I INTRODUCTION

The study of Greek art is always on the move. New discoveries, made in Greece or in the various regions of the ancient world with which the Greeks were in contact, add to and/or alter the overall picture. However, renewed investigation of the material already known, seen in the light of the fresh evidence, and the reinterpretation that may follow – whether of sculpture, architecture, pottery, texts, and so forth – can be of equal, if not greater, importance.

Traditionally, scholars and students of Greek art have approached the subject from aesthetic and stylistic points of view, and formal analysis is still strongly pursued, with emphasis on individual creativity and aesthetic effect. Greek art has been considered to have followed a straightforward development, and thus the historical approach continues to have its attractions. Following this approach, scholars pay attention to the individual objects and to their makers (what has been dubbed 'object fetishism'). This view arose in the textual tradition (particularly from Pliny, whose statements had a profound effect on post-antique writers), with an adherence to named masters and the stress placed on the organic model of growth towards naturalism, then maturity, and consequent decline through time. Such a formulation has its attractions and is hard to jettison, but its drawback is that, as a consequence, Greek art may be thought to have an autonomous trajectory and hence be disembodied from social, religious, and physical surroundings.

Over the last few decades there has been what has been termed a 'paradigm shift' in the view taken of Greek art.[1] Scholars today emphasize the fact that Greek art and craftsmanship did not exist outside society, and they concentrate more on the purposes for which the objects were created and the contexts in which they were displayed, alongside the effect that they may have produced on those who viewed them, not only at the time of their making but also in the following centuries during which they were on view. The viewer has become a major figure in the study of the subject. Hence, for many, the individual agency and the moment of creation have ceased to be

[1] Snodgrass 2002; cf. R. R. R. Smith 2002.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the only, or indeed the main, centres of interest. Developments in the study of Greek art now pose the question of the validity of the terms 'art' and 'artist' in reference to the works produced during the Archaic and Classical periods. The lack of the word 'art' in ancient Greek is well known; *technē* ('skill') covered all manner of craftsmanship, including objects that – for the qualitative difference – we would today list as 'fine art'. Bert Smith has expressed the difference well:

> In the modern world art is by definition without function; it exists for its own sake in some sense as a commentary (often remote) by an artist on the society in which he or she lives. In the ancient world it was the business of the sculptor and painter to express the values and concerns of his patron and his community, and artworks nearly all had some kind of explicit religious, social, or political function.[2]

The development of Greek art was conservative and slow-moving; the craftsmen reworked and remodelled earlier themes, creating effective new versions. Thus, the significance of the material that has survived and is gradually being recovered must be judged against the whole production of any period. The majority of craftsmen were poorly paid, manual workers, who learned their trade within the family; the signatures that were added to some finished products indicate pride in a job well done and/or an advertisement of a commission. By the fourth century BC, some sculptors, picking up commissions from foreign kings and patrons, were paid large sums for their work, but this did not automatically lead to social acceptability.

Some of the new publications on Greek art adhere to the more traditional approaches; others strike out on an innovatory path. The one-volume histories are of larger or narrower compass, some including the Bronze Age,[3] others omitting the second millennium but including the Roman contribution;[4] yet others focus on the Archaic and Classical periods of the Greek centuries[5] or even on a shorter period (e.g. the fourth century). Some volumes concentrate on one medium (sculpture, pottery, terracotta figurines, etc.), while much

[2] R. R. R. Smith 1994: 263.

[3] Biers 1996; Spivey 1997; Pedley 2007.

[4] Boardman 1993; Onians 1999. The Greek and Roman stages are shared between Osborne 1998a and Beard and Henderson 2001. Spivey and Squire 2004 is a richly illustrated volume of wider compass. Ling 2000 is a useful introductory book. Whitley 2001 takes an archaeological approach.

[5] M. Robertson 1975 and 1981 are still standard treatments. Boardman 1996 is the fourth, expanded edition of his 1964 handbook. Fullerton 2000 has good colour illustrations and looks closely at the meaning of 'classicism'. A. Stewart 2008a covers the same period as Pollitt 1972.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more detailed volumes look at a brief period or restricted region, or even an individual building or a single sculptor or vase-painter (see the following chapters). There is also a growing modern breed of multi-authored volumes.

All this is underpinned by a massive output of more academic literature in journals in all languages that gradually alters our understanding of and approach to the subject.[6] New finds and ideas take some time to filter through to popular or introductory treatments of the subject; and there are various ways in which new work on Greek art is disseminated. Two sources that have become more frequent than they used to be are museum exhibitions and international conferences. The former are often accompanied by sumptuous catalogues[7] and may be celebrated with a symposium at which scholars are invited to present their latest research. So the proceedings of both exhibitions and conferences present new material and some of the most up-to-date ideas.

Ancient written evidence

When Greek and Latin texts were basic tools for a well-educated scholar and the material evidence for classical antiquity was limited, it was natural that students of Greek art should turn to written sources for information and gratefully accept the statements and opinions that they read as the foundation for their research into Greek art. Today those sources take a less central, but still indispensable, position. Classical historians and comic dramatists, orators and philosophers, writing in the fifth and fourth centuries BC, provide vitally useful, if indirect, social and economic clues to the background against which material culture developed. What we do not have are the treatises on working practice written by sculptors of the fifth century such as Pythagoras of Rhegion, Myron of Athens, and Polykleitos of Argos, and by such fourth-century painters as Apelles. Nor do we have any of the critical and art-historical theories that began to be compiled in the third century BC; these have been filtered to us through the statements of much later authors. Art was then judged to be an 'autonomous

[6] *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu) is an easily accessible and quick guide to new publications across the whole of the Classical field.

