

Dates, methods and icons

Autor(en): **Vickers, Michael**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Cahiers d'archéologie romande**

Band (Jahr): **36 (1987)**

PDF erstellt am: **22.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-835471>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Dates, Methods and Icons

by Michael Vickers (Oxford)

Considerable doubts exist in some people's minds about the way in which the material remains of Greek antiquity are now usually dated⁽¹⁾. If these doubts prove to be well-founded, a point of method immediately arises: whether we should continue to live in a world based on archaeologists' fictions, or whether we should consider moving into the real world, difficult as that may be. One can see the attractions of the traditional approach: it has provided a classical *exemplum*, albeit a false one, which has fuelled progressive thought for the past two hundred years. In setting an Hellenic republican model in opposition to an imperialism which had its roots in ancient Rome, the philosophers, poets and artists of the Enlightenment performed services to culture and society from which the world has greatly benefited. Our democratic institutions are now, however, surely strong enough to allow us to examine, and if necessary reject, some of the misconceptions regarding the Greek world which have come to be central to the study of its physical remains.

Sadly, the prevailing material and ethical values of archaic and classical Greece were little different from those of the world against which Philhellenes rebelled, but all too often the source of the errors with which our subject is beset is to be found in the preconceptions which the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries brought to a modern Greece struggling for its independence from Ottoman Turkey — a Turkey which was, moreover, unquestioningly equated with Achaemenid Persia⁽²⁾. Since the ideals underlying Philhellenism came almost universally to be thought to be good, the historical preconceptions which accompanied them were rarely subjected to criticism⁽³⁾.

The surviving material remains of classical Greece have, strangely, come to be considered to represent a fair cross-section of what was produced in antiquity, notwithstanding the possibility that what we have is merely the *detritus* of Greek civilisation: ruined buildings, broken statues, scraps of bronze, and pottery for the most part. The more fine pottery that comes to light, the stronger becomes the view that in classical Greece rich men could commission the greatest artists of their day to decorate their fictile table-ware⁽⁴⁾. This view is the product of a *mésalliance* between Comtean positivism and Utopian philosophies and has helped to conceal the rather more polarised society which prevailed in Greek antiquity, a society in which pottery is unlikely to have figured large, if at all, in the eyes of the rich⁽⁵⁾. It is, however, but another ingredient the unreal world which our teachers have concocted for us, a world, moreover, within which even the most intellectually rigorous applications of social and religious anthropology and semiology will achieve but small success.

A re-appraisal of the so-called "fixed points" on which the currently accepted chronology of pre-classical art⁽⁶⁾ is based has shown them to be at best ambiguous, and frequently founded on criteria which do not stand up to close examination. E. D. Francis and I are not the first to hold such views: E. Löwy once argued for a similarly radical down-dating⁽⁷⁾, but his work was generally ignored, dismissed⁽⁸⁾, or derided⁽⁹⁾ at least by archaeologists (as opposed to epigraphers). New points of contact between the physical remains and history have emerged. It has been possible to show, for example, that there is evidence from sites in the eastern Mediterranean for a date of c. 720 for Attic Middle Geometric II pottery⁽¹⁰⁾. A date in the 540s for Early Corinthian pottery can be justified by the probability that the siege-mound at Old Smyrna (the "key point" in preclassical Greek chronology)⁽¹¹⁾ was constructed by Harpagus the Mede⁽¹²⁾ rather than by Alyattes the Lydian. (It is a commonplace that arguments regarding the chronology of Corinthian pottery based on the foundation dates given by Thucydides for Sicilian colonies are inherently circular⁽¹³⁾; cf. R. M. Cook: "the foundation dates given by Thucydides are accepted as a necessary assumption. However, in history and literature these foundation dates are equally assumed, so that archaeology sinks or swims with them")⁽¹⁴⁾. There are stronger arguments for placing the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi in the early 470s than c. 530-525⁽¹⁵⁾, and the latest Temple of Apollo Daphnephorus at Eretria can only have been built after the Persian wars, probably around 470⁽¹⁶⁾, not long before the Athenian Treasury at Delphi⁽¹⁷⁾. The buildings on the west side of the Agora at Athens which have in the past been dated to the late sixth century⁽¹⁸⁾ or the early fifth⁽¹⁹⁾, now appear to have been constructed as a direct consequence of the political changes which occurred at Athens around 460⁽²⁰⁾. P. Amandry has recently argued that material conventionally dated c. 490 should more properly be dated c. 470⁽²¹⁾, a shift which seems to be born out by the dendrochronological information from an Early La Tène princely

burial at Altrier in Luxemburg. This burial contained an Etruscan *stamnos* of a kind dated by P. Jacobsthal to "the second quarter of the fifth century" (22), but the *terminus ante quem* for the construction of the tomb is an unknown number of years after 435 (23).

