

Beyond “Art Collections”

Edited by Gianfranco Adornato,
Gabriella Cirucci, and Walter Cupperi

Beyond “Art Collections”

Owning and Accumulating Objects from Greek Antiquity
to the Early Modern Period

De Gruyter

Published thanks to the support of the Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca and the Dipartimento di Eccellenza Classe di Lettere e Filosofia, Scuola Normale Superiore.



ISBN 978-3-11-053791-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2020936978

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2020 Walter De Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Cover illustration: Fanciful Representation of Maximilian I's Treasury, detail from: The Triumphal Arch of Maximilian I of Habsburg, woodcut, 1515. London, The British Museum, inv. no. E 5,1.

Typesetting: SatzBild GbR, Sabine Taube, Kieve

Printing and binding: Beltz Grafische Betriebe GmbH, Bad Langensalza

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Acknowledgments — 7

Introductory Essay

Beyond “Art Collections”
Rethinking a Canon of Historiography
Gabriella Cirucci/Walter Cupperi — 9

Essays

Displacing Artifacts
Towards a Framework for Studying Collecting in the Ancient Roman World
Jane Fejfer — 29

Too Ugly to be Collected?
Unexpected Greek “Originals” in Roman Contexts
Gabriella Cirucci — 55

Collecting and Owning Sikyonian Paintings
Aratus of Sikyon and his Interest for Art in Plutarch’s Perspective
Eva Falaschi — 77

Ut etiam fictilia pluris constant quam murrina
Art market, Canons, and Archaeological Evidence
Gianfranco Adornato — 95

Contents

- Accumulating and Interacting
Artworks in Ancient Rome's Public Spaces
Alessandro Poggio — 113
- Memories of Mauretania
A Late Antique Installation in the House of Venus, Volubilis
Susan Walker — 133
- The "Marmorsaal" of the Harbour Baths in Ephesus and the Avarian Treasure
of Nagyszentmiklós
Two Case Studies
Georg A. Plattner — 149
- Treasures on Display
On the Forms of Exhibition of Medieval Church Treasures
Susanne Wittekind — 163
- Charles V's Valuables in Simancas
Titian's *Charles V with a Drawn Sword* and Other Items with a Controversial Status
Walter Cupperi — 183
- Studiolo, Grotta, Cupola e *Museum*
La Tribuna di Francesco I de' Medici e le Stanze di Bianca Cappello e Don Antonio agli Uffizi
Valentina Conticelli — 199
- A Material Dynasty
Royal Collections and Collecting in Tudor England, 1485–1603
Andrea M. Gáldy — 227
- Authors — 249
- Index — 251
- Credits — 257
- Plates — 261

Collecting and Owning Sikyonian Paintings

Aratus of Sikyon and his Interest for Art in Plutarch's Perspective

Aratus and Ptolemy II, two Politicians with a Weakness for Sikyonian Painting

Aratus of Sikyon was a statesman, commander, and historian of the third century BCE. He was such a prominent personality that Plutarch dedicated an entire biography to him, also describing him as an art expert; in particular, he dwells at length on Aratus' fondness for Sikyonian painting and the effects this had on his political activity (Plut. *Vit. Arat.* 12.6–13.6).¹

This description Plutarch makes of Aratus is connected with Aratus' deposition of the tyrant Nikokles in 251 BCE and the following events. Once the tyranny was defeated, many Sikyonian citizens who had been exiled by Nikokles came back to their homes and began demanding the restitution of their properties. Since Aratus was afraid that this situation could lead to a civil war, he decided to take action by admitting Sikyon to the Achaean League and by going to Egypt to ask king Ptolemy II for help.²

In Plutarch's narration, the well-structured description of Aratus' interest in art is embedded within the historical narrative. After mentioning the fact that Aratus gifted Ptolemy II some paintings, an action which pleased the Egyptian king, Plutarch proceeds to celebrate Aratus' sophisticated connoisseurship of Sikyonian painting (κρίσιν [...] κτώμενος). This celebration gives the author the opportunity for a brief digression on the greatness of Sikyonian painting itself (Ἦνθει γὰρ [...] μεταλαβεῖν),³ necessary to explain (διὸ) how

1 For full text and translation, see Appendix.

2 Plutarch only refers to "the king" (τῷ βασιλεῖ), without mentioning his name. For the arguments in favor of the identification of the king in question with Ptolemy II (308–246 BCE, king from 282 BCE, co-regent since 285 BCE), see *infra* fn. 62.

3 See Adrianus J. Koster (ed.), *Plutarchi vitam Arati, edidit, prolegomenis commentarioque instruxit A.J. Koster*, Leiden: Brill, 1937, p. XXXVI "Laudes pictorum Sicyoniorum [...] et lepida narratiuncula de tabula picta Aristrati [...] (c. 13, 1–5) quasi excursus interposta sunt. Verbis enim, quae sunt ἐκ τε δὴ τοῦτων (c. 13, 6), scriptor ad propositum revertitur"; see also *ibid.*, p. 61.

Aratus became a painting expert by growing up in close contact with art and to justify Aratus' behavior after Nikokles' downfall, when he decided to spare the portrait of the tyrant Aristratos by Melanthos (διὸ [...] λέγουσιν). Lastly, the passage ends circularly, going back to the historical narration and how Ptolemy was pleased with Aratus' gifts: an action which secured Aratus some funds from Ptolemy (ἔκ τε δὴ τούτων [...] ἀπέστειλεν).

Plutarch's description of Aratus as an art expert mentions his refined judgement for Greek painting, and his passion for "collecting" and acquiring exquisitely made works of art, especially those of Pamphilos and Melanthos (γραφαῖς καὶ πίναξιν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἐν οἷς κρίσιν ἔχων οὐκ ἄμουσον ὁ Ἄρατος αἰεὶ τι τῶν τεχνικῶν καὶ περιττῶν, μάλιστα δὲ Παμφίλου καὶ Μελάνθου, συνάγων καὶ κτώμενος ἀπέστειλεν). In other words, Aratus had the right knowledge to recognize good artworks (κρίσιν οὐκ ἄμουσον) and loved—literally—collecting, i.e. putting them together (συνάγων), but also owning them (κτώμενος). What he looked for in paintings was technical excellence (τεχνικῶν) and something out of the ordinary (περιττῶν). According to his taste these features were well expressed in Sikyonian art, especially in the paintings by Pamphilos and Melanthos. Therefore, Aratus' interest in painting was not just the whim of an incompetent person, but was based on his deep knowledge of this field.

Κρίσιν, συνάγων, and κτώμενος are Plutarch's keywords to describe Aratus' attitude towards art. However, this terminology is attested in relation to "collecting" artworks also in other sources. For example, in the *De genio Socratis*, Plutarch reports the opinion of a painter according to whom only the art experts can judge accurately an artwork. Within the narrative the painter states that common viewers without any artistic knowledge have a generic view of an artwork, while refined people and lovers of art (τοὺς δὲ κομψοὺς καὶ φιλοτέχνους) analyze artworks with judgement, i.e. τῇ κρίσει, in every part, without neglecting any details.⁴ In another instance, the verb συνάγω is used together with κατατίθημι by Joseph Flavius for describing the *Templum Pacis* in Rome as a place where many artworks were accumulated and stored from all over the empire (πάντα γὰρ εἰς ἐκεῖνον τὸν νεῶν συνήχθη καὶ κατετέθη).⁵ Therefore, we can conclude that συνάγω and κρίσις were used, at least in the Imperial age, to describe, respectively, "collecting" artworks and the capability of judging artworks.

To complete his portrait of the Sikyonian politician, Plutarch also states that only Aratus' hatred of tyranny was stronger than his passion for painting (ἦν δὲ τὸ ἔργον ἀξιοθέατον, ὥστε γνάμπτεσθαι τὸν Ἄρατον ὑπὸ τῆς τέχνης, αὐθίς τε μίσει τῷ πρὸς τοὺς τυράννους ἐξαγόμενον κελεύειν καθαιρεῖν). From Plutarch's perspective and, in general, according to the ancient political thought, this is a very strong assertion. Plutarch himself, in his *Life of Aratus*, repeats many times how deep Aratus' hate towards tyranny

4 Plut. *Mor. De gen.* 575 a–b: τῇ κρίσει κατὰ μέρος τὸ ἔργον διαλαμβάνοντας οὐδὲν ἀθέατον οὐδ' ἀπροσφώνητον ἐκφεύγει τῶν καλῶς ἢ τούναντίον γεγονότων.

5 Joseph. *BJ* 7.158–160.

was.⁶ Therefore, the comparison between fondness for art and hatred of tyranny reveals the importance of this issue: at least in Plutarch's thought, Aratus' artistic interest is not a superfluous appendix in his characterization as a politician and as a man, but rather it is displayed as an unquestionably true and admirable part of his personality.

Nonetheless, Aratus is not the only art lover in Plutarch's narration. Ptolemy II is also described as a great enthusiast of Sikyonian painting (τεθεραπευμένω γραφαῖς καὶ πίναξιν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος), a weakness of which Aratus successfully took advantage (ἔκ τε δὴ τούτων ὁ Ἄρατος ἠγαπᾶτο [...] τάλαντα).

Reliable Portraits of Third-century BCE "Collectors"?

