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The Persian and Carthaginian Invasions of 480 B.C.E. and the Beginning of the Classical Style: Part 2, The Finds from Other Sites in Athens, Attica, Elsewhere in Greece, and on Sicily; Part 3, The Severe Style: Motivations and Meaning

ANDREW STEWART

Abstract
This study, in three parts, addresses the problem of the beginning of the classical style—the so-called Severe Style—from an archaeological perspective, focusing on those sculptures either found, or allegedly found, in Persian destruction contexts or directly associated with the Persian and Carthaginian invasions. Part 1 appears in a previous issue of the AJA (112 [2008] 377–412). Parts 2 and 3 are presented in this article. The first part of the study reexamined the 19th-century excavations of the Acropolis and demonstrated that the style probably did not predate the Persian invasion of 480–479 B.C.E. Part 2 revisits finds from elsewhere in Athens and Attica, Phokis, the Aphaia sanctuary on Aigina, and Sicily, with similar results. Part 3 summarizes current theories on the origins and significance of the Severe Style, suggests that the Tyrannicides of Kritios and Nesiotes, dedicated in 477/6, indeed inaugurated it, and reconsiders the idea that the Greek victories of 480–479 somehow inspired it, at least in part.*

*This study, begun in the summer of 2003 and published in three parts in the AJA, was occasioned by Cambridge University Press’ invitation to replace Pollitt (1972) and thus to confront—as Pollitt had done—the problem of the origins of the classical style. I am most grateful to all who have helped me en route, particularly Roza Proskynetopoulou and Vassilis Barkas (National Museum), Alexander Mantis and Christina Vlassopoulou (Acropolis Ephoria and Museum), and Elena Partida (Delphi Ephoria) for enabling me to autopsy the material in their care; Elizabeth Langridge-Noti, John Oakley, and Alan Shapiro for verifying the dates of many of the ceramics; and Brunilde Ridgway and Catherine Keesling for their sympathetic and helpful critiques of the manuscript. I also must thank Gianfranco Adornato, Carmen Arnold-Biucchi, Erin Babnik, Barbara Barletta, Judy Barringer, Judith Binder, Adolf Borbein, Robert Bridges, Beth Cohen, Lynn Cunningham, Ortwin Dally, Humberto DeLuigi, Norbert Eschbach, Hans Goette, Joachim Heiden, Tonio Hölscher, Jeffrey Hunt, Nancy Klein, Leslie Kurke, Astrid Lindenlauf, Kathleen Lynch, Margaret Miles, Richard Neer, Diamantis Panagiotopoulos, Loren Partridge, Maria Pilali, Susan Rotroff, Philip Sapirstein, T. Leslie Shear, Anne Stewart, Reinhard Stuupperich, Barbara Tsakiris, Luisa Veneziano, Natalya Vogelkoff-Brogan, and Graham Zanker for their assistance on particular points and/or with obtaining photographs. I must also acknowledge the ever-helpful staffs of the Doe Library at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Blegen Library at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Lecture audiences in Athens, Berlin, Christchurch, and Heidelberg also contributed helpful comments and suggestions. Last but not least, I owe a literal debt of gratitude to the American Council of Learned Societies for awarding me a generous sabbatical grant in 2007 to complete this study, and to Dally and the German Archaeological Institute, Berlin, for a fellowship in 2008 that enabled me to edit and revise it. All translations are mine unless otherwise noted.


3 NM = National Archaeological Museum of Athens inventory number.
of the Tyrannicides of 477/6 (fig. 2). Ridgway has proposed lowering the ensemble’s date to after 480, and Junker even has suggested the 450s. Moreover, if the rebuilt temple was indeed destroyed by the Persians, no trace of a successor appears until the late fourth century, when Lykourgos refurbished the sanctuary and built a new temple a little to the south. Yet Pausanias saw not one but two temples there and two cult statues, “the one of Dionysos Eleuthereus and the other which Alkamenes made of ivory and gold.”

Unfortunately, no other archaeological evidence exists that might resolve the issue. The metopes of the Athenian treasury, however, are now known to postdate 490, for the foundations of the treasury and the Marathon trophy along its southern side are integrated; so a date for the south slope sculptures and rebuilt Dionysos temple soon after the Persian withdrawal seems tenable. Presumably, the Athenians took the ancient image of Dionysos Eleuthereus with them when they evacuated the city in 480 and set about rehousing it soon after they returned. This would have been one of the two temples that Pausanias saw (the other was Lykourgos’), and no doubt the image inside it was the ancient one.

Fig. 1. Torso of a (once) ithyphallic satyr perhaps from a pediment of the Temple of Dionysos Eleuchereus (NM 2324) (E. Gehnen; © DAI Athens, neg. 1994.17).

Fig. 2. The Tyrannicides of Kritios and Nesiotes (from a cast). Naples, Museo Nazionale, inv. nos. G103, G104 (H. Schwanke; © DAI Rome, neg. 84.3301).

---


2 Paus. 1.20.3.

3 The date of the treasury is highly controversial, though most now prefer the 480s (see Paus. 10.11.5), and the (still unpublished) French excavations of 1989 apparently have proved as much; cf. Cooper 1989, 1990; Bommelaer and La-roche 1991, 137: “Il est clair que l’état primitif de la base était prévu dès la construction du Trésor, dont le socle comporte un empattement destiné à le fonder.” Büsing (1994, 125–27) offers detailed architectural arguments for this date, using for comparison, e.g., the Temple of Aphaia on Aigina. Amandry (1998, 87–9) and Neer (2004, 67) summarize the excavators’ conclusions. Partida (2000, 50–4, 68–70) denies the connection between base and treasury and dates the latter, as Dinsmoor had done, to ca. 510–500. On the post-Classic date of the base’s extant statue cuttings, see de la Coste-Messelière 1942–1943; Gauer 1968, 45–51. On the treasury’s metopes, see de la Coste-Messelière 1957 (480s); Harrison 1965, 9–11 (490s); Gauer 1968, 50–1 (480s); Ridgway 1993, 343–44, 365 (with useful bibliography) (490s or perhaps 480s); cf. Stewart 1990, 132, figs. 213–17 (480s); Boardman 1991a, 159–60, fig. 213 (480s); Rolley 1994, 215–19, figs. 209–11 (480s); Neer 2004 (480s).
To my knowledge, the only other piece of Severe Style sculpture from the south slope is the fine fragmentary votive relief of ca. 460 assembled and published by Despinis in 1987. Since he found it in the storeroom of the Asklepieion, however, it can help us no further. He conjectures that it may have been dedicated to Artemis and fell or was pushed from the Brauronion at the southwest corner of the Acropolis.\(^7\)

*The Agora*

Though excavated intensively since 1931, the Athenian Agora has yielded only two pieces of large-scale sculpture from its immediately post-Persian deposits, and they are both archaic: a fragmentary marble bearded head and the upper part of a terracotta rider, both assigned on current chronology to the late sixth century.\(^4\) These extensive deposits in wells and pits, evidently dumped during the Athenian cleanup after the Persian retreat, were thoroughly surveyed by Shear in 1993, who catalogued 21 of them.\(^3\) They produced no bronze sculptures or statuettes (these were no doubt melted down for reuse), but all 51 terracotta figurines found in them, insofar as their style is discernible, also look archaic.\(^10\)

Yet far more significant than these small scraps are the huge quantities of pottery found in the deposits. Shear’s meticulous survey provides, for the first time, a detailed and authoritative conspectus of the ceramic types and styles current in Athens in 480 upon which all subsequent studies of the topic must be based. Further excavation has broadly confirmed his conclusions. Another post-Persian fill excavated in 1994/1995 in a well inside a destroyed archaic house matches this material nicely except for a sherd attributed to the Kerameikos.\(^9\) It was found a few meters apart in the fills of Building Z, just which Athenians refortified their city, using their vandalized funeral monuments as building material.\(^14\) Since the late 19th century, this Themistoklean city wall has produced spectacular finds of sculpture and epigraphy, including many pieces that rank among the finest works of archaic Greek art. Yet as far as I am aware, not one fragment of Severe Style sculpture has appeared in more than 150 years of investigation and excavation of its remains.\(^15\)

In 1978, however, the excavators of the Kerameikos discovered two joining fragments of an early Severe Style warrior’s head just inside the wall (fig. 3). Its smooth cranium indicates that it once wore a bronze helmet, though the actual spot where a dowel might have been inserted is missing. The fragments were found a few meters apart in the fills of Building Z, just inside and to the southwest of the Sacred Gate.

Publishing the head five years later, Knigge noted its proximity to a Late Archaic funerary precinct apparently destroyed in 480/79 and to an archaic sphinx found (Nicholls 1970, 117–20, 134, no. B1, pls. 32–4; Boardman 1991b, fig. 32; cf. fig. 20.2 [Oinomaos]).\(^15\) Its context has some corroborative value, however, in that it does not exclude manufacture after 479 and destruction perhaps as late as the Sullan sack of 86 B.C.E. By the time it was made, however, the Tyrannicides of Kritios and Nesiotes probably already dominated the now-cleaned-up Agora, where they had been triumphantly installed in 477/6 (see fig. 2).\(^13\)

*The Kerameikos*

In a famous passage, Thucydides describes how in the winter of 479/8, at Themistokles’ behest, the returning Athenians swiftly refortified their city, using their vandalized funeral monuments as building material.\(^14\) Since the late 19th century, this Themistoklean city wall has produced spectacular finds of sculpture and epigraphy, including many pieces that rank among the finest works of archaic Greek art. Yet as far as I am aware, not one fragment of Severe Style sculpture has appeared in more than 150 years of investigation and excavation of its remains.\(^15\)

In 1978, however, the excavators of the Kerameikos discovered two joining fragments of an early Severe Style warrior’s head just inside the wall (fig. 3). Its smooth cranium indicates that it once wore a bronze helmet, though the actual spot where a dowel might have been inserted is missing. The fragments were found a few meters apart in the fills of Building Z, just inside and to the southwest of the Sacred Gate.

Publishing the head five years later, Knigge noted its proximity to a Late Archaic funerary precinct apparently destroyed in 480/79 and to an archaic sphinx found

---

\(^7\) AkrM 13529 (Despinis 1987, pls. 58–60). AkrM = Acropolis Museum inventory number.

\(^4\) Bearded head: Agora S 1997 (Agora 11:no. 82, pl. 9); see Shear (1993, 468) for its context. Rider: Agora T 4025 (Shear 1973, 401–2, pl. 75a, b; Camp 1996, 213–14, no. 6, pl. 66 [joining arm fragment and its context]); I thank Rotroff for alerting me to this find.

\(^3\) Shear 1993.

\(^9\) These are Agora T 346, T 347, T 1549, T 1713, T 1714, T 1993, T 1998, T 2001, T 2583, T 3530, T 3531, T 3534, T 3535, T 3783–85. I thank John Camp and Jan Jordan for facilitating access to them.

\(^10\) Camp 1996, 242–52, pls. 71–5 (Well J2:4). In addition to pottery, the deposit included a Late Archaic terracotta protome (Agora T 4362). See Neer (2002, 202–4) for comments.

\(^12\) Leagros: Gadberry 1992, 453, fig. 4 (drawing); 471–72; 474; cf. Holloway 1995, 47 n; Camp 2001, 32–5, 261, fig. 31; Ridgway 2004, 605 n. 35. Terracotta warrior: Agora T 3253

---

© 2008 Archaeological Institute of America
in the first decade of the 20th century by Noack. Knigge speculated that the head might have been exhumed from the debris of that precinct when one of Building Z’s Hellenistic wells was dug. She attributed it to a funerary statue and placed it between the Kritios Boy and the Tyrannicides of 477/6, which she dated about a decade apart. In passing, though, she noted that apart from its “old-fashioned” (altertümlich) snail-curl coiffure, the head “displays many traits of the 470s” and even prefigures some aspects of the Olympia sculptures.  

So was its coiffure, she asked, intended to characterize the subject as a member of the older generation? Finally, she pointed out that the head sufficiently resembled Myron’s oeuvre to suggest, tentatively, his youthful hand at work, even though at present he is attested only as a bronzeworker. In the official publication of Building Z, Knigge repeated the information about the head’s findspot and possible origin and specified its context as the fill of Building Z5, built ca. 280–250 and destroyed in the Sullan sack of 86 B.C.E.