[7] E.g. Williams and Ogden 1994 (on gold jewellery); Pasquier and Martinez 2007 (on Praxiteles); Cohen 2006 (on Attic pottery).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

phenomenon', and fifth-century sculpture became the ideal construct that we have tended to accept today.[8]

Classical authors, mainly of the Roman period, who set down their information on classical art, are increasingly scrutinized and no longer treated as unimpeachable sources. Texts are as much archaeological objects as is material culture. Attention is concentrated more and more on the date of the writing, the purpose of the work, the sources from which the content has been derived, and also how rhetoric, propaganda, or the moral prejudice of the time affected the statements made. These later authors interpreted earlier evidence, whether read or seen, within the cultural framework of the age in which they were writing – many generations, indeed centuries, later than the time in which the works were originally created.

Of the later writers, the trio of Vitruvius, Pliny the Elder (both writing in Latin), and Pausanias (writing in Greek) have received most attention. Vitruvius (fl. 30–20 BC) was mainly concerned with architecture and the place of artists in Roman society, and his ideas on the beginnings of the architectural orders formed the basis for an understanding of their origins that Renaissance scholars accepted. His theories are now being questioned and are shown to be too systematically organized; they are only a loose fit with the archaeological evidence that we have today.[9] For centuries, the *Historia Naturalis* of Pliny the Elder (AD 23/4–79) was treated as the key source for students of Greek art. He did not write books 33–7 of his *HN* as a detached history of art, but for many years they were misused as a quarry for primary information. As with Vitruvius, his work has to be seen against the background of Roman society.[10] He was speaking of the need for artists to serve the community and denounced the abuse of nature, with its emphasis on luxury and avarice, that was spreading the seeds of moral decline in the first century AD. In contrast to this picture of his own day, Pliny's verdict on earlier ages was more accommodating and positive. He is unreliable over dates, places too much emphasis on

[8] An invaluable collection of sources is to be found in Overbeck 1868/1959. This has been re-edited and enlarged by Muller-Dufeu 2002, with a French translation facing the original texts and the inscriptions. A useful selection, with introduction and comments, is to be found in Pollitt 1990, and A. Stewart 1990 gives translations of some of the texts on sculpture (19–22) and the more important inscriptions (22–4). On the emergence of art criticism, see Pollitt 1974: 73–84 and Tanner 2006.

[9] Barletta 2001.

[10] Isager 1991/1998; Carey 2003.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

individual artists, and is apt to give works of art to the most famous name in any family business.

Pausanias (fl. AD 150–75), who presents us with a tour of the Greek mainland, has seen his status rise through recent studies and he may be considered to have taken an art historian's stance. Habicht's treatment of him is the cornerstone of modern research.[11] He showed that, although Pausanias 'did not have a brilliant mind', he made notes from personal observation and was more reliable and accurate than many had previously believed. Habicht pointed out that 'nearly all surviving Greek statues that are mentioned by ancient writers and are securely identified owe their identification to Pausanias'. He was naturally at the mercy of the local guides, who were the antiquarians of their day (see Chapter IV on the Temple of Zeus at Olympia), but from the inscriptions he read on site or the books he studied, he evaluated the works he saw through a mixture of style, technique, and materials – no easy task. His main interest was in the antiquities of Greece, together with history and works of art, but he is also an author who is being appreciated for the significance of what he reveals of his own day.[12]

Among the other authors who provide us with information (e.g. Cicero, Quintilian, Plutarch), brief mention might be made of two Greek authors of the Roman imperial period who furnish us with material. Athenaios of Naukratis (fl. *c.* AD 200) is still the main source of quotations from literature of the fifth and fourth centuries BC, many of which provide references to material culture. Lucian of Samosata (on the Euphrates) (b. *c.* AD 120) expresses sardonic views on painting and sculpture.

Collecting

The desire to possess works of art, from classical antiquity or from any other era or country, has always been strong, whether they be monumental sculptures, silver plate, gems, painted pottery, religious icons, tapestries, or rare manuscripts. The reasons for collecting have been many and various: personal greed, plunder for gain and glory, imperial prestige, social cachet, love of beauty. In antiquity, the

[11] Habicht 1998; quotes from 162 and 159–60, n. 80. Peter Levi's Penguin translation was also a catalyst.

[12] E.g. Arafat 1992, 1996; Elsner 1998; Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner 2001; Pretzler 2007.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

looting by invading armies is frequently mentioned (the Persian sack of Athens, Alexander's destruction of Persepolis, the Roman pillage of Syracuse and Corinth). Indeed, for the historian Livy (25.40.1–3) the beginning of Roman enthusiasm for Greek works of art originated with their sack of Syracuse in 212 BC, together with what he calls 'this general licence to despoil everything whether sacred or profane'. Rome became the repository of ancient sculpture, and Cicero's prosecution of Verres for extortion in Sicily in the 70s BC coupled with his own eagerness for collecting antiquities show the complex nature of the pursuit.[13]

In more recent centuries, European royal palaces, papal residences, and aristocratic mansions have acted as repositories for Greek and Roman artefacts, not always with any consequential understanding of what was being collected.[14] Some of these collections are still intact; others have been dispersed, either into other private collections or into national museums, helping the latter to become 'encyclopaedic' or 'universal' storehouses of material objects. The museums that were established when classical objects were widely available, were subject to no legislation that prevented the wholesale transfer of material from classical lands to the stronger and more developed nations.[15]

