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ABSTRACT

Allison Elizabeth Smith: The Juxtaposition of Styles in the Metopes of the Athenian Treasury
(Under the direction of Dr. Mary C. Sturgeon)

French archeologists uncovered thirty metopes belonging to the Athenian Treasury scattered in the Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi between 1893 and 1894. According to Pausanias the Athenians commissioned the Treasury to celebrate their victory over the Persians at the battle of Marathon in 490 BCE. The sculptures depict myths about the labors, of the Pan-Hellenic hero, Herakles, and tasks of the Athenian newcomer, Theseus. The metopes contain stylistic elements from multiple geographic locations and both the Late Archaic and Early Classical periods. The visual evidence challenges the scholarly assumption that Late Archaic artists were incapable of experimentation through the integration, combination and juxtaposition of multiple styles. The advanced state of the Late Archaic style during the 480s indicates the large artistic repertoire to which the commissioners, planners, and sculptors would have been exposed. This paper examines elements in seven of the metopes that indicate experimentations by the artists of the Athenian Treasury.
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INTRODUCTION: THE POLITICS AND HISTORY OF ATHENS IN THE LATE SIXTH AND EARLY FIFTH CENTURIES

The political meanings of the Athenian Treasury (building XI in fig. 1) in the Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, specifically the sculptural program of the metopes, were dependent on the activities and ambitions of powerful Athenian families. Architecture is political, and is based on the “underlying sense of function, whatever that function may be, that makes its construction necessary, for whatever reasons, at a specific moment in time.”¹

A ‘political’ function or aspect in Athens during this time should be understood as pertaining to the polis with its responsibilities and aspirations. By extension the city’s government in the late sixth and early fifth centuries dictated the construction of buildings. Due to its decorative nature, the modern eye may view and perceive architectural sculpture to be unessential to the function of the building, but to the Greek eye, “architectural sculpture […] was an intrinsic part of each building […]”² The imagery of architectural sculpture communicated powerfully with the larger population due to its prominence and permanence.³ The metopes of the Athenian Treasury (fig. 2) were intended to communicate with a larger audience at the international sanctuary of Delphi about the identity and the artistic innovation of the dedicatory polis.

¹B. S. Ridgway, Prayers in Stone: Greek Architectural Sculpture ca. 600-100 BCE. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 1.

²Ridgway 1999, 2.

The Persian Wars shaped the socio-political structures of Athens in the first two decades of the fifth century through the struggles for control over preparation and recovery efforts. The Athenian Treasury at Delphi, as a large-scale dedication of the polis during the decade of the 480s BCE, is likely to bear marks of the political environment in which it was conceived. The history of the city can illuminate the possible meaning(s) of the builder’s choices in the construction of the building and the reasons for the structure's commissioning. The new democracy, the increase in prosperity and the military success of Athens during the early fifth century shaped the Athenians’ new self-image, which they communicated artistically for the first time on the international stage at Delphi.

A few strong aristocratic families influenced political restructuring in the period before the building of the Athenian Treasury. Tyrants ruled Athens and many other Greek cities during the sixth century, tyrants who rose from the aristocratic families through military and political prowess. Peisistratos and his family, the Peisistratids, for example, shaped the political climate of the late sixth century BCE. Peisistratos reigned as tyrant intermittently from 546 BCE until his death in 528/7 BCE. His eldest sons, Hippias and Hipparchos, ruled Athens together for the next fourteen years. Harmodius and Aristogeiton, later referred to as the tyrannicides, ambushed and killed Hipparchos in 514 BCE. Hippias ruled alone until 510 BCE when the Athenians forcibly removed him from the polis, ending the tyranny of the Peisistratids (Thuc. 6.59.4).

---

4 H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, “The Tyranny of Peisistratos,” in Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reprisal of the Evidence, ed. by H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 2000), 10. She also discusses the ways in which Greeks understood their governing system of tyrants, and how Peisistratos obtained and maintained his power.


Peisistratos, during his rise to power, used visual symbolism as a powerful tool to persuade the Athenians of his ability to rule. Herodotus, a Greek historian born in the early fifth century, recorded that in an attempt to win the favor of the people, Peisistratos dressed a beautiful woman as the goddess Athena to accompany him on his entry into the city.\(^7\) Due to his visual and physical association with the tangible presence of the patron goddess, the people warmly welcomed him into the city (Hdt. 1.60).\(^8\)

During Peisistratos’ rule, Athens enjoyed a close relationship with the sanctuary of Apollo at Delos, but their rival chief rival, the Alkmaionidai, dominated the political climate at Delphi. They exerted considerable power over the oracle and the priesthood while in exile at Delphi (Hdt. 1.64).\(^9\) This family completed the Temple of Apollo in the late sixth century BCE.\(^10\) The marble sculptures of the eastern pediment tangibly represent the influence of the Alkmaionidai at Delphi.

The limited record of the governmental system obscures the activities of the Peisistratids. The involvement of particular families or organizations dedicating buildings was often not recorded. Peisistratos took personal interest in the restoration of the sanctuary of Apollo at Delos, as recorded by Herodotus (1.64). His participation in building within Athens is less defined. Scholars disagree on the extent of the Peisistratid-funded building campaigns on the Acropolis. It is possible the family was involved with both the temple of


\(^9\) Shapiro 1989, 49.

Athena Polias and the small treasury buildings in the area of the Hekatompedon.\textsuperscript{11} Dinsmoor associated the tyrants with the early stages of the large Temple of Olympian Zeus below the Acropolis.\textsuperscript{12} The scant written record suggests the Peisistratids had no formal building program, as existed under Pericles in the fifth century BCE, and the structures built during this time may have been funded independently by donations of the aristocracy.\textsuperscript{13}

After the death of Hipparchos and the expulsion of Hippias, the people of Athens chose between two political groups represented by Isagoras and Kleisthenes, choosing the latter.\textsuperscript{14} Kleisthenes reorganized the citizens of Athens into ten tribes and instituted an early form of Greek democracy. The changes brought more men into the voting ranks of citizens, and the ten divisions, not based on physical proximity, prevented one group from overpowering another.\textsuperscript{15} Each tribe funded and organized its own group of soldiers that were led by a general, who would have the distinction of an equal vote with the polemarch, the third archon.\textsuperscript{16}

After 20 years of relative freedom under the new constitution of Kleisthenes, in September of 490 BCE. Athens encountered her greatest outside threat from the Persian ruler, Darius. In September of 490 BCE Darius sailed for Greece, intent on destroying Athens and enslaving her people for their role in the Ionian revolt, of 499-3 BCE. During the


\textsuperscript{13}Boersma 2000, 56.


\textsuperscript{15}Grote 2001, 115-120.

\textsuperscript{16}Grote 2001, 122.
revolt, the Athenians incited and assisted the Ionian Greeks to rebel against Persian rule of their lands. After the failure of the rebellion, Darius largely destroyed Ionia and attempted to control Athens by installing the former tyrant Hippias as governor. On route to Athens, the Persians landed at Eretria, burning the city and its sanctuaries before proceeding to the northern Attic plains of Marathon and Oinoe. The flat land provided adequate space for the most efficient use of their cavalry attachment. Hearing of the impending Persian invasion, the polemarch Kallimachos led his generals and army to Marathon to stand against the Persians at the urging of the general Miltiades. The Athenians stood against the much larger Persian army with only the help of the small contingency from Plataea, due to the Spartan king’s decision to delay their troops. The Greeks attacked at a run, collapsing the flank defenses of the Persians, and caused the enemy to be either cut down or to retreat to the awaiting navy.