The grave precinct very likely was destroyed in 480, since the north wall of Building Z1, built apparently in the 470s, cuts and covers its southern part. Some red-figure sherds were found in a lens of stones abutting the robber trench of its west wall that might be the ruins of this wall or of a surface associated with it. Attributed to the mature Berlin Painter or his circle, these sherds date to the 480s on the traditional chronology.

Unfortunately, the warrior head was found on the other (southwestern) side of the north wall of Building Z, in a stratum 2 m higher (47.0–47.8 masl) than the tops of the walls of the funerary precinct (45.08–45.11 masl). So unlike the rest of the sculptures destroyed by the Persians, the head was not built into the Themis-toklean wall but (if it predates 480) somehow escaped reuse in this way.

Moreover, as Knigge also noted, it seems unlikely that the head belonged to a kouros. Although its neck is mostly gone, the transition between it and the jawbone is sharper on the proper left side, and its right sternomastoid muscle seems stronger and more prominent. So probably it was turned slightly to its left and belonged to a figure like the Kritios Boy (fig. 4), but looking in the opposite direction and thus standing perhaps with his left leg relaxed—a Kritios Boy in mirror-image.

On the chronology advanced here, then, the head should date to the early to mid 470s, when the snail-curl also makes a belated appearance on Harmodios (see fig. 2) and the Aigina pediments. Quite close to the copies of Harmodios in style, it seems slightly more advanced, for its bone structure is heavier and it no longer bears any trace of a smile. On the Acropolis, its nearest relative is the little head AkrM 634, which was evidently carved as a repair, presumably to a kore damaged by the Persians. It has been deliberately mutilated, however, probably—as the diagonal scar above its left eye suggests—by a hammer wielded by a

manufacture or with repolishing at intervals throughout its life. Its somewhat glassy appearance is quite different from the velvety texture of the Kritios Boy and the Blond Boy.

Knigge (2005, 86) notes that the head made its appearance in the Kerameikos Museum when the inhabitants were digging Well 5, but the exact findspots are not specified. Knigge’s early publications (Knigge 1980, 1983) suggests that they were found close to Well 5 but also that their provenance might not have been properly recorded. The head’s well-preserved surface is compatible either with burial soon after

© 2008 Archaeological Institute of America
right-handed person who blinded it and smashed its nose and lips. Since it was found in the fills of Building Z5, floating well above its floor level, was the statue to which it belonged brought there in Roman or even Medieval times, when the area had fallen into ruin, intentionally disfigured, broken up, and its body reused as building material or burned for lime?

As to its original function, three possibilities present themselves. First, it could have been a votive. Votive statues of warriors and hoplitodromoi appear on the Acropolis and elsewhere in the late sixth century, but this head was not found in a sanctuary, and there is no appropriate one nearby. So to fit this scenario, it must have been brought into the Kerameikos from elsewhere, perhaps from the Agora or the Acropolis.

Second, it could have been a funerary statue. Unfortunately, as Ridgway, Rolley, and Engels have independently pointed out, such a statue seems as de trop in the Kerameikos just before 480 as it is just after 479; most scholars agree that at Athens, such memorials had ceased somewhat earlier, perhaps under Kleisthenes or at least in the 490s. A law curbing funerary ostentation remains the most likely reason, and a century of scholarship has consistently pointed to the one recorded almost half a millennium later by Cicero, which he dates “somewhat after Solon” (archon, 594–592), hence its modern nickname as the post aliquanto law, and before Demetrios of Phaleron (tyrant, 317/6–307/6):

Sed post aliquanto propter has amplitudines sepulchrorum, quas in Ceramico videmus, lege sanctum est, “ne quis sepulchrum faceret operosius quam quod decem hominum effecerint triduo”; neque id opere tectorio exornari nec hermas, quos vocant, licebat imponi, nec de mortui laude nisi in publicis sepultris nec ab alio, nisi qui publice ad eam rem constitutus esset, dici licebat. Sublata etiam celebritas virorum et mulierum, quo lamentatio minueretur; auget enim luctum concursus hominum.

But somewhat later [i.e., later than Solon], on account of the enormous tombs that are visible in the Kerameikos, a law was passed “that no one should build a tomb that required more than three days work for ten men.” It was forbidden, too, to adorn a tomb with stucco and to place on it the so-called herms. Eulogies of the deceased were also forbidden, except at public funerals and by publicly appointed orators. Even crowds of mourners were forbidden, in order to limit the lamentation, for a crowd increases grief.

---

21 Suggested by Engels 1998, 104. On votive warriors, see esp. Schäfer 1996, 29–36, 50–1. At least two stood on the Acropolis: a bearded marble one (AkrM 621) (Payne and Mackworth-Young 1936, 46, pl. 103; Schrader 1939, 315, pl. 142; Brouskari 1974, 96, figs. 180, 181; Schäfer 1996, 33–4, fig. 5) and a bearded bronze one (NM Br. 6446) (see Stewart 2008, cat. no. 15, fig. 13). At around this very time, Kritios and Nesiotes made a bronze statue of the hoplitodromos Epicharinos, which he dedicated on the Acropolis (IG 13 847; Raubitschek 1949, no. 120; Keesling 2003, 171–72); I thank Keesling for these suggestions and related bibliography.


23 Cic. Leg. 2.64–5.
law was Kleisthenic; on the other hand, they ascribe this legislation to Kleisthenes or one of his supporters because the funerary sculpture is deemed to stop ca. 500/490. The lower sculptural chronology proposed in the present study calls both these assumptions into question. Indeed, strictly speaking, there is no reason prima facie why this post aliquanto legislation could not have been passed directly after the Persian withdrawal in 479.

Yet even so, on any chronology, the latest Attic funerary monuments do seem somewhat to predate the latest archaic votives on the Acropolis and elsewhere, rendering such a late date for this post aliquanto legislation unlikely. If, as argued here, the archaic style gives way to the Severe Style at Athens in the early 470s, it should have been passed ca. 490 or at the latest in the early to mid 480s, when anti-elitist sentiment seems to have sharpened considerably with the introduction of ostracism in 488/7.

Last, the warrior could have been a heros propylaios. Approaching Athens ca. 170 C.E., Pausanias saw “a tomb not far from the gates, and set on it is a soldier standing by a horse; who he is I do not know, but Praxiteles made both horse and soldier.” Although this is usually interpreted as a straightforward funerary monument, the phenomenon of the apotropaeic “hero before the gate” (heros propylaios) is a well-known one, recently discussed by Faraone. Thus, to cite but one example, a niche by the Gate of the Spring at Priene bears an inscription in which a certain Philios relates how he was told in a dream to set up “this hero as guardian (phylax) of the city.” As Faraone remarks, “the deictic pronoun clearly refers to a statue that once occupied the niche.”

If this head truly belonged to such a statue, it must have been set up before the gate after it was rebuilt in 478, vandalized in a later assault such as Kassandra’s in 307, and replaced by one commissioned from (the younger) Praxiteles. Or—given its comparatively late find context—was it vandalized during the Sullan sack of 86 B.C.E. and then catapulted into the city to land in the ruins of the pulverized Building Z? Unfortunately, not only shall we never know, but—to short-circuit all these speculations—if it were dumped into Building Z in Roman or Medieval times, it can have nothing to do with any predecessor to Praxiteles’ warrior, and all possibilities remain open.

Eleusis

According to Herodotus, the Persians burnt Demeter’s “dwelling” at Eleusis at some point before the Battle of Plataia. Fired up by this remark, Philios began to excavate the Eleusinian sanctuary in 1882 on behalf of the Archaeological Society of Athens. At first his annual reports to the society were remarkably full and detailed, in part perhaps because he felt a need to justify the very considerable sums of money spent on the project, for the hillside was covered with houses and even a church, all of which had to be purchased and demolished. Moreover, the site was large, complex, and in parts buried deep in fill. Later on, however—but fortunately after he had made his main sculptural finds—his reports become very summary indeed.

Philios found only one piece of Severe Style sculpture in his excavations, a fine votive relief of Demeter and Kore or (more probably) Hekate reused as a Byzantine drain cover. This piece is usually dated ca. 470, though anomalies in its iconography, style, and technique might suggest Late Hellenistic or even Roman manufacture. To my knowledge, no more Severe Style pieces have been found. Philios’ discoveries of archaic sculpture, however, merit brief consideration, since he may have found at least some of them in debris from the Persian sack.

These figures, small and housed not at Eleusis but in the National Archaeological Museum of Athens, are the Cinderellas of archaic Attic sculpture. The standard accounts of the site overlook them entirely, and the most recent study of the korai both omits two of them and offers a confused description of their find circumstances. Figure 5 maps these discoveries,

24 Keesling 2005, 420; see also Engels (1998, 103–4), who sensibly argues the legislation’s date on other (internal and historical) grounds. I thank Keesling for these references and her accompanying comments. An interval of a decade or two between the last funerary sculptures and the end of the archaic style is seldom argued per se by sculpture specialists but is implicit in their tendency to date the post aliquanto legislation to ca. 500 on the traditional chronology and/or to ascribe it to Kleisthenes (see, e.g., Richter 1961, 38–9; Stewart 1990, 131; Rolley 1994, 325).


26 Paus. 1.2.3.

made between 1882 and 1887. In general, three clusters of finds emerge: (1) those from the fill between the Periklean peribolos wall and the southern part of the Telesterion’s huge prostyle porch or prostoon (NM 24 [minus its head], NM 27); (2) those from the fill between the northern part of the prostoon, the archaic mudbrick wall, and its post-479 pseudo-isodomic repair (NM 5, NM 25, NM 26); and (3) those from the fill in the triangle between the archaic mudbrick peribolos wall, the Lesser Propylaia, and the Sacred Way (NM 24’s head, NM 59–61). It is convenient to discuss these in order, following the excavations chronologically from south to north.

Philios encountered a Periklean fill at the very start of his excavations in 1882, which began between the southern corner of the prostoon (see fig. 5[51]) and the Periklean fortification tower (see fig. 5[64]). Stratified below the Roman surfacing of the terrace, the fill contained sand, poros chips, and sherds (fig. 6, “Sandfüllung”). Just below the Roman surfacing, between the horseshoe-shaped exedra Π and the prostoon, he found a little Late Archaic kore (NM 24; then headless but to be reunited with her head five years later) and a Ripe Archaic kore head (NM 27). So at Eleusis, archaic sculptures were still being deposited in the backfills to the Periklean fortification walls more than a generation after the Persian sack, just as on the Acropolis.

Excavating northeastward along the outer face of the prostoon (see fig. 5[51]), Philios then discovered that it cut a limestone pseudo-isodomic wall (see figs. 5[43, 44], 6, Wall T-T). He soon identified this wall as a pre-Periklean fortification wall. Its backfill (see fig. 6, fills between Wall T-T, and the prostep, “d. Vorsprung des perikleischen Stereobates”), which he dug in 1882 and 1883, contained sandy soil mixed with fieldstones (esp. in its southwest corner by the prostoon), working chips, “sherds of the pre-Pheidian period,” and terracotta idols. This backfill produced another two small korai and a marble corner block from the sima of the Late Archaic Telesterion decorated with a spectacular ram’s head gargoyle. One of the korai (NM 5) is a mid-sixth-century peplophoros; the other (NM 25) is Ripe Archaic. Near the archaic mudbrick peribolos wall (see fig. 5[22]), this fill covered a layer of mudbrick debris.

