peitho can be an agent of discord and catastrophe.’

The role of the personification, Harmonia, in fifth-century Athens, was not limited to marriage. Like Peitho she bridges the private world of the bride and the public world of the polis. In the sixth century, the concept harmonia, whether or not personified, is considered by the pre-Socratic philosophers as a force of union, close in meaning to philia (friendship). Herakleitos discusses harmonia as a force of equilibrium between contrary tensions, while Empedokles discusses it as a force that coheres natural elements. In the fifth century Harmonia, ἡ ἀρμονία, pertained to order and stability in the polis. In Aischylos’ Prometheus Bound, for example, harmonia is a covenant set by Zeus. Here the meaning of harmonia is akin to eunomia (good laws): personifications of these two concepts are represented together on several late fifth-century vases, such as a lekanis lid now

---


101 This marital Harmonia may have been akin to Homonoia (Concord), as Milesian brides and grooms worshipped at the temple of Homonoia, in the post-Classical novel by Chariton, Chaireas and Callirhoe 3.2.16. Political homonoia (of which no Classical Athens personifications are extant) is discussed in Smith 1997, 143, 165. On Homonoia see also G. Theriault, Le culte d’Homonoia dans les cités grecques (Paris 1996).

102 Hdt. 5.32.

103 This is the same necklace used later by Polyneikos to bribe Eriphyle. For the necklace see Diod. Sic. 6.65, Sch. Pind. Pyth. 3.167, and Sch. Eur. Phoen. 71. For the inclusion of this scene on vases see Lewis 2002, 199.

104 For an allegorical interpretation of this vase see Shapiro 1986, 15.

105 Buxton 1985, 37.


107 31 B 27.3, 96.4, 122.2 DK.

108 Aesch. PV 550-51.
in Naples. And Harmonia is joined by other political personifications in non-narrative scenes that advertise virtues that may be useful to the polis: Hygieia, Peitho, Eukleia, Eukleia, Eudaimonia, and Paidia. Harmonia is particularly suitable as an advertisement of civic virtues on vases that may have been used as wedding gifts, as she, like the gift itself, bridges the realms of public and private, and represents marriage as well as civic harmony.

A retinue of other personifications is associated with Peitho and Aphrodite: Eudaimonia (Prosperity: Happiness) and her twin, Eutychia (Prosperity: Good Luck); Paidia (Play); Eukleia (Good Repute) and Eunomia (Good Order), both of whom had cults in neighboring states in the Archaic period. I will not discuss in detail these last two, who appear at least as frequently with other divinities besides Aphrodite and her entourage, and have received thorough treatment elsewhere.

The personifications of Prosperity—Eudaimonia and Eutychia—seem to have been created in the late fifth century, when they are known best from illustrations of the entourage of Aphrodite on Attic vase paintings. Beyond their appearances with Aphrodite (and Eudaimonia's one appearance with Dionysos) there is no indication that they were worshipped in the Classical period. They both represented prosperity, a virtue whose universal appeal might belong in both divine circles: followers of Aphrodite and Dionysos, as well as other gods, would pray for personal and civic prosperity, particularly during times of war. Eutychia, from ἐυτυχία, connotes success and good luck that are perhaps the causes of prosperity, whereas Eudaimonia, from ἐυδαιμονία, refers more to the happiness that results from material prosperity. The two personifications of prosperity would thus compliment each other when illustrated together, as on one of the Meidian hydriae in Florence (figure 13). Eutychia, standing, holds a mirror into which the seated Eudaimonia looks (presumably to admire herself). Perhaps the suggestion is that Eudaimonia (Happiness) is found through Eutychia (Good Luck/Success). This is the only extant representation of the two together. As she is

---

109 Lekanis lid in the manner of the Meidias Painter, 410–400. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale SA 316. ARV² 1327.85. See also figure 17; a lekanis lid in Mainz, in the manner of the Meidias Painter, ca. 410–400 (Mainz University 118 [ex Prussian Royal Collection] ARV² 1327.87); and perhaps also on the acorn lekythos in Paris (the labels on which are, however, modern, as noted supra n.83). See also the discussion of Eunomia in Smith 1997, 107-16.