Herodotus reports that the Persians lost six thousand four hundred men, while the Athenians lost only one hundred ninety-two (Hdt. 6. 117). The Athenians cremated and interred the dead on the plain of Marathon, lauding them as heroes. Kallimachos, Epizelos,

---


19 Balcer 1995, 217. This was not the first instance of the leadership of Miltiades. He was associated with the Peisistratids, and once worked with Darius. But his success in escaping the attempted capture of the Phoenicians who intended to turn him over to the Great King, added to his credibility as capable of resisting the Persian threat.


and Echetlos were named among the revered men who acquired fame for their deeds in battle, which only Epizelos survived. They achieved heroic status not only in literature and legend, but also in the visual arts. The Stoa Poikile in Athens, commissioned by Kimon the son of Kallimachos, contained famous paintings of Kallimachos and Echetlos during this battle.\textsuperscript{23} According to Herodotus (Hdt. 6. 117) the composition highlighted the heroic sacrifice of Kallimachos for Athens and the myth of Echetlos. Echetlos, a farmer who attacked “the Persians though only armed with a plough,” set an example of modesty and self-sacrifice for other Athenians.\textsuperscript{24} Epizelos of Cuphagoras, in spite of losing his sight during the battle, continued to cut down his enemy and lived to tell his story repeatedly (Hdt. 6. 117). The victory over the Persians was central to Athenian identity in the fifth century and was retold through oral tradition and the visual arts. The strong sense of cultural pride and commemoration of this important battle may have also resulted in the building of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi.

Miltiades, in the period just after the battle of Marathon, “was the popular hero of the hour [,]” and, while still serving his year as general, in 489 BCE he took seventy ships to punish the island of Paros, which had aided the Persians.\textsuperscript{25} After a month of attempting to seize the island he was wounded in the leg, which stalled the assault. When the fleet returned home, Xanthippus brought him before the law court for “defrauding the people [,]” The Athenians subsequently convicted and fined Miltiades fifty talents, an amount that far


\textsuperscript{25}P. Green, \textit{The Greco-Persian Wars} (Berkely: University of California Press, 1996), 43-44.
exceeded the general’s ability to pay.26 According to Plutarch, he died in prison leaving a young son, Kimon, in debt (Plut. Cim 2.4).27

During the decade after the Persian defeat, the Athenian general Themistokles continued to prepare the city for the inevitable return of the Persian armies. In 483/2 BCE, when money from the mines at Laureion was made available, Themistokles convinced the ruling body to invest it in a navy, which would later defeat the Persians at Salamis. In addition to the naval investment the long, double walls between the city of Athens and the port, Piraeus, were constructed.28 The Athenians invested in the religious structures on the Acropolis, replacing the limestone Hekatompipedon with a new temple to Athena, known as the Old Parthenon, made of local Pentelic marble with a much larger base than the previous building.29 The economic boom in Athens, which appears to have been large enough to fund these two building projects, may have been substantial enough to fund dedications outside of the polis. At the very least, the Athenian Treasury is representative of the wealth available to the government of Athens, and, by extension, the aristocracy.

After soundly defeating the Persians and forcing their withdrawal to Asia Minor, the Athenians “turned to the religious and moral paradigms of heroic myth, not only to celebrate their victory, [...] but to explain and justify it as well.”30 Reliance on myth for justification of power seems evident from the iconography of art under Peisistratos in the sixth century

26Green 1996, 45. Xanthippus, representative of another powerful family in Athens, was the father of Pericles.


29Dinsmoor 1973, 149-150.

30Castriota’s (1992, 3) book focuses on the later 5th century, but I believe that the Athenian Treasury in particular proves Athens’ interests in the political association of art and war in the 480s. I have taken this idea and applied the post-479 mentalities backwards.
The two themes carved on the metopes of the Athenian Treasury were the Labors of Herakles and the adventures of Theseus. Neither was a radically new subject for Attic art, as both were already prevalent in vase painting, Herakles much more so than Theseus. However, the Athenian Treasury, the first large-scale sculptural program to feature Theseus in the archaeological record, begins the period of popularity of this subject. Only a decade after the construction of the Athenian Treasury, Kimon repatriated the remains of Theseus with considerable fanfare and enshrined them in the Agora.  

This paper will focus on a stylistic re-evaluation of the metopes. Based on the current understanding of sculptural dating, through comparison with sculptures ranging from about 510 to 470 BCE it is apparent that the simultaneous use of Late Archaic and Early Classical styles is present in each of these metopes, if to varying degrees. Instead of creating further constructed categories of organization the focus will be on understanding the metopes as a group that displays a combination of styles.

---


32 Castriota 1992, 33. Whatever the veracity of the story, at the very least it emphasizes the importance of the hero to the polis of Athens during the time after the Persian wars. It is of note that this event is said to have happened roughly 10 years after the completion of the Athenian Treasury.
CHAPTER 1: HISTORY OF THE SANCTUARY AT DELPHI AND TREASURY

STYLES

The physical location and construction of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi are important to understanding the sculptural program, as the building and decoration were likely designed as a single unit. The Athenian Treasury incorporates aspects of an elaborate decorative style, as seen in Ionic treasuries, in the conservative canon of Doric architecture, indicating Athenian designer’s, and possibly the patron’s knowledge of the stylistic traditions of East Greece. The traditions at the sanctuary of Apollo, the influence of other treasuries and the goals of the city-state dictated the setting and form of the Athenian Treasury.

Throughout antiquity Greeks journeyed to the oracular sanctuary at the center of their world, Delphi, seeking guidance from the god Apollo.\(^3\) Central to the cult, Mount Parnassos and the Castilian spring defined the boundaries of the sanctuary. Evidence of constant religious activity remains, beginning with votives from Mycenaean times and stretching into the Roman period.\(^4\) Delphi rivaled Olympia in reputation as an international sanctuary, appealing particularly to mainland Greeks and Ionians.\(^5\) City-states constructed large-scale


monuments during the Archaic period in response to one another in ways not seen at other sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{36}

As early as the seventh century, rulers dedicated offerings both big and small to the god. Kypselos, for example, a seventh-century tyrant in Corinth, dedicated a small building in the general shape of a temple, the first of many such treasuries that would flank the sacred way.\textsuperscript{37} From the sixth to the third centuries, a treasury was “a votive offering in and of itself, dedicated by a state and intended to store votive offerings. In this fashion the treasury reflects not only the past glory of the state, but implies the future glory by providing space for the dedications that will symbolize this glory.”\textsuperscript{38} French archeologists identified remains of twenty-three treasuries, significantly more than the thirteen mentioned by ancient authors: “Sikyon, Siphnos, Thebes, Athens, Knidos, Potidaia, Syracuse, Korinth, Brasidas and the Akanthians, Klazomene, Massalia and Rome, Agylla (Caere), and Spina.”\textsuperscript{39} The difference between the number of physical foundations and those written about implies that not all treasuries were worth noting and their fame was earned. The Siphnian and the Sikyonian Treasuries were constructed in the late sixth century on the sacred way relatively close to the Athenian Treasury.\textsuperscript{40}

The Athenians won a prominent location for the site of their treasury building on the slope of Mount Parnassos. The steep terrain of the mountain necessitated the use of switchbacks for the sacred way, causing “the various monuments to be set upon terraces [,.] raised


\textsuperscript{37}Rups 1986, 85.

\textsuperscript{38}Rups 1986, 85.

\textsuperscript{39}Rups 1986, 92.

\textsuperscript{40}Andronicos 1976, 16-17; Jacquemin 1999, 143.
up behind terrace walls or cut at least partially into the rock.\textsuperscript{41} Literary evidence does not survive to explain the process of land selection for treasury buildings during this time, but the central location of the building implies its privilege. The façade of the building faced east, paralleling the façade of the Temple of Apollo, which stood directly above it on a higher terrace.

The architect of the Athenian Treasury constructed the building on a high stylobate, reducing accessibility.\textsuperscript{42} The small Doric building is distyle in-antis, a single-room building with a two column porch, and rests on a triangular terrace.\textsuperscript{43} It survived in better condition than most buildings at Delphi, standing for nearly 1,000 years, and remains the only treasury securely identified.\textsuperscript{44} The architect cut each block to fit only in one place on the building; though the seams do not line up in a traditional way, the building retains the regular rectangular shape. The expensive and meticulous style of construction allowed for the easy and accurate reconstruction of the building by the French in the early twentieth century.\textsuperscript{45}

Of the treasuries at Delphi, three were built before the Athenian Treasury, with essentially the same floor plan. The Siphnian, Sikyonian and Cnidian Treasuries were each small buildings with distyle in-antis construction, which became the conventional plan. The particular building material and order of the decoration correlates with the location of the dedicatory city. The Siphnians used the Ionic style, logical for an island in the Cyclades

\textsuperscript{41}Rups 1986, 90.


\textsuperscript{43}Rossiter 1981, 407.

\textsuperscript{44}Rups 1986, 125.