---

32Philios 1882, 89; cf. 94, pl. Γ (plan); 1883, 64 n. 1; Noack 1927, 249, no. 13.
33Philios 1882, 85 (NM 24, headless), 101 (other fragments), pl. Γ (plan). NM 24: Philios 1884, col. 182, pl. 8.5; 1889a, 117, pl. 3 (with head); Himmelmann-Wildschütz 1957, fig. 19; Richter 1968, 103, no. 185, figs. 591–94; Kaltss 2002, 82, no. 139; Karakasi 2003, pls. 122, 123; NM 27: Richter 1968, 86, no. 142, figs. 452, 453; Kaltss 2002, 72, no. 103; Karakasi 2003, pl. 120. On the dates of these korai, see also Karakasi 2003, 161, table 10.
34Philios 1883, 61.
35Philios 1883, 63–4 (gargoyle and NM 25, found at a depth of 3.0–3.5 m), pl. E; Noack 1927, 250, no. 17 (though Philios makes no mention of “Bauschutt” or “zahlreiche grössere Blocke” here), pl. 1A (east–west section, with findspots of the sculptures, though its alleged composition should be treated with caution). NM 5: Philios 1884, col. 179, pl. 8.1 (between the mudbrick wall and the prostep, at 5 m depth; presumably one of the 45 sculptures, no less, mentioned in Philios 1882, 101); Noack 1927, 250, no. 17, pl. 1A; Richter 1968, 52, no. 75, figs. 236–39; Kaltss 2002, 42, no. 26; Karakasi 2003, pl. 117. NM 25: Philios 1884, col. 183, pl. 8.6; Richter 1968, 86, no. 139, figs. 446–48; Kaltss 2002, 74, no. 107; Karakasi 2003, pl. 118. On the dates, see also Karakasi 2003, 161, table 10. For the gargoyle (Eleusis 5248), see Noack 1927, pl. 29; Mylonas 1961, fig. 21; Shear 1982, pl. 20b; Travlos 1988, fig. 139; not pierced as a spout, it was purely decorative.
in which a Late Archaic kore (NM 26) was found, about 1.5 m above the archaic ground level.  

A terminus post quem for this fill’s deposition is given by the ashlar pseudo-isodomic wall that replaced a 30 m stretch of the archaic mudbrick wall between its southeastern corner and the proston. Only the front (southern) face of this pseudo-isodomic wall was dressed smooth and thus intended to be seen; its rear face was completed in mudbrick. This wall is universally recognized as a repair for the section of the archaic mudbrick wall where the Persians broke through in 480 or 479; the mudbrick debris that yielded NM 26 must have been the degraded remains of the former or the demolished remains of the latter. This repair is often thought to be Kimonian, though it could well be Themistoklean. At the same time, the surviving northeastern section of the archaic wall (see fig. 5.22–91) also was strengthened by a 2.4 m thick mudbrick addition to its inner face.

So this fill was a post-Themistoklean (Kimonian?) backfill of the newly repaired archaic wall. Dumped there at some time after the wall’s completion, it turned the entire area between the wall and the Telesterion into a raised terrace, exactly as on the Acropolis. Philo’s fourth-century proston later cut this fill on its western side.

Unfortunately, since Philios had no Kawerau to draw sections for him, no Graef and Wolters to register his pottery, and never published a proper final report, a more exact chronology seems impossible to achieve. Although Philios reports discoveries of decorated pottery in the area and published a few of the choicest pieces, only one is useful for dating: a red-figure skyphos fragment with an owl in polychrome relief (fig. 7).

In his definitive studies of owl skyphoi, Johnson overlooked this one, which is far more elaborate than any in standard red-figure, and I know of no parallel to it. Since these skyphoi evidently began in the 470s at a time when the Themistoklean city wall and the Acropolis North Wall were both constructed.

---

36 Philios 1883, 63–4 (at 5 m depth); 1884, col. 185 (at 5 m depth, now specifying mudbrick debris), pl. 8.7; Noack 1927, 24, fig. 6 (at point “a”); 250, cat. no. 17 (overlooking its context in the mudbrick debris), pl. 1A (placing it too far from the walls and associated mudbrick debris that is, however, shown on his section, and its remnants on pl. 23b, at “b”); Richter 1968, 86, no. 140, figs. 449–51; Kaltzsa 2002, 72, no. 104; Karakisi 2003, pl. 119.

37 See Noack 1927, 90–2, pl. 24c, d, 27b; Mylonas 1961, 107–8, fig. 28; Travlos 1988, 94–5, figs. 152, 153. Its pseudo-isodomic construction resembles that of section 6 of the Acropolis North Wall, which is Themistoklean (Korres 2002, 181, 186, fig. 3), though the joints are more regular. In any case, it is hard to believe that this breach went unrepaird for 20 years.


39 Noack’s is a composite armchair reconstruction (see fig. 6).


41 Philios 1885, col. 175, pl. 9, no. 11.
and lasted until ca. 425, any date within this range is theoretically possible, though this example’s virtuoso technique perhaps suggests a date early, perhaps even very early, in the series.\(^42\)

Thus far, as on the Acropolis, there is no warrant for concluding a priori that the sculptures found in these post-Persian fills necessarily were victims of Persian violence. Yet since all of them are archaic, they may well have been, and (as will appear), NM 24 quite likely was.

In 1883, Philios also began excavating to the north of the Telesterion, finding burnt destruction debris presumably from the Persian sack of the archaic temple.\(^43\) In and around it, he found a certain amount of black-figure and some red-figure but again published only one fragment useful for dating the fill: a superb cockleshell aryballos signed by Phinias as potter, dating ca. 500.\(^44\)

In 1887, Philios pushed farther into this triangle. Halfway to the Propylaia, just inside the archaic polygonal wall of the sanctuary and its northeastern tower, he found more burnt destruction debris, together with sherds of the period “not long before Pheidias,” and, almost on the bedrock, four archaic heads.\(^45\) One of these fitted the Late Archaic kore (NM 24) that he had found 80 m to the south five years earlier. The second and third (NM 59, NM 60; figs. 8, 9) also came from Late Archaic korai and the fourth (NM 61) from a splendid mid sixth-century rider that echoes the famous Rampin Rider from the Acropolis but is slightly more advanced in style (the canthus of the eye is now indicated).\(^46\) All of them have been intentionally decapitated, and NM 59 and NM 60 show clear signs of burning. NM 59 is somewhat blackened in places, and NM 60 is severely calcined on the front and blackened at the back.

So this deposit may well have been Persian debris, cleared soon after the Athenian reoccupation of the site (otherwise the charred material would have disintegrated in the winter storms) and dumped to the north just inside the sacred peribolos as part of the terracing that followed the Athenian return and reconstruction of the sanctuary. Since this terracing operation cannot be precisely dated, and the phasing and chronology of the post-Persian Telesteria are still highly controversial,\(^47\) it is still theoretically possible that the fire was an accidental one (like, e.g., Ross’ burnt deposit on the Acropolis)\(^48\) and that the korai were victims of the post-

---

\(^{42}\) Papaspyridi (1924–1925) does not mention this skyphos, and apparently it has disappeared. On the type and its chronology, see Johnson 1951, 1955; Stewart 2008, 404. On red-figure relief work in general, see Cohen 2006, 108–9, 241–43.

\(^{43}\) Philios 1883, 61 n. 4; cf. Hdt. 9.65.

\(^{44}\) Philios 1885, col. 174, pl. 9, no. 10; ARV\(\text{2}\), 25, no. 2β; Cohen 2006, 266–67, no. 78 (text).

\(^{45}\) Philios 1887, 55.

\(^{46}\) Philios 1887, 55; 1889b, pls. 3–6. NM 24: supra n. 32. NM 59: Himmelmann-Wildschütz 1957, fig. 17. NM 60: Willemse 1953–1954, pls. 20a, 21; Himmelmann-Wildschütz 1957, fig. 18; Richter 1968, 103, no. 186, figs. 595, 596. NM 61: Kaltzat 2002, 56, no. 61. As Floren (Fuchs and Floren 1987, 278–79) has seen, the fragmentary horse’s head, Eleusis 5230, (Papaniageli 2002, 204 [unnumbered fig.]; DAI Athens, neg. Eleusis 500–1) probably belongs to the same statue, given the modeling of its forehead looks.

\(^{47}\) This is not the place to venture into the archaeological and textual labyrinth of the fifth-century Telesteria (IG\(\text{1}\) 332; Plut. Vit. Per. 13; Strabo 11.1.12; Vitr. De arch. 7, pref. 16). See Noack (1927) for the editio princeps. See Mylonas (1961, 106–29) and Travlos (1988, 94–5) for revisions after Kourouniotis’ excavations of the 1920s and 1930s. See Shear (1982) for further adjustments and Cooper (1996, 375–77, 379) for a thoroughly heterodox view; the latest book on Eleusis (Lippolis 2006) overlooks most of this. Mattingly’s lower date of ca. 432/1 for IG\(\text{1}\) 332 (bibliography [the Koroibos inscription]) perhaps should prevail; if this is the family memorialized in the Koroibos-Kleidemos plot in the Kerameikos (IG\(\text{2}\) 6008), the Periklean Koroibos of IG\(\text{1}\) 32 and Plutarch (Vit. Per. 13 [recording his premature death]) would be Koroibos I’s grandfather. Did he die in the plague?

\(^{48}\) Stewart 2008, 404.
Persian reconstruction project(s) rather than of Persian violence. But this seems altogether less likely.

NM 60 is certainly late in the series of archaic Attic korai but perhaps not quite as late as is sometimes claimed, for the slightly down-turned corners of its mouth convey something of a false impression. Rather than placing it near the Euthydikos kore, they seem to be a mannerism of this atelier or even artist, for the lips of the unimpeachably archaic NM 59 (see fig. 8), attributed by Himmelmann-Wildschütz to the same hand, are similarly modeled. NM 60 (see fig. 9) also lacks the rectangular face and massive bone structure of the Euthydikos kore’s head or that of AkrM 688, with which it is sometimes compared. Suggestively, Philios and Himmelmann-Wildschütz both saw a strong resemblance between NM 60 and the similarly unsmiling AkrM 684, now usually dated ca. 490, which also lacks these other characteristically Severe Style features (fig. 10).

Finally, we turn to the famous Late Archaic Running Maiden, brilliantly identified by Edwards in 1986 as Hekate. Found in 1924 in a fill “at a spot some meters from the south gate of the enclosure” (i.e., of the Eleusinian sanctuary proper), it is usually dated to the mid or late 480s because of its pristine surface (suggesting destruction soon after it was carved) and its general stylistic similarity to the Nike of Kallimachos, AkrM 690, and other contemporary sculptures. Next in the sequence should come the severely burnt head, NM 60. Since the Running Maiden’s findspot unfortunately sheds no further light either on its date

---

50 Kourouniotis 1926, 113.
51 Eleusis 5235: Boardman 1991a, 155, fig. 202; see esp. Edwards 1986. On its findspot, see Kourouniotis 1926, 113; Nowack 1927, 219, figs. 87, 88; Kourouniotis and Travlos 1937, 51 (attributing it to the successor of the Sacred House); Mylonas 1961, 101–3, fig. 34; Preka-Alexandri 1995, 45–7, fig. 26; Neer 2002, 193–94; Papangelis 2002, 207–11 (unnumbered figs.); once again, Lippolis (2006, 179) overlooks the debate entirely. On its date, see Willemsen 1953–1954, 39 (contemporary with NM 60); Himmelmann-Wildschütz 1957, 9 (after
or original location (apparently a pediment, but the only available candidate, the small Late Archaic building erected above the nearby Sacred House, is problematic), nothing more can be said.

**Rhamnous, Brauron, and Prasiai**

According to Diodorus Siculus, after the Persians sailed through the Euripos in September 480, they ravaged the coastal sites of Euboia and Attica before rounding Cape Sounion and reaching Phaleron. We should therefore expect some evidence of Persian destruction at the two northern Attic coastal sites that have been extensively excavated, namely Rhamnous and Brauron.

Unfortunately, although at Rhamnous the Late Archaic poros Temple of Nemesis was destroyed probably in this campaign, no clear Perserschutt has been recognized at the site. When Staïs excavated it for the Greek Archaeological Society from 1890 to 1892, he not only dug the classical terracing down to bedrock in many places but also dumped most of the context pottery outside the site, where Petrakos recovered some of it in the 1980s, hopelessly mixed with that from the cemetery. As for sculpture, the site has yielded a fine Ripe Archaic seated goddess, a miniature head of a kouros, and a Severe Style peplophoros of ca. 460, none of them from any helpful archaeological context.

As for Brauron, according to Pausanias, the Persians sacked the sanctuary and took the cult image. Unfortunately, the lamentable state of publication of this key site renders all discussion moot.