Plutarch wrote the *Life of Aratus* between the end of the first century CE and the beginning of the second century CE. He refers to events which took place in the middle of the third century BCE, in a political, historical and cultural context that was very far from his own. For this reason, it is necessary to wonder how reliable his description of Aratus and Ptolemy II as "collectors" of artworks is, and instead, how much his portraits correspond to an Imperial Age ideal of a "collector"/"connoisseur".

How to Acquire Practical Knowledge in Painting

To establish the reliability of Plutarch's narration, it is first of all necessary to consider if Aratus could have actually acquired a good expertise in painting and how this could have been possible.⁷ Pliny the Elder declares that since the fourth century BCE, thanks to the

6 See, for example, Plut. *Vit. Arat.* 28.6. In particular, on Aratus's destruction of paintings and its connection with his hatred for tyranny, see Roberto Capel Badino, *Polemone di Ilio e la Grecia. Testimonianze e frammenti di periegesi antiquaria*, Milano: Ledizioni, 2018, pp. 232–233: "Tutta l'impostazione dell'episodio rivela un'intenzione apologetica, che doveva essere caratteristica già dei *Memoriali* di Arato. È probabile che l'intero episodio, per il quale Plutarco si richiama a fonti imprecisate, indicate al plurale (φασί—λέγουσιν), risalga nell'insieme agli Ὑπομνήματα aratei".

7 On the presence of drawing/painting in the Greek educational system see, in general, Eva C. Keuls, *Plato and Greek Painting*, Leiden: Brill, 1978, pp. 144–150; Marek T. Olszewski, *Fabriqueur des images (ποιεῖν ἀγάλματα)*. A propos du métier de pictor, remarques et réflexions, in: Eric M. Moormann (ed.), *Functional and Spatial Analysis of Wall Painting. Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress on Ancient Wall Painting (8–12 September 1992)*, Leiden: Stichting BABESCH, 1993, pp. 184–186; Michael Donderer, *Zeugnisse Kleinasien für Agone in den Bildenden Künsten*, in: Fritz Blakolmer et al. (eds.), *Fremde Zeiten. Festschrift für Jürgen Borchhardt*, Wien: Phoibos Verlag, 1996, vol.1, pp. 329–338; Lucio Del Corso, *Le pratiche scolastiche nelle testimonianze epigrafiche di età ellenistica*, in: José A. Fernández Delgado, Francisca Pordomingo, Antonio Stramaglia (eds.), *Escuela y Literatura en Grecia Antigua, Actas del simposio internacional, Universidad de Salamanca, 17–19 Noviembre de 2004*, Cassino: Edizioni dell'Università degli Studi di Cassino, 2007, pp. 141–190; Jerome J. Pollitt, *Education in the Visual Arts*, in: W. Martin Bloomer (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Education*, Malden, MA, Oxford, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015, pp. 375–386, pp. 380–382; Antonio Corso, *Sugli agoni di artisti nella Grecia classica*, in: *RendLinc* s. 9, 27 (2016), pp. 115–127; Jorge T. García, *Nulla dies sine pictura: la pintura como materia docente en la antigua Grecia*, in: *Arte, Individuo y Sociedad* 29 (2017), pp. 265–282 (with further bibliography).

painter Pamphilos, it was common for children (*pueri ingenui*), first in Sikyon and later in all of Greece (*Sicyone primum, deinde in tota Graecia*), to study wood painting (*graphicen, hoc est picturam in buxo*), and that this art form was considered the first level of their studies (*recipereturque ars ea in primum gradum liberalium*).⁸ On the other hand, Aristotle in his *Politics* mentions drawing (γραφικήν) as a possible (ἐνιοι) subject at school beside more common subjects such as grammar, gymnastics and music (ἔστι δὲ τέτταρα σχεδὸν ἃ παιδεύειν εἰώθασι, γράμματα καὶ γυμναστικὴν καὶ μουσικὴν καὶ τέταρτον ἐνιοι γραφικήν). He also explains why drawing should be taught, stating that it is useful to better judge artists' works (δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ γραφικὴ χρήσιμος εἶναι πρὸς τὸ κρίνειν τὰ τῶν τεχνιτῶν ἔργα κάλλιον) and in private purchases to avoid being cheated in buying and selling furnishings (τῶν σκευῶν).⁹ However, the importance of drawing is not confined by the author exclusively to these practical matters, but is rather stated to be fundamental to appreciating the beauty of bodies (οὐχ ἴνα ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις ὠνίοις μὴ διαμαρτάνωσιν ἀλλ' ὥσιν ἀνεξαπάτητοι πρὸς τὴν τῶν σκευῶν ὠνήν τε καὶ πρᾶσιν, μᾶλλον δ' ὅτι ποιεῖ θεωρητικὸν τοῦ περὶ τὰ σώματα κάλλους).¹⁰

Other literary, archaeological and epigraphical sources may be added to this evidence, confirming that in the Late Classic and Hellenistic Greek world young aristocrats would have been educated in drawing/painting.¹¹ For example, an inscription from Teos¹², dating to the second century BCE, attests that *paidēs* at the middle level of their studies learnt—and competed in—drawing (ζωγραφία, l. 10);¹³ at the same age they also studied reading and general culture (πολυμαθία, l. 8),¹⁴ after having learnt writing and reading at the first level of their education. In other words, ζωγραφία was considered part of the basic level of knowledge, preparatory to the following levels of studies, in particular rhetoric. This and other inscriptions from Asia Minor attest public competitions among students in all the subjects

8 Plin. *NH* 35.77. On the philological problems of this text, see Jean-Michel Croisille (ed.), *Pline l'ancien. Histoire naturelle, livre XXXV, texte établi traduit et commenté par J.M. Croisille*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1985, ad loc.; Pollitt 2015 (as fn. 7), p. 380.

9 τῶν σκευῶν indicates here all the furnishings of the house, including also paintings and statues, not just furniture.

10 Arist. *Pol.* 1337b–1338b.

11 Among literary sources, see Diogenes Laertius (3.5), who states that the young Plato had applied himself to drawing/painting (γραφικῆς ἐπιμεληθῆναι) and wrote poems. Plutarch himself (*Vit. Aem.* 6.4–5) attests that Aemilius Paulus called sculptors and painters (καὶ πλάσται καὶ ζωγράφοι) to give a Greek education to their sons. In the *Life of Demetrius* he also describes Demetrius as not applying his ingenuity to things that would afford useless diversion, “like other kings who played on the flute, or painted (ζωγραφοῦντες), or chased metals” (*Vit. Dem.* 20.2).

12 CIG 3088a. See Donderer 1996 (as fn. 7), pp. 329–330; Del Corso 2007 (as fn. 7), pp. 167–174; Pollitt 2015 (as fn. 7), p. 380; Corso 2016 (as fn. 7), pp. 119–120.

13 Scholars have usually interpreted ζωγραφία in this and the following inscriptions as drawing rather than painting, see Wolfgang Blümel, *Inschriften aus Karien I*, in: *EpigAnat* 25 (1995), pp. 35–64, p. 62; Donderer 1996 (as fn. 7), p. 329; Del Corso 2007 (as fn. 7), p. 168. Pollitt 2015 (as fn. 7), pp. 380–381 prefers “painting/drawing”.

14 This is connected mainly with the knowledge of poetry, see Del Corso 2007 (as fn. 7), p. 172.

learnt at school, including ζωγραφία.¹⁵ The best students together with their teachers were honored in front of their entire community. The fact that ζωγραφία was one of the subjects evaluated thus demonstrates its social importance: having a good knowledge in ζωγραφία was, in fact, a merit in front of the community.¹⁶ The social relevance of ζωγραφία is also proven by the fact that the winning students were recorded on public inscriptions with great attention to their genealogy.¹⁷

In addition to these textual sources, archaeology could maybe contribute to our understanding of this topic. For example, in the graffiti from the gymnasium of Delos, dating to the second century BCE, could plausibly be a confirmation of the inclusion of drawing as a subject within the Greek educational system. Among these graffiti, there are, in fact, also high quality drawings of artworks (probably those which decorated the gymnasium itself), demonstrating that the visitors of the gymnasium had interest and practical training in drawing.¹⁸

Therefore, in the light of this evidence, it is neither surprising nor unhistorical that Aratus, as Plutarch states, had great expertise in painting and used this knowledge to “collect” artworks. He could have acquired this knowledge not only by reading books about art on