As time has passed, the constraints on such transfers have become tighter and the availability of collectibles scarcer. This has not prevented looters and dealers from supplying private individuals and museums with antiquities to add to their store. The last generation has seen even more stringent moves, in attempts through cultural heritage laws to legislate against the illegal export of objects from classical lands, particularly the UNESCO Convention against the Illicit Traffic in Antiquities issued in 1970, to which most museums now adhere.[16] Statistics show, however, that illegal trading still continues worldwide. As for classical antiquities, as long ago as 1834 the government of the newly independent Greece passed a law that required all antiquities to stay in Greece – without success. Now, authorities in classical lands, led by Italy, have taken more positive steps to retrieve objects that can be shown to have been illegally looted and exported from their shores. The

[13] Beard and Henderson 2001: 89–96; Miles 2008, mainly on Cicero but ranging more widely.

[14] Haskell and Penny 1981 is fundamental.

[15] Jenkins 1992 and 2006 on the acquisition of the classical collection by the British Museum; Dyson 1998 on American interest in classical art and archaeology. There has been an emphasis recently on Sir William Hamilton: see Jenkins and Sloan 1996.

[16] See Renfrew 2000; Greenfield 2007; Rhodes 2007; Waxman 2008.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Figure 1 Parthenon Gallery, The New Acropolis Museum.
[This image has been removed due to copyright restrictions.]

success of these operations seems to be gathering strength, and some illegally acquired objects have started to be returned to their actual or presumed country of origin. The much more complex problems of the sculptures from the Athenian Acropolis that Lord Elgin had shipped to England have historical, legal, moral, and political aspects and are still unresolved. The layout of the New Acropolis Museum gives visible shape to the dichotomy (Figure 1).

The damage done to our understanding of the classical world by destroying the contexts in which the objects were discovered is serious; the find-spot is lost, or sometimes falsely invented by dealers to disguise their source of supply.[17] Wealthy collectors have paid increasingly large sums of money to secure their trophies, and the present-day prices demanded for Greek painted pottery bear no relation to their original cost and so misrepresent the place of such items in their original religious, social, and commercial contexts.[18] The country in whose

[17] Chippindale and Gill 2000 give a detailed critique of dubious practices in collecting antiquities that have recently surfaced. Watson and Todeschini 2006 is a trenchant exposé of illicit dealings.

[18] For a useful account of the collecting of Greek vases, see Rouet 2001: ch. 1. For museums and the collecting of vases over the last fifty years, see Nørskov 2003.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

confines the objects are excavated is considered to have entitlement to the finds, but some argue that, as today's nation-states are modern constructs, their connection with the small communities that existed in antiquity is slight and their claims to the illegally exported objects as state property are self-serving. The attitude of 'Please, may we have our ball back?' is too simple.[19] The magnificent Attic red-figure cup with scenes of the sack of Troy that was one of the most attractive works on view in the J. Paul Getty Villa at Malibu (Figure 44) has been shown by its Etruscan graffito to have been clandestinely excavated from a sanctuary of Herakles at Cerveteri in Etruria.[20] Now handed back to Italy and on exhibition in the Villa Giulia in Rome, it is ironic that it is a supreme example of the many Attic vases that were exported to Etruria in the sixth and fifth centuries BC and dedicated or buried there but was never itself a part of Roman or Italian cultural history. By contrast, the acrolithic statue of 'Aphrodite' (Figure 11), now 'repatriated' to Morgantina in Sicily, can be presumed to have stood for many years in the local temple and to have had a place in the religious history of the city. Questions are also raised over the return being made to countries whose social, political, and religious bases are no longer related to the earlier culture and whose inhabitants have no regard for and maybe antipathy towards the material remains beneath their soil. Repatriation is a delicate matter, and 'many happy returns' are not always the outcome of the transactions. Extreme nationalism has always had its drawbacks, and by a judicious selection of archaeological objects states can present a picture of their nation's past that suits the present ideology.

Solutions have been proposed to help reduce the trade in antiquities from illicit excavations, such as 'partage' (i.e. the sharing of newly excavated material between the excavators and the host country), more loans or gifts, the selling of lesser or duplicate antiquities, and travelling exhibitions. Certainly, halting illegal trading and organizing repatriation are both difficult procedures.[21]

[19] See Cuno 2008a and 2008b.

[20] Williams 1991: 47 ff.; Sgubini Moretti 1999.

[21] For the conference on illegal trading and repatriation, held in Cairo in April 2010, see Beresford 2010.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Polychromy[22]

Greek and Roman statues, when unearthed during the Renaissance, were white, and antiquarians of the day presumed that such was their original appearance. The respect paid to classical precedence was so strong that surfaces that by chance had retained their colour were sometimes treated to detrimental cleaning. By the early nineteenth century, it had been realized that polychromy had been practised, and excavations in the later nineteenth century showed how vivid the colour could be, particularly on statues dating to the Archaic period (e.g. on the Aigina pedimental sculptures (Figure 15) and the Acropolis *korai*). However, there was still a certain reluctance to accept the idea that colour was widespread, though the nineteenth-century English sculptor John Gibson spoke strongly for painted statues:

> I am convinced that the Greek taste was right in colouring their sculpture…The moderns, being less refined than the Greeks in matters of art, are, from long and stupid custom, reconciled to the white statue. The flesh is white, the hair is white, the eyes are white, and the drapery white – this monotonous cold object of art is out of harmony with everything which surrounds it.[23]

It is now clear that, in accepting that monochrome was their default appearance, our understanding of the purpose and the effect of buildings, of architectural and relief sculpture, and of free-standing statues was misrepresented to a larger extent than was previously realized. The colouring of the Greek stone statues brings them into line with the practice of treating wood, terracotta, and ivory, and with the approach adopted in other cultures.