One indication of the unhappy condition of the chronological framework within which we have come to conduct the study of archaic and classical Greece, is the serious discrepancy which exists between the testimony of the ancient historical sources which describe economic conditions on Greece after the Persian Wars and the currently prevailing view of the archaeological evidence. It is a reasonable conclusion to draw from the physical remains as they are usually interpreted that "Athens was not a wealthy state in the 470s and 460s (24)" but that she had been exceptionally wealthy during the previous few decades. This is the position maintained by most recent writers on Greek economic history and art (25), but it is not a view shared by writers in antiquity itself. From them we learn of the great amounts of booty which were taken from the Persians at Salamis, Plataea, Mycale and especially the Eurymedon. Themistocles, so Aristophanes reminded a fifth century Athenian audience, "filled the city to the brim, though he had found her empty" (26). Diodorus says much the same, though he speaks of the whole of Greece: "[after the Persian Wars] every Greek city was filled with such abundance that everyone was amazed at the change for the better. For the next fifty years, Greece enjoyed great progress towards prosperity. During this time the crafts increased owing to prosperity, and the greatest artists are mentioned as having flourished at that time" (27). The way to resolve such a discrepancy is not to give precedence to a particular view of the material evidence and to dismiss the literary evidence as worthless (or worse, not even to consider the literary evidence at all). Rather, we must not rest until both history and archaeology tell the same, consistent, story, for only then can the images we wish to study begin to make sense.

It is surely the case that the mythical images created by the poets and artists of fifth-century Athens carry a secondary meaning, and that they are employed as metaphors for events of current concern. E. D. Francis has put the matter well: "The modern connotations of what we call 'myth' and 'history' inadequately serve our understanding of the relationship between the Greek sense of these terms. A fifth century Greek would have been unlikely to use such language, as we might, to distinguish between fact and fancy. For the Greeks, myth was an exceptionally powerful form of metaphor, a code through which human events, indeed contemporary experience, could be expressed, interpreted, analysed in symbolic terms" (28). Myth also played a prominent part in the rhetorical tradition, as N. Loraux has recently shown (29). She has also demonstrated that in this tradition Athenian history begins with Marathon. One consequence of the chronological changes being proposed is that the same holds true for Athenian *art*, whether of the literary or the graphic kind.

It is an important point of method, indeed an elementary precaution, when one is dealing with a topic as potentially significant as the meaning of the icons created at a certain period, to ensure that we are in fact dealing with the artefacts of that age and not those of another. For it is only when the material remains of a society are securely dated that their iconographic content can begin to make sense. One by-product of the current chronological dispensation is that it is perfectly possible for respectable scholars to claim that a given mythological scene is "merely decorative" or that "art obeys its own laws" or that artistic representations of myths simply tell the story of a god or a hero in a manner indistinguishable from the tales told to children by Professor Witt or Charles Kingsley in the nineteenth century. Nothing is "merely decorative" (30); art obeys the laws of the cash register before it develops any of its own (31); and Aristotle already gave grounds for caution when he wrote "all poets err who have written a Heracleid, a Theseid, or similar poems. They imagine that since Heracles was one, the plot should also be one" (32).

Even today, much public art carries a metaphorical meaning. The language of visual metaphor is rarely difficult to understand, once one knows the code. It is thus possible to understand the metaphor underlying "Tippoo's Tiger", one of the most popular exhibits in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, once we appreciate that Tipu actually means "tiger" and that Tipu hated the British. "Tippoo's Tiger" is in fact a mechanical organ which when played emits the groans of the English soldier pinned underneath (33). It is also easy to understand the metaphor carried by the gold medal struck by the British to commemorate the sack of Tipu's capital in 1799: a lion beating the living daylights out of a tiger. The inscription reads "the lion is victorious" in case anyone missed the point (34).

Many analogous images existed in antiquity, including that of a lion attacking a bull, an image familiar above all from the ramps of the Apadana at Persepolis. Groups of struggling animals punctuate the rows of tribute bearers from all over Darius' empire (35) and are clearly intended to strike fear into the heart of any potential rebel, a concern spelt out in some detail in the Behistun and Naksh-i-Rustam inscriptions (36), as well as in Herodotus' narrative. Margaret Cool Root has made the attractive suggestion that the lion and bull motif on the Apadana "seems to have played the part of a royal seal on an important document" (37). The same motif occurs on gold coins placed in fours in the foundation deposits at the North-east and South-east corners of the Apadana, together with gold foundation tablets and greek silver coins (38). The coins found here have always been considered to possess the haphazard quality of a hoard, and no significance beyond their use as potential chronological guides has ever been attached to them. It is more than likely, however, given the highly regular and controlled way in which Persepolis is planned and decorated (39) that careful thought went into the choice of the contents of the foundation deposits. The tablets described Darius' empire in the most general terms: "from India to Sardis", and it was assumed by the excavators that the deposits were laid around 515 B.C. since a specific reference to Thrace (which became part of the Persian empire about then) was lacking (40). This now seems unlikely, not least because other, certainly later, documents exist which describe the empire in similarly general terms (41). If, moreover, we cease to regard the coins as a "miscellaneous