Finally, Prasiai, near Porto Raphti, merits inclusion in this survey only because a base signed by the sculptor Pythis has been found there imbedded in an Early Medieval wall together with a Late Archaic head, possibly of Apollo. A cutting in the upper surface of the base shows that it carried a marble figure in a pose identical to that of the Salaminian Apollo at Delphi, the statue of Leagros in the Agora, the Kritios Boy, and the Kassel

---

**Fig. 10. Head of a kore from the Acropolis (AkrM 684) (courtesy the American School of Classical Studies at Athens; Alison Frantz Photographic Collection, AT 528).**

Apollo. Pythis also signed a statue on the Acropolis, a marble Athena in a kore pose. So whether or not the base from Prasiai postdates 480–479, like the Salaminian Apollo and its fellows, it shows that Pythis, just like Euenor, changed his style with the times, cheerfully adopting the new device of contrapposto to replace the now-outmoded striding kouros/kore pose.

**Sounion**

In 1897, Staïs turned his attention to Sounion. In 1906, he discovered a large, triangular pit 3 m to the east of the Poseidon temple that contained the remains of a Late Archaic temple and a Late Archaic pedimental frieze.

---
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mains of four kouroi—two colossal and two life-sized. Shortly thereafter, he found a second pit just outside the sanctuary wall to the east, containing a rich cache of small finds (metal, ceramic, and stone), including fragments of three archaic reliefs. Since the kouroi are badly calcinated in places, and none of these finds postdates the Archaic period, he and others have conjectured that they are votives vandalized by the Persians presumably in 479, since Herodotus seems to indicate that the sanctuary was still functioning after the Battle of Salamis in 480.60

In 1915, Staïs dug east of the classical Temple of Athena. In an artificial terrace between it and the temenos wall, measuring approximately 10 m east–west x 20 m north–south and up to 2.5 m deep, he found a mass of small finds, again all archaic, which he again identified as debris from Persian vandalism. They included a life-sized Late Archaic kouros (now lost), the inscribed thighs of two more kouroi, a Late Archaic kore head, hundreds of archaic terracotta protomes, and a series of terracotta plaques. The only published black-figure example among the latter (he mentions no red-figure) seems Ripe Archaic. Excavating this terrace down to bedrock, Staïs then came upon a 15 m deep rock-cut shaft filled with yet more offerings, chiefly coarse pottery and the ubiquitous archaic protomes (none of which he published).61

Right above this shaft he had also found a fine Severe Style relief of an athlete (fig. 11)—the only post-Archaic find from the sanctuary and one of only a handful from the entire Sounion promontory. Although he published it together with the finds from the shaft, he was at pains to note that it was not lying in the shaft itself or even in the 2.5 m thick terrace fill that covered it but almost on the surface, in topsoil. It therefore should be stricken from any account of the Perserschutt, especially since it is universally dated up to a decade after the beginning of the Severe Style (i.e., to ca. 470).62

**Phokis: Kalapodi**

According to Herodotus, after the Battle of Thermopylai, the Persians overran Phokis, sacking and burning every town they encountered, including Drymos, Charadra, Erochos, Tethronion, Amphikaia, Neon, Pedica, Tritea, Elatia, Hyampolis, Parapotamioi, and Abai.63 At Panopea, Xerxes divided the army into two. The main body, led by the king himself, headed for Athens, and a smaller force set off for Delphi, laying waste the towns of the Panopeans, Daulians, and Aiolidai en route. At Delphi, however, Apollo himself promptly sent them packing by arranging a well-timed earthquake and landslide.

The results of Xerxes’ depredations in Phokis were still visible to Pausanias almost 700 years later.64 Yet of all of these sites, to my knowledge only Kalapodi (now persuasively identified with ancient Abai) has produced clear evidence of a Perserschutt, but so far the destruction layer has yielded no sculptures at all. A temporary shrine built among the ruins, however, includes in its final phase (apparently datable ca. 450) an offering

---

60 Hdt. 8.121. Staïs 1917, 170, 189–97, figs. 6–10; Goette 2000, 20 (discussion), figs. 11–18, pls. 8, 9. For summaries and a bibliography of the excavations, see Travlos 1988, 404–29; Camp 2001, 305–9.

61 Staïs 1917, 201–8, figs. 13, 14, 17–21, pls. 8, 9; cf. Goette 2000, 32–5 (but the printer has switched the inscriptions on NM 3449 and NM 3450 and has erroneously placed NM 3450–59 in col. 3), pls. 32–8, figs. 61–71 (with captions claiming that most of the finds are from the rock-cut shaft). Staïs thought that the finds in the shaft were deposited gradually over a long period, but Goette identifies them as Perserschutt debris.

62 NM 3344: Staïs 1917, 189 (context), 204–6, fig. 11; Ridgway 1970, 49–50, fig. 70; Stewart 1990, 149, fig. 303; Boardman 1991b, 66, fig. 40; Rolley 1994, 357–58, fig. 374; Goette 2000, 41–2. Identifying it as a gravestone, Staïs went further, declaring it a recent theft from the cemetery on the hill above, destined for export from the cove below but hastily abandoned in the sanctuary. On the motif, see Goette 2000, 41–2 (endorsing Schäfer’s opinion that he was plucking a leaf from his crown as a dedication).

63 Hdt. 8.32–5.

64 Paus. 10.33.8, 10.35.2–6.
bench with a Late Archaic bronze kouros statuette and a Severe Style terracotta mask fixed to it using molten lead. So bronzes in the new style either were still unavailable in upland Phokis or were for some reason deemed unsuitable in this context, or the kouroi had some special significance of its own. Was it perhaps the lone survivor of the Persian sack?

Aigina

Although no ancient source mentions a Persian descent upon Aigina, the Persian fleet had encountered Aiginetan ships at Artemision and had even captured one, and its lookouts would have seen the island’s Sanctuary of Aphaia soon after rounding Sounion, for it lay just only south of their course to Phaleron. Moreover, as far as the Persians were concerned, any Greek state that had not given them earth and water was de facto their enemy. The burning of the early sixth-century Aphaia temple is usually dated well before this, though Persian violence occasionally has been suspected. Yet if the temple were simply the victim of an accidental fire, as most scholars believe, why was so much of its superstructure not merely burned but literally smashed to pieces, making it unusable for building material thereafter? Finally, the extra pediment blocks from its replacement, of an extra central acroterion, and (allegedly) of one or even two extra sets of pedimental sculptures often have been connected with a Persian attack and/or with changes made after 479 to commemorate their defeat. All this activity justifies including the sanctuary in this study.

In 1995, Eschbach challenged the theory of a complete replacement of one or both pediments. He showed that many of the supposed extra cornice fragments could fit perfectly well into the fabric of the temple and that others cannot belong to it at all. Some repairs indeed had been made, but quite minor ones; moreover, the extra “acroterion” had been intended from the start as a freestanding votive. And in a lecture given in 2006, Wünsche argued that the supposed extra pedimental figures either were freestanding votives also (reassigning some figures from west pediment II to this category) or actually belonged back in the gables. Since neither study has been published, it would be inappropriate to comment further, except to say that this now seems the right time to reach for Occam’s razor. For our purposes, a single building campaign and a conventional embellishment of only two pediments may be tentatively assumed.

As for the date of the second temple, this has been dropping gradually for some time. Though 19th-century scholars tended to place it after 480, 20th-century ones gradually pushed its date higher; but in her authoritative book on the Severe Style, published in 1970, Ridgway courageously bucked this trend. She proposed dropping west pediment II to ca. 490 and east pediment II to ca. 480–470, a position enthusiastically endorsed by the present author in 1990. The official publications of the sculpture by Ohly and of the architecture by Bankel ignored these proposals, arguing for ca. 510–500 for the supposed “earlier” pedimental groups, ca. 500 for west pediment II (fig. 12), ca. 495–490 for east pediment II (fig. 13), and ca. 500–480 for the architecture. Yet by the end of his life, Ohly had begun to lower his dates for the sculpture again.

Now, in the absence of inscriptions or literary testimonia to decide the issue, one might be forgiven for thinking that this chronological seesaw could go on forever. Fortunately, once again other evidence exists that might help tip the balance permanently: the pottery. In 1986, publishing the Attic black-figure from Ohly’s partial excavation of the temple terraces (his probes yielded no red-figure), Moore placed its latest pieces in the early fifth century, “around the time of the Persian Wars”; and in 1987, publishing the red figure and other pottery from elsewhere in the sanctuary and from its environs, Williams argued for a compromise date of ca. 500–490 for temple and sculptures together.

65 See Felsch (1980, 84–99, figs. 71–6) for the sack, the temporary shrine, and its offerings. For updates, see Niemeier (2005, 166–68; 2006, 166; 2007, 212), who argues that the newly discovered Roman temple identifies the site conclusively as Abai (after Paus. 10.35.1–4).

66 And its lookouts would have seen the island’s Sanctuary of Aphaia soon after rounding Sounion, for it lay just only south of their course to Phaleron. Moreover, as far as the Persians were concerned, any Greek state that had not given them earth and water was de facto their enemy. The burning of the early sixth-century Aphaia temple is usually dated well before this, though Persian violence occasionally has been suspected. Yet if the temple were simply the victim of an accidental fire, as most scholars believe, why was so much of its superstructure not merely burned but literally smashed to pieces, making it unusable for building material thereafter? Finally, the extra pediment blocks from its replacement, of an extra central acroterion, and (allegedly) of one or even two extra sets of pedimental sculptures often have been connected with a Persian attack and/or with changes made after 479 to commemorate their defeat. All this activity justifies including the sanctuary in this study.

67 On the conflagration, see Schwandner 1985, 1. For the competing theories as to its cause, see Williams 1987, 671 n. 15; Santi 2001, 198.

68 Eschbach (1995, ch. 12) kindly sent a letter to the author; (forthcoming); N. Eschbach and H. Goette, pers. comm. 2007 (reporting on a lecture by Wünsche). This reduction of the pediments to two revives a suggestion made by Delivorrias 1974, 180–81. On the sculpture, see Ridgway 1970, 13–17, figs. 1–12; Stewart 1990, 137–38, figs. 239–53; Boardman 1991a, 206–7, fig. 206; Rolley 1994, 202–5, figs. 186–90.


71 Ohly’s final position is summarized in Williams 1987, 671.

Fig. 12. Center of the west pediment of the Temple of Aphaia at Aigina. Munich, Glyptothek.

Fig. 13. Right side of the east pediment of the Temple of Aphaia at Aigina (H. Koppermann; © Munich Glyptothek, neg. Koppermann 411).
visiting this same pottery in 1988 and 1993, however, Gill put the latest pieces ca. 480 and the temple itself after the Persian Wars.\textsuperscript{73}

Though Gill’s conclusions also have been either dismissed or ignored,\textsuperscript{74} the sherds from the northern terrace, at least, clearly were deposited as the temple’s foundations were laid. Ohly’s published sections of the terrace (fig. 14) show that, in accordance with standard Greek practice, each foundation course was laid, dressed from end to end, backfilled, and then swept clean in preparation for the next course.\textsuperscript{75} The entire sequence then began all over again, and finally a leveling fill was dumped on top of these deposits to create a flat terrace around the temple. In section, the terrace looks like a layer cake, with alternating thick strata of earth laid against each course and thin ones of working chips that more or less reach the joints between the courses. This stratification proves beyond reasonable doubt that the pottery recovered from these levels was deposited as the temple foundations were being laid and thus predates them.

The latest black-figure pieces found in this northern deposit, all dated by Moore to the early fifth century, are:

1. Skyphos fragment: N.T.30; CHC Group.\textsuperscript{76}
2. Skyphos fragment: N.T.31.\textsuperscript{77}
3. Skyphos fragment: N.T.32.\textsuperscript{78}
4. Skyphos fragment: N.T.33; perhaps Pistias Class.\textsuperscript{79}
5. Skyphos fragment: N.T.34.\textsuperscript{80}
6. Skyphos fragment: N.T.35.\textsuperscript{81}
7. Skyphos fragment: N.T.36.\textsuperscript{82}
8. Skyphos fragment: N.T.37; Ure’s K2 Class of skyphoi; manner of the Haimon Painter.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{73}Gill 1988, 1993; cf. Johnston (1990, 60) on the storage jars from the terrace fills: “the assemblage as a whole is closely similar to that found in deposits persuasively associated with the Persian destruction in the Agora of Athens in 480/479.” For the stratigraphy of the terraces, see Ohly (1971, 509–18, figs. 4–6), arguing that both the northern and western terraces (in origin a construction ramp; see fig. 6) were contemporary with the temple’s foundations, but Moore (1986, 51 [unnumbered note]) cautions that “later building activity” has compromised the integrity of the western, southern, and eastern fills. Accordingly, only the pottery from the northern terrace (Ohly 1971, 522–26, figs. 9–15; Moore 1986, 60–8, figs. 1–12) is addressed here.