In the last generation, colour has become a major subject of research, in particular through the work of Vinzenz Brinkmann. His work has involved close observation, supported by modern technology such as ultraviolet fluorescence and infra-red reflection, and by the practice of taking photographs in raking light to reveal the ghosts of vanished colours and incised sketches that helped the painter to pick out the areas to be coloured. All these approaches have revealed much more information than was previously available. The pigments used (Figure 2) were mainly of mineral extraction: ochre (red and

[22] Rolley 1994: 78–83; Koch 1999; Ridgway 1999: 103–42; Tiverios and Tsiafakis 2002; Brinkmann 2003; Jenkins 2006: 34–44; Brinkmann and Wünsche 2007 (English version); Panzanelli et al. 2008; Bradley 2009.

[23] Eastlake 1870: 212.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Figure 2 Pigments (malachite, azurite, red ochre, cinnabar, haematite, Egyptian blue, realgar, and auripigment).

yellow), azurite (blue), cinnabar (red), malachite (green), and so forth. Alongside these modern studies of the pigments, a renewed look has been taken at the references to colouring in classical literature.[24] It was well known that there were professional craftsmen who finished the statues by adding the colour.

There is now no doubt that the presence of colour was a fundamental element in the total effect – eyes, hair, and clothes that were sometimes decorated with figured scenes (see, for example, Figure 28). There was also the red and blue background to relief sculptures. Inserted eyes of glass paste, attached jewellery, and additions of metal for diadems, bridles, reins, and the like, further helped to enhance visibility and the impression of realism. Major work has been carried out on colours of the archaic period, on free-standing statues such as the *korai*, on reliefs, and on architectural sculptures and their background, such as

[24] Primavesi 2007. Ancient colour terms are difficult to decipher.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi and the Athena Aphaia temple on the island of Aigina (Figure 15). The undifferentiated colours that the recently published images of Archaic statues present are hard to countenance, and it may be that future experiments will soften the effect. However, no matter what the final academic decision on the intensity of the colours may be, there is no doubt that they had a vivid effect, both on the general look of the buildings and on the details of individual statues and reliefs (see Figure 18).[25]

The realistic appearance of bronze statues was also heightened by colouristic effects, and in such additions as copper eyelashes, lips, and nipples, silver teeth, silver headbands, and eyes inlaid with glass and stone, as on the Riace bronzes and the Delphi Charioteer; and the variegated colours of chryselephantine statues also belie the notion of the purity of Greek expression.[26] The total effect in sanctuaries and public arenas was to create a radiant host of statues in the open air. 'The result was a second population within the ancient city, intermingling with the living and sharing their iconography, values and history.'[27]

In recent years there has also been a greater interest shown in colour on wall-painting and pottery. The emphasis on red and black has been widened to include such special techniques as gilded relief, coral red, and white with polychrome additional colours. Research has shown that the same materials were used for both wall-paintings and white-ground vases. The increased use of colour photography makes such images readily available in publications and helps in the understanding of the monumental paintings that have been lost.[28]

Sculpture[29]

Sculpture is central to any study of Greek art. Over the centuries, in answer to public and private demand, Greek craftsmen set up thousands of free-standing, architectural, and relief sculptures as

[25] For the colouring on the Parthenon metopes, see Williams, Higgs, Opper, and Timson 2007. For painted figures on the Mausoleum, see Jenkins, Gratziu, and Middleton 1997.

[26] For chryselephantine statues, see Lapatin 2001.

[27] Bradley 2009: 442–3.

[28] Koch-Brinkmann 1999; Cohen 2006; Lapatin 2008.

[29] Boardman 1995 has added the Late Classical period to his earlier two on the Archaic (1978) and Classical (1985/1991) periods. A. Stewart 1990 is a major treatment, with one appendix (no. 2) containing a list of extant original Greek sculptures mentioned in the literary sources, and another (no. 3) listing an absolute chronology of the statues, with the originals and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dedications in sanctuaries, as commemorations in public places, as memorials in cemeteries. Statues, whether of gods, humans, or animals, were essential elements of Greek life. But we must be conscious of the balance between what survives and what has been lost. We are at the mercy of historical accidents, and what we have is for the most part an unrepresentative selection of what was produced: heavily biased towards stone sculpture and, within that reduced orbit, favouring sculpture as architectural decoration. The quality of the best work that has survived cannot be denied and can be appreciated for itself, but we are still haunted by the ghosts of lost statues, whether in gold, ivory, bronze, or marble. The ghosts reside in the later literary sources, with their names of lost masters (Polykleitos, Pheidias, Praxiteles et al.), and in the assessment of their standing and quality expressed by later authors. It is certainly necessary to take these into account in understanding the character of sculpture in different periods, but it is treacherous territory.