group" and begin to see them as programmatic and as carrying the same metaphor as the sculptured frieze, then the Greek coins emerge as those of states which, like the tribute-bearers on the reliefs, were subject to the Great King at the time of burial, and the lion/bull coins placed with them as providing warnings against rebellion. The presence of Cypriot coins seems to have been intended to recall the firm and uncompromising way in which the Persians put down revolt in the island between 499 and 496⁽⁴²⁾, and the Aeginetans were, according to Herodotus, the most notable of the Greek states to give Darius earth and water in 491⁽⁴³⁾. A coin of Abdera is especially interesting because its presence provides the claim to Persian suzerainty over Thrace which was thought to have been lacking in the foundation deposits. If these conclusions are correct, then the case which M. Roaf has made for the construction of the Apadana having probably commenced "a few years before Darius' death in 486"⁽⁴⁴⁾ is vindicated, and all lion/bull coins can now be seen to be coins of Darius, and those from Persepolis which belong to what are called the "light series" to come from the end of his reign. Most numismatists already believe that the "light series" already belongs to Darius, but have placed it early in his reign and in those of his Achaemenid predecessors⁽⁴⁵⁾. The earlier heavy series is generally held to have been issued by Croesus of Lydia, who fell from power in 547 B.C. when his capital Sardis was sacked by the Persians, but there is no real evidence to support this view⁽⁴⁶⁾. Rather, the heavy series was issued early in Darius' reign and the light late. The change, which was accompanied by a change in the ratio of gold to silver from 1:13 to 1:13½, can be associated with the damage wrought by a combined Athenian and Eretrian attack on Sardis in 499. The mint had to be re-equipped, and the trans-Aegean Greeks, whose economy was based in effect on a silver standard, were thenceforth forced to pay more for their gold.

The Achaemenid empire did not serve merely as a paragon of wealth and as an exemplar to the Greeks of what could be achieved by means of wealth, but also served as the source of much of the wealth the Greeks won as booty on the battlefield and also as the direct inspiration of the art which celebrated Greek triumph over an oriental enemy. The Persians in effect delivered to the Greeks' very doorsteps the oriental models which made possible the flowering of the last phase of what has come to be known as "archaic Greek art". The Greek debt to Achaemenid Persia was thus considerable: for example, the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi, completed probably by 475⁽⁴⁷⁾, not only includes in the persons of its Caryatids references to the fate meted out to medisers⁽⁴⁸⁾, but a continuous frieze after the manner of those at Persepolis. The image of the Siphnian frieze is eminently suitable as a celebration of Greek victories over the Persians, and in the Gigantomachy scene (whose Giants have rightly been seen to be characterised as overweening orientals)⁽⁴⁹⁾ the artist has placed a lion beneath the yoke of one of the deities; the symbol of Persian power is thus neatly represented as itself enslaved. M.C. Root has recently disproved⁽⁵⁰⁾ the hypothesis of G.M.A. Richter to the effect that Persian relief sculpture depended on Greek sculptural traditions for certain stylistic traits such as details of drapery folds⁽⁵¹⁾; it is now quite possible that the inspiration for Greek practice came from Achaemenid Persia.

The *korai* from the Athenian Acropolis are probably also to be regarded as tokens of success in 480/479; or at least of post-war prosperity at Athens. The belief that these statues were erected long before the Persian Wars and destroyed by the Persians during their occupation of the Acropolis in 480 is another unfortunate legacy of the way in which the ancient world came to be viewed during the nineteenth century. A study of the circumstances in which the famous Acropolis hoard was found in 1886 tends to suggest that the *korai* buried beneath it were damaged during what we might call the "cultural revolution" of 462/1⁽⁵²⁾. The currently prevailing view that the Persians were necessarily responsible has its roots much earlier in the nineteenth century in the work of Ludwig Ross. Ross was one of the first scholars to excavate in Greece after the War of Independence. His memoirs make for delightful reading, but it is clear that he was deeply imbued with a highly romanticised view of Greece. He drew a ready analogy between the ruins of an Athens devastated by the Turk and Thucydides' description of the same city after the departure of the Persians⁽⁵³⁾. Despite what Wilamowitz called his "very obvious... lack of historical training"⁽⁵⁴⁾ he quickly became Oberconservator of the antiquities of Greece and conducted excavations on the Acropolis. When in the course of his excavations he found a burnt plate he attributed the burning to the Persian sack of Athens in 480/479. On such a view not only will the plate in question⁽⁵⁵⁾ have been made before 480, but red-figure pottery have "developed" to a certain stage by that time. Ross's observation regarding this plate, based on the implicit idea that signs of burning necessarily require the presence of a Persian, became the cornerstone of the chronology which is generally accepted today, having been taken up by F. Studniczka in 1887 after more burnt pots (including several dated even on the current chronology to after 480)⁽⁵⁶⁾ had been found in excavations on the Acropolis⁽⁵⁷⁾. One reason why Studniczka so readily incorporated Ross's burnt plate into his new chronological system was that the pottery found together with the *korai* in 1886 was of the same period, and it was never doubted that the Persians had been responsible for the destruction of the statues. This interpretation was first put forward by the excavator P. Kavvadias⁽⁵⁸⁾ and quickly endorsed by W. Doerpfeld⁽⁵⁹⁾. They were both important men in their day, and it is easy to understand why their views were not questioned at the time. It is less easy to understand why they have never been questioned since.

