


Tekmeria

Vol 7 (2002)



Representations of Schield-aprons on Attic pottery and their connection with the battle of Marathon and Miltiades

K. GÖRKAY

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.179](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.179)

To cite this article:

GÖRKAY, K. (2002). Representations of Schield-aprons on Attic pottery and their connection with the battle of Marathon and Miltiades. *Tekmeria*, 7, 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.179>

K GÖRKAY

REPRESENTATIONS OF SHIELD-APRONS ON ATTIC POTTERY
AND THEIR CONNECTION WITH THE BATTLE OF MARATHON
AND MILTIADES*

For Prof. H. Wiegartz

I. Introduction

In 1986, E. Jarva published an article on the shield-apron, a military accessory which is known to us largely from pictorial representations of the hoplites of Amazons and Easterners¹. This accessory was a flexible curtain fitted to, and hanging down from, the lower edge of the shield, usually reaching to the feet of the warrior (Fig. 1. 1-5).

In his article, Jarva dealt with the investigation of the ancient Greek name for the shield-apron, the archaeological evidences on its origin, its material and function, and its first appearance in Greek Art. He surveyed extensively the representations of shield-aprons on East Greek, Attic black-figure and red-figure pottery. He concluded that the shield-apron was well represented on pottery produced in East Greek workshops (Clazomenae and Miletos) but rarely illustrated by Attic potters in the second half of the sixth century B.C. As Jarva also pointed out, only one example suggests that the Attic black-figure vase painters were aware of the shield-apron as early as c. 540 BC². Its frequent appearance in the repertory of Attic black and red figure pottery begins in the Late Archaic

* This paper was made possible with the support of the Cast Gallery and the Beazley Archive at Oxford University. I should like to express my gratitude to D. C. Kurtz, T. Mannack and R. R. R. Smith of Oxford University for their invaluable help, to A. Chaniotis of Heidelberg University for discussing with me related epigraphic matters, and to G. Darbyshire of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara for his comments on a draft. I am also grateful to R. Descat, who provided an opportunity to improve my research in the Ausonius Institute of Archaeology (Maison de l' Archéologie, Université Michel de Maigne Bordeaux 3).

1. E. Jarva, «On the Shield-Apron in Ancient Greek Panoply», *Acta Archaeologica* 57 (1986) 1-25.

2. Jarva, *loc.cit.*, 16, fig. 17a

and Early Classical period, which generally corresponds to the Persian Wars. Jarva also came to conclusion that the ancient Greek name for the shield-apron is obscure³; and that the shield-apron was an East Greek innovation⁴.

I now return to the same subject because I believe that some adjustments and contributions to Jarva's study are possible, although I agree with most of his remarks. Most importantly, I believe that representations of Attic hoplites with shield-aprons should be distinguished from the representations of Easterners with shield-aprons, in order for us to trace these representations back to specific historical events, which was beyond the scope of Jarva's study. He was concerned more with the history of the representation of the "hoplite with a shield-apron" as a type, while I am trying to link these representations to history by distinguishing between the identities of the Attic and Eastern hoplites depicted.

II. The ancient name and the material of the shield-apron

We have no direct evidence for determining the material used for shield-aprons, but presumably it was leather, strong textile, or a similar material, as scholars have generally agreed upon⁵. However, so far no scholar has suggested that felt could have been used for the aprons. Felt, a mat made of tightly goat hair or wool, is the lightest possible material capable of absorbing the energy of missiles such as arrows. It is also worth nothing that felt was the material used in the peculiar headgear of the Janissaries of the Ottoman army, apparently for the protection of the neck against swords and perhaps arrows, without charging the head with too much weight.

3. Jarva, *loc.cit.*, 2, 14.

4. CVA BM 7, 54; R. M. Cook, *Clazomenian Sarcophagi*, Mainz 1981, 124; Jarva, *loc.cit.*, 13: «The existing evidence suggest explicitly that the Greeks in the East were the first to use it, and that it was introduced in the Greek mainland and among barbarian peoples only later».