110 Hygieia: Figure 21 and the Naples lekanis lid (supra n.109); Peitho: the Naples lekanis lid (supra n.109); Eukleia: the Mainz lekanis lid (supra n.109); Eudaimonia and Paidia: figure 21.


112 On a volute krater attributed to the Kadmos Painter, ca. 420-410, in Ruvo, Museo Jatta 36818 (cat. no. J 1093): ARVδ 1184.1; Add 3 340; Para 460.

113 Cults for both are attested in later periods. For a Macedonian dedication to Eutychia (SEG 17.317) see P. Petras, ‘Ἀρτέμις Ἀγγελὴ τοῦ Δεμοκρίτου τοῦ Πετραὶ’ BCH 81 (1957) 387-90, pl. 6. For Eutychia’s possible connection to Isis in the Roman period, on an inscribed gem once in the Beugnot Collection, see J. de Witte, Description de la collection d’antiquités de M. le Vicomte Beugnot (1840) no. 403. An inscribed (Roman) altar found at Philadelphia (modern Alasehir, Turkey) is dedicated to Eudaimonia, as well as Arete (Virtue), Hygieia, Agathe Tyche (Good Fortune), and Nike: Syll.³ 3.985.9 (SEG 41.1190).

114 As in Pind. Nem. 7.56, Hdt. 1.5.32, and Thuc. 2.97. See LSJ s.v. εὐδαιμονέω.
shown with personifications of personal and civic virtues in most of her other appearances—e.g. Eudaimonia, Hygieia, and Paidia (figure 18)—Eutychia too may be taken as a personification of a civic virtue implicated in the cult of Aphrodite Pandemos.

Although the noun eudaimonia was used to mean happiness as early as the seventh century, in the Homeric Hymn to Athena, it was first personified in the mid-fifth century, by Prodikos of Keos, in his famous ‘Choice of Herakles,’ where she got a bad reputation. In this morality tale, Herakles is forced to choose between Arete (pery ‘Aretç), Virtue or Excellence, and Kakia (pery Κακια), Baseness or Cowardice. As part of her attempted seduction of the hero, Kakia explains to Herakles that her friends call her Eudaimonia. This negative presentation of Eudaimonia as the alter ego of Kakia is not, however, representative of her role in fifth-century thought; Antisthenes (in the late fifth century) classed eudaimonia as a derivative of arete, perhaps in reaction to Prodikos’ harsh representation of Eudaimonia. In visual arts of Athens Eudaimonia is shown exclusively on vases dating to the last two decades of the fifth century, surrounded by other beneficent personifications; as her flattering appearance is similar to that of the ‘civic virtues’ with whom she congregates, we can be confident that the artist intended to suggest that Eudaimonia was also a ‘virtue’. Her seductive role as the personification of material prosperity is clearly expressed, however, on a squat lekythos in London, in the manner of the Meidias Painter (figure 20) on which she holds a necklace towards a youth, Polykles. On a pyxis in New York, also in the manner of the Meidias Painter (figure 17), she lures Paidia (Play) with a similar necklace. On parallel with this example, she may also be the seated woman who lures a standing Paidia with a necklace, on a squat lekythos attributed to Aison, in Paris. Eudaimonia turns her back on Paidia on a pyxis in London (figure 21), but looks covetously toward a necklace that Himeros (Desire) dangles in front of her. Eudaimonia, who is seated (‘in the lap of luxury’) in half of her eight appearances on Attic vases (including figures 18-20), certainly conveys the image of a healthy, prosperous woman; she even represents agricultural prosperity on another squat lekythos in London, in the manner of the Meidias Painter (figure 15), where she is seen plucking fruit, with which to fill her plate, from a tree.