The evidence for post-war *korai* will be spelt out in detail elsewhere⁽⁶⁰⁾. An important corollary is that the so-called *Tyrannenschutt*⁽⁶¹⁾ — in effect a destruction level, for which no plausible explanation exists in either 510 or 508/7 — becomes the new *Perserschutt*, and there are other, purely archaeological, grounds for believing that much of this material was made in the decade 490-480, and was probably paid for with booty from Marathon. There is one immediate iconographical gain from such a chronological shift. The relevant literary sources leave us in no doubt that Heracles was considered to be the hero of Marathon. Herodotus describes how the Athenians encamped in one shrine of Heracles in the days before the battle, and in another on the day after⁽⁶²⁾, and Pausanias makes it clear both how the hero was supposed to have assisted the Athenians

in battle and how popular was his cult at Marathon⁽⁶³⁾. With hindsight, it might seem that Athenian success was due in large part to Heracles' role in warding off evil. When monuments and artefacts are dated according to the new chronological scheme, then Heracles only begins to appear in Athenian art after 490. A very useful overview of the incidence of Heracles scenes on Athenian fictile vases has recently been published⁽⁶⁴⁾, and when the dates are recalibrated so that "575-550" becomes c. 490, "550-525" c. 480, "525-500" c. 475 and "500-475" c. 465 then we can well see how Heracles' popularity grew after Marathon, was reinforced after Plataea and went into a steady decline when relations between Athens and Sparta (whose kings reckoned their descent from Heracles)⁽⁶⁵⁾ became sour in the later 460s. It is important to bear in mind the fact that the image of a figure such as Heracles could be employed to show the values or interests he represents in an unfavourable light. So much is clear from the literary evidence we have concerning the Rape of the Tripod. It is apparent from Herodotus⁽⁶⁶⁾ and Pausanias⁽⁶⁷⁾ that sculptured groups of "Heracles and Apollo holding on to the Tripod and set to fight over it, with Athena restraining Heracles' temper and Leto and Artemis restraining Apollo" were set up at both Abae and Delphi to commemorate a Phocian victory over the Thesalians "not many years before [Xerxes'] invasion". Heracles here is clearly intended to represent the Thesalians whose ancestor he was also thought to be⁽⁶⁸⁾. A similar scene was employed after the Persian Wars to recall the Thesalians' role as medisers. It is thus found on the east pediment of the Siphnian Treasury (a building whose west facade was dominated by the presence of medising Caryatids)⁽⁶⁹⁾, and on early red-figure Athenian pottery (e.g. the "bilingual" amphora Berlin F2159) made in imitation of gold on silver vessels⁽⁷⁰⁾ introduced in the early 470s⁽⁷¹⁾. A similar explanation underlies the Heracles dressed as a Persian archer on such red-figure cups as Berlin F 2293 or London E65⁽⁷²⁾. Later in the fifth century, Heracles might be cast in a very bad light indeed (e.g. in Sophocles *Trachiniae* or Euripides *Heracles*) in order to discredit the Athenians' Spartan enemies⁽⁷³⁾. For the most part, though, Heracles plays the part of the "good guy" whose *alexeterion xulon*⁽⁷⁴⁾ is wielded in defence of Athens and Hellas against the oriental foe.

The less said about some current interpretations of Heracles in Athenian art the better, except to note that the very little direct knowledge we have regarding Pisistratus' religious inclinations includes the information that he held a military parade in a shrine of Theseus⁽⁷⁵⁾. Far from being in any way opposed to Heracles^(75a), Theseus represents another Athenian view of the Persian Wars; a view, moreover, which was only fully developed after Plataea. Hitherto, Heracles had been the principal vehicle for Athenian anti-Persian propaganda, but since it was the case that Heracles could easily be identified with the Spartans who held the command at Plataea, Athenian propagandists in the circle around Cimon seem to have constructed a cycle of myths around the Attic hero Theseus⁽⁷⁶⁾. Theseus' Saronic Labours have their first literary mention in Bacchylides 18, 19-30, a dithyramb which probably dates from the 470s⁽⁷⁷⁾, and while we can never be certain that earlier poetic versions have not been lost in transmission, it seems safest to assume that the first visual representations of these Labours belong to the same time. Scholars of Greek art have found little difficulty in accepting that pictorial representations may sometimes anticipate verbal records by several decades⁽⁷⁸⁾, but it is as well to remember that such a phenomenon has no parallel in cultures of which we have a more thorough documentation and closer knowledge. "The essential function of the visual image... is the summing up of trends or currents of thought"⁽⁷⁹⁾ but in every case the "word" accompanies or precedes the "images"⁽⁸⁰⁾. It is for reasons such as these that Heracles and Theseus appear virtually side by side on the Athenian Treasury at Delphi. Both in their own way celebrate Greek victories over the Persian enemy, but Theseus, the mythical antetype of Cimon, is given the more prominent position.