5. J. D. Beazley, «The Castle Ashby Apollodorus», *JHS* 53 (1933) 69; J. K. Anderson, *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1970, 17; L. Ognenova, «Alcune notazioni sulle Lamine d'oro sui Pettorali Rinvenuti in Tracia e Macedonia», *Atti del Settimo congresso internazionale di archeologia classica*, vol. III, Roma 1961, 126ff.

According to Blyth⁶, as depicted in pictorial representations, the shield-apron is reminiscent of the canvas παραβλήματα used to shield trireme crews from arrows (Xen. *Hell.* II.1,22). Some scholars also proposed the Greek word λαισήϊον denotes animal skin with its hair or wool on used as a shield, and could semantically be related to the term λαισήϊος (hairy) which was mentioned in Homer's *Iliad* (V 451-453), and Herodotos (VII.91). Michaelis⁷, and after him Smith⁸, proposed that the στρώματα mentioned by Aristophanes in his *Acharnians* was a shield-apron (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 1136). However, Anderson and Javra suggest that στρώματα is not a shield-apron, but a kind of padding or covering preventing the shield from chafing⁹. The coverings that were depicted in the "unwrapping-the- shield" representations on several Attic red-figure vases¹⁰ should be this στρώματα mentioned by Aristophanes. The ancient term used for the shield-apron, or for the type of shield fitted with an apron, is still obscure¹¹.

6. P. H. Blyth, *The Effectiveness of Greek Armour against arrows in the Persian War (490-479 BC)*, Diss. University of Reading 1977.

7. A. Michaelis, «Il monumento delle nereidi II», *Annali* 47 (1875) 78.

8. A. H. Smith, *A Catalogue of the Greek Sculptures in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum II*, London 1900, 14.

9. Anderson, *loc.cit.*, 261-2; Jarva, *loc.cit.*, 2 note 13.

10. **Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Vaticano, 16583**: the Brygos Painter, ARV2, 373.48, 1649; **London Market**: the Bowdoin-Eye Painter, *Sotheby, sale catalogue*, 5.7.1982, 121, nr. 351 (I); **Tübingen, Eberhard-Karls Univ., Arch. Inst., S101562**: the Painter of Louvre G 456, CVA Tübingen 5, pl.12.5-6, 35, fig. 15; **Altenburg, Staatliches Lindenau-Museum, 234**: the Bowdoin-Eye Painter, E. Paul, *Antike Keramik im Lindenau-Museum, Die Sammlungen des Staatlichen Lindenau-Museums Altenburg 1* (Altenburg 1992), 67 nr. 29; **Paris, Cabinet des Medailles, 420A**: Kleophrades Painter, ARV2 185.37; **Athens, National Museum, Acropolis Coll., 2.759**: Kleophrades Painter, ARV2 187.54; **Dresden, Staatl. Kunst-sammlungen, Albertinum, 349**: The Villa Giullia Painter, ARV2 619.8; **Berne, Private**: Painter of Louvre G456, 1671.8bis; **Paestum, Museo Archeologico Nazionale**: Nikoxenos Painter, 220.2 (probably *stromata* or apron).

11. Smith, *op.cit.* (8), 14; Anderson and Blyth believe its ancient name is not known, Anderson, *op.cit.* (5), 17; Blyth, *op.cit.* (6), 77 note 3.

III. Archaeological Evidence

Shield-aprons, made largely from organic material, are most unlikely to survive at all, less so to be well-preserved, in the archaeological record. Their metal fittings, however, are another matter. A number of golden appliqués found in the tombs at Trebeniste, Macedonia, dateable to the second half of the 6th century BC, were convincingly interpreted by Ogenova and Argirova as being adornments for shield-aprons. These metal appliqués constitute our single direct archaeological evidence for this category of military equipment¹².