- 15 Student competitions in ζωγραφία are attested to also in Knidos (Blümel 1995 (as fn. 13), pp. 62–63, no. 33, see also Del Corso 2007 (as fn. 7), pp. 175–176) and in Magnesia on the Maeander (SIG 960, second century BCE, see Donderer 1996 (as fn. 7), p. 330; Del Corso 2007 (as fn. 7), p. 176; Pollitt 2015 (as fn. 7), p. 380; Corso 2016 (as fn. 7), 120–121), see also next footnote for Ephesos.
- 16 In an inscription from Ephesos (I. Ephesos IV 1101, second century BCE), before the list of the winning students, there is the list of teachers (παιδευταί) honored for the skills of their students in the competition (τεῖ ἀποδείξει), among which there were also the ζωγράφοι: the winner was Sotikos (Ζωγράφων Σωτικός Ἴερο[—]). On this inscription and the role of teachers in these competitions, see Donderer 1997 (as fn. 7), p. 330; Del Corso 2007 (as fn. 7), pp. 164–166: “Fare in modo che i propri allievi riportassero una vittoria, così, poteva rappresentare per un insegnante una buona occasione per integrare il proprio magro salario e soprattutto per acquisire lustro e prestigio agli occhi della comunità, che spesso costituivano l’unica garanzia di essere riconfermati nell’incarico”. See also Pollitt 2015 (as fn. 7), pp. 380–381: “The inscription does not say, and we have no way of knowing, whether the teachers were receiving these awards on behalf of their students or whether they were in fact directly competing with one another, perhaps for reappointment or higher salaries”.
- 17 For example, in the inscription from Teos, the winner was “Dionysios, the son of Dionysios, grandson of Dionysios, and great-grandson of Menekrates” (ll. 10–11). As Pollitt has correctly underlined, “The inscription’s emphasis on Dionysios’s genealogy would seem to indicate that achievements like this were a source of great family pride”, see Pollitt 2015 (as fn. 7), p. 380. See, also, the winners of the prizes in ζωγραφία in the inscription from Magnesia (*supra* fn. 15): “Apollonios the son of Apollonios, Kallistratos the son of Zopyros, and Alkis the son of Zopyros” (ll. 14–16).
- 18 Salomon Reinach, *Antiquités découvertes au théâtre de Délos*, in: *BCH* 13 (1889), pp. 374–8; Erich Ziebarth, *Aus den griechischen Schulwesen. Eudemos von Milet und Verwandtes*, Leipzig et al.: B.G. Teubner, 1914 (Groningen: Bouma, 1971); Jean Audiat, *Le Gymnase de Délos et l’inventaire de Kallistratos*, in: *BCH* 54 (1930), pp. 99–130; Casimir Michalowski, *Les hermès du Gymnase de Délos*, in: *BCH* 54 (1930), pp. 131–46; Marie-Thérèse Couilloud, *Les graffites du Gymnase*, in: Jean Audiat (ed.), *Le Gymnase. Exploration archéologique de Délos XXVIII*, Paris: De Boccard, 1970, pp. 101–137; Anne Jacquemin, *Quelques offrandes du Gymnase de Délos*, in: *BCH* 105 (1981), pp. 155–69; Martin Langner, *Antike Graffitizeichnungen. Motive, Gestaltung und Bedeutung*, Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 2001, pp. 96–97.

his own and by taking part in the artistic environment of Sikyon, but also at school, where, judging from his later interest, he might also have shown good skills in this subject. The way he used this knowledge during his life both as a “collector” and in the politics of the city, could corroborate the social importance that studying art at school might have had, besides demonstrating the utility and the variety of aims for which it was taught, as already declared by Aristotle.

Aratus’ Relations with Sikyonian Artists

Aratus’ connection with the artistic environment of the third-century BCE Sikyon is also confirmed by other facts recorded.¹⁹ Plutarch himself, throughout the *Life of Aratus*, underlines several times Aratus’ relationships with the Sikyonian artists of his time. For example, the narrative mentions that Timanthes depicted a very vivid picture of his victory in 241 BCE against the Aetolians at Pellene.²⁰ This painter is usually identified with the figure bearing the same name who, according to Plutarch, went to Egypt together with Aratus: in fact, since, as mentioned previously, Aratus wanted to gain Ptolemy’s favor by gifting him Sikyonian paintings, it would have been plausibly profitable to bring an artist with him.²¹ Moreover, when Plutarch narrates about Nealkes’ attempt to spare the portrait of Aristratos Melanthos had made, he introduces Nealkes as a friend of Aratus (see Appendix, 13.4: τὸν οὖν ζωγράφον Νεάλκη φίλον ὄντα τοῦ Ἀράτου).²² Finally, it is possible that

19 Ernst Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen*, 3 voll., München: Bruckmann, 1923, vol. 2, pp. 812–813; Audrey Griffin, *Sikyon*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982, pp. 152–153.

20 Plut. *Vit. Arat.* 32.3.

21 Plut. *Vit. Arat.* 12.3. See, e.g., Heinrich Brunn, *Geschichte der griechischen Künstler. Zweiter Band*, Stuttgart: Ebner & Seubert, 1859, p. 290; Pfuhl 1923 (as fn. 19), vol. 2, p. 814; Charles H. Skalet, *Ancient Sicyon, with a Prosopographia Sicyonia*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928, p. 141; William H. Porter (ed.), *Plutarch’s Life of Aratus, with Introduction, Notes and Appendix by W.H. Porter*, Dublin: Cork University Press, 1937 (New York: Arno Press, 1979), pp. 56–57; Koster 1937 (as fn. 3), p. 92; Paolo Moreno in: EAA (1966), s.v. *Timanthes* 2); Robert Flacelière, Émile Chambry (eds.), *Plutarque. Vies. Tome XV, texte établi et traduit par R. Flacelière et É. Chambry*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1979, p. 233; Mario Manfredini, Domenica P. Orsi, Virgilio Antelami (eds.), *Plutarco. Le Vite di Arato e di Artaserse. A cura di Mario Manfredini e Domenica Paola Orsi*, Milano: Mondadori, 1987, p. 219.

22 It is also possible that Aratus acted as a go-between for Nealkes and the Egyptian court. According to Pliny the Elder (*NH* 35.142), in fact, Nealkes depicted a naval battle between Persians and Egyptians: this has suggested a contact between the artist and the Egyptian court, and some scholars have hypothesized that he was introduced to the court by Aratus himself. See, e.g., Brunn 1859 (as fn. 21), p. 290; Skalet 1928 (as fn. 21), p. 141; Georg Lippold, in: *RE* 16.2 (1935), cols. 2105–2106; Bernhard Hebert, *Schriftquellen zur hellenistischen Kunst. Plastik, Malerei und Kunsthandwerk der Griechen vom vierten bis zum zweiten Jahrhundert*, Horn: Berger, 1989, p. 188, no. 363. However, Andreas Rumpf, in: Thieme-Becker, 25 (1931), p. 369 shows some doubts about that. On the chronological problems connected to this painting and the possible existence of a second Nealkes, see Eva Falaschi, *BIOI ΠΟΙΚΙΛΟΙ. Le biografie dei pittori negli scritti di Plutarco*. Ph.D. diss., Scuola Normale Superiore, 2015, p. 367 n. 1311.

the Mnasitheos, who, according to Plutarch, took part in the liberation of Sikyon,²³ was the same as the painter mentioned by Pliny the Elder.²⁴

On the other hand, excluding Plutarch's narration, Pliny is the only author mentioning that the painter Leontiskos depicted Aratus as a winner with a trophy. However, some scholars do not agree to identify this Aratus with the Sikyonian politician.²⁵

According to these sources, we can therefore conclude that Plutarch's description of Aratus is the coherent portrait of a well-educated man of high status who cultivated many relationships with the artists of his times. Plutarch also depicts a situation where artists take an active part in the political events of the city and, thanks to the value of their art, seem to detain decisional power. Except for Pliny's reference to Leontiskos, this portrait does not find a correspondence in sources other than Plutarch, but nothing contradicts it. Aratus' education and knowledge in the field of painting finds, instead, a confirmation in many other sources which attest to the study of drawing/painting at school and its social relevance, all over the Greek world and in particular in Sikyon, from at least the fourth century BCE.

A "Collector" at the Egyptian Court: Ptolemy II's and Sikyonian Painting

On the other hand, Ptolemy II's fondness for Sikyonian painting is corroborated by Athenaeus. According to him and his source, Kallixeinos of Rhodes, the pavillon built in the occasion of Ptolemy II's Great procession was decorated with Sikyonian paintings: they were displayed in the intercolumns, together with portraits, embroidered garments, statues, weapons, and many other artworks.²⁶ This specific presence of Sikyonian art in the pavillon

23 Plut. *Vit. Arat.* 7.6.

24 Plin. *NH* 35.146. This identification is accepted, e.g., by Adolphe Reinach, *Textes grecs et latins relatifs à l'histoire de la peinture ancienne*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1921, p. 397, no. 527 and n. 9; Skalet 1928 (as fn. 21), p. 141; Porter 1937 (as fn. 21), p. 57; Croisille 1985 (as fn. 8), p. 255 (*dubitanter*); Antonio Corso, Rossana Mugellesi, Gianpiero Rosati (eds.), *Gaio Plinio Secondo. Storia Naturale V: mineralogia e storia dell'arte. Libri 33–37. Traduzioni e note di A. Corso, R. Mugellesi, G. Rosati*, Torino: Einaudi, 1988, p. 467, no. 146,1.

25 Plin. *NH* 35.141 *Leontiscus Aratum victorem cum tropeo*. Katherine Jex-Blake, Eugenie Sellers (eds.), *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art. Translated by K. Jex-Blake, with Commentary and Historical Introduction by E. Sellers*, London: Macmillan and Co., 1896, p. 166 show doubts on the identification of this Aratus with the Sikyonian strategos. However, other scholars have accepted this identification: see, e.g., Pfuhl 1923 (as fn. 19), vol. 2, p. 813; Reinach 1921 (as fn. 24), p. 397, n. 6; Skalet 1928 (as fn. 21), p. 141; Silvio Ferri (ed.), *Plinio il vecchio. Storia delle arti antiche*, Roma: Palombi, 1946, p. 202; Croisille 1985 (as fn. 8), p. 248; Corso et al. 1988 (as fn. 24), p. 455, n. 141,4.