The worst insult that could be thrown at a Persian was to call him a woman⁽⁸¹⁾: hence battles involving Heracles or Theseus, or simply anonymous Greeks. The Persians had acted with impiety in destroying the Athenians' most sacred shrines: show them as Giants who had defied the gods and were punished by them. The Persians who had behaved in an utterly uncivilised manner in destroying olive trees, the staple crop of Attica: show them as Centaurs (creatures to whom the Persians are supposed to have likened themselves)⁽⁸²⁾, preferably as Centaurs being bested by Greeks. The Persians were orientals, and so were the Trojans. Both had been defeated after wars which had lasted, give or take a month or two, ten years: recall these facts in allusions to the Trojan War. In brief, most mythical scenes in Athenian art at least can be accounted for if we assume that they refer to a recent conflict against an oriental, impious, violent and effeminate foe.

To employ Dionysian scenes was yet another way of saying "We beat the Persians". The Dionysian metaphor can be found, and is explained, in writers later than the fifth century. The most telling passage occurs near the beginning of Plutarch's life of Demetrius Poliorcetes: "[Demetrius was] in his hours of leisure, a most agreeable companion; at his table, and every species of entertainment, of all princes the most delicate; and yet, when business called, nothing could equal his activity, his diligence and despatch. In this respect he tried to resemble Dionysus most of all the gods, since he was not only terrible in war, but knew how to terminate war with peace, and turn it with the happiest address to the joys and pleasures which that inspires"⁽⁸³⁾. This well encapsulates, and goes a long way to explain the "deux états contradictoires"⁽⁸⁴⁾, "the ambiguous nature of Dionysus"⁽⁸⁵⁾, the ambivalence which commentators have noted in the image of Dionysus and his attendants that we receive in Athenian art and literature. In the *Bibliotheca* of Apollodorus we learn that Dionysus is supposed to have rendered mad the women of Argos and Thebes⁽⁸⁶⁾. These are the two most important Greek cities to have medised in 480 (or, in the case of Argos, remained neutral — which, however, was regarded as being tantamount to medising)⁽⁸⁷⁾. It is likely that whenever we see maenads, women or even goddesses being insulted by satyrs, that reference is being made to the unhellenic behaviour of the two cities which allowed Athens to suffer so much during the Persian invasion. That Dionysus was considered to have

played a part in the events of 480/479 is clear from Xenophon's *Symposium* where Demeter and Kore are said to have "marched with Dionysus against the barbarians"⁽⁸⁸⁾.

Lest it be thought that to see most mythical representations in fifth century Athenian art as a celebration of triumph over the Persians is an extreme position to adopt, it should be remembered that Athens' Finest Hour was still being recalled some six centuries later⁽⁸⁹⁾. It is unlikely that it was overlooked in the fifth century either, though we might be excused for so thinking on the basis of the way in which the material remains of pre-classical Athens are currently interpreted. The resulting picture of Greek culture and society, moreover, does the latter for more credit than does the current view, based as it is on nineteenth century misconceptions regarding art and history.

This paper owes much to work done together with E.D. Francis; the writer, however, is alone responsible for the views expressed here.

M. Vickers

NOTES

⁽¹⁾ E.g. P. Amandry, *Sur les concours argiens*, *Etudes Argiennes*. BCH Suppl. 6, 1980, 211-216; E.D. Francis and M. Vickers, *Leagros kalos*, PCPhS 207, 1981, 96-136; R. Tölle-Kastenbein, *Bemerkungen zur absoluten Chronologie spätarchaischer und frühklassischer Denkmäler Athens*, AA 1983, 573-584.

⁽²⁾ In marked contrast to attitudes towards Persia before the Enlightenment, on which see D. Metzler, *Die Achämeniden im Geschichtsbewusstsein des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts*, in: H. Koch and D.N. Mackenzie (eds.), *Kunst, Kultur und Geschichte der Achämenidenzeit und ihre Fortleben*. Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, Ergänzungsband 10, 1983, 289-303.

⁽³⁾ Thus, for example, the reason why G.E. Lessing's wrong but influential opinions regarding Vitruvius' story of the origin of Caryatids (on which now see: E.D. Francis and M. Vickers, *Signa priscae artis: Eretria and Siphnos*, JHS 103, 1983, 60) was hardly ever challenged in the nineteenth century is probably that to admit to there having been philo-Persians in the Peloponnese came dangerously close to allowing there to have been philo-Turks in the area.

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. H.A. Shapiro, *Courtship scenes*, AJA 85, 1981, 137.

⁽⁵⁾ These matters will be discussed in M. Vickers, *Rosincrantz and Guildenstern are dead: the artful crafts of the Athenian potter*, JHS 105, 1985.

⁽⁶⁾ A chronology which was established by F. Studnickza, *Zur Zeitbestimmung der Vasenmalerei mit roten Figuren*, JDAI 2, 1887, 159-68, and canonised by E. Langlotz, *Zur Zeitbestimmung der strengrotfigurigen Vasenmalerei und der gleichzeitigen Plastik* (1920).