IV. Representations of shield-aprons

Ample representations of shields fitted with aprons begin to appear in East Greek art soon after the mid-sixth century BC. Some of the best examples are found on pottery and on Clazomenian sarcophagi¹³. The earliest dateable apron representations appear on a Clazomenian pottery sherd¹⁴ and on the Clazomenian sarcophagi of the Borelli Painter, whose was active between 530 and 515 BC¹⁵. This early depictions clearly indicate that the apron was made from a soft and flexible material. As represented, these aprons appear to be much larger than the later examples depicted on Attic pottery. Very close parallels to the Clazomenian examples are found on a silver *alabastron* from the Lydian tumulus of Ikiztepe¹⁶. Amongst the figural decoration is a pair of confronting hoplites, each holding a circular shield from which is suspended an

12. Ogenova, *loc.cit.* (5), 117-131, 120.

13. Cook, *op.cit.* (4), **Instabul 1427**: pl. 6.1, pl. 7.1; **London 86.3-26.1**: pl. 6.2; **Izmir 6683**: pl. 9.1; **Hanover 1897.12**: pl. 15.1; **London 96.6-15.1**: pl. 41, 43.2-3; **Leiden 1.189/12.1**: pl. 48.3; **Izmir 510**: pl. 49.2-3; **Louvre CA 1024**: pl. 54.1; **Dresden 1643**: pl. 58.1; **Louvre CA 460**: pl. 63.1; **Berlin 3145**: pl. 64-65.1; **Tüningen S/12.2862**: pl. 69.1; **Paris Louvre CA 460**: pl. 71.2; **Athens 16471**: pl. 83.1.

14. **Brussels M831**: E. Walder-Karydi, *Samos VI.1. Samische Gefässe des 6. Jahrhunderts v. Chr., Landschaftsstile ostgriechischer Gefässe*, Bonn 1973, pl. 119, nr. 976a.

15. Cook, *op.cit.* (4), 10ff, fig. 8, 9 pl. 6-7.

16. I. Özgen-J. Öztürk, *Heritage Recovered. The Lydian Treasure*, Istanbul 1996, 124, cat. nr. 78 (**Usak Museum 1.61.96**), fig. 154.

apron made probably of a feline skin with paws visible at both lower corners¹⁷. This example also presents an important clue about the material of the apron in that period. A similar shield arrangement also appears on a Fikelluran amphoriskos, dated from 520-500 onwards¹⁸.

The latest examples of shield aprons are found in Asia Minor, on the reliefs of Lycian grave monuments to the 4th century BC¹⁹.

V. Earliest representation of shield-aprons on Attic Pottery

Although the shield-apron was well-represented in East Greek, Thracian and Lydian art of the last quarter of the 6th century BC, it is strikingly rare in the Attic black-figure repertoire of the same period²⁰. The earliest Attic representation

17. These can also be the tassels of the apron.

18. *Samos VI 1, op.cit.*, (14), pl. 71, nr. 555.

19. Anderson, *op.cit.* (5), 17. For the shield aprons on the Gölbaşı-Trysa Heroon see O. Bendorf, *Das Heroon von Gölbaschi-Trysa* (1888), pl. 24b, block 3, pl. 13a, block 10-11; W. Oberleitner, *Das Heroon von Trysa, Ein lykisches Fürstengrab des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Mainz 1994, 25, figs. 38, 41, fig. 80; Fr. Eicher, *Die Reliefs des Heroon von Gölbaschi-Trysa*, Vienna 1950, pls. 2-3, 20 (A 10); J. Boardman, *Greek Sculpture, Late Classical Period*, London 1995, figs. 222.4, 222.9. For the Nereid Monument see A. H. Smith, *op.cit.* (8), nos. 855, 880, 883; Boardman, *op.cit.*, figs. 218.12, 218.15; see also an early Hellenistic amphora on which a scene of a panther hunt was represented. The hunter on the horse probably carries a shield with apron as hanging on his back. This detail was not interpreted in the article as a shield with apron. See L. Zoroğlu, "Kültepe' de Bulunan Hellenistik Çağa Ait Bir Amphora", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1 (1981) 242, note.7. pls. 1-6.