The emphasis that used to be placed on style, and particularly on distinguishing individual hands of originals and copies, whether the names of the sculptors were known or not, gave rise to brilliant results but has begun to diminish. Other aspects have become of more pressing concern. Interest is now directed to such aspects of the study as the technique of the crafts, the function of a work, its relation to social structures, the identity of those assigning the commissions, the response of the observers, the extent to which changes of form are to be laid at the door of individuals or of 'the spirit of the age', and the reception of a work in the centuries following its installation. Architectural sculpture raises the question of who was responsible for the choice of subject that decorated a temple or a treasury, and why particular narratives were selected for friezes, metopes, or pediments (see Chapter III).

Research into the techniques of stone-carving and bronze-casting is widespread. The study of different stones and other materials is now well advanced, with an understanding of their provenance and the quarries from which they were extracted.[30] The processes that went into carving a statue mean that we must look at those details of the figure that most popular illustrations try to hide: the 'piecing' that went

copies given in separate sections. See also Rolley's two wide-ranging volumes 1994 and 1999, and Spivey 1996 for a modern approach.

[30] Grossman 2003 is a useful introduction. Palagia 2006b has some chapters that give attention to marble provenances and the techniques of stone-carving and bronze-casting.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to make up the complete image, the attachment of a separate head, the dowel holes that might indicate an addition of a new part or of metal accessories. Unfinished statues are prime evidence for techniques. As for bronze, its changing composition is also of importance, and study of the techniques of manufacture, including the siting and construction of kilns, has brought out revolutionary ideas about the history of bronze-working (see Chapter II).

All these items that are concerned with processes of creation relate closely to the subject of workshops and individual craftsmen.[31] How many men were employed in the workshops? There were families of workmen, both at the quarry and at the site of the fashioning of the statue or the group. Unfortunately, the names of individual sculptors known from texts and inscriptions have tended to overshadow the picture of the company of stone-workers and bronze-workers involved in any enterprise. Allied to this is the problem of understanding what the status of these sculptors might have been. They seem to have risen from the position of *banausoi* (poorly paid manual workers) in the Archaic period to more highly paid craftsman in the later fifth and fourth centuries, when, being independent, they answered the call of commissions from different and richer regions of the Greek world and beyond.

The Siphnian Treasury at Delphi[32]

The Siphnian Treasury at Delphi may be used as a case study of the various aspects of Greek sculpture that need to be taken into account in understanding a building and its sculptures in relation to its location. It has always been considered a key building in the history of Greek architectural sculpture – a relatively well-preserved building erected at a Panhellenic sanctuary by a small island state to advertise its wealth and civic pride – and it continues to undergo serious investigation and interpretation. The Treasury, made of marble imported from Siphnos itself, stood at the far west end of the first leg of the Sacred Way at Delphi, turning its back on the pilgrims as

[31] Kozelj 1988; A. Stewart 1990: part 1; Viviers 1992. See Hadjidimitriou 2005 for images of men at work.

[32] See A. Stewart 1990: 128–9; Childs 1993; Ridgway 1993: 297–9 and 1999: 79–80 and 112–13; Brinkmann 1994; Rolley 1994: 221–4, 228–30, 269–71; Neer 2001. See also Scott 2010: 11–12, 63–6 on the importance of the location, and 250–73 on the term 'Panhellenism'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

they approached from below. The friezes have long been considered jewels in the crown of Late Archaic art. The architectural decoration was given its 'official' publication by the French excavators as long ago as 1928; more recently, the building itself has been exhaustively published in the same series.[33]

On the basis of new interpretations and new findings, the approaches may be set as questions:

1. Have we correctly identified the building? Do the ruins and the associated sculptures connect with the Siphnian Treasury mentioned by Herodotus (3.57.1–58.4) and Pausanias (10.11.2)? Doubts have been raised about the identity of the two, and although these doubts do not detract from the quality of the sculptures, dissociation puts them in a different context.[34] More seriously, if we are not dealing with the Siphnian Treasury when we study the friezes, the pediments, and the entrance columns with their supporting *korai*,[35] then we are cast adrift from what has been considered one of the more firmly fixed dating points in Late Archaic art. Majority opinion agrees that the connection is correct.
2. But how secure is the date of the Siphnian Treasury, even if we are to suppose that the building and its sculptures have been correctly identified? Herodotus, in the course of his narrative of the Persian king Kambyses' invasion of Egypt (525/524 BC), makes a complicated connection between Samian pirates, Polykrates, and Siphnos. Traditional understanding of the connection places the collapse of the Siphnian gold mining industry at the same time (Paus. 10.11.2), and thus the erection of the Treasury at Delphi in the years immediately preceding the raid on Siphnos by the Samian pirates. If it is possible, as has been suggested, to disengage the completion of the building from that decade 530–520 BC and suggest a different, later chronology, then our present understanding of Late Archaic architectural sculpture is flawed. This has repercussions for our dating of Attic vase-painting, as the closest comparanda with the Siphnian figures are to be found in the work of the Andokides Painter in very early Attic red-figure.[36] There has been reluctance to

[33] Picard and de la Coste Messelière 1928; Daux and Hansen 1987.
[34] Francis and Vickers 1983; contra, Amandry 1988.
[35] For the *korai* at Delphi, see I. M. Shear 1999.
[36] M. Robertson 1992: 11–12; Neer 2002: 19. Rotroff 2009 has now suggested a slight downdating of the beginning of red-figure.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Figure 3 The battle of the Gods and the Giants, section of the north frieze of the Siphnian Treasury, Delphi, *c.*530–520 BC. Height 64 cm.

follow the new dating, but the fact that the problem can be raised shows the unsteadiness of the ground.