⁽⁷⁾ E. Löwy, *Zur Datierung attischer Inschriften*, SAWW 206/4, 1937, and idem, *Der Beginn der rotfigurigen Vasenmalerei*, SAWW 207/2, 1938.

⁽⁸⁾ E. Vanderpool, *The rectangular rock-cut shaft*, *Hesperia* 15, 1946, 265-6.

⁽⁹⁾ W.B. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Treasury as dated by its ornament*, AJA 50, 1946, 87.

⁽¹⁰⁾ E.D. Francis and M. Vickers, *Greek Geometric pottery at Hama and its implications for Near Eastern chronology*, *Levant* 17, 1985.

⁽¹¹⁾ T.J. Dunbabin, *The chronology of Protocorinthian vases*, AE 1953-54, 260.

⁽¹²⁾ E.D. Francis and M. Vickers, *New wine from Old Smyrna: the Greeks and their eastern neighbours* (in preparation); cf. Hdt. 1, 162.

⁽¹³⁾ K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² 1913, 224; A.R. Burn, *Dates in early Greek history*, JHS 55, 1935, 137; R.M. Cook, *The date of the Hesiodic Shield*, CQ 31, 1937, 204-5; A.R. Burn, review of *CAH*³ 3/3, in *CR* n.s. 33, 1983, 251-2.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cook, *op. c.* (*supra* note 13). 204-5.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Francis and Vickers, *op. c.* (*supra* note 3).

⁽¹⁶⁾ *Ibid.*

⁽¹⁷⁾ E.D. Francis, *The Waynflete Lectures 1983: Reflections of Persia in Greek Art and Literature* (in preparation); cf. E.D. Francis and M. Vickers, *Burlington Magazine* 124, 1982, 41-2.

⁽¹⁸⁾ H.A. Thompson, *Buildings on the west side of the Agora*, *Hesperia* 14, 1972, 29.

⁽¹⁹⁾ H.A. Thompson and R.E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens*. *Agora* 14, 1972, 29.

⁽²⁰⁾ H.A. Thompson, *The Pnyx in models*, in: *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography presented to E. Vanderpool*. *Hesperia*, Suppl. 19, 1982, 136-7; E.D. Francis and M. Vickers, *The Athenian Agora* (in preparation) (with further evidence from the Agora which supports Thompson's latest view).

⁽²¹⁾ Amandry, *op. c.* (*supra* note 1).

⁽²²⁾ P. Jacobsthal, *Early Celtic Art* (1943) 137-8; G. Thill, *Fürstengrabbügel bei Alttrier*, *Hemoch* 24, 1972, 444-5, fig. 4-5, 1-2.

⁽²³⁾ E. Hollstein in Thill, *op. c.* (*supra* note 22); W. Dehn and O.-H. Frey, *Southern imports and the Hallstatt and Early La Tène chronology of central Europe*, in: D. and F.R. Ridgway (eds.), *Italy before the Romans: the Iron Age, Orientalizing and Etruscan Periods* (1979) 504 — revised in the light of E. Hollstein, *Mitteleuropäische Eichenchronologie*, *Trierer dendrochronologische Forschungen zur Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte* (Trierer Grabungen und Forschungen 9, 1980) 10-11.

⁽²⁴⁾ C.G. Starr, *Athenian Coinage 480-449 B.C.* (1970) 81; repeated idem, *New specimens of Athenian coinage 480-449 B.C.*, *NC* 142, 1982, 133.

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. the table, based on the conventional chronology, in D.C. Kurtz, *Attic White Lekythoi* (1975) 134-5, from which it would appear that the output of white-ground pottery (copied from ivory M. Vickers, *Burlington Magazine* 126, 1983, 303) fell dramatically after 480.

⁽²⁶⁾ *Ar. Equ.* 814; cf. *Ath.* 12, 553e, with Perrin's note *ad loc.*: "In the new prosperity after the Persian Wars, in the second quarter of the fifth century".

⁽²⁷⁾ *Diodorus* 12, 3-4; cf. *Arist. Ath. Pol.* 24, 1.

⁽²⁸⁾ E.D. Francis, *Greeks and Persians: the art of hazard and triumph*, in: D. Schmand-Besserat (ed.), *Ancient Persia: the Art of an Empire* (Invited Lectures on the Middle East at the University of Texas at Austin 4, 1980) 62.

⁽²⁹⁾ N. Loraux, *L'invention d'Athènes. Histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la « cité classique »* (Civilisations et sociétés 65, 1981).

⁽³⁰⁾ For an excellent critique of formalism, with a significance extending beyond the subject matter, see A. Hemingway, "Meaning in Cotman's Norfolk subjects", *Art History* 7, 1984, 57-77.

⁽³¹⁾ Cf. M. Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy* (1972), especially ch. 1, "Conditions of trade".

⁽³²⁾ *Artist. Poet.* 8, 2.

⁽³³⁾ M. Archer, *Tippoo's Tiger* (1959); V. Murphy, *Tippoo's Tiger* (1976).