20. There is only one Attic black-figure vase (a *hydria*) with a shield identified as having an apron: **Munich, Antikensammlungen**, J572: Beazley database (beazley.ox.ac.uk) vase nr 300897, ABV2 123.1, "the Painter of Louvre F6". On this vase, the shield of a fallen hoplite in the background was mistakenly identified as an apron. Another example that should not be confused with a shield-apron is **Basle, Market** (neck-amphora): *Paralipomena* 135.92bis, "the Swing Painter". The hanging curtain which appears behind the shield on this vase is more likely a cloak, rather than an apron. It does not seem to be attached to the shield but to be held by the hoplite separately from the shield. This kind of cloak and shield combination is well-represented in Attic black-figure pottery. See, for example, D. von Bothmer, *Amazons in Greek Art*, Oxford 1957, pl. XLII.3 (**London B 634**, "the Diosphos Painter"); pl. LX.2 (**Oxford G 217**, "the Diosphos Painter"); pl. LX.4 (**Louvre MNC 624(M10)**, "the Diosphos Painter").

of a shield-apron is on a black-figure amphora in Villa Giulia²¹ (c. 540 BC), where the apron was depicted as attached to the shield devices of east Greek hoplites —most probably Trojans²². After a big gap, from 490-480 BC onwards, we see ample representations of shield-aprons as fitted to the mainlanders' shield devices, as well as East Greek and easterners' shield devices, on Attic black-figure *lekythoi* and negro-alabstrons, and on Attic red-figure pottery. The earliest known representation of aprons fitted to the shield devices of Attic hoplites is of the red-figure cup of Apollodoros (**Figure 1. 1-5**). In the handle zone of this cup we see Attic hoplites holding spears and wearing greaves. One of them hoplite holds a shield with an apron. The hoplite in the tondo of the cup holds also a shield with an apron where the apron appears to have been fitted to exterior of the shield.

The Villa Giulia amphora proves that already around 540 BC, Attic potters were aware of the shield-apron as an eastern innovation, as Jarva has also stated. What Jarva did not mention is that before 490 BC, Attic painters depicted the apron as an attribution of East Greek hoplites or easterners. It was in the late archaic period, as late as 490-480 BC, that Attic painters introduced Attic hoplites with shield-aprons to their repertoire, of which the cup of Apollodoros is the first relatively securely dated example. The fragments of this cup were formerly housed in the collections of Villa Giulia (Italy) and Castle Ashby (Northampton, U.K.)²³, and are now in a private collection. The advancing warriors represented on the cup's handle-zone and tondo fragments carry shields with aprons.

Aprons were also depicted on four black-figure and white-ground *lekythoi* and one white-ground *alabastron* of the Emporion Painter, but these vases date from after 490 BC.

21. Villa Giulia 50694: P. Mingazzini, *Vasi della Collezione Castellani*, Vol. 2, Rome 1971, pl. 63.4; Jarva, loc.cit., 16, fig. 17a; Beazley Archive database vase nr. 19466.

22. Mingazzini, *op.cit.* (21), 233.

23. ARV2 120, nr. 4. Beazley believes that the fragments in the Villa Giulia and the Castle Ashby Museum belong to the same cup: Beazley, *op.cit.* (5), 69-70, pl. 6, nr. 1 (Castle Ashby piece) and nr. 3-5 (Villa Giulia pieces). For another work by Apollodoros on which the shield-apron is represented, see ARV2121 (**Leipzig T3593**). For Apollodoros see also P. Hartwig, *Die Griechischen Meisterschalen der Blüthezeit des Strengen rothfigurigen Stiles*, Berlin 1893, 628 ff.

VI. Dating of the Villa Giulia-Castle Ashby Cup of Apollodoros

On stylistic grounds, the cup was dated to c. 490-480 BC²⁴. This dating can be supplemented by the epigraphic evidence of the name of the *kalos* on the vessel, Euryptolemos, a name that appears on three other works by Apollodoros²⁵. We know of two contenders here, Euryptolemos I and Euryptolemos II, and it is impossible to be certain which is being referred to in this connection (a third example, Euryptolemos III, can be ruled out here since his floruit was the late fifth century BC, by which time Apollodoros must have been dead).

Euryptolemos I is known from a dedication from the Athenian Acropolis²⁶. Raubitschek restored the preserved letters on this dedicatory inscription as Μεγακλες ἀνέθεκεν ἡο Εὐρυπτολεμο²⁷; and Bicknell indicated that the person in Raubitschek's restoration is Euryptolemos I²⁸. The names of Megakles and Euryptolemos occur in the stemma of the famous Megakles family: Raubitschek believed that, if his restoration of the inscription were correct, Megakles would be the eldest son (so far unknown) of this elder Euryptolemos, and a brother of Peisianax II and Isodike²⁹. Kirchner too differentiates this elder Euryptolemos (nr. 5983)³⁰ from the younger Euryptolemos (Euryptolemos II) (nr. 5984)³¹. In Kirchner's *prosopographia*, Euryptolemos I is believed to have lived between 501 and 468 BC³², but according to Davies, Euryptolemos I must have lived earlier³³.