3. What are the subjects of the friezes and how were they arranged? Although we are now in a more secure position through Brinkmann's research, there is still uncertainty about the iconography of some of the subjects and thus their significance. One subject has never been in doubt – the brilliantly extended composition of the north frieze that faced the Sacred Way shows the battle of the Gods and the Giants (Figure 3). Comparison with Attic black-figure vase-painting has enabled a detailed picture of the frieze as a whole to be recreated, and a strong light on the lettering has sharpened some of the readings and altered others. Almost all the divine names are now certain, and there is a more logical connection in the flow of the narrative. The same scientific work on the lettering has made the east frieze at the back of the Treasury more intelligible. The two juxtaposed scenes were always seen to be connected with the Trojan War: a discussion on Olympos and a duel on the Trojan plain. The new readings of the lettering have helped to suggest a different connection between the two halves from that previously proposed. The battle is between Achilles and Memnon over the body of Antilochos, whom Memnon has killed (an episode related in the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Aethiopis of Arktinos), and the scene in heaven shows the weighing of the destinies of the fighters, the balance held by Hermes, in the presence of their mothers, Thetis and Dawn, a theme known from vase-painting. The story on the west front of the Treasury, where the tripartite division of the frieze matches the architectural setting in which it is placed, above the antae and columns, is still unclear. The subject is usually interpreted as the Judgement of Paris, with the three goddesses distributed in the three sections, the chariots ready to leave, and Paris, his task completed, somewhat marginalized above a column. Brinkmann prefers the Apotheosis of Herakles, and Neer sees Herakles killing Orion or Tityos. The south frieze is desperately fragmentary and, although the old interpretation of the scene as Kastor and Polydeukes carrying off the daughters of Leukippos is still considered the most likely subject (cover image), there is much space to fill. The rape of Helen or of Persephone has also been suggested.[37]

4. But why were these particular subjects chosen for the friezes? Are they to be considered a unity? To some, the choice has seemed banal. And what of the pediments? Also, what of the *korai* in the porch and the Victories as acroteria on the roof? Do they all hang together as a programmatic plan devised by the priesthood at Delphi, or were they chosen by the Siphnians themselves? Some ingenious attempts have been made to inject political significance into the stories, seeing them as warnings against hubris, with specific reference to the tyrant of Athens and his allies. The battle of the Gods and the Giants on the north side is found on other buildings at Delphi and shared its subject with the nearby Apollo temple, which was being designed at the same time. The stilted Struggle for the Tripod in the east pediment has been seen as an allusion to the First Sacred War, and also once more to Peisistratos and Athens. Downdating of the building to a time after the Persian Wars (not generally accepted) has been thought to give significance to the Victories and the *korai*, and to provide an anti-Persian context for the whole programme. Brinkmann rejects a political meaning, and Neer proposes a complex analysis that relates to the political tensions back on Siphnos.[38] As can be seen, there is no shortage of interpretations.

[37] Brinkmann 1994: 101–11, who sees the rape of Persephone by Hades; Neer 2001: 318–26, who sees a rape but cannot name the victim.

[38] Neer 2001.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5. Who designed the friezes and who executed them? This question may be tackled on both a general and an individual level. Two 'Masters' have usually been distinguished, Master A of the west and south, and Master B of the north and east, a distinction based on style but also indicated by the re-cut inscription on the shield of a giant on the north frieze: '…made these and those behind' (Figure 3). The style of each is clear: Master A's flat technique with decorative detail and sensitive rendering of horses (cover image) (the *korai* are thought by some to be his); Master B's more active, robust figures in a complex composition that includes three-quarter views and foreshortening. Master A is usually thought to have originated from eastern Greece, most probably an Ionian from Asia Minor, as is shown by the winged Athena and the high-crowned heads, whereas Master B has Athenian affinities but has also been claimed for the Cyclades. As for the names of the sculptors, the fragmentary inscription on the shield of the Giant has been variously completed. Viviers has now proposed that it read 'Boupalos, son of Archermos…', thus naming the Chian sculptor whose family is known from texts and inscriptions.[39]
6. Could the sculptor have also been a painter? The four friezes furnish evidence of colours, and recent study of polychromy brings this question into prominence. The close connection in style between the sculptor of the east pediment and the Athenian vase-painter, the Andokides Painter, has prompted the remote possibility of their identity.[40]

As can be seen, the Siphnian Treasury is characteristic of the problems raised for all such buildings by the combination of written evidence, technique, style, content, chronology, and context.

Painting and pottery

Our knowledge of Greek painting is unbalanced in the extreme. Monumental painting of the Archaic and Classical periods is almost totally lost and we are dependent once more on literary sources that

[39] Viviers 2002, followed by D'Acunto 2007. For the family of Archermos and Boupalos mentioned by Pliny (*HN* 36.11–13), see A. Stewart 1990: 243–4 and Pollitt 1990: 28–9.