\textsuperscript{45}Rups 1986, 125.
during the later sixth century, and, likewise, the Athenians preferred the Doric order.\textsuperscript{46} The exhibition of local architectural styles suggests that the international sanctuary at Delphi did not dictate the order of buildings, nor did it have a regional style of its own. Rather, the style of buildings in the sanctuary reflected the aesthetic values of the commissioners.

Constructing a victory monument quickly may have necessitated the use of a non-Athenian marble in order to complete the monument during a five or ten year period. Earlier builders at Delphi preferred Parian and Naxian marbles, and scholars long believed the Athenian Treasury was no exception.\textsuperscript{47} Herz and Palagia published the results of isotopic analysis, which proved the blocks of the columns and walls were quarried at Chorodaki on the island of Paros.\textsuperscript{48} Neer subsequently suggested that the material of the treasury might have been defined by political climate instead of fashion.\textsuperscript{49} The Athenians had attempted and failed to invade the island.\textsuperscript{50} Neer believed that the Athenians sought to control the island by providing a large commission through which the Parians would be economically dependent.\textsuperscript{51} The Athenians may have chosen not to use marble from Mount Penteli, as it


\textsuperscript{48}Palagia and Herz 2002, 240. The builders used limestone from unidentified structures as spolia in the construction of the treasury’s platform. No isotopic analysis has been done on the structures beneath ground level because of the early twentieth century reconstruction of the building.


\textsuperscript{50}Green 1996, 45. Xanthippus represents another powerful family in Athens and was the father of Pericles.

\textsuperscript{51}Neer 2004, 63-94.
was being quarried at full capacity during the 480s BCE for the construction of the Old Parthenon on the Acropolis.52

**History of the Excavation and Reconstruction of the Athenian Treasury**

The tradition of elaborate decoration on the exterior of treasury buildings in Delphi predating the Athenian construction was established by the Siphnian Treasury, erected ca. 525 BCE, due to its continuous frieze, caryatids, and sculpted moldings. The decorative elements of the Athenian Treasury, in particular the metopes, would have been placed and carved before the roofing system could be installed. In comparison to other Treasuries at Delphi, these sculptures are relatively well preserved. Twenty-seven of the thirty metopes survive in fragments. No single block is whole, but enough remains to support the analysis of their composition and style. Thirty metopes once encircled the building, with six on the ends and nine on the flanks. This is the first surviving example of a complete set of sculpted metopes on the mainland of Greece.53

In 1846 the French government created a scientific organization, the École Française d’Athénes, with permission of the Greek government, to excavate and publish findings at archaeological sites.54 In 1860 Paul Foucart, representing the École Française d’Athénes, obtained permission to do topographical and epigraphical studies at Delphi.55 In 1880 the modern village of Kastri, built on the remains of Delphi, was moved two kilometers to the

---


53 Dinsmoor 1973, 117.


55 La Coste-Messelière 1936, 47.
west to facilitate excavation of the site.\(^{56}\) From 1892 to 1901 Théophile Homolle and Émile Bourguet co-directed the excavations.\(^{57}\)

The archeologists uncovered the Athenian Treasury metopes on June 14, 1893, a decade after they began clearing the Sanctuary of Apollo.\(^{58}\) In 1903 Joseph Replat and Albert Tournnaire obtained the Greek government’s permission to reconstruct the monument.\(^{59}\) The fragmentary state of the column drums forced Replat to replace those blocks during the rebuilding, though he was able to include the original architrave and entablature. The reconstruction team attempted to recreate the original decorative scheme by placing casts of the metopes above the architrave.\(^{60}\)

**Mythology and Decoration of the Athenian Treasury**

The themes represented on the metopes of the Athenian Treasury were relevant both to the city of Athens and to the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi. The combination of myths of a well-known Panhellenic hero and an Athenian newcomer suggests that the planners of the Athenian Treasury considered carefully how to represent Athens in an international sanctuary at a time when the polis was gaining wealth and power. The metopes contain compositions planned in the traditional, older mode of the Late Archaic period and in the more advanced

---

\(^{56}\)La Coste-Messelière 1936, 50.  
\(^{57}\)Themelis 1983, 12.  
Early Classical style. This suggests that innovation was a concern in the metopae compositions, not just their mythological content. The designer of the Athenian Treasury used the new subject of Theseus and the newest sculptural styles to present the Athenian polis in an international venue.

Scholars agree on identifying the four distinct but complementary themes on the metopes: the labors of Herakles, the tasks of Theseus, an Amazonomachy, and the Cattle of Geryon. Neer suggested that the Athenians may have expressed their role in the Battle at Marathon through the myths of Herakles and Theseus. The Athenian troops stayed in the temenos of Herakles before they marched into battle against the Medes and again afterwards according to Herodotus (6.108, 6.116). Herakles, by implication, received a greater political and religious meaning than the role of the Panhellenic hero, when the people of Marathon believed that they were the first to worship him. Plutarch reports Theseus appeared in the battle to help the Athenians when they were badly outnumbered (Theseus 35.5). Images of Theseus existed in the sixth century, but a more specific “cycle of deeds” seems to have been invented in the 490’s BCE based on the popular story of Herakles. The placement of Theseus in compositions and battles similar to those of the Panhellenic hero serves to raise his level of importance. Conversely, the Athenian use of a depiction of Herakles in an official Athenian context establishes him as an Athenian figurehead.

The Amazonomachy, a battle between the Greeks and the Amazons, on the Athenian Treasury may refer to several myths, yet no association can be made. The general theme

---

62 Neer 2004, 76.
63 Neer 2004, 74.
64 Neer 2004, 76.
features the Greeks represented by nameless soldiers, fighting beside Theseus and Herakles against eastern, specifically non-Greek women. The Amazons wore Persian dress, as seen in Athenian art during the rule of Kimon several decades later. 65 Ten metopes depict a battle between the Amazons and the Athenians, while Amazons on horseback form four akroteria. 66 The composition of the akroteria recall the stance of the Amazon in metope 10, but their relationship to the four sides of the building remains unclear. 67 Akroteria in Doric architecture were most often floral instead of figural; later, notable examples of Athenian figural akroteria occur on the Parthenon, though they are Nike figures. 68

The elaborate decoration on the Athenian Treasury is a feature made acceptable by its non-cult function and its location among other elaborate treasury buildings. The organization of the metopes on the Athenian Treasury is essential to understanding the building as a planned unit, as any work of architectural sculpture would have been. I discuss the arrangement of the metopes only as a side note as a part of the historiography, for it is the style of the metopes that figures prominently in this thesis.

During the excavation of the sanctuary of Apollo, excavators found the metopes of the Athenian Treasury scattered down the hill as seen in fig. 3. The findspots of the sculptures indicated nothing of their original position. Homolle arranged the metopes based on his interpretation of the subject matter. He found that the metopes split logically into

65 Castriota 1992, 33.
two groups of six and two groups of nine to fit the four sides of the building. He then determined their location based on the popularity of the subject matter in early fifth century Athens. He placed the tasks of Theseus on the south side of the building, the Amazonomachy on the east, the labors of Herakles on the north, and the cattle of Geryon on the west.  

Subsequent scholars’ interpretations of the placement of these subjects and of the individual compositions vary. The layout of the metopes can be debated, as some fragments were found as far away as the sanctuary of Athena Pronaia, which lies farther down the slope of Mt. Parnassos. Scholars agree on the placement of the six metopes of the Cattle of Geryon on the back of the building, because of the moderate relevance to the rest of the building and the rare occasion that they would have been seen by visitors. All reconstructions place Theseus on the South side of the Treasury, the first visible to the viewer. Jenifer Neils had accepted Homolle’s general organization, but re-ordered the metopes of Theseus on the South side. She suggested the metopes should appear in the chronological order of their occurrence and the physical location of the myth. Most scholars organized the metopes in the order they occurred in myth, though Klaus Hoffelner based his reconstruction on the flow of the composition. He surveyed the reasoning of other scholars, created new line drawings and incorporated more fragments into the reconstructions of individual metopes. He

---


70 La Coste-Messelière 1957, 197.


73 Hoffelner 1988, 77-117. This article grew out of his 1988 dissertation under the direction of Dr. Wolfgang Wohlmay. Soon after the 1988 excavation began, Klaus Hoffelner reorganized the metopes. His was the first re-examination of the composition, figural position and sequence since La Coste-Messelière’s 1957 report. Hoffelner accepted the French dating, and sidestepped the dating discussion, for it was not the focus of his work.
agreed with Homolle’s placement of Theseus on the south and Geryon on the west. He moved the Amazonomachy to the less visible north side and Herakles to the east façade. He believed the Panhellenic hero’s position on the front of the building would have made those scenes more understandable to non-Athenian visitors.  