---

115 She is perhaps with Eudaimonia on a Meidian plate (ca. 430-420) in Leuven, Katholieke Universiteit, Didaktisch Museum, Archeologie (KUL-A)-1000 (ex Cramers Coll. G 36) (see Shapiro 1993, 65, 234 no. 20, fig. 18) and with Eunomia and Paidia on a squat lekythos attributed to the Makaria Painter, ca. 420-410, in Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 48.205: ARl2 1330.8; J.H. Oakley, CVA. The Walters Art Gallery 1 (1992) 35-36, pl. 38.1-3, fig. 11.2.
116 Hymn. Hom. 11.5.
118 H.D. Rankin, Antisthenes Sokratikos (Amsterdam 1986) 100-108.
119 Paris, Louvre MNB 2109, ca. 420-410: ARl2 1175.7; Add2 339.
120 Also on a Meidian plate in Leuven (supra n.115).
121 We find this plate also in the hands of Opora (Harvest), on the volute krater, attributed to the Kadmos Painter, in Ruvo (supra n.112) and on a calyx krater, ca. 420-410, attributed to the Dinos Painter.
The word *eutychia* (ἡ ἐὐτυχία) is not known in until the 470s, and it soon becomes common in literature, but never as a personification. Pindar uses it to describe the good luck that the gods bestowed on Hagesias of Syracuse. In Athenian visual arts, the personification Eutychia is restricted to vases painted in the last two decades of the fifth century: perhaps she was a spontaneous creation of the artists. Eutychia’s appearance and attire are remarkably similar in three of her four appearances. On the two squat *lekythoi* by the Makaria Painter, in Reading (figure 22) and Baltimore, at least, Eutychia (like Eudaimonia) is laden with boxes and jewels, as befits a personification of Prosperity. As she is shown with personifications of personal and civic virtues in most of her other appearances, Eutychia may also be taken as a personification of a civic virtue implicated in the cult of Aphrodite Pandemos. She joins Makaria (Happiness) in bringing gifts (of Prosperity and Happiness) to Aphrodite, Eros, and Himeros, on the squat *lekythos* in Reading. The likely implication is that Aphrodite will deliver these gifts to her followers, and specifically to the owner of the vase (perhaps a bride).

Paidia (Play, Pastime, Amusement) is known only from the visual sources, but for a relatively long period, from the 430s to the 390s. No sources indicate that she was ever worshipped. She appears in the circles of Dionysos and Aphrodite, as she is equally suited to both, although she tends to represent musical or theatrical amusement in the former, child’s play in the latter, and erotic play perhaps in both. A subtle reference to the erotic aspect of Paidia is her appearance with Aphrodite’s winged companions, Himeros (Desire), on a squat *lekythos* in

---


In her only appearance in the circle of Dionysos—on the volute *krater*, attributed to the Kadmos Painter, in Ruvo (*supra* n.106)—Eudaimonia holds a branch that evokes her agricultural aspect. Like Eirene (Peace) and Opora, she is probably meant to be a maenad here, although her appearance and role are similar to her epiphany in the circle of Aphrodite. See the discussion of maenads as real women and personifications in A.C. Smith, ‘From Drunkenness to a Hangover: Maenads as Personifications,’ in J. Herrin and E. Stafford (eds.), *Personification in the Greek World: From Antiquity to Byzantium* (Aldershot 2005), 211-30. Nevertheless the human representations treated as personifications and maenad appearances of Eudaimonia are treated separately in *LIMC*: see *LIMC* 4 (1988) 46-47 s.v. Eudaimonia 1 (H.A. Shapiro), and for maenads see *LIMC* 4 (1988) 47 s.v. Eudaimonia 2 (A. Kossatz-Deissmann).

On the Meidian plate in Leuven (*supra* n.115), Eudaimonia’s garland is celebratory, rather than agricultural. As Burn has suggested (Burn 1987, 71), there may be two events celebrated here: the arrival of Asklepios’ cult at Athens and perhaps also a dithyrambic victory (indicated by the tripod in the background).

122 Pind. *Ol.* 6.81. This poem celebrated Hagesias’ victory, at the games of either 476 or 472 (while Hieron ruled Syracuse). Eutychia also appears in fragments of two lyric poets, fr. 846.5 (Hermolochos) and fr. 921a3 Page, *PMG*.

123 Shapiro 1993, 86.

124 *Supra* n.115.

125 For visual and written sources on Makaria see, most recently, Shapiro 1993, 171-72.

This image of the two playing with a swing, however, also strongly suggests the meaning of Paidia as Child’s play. Shapiro has speculated that she may have appeared in a comedy by Krates (in the third quarter of the fifth century), which dealt with children’s games, Paidia. But Paidia is hardly political, apart from her inclusion in Aphrodite’s entourage. Like the civic virtues who are her companions, she may have served as a reminder of the pleasures enjoyed by individuals in a civilised polis during times of peace: Krates’ play is but one expression of the burgeoning interest in games at the outset of the Peloponnesian War. It is no wonder that Paidia disappears from the repertoire of Attic artists, and perhaps also from the minds of Athenians, after the first decade of the fourth century, when ‘peace’ brought only poverty and disillusionment, and little time or cause for play.