24. J. Boardman, *Greek, Etruscan and South Italian Vases from Castle Ashby*, 1980, 72.

25. D. M. Robinson-E.J. Fluck, *A Study of the Greek Love Names*, 1937, 112, nr. 102. See also ARV2120 nr. 1, (**Louvre G139-140**); nr. 4 (**Villa Giulia-Castle Ashby, Northampton**); nr. 5 (**Florence 73131**).

26. *IG* I2, 594. See also *IG* I2, 707.

27. A. E. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis, a catalogue of the inscriptions of the sixth and fifth centuries*, Cambridge-Mass. 1949, 284, nr. 251.

28. P. J. Bicknell, «The Euryptolemos at Xen. Hell. I 3, 12-13», *Mnemosyne* 21 (1971) 390-1.

29. Bicknell, *loc.cit.* See also *RE* VI.1, 1334 ff. (s.v. Euryptolemos); *RE* XIX.1, 147ff (s.v. Peisianax); *Plut., Kim.*, 4.16.

30. *Plut., Kim.*, 4.16; I. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* I, Berlin 1901, 392 nr. 5983.

31. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* I, nr. 5984.

32. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* II, Berlin 1903, 53 (table).

33. J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 BC*, Oxford 1971, 376 ff.

Euryptolemos II is known from Kirchner's number 5984 (c. 468 BC)³⁴. He was the son of Peisianax I and a contemporary of Perikles³⁵. According to Davies, he should have been born between 510-500 BC³⁶, and hence he would have been 15-20 years of age between 490 and 480. Kirchner also believed that the *kalos* name on the cup of Apollodoros refers to Euryptolemos II³⁷, followed by Robinson and Fluck³⁸. I agree that the *kalos* on the cup of Apollodoros should be Euryptolemos II, because his age-range, as indicated above, would be more appropriate for an epebos receiving a *kalos* name. Hence, the Villa Giulia-Castle Ashby cup can be relatively securely dated to shortly after c. 490.

VII. Function of the shield-apron

Clearly, the major purpose of the shield-apron was to protect the warrior's legs from enemy missiles (primarily arrows), especially when the shield itself was drawn up to guard the head and the upper body. If the warrior was in an upright posture, the apron would help to protect the area of his groin and things/upper legs. In a crouching position, the apron would help to protect all of the leg and groin area.

Als Blyth has suggested, the flexible material of shield-aprons, as well as a good deal of the lateral motion in the apron, would have absorbed the kinetic energy of missile impacts. He indicates that the effectiveness of such hanging curtains would have been considerable, although this aspect has not been discussed elsewhere³⁹.

As well as affording protection, these flexible aprons presumably enabled relatively easy movement of the legs while marching or running⁴⁰. Indeed, shield - aprons are generally depicted as being used by infantry hoplites. Admittedly, a Clazomenian sherd shows a hoplite on a chariot holding a shield

34. Plut. *Per.*, 7; Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* I, 392 nr. 5984; see also Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* II, table 53.

35. Plut. *Per.* 7; Robinson-Fluck, *op.cit.* (25), 112; Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* I, 392, nr. 5984; II, 53 (table, Euryptolemos II); Davies, *op.cit.* (33), 377-8.

36. Davies, *op.cit.* (33), 378.

37. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* I, 391, nr. 5979.

38. Robinson-Fluck, *op.cit.* (25), 112.

39. Blyth, *op.cit.* (6), 77 note 3.

40. See the figures on a kalpis of the Leningrad Painter, ARV2 571.79; J. Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases. The Archaic Period*, London 1985, fig. 326.

with apron, but the vehicle is most probably simply a conveyance for transporting the warrior, rather than a mobile fighting platform for use on the battlefield⁴¹.