[40] M. Robertson 1992: 11 considers the theory that the Andokides Painter worked on the treasury 'charming but difficult to accept'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

show that wall- and panel-paintings became highly regarded, but we are once again in the position of 'many names, few remains'.[41] As an instance of what we have lost in the Archaic period, Herodotus (7.88) tells of a painting in the Heraion on Samos commissioned by Mandrokles with money given to him by Dareios, king of Persia, for his construction of the bridge across the Bosphoros in 512 BC – it showed 'the whole bridge, and King Dareios sitting on his throne, and the army passing over it'. In the generation after the Persian Wars, Polygnotos (and Mikon) was commissioned to paint scenes on specially designed colonnades in Delphi (the *leschē* ['club house'] of the Knidians) and in Athens (the *Stoa Poikilē* ['the Painted Colonnade'], which is under excavation at present by the American School); and it is these paintings, which are described in detail by Pausanias (10.25–31 and 1.15), that have received the most intensive scholarly investigation, particularly for their subject matter, composition, and the *ēthos* that is said to have characterized Polygnotos.[42] By the end of the century they must have seemed unsophisticated, as perspective, light and shade, and volume through outline and foreshortening were then in being, connected with the names of Apollodoros, Agatharchos (perspective), Zeuxis (light and shade), and Parrhasios (volume through outline). Later authors judged the apogee of painting to have been reached in the fourth century, with the works of Euphranor, Philoxenos of Eretria, and Apelles of Kos in particular, and with the pictorial illusionism of shading, cast shadows, and highlights.

When we turn to actual evidence for paintings, we see how little there is: the late seventh-century Thermon terracotta metopes from the temple of Apollo, the fragmentary painted plaster on the early archaic temple of Poseidon at Isthmia, the early sixth-century Kalapodi material, and, on a smaller scale, the wooden votive plaques from the Sanctuary of the Nymphs at Pitsa. To set against this very small quantity, tombs provide us with a larger amount of first-hand information, such as the sixth-century tombs in Asia Minor, the fifth-century Diver tomb in Paestum, and the fourth-century Macedonian and Thracian tombs.[43]

[41] For the texts, see Reinach 1985 and Rouveret 1989, with a selection in Pollitt 1990: chs. 7–9. For the beginnings of Greek monumental painting, see Koch 1996.

[42] Delphi: Stansbury-O'Donnell 1999: ch. 5. Athens: E. B. Harrison 1996: 18–23; Sommerstein 2004; and see Boardman 2005; Castriota 2005; and Stansbury-O'Donnell 2005 (all in Barringer and Hurwit 2005).

[43] Tombs in Asia Minor: Mellink et al. 1998; at Paestum: Holloway 2006; in Macedonia: S. G. Miller 1993, with a useful appendix of Macedonian tombs; in Thrace: Archibald 1998.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

With such a dearth of primary material it is only to be expected that attention should turn to painted pottery in a search for evidence in subject, style, and composition that might match the developments mentioned. However, this is only a small element in the total study of pottery (Figure 4). The quantities that have survived, and the fascination of their shapes, decoration, and contexts, make them an attractive subject for study, whether for archaeological, social, economic, or aesthetic reasons. Despite the fact that they were products of an essential craft that had business and profit as their basis and are not examples of ornamental 'studio' pottery, the high quality of many of them, and the subject matter of the scenes depicted, make them not only archaeological objects but also suitable material for treatment under the heading of 'art'.

General books on Greek pottery integrate new finds and new interpretations into the older treatments.[44] Some serve as brief introductions to the field, with attractive colour images; others provide more detailed histories, with full references and bibliographies. Connoisseurship and attribution to individual painters, alongside an interest in the way in which the visual vocabulary was created and developed, still exert a strong pull, but there has been a realignment of emphasis, with more concern with shapes, functions, distribution, and the status of the craftsmen in the potters' shops (see Chapter V). In the study of figured scenes, their interpretation and meaning have also been considered afresh (see Chapter VI). Again, as with sculpture, stress is laid on the importance of seeing painted pottery against the culture within which it was created.

Chronology[45]

The fact that classical Greek art was produced during a historical period affects students in different ways: some are anxious to fix dates as closely as possible on an absolute timescale, while others

[44] R. M. Cook 1997 is a third edition of a basic volume. Boardman's four handbooks (1998: early; 1974/1991: Athenian black-figure; 1975 and 1989: Athenian red-figure) and Trendall's handbook (1989: south Italian and Sicilian red-figure) provide a feast of illustrations. Williams 1999 is a good introduction, with an excellent selection of images; and Boardman 2001b covers a broad spectrum of approaches. Lissarrague 2001 is a magnificent book of close-up photographs of Athenian pottery. For a general review of recent work on Greek pottery, see Oakley 2009b.

[45] For general statements, see A. Stewart 1990: 27–9 and Appendix 3; Sparkes 1991: 28–59; Biers 1992; R. M. Cook 1997: 249–58; Whitley 2001: 60–74; Mannack 2002: 53–61 and 181–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF GREEK PAINTED POTTERY

INTERNAL ASPECTS

Manufacture -
techniques of throwing (hand-made, wheel, mould)
techniques of painting (e.g. black-figure, red-figure, white-ground, polychromy, etc.)
techniques of firing (kiln, bonfire, etc.)
potters and organisation of workshops (size, location, status)

Shapes -
variety (open or closed shape, container or contents)
functions
names (ancient and modern, correct or conventional)
relation to non-figured pottery and to metal vases

Images -
composition in shape of area available for decoration (panels, friezes, tondos)
choice of subject (gods, heroes, humans, animals, plants, fantasy)
significance and meaning
painters and styles
outside influences (tradition, ideology, life, sculpture, major painting, clientèle)

Inscriptions - (before firing)
local script and spelling
types of painted and incised inscription (names of figures, signatures, speech, comments, greetings, kalos-names, archons' names, nonsense)

EXTERNAL ASPECTS

Purchasing -
selling and buying
retail or wholesale, full or empty
markets and traders

Inscriptions - (after firing)
graffiti (scratched letters) and dipinti (painted letters) (e.g. signatures, possession, dedication, ostraka, prices)

Contexts of use -
homes, public places, sanctuaries, cemeteries (inhumation, cremation)

Distribution -
modern find-spots (home, sanctuary, grave, well, workshop, etc.)
primary v. secondary location (re-use)
near or far, Greek or non-Greek context
routes of communication
gift or trade (second-hand market?)