The juvenile aspect of paidia is most clearly evoked on the New York pyxis (figure 17), on which she enthusiastically plays a stick balancing game with herself. In this context—as in most—she appears to be particularly girlish, certainly younger than her companions: she wears a simple sleeveless chiton and curly, shoulder-length hair in a ponytail. This youthful, childish Paidia has been plausibly mistaken for Paideia (Childhood, Upbringing) in modern scholarship, although the personification’s name is always spelled ΠΑΙΔΙΑ (rather than ΠΑΙΔΕΙΑ) in the intact labels. The close relationship of the two words, paidia, η παιδία, and paideia, η παιδεία, is expressed in Plato’s Laws (written in the 350s), when the old Athenian refers to the educational and recreational aspects of music. It is then tempting to infer the occasional word play on the part of the Attic vase painters and to read Paideia in addition to Paidia in that personification’s more mature epiphanies on late fifth-century to early fourth-century vases. This double entendre would be particularly appropriate for the figure labeled Paidia on the white ground squat lekythos in Kansas City, attributed to the Eretria Painter, where she seems to be involved in the upbringing of the child shown in the center of the scene (figure 23).

3. Personifications in the public/private nexus of wedding vases

The public exposure of the wedding vases under consideration to men and women alike, through the wedding processions, obviates the need to explain them as objects made only for use and appreciation by women in the gynaikeion (women’s quarters). In the case of gifts, it is likely that the purchaser, whether father, groom, or friend, might have intended to bestow on the bride and/or the married couple the personal and public qualities and benefits that the personifications represented. The images would reinforce social expectations, as they advertised the virtues that would create a happy marriage—Peitho,

---

127 Squat lekythos, ca. 430-420. Munich, Antikensammlungen 2520 (J 234). See Shapiro 1993, 120, 182, figs. 73, 140.
128 Krates frs. 27-29 KA.
129 H. Ruhfel, Kinderleben im klassischen Athen (Mainz 1984).
130 I.e. those that can be identified with weddings by a combination of nuptial imagery and relevant shape
131 See the discussion of courtship gifts in relation to the engye (supra 3).
Harmonia, and Eukleia—and promise the benefits that might result from adherence to these values—Eudaimonia, Eutychia, Hygieia, and Paidia.

Just as nuptial vases bridged the gap from public to private, so did the personifications with which many of them were decorated. Most of these personified virtues individually express a similar nuptial/civic duality, particularly when used in patriotic illustrations of local myths and legends. Peitho and Eunomia, important contemporary political concepts, were also applicable to personal matters such as marriage. Hygieia, Eudaimonia, and Eukleia, and even Paidia, virtues of a more general nature, were considered beneficial to individuals (in marriage and in other pursuits) as well as to the group of individuals that comprised the demos of the city.

The juxtaposition of the civic virtues with Aphrodite and Eros suggests that they are intended as symbols of civic as well as personal virtues, i.e. marital virtues. Aphrodite’s double role as a civic protector and patron of erotic love is expressed through her association with civic virtues in nuptial imagery, and the significance of her attendants as both marital and civic virtues reinforces her two spheres of involvement. Although the goddess is never labeled with the epithet, Pandemos, in her appearances amid these civic personifications, the allusion to her civic nature must have been obvious to the Athenians who had worshipped her in this role from at least the sixth century.

Political overtones are particularly inferred, however, in the illustrations of civic heroes—the mythological births, and particularly the presence of four of the ten eponymous tribal heroes of Athens on the Hamilton Hydria (figure 14). Civic virtues are also relevant in depictions of the births of heroes as well as mortals, as procreation was another civic virtue that was important to Athenians and patronised by Aphrodite, Peitho, and Eukleia. The encouragement of marriage for the purposes of childrearing, as illustrated on some of these vases in the circle of Aphrodite, would serve to better the city. As Demosthenes noted in the fourth century, the principal purpose of marriage was to make legitimate children, and this would have been a particular concern during wartime when the numbers of young males were declining.