26 Ath. 5.26 (196e). On this passage, see Ingeborg Scheibler, *Griechische Malerei der Antike*, München: C.H. Beck, 1994, p. 15; Elena Calandra, L'occasione e l'eterno: la tenda di Tolomeo Filadelfo nei palazzi di Alessandria. Parte prima. Materiali per la ricostruzione, in: *Lanx* 1 (2008), pp. 26–74; eadem, L'occasione e l'eterno: la tenda di Tolomeo Filadelfo nei palazzi di Alessandria. Parte seconda. Una proposta di ricostruzione, in: *Lanx* 2 (2009), pp. 1–77, pp. 54–59; eadem, A proposito di arredi. Prima e dopo la tenda di Tolomeo Filadelfo, in: *Lanx* 5 (2010), pp. 1–38, pp. 23–24; Elena Ghisellini, Immagini e potere alla corte dei Tolomei, in: Marianna Castiglione, Alessandro Poggio (eds.), *Arte—Potere. Forme artistiche, istituzioni, paradigmi interpretativi. Atti del convegno di studio tenuto a Pisa, Scuola Normale Superiore, 25–27 Novembre 2010*, Milano: LED, 2012, pp. 273–300, p. 276 (with bibliography); Paul T. Keyser, Kallixeinos of Rhodes (627), in: Ian Worthington (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby*, Brill online

seems to demonstrate Ptolemy's interest in this kind of painting and to support the idea that Aratus' political move of gaining Ptolemy II's favor by giving him Sikyonian paintings was very strategic and wise.²⁷

On this basis, we do not really have any reason to suspect that Plutarch's depictions of Aratus and Ptolemy II are fictitious. His descriptions agree with what literary and epigraphical sources, as well as archaeological evidence, confirm for the Hellenistic Age, which is to say that kings and political figures had a great interest towards art. In particular, Ptolemy II's characterization has a correspondence in another source from Imperial times, Athenaeus, whose account probably depends on the second-century BCE writer Kallixeinos of Rhodes. Likewise, Aratus' portrait appears coherent and solid in all Plutarch's *Life*, and finds some echoes in Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*; also conforms with the educational system of the late Classical period and the Hellenist age. Therefore, Plutarch's descriptions turn out to be reliable and consistent with the historical figures in question, as far as we know them.

The Fame of Sikyonian Art in the Imperial Age: a Later Distortion of Aratus' Portrait?

Nonetheless, in evaluating the reliability of these depictions we should reflect on what idea of Sikyonian art was widespread in the Imperial age and evaluate the influence it could have had on Plutarch's historical narration.²⁸

In fact, in the Imperial age Sikyon was considered the cradle of Greek art, the place where painting, sculpture and every other art flourished, as Strabo narrates (ἐν Σικυῶνι ἠύξιθη γραφικὴ τε καὶ πλαστικὴ καὶ πᾶσα ἡ τοιαύτη δημιουργία).²⁹ Pliny the Elder stated that this city "was for a long period a native place of painting" (*diuque illa fuit patria*

2014, no. BNJ 627 F 2; Jorge T. García, *Pausias de Sición*, Roma: Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, 2015, pp. 26–29 (with further bibliography).

27 Cf. Miguel Angel Elvira Barba, *El pintor en las cortes helenísticas*, in: Adolfo J. Domínguez Monedero, Carmen Sánchez Fernández, *Arte y poder en el mundo antiguo*, Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas – Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1997, pp. 161–176, 168; García 2015 (as fn. 26), pp. 27–28 "Esta serie de cuadros de la escuela de Sición en la corte de Ptolomeo II se puede encuadrar dentro de la necesidad que tenían este tipo de monarcas de corte helenístico para expresar de manera oficiosa su poder regio. [...] Este referencia sobre la presencia de imágenes de la escuela de Sición es especialmente importante ya que define el gusto cultural".

28 In the fourth century BCE Sikyon became an important artistic centre, for both sculpture and painting. In particular, on Sikyonian painting see, with further bibliography, Reinach 1921 (as fn. 24), pp. 250–267; Pfuhl 1923 (as fn. 19), vol. 2, pp. 728–734; Ferri 1946 (as fn. 25), pp. 158–161; Paolo Moreno, *Il realismo nella pittura greca del 4 sec. a.C.*, in: *RivStArch* 13–14 (1964–5), pp. 27–98; Keuls 1978 (as fn. 7), pp. 139–150; Paolo Moreno, *La pittura tra classicità ed ellenismo*, in: Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli (ed.), *Storia e civiltà dei Greci. Vol. VI. La crisi della polis. Arte, religione, musica*, Milano: Bompiani, 1979, pp. 459–520, pp. 484–494; Griffin 1982 (as fn. 19), pp. 147–157; Croisille 1985 (as fn. 8), pp. 192–196; Corso et.al. 1988 (as fn. 24), pp. 373–377; García 2015 (as fn. 26); García 2017 (as fn. 7).

29 Strabo 8.6.23 (381–382).

picturae),³⁰ where well educated people began studying painting.³¹ In this perspective, it is also interesting that in the second century BCE the polygraph and erudite Polemon of Ilion,³² whose antiquarian interest for artworks and monuments is well attested to by his fragmentary writings, wrote some books on the artworks which decorated Sikyon.³³ These books were still known in the Imperial age, when Athenaeus quoted them: in particular, he speaks twice about a volume *περὶ τῆς ἐν Σικυῶνι Ποικίλης Στοᾶς*³⁴ and once about a book *περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικυῶνι πινάκων*.³⁵ Although it is not clear whether these titles should be referred to as the same work, we can conclude that already in the second century BCE the artworks of Sikyon had gained interest beyond the boundaries of the city and had captured the attention of intellectuals and educated people like Polemon³⁶. The fame of his book(s) persisted up to the Imperial age: not only does Athenaeus mention them, but Plutarch himself shows that he knows Polemon as a source for the Sikyonian school (*ὡς Πολέμων ὁ περιηγητῆς ἱστορήκεν*).³⁷

Moreover, a contemporary of Plutarch, Pliny, in order to support his statements that Sikyon was for a long time *patria picturae*, remembers that the paintings which were publicly displayed in Sikyon were sold at an auction by the city in order to pay its debts to the Romans, and were brought to Rome when Aemilius Scaurus was aedile in 58 BCE.³⁸ The economic and civic value attributed to those paintings on that occasion, but also the way they were prestigiously displayed in Rome, and their mention by Pliny, prove the fame of the Sikyonian school in the Imperial age.³⁹ It is not clear whether Pliny saw these paintings.

30 Plin. *NH* 35.127. Cf. also Plin. *NH* 35.15 *De pictura initiis incerta nec instituti operis quaestio est. [...] Graeci autem alii Sicyone, alii apud Corinthios repertam.*

31 Plin. *NH* 35.77. See *supra* fn. 8.

32 On Polemon see Heinrich Bischoff, in: *RE* 19.1 (1937), s.v. *Perieget*, cols. 728–732 (no.3); Ludwig Preller (ed.), *Polemonis periegetae fragmenta, collegit, digessit, notis auxit L. Preller*, Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1838; Mariachiara Angelucci, Polemone di Ilio fra ricostruzione biografica e interessi antiquari, in: *Studi Classici e Orientali* 49 (2003), pp. 165–184 [year of publication: 2008]; eadem, Polemon's contribution to the periegetic literature of the II century B.C., in: *Hormos* 3 (2011), pp. 326–341; David Engels, Polemon von Ilion. Antiquarische Periegesis und hellenistische Identitätssuche, in: Klaus Freitag, Christoph Michels (eds.), *Athen und/oder Alexandria? Aspekte von Identität und Ethnizität im hellenistischen Griechenland*, Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2014, pp. 65–98; Capel Badino 2018 (as fn. 6).

33 Cf. Plin. *NH* 35.127, who speaks about paintings which were publicly displayed (*e publico*) in Sikyon.

34 Ath. 13.38 (577c) (= Polem.Hist. fr. 14 Preller = fr. 7 Capel Badino) and Ath. VI, 62 (253b) (= Polem.Hist. fr. 15 Preller = fr. 8 Capel Badino). For a commentary on these passages, see Capel Badino 2018 (as fn. 6), pp. 139–153.

35 Ath. 13.21 (567b) (= Polem.Hist. fr. 16 Preller = fr. 9 Capel Badino). For a commentary on this passage, see Capel Badino 2018 (as fn. 6), pp. 153–164.

36 Capel Badino 2018 (as fn. 6), pp. 139–140, 153–154.

37 On Plutarch's quotation and, in general, on Polemon as source for Sikyonian art, see Falaschi 2015 (as fn. 22), pp. 406–408.

38 Plin. *NH* 35.127. See, recently, Capel Badino 2018 (as fn. 6), pp. 146–147; Nathaniel B. Jones, *Painting, Ethics, and Aesthetics in Rome*, Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, p. 122.