The remaining Amazonomachy and labors of Herakles must line either the front of the building or the north side, which faces the retaining wall of the Temple of Apollo. Pierre de La Coste-Messelière, the French scholar who wrote primary publication of the sculptures, positioned the scenes of the Amazons on the front of the building and the labors of Herakles in the less visible position on the north.  

Hoffelner reversed the position of these two groups of sculptures based on the importance and connection between Theseus and Herakles. The positioning of Herakles on the front of the building would have put the best-known myth on the most visible side, possibly increasing their readability. Hoffelner arranged the compositions with the Greeks moving towards the right, the side of victory, except for the final metope of each side. He carefully chronicled previous interpretations and reordered the metopes based on compositions of other metope programs elsewhere. His arrangement has been generally accepted. 

How those who traveled to Delphi in the fifth century BCE would have interpreted these images is difficult to assess. The marble building itself would have stood out in a sacred precinct built primarily of limestone, with the notable exception of the Siphnian
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74 Hoffelner 1988, 77.

75 La Coste-Messelière 1957, 197.

76 Hoffelner 1988, 115-116.

77 The final Greek faces left to close the composition at the end of the building. Previously the metopes had been organized based on theme. Cf. La Coste-Messelière 1957 and Neils 1987.
Treasury, and bright paint would have called attention to the metopes. Two of the four sides would have been easily visible to pilgrims as they climbed the sacred way. The treasury building would have been surrounded by dedications not long after its construction. Additionally, the height of the south metopes may have limited their visibility. The combination of these aspects does not diminish the importance of the metopes, which were well planned and carefully executed.

The Athenians chose the material, form, position, decoration and subject matter of their treasury at the international sanctuary at Delphi with great care. They spent great wealth on the most valued marble of the time, in thanks for their victory over their eastern foe. The choice of an elaborate decorative scheme was deliberate, in light of the Treasury’s position among Ionic treasuries at Delphi, with their impressive decorative schemes.

---

78 We must take into account the height of the building, the height of the foundations and the way the slope falls away from the building.
CHAPTER 2: THE DATE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE ATHENIAN TREASURY

Dating the Athenian Treasury is important, as it is one of the most complete architectural and sculptural projects from the Late Archaic Period. The placement of the Treasury between 510 and 480 BCE helps to define visual culture at the end of the Archaic Period outside of Athens, where the most complete archaeological record exists. Due to the lack of exact written record, the style of the sculptures has figured prominently in constructing a system of relative dating for the Archaic Period. Dating for the period 650 to 480 relies on stylistic changes to distinguish different phases, as so-called fixed points are rare. Based on comparative studies of sculpture the metopes of the Athenian Treasury have been dated to ca. 500.

The relative dating of Archaic Greek material culture in the scholarship of the nineteenth and most of the twentieth century is now generally considered to be too early. In 1983, David Francis and Michael Vickers first proposed a radical lowering of dates for the sculptures of the Siphnian Treasury and the Temple of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria. They based their argument largely on social and economic events in the late sixth and early
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80 Ridgway 1993, 3.

81 Ridgway 1993, 7.


fifth centuries. Though the ideas in the article intrigued the scholarly community, most agreed that the pair had little archaeological evidence to back their claims. In response, Boardman suggested guidelines that would lower dates no more than half a generation, or by ten to fifteen years. Andrew Stewart has recently re-evaluated the understanding of chronology, particularly for the 510 to and 460 BCE period. Scholars of pottery were among the first to look carefully at the dating of objects during the first half of the fifth century. Susan Rotroff discusses ways in which relative dating of pottery had been formed in the past. She explores the stratigraphic record of red figure vase painting and concludes that late Archaic chronology should be lowered between 5 and 15 years.

Dating of sculpture between 500 and 470 BCE is based on analysis of the so-called Perserschutt on the Athenian Acropolis, as it represents much material from this period. Deep pits, filled with broken dedicatory objects, were created after the second Persian
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85 Boardman 1984, 162.


87 R. T. Neer, Style and Politics in Athenian Vase Painting: The Craft of Democracy ca. 530-460 BCE. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). He has lowered the dates of the Pioneer potters and consequentially the rest of late Archaic vase production in Athens.


89 Rotroff 2009, 253.
invasion in 480/79 BCE, providing a secure *terminus ante quem*. Other ritual burials preserved layers of debris through the second half of the fifth century buried on other parts of the Acropolis, when the Athenians began large scale building programs. They buried the damaged (sic) dedications in order to clear space and expand retaining walls on the cramped Acropolis.  

The Acropolis deposits were found and excavated during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries under the presumption that most contained objects damaged by the Persians. Stewart’s re-evaluation of the evidence suggests that only one deposit on the Acropolis dates from 480/79 BCE, and Early Classical material found in deposits were buried after that time. The Early Classical style emerged fully formed after 479 BCE, which he believes appeared distinctly different from Archaic sculpture. Based on the deposits containing Early Classical sculpture, he believed this style remained popular longer than previously believed, perhaps until 460 BCE.
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90 Stewart 2008a, 277.
91 Stewart 2008a, 377.
93 Stewart 2008a, 406-407.
94 Stewart 2008b, 601.
95 Stewart 2008a, 407.
Dating the Athenian Treasury

Homolle advocated dating the Athenian Treasury to the decade after the battle of Marathon in 490 BCE, based on a passage in Pausanias and the inscribed so-called Marathon base.\(^\text{96}\) Pausanias, the second century Roman traveler, wrote of his experience in his book, *Description of Greece*:

[t]he Thebans have a treasury built from the spoils of war, and so have the Athenians. Whether the Cnidians built to commemorate a victory or to display their prosperity I do not know, but the Theban treasury was made from the spoils taken at the battle of Leuctra, and the Athenian treasury from those taken from the army that landed with Datis at Marathon (10.11.5).\(^\text{97}\)

This record is substantiated by the inscription on the Marathon Base to the south of the treasury:

\[
\text{ΑΘΕΝΑΙΟΙ Τ[Ο]Ι ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ[Ι ΑΠΟ ΜΕΔ]ΟΝ ΑΚΙΠΟΘΙΝΙΑ ΤΕΣ ΜΑΡΑΘ[Ο]ΝΙ}
\]

M[AXE]Σ

“The Athenians to Apollo as offerings from the Battle of Marathon, taken from the Mede.”\(^\text{98}\)

---

\(^{96}\) The Marathon base held bronze sculptures that sat a little more than a meter away from the building. The foundations of the treasury and the base are connected underground and the connection between the two is not visible at ground level. Until archeological work by the French in the 1980s, the scholarly community could only speculate on the exact relationship between the two. W. Gauer (*Weihgeschenke aus den Perserkriegen* (IstMitt-BH 2: Tübingen, 1968), 45-51) agreed with the French community’s dating before the release of the data from the 1980s. P. Amandry commented on the connection between the treasury and the base: “A Propos de Monuments de Delphes. Questions de Chronologie,” *BCH* 112.2 (1988): 591-610, and “Le Socle Marathonien et le Trésor des Athéniens,” *BCH* 122.1 (1998): 75-90.

\(^{97}\) “οἱ δὲ θησαυρὸι Θηβαίων ἀπὸ ἔργου τῶν ἔς πόλεμων, καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἔστιν ὑστατῶς: Κνιδίους δὲ οὐκ οἶδα εἰ ἔπι νικήν τινη ἢ ἐπὶ ἐπιδείξειν εὐδαμονίας ὑκοδομήσαντο, ἐπεὶ Θηβαίως γε ἀπὸ ἔργου τοῦ ἐν Λεύκτροις καὶ Ἀθηναίως ἀπὸ τῶν ἔς Μαραθώνα ἄποβάντων ὅμω διά τιδε ἐλεύθερον οἱ θησαυροί.”