It is worth considering the functions to which these semi-public vases decorated with nuptial/political virtues were put. Table 1 provides an overview of shapes and findspots of wedding vases decorated with civic personifications in the realm of Aphrodite. It becomes immediately clear why this discussion has focused on the period of the Peloponnesian War: with the exception of Peitho and a unique appearance of Philia, none appear before 430, according to traditional stylistic dating, and very few after 400.

132 I have excluded as many as ten examples of these personifications shown in contexts that might not be considered nuptial. Where Aphrodite is present I have indicated her with the abbreviation ‘Aph.’

133 In the decade 440-430, Philia appears as a maenad in a procession depicted on side A of the name vase (a bell krater) of the Eupolis Painter, in Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum IV 1772: \textit{ARI}² 1072.1; \textit{Add}² 325; \textit{LIMC} 7 (1994) 375 s.v. Philia no. 1 (A. Kossatz-Deissmann) 702 s.v.
An analysis of finds spots indicates that only the larger vessels—those that would have been more useful to the Etruscans at their funerary banquets—travelled to Italy. Perhaps the later ‘masterpieces’ sold off for high prices to the Etruscans when the (Greek) families had to deaccession their treasures in times of declining wealth, after the war. One might also consider that such civic nuptial images, such as are found on the ‘gifts’, would not be so interesting to the Etruscans and others outside of Athens, so the class of vases under discussion in this essay would not have been among the items prepared by Athenian craftsmen for export. With the exception of two squat lekythoi and a few lekanis lids found in South Italy, Spain, and Turkey, the smaller vases seem to have gone to the grave with customers in Athens, where they found a third audience, to whom the imagery was also appropriate.

A consideration of shapes reveals that these personifications tend to appear on the ‘gift’ vases rather than on pots associated specifically with the wedding rites, such as loutrophoroi or lebetes gamikoi. Very few appear on larger vases: the Meidian masterpieces, hydriai, and smaller kalpis hydriai, as well as pelikai would have been used for the water and wine associated with the wedding feast. But they appear primarily on the ‘gift’ vases: ornamental pots that held precious items, such as perfume (especially lekythoi and choes; also amphoriskos and aryballos); cosmetics, jewelry, and other ornaments held in pyxides and lekanides, even perfume jars as well as the one epinetron, and a remarkable plate that may have simultaneously celebrated the introduction of Asklepios to Athens. An overabundance of lekanides might be explained by a note from Photios, that such vessels held ‘the playthings of [a girl’s] childhood’ that were sent to her new house as part of the wedding rite (presumably the epaulia).

Another point worth considering is the relatively small size of the ‘gift’ vases that remained at Athens. The fact that these are all small (not miniature) vases might reflect the greater success of preservation experienced by smaller vases. It is also worth noting that smaller objects holding special things always draw more visual attention regardless of where they are placed in the home. And of course they would have been more affordable. I would then conclude that, with the exception of a few big water jars that might have been used more conspicuously at the wedding feast, the patrons and painters who were inclined to decorate their vases with personifications evoking the politically tinged blessings of civic happiness restricted this message to small pots that they knew would be treasured, might actually be read, both visually and literally, and would last a lifetime, if not a couple of millennia. So the message would have been intended for long term

134 See Pritchard 1999 for the original value of ceramic vases and R. Osborne, ‘Pots, trade, and the archaic Greek economy,’ Antiquity 70 (1996) 31-44 for the export of these vases to Etruria.
136 Photios s.v. lekanis.
137 For the affordability of red figure see, most recently, Pritchard 1999, 20-21.
consumption, as a gift to the bride (and her groom); but also for the short-term appreciation of members of the community, who eyed the happy couples’ wedding gifts during the processions. Either way, the message would reflect directly on the donor, who in giving such a gift might be seen to be trendy, perhaps subtle and political, almost certainly clever, but primarily concerned for the civic virtues that supported the well-being of the city.