\textsuperscript{74}Boardman (1991a, 156–57, fig. 206 [caption]) dates the ensemble to ca. 490–480, with no mention of Gill’s conclusions. Rolley (1994, 204–5), explicitly rejecting them, prefers “500 or a little later” for west pediment II, “not after 480” for east pediment II; Burnett (2005, 29–44) footnotes them but still opts for Ohly’s dates, as does Walter-Karydi (2006, 67), finding Gill’s arguments “not convincing.”

\textsuperscript{75}Ohly 1971, 509–13, fig. 5. I should point out, however, that according to Eschbach (pers. comm. 2008), at least one German scholar involved in Ohly’s excavations believes the stratigraphy to have been considerably less clear-cut than Ohly’s sections show.

\textsuperscript{76}Moore 1986, cat. no. 37, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{77}Moore 1986, no. 35, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{78}Moore 1986, no. 36, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{79}Moore 1986, no. 37, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{80}Moore 1986, no. 38, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{81}Moore 1986, no. 39, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{82}Moore 1986, no. 40, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{83}Moore 1986, no. 41, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{84}Moore 1986, no. 42, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{85}Moore 1986, no. 43, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{86}Moore 1986, no. 44, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{87}Moore 1986, no. 45, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{88}Moore 1986, no. 46, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{89}Moore 1986, no. 47, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{90}Moore 1986, no. 48, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{91}Moore 1986, no. 49, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{92}Moore 1986, no. 50, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{93}Moore 1986, no. 51, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{94}Moore 1986, no. 52, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{95}Moore 1986, no. 53, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{96}Moore 1986, no. 54, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{97}Moore 1986, no. 55, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{98}Moore 1986, no. 56, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{99}Moore 1986, no. 57, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{100}Moore 1986, no. 58, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{101}Moore 1986, no. 59, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{102}Moore 1986, no. 60, fig. 11.
\textsuperscript{103}To see, e.g., Bankel 1993, 169; Büsing 1994, 123–27. On the treasury’s date, see supra n. 6.

\textsuperscript{85}Also discovered was a black-glazed stemless cup fragment.\textsuperscript{86}

Shear’s 1993 publication of the Agora Parschuttceramics strongly supports Gill’s somewhat lowered date for this entire assemblage. As Gill realized, the latest sherds from the terraces clearly postdate the pottery from the Marathon tumulus of ca. 490/89 (also conveniently catalogued by Shear), but now it is clear that the crucial northern group lacks the very latest pieces in the Agora deposits of 479/8: the Class of Athens 581 lekythoi, tubular lekythoi of Haimonian type (both are, however, represented among the unstratified sherds),\textsuperscript{87} and blob-palmette cup skyphoi. So a terminal date of ca. 485–480 for this northern group of sherds seems reasonable. The story does not end there, however. Whereas the Marathon pottery presumably was made for the grave, and the latest Agora material was destroyed perhaps very soon after manufacture, at least some of the Aiginetan vessels must have been used before they were discarded. We cannot, of course, know for how long they were used, but this could lower the date of their deposition to ca. 480 or even later.

The conclusion is inevitable—however unpalatable to some: the new Aphaia temple surely postdated the Persian Wars in its entirety. Its architecture in no way gainsays this, for no early fifth-century Doric buildings, apart from the Athenian treasury at Delphi (490–ca. 485) and the Temple of Zeus at Olympia (ca. 470–457), are datable exactly, and specialists now seem to agree that it belongs between them.\textsuperscript{88} As to how long it took to build, in the fourth century, the somewhat smaller Temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus, also hexastyle Doric...
and also built of limestone with marble pediments and acroteria, took a little more than four years. All in all, a time span of five to six years seems reasonable, and a date wholly within the 470s all but inescapable.

Concerning the pediments, now tentatively reduced to only two, Eschbach notes many similarities in detail between them, indicating that the two teams were checking out each other’s work and probably also talking to each other. As for the differences, he argues convincingly that they seem far more likely also to be attributable to two contemporary workshops, one conservative and one progressive, than to an unexplained hiatus of a decade or more between two separate commissions.

As to the choice of subjects, the east pediment shows the first sack of Troy by Herakles and (among others) Telamon, son of Aiakos; the west shows the city’s second sack by the Achaians under Agamemnon and (among others) Telamon’s son, Aias. Herodotus tells us that in 480, the Greeks formally invoked the aid of Aiakos, Telamon, and Aias before the Battle of Salamis, even fetching their images from Aigina and Salamis to accompany the fleet. In 479, Simonides formally linked the (second) Trojan War with the Persian one in his elegy on the Greeks who had fallen at Plataia; a few years later, Pindar further stressed the Aiginetans’ particular attachment to the Aiakids and the two Trojan Wars in an ode for the pankratiast Phylakidas of Aigina.

---

90 IG 4 1102. Aphaia’s temple measures 13.77 x 28.81 m on the stylobate, and its order is 7.25 m high; Asklepios’ temple measures 11.76 x 23.06 m, and its order was 6.77 m high.

91 Hdt. 8.64, 8.83 (reference kindly supplied by Keesling). Simonides: P. Oxy. 2327+3965; West 1991–1992, 2:114–22, frfs. 1–18; Boedeker and Sider 2001, 13–29 (revised text and translation). For the connection, see Stewart 1990, 138. On Pindar’s lines, see Hornblower 2004, 222–26 (reference kindly supplied by Kurke); Burnett 2005, 89–100 (dating the ode to 478 or shortly after); Walter-Karydi 2006, 68 (curiously claiming that this and his other victor odes written after 479 “fail to show any . . . connection” to the Persian Wars). If only we had the ode on the Aphaia temple itself, written for the Aiginetans (fr. 89b [Maehler]: Ἀφαίας ἱερόν, ἐς ἣν καὶ Πίνδαρος ᾆσμα Αἰγινήταις ἐποίησε), but sadly it has not survived.
Reassignment of the later Aphaia temple to the 470s both strengthens the force of these invocations and raises the possibility that it was financed by Persian loot (Aigina was awash in it)\(^9\) and that its predecessor was indeed torched by the Persians. A single burnt red-figure cup fragment has been associated with this event even when the Carthaginians took the city in 406, and its sculptural themes all point to a date for the fire and thus, indirectly, for the replacement of the archaic temple.

\(^9\)Pind. Isthm. 5.34–50.

\(^{95}\)Hdt. 8.93, 8.122, 9.80–1. On Aigina’s wealth during this period, see Santi (2001, 200–1), though he follows Zevi in opting for Sostratos of Aigina as the new temple’s patron (after Hdt. 4.152), his dedications in the Aphaia sanctuary and at Gravisca, and a series of Attic vases from Etruria monogrammed ΣΟ. Walter-Karydi (2006, 94–5) cautiously endorses this idea.

\(^{94}\)Attributed to Epiktetos, ca. 510–500; ARV\(^2\), 74, no. 51; Williams 1987, 630, cat. no. A1, fig. 1.

\(^{95}\)Diod. Sic. 11.25.3–4, 26.2–3. See Adornato (2006) for the most recent discussion.

\(^{97}\)On the Olympicieon’s date, see Bell (1980, 371) and Vonderstein (2000, 71–2), both citing the (extensive) earlier literature. I thank Barletta for these references, for the insight concerning the treaty temples, and for her kind help and advice concerning this section in general.

\(^{96}\)Diod. Sic. 13.82.1–4; Polysb. 9.27.9. On Cumae as the western Greek Salamis, see Pind. Pyth. 1.72–81 (470 B.C.E.).

\(^{98}\)Theron himself died in 472/1. Its eponymous Giants are now convincingly identified as Titans, con-
demned to eternal slavery by Zeus, and its pedimental decoration, a Gigantomachy in the east and a sack of Troy in the west, fits perfectly with the Greek antilibarian rhetoric of the 470s. Theron must have been thoroughly familiar with this rhetoric, since both Simonides and Pindar visited Akragas and wrote praise poetry for him; Pindar even celebrated his Olympic victory of 476 twice over.99

Of the Olympiaion’s sculptures, the Titans are transitional in style. Their bodies are ruined beyond redemption; their heads, however, look very Late Archaic or occasionally very early Severe in structure, coiffure, and features, but most of them still sport an archaic smile—somewhat strangely to our eyes, considering their unhappy occupation.100 Since these figures were constructed course by course as a part of the temple’s exterior wall, their heads can hardly predate the late 470s, again showing that the new style still had to take full root on the island at the time. This raises the suspicion that the dates commonly assigned to all western Greek Severe Style sculptures may be too high by a decade or more. As far as I am aware, no independent absolute chronology sustains these dates; they are based purely on style and thus on correlations with mainland Greece and with Sicilian coins.

The few pedimental fragments from this temple, almost all lost since their recovery in the early 19th century, were in stuccoed limestone relief; from the published line drawings, they look fully classical.101 Fragments of a fine marble warrior or warriors found nearby are authentically Severe in style; the head somewhat resembles the Kerameikos warrior (see fig. 3) and the torso recalls the satyr from the south slope of the Acropolis (see fig. 1). The material, relatively small scale, and finish render an attribution to the pediments most unlikely, and recently the figure has even been sundered in two.102 Probably, then, this was a freestanding group like those in the Aphaia sanctuary on Aigina, the archer from the Acropolis (AkrM 599),103 and the “Leonidas” from Sparta, as Knigge presciently suggested in 1965.104

At Himera, the so-called Temple of Victory has yielded a few fragments of limestone pedimental and metop sculpture, commonly dated ca. 470–460 but carved “in a tradition still linked with the archaic”—a judgment that is particularly true of the draped pieces; all the rest are disembodied limbs. As mentioned above, in the fourth century, the Temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus, also hexastyle Doric and also built of limestone, took a little more than four years to construct but was only a quarter the size of the one at Himera.105 So under the reasonable assumption that the latter was begun soon after the battle, a date ca. 470 for its pediments seems tenable. Himera’s continuing adherence to the archaic style at that time is also signaled by a tetradrachm probably celebrating the victory of its star athlete, Ergoteles, in the Olympic footrace of 472 or even 464. Pelops appears in his chariot on its obverse, above a palm branch and amphora in the exergue, and Himera’s eponymous nymph on its reverse, poised contrapposticly but dressed in full Ripe Archaic garb and with mannered archaic features.106

Finally, at Syracuse, whatever pedimental or metopa embellishment the Athenaion may have boasted is now lost. A Nike found nearby, however, is often thought to be one of its acroteria. A mobile version of the afore-mentioned Himeraean nymph, and fully Late Archaic in style, it presumably also belongs ca. 470.108

All this brings these Sicilian sculptures more into line with the generally accepted lower chronology for western Greek coinage following Kraay’s decoupling of the famous Syracusean silver decadrachms (Böhr-
ringer Series 12e) from the “Damarateion” supposedly minted from the Carthaginian indemnity after Himera and of the city’s “ketos” tetradrachms (Boehringer Series 13–18) from the Battle ofCumae in 474 (fig. 15). As numismatists have noticed, the style of the Arethusa heads on these Syracusan coins develops remarkably fast. Whereas the dekadrachms and the (contemporary?) early ketos tetradrachms (Boehringer Series 13) show scant evidence of the Severe Style, the next ketos issues (Boehringer Series 14, 15) and the related ones of Leonteni display it in all its glory. Opinion is divided, however, on the crucial question of the dekadrachm’s date, with some preferring the few years immediately before the fall of the tyranny in 466 and others the few years just after it; on these chronologies, the Severe Style ketos issues (Boehringer Series 14, 15; see fig. 15[439–45]) would thus belong to the early or late 460s, respectively. Whatever the final verdict, the Severe Style’s “official” Sicilian birthday evidently occurred up to a decade or so after its mainland Greek one, represented by the Tyrannicides of 477/6 (see fig. 2).