⁽³⁴⁾ J.G. Pollard, *Matthew Boulton and Conrad Heinrich Kuchler*, *NC*, 7th ser. 10, 1970, 290, no. 20.

⁽³⁵⁾ E.g. E.F. Schmidt, *Persepolis 2* (1957) Pl. 19; F. Krefter, *Persepolis Rekonstruktionen* (Teheraner Forschungen 3, 1971) Beil. 4; M.C. Root, *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art. Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire* (AI, 3^e série: Textes et Mémoires, 1979) fig. 11.

⁽³⁶⁾ R.G. Kent, *Old Persian Grammar, Texts, Lexicon* (1950) 116-34 (DB); 137-41 (DN).

⁽³⁷⁾ Root, *op. c.* (*supra* note 35) 236.

⁽³⁸⁾ E. Herzfeld, *Notes on the Achaemenid coinage and some Sasanian mint-names* (Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress 1936) 413ff.; Schmidt, *op. c.* (*supra* note 35) 110, 113, 114; M. Vickers, *Early Greek coinage: a reassessment*, *NC* 145, 1985.

⁽³⁹⁾ Cf. Root, *op. c.* (*supra* note 35); M. Roaf, *Sculpture and Sculptors at Persepolis, Iran* 21, 1983.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Schmidt, *op. c.* (*supra* note 35) *l. c.*; Herzfeld, *op. c.* (*supra* note 38) *l. c.*; M. Price and N. Waggoner, *Archaic Greek Silver Coinage: The Asyut Hoard* (1975); H.A. Cahn, *Asiut: kritische Bemerkungen zu einer Schatzfundpublikation*, *SNR* 56, 1977, 281-2.

⁽⁴¹⁾ R. Seager and C. Tuplin, *The freedom of the Greeks of Asia*, *JHS* 100, 1980, 149.

⁽⁴²⁾ *Hdt.* 5, 108-16; A.R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks: the Defence of the West 546-478 B.C.* (1962) 202-5.

⁽⁴³⁾ *Hdt.* 6, 49. On the significance, in Persian eyes, of such an act see: L.L. Orlin, *Athens and Persia ca. 507 B.C.: a neglected perspective*, in: L.L. Orlin (ed.), *Michigan Studies in Honor of George G. Cameron* (1976) 255-66.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ M. Roaf, *The subject peoples on the base of the statue of Darius*, *Cahiers de la Délégation Française d'Archéologie en Iran* 4, 1974, 90-91.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ E.g. E.S.G. Robinson, *The beginnings of Achaemenid coinage*, *NC* 6th series 18, 1958, 188-9; P. Naster, *Remarques caractérisques et technologiques au sujet des Créséides*, *Congresso internazionale di Numismatica Roma*, 1961, 2 *Atti* (1965) 34.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ The view that lion/bull coins should be attributed to Croesus goes back to E.M. Cousinéry in: T.E. Mionnet, *Description des médailles antiques grecques et romaines*, *Suppl.* 6, 1833, 405, note a, and H.P. Borrell, *An inquiry into the early Lydian money, and an attempt to fix the classification of certain coins to Croesus*, *NC* 2, 1840, 216-23. Borrell's belief that the coins of the Athos hoard contained Darics of Darius the Great (cf. *NC* 6, 1843-44, 153) no doubt helped him to this position. It is now well known however, that the Athos hoard, and the coins in it, dates to c. 400 (M. Thompson, O. Morkholm and C. Kraay, *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards* (1973) 360, No. 362).

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Cf. Francis and Vickers, *op. c.* (*supra* note 3).

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Cf. *Vitr.* 1, 4.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ L. V. Watrous, *The sculptural program of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi*, *AJA* 86, 1982, 169-71.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Root, *op. c.* (*supra* note 35) 9-15.

⁽⁵¹⁾ G.M.A. Richter, *Greeks in Persia*, *AJA* 50, 1946, 16-30; *eadem*, *Archaic Greek Art against its Historical Background* (1949).

⁽⁵²⁾ See further Vickers, *op. c.* (*supra* note 38).

⁽⁵³⁾ L. Ross, *Erinnerungen und Mittheilungen aus Griechenland* (1863).

⁽⁵⁴⁾ U. Wilamowitz-von Moellendorff (ed. H. Lloyd-Jones), *History of Classical Scholarship* (1982) 126.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ L. Ross, *Archäologische Aufsätze 1* (1855) 140, pl. 10.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ E.g. B. Graef and E. Langlotz, *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen 2* (1933) Nos 382-3, 393, 397, 630, 693, 704 (found "in den tieferen Schichten des Perserschuttes", but dated to "480-70"), 761, 810, 823, 825-6, 829-30, 856, 868, 997, 1015, 1028, 1051.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ P. Kavvadias, *Anaskaphai en têi Akropolei*, *AE*, 1886, 76-9.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ W. Doerpfeld, *Über die Ausgrabungen auf der Akropolis*, *AM* 11, 1886, 162-9.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Vickers, *op. c.* (*supra* note 38).