Based on these two pieces of evidence, Homolle constructed a date post-490 BCE for the building, sculpture, and inscription. The next generation of scholars at the École Française d'Athènes, Charles Picard and La Coste-Messelière, resisted stylistic arguments for changing the date of the edifice to pre-490 BCE.

Other scholars disagreed with the interpretation of the excavators. The Americans, British and Germans, in particular, voiced their disagreements prior to the excavations of 1988/9. The strongly Archaic features of some sculptures and the apparent separation of the Treasury and the Marathon pedestal led William Bell Dinsmoor to date the Marathon base and the Treasury building separately. He considered the date of the Treasury based on the styles of clamps binding the blocks of the building together, which he believed were older than those used to construct the base. He also found the closest comparisons for the painted

---


cornices of the treasury repeated on vase paintings from circa 510 BCE, following Sir John Beazley’s dating system. Sir John Boardman, in *Greek Sculpture: The Archaic Period*, summarized the relative dating of the building by the sculptural style: “[s]tyle and theme invite comparison with Athenian vases and suggest a date very few years after 500.”

Gisela Richter endorsed Dinsmoor’s findings when she compared the metopes to contemporary vases, though she suggested 500 BCE as a more appropriate date, noting several illustrations he omitted. Evelyn Harrison reviewed the evidence and concluded that the sculptural style conformed to stylistic forms in sculpture ca. 500 BCE. She went on to admit there was little evidence to refute the claims of the French. Brunilde Ridgway agreed with Harrison’s ca. 500-490 BCE date, and further placed the metopes within the stylistic context of the Late Archaic Period.

In the 1980s, Jean-François Bommelaer and Didier Laroche revisited the physical remains of the building and suggested new interpretations that confirmed the earlier theories of the École Française d’Athénes. They excavated the area around the foundations in order to ascertain the architectural relationship between the Treasury and the Marathon base. In a 1991 summary, they suggested that the building and base shared a common foundation though they did not publish the archaeological evidence. In 1998 Pierre Amandry summarized the evidence for the integral construction of the two, as the support of the
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100Dinsmoor 1946, 86-121.
101Boardman 1991a,159.
102Richter 1970, 43.
103Harrison 1965, 9-11.
104Ridgway 1993, 343-4 and 365.
Marathon base extends 0.3 meters into the foundation of the Treasury.\textsuperscript{105} He reported on the clamping between the treasury, statue base, and foundation course and the dating of the epigraphy.\textsuperscript{106} He went on to argue that each of these features supports the idea of contemporary construction, and with the additional evidence of the inscription, a post-Marathon date.\textsuperscript{107}

During the 1990s, Stewart, Boardman and Claude Rolley followed the chronology of the new French findings, locating the treasury sculptures in the 480s.\textsuperscript{108} Hermann Büsing reevaluated the relative architectural dating based on comparative analysis of the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina and agreed with the post-490 BCE date.\textsuperscript{109} Richard Neer enthusiastically supported the date proposed by Amandry and built an argument based on the social and political environments in Athens.\textsuperscript{110} Neer’s article contextualizes the political, historical and cultural landscape of Athens after 490 BCE. His argument builds on the archaeological discussion by Amandry, making the post-Marathon date even more compelling. Though circumstantial, his evidence creates a convincing image of Athenian statehood and international dedications.\textsuperscript{111}

In the last two decades few scholars have entered the discussion. Elena Partida followed the date of 510-500 BCE proposed by Dinsmoor based on her close evaluation of

\textsuperscript{105}Amandry 1998, 75-90.
\textsuperscript{106}Amandry 1998, 76 – 82 and 87.
\textsuperscript{107}Amandry 1998, 87-90.
\textsuperscript{109}Büsing 1994, 123-7.
\textsuperscript{110}Neer 2004, 63-66.
\textsuperscript{111}Neer 2004, 63-95.
the physical remains. More recently, Klaus Fittschen questioned Amandry’s analysis of the Treasury foundations and Marathon base. Fittschen studied the foundation course and noted that the 0.3 m projection on the south side of the building can also be seen on the north side. He explained that the foundation on the south side narrows towards the front of the building. This shape he believed proves that the foundation beneath the sculpture base was solely structural for the Treasury. Hence, Fittschen sees a lack of connection between the building and the base, which proves to him that the Athenian Treasury dates to the end of the sixth century and the Marathon base to after 490 BCE. Ralf von den Hoff builds on Fittschen’s interpretation of the foundations by asserting that the narrowing ledge could not support the weight of the Marathon pedestal. His critique of Amandry and Neer, which is yet to receive any counterargument, is a reminder of the perpetual ambiguities that exist regarding the construction of this building.

Stylistic analysis of sculpture has been the primary mode of understanding the change in artistic style and chronology. The tradition of close and meticulous looking has created organization based on analysis of the hands of sculptors, affiliations, sources of influence, and chronology. In 1957 La Coste-Messelière wrote the only in-depth stylistic analysis of the sculptures from the Athenian Treasury. He aimed to write comprehensively about the
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112 Partida 2000, 50-4, 68-70. Partida did not see an integral connection between the foundation of the Treasury and the Marathon base. She believes her dating is supported by the style of the decoration and sculpture.


115 Fittschen 2003, 14.

chronology, style, material and location of the metopes. He defined three stylistic categories: Archaic, Mixed and Classical. He examined anatomical details and drapery styles to determine into which category each metope fit. He identified hands of three sculptors without speculating where they may have originated. Though he observed and recorded strongly Archaic features in the metopes, he believed that the Early Classical aspects proved the Treasury’s post-490 BCE date. The combination of Late Archaic and Early Classical styles in a single building phase on this monument and the circumstantial historical evidence suggests that focusing discussions on the decade of the 480s would be most productive.
CHAPTER 3: THE SCULPTURAL STYLE OF THE METOPES

As in “the architecture of the Athenian Treasury we detect the input of heterogeneous specialists whose consortium was sparked by the consecration of this monument at Delphi, a centre [sic] for the interchange of artistic modes[,]” so too the sculpture can be seen in light of its placement at Delphi.117 The Athenian Treasury can serve as a case study of Athenian sculptural styles during the Late Archaic and Early Classical period. In the original French Publication, La Coste-Messelière organized the metopes by attempting to fit them within three categories: Archaic, Classical, and Mixed.118 This discussion identifies the features of style that demonstrate the simultaneous use of Late Archaic and Early Classical stylistic elements. To do so, I focus on seven well-preserved metopes depicting two figures, rather than glossing over the stylistic characteristics of the entire sculptural program. I consider the representations of Herakles and Theseus equally, as there is no indication of one hero being depicted in a new style more often than the other.119

117Partida 2000, 70.
118La Coste-Messelière 1957.
119All of the thirty original metopes are damaged, some more severely than others. I have selected the best preserved examples of each here. I elaborate on the subject matter of each scene, but do not believe that there is a correlation between style and theme. Each of the works discussed exemplifies a physical attribute that can be accessed stylistically in the rubrics developed in G. M. A Richter, Korai: Archaic Greek Maidens (New York: Phaidon, 1968), G. M. A. Richter, Kouroi: Archaic Greek Youths (New York: Phaidon, 1970), Ridgway 1970, Ridgway 1993, Stewart 1990, and Stewart 2008.
Twentieth century scholars categorized Greek sculptures based on stylistic analysis. A number of features are useful in identifying stylistic trends during the transition from the Late Archaic to Early Classical periods. Richter traced developments in the Archaic style by studying the kouroi, analyzing changes in anatomical representations over time. Ridgway defined six primary elements in the Archaic style: frontality, symbolism, standardization, decorativeness, rapid rate of change toward naturalism, and quality of agalma. In contrast, she characterizes the “Severe” style as typified by simplicity of forms, change in drapery type from Ionic to Doric, change in subject matter to narratives, interest in emotion, and interest in motion.

Late Archaic sculptures from ca. 500-480 BCE and Early Classical sculptures from ca. 480-450 BCE have many stylistic elements in common. Innovations in the artistic repertoire that began to appear during the late sixth century were slowly accepted into the broader Archaic “International style.” Sculptors working between ca. 500 and 480 BCE could use elements of both the Archaic and Classical styles. This paper demonstrates this juxtaposition of styles in these sculptures through the evaluation of composition, body position, facial expression, hairstyle, and definition of musculature and drapery. The
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121 I use the designations Late Archaic and Early Classical based on recent usage, as in Stewart 2008a. I use stylistic features discussed by Ridgway as characteristic of the Severe style, considering it a subset of the Early Classical style and from the Early Classical period, Stewart 1990, Stewart 2008a, Stewart 2009, Ridgway 1970 and Ridgway 1993.