Regardless of the specific messages intended by patrons and painters of the ‘gardens of Aphrodite’ nuptial scenes, civic personifications could be interpreted on the private level—as personal virtues—and on the public level—as civic virtues—especially because they appeared on vases that functioned both in public and private. The nexus of public/private is brought to the fore by weddings, which were public acknowledgments of private changes in the lives of individuals within the demos. Especially when combined with mythological scenes, ‘these are statements of Athenian pride, patriotism, and confidence in future generations of a city then so beleaguered by war,’ as Jenifer Neils rightly put it. These ‘statements’ on fifth-century Attic vases actually anticipate political and social concerns expressed in the literature of fourth-century Athens, some of which were debated by fifth-century writers (e.g. the tragedians’ varying attitudes towards the nature of Peitho, see supra 12-14). That is to say, the nuptial vases do not simply replicate issues or ideas that were previously worked out by writers, but seem to have played a central role in the evolving political discourse of fifth-century Athens.139

139 This phenomenon is in line with the central role of symposium pottery in late Archaic/early Classical Athens, as explained by Richard T. Neer in Style and Politics in Athenian Vase-Painting. The Craft of Democracy, ca. 530-460 BC (Cambridge 2002).
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http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/

Figure 5. Squat *lekythos* in the manner of the Meidias Painter, 410–400. London, British Museum 1856.5-12.15. *ARV*² 1324.45 (cat. no. E 697).
Search for 1856.5-12.15 on Compass at
http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/

Figure 6. Squat *lekythos* in the manner of the Meidias Painter, 410–400. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 11.213.2. *ARV*² 1324.47; *UKV* 147.
Search vase number 220601 on the Beazley Archive at
http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/test/Vases/ASP/default.asp

Figure 7. *Pyxis* in the manner of the Meidias Painter, 410–400. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 09.221.40. *ARV*² 1328.99.
Search vase number 220655 on the Beazley Archive at
http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/test/Vases/ASP/default.asp

Figure 8. *Hydria* attributed to the Meidias Painter, 420-410, showing Paideia in the lap of Hygieia. Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 81948. *ARV*² 1312.1.
Search vase number 220493 on the Beazley Archive at
http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/test/Vases/ASP/default.asp
Figure 19. *Hydria* attributed to the Meidias Painter, 420–410, showing Eudaimonia leaning on Hygieia. Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 81947. *ARV*² 1312.2.
Search vase number 220494 on the Beazley Archive at http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/test/Vases/ASP/default.asp

Search vase number 220518 on the Beazley Archive at http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/test/Vases/ASP/default.asp

Figure 21. *Pyxis* in the manner of the Meidias Painter, 410–400. London, British Museum 1893.11-3.2 (cat. no. E 775). *ARV*² 1328.92. Search vase number 220648 on the Beazley Archive at http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/test/Vases/ASP/default.asp

Figure 22. Squat *lekythos* attributed to the Makaria Painter, 420–410. University of Reading, Ure Museum 52.3.2. *ARV*² 1330.7.
See this on the Ure Museum Database: http://lkws1.rdg.ac.uk/cgi-bin/ure/uredb.cgi?rec=52.3.2