39 We do not know exactly where these paintings were displayed in Rome, but it is usually accepted that at first they were exhibited in Scaurus' wooden theatre in the Campus Martius, which was famous for the ostentation of its furnishings, see Corso et al. 1988 (as fn. 24), *ad loc.*; Hariclia Brecoulaki, Greek

If so, this could be the reason why he mentions them and their Roman location, since they were for him the most tangible proof of the famous Sikyonian paintings he read about in art history books. Certainly, if they still existed in Rome, Plutarch must also have admired them during his journeys to Rome.⁴⁰

Sikyonian Painting in Plutarch's Words

It follows that Plutarch was conscious of the fame of Sikyonian art and, writing about Aratus' fondness for painting, could not avoid celebrating it. His words sound like a very elegant, almost poetic and sincere glorification of Sikyonian painting, which seems to mirror a personal feeling. He says, in fact, that "the fame of Sikyon's Muse and good painting was still in full bloom, and it alone was thought to have a beauty that was indestructible" ("Ἦνθει γὰρ ἔτι δόξα τῆς Σικυωνίας μούσης καὶ χρηστογραφίας, ὡς μόνης ἀδιάφθορον ἐχούσης τὸ καλόν).

Χρηστογραφία is a *hapax legomenon* the meaning of which has been debated at length. In his commentary on the *Life of Aratus*, William Porter considered χρηστογραφία "either fine painting generally (cf. καλλιγραφία, artistic writing), or else it must have a technical meaning not elsewhere recorded, in reference to the encaustic process which is mentioned in the words immediately following".⁴¹ In contrast, Ernst Pfuhl stated that "als Chrestographie bezeichneten die Späteren diese Malerei, in welcher sie die reine Schönheit und das wahre Können fanden: Techne in höchsten Sinne des Wortes, ratio, Methode."⁴² Moving from this definition, Michelangelo Cagiano de Azevedo intended χρηστογραφία as "pittura corretta" or "pittura accademica", that is "scolastica, ligia a norme precise, devota ai canoni insegnati e appresi", a kind of painting that "relega in secondo piano la fantasia

Painting and the Challenge of Mimesis, in: Pierre Destrée, Penelope Murray (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics*, Malden, MA, Oxford, Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2015, pp. 218–236, p. 218. According to Pliny (*NH* 36.114–115), after the structures of the ephemeral theatre were removed, many furnishings were brought to a villa in Tusculum, where they were destroyed during a slaves uprising (*relicus apparatus tantus Attalica veste, tabulis pictis, cetero choragio fuit, ut, in Tusculanam villam reportatis quae superfluebant cotidiani usus deliciis, incensa villa ab iratis servis concremarentur HS [CCC]*). It is not clear whether Scaurus' Sikyonian paintings had this destiny or if they were exhibited elsewhere in the city. For example, we know that at Pliny's times the "Sacrifice of oxen" by Pausias was displayed in the Porticus of Pompey (Plin. *NH* 35.126 *sicut spectatam in Pompei porticu boum immolationem*).

40 Plutarch went to Rome at least twice, in Vespasian's reign and later, under Domitian. On Plutarch's journeys to Rome, see Jean Sirinelli, *Plutarque de Chéronée. Un philosophe dans le siècle*. Paris: Fayard, 2000, pp. 53–73; John Scheid, *À Rome sur les pas de Plutarque*, Paris: La Librairie Vuibert, 2012; Philip A. Stadter, *Plutarch and Rome*, in: Mark Beck (ed.), *A companion to Plutarch*, Malden, MA, Oxford, Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2014, pp. 13–31.

41 Porter 1937 (as fn. 21), p. 57. He is followed by Anastasios G. Nikolaidis, *Plutarch's Views on Art and Especially on Painting and Sculpture*, in: Germán Santana Henríquez (ed.), *Plutarco y las artes—XI simposio internacional de la Sociedad Española de Plutarquistas (Las Palmas de Gran Canaria 8–10 noviembre 2012)*, Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 2013, pp. 169–181, p. 174, n. 18. Contra, Sascha Kansteiner et al. (eds.), *Der Neue Overbeck: die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen. Vol. IV. Spätklassik—Hellenismus*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014, p. 8, no. 2686, s.v. *Pamphilos*.

42 Pfuhl 1923 (as fn. 19), vol. 2, p. 724.

per esaltare la verisimiglianza del soggetto, la perfezione del disegno in funzione di questa, l'esperienza della simmetria come conoscenza dello spazio e manifestazione di ordine". On this basis, he also identified some rules in composition and perspective in Pompeian painting which derive from the Sikyonian school, and concluded that "il termine 'chrestographia' nel significato di 'pittura accademica' era perfettamente inteso da Plutarco, non solo in virtù di una sua conoscenza delle opere di Polemon, ma perché il termine indicava un gusto ancor vivo e operante al suo tempo. Non per nulla i dipinti citati si trovano eseguiti o riadoperati in edifici della ultima fase pompeiana e rispecchiano quindi una moda di tal momento."⁴³

Χρηστογραφία is certainly a rare word which seems to perfectly fit into Plutarch's style,⁴⁴ whether it was created by Plutarch or whether it was an already existing term.⁴⁵ Although Hariclia Brecoulaki has attributed a moral meaning to this word, emphasizing the moral nuance of the adjective χρηστός, and Nadia J. Koch has underlined the connection of the term with the concept of utility,⁴⁶ I have the impression that Plutarch uses it—and

43 Michelangelo Cagiano de Azevedo, La chrestographia, in: *ArchCl* 8 (1956), pp. 24–28, pp. 24–25. See also Scheibler 1994 (as fn. 26), p. 58, who considers χρηστογραφία the main feature of Sikyonian art and defines it as "auf wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen beruhende, korrekte und objective Wiedergabe von Figuren und Dinge". Against these interpretations see Kansteiner et al. 2014 (as fn. 41), p. 8, no. 2686, s.v. *Pamphilos*. Also Keuls 1978 (as fn. 7), p. 143 connected χρηστογραφία with Sikyonian artistic practice: "The term χρηστογραφία is obscure, because it is not otherwise attested, and was apparently coined to designate the practices of Pamphilus and his successors. I suspect it as formed by analogy with χρηστομαθία and carried the same connotation of study by means of selected models from the past. This interpretation of the term is supported by the circumstance that the school was highly prolific of manuals and treatises". More recently, the technical meaning of the word has been proposed by Nadia J. Koch, *Paradeigma: die antike Kunstschriftstellerei als Grundlage der frühneuezeitlichen Kunsttheorie*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013, pp. 91–92; Brecoulaki 2015 (as fn. 39), pp. 218–219; García 2015 (as fn. 26), pp. 39–41; García 2017 (as fn. 7), p. 273; Jorge T. García, *The Limits of Greek Painting. From Mimesis to Abstraction*, in: Heather L. Reid, Jeremy C. DeLong (eds.), *The Many Faces of Mimesis. Selected Essays from the 2017 Symposium on the Heritage of Western Greece*, Sioux city, Iowa: Parnassos Press, 2018, pp. 325–338, pp. 328–331: "This type of painting was based on the symmetry of forms, the balance of the composition" (p. 328). Finally, see Capel Badino 2018 (as fn. 6), pp. 153 and 236–238: "La caratteristica che fa dell'arte di Sicione una vera e propria scuola, uno stile distinto, è posta da Plutarco sotto la definizione di χρηστογραφία, un'espressione tecnica con ogni probabilità risalente alla fonte"; in general, Capel Badino follows Cagiano de Azevedo's technical interpretation of the term.

44 Plutarch often uses compound words not elsewhere attested, see Sven-Tage Teodorsson, Plutarco, innovatore del vocabolario greco, in: Aurelio Pérez Jiménez, Frances Titchener (eds.), *Valori letterari delle opere di Plutarco. Studi offerti al Professore Italo Gallo da The International Plutarch Society*, Málaga, Logan, Utah: Universidad De Málaga, Utah State University, 2005, pp. 405–418. Teodorsson, however, does not include the word χρηστογραφία in his list.

45 Cagiano de Azevedo 1956 (as fn. 43), pp. 24 and 28 thinks that the word χρηστογραφία was common in Plutarch's times and maybe was already used by Polemon. See also, Capel Badino 2018 (as fn. 6), p. 153 n. 505 "Il termine tecnico doveva essere usato da Polemone, cui Plutarco attinge in questa pagina della *Vita di Arato*", and p. 236.

46 Brecoulaki 2015 (as fn. 39), pp. 218–219 "The word *chrestographia* is not easy to translate into English, for it evokes a more profound and complex meaning than merely 'beautiful' or 'refined'. It also encompassed the notion of 'morally good', as in the noun *kalokagathia* in which both the notions of beauty and virtue are combined (see Aristotle on the requirement of tragedy that its characters be

maybe creates it—first of all to distinguish the concept of beautiful painting from that of beautiful writing, καλλιγραφία.⁴⁷ The etymology of χρηστογραφία suggests the meaning “good painting, painting of good quality”, that is, an indication of the high level reached by Sikyonian painting.⁴⁸ Any reference to a particular artistic technique or style is, indeed, lacking in Plutarch’s account, so that the interpretations offered by scholars involve the risk of forcing the meaning of Plutarch’s text.