Chronology (relative and absolute) is of concern for both internal and external aspects

Figure 4 Approaches to Greek pottery.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are antipathetic to precise dates, which are seen to create too rigid a development. The bases for chronology are a mixture of written texts and inscriptions, and historical and archaeological contexts, aided by the technique, style, and subject matter of the artefacts, especially pottery. Chronology based on historical events differs from that reached by the archaeologist or art historian, though there are obvious connections: 'people and societies produce the major events and monuments and texts; each is therefore of necessity a parallel and dependent creation'.[46] It is a case of the longue durée versus specific events.

The conventional division of Greek art into time periods such as Geometric, Orientalizing, Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic is useful but has its drawbacks.[47] The term 'Orientalizing' highlights the increasing influence of Near Eastern ideas in the seventh century, whether through imports of goods or immigration of craftsmen, but masks the influence that had already taken place and continued later. The close of the Archaic period is usually fixed at the time of, and by many as a consequence of, the successful repulse of the Persian invasions, but the change is not clear-cut and some developments had started earlier.[48] Indications of the change to the Hellenistic period start in the earlier fourth century, and one has to resist the tendency to delay such indications for the sake of tidiness. Subdivisions within the larger framework (Early, Middle, Late) also have their problems. Should we place a break between the Classical period and the Late Classical at the end of the fifth century, or is the period from 430 to 380 BC art-historically a more recognizable stage in development?[49]

Absolute dates depend on written evidence (either texts or inscriptions). They are few and not always straightforward. Evidence for the dates of the construction of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia (*c.*470–456 BC) and of the Parthenon in Athens (*c.*447–431 BC) is the clearest assistance we have, as they provide both a beginning and an end.[50] By contrast, Thucydides' paragraphs (6.2–5) on the foundation dates of Greek settlements in Sicily are hard to relate to the

[46] Childs 1993: 400 and see M. Robertson 1992: 41–2 and passim.
[47] On periodization, see Golden and Toohey 1997: part 2.
[48] For Late Archaic, see Neer 2002, Appendix 1; Keesling 2003: 46–62.
[49] For a study of this fifty-year period, see Schultz 2007.
[50] Temple of Zeus, Olympia: Paus. 5.10.2–10; Parthenon: *IG* 1^3 436–51; Plut., *Vit. Per.* 12.1–13.8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

archaeological material unearthed in the various excavations there.[51] There are other major archaeological contexts that are linked closely or loosely to historical events: the mound raised over the tomb of the Greeks who died at Marathon in 490 BC; the highly complex evidence that is presented by the deposits on the Athenian Acropolis and in the Agora following the Persian sack of Athens in 480–479 BC; the relief sculptures built into the wall erected in Athens by Themistokles in 479 BC; the material found at Olynthos as a consequence of its destruction by Philip of Macedon in 348 BC; the Macedonian royal tombs.[52] Some Attic document reliefs can be dated to a precise year, and those that are topped by relief scenes help towards the stylistic dating of sculptural figures.[53] As far as painted pottery is concerned, the prize Panathenaic amphorae that carry the name of the *archon eponymos* of a specific year in the fourth century are by far the most exact dates for pottery that we have.[54]

It has been well said that 'Dates for individual monuments produced by the process of relative chronology are better understood as guesses contingent upon the structure of the chronology as a whole rather than as facts with independent value.'[55] Styles did not change at a constant rate; there were experimental and traditional craftsmen, and consequently stylistic periods are not self-contained. Style phases (such as Severe, Bold, Rich) avoid the chronological strait-jacket but are confusing and open to individual interpretation. Because of the vast amount and variety of the material preserved, and its discovery in association with other types of material in excavated contexts, the study of pottery provides the most dependable clues as to relative and even absolute dates. The relationship between the sculptures on the Siphnian Treasury and the work of the Andokides Painter is generally agreed (see earlier), as is the connection between various red-figure painters and the style and subject matter of the Parthenon sculptures. There are a few subjects that are introduced into the iconography of

[51] See Amyx 1988: ch. 3 for the dating of Corinthian pottery vis-à-vis Thucydides; and Hornblower 2008 *ad loc*.

[52] Marathon tomb: Williams 1991: 44–5 and fig. 5 for the sole red-figure fragment; 1996: 249–50. Acropolis deposits: Williams 1996: 244–8; Keesling 2003: 49–50; A. Stewart 2008b. Agora deposits: T. L. Shear 1993. Themistoklean Wall: Knigge 1991: 49–55; Keesling 1999; Camp 2001: 59–60. The identity of the occupants and hence the date of tomb II at Vergina ('Philip's tomb') seem to depend more on medical science than on archaeology or history: see Musgrave et al. 2010.

[53] Lawton 1995.

[54] Bentz 1998.

[55] Keesling 2003: 59.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vase-paintings that may be connected with historical people or events – for example, Kroisos, the Tyrant-Slayers – but they are only useful as post-quem dates. Other attempts to fix dates – by using letter forms on inscriptions, historical names such as '*kalos*' ('handsome') names of famous Athenians that were painted on pots between 550 and 450 BC, and names of politicians scratched on vase fragments that were used as sherds for voting at the time of ostracisms – have proved uneasy supports.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press