125 Stewart 1990, 122.
metopes of the Athenian Treasury suggest that changes in the representation of the male figure began to emerge before the culmination of the Early Classical style ca. 480 BCE.

**Herakles and the Kerynitian Hind** (Figure 4, Metope 19)

The composition in metope 19, which is based on a linear design and 2-dimensional conception, conforms to composition and forms found in Late Archaic relief sculpture. Herakles’ frontal body emphasizes his prowess. The hero, his back pressed flat against the relief ground, leaps energetically above the hind.  

The curve of Herakles’ body and that of the hind are in an “‘interlocked c’s’ pattern” that originated in the sixth century and continued into the fifth. This format represents a Late Archaic conception of a dynamic two-figure composition, in which one figure is being taken over by another.

Facial expressions change between the Late Archaic and Early Classical style, particularly in the articulation of eyes and mouths. The Late Archaic style of Herakles’ face is evident in the facial expression, lips and eyes. Herakles looks down at the deer; his smile, as with other Archaic sculpture, may suggest that he is full of life. The top lip protrudes slightly over the bottom lip, resembling the mouth of Theseus from the west pediment of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria from ca. 500-490 BCE (fig. 5). The curve of the lips is similar, though the structures of the cheeks differ. The upper lip of Acropolis 666 (fig. 6), from 520-510 BCE, is significantly larger than the lower, showing the lip style that precedes
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126 Robertson 1975, 170.


the Athenian Treasury. The lips are not as sharply shaped as they become during the Early Classical Period, though the proportions of the lips change little. Herakles’ ear is naturalistically attached, rendered like that of Theseus from Eretria, as expected from the Late Archaic period. His chin is relatively narrow and pointed in relation to the chins of the Blond boy (Acropolis 689) and the Kritian boy (Acropolis 698) from ca. 475 BCE. The width of the chin, like the smile, lips, and eyes, is rendered in the Late Archaic manner.

Adding to the Late Archaic features of Herakles’ head, the coiffure and rendering of curls resembles Late Archaic hairstyles. The hair at the nape of the neck terminates in round globs in a short style traditionally associated with the hero. Late Archaic and Early Classical representations of hair often include snail shell patterns, which Herakles here lacks. Such snail shell patterns at the ends of the locks can be seen in the Eretria Theseus, and Olympia Apollo (fig. 7). The plain pattern resembles the “early Attic beads” on kouroi from the early sixth century. The much earlier style used to represent curls suggests a deliberate reference to Early Archaic art. The Late Archaic features of Herakles’ head seem to predate the style of Theseus from Eretria, though association with other
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131 Richter 1970, 17-22. The figure of Aphrodite on the Siphnian Treasury Frieze at Delphi, ca. 525 BCE. has a more stylized ear which, however, shares a few features with the ear of metope 19; but this is much earlier. The Euthydikos Kore, from the Athenian Acropolis, has a well-preserved example of a naturalistic ear, ca. 480 BCE. A. Snodgrass, *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 210.


133 La Coste-Messelière 1957, pls. 50 and 55.

134 Cf. La Coste-Messelière 1957, pl. 52.

135 The breadth in time of these examples suggests that the use of snail shell curls around the face was in use between ca. 500 BCE and 450 BCE.

geographical traditions may also account for differences. Herakles’ beard denotes the mature age of the hero and continues the pattern of round beads, though these are smaller than those above the forehead and at the nape. The stylization of hair and beard suggests the artist’s interest in pattern over naturalistic depiction, one of Ridgway’s basic traits of the Archaic style.

Herakles’ cloak and quiver hang behind him on a tree, which would likely have been added in paint. The folds of the cloth are strongly carved with closely set, parallel folds that end in zig-zags with undulating edges, in late Archaic style. The regular patterns predate the softness of drapery in the Early Classical period. Draperies similar to metope 19 can be seen in the korai from the east pediment of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi of ca. 510. The style of Herakles’ eyes, the carved eyelids meeting at well-defined corners, bridges Late Archaic and Early Classical styles. The eyes more closely resemble eye carving techniques at the end of the Late Archaic period; they have anatomical specificity, though they still bulge slightly out from his face. The upper eyelid is more open, distinguishing

---

137 Stewart 1990, 132; this assumption is made because the relief is intact in this area and no tree is carved. The motif of his attributes hanging behind him is seen first in vase painting: Amphora by Psiax, Brescia, Brescia Museo Civico, ABV 292, ca. 510 BCE and Attic Red Figure Cup, Paris, Louvre, G263, ARV² 341 ca. 480 BCE. Cf. J. Boardman, W. Felton, et al., “Herakles” in LIMC volumes IV and V (Zurich, Artemis Verlag: 1988) 728-838 and 5-199.

138 D. Ohly, *Die Aegineten: Der Marmorskulpturen der Tempels der Aphaia auf Aegina, Die Katalog der Glyptothek* (Munich: Beck, 1976), part I, pl. 30. The drapery of Herakles from the east pediment at Aegina ca. 475 BCE shows the softer depiction of Early Classical drapery. The folds of his under garment fall in irregular zig-zags that react to his backward motion. The peaks of the drapery are softer than in metope 19.

139 Stewart 1990, pl. 201.

140 La Coste-Messelière 1957, pl. 57. Early Classical examples that show the same amount of anatomical specificity include the Kritian Boy, the Blond Boy, and the Propylaia Kore (Acropolis 688).
Herakles’ eye from the more awkward eye of the Eretria Theseus. Herakles’ Late Archaic eye style contrasts with the earlier Archaic features of the rest of the head.

In the torso, the artist strives to show the agility of a man unlimited by mortal abilities, rather than naturalism. Strongly modeled abdominal muscles are common in the Late Archaic style. The definition in Herakles’ torso closely resembles the torso from the West pediment at Aegina (IX). The artist has carved the muscles naturalistically, exhibiting the beginnings of the simplicity of the Early Classical period in sculptures generally classified by their Archaic features. The sterno-mastoid muscle is attached naturally as expected from the Late Archaic period forward, but in comparison to the highly stylized hair, the feature is understated. The serratus magnus muscles, which stretch over the rib cage, are taut and fully reveal the bones that lie beneath, a feature seen in both Herakles and warrior West IX from Aegina. The rectus abdominis, iliac crest, and linea alba, the lines that divide and differentiate the six abdominal muscles, are deeply carved, but the grace and naturalism with which they were rendered suggests the latest period of Archaic style.

The sculptor of metope 19 has thus juxtaposed the Archaic features of the composition, hair, mouth, facial expression, drapery and torso with Late Archaic elements in the eyes. The artist of this metope was well versed in traditional Archaic modes of representation, and combined these with new stylistic innovations.
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141 As is common in architectural sculpture, Herakles’ right eye is more open than the left, though the upper lid of the right is more pronounced than seen in the Eretria Theseus.

142 Ridgway 1993, 345.

143 Stewart 2008a, 55-6. The date of the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina, like the Athenian Treasury, has been constantly debated. This paper follows Stewart’s date of 475 BCE based on his recent work on the Acropolis pits. The style of the west pediment is earlier (more Archaic) in appearance than the east, and its date after 480 indicates that some aspects of Archaic style remained pronounced in sculpture after the second Persian invasion.

144 Stewart 1990, 132.
Herakles and Kyknos (Figure 9, metope 21)

The artist of metope 21 treated the bodies of Herakles and Kyknos differently than Herakles in metope 19. Aspects of Early Classical style feature more prominently than in metope 19, but the metope retains stylistic elements of the Late Archaic style. Herakles and Kyknos stand armed facing one another in a duel. Herakles, at right, attacks Kyknos, preparing to slash him with a sword he wields above his head. This composition rejects the Archaic frontality of Herakles in metope 19. Instead, the outer shoulder of each figure is turned outward, creating a three-quarter pose, so the far sides of the figures recede more naturally into space. Kyknos embodies a truer three-quarter pose than Herakles. Herakles’ more frontal position may be caused by the need for more structural support for the upper extremities. The interaction between the two men creates two parallel lines, naturalistically showing the falling body of Kyknos.