Moreover, many compounds of χρηστός—all of them rare words—are attested to for the first time, with a few exceptions, only from the Late Hellenistic/Imperial Age, and some of them just in this period.⁴⁹ Therefore, this could be considered a late linguistic use, typical

morally good ‘*chresta*’, in order for the true tragic effect to be achieved [...]). In my opinion, *chrestographia* is a key word for our understanding of the Sicyonian school’s fame, and its significance has to do with the philosophical and aesthetic question of ‘how to represent’ and ‘what is worthy of being represented’ in figural painting, as originally defined through the highly influential, yet different, views on mimesis of Plato and Aristotle”. Koch (2013, as fn. 43, pp. 91–92) offers a different interpretation. She translates the term “Nützlichkeitsmalerei” (p. 91, n. 121) and explains: “Nach Plutarch war dies eine Lehre, die nicht wenig beanspruchte, nämlich als einzige das Schöne in reiner, unvergänglicher Form zu vertreten, wobei dieses *kalon* wie das *eu* Polyklets wohl im Sinne der technischen Ästhetik als ‘optimal seine Funktion erfüllend’ zu verstehen sein dürfte. [...] nicht etwas eine ethischem Sinne besonders ‘gute’ oder ‘schöne’ Malerei, sondern eine im Sinne des aristotelischen *chrêsimon* auf alle übrigen Lehrgegenstände anwendbare Lehre von der Malerei, eine Art Schlüsselqualifikation”.

- 47 Plutarch is the first author to use the word καλλιγραφία in literature, in reference both to style (Plut. *Mor. De Tranq. anim.* 465a; Plut. *Coniugalia praecepta* 145f; Plut. *Mor. Quaest. conv.* 683e; see also Diog. Laert. 3.66) and to the beauty of characters (Plut. *Mor. De Pyth. or.* 397c). Nonetheless, inscriptions show that already in the Hellenistic period καλλιγραφία, that is, “good handwriting”, was a subject of competition in schools: see, e.g., CIG 3088b, l. 4 (from Teos, high Hellenistic period, cf. Donderer 1996 (as fn. 7), p. 329, with further bibliography); IMyl 909, l. 19 (from Mylasa); Blümel 1995 (as fn. 13), pp. 62–63, nr. 33, l. 7 (from Knidos, late Hellenistic period, see SEG 44, 902). On these inscriptions and on καλλιγραφία as a subject at school, see Del Corso 2007 (as fn. 7), pp. 168–170. Obviously, Plutarch’s use of the word καλλιγραφία uniquely for indicating handwriting does not exclude that this word family could be used elsewhere in reference to painting: for example, Philo of Alexandria (*De providentia* 2, 15) uses καλλιγράφος for “painter”. Nonetheless, Plutarch is attentive in relegating καλλιγραφία just to the sphere of handwriting.
- 48 LSJ, s.v. χρηστογραφία: “good or beautiful painting”; Gl, s.v. χρηστογραφία: “finezza della pittura, alto pregio della pittura”. This meaning is generally accepted by scholars, see e.g. Bernadotte Perrin (ed.), *Plutarch’s Lives. Vol. XI, with an English translation by B. Perrin, London, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926, ad loc.* “refined and beautiful paintings”; Ferri 1946 (as fn. 25), p. 158 “perfezione pittorica”; Jerome J. Pollitt, *The Art of Ancient Greece. Sources and Documents*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990² (first edition 1965), p. 158 “the success of its painting”; Flacelière, Chambry 1979 (as fn. 21), *ad loc.* “de ses excellents peintres”; Moreno 1979 (as fn. 28), p. 486 “perfetta pittura”; Manfredini et al. 1987 (as fn. 21), *ad loc.* “*la fine arte del dipingere*”; Gabriele Marasco (ed.), *Vite di Plutarco. Vol. V. Demetrio e Antonio; Arato; Artaserse; Agide-Cleomene e Tiberio-Gaio Gracco, a cura di G. Marasco*, Torino: Utet, 1994, *ad loc.* “dei suoi eccellenti pittori”. See also Gansteiner et al. 2014 (as fn. 41), p. 8, no. 2686, s.v. *Pamphilos* “trefflichen Malkunst”, but cf. the related comment: “Die genaue Bedeutung von Chrestographie, wörtlich etwa ‘brauchbare, tüchtige Malerei’, muss erschlossen werden, da das Wort sonst nicht vorkommt, und ist dementsprechend umstritten”. Also other compounds of χρηστός attested in Greek literature (for a list of attestations before the third century CE, see *infra*, fn. 49) confirm this meaning (see LSJ, s.v. for their meanings).
- 49 Aristotle is the first (and the only) author to use compounds of χρηστός in the fourth century BCE. After that, the next attestations date since the first century BCE, with the exception of χρηστοθήεια, present

of the Imperial Greek, which Plutarch made his own to distinguish *χρηστογραφία* from *καλλιγραφία* and embellish his prose with a rare and refined word.

To sum up, it is not possible with certainty to either attribute a technical meaning to the word *χρηστογραφία* or to conclude that it is connected specifically with the Sikyonian painting school, expressing its peculiar style. Considering also the highly rhetoric style of this passage, it is simply possible that Plutarch rather wanted to celebrate Sikyonian painting with a rare word, which expressed the high quality of that school and, also, his personal admiration for it.

The Σικυώνια μούση also gives a poetic touch to Plutarch's words. This allusion is not immediately clear and has been interpreted in different ways, mainly as a reference to art,⁵⁰ but also to literature.⁵¹ Other scholars, instead, have rightly preferred to maintain the image of the Muse, respecting the poetic style of the text.⁵² Since a Muse of painting or sculpture does not exist and Muses, even though connected to specific literary fields, can indicate education and culture in general,⁵³ the allusion to the Sikyonian Muse seems to show, first and foremost, Plutarch's interest in depicting Sikyon as a cradle of culture.⁵⁴ Nonetheless, Sikyon was particularly famous for its art—especially sculpture and painting—not for tragedy or music, so that it could be interpreted as a celebration of Sikyonian art in particular. The combination of the word *χρηστογραφία*, which probably alludes to painting, and

in the Septuagint (but of uncertain date). Here is the list of the compounds attested to before the third century CE, with their first attestation: *χρηστοθήθεια*, LXX *Si.* 37.11 (third century BCE–third century CE), Demetr. *Eloc.* 244 (first century BCE–first century CE?); *χρηστοθήτης*, Arist. *Rh.* 1395b17 (fourth century BCE); *χρηστοινέω*, Strabo 14.1.15 (first century BCE–first century CE); *χρηστοκαρπία*, Strabo 6.4.1; *χρηστόκαρπος*, Strabo 3.6; *χρηστολογία*, NT. *Ep.Rom.* 16.18 (first century CE); *χρηστολόγος*, *Hist. Aug. Pertinax* 13.5 (Pertinax' nickname, *chrestologum eum appellantes*; uncertain date, but after Pertinax' times, who died in 193 CE); *χρηστομάθεια*, Longin. 44.1 (first century CE?), Sor. 1.2 (first–second century CE); *χρηστομαθέω*, Longin. 2.3; *χρηστομαθής*, Cic. *Att.* 1.6.2 (first century BCE), Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.9.43 (second–third century CE), adv. *χρηστομαθώς*, Phld. *de Musica.* 4.17.3 (p. 83 K.) (first century BCE); *χρηστομουσέω*, Ath. 14.633b (second–third century CE); *χρηστομουσία*, inscription from Gadara (unknown date) referred to the city of Gadara in an epitaph, see Charles Clermont-Ganneau, *Etudes d'archéologie orientale*, vol. 2, Paris: Bouillon, 1892, p. 142; Paul Perdrizet, *Syriaca*, in: *RA* 35 (1899), pp. 34–53, pp. 49–50 “Gadara où les Muses sont cultivées”, but see also Charles Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d'archéologie orientale*, vol. 2, Paris: Leroux, 1898, p. 399 “aux belles mosaïques”, and Gl, s.v. *χρηστομουσία*, “buona scuola”; *χρηστοουργία*, Iambl. (?) apud *Suda* (χ 516) (second century CE); *χρηστοφιλία*, Arist. *Rh.* 1361b35; *χρηστόφιλος*, Arist. *Rh.* 1361b38; *χρηστοφωνία*, Oribasius 6.10.7 (fourth century CE, probably from Antyllus, second century CE).

50 Perrin 1926 (as fn. 48), *ad loc.* “the fame of Sicyon's refined and beautiful paintings”; Pollitt 1990 (as fn. 48), p. 158 “the fame of the Sikyonian school and the success of its painting”; Flacelière, Chambry 1979 (as fn. 21), *ad loc.* “La renommée de l'École artistique de Sicyone et de ses excellents peintres”; Marasco 1994 (as fn. 48), *ad loc.* “La fama della scuola artistica di Sicyone e dei suoi eccellenti pittori”; Kansteiner et al. 2014 (as fn. 41), p. 8, no. 2686, s.v. *Pamphilos* “*der Ruhm der Kunst von Sikyon*”.

51 Reinach 1921 (as fn. 24), p. 255, no. 321: “Les lettres étaient alors florissantes à Sicyone, ainsi que le bonne peinture”.

52 Manfredini et al. 1987 (as fn. 21), *ad loc.*: “La fama della musa sicionia e della fine arte del dipingere”.

53 LSJ, s.v. Μούσα II, “liberal arts, accomplishments”. See, also, in Plutarch's passage (see Appendix, 12.6) the description of Aratus as having a refined (οὐκ ἄμουσον) judgement in art.