Conclusions

As in part 1 of this study, the totality of the evidence from the stratigraphy, architecture, sculpture, pottery, coins, and small finds from the remaining sites known or conjectured to have been destroyed by the Persians during 480–479 and reoccupied after their defeat, and from Sicily after the Carthaginian debacle of 480, supports the contention that the Severe Style began after this date and nowhere contradicts it. So should we therefore resurrect the theory, first hinted at by Winckelmann, that the style was somehow occasioned by these events?

Before proposing a revised chronology and examining its implications in detail, however, I must repeat a warning from part 1. In table 1, stylistic dates and sequences are approximate only. Especially in a period of experiment and rapid change, differences in style do not translate readily into differences in date, and pieces that look contemporaneous may not be so. Dates are thus handy metaphors for charting stylistic change, not its inevitable or even most likely consequence. Therefore, all dates suggested in this table should be taken cum grano salis. They either reflect consensus where it exists and does not conflict with the results of this study or personal preference, given the thrust of the present argument and its consequences for Greek sculptural chronology.

THE SEVERE STYLE: MOTIVATIONS AND MEANING

So what does it all mean? Is the classical revolution—the so-called Severe Style—purely a formal development, as some maintain? Did it emerge naturally and almost inevitably out of Late Archaic experiments with more lifelike anatomy and visually striking poses? Was it invented to restore monumentality, simplicity, dignity, and authority to an art supposedly compromised by Late Archaic excess? Does its revaluation of man in some way relate to the advent of democracy? Does it relate to the Persian and Carthaginian Wars? Or were other, different forces at work?

Let us revisit the facts.

109Diod. Sic. 11.26.3; Poll. Onom. 9.85. For the dekadrachms’ traditional date (480/79), see Boehringer 1929, 36–41; contra Kraay 1969, 19–42 (ca. 461, after Diod. Sic. 11.76.2); Kraay 1972 (suggesting ca. 466/5, when the tyranny fell); 1976, 211 (later 460s); Williams 1972 (attempted rebuttal); Arnold-Biucchi 1990, 47 (ca. 470); Jenkins 1990, 84–5 (ca. 465); Knoepfler 1992 (472/1); Mattingly 1992 (new arguments for ca. 465); Rutter 1997, 121–32 (ca. 470–466); 1998 (ca. 470–466); Manganaro 1999 (465–463); Heilmeyer 2002, 593–95, no. 448 (ca. 465) (Weisser). Rutter (1993) and Mafodda (2000) consider the Damarateion story a Hellenistic invention; Green (2006, 81 n. 106) is dubious. As Knoepfler (1992, 12–27) pointed out, Series 3–5 (dated by Boehringer [1929] to ca. 510–485 and by Arnold-Biucchi [1990] to ca. 490–485) should actually be dated to ca. 479–474 by the shift from kappa (ϙ) to kappa (ℇ), which occurs also on Syracuse dedications after the victories at Himera and Cumae. Yet as Arnold-Biucchi and Weiss (2007, 66) observe, this new chronology’s repercussions may be limited, for “the ‘massive’ coinage of [Boehringer] Group III, Series 6–12, was struck in parallel issues, and the dates of the Series need not necessarily be calculated consecutively and lowered one after the other.” I thank Arnold-Biucchi (pers. comm. 2008) for some of these references and for her opinion on the dekadrachm’s date, which remains unchanged from 1990.

110Stressed by Arnold-Biucchi 1990, 34.

111For Leontinoi, see, e.g., Kraay 1969, 39, pl. 6.1–3; Arnold-Biucchi 1990, 25, pl. 4, cat. nos. 88–90; Jenkins 1990, figs. 233, 234; Rutter 1997, 130, figs. 129, 130; 1998, 313–14, pl. 67.10–12; Heilmeyer 2002, 596, no. 451 (Weisser).

112For what it is worth, the foregoing proposal fits the scientific definition of a theory for the following reasons: (1) it accords with all known facts and is contradicted by none; (2) it is parsimonious, offering a unified explanation for the phenomena in question; (3) it is predictive, positing that new data will continue to support and be explained by it; (4) it is testable and potentially falsifiable by such new discoveries; (5) it is bold, entailing a certain degree of risk (but fortunately, no longer to my career); and (6) it is (I hope) fertile, raising new questions in its turn.

Fig. 15. Silver coins of Syracuse: 374–78, selected dekadrachms from Boehringer Series 12c; 409–14, selected tetradrachms from Boehringer Series 13a; 434–38, selected tetradrachms from Boehringer Series 13b; 439–45, selected tetradrachms from Boehringer Series 14, 15 (after Boehringer 1929, pls. 14, 16).
The Severe Style appears suddenly and in revealing circumstances. If any development in ancient Greek art may be described by the cliché “sprung fully armed from the head of Zeus,” it is this one. In the years after Marathon (490), Salamis (480), Himera (480), and Plataia (479), seven significant concentrations of sculpture and/or pottery can be securely dated, five of them Athenian: (1) the Marathon tumulus itself, which contained the 192 Athenian dead and the pots buried with them; (2) the Athenian treasury at Delphi; (3) the debris from the Persian sack of Athens during 480–479, discarded in disused wells and pits in the Athenian Agora; (4) the Themistoklean city wall of 478, which contains the carved tombstones and other marbles smashed by the Persians in 480 and 479; (5) the fill dumped behind the central section of the

---

\[114\] Contra, e.g., Strocka 2002, 120.

\[115\] On this tumulus and the persistent attempts to disqualify it as the Athenian polyandrion, see Goette and Weber 2004, 78–83.
north wall of the Acropolis, rebuilt in the 470s, which contained korai and other offerings vandalized by the invaders; (6) the northern terrace fill of the second Temple of Aphaia on Aigina, and by extension the temple’s architectural fabric and sculptures; and (7) the Temple of Victory at Himera.

First, as we have seen, no hint of the new style appears either in the first five of these or in any other deposits in Attica that tentatively seem attributable to Persian violence. Yet the Tyrannicides (see fig. 2) prove that it had indeed emerged, almost fully formed, by 476. The Charioteer of Delphi does not contradict this scenario, since Adornato has now dissociated it convincingly from the base block with Polyzalos’ inscribed victory dedication, which replaced an erased one honoring a “Lord of Gela,” perhaps Hieron, in 482 or 478. Not only is it too big for the Polyzalos base and the fragmentary chariot and team found near it but also, as he has shown, stylistically it belongs in the 460s with the Olympia sculptures. In support of all this, the evidence from Aigina dates the transition from archaic to classical on that island at ca. 475; and in Sicily, the temple at Himera and its companions, together with the Syracusan coinage, push the introduction of the new style down to ca. 470 at the earliest.

Second, the Severe Style is confined to the representational arts. It is a mode of figuration. Fifth-century Greek architecture and literature experienced no such revolution. The Doric and Ionic orders develop serenely and smoothly across the archaic/classical divide, and there is nothing austere or simple about the poetry of Simonides, Pindar, and Aeschylus. Indeed, sometimes their works are so complex that, although they wrote for oral performance, one is tempted to wonder how many of their listeners understood them.

Third, the Severe Style is Panhellenic. Once it takes root, it is remarkably uniform across the Greek world from Athens to Sicily. Although the metopes from Temple E at Selinus, for example, are unmistakably west Greek in some respects, for the most part they closely parallel work on the Greek mainland, and the Agrigento warrior(s) and Motya Charioteer look more “metropolitan” still. Since tyrants and oligarchs ruled at least some of these centers, a strong connection between the style and Athenian democracy seems problematic at best—and increasingly dubious on chronological grounds also.

As noted in part 1 of this study, almost 40 years ago Ridgway catalogued the most prominent traits of the style. To rework her description from another perspective, it characterizes its (Greek and Olympian) subjects, irrespective of age, gender, and status, as paragons of simplicity, strength, vigor, rationality, self-discipline, and intelligent thought. It conveys this by clear-cut proportions and the novel, integrating, disciplined, and lifelike compositional device of contrapposto; by dynamic poses and robust modeling; by simple, unornamented clothing; and by sober facial expressions, either focused on some target or averted from the viewer.

Clear-cut proportions structure the human body in a lucid, logical way; contrapposto rationalizes and disciplines the flux of human movement; simple clothing bespeaks personal restraint and a commitment to egalitarianism; forceful postures, modeling, and gazes radiate health, vigor, and determination; and an averted head and sober expression suggest, quite simply, that the subject has stopped to think. Together, these cues create a strong sense of physical presence, of a rational, disciplined, goal-directed subject acting in the here and now. They are essential to holding our attention, for otherwise the impassive faces now in vogue tend to look blank and zombie-like. (The momentary facial expressions noted by Ridgway are rare, and occur mostly in battle scenes and on centaurs and other bestial foes.) In contrast to archaic figures, which seldom invite us to interact with them, Severe Style ones regularly request or even demand our attention. They

110 Adornato 2007 (arguing that Polyzalos’ dedication does not conform to the formulas for a Pythian victory and that the group on the base was life-sized, in contrast to the somewhat over-life-sized charioteer). This observation can be verified easily in the Delphi Museum, where the supposedly 1:1 graphic reconstruction of the monument displayed immediately behind the chariot and horse fragments slyly reduces the charioteer’s size by 25% or so in order to fit him in. Unfortunately, though, Adornato overlooks Maehler (2002), who anticipates his conjectures as to the identity of the Polyzalos monument’s first dedicant and its date.

111 A point justly stressed by Ridgway 1970, 7, 56–70.


113 Proposed, e.g., in Buitron-Oliver 1992, 9. But if Athenian democracy were indeed the catalyst, how does one explain the 30-year lag and Panhellenic response?

114 Ridgway 1970, 8–11.

115 On the significance of the invention of contrapposto, see esp. Borbein 1989. On the early evidence for it, see Stewart 2008 n. 55—though as noted there, its invention need not have been contemporary with the beginning of the Severe Style itself: the two are logically independent. Precedents occur in both the relief sculpture and painting (Boardman 1975, figs. 24.3, 129.1, 135.3, 140, 151) of the previous generation, and one can easily imagine a late kouros such as Aristodikos (Fuchs 1969, fig. 22; Ridgway 1970, fig. 40; Stewart 1990, fig. 218; Boardman 1991a, fig. 145; Rolley 1994, fig. 153) converted into a contrapposto pose. The impression that contrapposto and the lowered head give of pondered thought, however, would come only with the elimination of the archaic smile.
intimidatingly invade our space (see fig. 2), implacably hunt down our enemies (see figs. 2, 13), engagingly solicit our sympathy (see fig. 13), or boldly ask us to psychologize them (see figs. 4, 11).

Leaving the archaic style far behind, these innovations changed the face of Western art forever. And because images help shape the ways in which people see, after the 470s, the world looked different and would never look the same again. What could have caused this revolution?

It is well known that a trend toward simplicity, restraint, even austerity emerges in two key areas of Greek material culture—dress and mortuary practices—during the period in question. Concerning the former, Thucydides tells us:

> Ἐν τοῖς πρώτοι δὲ Ἀθηναίοι τὸν τε σίδηρον κατέθεντο καὶ ἀνειμένῃ τῇ διαίτῃ ἐς τὸ τρυφερώτατον μετέστησαν. καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι αὐτοὺς τῶν εὐδαιμόνων διὰ τὸ ἀβροδίαιτον ὑπὸ πολὺς χρόνος ἐπέζητο γεγονός τε λινοῦς ἐπεσάντω Φωκίδων καὶ χρυσῶν τεττίγων ἐνέρσει κρυφτὸν ἀναδομήνων τῶν ἐν τῇ κυριαρχίᾳ τριγόνων· αὐτοὶ καὶ Ἰώνων τοὺς πρεσβύτερους κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενὲς ἐπὶ πολὺ αὕτη ἡ σκευὴ κατέσχεν. μετρίᾳ δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς τὸν γύνη τρόπον πρῶτοι Δακεδαιμονίων ἔχονταν καὶ εἰς τὰ ἄλλα πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς οἱ τὰ μείζονα κεκτημένοι ἰοστάσιας κατέστησαν.