One might think that hoplites equipped with shield-aprons would not have required greaves, especially since the latter may have caused difficulties in long distance attacks owing, to their greater weight. However, most of the hoplites depicted on vases are in fact fitted out with both greaves and shield-aprons. It would seem then that the primary purpose of the apron was to protect the area of the upper legs and groin from missile impacts. This part of the body was not protected by greaves, nor by the shield when the latter was held in a raised position to defend the head and upper body from arrows. The flexible shield-apron would be valuable for troops initiating attacks in the face of archers, since as well as providing extra protection to a vulnerable and vitally important area of the body, it allowed a reasonable degree of movement for the advancing warrior⁴².

VIII. Shield-aprons and Marathon

Considering the date of the Villa Giulia-Castle Ashby cup of Apollodoros (c. 490-480), we may suggest that the shield -apron carried by Attic hoplites begins to appear on Attic pottery soon after c. 490. After this date, its representation increased during the period of the Persian Wars.

The date we have advanced for the Villa Giulia-Castle Ashby cup allows the suggestion that, in composing his work, Apollodoros was directly inspired by an event of fundamental importance in the history and culture of Athens, and indeed of the Greek world as a whole: the victory over the Persians at the Battle of Marathon, in 490 BC⁴³.

The usage of the shield-apron by the Greek troops would fit in with what is known and is hypothesised about Marathon. Some scholars believe that "at Marathon in 490, hoplites charged successfully at the double against Persian

41. **Brussels M831**: *Samos* VI.1, *op.cit.* (14), pl. 119, nr. 976a.

42. The views expressed in this section concerning the practical use of the shield-apron were developed with discussion with G. Darbyshire.

43. Poulsen proposed the idea that the shield-apron was introduced into Greece after the battle of Marathon, F. Poulsen, «Fragment eines attischen Grabreliefs mit zwei Krieger», *AM* 44 (1929) 138 and 140.

archers, whose bows were probably not powerful enough to penetrate Greek shields⁴⁴, with the Greeks allegedly advancing by running over a distance of c. 1600 m against the Persian archers. Since it has been argued that a Greek hoplite could move only 5 or 6 mile (4 or 5 km) per hour when equipped with typical heavy armour⁴⁵, some have claimed that the hoplites at Marathon must have taken off some of their weighty equipment in order to accomplish the attack⁴⁶. In this connection, the Greek hoplites could have removed their greaves prior to their rapid advance on the Persian battle-line, relying on light shield-aprons alone for protection of their lower body parts; the speed of their advance would have also reduced the Greeks' exposure time to Persian missiles⁴⁷.

Hence, we may propose that the shield-apron was first introduced to Mainland Greece in, or shortly before, 490 BC, at the time of the Persian invasion of Attica, as a defensive measure in response to the threat posed by the Persian archers, the main component of the Asianic infantry forces. Marathon was the first time that an Athenian army faced an enemy so fully equipped with archers. This defensive measure may have been adopted by the Mainland Greeks from East Greek mercenaries. It is also most likely that the shield-apron was introduced to the Greek army as an urgent war strategy for Marathon by Miltiades, who could have known of this type of shield-fitting from Thrace,

44. V. D. Hanson, *Hoplites, Classical Greek Battle Experience*, London 1991, 21.

45. D. Donlan-J. Thompson, «The charge at Marathon: Herodotos 6.112», *CJ* 71 (1976) 339-43.

46. H. Delbrück, *Geschichte der Kriegskunst im Rahmen der politischen Geschichte*, Vol. 1, *Das Altertum*, 1900, (new edition by Karl Christ), tr. W. Renfroe, *History of the Warfare*, Vol. I, Westport, Conn. 1975, 83-5.

47. However, G. Darbyshire has suggested in discussion with me that perhaps Herodotos has exaggerated the running: the advance was, according to Herodotos, made over a considerable distance, and it seems unlikely, contra Herodotos, that the whole duration of the attack was made at a run. Running for any great distance, even over slightly uneven terrain, would probably have dangerously disordered the Greek battle line; in addition, the long Greek thrusting spears and their large shields could more easily have injured comrades in this situation; and the men would have fatigued more quickly. Hence, it may be more plausible that the attack was largely conducted at a fast walk, keeping formation, with perhaps a run only in the final stages as they closed to impact with the enemy. Both greaves and shield-aprons could have been employed together in this scenario, so as to maximise protection against the Persian arrows, and a relatively fast attack speed would still have reduced exposure time to missiles.

where he had first-hand experience with Persian battle tactics while serving with Darius in his failed Scythian expedition.