54 Cf. the word *χρηστομουσία*, referred to the city of Gadara in an epitaph, see *supra*.

the general content of these chapters, which are dedicated to Sikyonian painters and their artworks, also seems to push in this direction. In other words, the reader has the impression that Plutarch intends to recognize Sikyonian art as worthy of a place among the Muses, both in Aratus' times, which he is speaking about, but also in his own times, since in this statement he also seems to express a personal, shared opinion, as the poetic style of the sentence betrays.

Behind Rhetoric: Elements of Sikyonian Art History

As mentioned above, we do not have any definitive proof to state that in this text Plutarch uses technical art terminology and alludes to practical and/or theoretical aspects of Sikyonian painting. In contrast, the rhetorical and poetic style of his words can be clearly identified, and reveal a personal appreciation of Sikyonian art.

Nonetheless, we cannot deny that Plutarch's account contains art history reflections. First of all, Plutarch's evaluation is based on the clear awareness of the existence of a Sikyonian painting tradition, which flourished for a long time: in other words, it implies the understanding of the development of painting through time. "Ἦνθει ἔτι, in fact, suggests that in Aratus' times Sikyonian painting and its fame had a long tradition behind it, while after that period it declined.⁵⁵ Moreover, ὡς μόνης ἀδιάφθορον ἐχούσης τὸ καλόν seems to indicate that in the third century BCE other schools had declined.

This description could be an allusion to the Attic painting school and its decline after the Peloponnesian war, although it continued to host renowned painters. Such a change in the history of art had been acknowledged also through the new division of schools proposed by one of the most eminent exponents of the fourth-century BCE Sikyonian school, Eupompos. He was the first to distinguish three schools: *Ionicum*, *Sicyonium* and *Atticum*, while before him only two were recognized, *Helladicum* and *Asiaticum*. That is, Eupompos divided *Helladicum*—which represented the Attic school—into two different schools, *Sicyonium* and *Atticum*, giving the Sikyonian school a new role in the history of Greek painting.⁵⁶

In conclusion, even if Plutarch's celebration of Sikyonian painting appears to be a rhetorical elaboration, we cannot exclude that he was influenced by artistic theories well known in his times and canonized by ancient art historians. The following anecdote on Apelles also speaks in the same direction. Plutarch mentions it as proof of Sikyon's fame in painting: according to the philosopher, Apelles, who at the time was already famous, went to Sikyon to join its artists and paid one talent for attending their lessons; his goal was not to learn the *technē*—he was already a great painter—but to tie his name to that of the

55 See also the use of *diu* in Plin. *NH* 35.127 *diuque illa fuit patria picturae*.

56 Plin. *NH* 35.75. On the different painting genres, see Reinach 1921 (as fn. 24), pp. 250–251, no. 315 with notes; Silvio Ferri, Note esegetiche ai giudizi d'arte di Plinio il Vecchio, in: *AnnPisa* 11 (1942), pp. 69–116, p. 100; Ferri 1946 (as fn. 25), p. 160, who connects Pliny's division of painting genres with that one of rhetorical genres; Croisille 1985 (as fn. 8), p. 194; Corso et al. 1988 (as fn. 24), pp. 375–377; García 2015 (as fn. 26), pp. 35–41.

Sikyonian school and to benefit from its fame (see Appendix, 13.1: τῆς δόξης μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς τέχνης δεόμενον).

Although this seems just another rhetorical motive, this piece of news is corroborated by Pliny, who states that Apelles was a pupil of Pamphilos of Amphipolis, together with Melanthos, and paid one talent for his lessons.⁵⁷ Nonetheless, Plutarch's aim in telling this story is very different from Pliny's. The latter—and probably his source—intends to show the relationship between master and pupil and trace the history of the Sikyonian school; in contrast, Plutarch wants to prove the fame of the Sikyonian school. Therefore, once again we have the impression that this information, which finds confirmation in ancient treatises on art history, could have been elaborated by Plutarch in a rhetorical perspective to support his point, which is to exalt the greatness of the Sikyonian painting school.

Plutarch in the Mirror? A Portrait of Aratus, a Portrait of Himself

In conclusion, Plutarch portrays Aratus and Ptolemy II as “collectors” and owners of artworks and enhances this aspect of their personality in a historical and political context. He underlines how their passion for Sikyonian art interlaces with the epochal events that made the history of Sikyon in the third century BCE, and how Sikyonian paintings assumed in this context a political, economic, and social value.

His descriptions are quite consistent with the information we can find elsewhere on these two political figures and the period in which they lived. Moreover, throughout all his *Life* Plutarch depicts, with coherence, a portrait of Aratus as a well-educated aristocrat with a great interest in art and many relationships with the artists of his time.

Nonetheless, in depicting this picture, another dynamic plays an important role. In fact, Plutarch's account is not neutral, and the relevance he attributes to art and “collecting” artworks in his historical narration, as well as the celebratory tones he takes, betrays his own interest in art. Between the lines, the reader perceives the admiration of a lover and maybe “collector” of paintings, Plutarch, towards another ancient lover and “collector” of paintings, Aratus.⁵⁸

Therefore, our attempt to understand the phenomenon of “art collecting” in ancient times through literary sources faces not only the risk of using modern categories, definitions and dynamics, but also that of neglecting the categories, definitions and dynamics that characterized the epoch of the sources. In particular, in the case of Aratus and Plutarch, historical data on Aratus' personality and the events of which he was the protagonist are

57 Plin. *NH* 35.75–76 *Pamphilum, Apellis praeceptorem ... docuit neminem talento minoris—annis ΧD—quam mercedem et Apelles et Melanthius dedere ei*; Plin. *NH* 35.123 *Pamphilus quoque Apellis praeceptor*. See also *schol. Ar. Plut.* 385b and *Suda* (α 3008).

58 For Plutarch's interest in art, see Falaschi 2015 (as fn. 22), pp. 13–32; Eva Falaschi, *Di fronte ai dipinti. Plutarco sulla pittura tardo-classica ed ellenistica*, in: Gianfranco Adornato, Eva Falaschi, Alessandro Poggio (eds.), *Περὶ γραφικῆς. Pittori, tecniche, trattati, contesti tra testimonianze e ricezione*, Milano: LED, 2019.

strongly intertwined with the artistic fame of Sikyon in the Imperial age, in a continuous exchange between art history knowledge, rhetorical elaboration, and historical narration. Although these different dynamics appear clear in the text, it is not possible to trace the exact boundaries between them. Moreover, with the exception of Polemon, we do not know anything about Plutarch's sources. However, Aratus' description results as being reliable as well as the information on the Sikyonian painting school, which is confirmed by other sources.

What these different epochs have in common, undoubtedly, is the timeless fame that Sikyonian painting enjoyed and the relevant place it gained in the art market and in the "art collecting" scene of both periods. This is proven in Aratus' time by his own, by Ptolemy II's, and by the city of Sikyon's "collections". Later the importance of Sikyonian painting is confirmed by the fact that the paintings acquired from Sikyon were probably displayed briefly in Scaurus' theatre in Rome. Their later fortune is uncertain. However, it is plausible that they were exhibited elsewhere in the city, maybe together, in a "Sikyonian collection", maybe separately, in different buildings of the city. Instead, we do not know the "biographical history" of the paintings that were brought to Alexandria by Aratus as gifts to Ptolemy II, whether they remained there until their loss, whether they were brought to Rome, or whether they were lost due to other vicissitudes. Nonetheless, in every age and everywhere they were brought, it is plausible that Sikyonian paintings remained very precious "collectible" objects, as also Plutarch describes and considers them.

Appendix: Plutarch, Life of Aratus 12.6–13.6.⁵⁹

ἐκ δὲ Καρίας χρόνῳ πολλῷ περαιωθεὶς εἰς Αἴγυπτον, πατρόθεν τε τῷ βασιλεῖ διακειμένῳ πρὸς αὐτὸν οἰκείως ἐνέτυχε καὶ τεθεραπευμένῳ γραφαῖς καὶ πίναξιν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἐν οἷς κρίσιν ἔχων οὐκ ἄμουσον ὁ Ἄρατος αἰεὶ τι τῶν τεχνικῶν καὶ περιπτῶν, μάλιστα δὲ Παμφίλου καὶ Μελάνθου, συνάγων καὶ κτῶμενος ἀπέστελλεν.

13. Ἦνθει γὰρ ἔτι δόξα τῆς Σικυωνίας μούσης καὶ χρηστογραφίας, ὡς μόνης ἀδιάφθορον ἐχούσης τὸ καλόν, ὥστε καὶ Ἀπελλῆν ἐκείνον ἤδη θαυμαζόμενον ἀφικέσθαι καὶ συγγενέσθαι τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐπὶ ταλάντῳ, τῆς δόξης μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς τέχνης δεόμενον μεταλαβεῖν. **(2)** διὸ τὰς μὲν ἄλλας εἰκόνας τῶν τυράννων ἀνεῖλεν εὐθύς ὁ Ἄρατος ὅτε τὴν πόλιν ἠλευθέρωσε, περὶ δὲ τῆς Ἀριστράτου τοῦ κατὰ Φίλιππον ἀκμάσαντος ἐβουλεύσατο πολὺν χρόνον. ἐγράφη μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ [πάντων] τῶν περὶ τὸν Μέλανθον ἄρματι νικηφόρῳ παρεστῶς ὁ Ἀρίστρατος, Ἀπελλοῦ συνεφασαμένου τῆς γραφῆς, ὡς Πολέμων ὁ περιηγητὴς ἰστόρηκεν.⁶⁰ **(3)** ἦν δὲ τὸ ἔργον ἀξιοθέατον, ὥστε γνάμπτεσθαι τὸν Ἄρατον ὑπὸ τῆς τέχνης, αὐθὶς τε μίσει τῷ πρὸς τοὺς

59 Claes L. Lindskog, Konrat Ziegler, Hans Gärtner (eds.), *Plutarchi Vitae parallelae, vol. III, 1, recognoverunt C.L. Lindskog et K. Ziegler, iterum recensuit K. Ziegler, editionem correctionem cum addendis curavit H. Gärtner*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1996.