The Athenians were the first to give up the habit of carrying weapons and to adopt a way of living that was more relaxed and more luxurious. In fact the elder men of rich families who had these luxurious tastes only recently gave up wearing linen undergarments and tying their hair behind their heads in a knot fastened with a clasp of golden grasshoppers. The same fashions spread to the Spartans who first began to dress simply and in accordance with our modern taste, with the rich leading a life that was as much as possible like the lives of ordinary people.

Although the historian clearly is talking about men’s clothing, this passage is often interpreted more liberally and connected with the (apparently Panhellenic) fifth-century shift to the simple himation for men and the belted, overfolded peplos for women (fig. 16, right-hand couple). Unfortunately, no other extant source comments on these developments, and cloth does not survive in the relatively damp Greek climate, but the evidence of sculpture and vase painting nevertheless allows something to be said.

Concerning Sparta, Lakonian art suggests two possible interpretations of Thucydides’ remarks. In seventh- and sixth-century Lakonian painting and sculpture, both sexes are almost always simply dressed. Men wear short, belted chitoniskoi outdoors and a simple himation inside—at symposia at least; women wear long, belted chitons and sometimes a shawl-like himation too. In the second half of the sixth century, fancier clothing occasionally makes an appearance: elaborate cloaks on one or two men and the Ionic chiton and himation combination on a few of the women. Although Lakonian vase painting peters out ca. 530 and Lakonian sculpture dwindles almost to nothing after 500, the handful of surviving fifth-century grave and votive reliefs show that the classical men’s himation and women’s belted, overfolded peplos have appeared at least by ca. 460 and ca. 430, respectively. So was Thucydides referring to a long-standing Spartan preference for simple clothing, or (perhaps more likely, given his preamble about Athenian and Ionian fashion trends) to the Spartans’ repudiation of a—perhaps quite limited—flirtation with more elaborate garb in the later sixth century?

Athenian art is incomparably richer and more informative. The long chiton and himation combination is standard for men until ca. 510, when a few of them begin to wear the himation alone, often at symposia or in the gymnasium; ca. 500, youths similarly attired watch a cat-and-dog fight on the Athens Ballplayer Base. Some might wish to hold the reforms of Kleisthenes (enacted in 508/7) responsible, but the chronology is very tight, and the reforms themselves cannot have come completely out of the blue: a desire for greater political equity must have been growing quietly for a while. In any case, during the next 40 years, the new, simpler fashion gradually nudges out the old, until by ca. 470 the latter has all but disappeared.

122 Thuc. 1.6.3–4.
124 Though Herodotus (5.87.3–5.88.1) purports to give an explanation for the preceding fashion shift (in Athens) from “Dorian” to “Ionian.”
125 Numerous studies have shown that vase paintings reproduce Greek armor quite accurately, so it seems permissible to also use them, with due caution, as an indicator of dress fashions.

126 See Pipili 1987, figs. 103–5 (symposiasts in himatia); Stubbie 1996, figs. 138, 139 (classical gravestones with males in himation alone); esp. Fortsch 2001 (males in belted chitoniskoi, women in long belted chitons), figs. 108 (man in a fancy cloak), 154, 155, 217 (women in Ionic dress); figs. 126–29, 212, 340 (males in himation alone), 216 (woman in a Doric peplos).
127 Stewart 1990, fig. 140; Boardman 1991a, fig. 242.
Women’s clothing was far slower to change, as the vases and the Acropolis korai demonstrate. The Doric peplos does not even appear in sculpture and vases until the late 470s (with Angelitos’ Athena), though by then it must have been familiar enough in Athens for Aeschylus to contrast it with Persian dress in his Persae (182–183), first performed in 472. Soon, however, the peplos is everywhere (see fig. 16, far right), although the Ionic chiton and himation combination never completely vanishes, presumably in part because of its status as an elite costume suitable for mythological scenes and for venerable figures such as priestesses.

These fashions, with their powerful message of social and financial equality (isonomia and homoiotês) within the citizen body, and thus of broad social and political consensus (homonioia) within the polis, soon spread to other parts of the Greek world.

As to mortuary practices, Morris has shown that elaborate tombs all but vanish and grave goods shrink precipitately in quantity and quality throughout Greece during this very period; elaborate jewelry, for example, disappears almost entirely. In Athens and Attica, funerary kouroi and korai and fancy carved gravestones famously vanish shortly before the end of the Archaic

129 Stewart 2008, cat. no. 1, fig. 5.
131 See, e.g., the Peloponnesian “caryatid” mirrors, the Olympia sculptures, Aksor of Naxos’ stele from Orchomenos, the “Adoration of the Flower” relief from Pharsalos, the “Archilochos” relief and Nike from Paros, the stele from Syme on Rhodes, the woman from Heroon G at Xanthos, the himation-clad youth from Syracuse, and the Lokrian peplophos and terracotta plaques (Fuchs 1969, figs. 31, 32, 184–91, 556, 557, 560–62; Ridgway 1970, figs. 56, 58–60, 68, 110, 129, 130; Stewart 1990, figs. 235, 254, 264–83; Boardman 1991a, figs. 244, 245; 1991b, figs. 15, 16, 20–3, 27, 54; Rolley 1994, figs. 232, 235, 301, 366–69, 378, 381, 388–403, 417). On the political and social implications of this sartorial revolution, see Geddes 1987, 325–30.
period, and this time a connection with the new democracy is hard to resist. An official curb on funerary ostentation remains the most likely culprit, and as noted above, a century of scholarship has consistently pointed to the so-called post aliquanto law, mentioned by Cicero and passed perhaps in the (early?) 480s.

Always suspicious of elite self-assertion, which elevates the individual and his household above the collective and could signal an aspiring tyrant, the demos targets a particular elitist practice and stages a coup, nationalizing and democratizing it—an increasingly familiar pattern. Yet as we have seen, Athens was by no means alone in this respect. Throughout mainland Greece, restraint, austerity, and egalitarianism were in the air, suggesting that the Athenian democratic revolution itself may have been as much a symptom as a cause, and the western Greeks soon followed suit. The Syracusans, for example, passed a similar funerary law some years before 478, though widespread democracy there and in Sicily as a whole had to wait until the later 460s. Simultaneously, as it happens, from ca. 510, the arts of the Greek mainland—at Athens in particular—take a strongly naturalistic turn, particularly in the rendering of the human figure. In vase painting, this manifest itself in the twisting poses, bold foreshortenings, and so-called new anatomy of the Pioneer Group, particularly Euphronios, Euthymides (fig. 17), and Phintias. Sculptors quickly seize upon these innovations, as evidenced by the Ballplayer Base (fig. 18), the lunging and collapsing giants from the Old Temple of Athena on the Acropolis, and the virtuoso series of bronze athlete statuettes dedicated there (fig. 19).

Drapery, however, becomes ever more elaborate, even when only the simple himation is worn. In sculpture, the results are best exemplified in Kallimachos’ Nike, dedicated soon after Marathon, and the metopes of the Athenian treasury at Delphi, now conclusively dated to the 480s as well. Some of the figures on these metopes are strikingly naturalistic, while others opt for a highly mannered archaism that in hindsight seems to proclaim that the style has reached a dead end.

Yet although these broadly egalitarian and anti-elitist/anti-aristocratic trends together with the new naturalism clearly stand out as necessary preconditions for the emergence of the Severe Style, by the same token they seem insufficient to explain its sudden appearance at Athens, fully formed, in the early 470s. Although the style both answers the growing desire for restraint and egalitarianism on the one hand and exploits the new interest in naturalism on the other, these two trends do not constitute a style as such—in this case, the coherent, consistent, polythetic set of constantly recurring stylistic traits authoritatively defined by Ridgway. One should not forget that for all the Severe Style’s debt to these trends, it represents a radical change in direction from them. Whereas the previous generation had explored the human body in an increasingly detailed way, and apparently saw no contradiction in combining this with increasing sartorial elaboration, Severe Style artists resolutely opted for selection and simplification, forcefully emphasizing some features and ruthlessly eliminating others.

Given the chronology of the Severe Style and its eventual Panhellenic popularity, it can hardly be coincidence that during 480–479, the battles at Thermopylae, Salamis, Plateia, MykaIe, and Himera had established Greek physical superiority over the invading barbarians as a fact, and that (as Pindar recognized) in 474 the Battle of Cumae—the western Greek Salamis—put the Greek colonies there fully on a par with the mainland. Moreover, in Attica especially, Persian violence had created a sculptural and pictorial tabula rasa that offered what Ridgway has aptly called a “free field for assertion.” Did some radicals and anti-elitists perhaps greet it with a sigh of relief? Last but definitely not least, simplicity, rationality, pondered thought, and self-discipline—summed up in the keyword sophrosyne—were precisely the qualities that (allegedly) the defeated barbarian hordes and their capriciously des-

---


136 Diod. Sic. 11.38.2, 11.68.5–6, 11.72.1. Greek dedication to restraint had its limits, however, especially in the athletic sphere, as Smith (2007) and Thomas (2007) point out.


138 Nike (AkrM 690): for full bibliography, see Stewart 2008 n. 21; see also Fuchs 1969, figs. 182, 183; Stewart 1990, fig. 210; Boardman 1991a, fig. 167; Rolly 1994, fig. 169. On the treasury’s date, see supra n. 6.

139 See Davis 1990, 19: “‘Style’ is a description of a polythetic set of similar but varying attributes in a group of artifacts . . . [where] (1) each artifact possesses a (large) number of the attributes of the group; (2) each attribute may be found in a (large) number of the artifacts in the group; and (3) no single attribute is found in every artifact in the group”; cf. Stewart 2004, 62–4. For Ridgway’s definition of the Severe Style, see Stewart 2008, 377–78.

140 Pind. Pyth. 1.72–81 (470 B.C.E.).

potic monarchs largely or completely lacked and the victorious, egalitarian-minded Greeks possessed to an extraordinary degree.\footnote{On \textit{soφh\ion}, see esp. North 1966; Rademaker 2005; on Xerxes' utter lack of it, see, e.g., Aesch. \textit{Pers}. 753–58; Hdt. 7.39.1. On Greece as the mean between two extreme barbarian states—a hardscrabble life on the margins and decadent Eastern hyper-civilization—see Hdt. 9.122; Hippoc. \textit{Ar}. 12–24.}


\begin{quote}
Ταῦτα δὴ λιποῦσ’ ἱκάνω χρυσεοστόλμους δόμους καὶ τὸ Δαρείου τε κἀμὸν κοινὸν εὐνατήριον. καὶ μὲ καρδιὰν ἀμύσσει φροντίς· ἐς δ’ ὑμᾶς ἐρῶ μὴ μέγας πλοῦτος κονίσας οὖδας ἀντρέψῃ ποδὶ ὧλβον, ῥὰ Δαρεῖος ἦρεν θεῶν ἄνευ τινος. ταῦτα μοι διπλῆ μέριμνα’ φραστός ἐστιν ἐν φρεσίν, μήτε χρημάτων ἀνάνδρων πλῆθος ἐν τιμῇ σέβειν μήτ’ ἀχρημάτοισι λάμπειν φῶς, ὅσον σθένος πάρα. ἔστι γὰρ πλοῦτός γ’ ἀμεμφής, ἀμφὶ δ’ ὀφθαλμῷ φόβος. ὅμμα γὰρ δόμων νομίζω δεσπότου παρουσίαν.
\end{quote}

I have left the golden-furnished chamber that I shared with King Darius, to tell you my own dread, that our vast wealth may in its rash course overturn the fair peace that Darius built up with Heaven’s help. Two thoughts born of this fear fill my uneasy mind, yet shrink from words: first, that a world of wealth is trash. If men are wanting; next, that men who have no wealth. Never find Fortune smiling as their strength deserves. We have wealth aplenty, but fear surrounds my eyes.