Apollodoros, who is the first Attic painter to depict Attic hoplites with shield-aprons, is unlikely to have witnessed the Battle of Marathon in person. However, he might have seen this new type of shield-fitting carried by Attic hoplites after Marathon. If this assumption is correct, the effectiveness of the shield apron against arrows must have been tested and proved in the battle of Marathon by the Athenians and as a result become a major and successful defensive tactic against Persian archery.

X. Conclusion

My main point which complements the work of Jarva is that, although the shield-apron was known by Attic painters as early as c. 540, the shield-apron then appears to have been depicted as an attribution of East-Greek hoplites. I do not know of any Attic black-figur representations of Attic hoplites with shield-aprons from the second half of the sixth century. The Attic hoplite with a shield-apron appears first in the Attic repertoire with the above-mentioned cup of Apollodoros, between 490-480 BC. Cook believed that the shield-apron was an East Greek military innovation⁴⁸. Accordingly, many East Greek representations of shield-aprons are known from the sixth century BC. Apart from the Villa Giulia amphora mentioned above, the hoplite with a shield-apron is absent from the Attic black-figure repertoire of the same date, but then suddenly appears amply on Attic red-figure ware beginning with the first quarter of the fifth century, now depicting Attic hoplites as well as easterners.

Athenian employment of the shield-apron was discussed by Anderson in 1970⁴⁹. According to him, its use by the Athenian military would appear to have been derived from the asiatic Greeks during the period of the Persian Wars but was then discontinued following the termination of these particular conflicts. I suggest that the sudden appearance of the shield-apron carried by Attic hoplites in the Attic pottery repertoire is the reflection of the first employment of this piece of equipment in a real battle-Marathon. The use of the shield-apron was probably introduced into Mainland Greece with the battle of Marathon, and not

48. CVA BM 7, 54; Cook, *op.cit.* (4), 124; Anderson, *op.cit.*, 17; Ognenova, *loc.cit.* (5), 120 pl. 2, fig. 5.

49. Anderson, *op.cit.* (5), 17.

after this battle as Poulsen has proposed⁵⁰. Certainly the date of the Villa Giulia-Castle Ashby cup, as well as its figural imagery, suggests that the scene depicted may well represent hoplites at this crucial engagement.

Furthermore, it can be suggested that the use of the shield-apron as protection against Persian arrows seems likely to have been a significant factor in the Greek victory at Marathon, as well as in subsequent actions. The increase of representations of shield-aprons on Attic red-figure pottery after c. 490 BC, through the period of the Persian Wars, should be seen in this light.

The presence of Attic hoplites with shield-aprons in representations may thus be used as a dating criterion for Attic pottery.

Ankara University

Kutalmiř Grkay

50. See note 43 above.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

ΠΑΡΑΣΤΑΣΕΙΣ ΑΣΠΙΔΩΝ ΜΕ «ΠΟΔΙΑ»
ΣΤΗΝ ΑΤΤΙΚΗ ΑΓΓΕΙΟΓΡΑΦΙΑ
Η ΣΧΕΣΗ ΤΟΥΣ ΜΕ ΤΗΝ ΜΑΧΗ ΤΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΑ

Ἀντικείμενο τῆς μελέτης εἶναι ἡ «ποδιά» ἀσπίδας, ἓνα προστατευτικό κάλυμμα ἀπὸ εὐκαμπτο ὕλικό στὸ κατώτερο ἄκρο τῶν ἀσπίδων τῶν ὀπλιτῶν (κυρίως Ἀμαζόνων καὶ πολεμιστῶν ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀνατολή) ποὺ ἔφθανε ὡς τοὺς ἀστραγάλους καὶ ἀπεικονίζεται σὲ παραστάσεις τῆς ἀγγειογραφίας καὶ τῆς ζωγραφικῆς. Ὁ τύπος αὐτὸς ἀσπίδας εἶναι ἀρχαιολογικὰ γνωστὸς ἀπὸ κτερίσματα τάφων στὴν Θράκη καὶ ἔργα τέχνης —ἰδιαίτερα τῆς τέχνης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἀνατολῆς τὰ ὁποῖα χρονολογοῦνται ἀπὸ τὸ δεύτερο ἡμισυ τοῦ βου αἰ. π.Χ. καὶ ἀργότερα. Στὴν ἀττικὴ ἀγγειογραφία τῆς ἀρχαϊκῆς ἐποχῆς παραστάσεις τῆς ἀσπίδας μὲ «ποδιά» εἶναι πολὺ σπάνιες. Ἡ παλαιότερη παράσταση ὑπάρχει σὲ μελανόμορφο ἀμφορέα τοῦ Μουσείου Villa Giulia (ἀρ. 50694 — περ. 540 π.Χ.), ὅπου «ποδιές» ἀσπίδων ἀπεικονίζονται ὡς ἐξαρτήματα τοῦ ὀπλισμοῦ ὀπλιτῶν ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀνατολή, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον (προφανῶς) Τρώων. Ὁ ἀμφορέας αὐτὸς εἶναι τὸ μοναδικὸ ἀττικὸ παράδειγμα ὡς τὸ 490/480 π.Χ. Ἡ παλαιότερη παράσταση μὲ Ἀθηναίους ὀπλίτες ὑπάρχει σὲ ὄστρακα ἀπὸ τὴν ἐρυθρόμορφη κύλικα τοῦ Ἀπολλοδώρου, ποὺ χρονολογεῖται τὸ 490-480 π.Χ. Ὁ ἀμφορέας τῆς Villa Giulia δείχνει σαφῶς ὅτι οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀγγειογράφοι γνώριζαν τὴν «ποδιά» ἀσπίδας ἤδη ἀπὸ τὸ 540 π.Χ. Ἦδη πρὶν ἀπὸ τὸ 490 π.Χ. φαίνεται ὅτι εἶχαν ἀπεικονίσει τὴν «ποδιά» ὡς ἐξάρτημα τοῦ ὀπλισμοῦ Ἑλλήνων ὀπλιτῶν ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀνατολή ἢ Ἀνατολιτῶν. Ἡ ἀπεικόνιση Ἀθηναίων ὀπλιτῶν μὲ «ποδιά» ἀσπίδας στὴν ἀττικὴ ἀγγειογραφία τῶν χρόνων 490-480 π.Χ. ὑποδηλώνει ὅτι οἱ ὀπλίτες στὴν μητροπολιτικὴ Ἑλλάδα εἶχαν ἀρχίσει νὰ χρησιμοποιοῦν αὐτὸν τὸν τύπο ἀσπίδας ἤδη γύρω στὸ 490 π.Χ., δηλ. τὴν χρονολογία τῆς μάχης τοῦ Μαραθῶνα. Σχετικὰ μὲ τὴ μάχη αὐτὴ ἀναφέρεται ὅτι οἱ Ἕλληνες ὀπλίτες εἶχαν ἀντιμετωπίσει μὲ ἐπιτυχία τοὺς Πέρσες τοξότες· μερικοὶ δὲ ἐρευνητὲς ἔχουν ὑποστηρίξει τὴν ἄποψη ὅτι τὰ περσικὰ βέλη δὲν ἦσαν ἀρκετὰ ἰσχυρὰ ὥστε νὰ διαπεράσουν τίς ἑλληνικὲς ἀσπίδες. Εἶναι πιθανὸν ὅτι αὐτὲς οἱ «ποδιές» ἀσπίδων ἦταν ὁ κύριος λόγος γιὰ τὴν ἀναποτελεσμα-

τικότητα τῶν Περσῶν τοξοτῶν. Σύμφωνα με ὅλα αὐτὰ ἡ παλαιότερη ἀπεικόνιση τῶν ἀσπίδων με «ποδιά» στήν ἀττική ἀγγειογραφία πρέπει νά συνδεθεῖ με αὐτὸ τὸ ἰδιαίτερης σημασίας ἱστορικὸ γεγονός.



K. Görkay, Fig. 1. 1-5