The artist carved Herakles’ musculature with elements of both Late Archaic and Early Classical styles. The right side of Herakles’ torso partially survives. His right clavicle assumes a naturalistic position curving gently in an S-shape, disappearing into the shoulder muscle without awkwardness, as in the shoulder of the Early Classical Kritian boy. The deep ridge of the right iliac crest separates the abdomen from the groin. The artist carved the iliac crest with flatness consistent with the Late Archaic Samos 77 (fig. 8).

145 Cambitoglou and Paspalas 1981, 970.
146 Ridgway 1993, 345.
147 Stewart 1990, 133. In contrast the clavicles of Aristodikos (500-490 BCE) are carved more naturally, extending from the center of his chest to his shoulders, not disappearing into the muscles. Ridgway 1993, 83-5.
The three-quarter pose and Early Classical style of Kyknos contrast with that of Herakles. The deltoid and bicep bulge under the weight of his shield. The smoothness of the arm exemplifies the simplicity of forms in the Early Classical style as in the arm of the Kritian boy. The sterno-mastoid and linea alba are much more shallowly carved than in the Herakles in metope 19, suggesting the Early Classical style. The simplicity and softness in rendering is similar to depictions of stomachs in the Early Classical period as seen in the body of the Kritian Boy, whose iliac crest emphasizes the groin, resembling the groin of Herakles on this metope in the Late Archaic style. Kyknos’ left leg shares the slender proportion of his arm. The artist depicted the strength of the leg subtly, unlike the muscle-bound leg of Herakles in metope 19, with specificity found in the Late Archaic period.

Herakles’ helmet covers his hair, forehead and sides of his face obscuring the shape of his head and face, but the facial features display a mixture of styles. His eyes protrude prominently from his face, resembling the eyes of Acropolis 666, ca. 480 BCE. The eyelids and canthus are not carved, as in metope 19. This part of the sculpture appears finished, suggesting those anatomical details were intentionally unworked, a feature also seen in East Greek sculpture. The lips resemble Herakles’ in metope 19. The softened lower lip alters the expression, recalling the lips of Theseus from Eretria. The cheek piece of the helmet emphasizes the width of his chin, but his chin is narrower and more pointed than the Early Classical chin seen in the Blond boy. At the bottom of the chin a small section of the
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148 A. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armor of the Greeks* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 50-2. Herakles’ helmet is of the Corinthian type, which was widely accepted during this period as appropriate head gear of hoplites and was not specific to Corinth.

149 Ridgway 1993, 345. In particular she notes that some of the eyes are “simply a raised almond-shaped surface” as can also be seen in the sculpted column drums from Ephesos. She believes that the simplified renderings of abdominal muscles can also be linked to Ionic artists.

150 Stewart 1990, 133.
beard is visible between the cheek-pieces, the curls represented by small round protrusions. A row of similar, larger curls occur at the nape of his neck, with the shell-like detail, as in the Eretria Theseus, though these surround his face, and the standing warrior from Aegina IX. As the broad date range, between 500-490 BCE for Theseus and 480-470 BCE for the Temple at Aegina, suggests, this aspect doesn’t prove a post-490 date, but suggests that certain Archaic stylistic characteristics were carried through several decades.

La Coste-Messelière’s classification of this metope as Early Classical focuses on the grace of the composition and the poses’ emphasis on three dimensionality, rather than anatomical details. 151 The bodies of Kyknos and Herakles each have Late Archaic and Early Classical elements. Kyknos’ anatomical rendering emphasizes stylistic features of the Late Archaic style, while his pose, arms and torso muscles appear more naturalistic. in the Early Classical style. Herakles’ near frontality, hair, eyes, ears, lips chin, and iliac crest conform to the Late Archaic style.

**Herakles and the Nemean Lion (Figure 10, metope 15)**

The pose and drapery of Herakles appear in the Late Archaic style while the musculature has elements of Early Classical style. Herakles secures the head of the lion, gripping him about the neck. The composition in this metope resembles Archaic black figure vases, with Herakles and the lion standing rather than wrestling on the ground. 152 Most of
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151 La Coste-Messelière 1957, 130-5.

152 W. Felton, “Herakles and the Nemean Lion,” in *LIMC*, ed. J. Boardman (Zurich: Artemis Verlag: 1981), 19-23. This scene is common in vase painting; Exekias’ neck amphora in Berlin (Staatl. Mus. F 1720) ca. 540 BCE resembles it closely. Other examples can be seen in *LIMC* V 18-19 (nos. 1781-1850). These contrast with Psiax’s Attic black figure amphora from ca. 520 BCE (Brescia Museo Civico *ABV* 292), which shows the two wrestling on the ground instead of standing up.
Herakles’ back, save one shoulder, makes solid contact with the relief ground, so his body is presented in three-quarter view. The frontality in metope 19 is much more pronounced than in metope 15. Herakles’ clavicles are prominent; they dip at the center and arch outwards to the shoulders. The end of the bone curls slightly in the Late Archaic style, as in the torso of Aristodikos. The awkward appearance of the clavicles may result from an artist working on the problem of turning the figure in space.

As on metope 19, the quiver, bow, and cloak of Herakles hang behind him, the patterned folds of the fabric emphasized. The recession of space is suggested by overlapping the cloth and by carving the farther set of folds in very low relief. The delicate treatment of folds shows a good understanding of how to render cloth in stone. Movement and folds in the himation edge on the torso of the Kallimachos Nike (Acropolis 690, fig.11), ca. 490 BCE, which resemble the drapery in metope 15, show a shift towards the naturalistic drapery of the Early Classical period. As around the edges of Herakles’ face in metope 19, the locks of the lion’s mane are depicted by even rows of flame-like locks. This patterning is part of the decorativeness of the Archaic period, though this pattern continues into the Classical period.

The definition of the sterno-mastoid and linea alba are similar to that of Herakles in metope 19. Deep grooves define the abdominal muscles suggesting the strength of the hero. The sculptor accented the abdomen with a flap of skin partially covering the belly button. The left iliac crest is strongly defined, probably to indicate that this is the weight leg. The artist of metope 15 rendered the torso muscles softly, in the Early Classical style, while maintaining an Archaic nearly frontal pose. The artist designed the composition based on
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153Stewart 1990, pl. 218.

popular, earlier Archaic vases, but depicted drapery with weight and modeling consistent with the end of the Archaic period. Like the previously discussed metopes, the sculptor of metope 15 combined elements of Late Archaic and Early Classical style.

**Theseus and the Minotaur (Figure 12, metope 7)**

Metope 7’s artist combined Late Archaic drapery and composition with an Early Classical musculature style in the depiction of Theseus and the Minotaur. Theseus, advancing right, grabs the head of the beast with his left arm and likely draws back a sword with his right. Theseus’ legs and hips are carved in profile, and he turns his torso outward so that his shoulders lie nearly flat against the background. The artist partially concealed the anatomical detail of Theseus’ body with a chitoniskos, rendered in Archaic style. The folds of the cloth are carved in low relief, with parallel, wavy lines. The garment is characterized as very thin and clings to the body in ways that suggest the early fifth century. The lines of the drapery closely match the drapery in the torso of Herakles in Acropolis 638, ca. 510-500 BCE, in the depth of the carving and the curve of the lines. The chiton folds match Acropolis 670 ca. 500 BCE in the way folds are formed. The folds that terminate at Theseus’ upper thigh in closely-set symmetrical zig-zags resemble those seen in Acropolis
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155 Ridgway 1993, 236. In Felton 1981, a comprehensive set of examples can be found (LIMC V 17-30) in both vase painting and statuary. In red figure vases from this period, the mane of the lion is shown through a pattern of black dots in the shape of flames. It is likely that this tradition was translated to sculpture on the Athenian Treasury through round mounds representing the hair. Felton 1981, 16. This myth appears in many ancient sources, the most complete accounts: Hes. Theog. 326-332; Diod. 4,2,3-4; Apollo. Bibl 2, 74-76.