And later:\footnote{Aesch. \textit{Pers}. 753–58 (Vellacott 1961, 127).}

\begin{quote}
‘Ελλάδα.\\
Δ’ ὑπὸ τοι θυρεύς οὐκ ἀνασκεται ἕξοδ’ ὕπο τὸν μέγαν τέκνοις πλοῦτον ἐκτῆσω σὺν αἰχμῇ, τὸν δ’ ἀνανδρίας ὑπὸ ἕναν αἰχμῆς, πατρῷον δ’ ὄλβον οὐδὲν αὐξάνειν. τοιάδ’ ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ἁμαρτούν πολλής κλών κακῶν τίνης’ ἐμβυθάνεσθαι κέλευθον καὶ μέγαν τεκνὸν γένε\textit{t}.’ ἐφ’ Ἔλλαδα.
\end{quote}

Fig. 17. Attic red-figure amphora signed by Euthymides. Munich, Antikensammlung, inv. no. 2307 (Furtwängler 1904, pl. 14).
Xerxes the rash learned folly in fools’ company. They said that you, his father, with the sword had won
Gold to enrich your children; while he, like a coward, Gaining no increase played the warrior at home.
He planned this march on Hellas, this vast armament, Swayed by the ceaseless slanders of such evil men.

Xerxes and his Persians, in other words, fatally lacked sophrosyne, the wisdom that begets a measured self-discipline, and Zeus punished them accordingly. Darius’ ghost foretells the inevitable outcome: 144

Zeus τοι τολμητης των υπερκομπων άγαν φορηματων έπεστιν, ευθυνους βαρος, προς ταυτι’ έκεινων, σωφρονειν κεχρημακων πινυσκετ’ ευλόγοισι νουθετήμασιν, λήξει θεοβλαβόνθ’ υπερκομπο θράσει.

On the Plataian plain the Dorian spear shall pour Blood in unmeasured sacrifice; dead heaped on dead Shall bear dumb witness to three generations hence That man is mortal, and must learn to curb his pride.

For pride will blossom; soon its ripening kernel is Infatuation and its bitter harvest, tears.
Behold their folly and its recompense, and keep Athens and Hellas in remembrance. Let no man Scorning the fortune that he has, in greed for more, Pour out his wealth in utter waste. Zeus, enthroned on high, Sternly chastises arrogant and boastful men. As for my son, since Heaven has warned him to be wise,
Instruct him with sound reason, and admonish him To cease affronting God with proud and rash attempts.

In Hall’s oft-quoted words, the Persae represents “the first unmistakable file in the archive of Orientalism, the discourse by which the European imagination has dominated Asia ever since by conceptualizing its inhabitants as defeated, luxurious, emotional, cruel, and always as dangerous.” Pelling elaborates: “

---

Fig. 18. Ballplayers, side B of a kouros base (the Ballplayer Base), from the Themistoklean wall in the Kerameikos (NM 3476) (G. Welter; © DAI Athens, neg. NM 2159).

Persians are what the Greeks are not, and particularly what the Athenians are not, tyrannical and tyrannized, populous, wealthy, materialistic, daintily luxurious, cruel, land-based, hierarchical, insensitive to freedom. Emphatically rejecting them and all they stood for as irremediably decadent, the Severe Style targeted them and their insensate *hybris* as much as it did the excesses of the Greek homegrown elites.

In short, they are a slave society, eternally groveling in fear before a puerile, capricious, and horrendously cruel tyrant who perforce they must regard as a god. Emphatically rejecting them and all they stood for as irremediably decadent, the Severe Style targeted them and their insensate *hybris* as much as it did the excesses of the Greek homegrown elites.

In short, it is arguable that the Persian and Carthaginian invasions of 480 were a tipping point: an earthshaking event after which everything looks utterly different. But to speculate further—since such a tight chronology points to a specific inventor—who first translated these notions into bronze, marble, clay, or paint?

The obvious candidates are Kritios and Nesiotes. Their Tyrannicides (see fig. 2), dedicated in 477/6, are not only the earliest dated monuments in the new style but also themselves revolutionary. As far as we can tell—for their relation to Antenor’s earlier Tyrannicides group remains clouded—they were the first purely secular commemorative statues in Greece. Did this new freedom from both precedent (after the Persian theft of their archaic predecessors) and the constraints of genre help to spur innovation? For if the copies are to be trusted, they perfectly exemplified all the Severe Style traits listed above and did so in the persons of two Athenian warriors and (alleged) crusaders against tyranny and excess, both internal and external.

Yet—and this is often overlooked in descriptions—they still retain faint traces of an archaic smile. It is evident not only in some of the copies but also in the plaster cast of the head of the Aristogeiton from Baiae (fig. 20), surely a faithful 1:1 reproduction of the lost original, and shows that even in this inaugurative work, one of the old mannerisms still lingered.

In fact, a careful comparison between the fragments from Baiae and Severe Style originals such as the Kritios Boy (which also smiles slightly; see fig. 4), Blond Boy, and Charioteer of Delphi has led at least one scholar to decide that the two assassins are “transitional” in style and thus should copy Antenor’s earlier group. Although the lower chronology advanced here would invalidate the latter conclusion, the analysis itself is suggestive and supports the Tyrannicides’ claim to be truly on the cutting edge stylistically.

Of course, other people surely were involved in the commission, too. At the very least, a committee ap-

---

145 Hall 1989, 99; Pelling 1997, 13 (summarizing Hall 1989, 56–100); see also Hall 2006, 184–224 (update).

146 See, e.g., Aesch. *Pers.* 73, 80, 157, 369–71, 643, 693–702, 711; Hdt. 7.27–8, 7.38–9, 8.99; see esp. Georges 1994, 98–101 n. 73 (citing many more examples of Persian cruelty).

147 This is not to say, of course, that the style’s signal advantages on other fronts were not swiftly perceived and exploited (see, e.g., Hallett 1986). Moreover, the archaic style did not disappear immediately—far from it (see, e.g., Ridgway 1993, 458–59 [on “lingering archaic”]; Eschbach 1995; [forthcoming]). On the rapid increase in anti-elitist sentiment in Athens from the introduction of ostracism in 488/7, see supra n. 25.

148 It is not clear what Antenor’s group looked like or even where it stood originally. For the evidence, such as it is, see, e.g., Paus. 1.8.5; Plin. *HN* 34.16–17; Brunnsäker 1971, 39–45.

149 For the copies, see Brunnsäker 1971. For the cast, see Landwehr 1985, 27–34, 45 (the smile), no. 1, pls. 4–7. For a selection of them, including the cast, see Boardman 1991b, figs. 3–9. Hölscher (1973, 85–9) offers the classic statement of their secular character. Keseling (2003, 172–75) succinctly discusses the group’s innovations; see also Stewart (1997, 70–5) for its homoerotic agenda.

pointed by the demos or boule must have overseen it; and maybe a formal competition was held as well. Yet in the end, it must have been the two sculptors who proposed—committees of laymen do not invent styles—and the Athenians who disposed. Without them, Athenian art might have taken quite another path, anticipating the achievements of Hellenistic naturalism, even realism, two centuries avant la lettre. Moreover, the two sculptors may well have been innovators in other genres too. As Keesling has pointed out, their lost bronze Athena on the Acropolis was posed like Euenor’s marble Athena for Angelitos, and it might have been the latter’s source of inspiration. In any case, it is clear that the style’s wider utility was swiftly perceived and eagerly exploited. The revolution quickly spread to nearby Aigina, proud recipient of the prize for valor at Salamis. There, the transition can be dated confidently to ca. 475, and presumably it soon reached the major Peloponnesian and Cycladic centers also—though here, precise chronologies are lacking. Remoter communities took a little longer to catch on. In Sicily, for example, where the Syracusans had humbled the Carthaginians at Himera (480) and the Etruscans at Cumae (474) before they could do any real damage, the transition apparently occurred around or shortly after 470. It is tempting to wonder whether events such as the restaging of Aeschylus’ Persae by Hieron of Syracuse (d. 466/5)—apparently to enormous acclaim—and (if the lower chronology for the transition holds) the cities’ almost simultaneous attainment of freedom from tyranny in the mid 460s, may have provided some additional stimulus. In the ancient world, artistic innovation is signaled in three main ways: the artist is described as a discoverer of a new technique or image type (as its πρῶτος εὑρετής or primus inventor); as a stylistic paradigm; and/or as the founder of a school. Kritios satisfies two of these three categories and is the only artist of the period ca. 550–450 to do so. Lucian (Rhetorum Praeceptor 9) calls his style and that of Nesiotes and the shadowy Hegias typical of “men of old, compact, sinewy, hard, and precisely divided into parts by lines”; and Pliny and Pausanias give him a school that allegedly lasted into the fourth century:

Fig. 20. Roman plaster cast of the head of Aristogeiton (Baiae 174.479) (G. Hellner; © DAI Rome, neg. 1978.1857).

Praeterea sunt aequalitate celebrati artifices, sed nullis operum suorum praecipui; Ariston . . . Diodorus Critiae discipulus . . . Scymnus Critiae discipulus.

Also artists of equal merit but of no great excellence in any of their works are: Ariston . . . Diodorus the pupil of Critias . . . Scymnus the pupil of Critias. The statue of Hippos of Elis, who won the boys’ boxing match, was made by Damokritos of Sikyon, of the school of the Attic Critias, being removed from him by four generations of teachers. For Critias himself taught Ptolichos of Korkyra, Amphion was the pupil of Ptolichos, and taught Pison of Kalaureia, who was the teacher of Damokritos. 
Euenor and Pythis, not mentioned by either of these authors or indeed by any ancient literary source at all, probably should join this list. Before making his little marble Athena for Angelitos, Euenor made two korai whose bases survive and whose inscriptions look earlier than the Athena’s. Pythis made an Athena in a kore pose and a statue, presumably male, using the new contrapposto. Both of them thus emerge as true denizens of the transition from archaic to classical, companions or (more probably) immediate followers of its pioneers, Kritios and Nesiotes.

In archaeology, it is now distinctly unfashionable to ascribe radical innovation to any single individual, still less to any single work or historical event. (Indeed, I have spent much of my career attempting to sever or at least to question facile connections between art and circumstance.) Yet not only are the persistent reports of the “death of the artist” greatly exaggerated but also in this case the facts seem to speak for themselves. When viewed dispassionately, they neatly turn the debate on its head, for the chronology advanced here constitutes a strong argument in favor of the individual artist as an innovating force in fifth-century Greece, in this key case at least.

“Compact, sinewy, hard, and precisely partitioned by lines,” as Lucian put it (Rhetorum Praeceptor 9), Kritios’ and Nesiotes’ two assassins simultaneously celebrated this new, militaristic, disciplined, almost puritanical Athenian civic ideal; consigned the kouroi and its world to history, and formally inaugurated the Severe Style—the first phase of the classical. But they did not. In the (admittedly fleeting and superficial) spirit of Panhellenism that gripped the mainland after Salamis and Plataea, they inspired influential men in other cities to adopt this ideal and make it their own, for the new style satisfied everyone. It declared that the new Greek—like the Tyrannicides—was simply invincible.

---

156 IG 13 786–87; Raubitschek 1949, nos. 23, 14, respectively (associating the fragmentary kore AkRM 318+344+497 with the second of these bases). Kissas (2000 n. 446), however, rejects the association, since the cutting is too small and, at only 1 cm deep, too shallow for a marble plinth but appropriate for a bronze statuette. For Angelitos’ Athena, see Stewart 2008, cat. no. 1, fig. 5.


158 The bibliography is too vast and diffuse to cite here. See Hurwit (1997) for a judicious survey and sensible intermediate position.

159 Cf. Rhead 1970, 12. “The official date of the Tyrannicide group by Kritios and Nesiotes, 477 B.C., can therefore be considered the legal birthday of the Severe style.” Later examples of such “tipping points” in the history of art include Michelangelo’s David, David’s Oath of the Horati, and Picasso’s Les Demoiselles d’Aville.

160 Post-Persian Panhellenism emerges particularly in the official Plataian and other epigrams of 479 (Anth. Pal. 6.50, 7.251, 7.253; Diod. Sic. 11.33) and in the fragments of Simonides’ elegy on the battle (P. Oxy. 2327+3965) (supra n. 73; see esp. Aloni 2001, 97–100; Koverski 2005, 63–107, appx., nos. 18, 22, 27, 28). It was, of course, simultaneously undercut by the realities of Greek intercommunal rivalry, vividly chronicled in Herodotus (8–9) and in, e.g., Plut. Vit. Arist. 20.
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