Search vase number 216944 on the Beazley Archive at http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/test/Vases/ASP/default.asp
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vase (Museum no.)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Findspot</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Personifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MFA 13.186</td>
<td>490-480</td>
<td>Suessula</td>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>Aph., Peitho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna, KHM IV 1772</td>
<td>440-430</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td>Bell krater with lugs</td>
<td>Philia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, BM 1867.5-8.1044</td>
<td>440-430</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Kalpis hydria</td>
<td>Peitho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 30036</td>
<td>430-420</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Pointed amphoriskos</td>
<td>Aph., Nemesis, Peitho, Heimarmene, Themis, [Eukleia/Tyche]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, NM 1629 (CC 1588)</td>
<td>430-420</td>
<td>Eretria</td>
<td>Epinetron</td>
<td>Aph., Harmonia, Peitho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, MMA 31.11.13</td>
<td>430-420</td>
<td>(STB) Athens</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>Eunomia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican 16535 (H 525)</td>
<td>430-420</td>
<td>Vulci</td>
<td>Oinochoe (shape 1)</td>
<td>Aph., Peitho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin F 2634</td>
<td>420-410</td>
<td>Vulci</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>Harmonia, Peitho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence 81948</td>
<td>420-410</td>
<td>Populonia</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>Aph., Eudaimonia, Eutychia, Hygieia, Peitho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence 81947</td>
<td>420-410</td>
<td>Populonia</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>Aph., Eudaimonia, Hygieia, Pannychis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, BM 1772.3-20.30*</td>
<td>420-410</td>
<td>Campania (?)</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>Aph., Hygieia, Peitho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, MMA 37.11.23</td>
<td>420-410</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Pelike</td>
<td>Aph., Harmonia, Peitho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leuven, University (KUL-A)-1000</td>
<td>420-410</td>
<td>(STB) Athens</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Eudaimonia, [Eukleia]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, NAM 31.80</td>
<td>420-410</td>
<td>(STB) Macerata</td>
<td>Squat lekythos</td>
<td>Aph., Peitho, Eunomia, Paidia, [Eukleia]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Louvre MNB 2109 (L 58)</td>
<td>420-410</td>
<td>(STB) Athens</td>
<td>Squat lekythos</td>
<td>Aph., Paidia, [Eudaimonia]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, Ure 52.3.2</td>
<td>420-410</td>
<td></td>
<td>Squat lekythos</td>
<td>Aph., Eutychia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Walters 48.205</td>
<td>420-410</td>
<td></td>
<td>Squat lekythos</td>
<td>Eunomia, Eutychia, Paidia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlsruhe 259 (B 36)</td>
<td>410-420</td>
<td>Ruvo</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>Aph., Eutychia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once London, Hope Collection</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Kalpis hydria</td>
<td>Peitho, Eukleia, [Eunomia]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, NM, Vlasto 47</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Chous</td>
<td>Pompe, [Hygieia]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empúries 1494</td>
<td>400-390</td>
<td>Empúries</td>
<td>Large pelike</td>
<td>Hygieia, Paidia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vase (Museum no.)</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Personifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 2617 (F 2705)</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Squat lekythos (tallboy)</td>
<td>Eukleia, Eunomia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, BM 1849.9-25.12 (E 698)</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Ruvo</td>
<td>Squat lekythos</td>
<td>Eudaimonia, Hygieia, Pandaisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, BM 1856.5-12.15 (E 697)</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Squat lekythos</td>
<td>Aph., Eudaimonia, Eunomia, Paidia, Peitho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, MMA 11.213.2</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Squat lekythos</td>
<td>Aph., Pompe, [Peitho]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once London, Embiricos Coll.</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Squat lekythos (tallboy)</td>
<td>Aph., Eukleia, Eunomia, Peitho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Paris, Bauville Coll.</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Attika</td>
<td>Squat lekythos (tallboy)</td>
<td>Aph., Eunomia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Louvre MNB 1320</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Attika</td>
<td>Acorn lekythos</td>
<td>[Hygieia, Harmonia, Peitho, Tyche]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest T 754</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>Eukleia, Eunomia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples SA 316</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Gnathia</td>
<td>Lekanis lid</td>
<td>Aph., Eukleia, Eunomia, Harmonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainz, University 118</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Lekanis lid</td>
<td>Eukleia, Eunomia, Paidia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ullastret (Gerona) 1486</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Ullastret</td>
<td>Lekanis Lid</td>
<td>Eunomia, Eukleia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Paris, Raoul-Rochette</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Ruvo</td>
<td>Pelike</td>
<td>Eirene, Pannychis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, BM 1893.11-3.1 (E 775)</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Eretria</td>
<td>Lidded pyxis (type b)</td>
<td>Eudaimonia, Eunomia, Harmonia, Hygieia, Paidia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, MMA 09.221.40</td>
<td>410-400</td>
<td>Pyxis (type d)</td>
<td>Aph., Eudaimonia, Eukleia, Eunomia, Hygieia, Paidia, Peitho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Cambridge</td>
<td>400-390</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Aryballos</td>
<td>Aph., Peitho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izmir 12548</td>
<td>400-390</td>
<td>Lekanis (or pyxis) lid</td>
<td>Paidia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empúries 1494</td>
<td>400-390</td>
<td>Empúries</td>
<td>Large pelike</td>
<td>Hygieia, Paidia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: (STB) denotes ‘said to be’; [] demotes possible rather than certain inclusion.