60 Polemon fr. 17 Preller = fr. 17 Capel Badino (*FHG* 3.120). For a commentary to this passage, see Capel Badino 2018 (as fn. 6), pp. 231–238. On Plutarch as reader of Polemon, see Capel Badino 2018 (as fn. 6), pp. 184–185.

τυράννους ἐξαγόμενον κελεύειν καθαιρεῖν. (4) τὸν οὖν ζωγράφον Νεάλκη φίλον ὄντα τοῦ Ἀράτου παραιτεῖσθαι φασὶ καὶ δακρύειν, ὡς δ' οὐκ ἔπειθεν, εἰπεῖν ὅτι τοῖς τυράννοις πολεμητέον, οὐ τοῖς τῶν τυράννων· „ἐάσωμεν οὖν τὸ ἄρμα καὶ τὴν Νίκην, αὐτὸν δέ σοι παρέξω τὸν Ἀρίστρατον ἐγὼ παραχωροῦντα τοῦ πίνακος.“ (5) ἐπιτρέψαντος οὖν τοῦ Ἀράτου, διήλειφεν ὁ Νεάλκης τὸν Ἀρίστρατον, εἰς δὲ τὴν χώραν φοίνικα μόνον ἐνέγραψεν, ἄλλο δ' οὐδὲν ἐτόλμησε παραβαλεῖν· τοὺς δὲ πόδας ἐξαλειφομένου τοῦ Ἀριστράτου διαλαθεῖν ὑπὸ τὸ ἄρμα λέγουσιν. (6) ἔκ τε δὴ τούτων ὁ Ἄρατος ἠγαπάτο, καὶ διδοὺς πείραν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἤσπατο τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ δωρεὰν ἔλαβε τῇ πόλει πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν τάλαντα.

From Caria,⁶¹ after a long time, he made his way across to Egypt, and found the king⁶² both naturally⁶³ well disposed towards him, and much gratified because Aratus had sent

61 Translation by Perrin 1926 (as fn. 48). For a deeper philological analysis of this text, see Falaschi 2015 (as fn. 22), pp. 391–393, nos. 1380–1388.

62 The king in question is to be identified with Ptolemy II (308–246 BCE, king from 282 BCE, co-regent from 285 BCE), rather than Ptolemy III (ca. 284–222 BCE, king from 246 BCE). In fact, the Ptolemy in question is also mentioned in Cic. *Off.* 2.81–82 explicitly as Ptolemy II: *isque (sc. Aratus) celeriter ad Ptolomaeum, suum hospitem, venit, qui tum regnabat alter post Alexandream conditam*, cf. Andrew R. Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996, *ad loc.* Ptolemy III ascended to the throne in 246 BCE, while, both from Cicero's and Plutarch's account, Aratus' travel to Egypt does not seem too much later than the liberation of Sikyon, generally dated to 251 BCE, even though it is not possible to quantify Plutarch's χρόνω πολλῶ. Moreover, if Ziegler's correction πατρόθεν (instead of αὐτόθεν) is accepted (see *infra* fn. 63), Plutarch would say that the Ptolemy in question was well disposed towards Aratus since he was a friend of Aratus' father, Klinias (died in 264 BCE), which is difficult to refer to Ptolemy III for chronological reasons. Cf. also Plut. *Vit. Arat.* 4.2 where the biographer alludes to Aratus' negotiations with “kings who were friends and guests of his father”. For the identification of the king as Ptolemy II, see Aldo Ferrabino, *Il problema dell'unità nazionale nella Grecia antica. I: Arato di Sicione e l'idea nazionale*, Firenze: Le Monnier, 1921, pp. 28–29; Mario A. Levi, Arato e la liberazione di Sicione, in: *Athenaeum* 8 (1930), pp. 508–518, p. 515; Frank W. Walbank, *Aratos of Sicyon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933, p. 39; Porter 1937 (as fn. 21), p. XXXV; Frank W. Walbank, *A historical commentary on Polybius*, vol. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957, p. 245; Manfredini et al. 1987 (as fn. 21), p. XVII; Yannis A. Lolos, *Land of Sikyon. Archaeology and history of a Greek city-state*, Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2011, p. 74; García 2015 (as fn. 26), p. 27; Capel Badino 2018 (as fn. 6), p. 232. For the identification of the king as Ptolemy III, see Preller 1838 (as fn. 32), p. 47; Reinach 1921 (as fn. 24), pp. 254–255, no. 321 and n. 2; Pfuhl 1923 (as fn. 19), vol. 2, p. 730; Georg Lippold, in RE 15.1 (1931), cols. 431–432, s.v. *Melanthios* 14); Lucia Guerrini, in: EAA (1961), s.v. *Melanthios*; Moreno 1964–1965 (as fn. 28), p. 75; Scheibler 1994 (as fn. 26), p. 16: “(Arat) von dem inzwischen an die Regierung gelangten Ptolemaios III eine Unterstützung von 150 Talenten erwirken konnte”; Ingeborg Scheibler, in: Rainer Vollkommer (ed.), *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, München, Leipzig: Saur, 2001–2004, vol. 2, s.v. *Melanthios*, p. 60; Calandra 2009 (as fn. 26), p. 55; Kansteiner et al. 2014 (as fn. 41), p. 8, no. 2686, s.v. *Pamphilos*; Keyser 2014 (as fn. 26). See also Margit Linder, Plutarch's Use and Mention of Famous Artists in the Parallel Lives, in: *Ancient Society* 45 (2015), pp. 53–81, pp. 65–66, who gives, however, an inaccurate reading of the historical events, putting them “after his (sc. Aratus) defeat of Kleomenes III in the battle of Leuktra (227 BCE)”.

63 αὐτόθεν is the reading transmitted by manuscripts and followed by Perrin in his translation, see also Koster 1937 (as fn. 3), p. 60 “*sua sponte, non donis conciliatus*”; Porter 1937 (as fn. 21), *ad loc.*; Flacelière, Chambry 1979 (as fn. 21), *ad loc.* Ziegler has proposed the correction πατρόθεν (“as his father's son”) on the basis of Plut. *Vit. Pomp.* 6.1. This correction, which is accepted by Manfredini et al.

him drawings and paintings⁶⁴ from Greece. In these matters Aratus had a refined judgement, and was continually collecting and acquiring works of artistic skill and excellence, especially those of Pamphilus and Melanthus. These he would send to Ptolemy.

For the fame of Sicyon's refined and beautiful paintings was still in full bloom, and they alone were thought to have a beauty that was indestructible. Therefore, even the great Apelles, when he was already admired, came to Sicyon and gave a talent that he might be admitted into the society of its artists, desiring to share their fame rather than their art. Hence it was that Aratus, although he at once destroyed the other portraits of the tyrants when he had given the city its freedom, deliberated a long time about that of Aristratos (who flourished in the time of Philip of Macedon). For it was the work of Melanthus and all his pupils, and Aristratos was painted standing by a chariot in which was a Victory; Apelles also had a hand in the painting, as we are told by Polemon the Topographer. And the work was a marvellous one, so that Aratus was moved by the artistic skill therein; but afterwards, such was his hatred of the tyrants, that he ordered it to be removed and destroyed. Accordingly, the painter Nealkes, who was a friend of Aratus, interceded with him for the picture, as we are told, and with tears, and when he could not persuade him, said that war should be waged against the tyrants, but not against the treasures of the tyrants. "Let us therefore leave the chariot and the Victory, but Aristratos himself I will undertake to remove from the picture." Aratus therefore yielded, and Nealkes erased the figure of Aristratos, and in its place painted a palm-tree merely, not daring to introduce anything else. We are told, however, that the feet of the erased figure of Aristratos were left by an oversight beneath the chariot.

In consequence of this love of art Aratus was already beloved by the king, and in personal intercourse grew yet more upon him, and received for his city a gift of a hundred and fifty talents.

1987 (as fn. 21), *ad loc.* ("perché ospite del padre"), appears to me interesting (and possible) but not strictly necessary.

64 Perrin 1926 (as fn. 48), p. 29 translates γραφαῖς καὶ πίναξιν as "drawings and paintings", see also Koster 1937 (as fn. 3), p. 60: "*susplicamur voce γραφαῖς imagines delineatas et voce πίναξιν tabulas pictas*". Another interpretation is given by Flacelière, Chambry 1979 (as fn. 21), *ad loc.* "par le tableaux et les peintures", and Manfredini et.al. 1987 (as fn. 21), *ad loc.* "pitture e quadri dalla Grecia".