⁽⁶¹⁾ R. Heberdey, *Altattische Porosskulptur* (1919), 3ff; J. Boardmann, *Greek Sculpture, the Archaic Period* (1978) 153-4.

⁽⁶²⁾ *Hdt.* 6, 108; 116.

⁽⁶³⁾ *Paus.* 15, 3, cf. 32, 4ff.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ V.C. Di Bari and G. Orsolini-Ronzitti, *L'elaborazione elettronica dei vasi attici a figure nere e rosse del Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, in: F. Lissarrague and F. Thélamon, *Image et céramique grecque* (Actes du Colloque de Rouen 25-26 novembre 1982. Publications de l'Université de Rouen N° 96, 1983) 81-90, esp. fig. 2, p. 89.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ E.g. *Hdt.* 7, 204; *Pind. Pyth.* 10, 1ff.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ *Hdt.* 8, 27; it is important to realise that this is the earliest literary reference we have relating to the Rape of the Tripod.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ *Paus.* 10, 13, 3-4.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Cf. *Pind. Pyth.* 10, 1.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Francis and Vickers, *op. c.* (*supra* note 3); *Vitr.* 1, 4.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ M. Vickers, *Les vases peints: image ou mirage?* in *Actes Rouen op. c.* (*supra* note 64); *idem*, *op. c.* (*supra* note 5). The case made at Rouen for Attic black- and red-figure pottery having been made according to norms created in the domain of the silversmith receives support from a newly edited papyrus fragment which quotes the pre-Socratic philosopher Thrasyacles as saying that "silver is black": D. Hughes and P.J. Parsons, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 52 (1984) No. 3659. Simple economics will thus frequently underlie the composition of the images on the pots which preserve for us the designs prepared for the silverware enjoyed by the wealthy at Athens. This point can best be illustrated by reference to an issue raised by Annie Verbanck-Piérard in her paper. She asks why scenes of the

Apotheosis of Heracles, so common in black-figure, "disappear" in red-figure. The explanation is to be found in the sphere of metalworking: if the figures in an Apotheosis of Heracles scene were rendered in gold-figure (the model for "red-figure") they would use an uneconomically large amount of gold. In silver-figure (on which "black-figure" was based), the more horses and other participants there were in a scene, the less the amount of gold needed for the background (cf. Xen. Hipparch. 5, 14: "... a horseman obstructs the view more than a foot soldier"). An explanation such as this will be found to account for many of the supposedly semiological questions raised at this colloquium.

⁽⁷¹⁾ M. Vickers, Heracles Lacedaemonius (in preparation).

⁽⁷²⁾ E.D. Francis, The Waynflete Lectures 1983: Reflections of Persia in Greek Art and Literature (in preparation).

⁽⁷³⁾ Vickers, *op. c.* (*supra* note 71).

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Eur., Her., 470.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ Ath. Pol. 15, 4.

^(75a) Cf. Aelius Aristides, *Panath.* 34, where the friendship of Heracles for Theseus is said to have "entirely surpassed not only the ties of association which they had with others but the ties that any men whatsoever had with each other".

⁽⁷⁶⁾ Francis, *op. c.* (*supra* note 72). For indication of politics in poetry written in the circle around Cimon see: J.P. Barron, Bakchylides, Theseus and a woolly cloak, *BICS* 27, 1980, 1-8.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ Barron, *op. c.* (*supra* note 76) 1.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ E.g. F. Brommer, Theseus, die Taten des griechischen Helden in der antiken Kunst und Literatur (1982).

⁽⁷⁹⁾ J. Seznec, The Survival of the Pagan Gods (1953) 7.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ E.D. Francis and M. Vickers, review of Brommer *op. c.* (*supra* note 78) in *JHS* 104, 1984.

⁽⁸¹⁾ Hdt. 9, 107; cf. 8, 88 and 9, 20.

⁽⁸²⁾ Cf. Xen. Cyr. 4, 3, 17-22.

⁽⁸³⁾ Plut. Dem. 2.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ P. Vidal-Naquet, *Le chasseur noir* (1983) 367.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ A. Heinrichs, Greek and Roman glimpses of Dionysos, in C. Houser, *Dionysos and his Circle* (1979) 3.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ Apollod. 3, 5, 2.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ Hdt. 8, 73.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ Xen. Symp. 8, 40; cf. Hdt. 8, 65; Plut. Them. 15; Polyae. 3, 11, 2. The corpus assembled by François Lissarrague (pp. 111 sqq) fits well into this historical context and its aftermath, as does the figure of Dionysus in the Gigantomachy frieze on the Siphnian Treasury (p. 114, *infra*). T.H. Carpenter will discuss the likely association between the *Kanthalos* on the Giant *Kanthalos*' helmet and Boeotia in his forthcoming monograph: *Development of Dionysian Imagery in Archaic Greek Vase Painting*, ch. 6.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ For an excellent recent study of some of the nostalgic aspects of the Second Sophistic, see: J.W. Day, *The Glory of Athens: the popular tradition as reflected in the Panathenaicus of Aelius Aristides* (1980).