156 Brouskari 1974, 96.

157 Karakasi 2003, pl. 153. There are several other korai from this time, but Acropolis 670 is the best preserved.
686 ca. 480 BCE.\textsuperscript{158} Like the use of ‘Attic beads’ in Herakles’ hair in metope 19, the artist used an earlier drapery style, thereby accentuating the Archaic aesthetic of the torso of Theseus.

The Minotaur is presented completely frontally. Theseus presses the beast’s head forward sharply causing its body to twist abruptly, satisfying the Archaic aesthetic of frontality. The artist defined the sterno-mastoid and linea alba of the Minotaur like those of Herakles in metope 15, but the stomach muscles of the Minotaur in metope 7 are less deeply carved. The naturalistic rendering of the muscles depicting specific muscle groups with physical weight suggests a shift towards the Early Classical. The top flap of skin on the belly button and the large iliac crest emphasize the Early Classical character of the torso, in contrast with the Archaic pose. In addition to the near-frontal pose, Theseus’ drapery is rendered in late Archaic style, consistent with the post-490 B.C.E. dating of the building.

**Theseus and the Marathon Bull (Figure 13, metope 6)**

Theseus’ head in metope 6 displays multiple styles in his hair, eyes, and face. Theseus tilts his head down toward the bull as he kills it. His eyes protrude strongly, but as in metope 21 and Acropolis 666, without the carved eyelids expected in the Early Classical period. The sculptor carved round semi-spheres of hair with interior spirals, unlike the hair of Herakles in metope 19. The spheres draw attention to the thick hair that was presumably rolled at the back of his neck, in a style fashionable in the late Archaic period.\textsuperscript{159} Wavy

\textsuperscript{158}Karakasi 2003, pl. 204-5.

\textsuperscript{159}Richter 1970, 18 and Ridgway 1993, 67 and 78. The short hairstyle continues to be popular throughout the fifth century in male figures; but here the hair is looped over the filet. Comparisons occur in Red Figure vases,
strands over Theseus’ forehead assume a second tier of decoration above the round spheres; these resemble the hair of Acropolis 645. A ribbon that holds the hair in place recalls the fashion of heroes and champions, as seen on the head of Apollo from Olympia. His eyebrows arch prominently exaggerating his facial expression, a trait shared with Acropolis 640 and Acropolis 688 (the Propylaia kore), both from ca. 480 BCE. The close positioning of elements in two styles suggests that the combined aesthetic was desired.

**Theseus and Antiope (Figure 15, Metope 8)**

Pose, facial expression, and musculature in the figures of Theseus and Antiope suggest a date of ca. 500 BCE or earlier, while the drapery of the figures appears closer to 490 BCE. Theseus, left, looks down toward Antiope, right, and each is frontally posed. Theseus turns slightly towards Antiope, in an action that looks too gentle to be a part of a combat scene. The head of Antiope falls awkwardly toward Theseus while her body sinks away from him. His lips are smiling, but lack the fullness of Herakles’ in metope 19, and his upper lip is smaller than the lower lip, like that of kore Acropolis 674, ca. 500 BCE. The strong modeling of the cheekbones stresses the shape of the broad smile. The artist combines the Archaic facial expression with plain eyes. The deep carving of the concha and the large earring exaggerate the appearance of the ear, though the ear itself is worn. The choice
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160 Karakasi 2003, pl. 163.
of stylistic elements demonstrates the sculptor’s knowledge of previous artistic movements and his ability to execute the newest techniques. He could have been an older artist experimenting at the end of his career or an artist from the islands or East Greek colonies combining their techniques with those from Attica.

The hair that surrounds Theseus’ face is articulated as snail curls, as discussed in metope 19, a stylized manner typically used in the Late Archaic period. Unlike the rest of the figures examined, Theseus’ hair is worn long, as in korai statues. Three locks hang down on each side of the chest, but individual strands of hair are not distinguished. These long locks are a regular feature of Archaic korai, for example the hair of Acropolis kore 666 ca. 520-510 BCE and the Euthydikos Kore ca. 480 BCE, though the Theseus’ locks are shorter than their female counterparts. The long hair suggests Theseus’ youthful appearance, in opposition to Herakles’ short coiffure.

The surface of Theseus’ body is damaged, but the general form remains clear. The artist accentuates the slender torso with flat, lightly carved pectoral muscles. The muscles of the lower abdomen are shallowly depicted without the suggestion of weight and strength of Herakles in metope 19. Shallow grooves suggest the idea of muscles instead of representing the volume of actual muscles. The artist modeled the torso muscles with half horseshoes that extend halfway down to his waist, much like in the torso of the ‘Theseus’ from the Acropolis
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165 Ridgway 1993, 60.

166 Neils (1987, 32-3) discusses the typically young appearance of Theseus and his hairstyle. She also briefly discusses his hair on the Athenian Treasury (1987, 53). In vase painting a number of well preserved examples of his long hair occur: Red Figure cup by Euphronios, Paris, Louvre G104, ARV² 318, ca. 500-490 and White Ground lekythos, Berlin, Staatliche Museum, 1984.61, CVA 8 ca. 480-470. Contrast an example with his long hair tied up: Neck Amphora, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, GR 22.1937, ARV² 565, ca. 475-465.
ca. 500.\textsuperscript{167} The linea alba, very lightly carved, is barely distinguishable. The style of the musculature may be related to the depiction of Theseus as a young man, while Herakles was traditionally portrayed as a bearded mature man.

In metope 8 the depiction of drapery contrasts with Archaic poses and representations of musculature, facial features and hair. The \textit{chlamys}, a riding cape, flies behind the body of Theseus, reacting to gravity and forward motion. It is fastened about his neck with a Herakles knot, like the lion skin of Herakles on Acropolis 638.\textsuperscript{168} The similar type of knot establishes a meaningful relationship between Theseus and the panhellenic hero. The artist carved the folds deeply enough to create a play of light and shadows. In the lower left corner of his cape, overlapping folds create a sense of depth, but the lower edge of much of the rest of the cape is missing. The Amazon wears a light Ionic chitoniskos under a leather cuirass.\textsuperscript{169} Over the shoulder Antiope’s drapery reveals the bulge of her deltoid. The articulation of the folds recalls the himation folds running diagonally down the upper torso of the Kallimachos Nike.\textsuperscript{170} The folds, depth of carving and movement suggests the drapery belongs to a newer style than that of the figures. The bodies of Theseus and Antiope resemble sculptures dated to 510-500 BCE, while the drapery of the figures anticipates later developments.

\textsuperscript{167}Stewart 1990, pl. 159; Boardman 1991, 168; Brouskari 1974, 62.


\textsuperscript{169}La Coste-Messelière 1957, 74.

\textsuperscript{170}Ridgway 1970, 19 and Neer 2004, 76.
Theseus and Athena (Figure 16, metope 5)

The sculptor of this metope paired Late Archaic drapery with some elements of Early Classical musculature in a scene not previously seen in Greek representations. Athena and Theseus, who face each other, are attached to the background at their sides and turn outward in three-quarter view. These open, more three-dimensional poses communicate a warm relationship between the two and showcase the artist’s ability to convey emotion. The aegis worn by the left figure identifies her as Athena. The edges of the aegis have equally spaced holes for metal snakehead attachments, which likely would have been cast in bronze.¹⁷¹

The flat expanse of the aegis clings to Athena’s body, revealing the breasts. The light chiton below her aegis reveals her legs, the left advanced before the right. The artist accurately depicts differences between the inner and outer legs by the articulation of the knees, calves, shins, and ankles, as on the Kallimachos Nike. Beneath the aegis the figure wears a short himation over the chiton.¹⁷² The folds of the ‘skirt’ are bunched between the legs flanking a narrow paryphe, with light curving folds indicating the material pulled toward the center. The artist differentiates the heavier folds of the himation, which are arranged in stacks ending in zig-zag patterns similar to those on the torso of the Kallimachos Nike.¹⁷³

Theseus wears a short light chiton and chlamys. The diagonal folds crossing his chest indicate the turn of the upper torso. His undergarment is like that in metope 7, carved with parallel wavy lines in a systematic pattern. The lower edge terminates in neat, overlapping folds. He raises his right arm, the muscular bicep emphasizing his strength. The pairing of

¹⁷¹Stewart 1990, 132.
Late Archaic drapery style with Early Classical poses and composition emphasizes the use of the two styles simultaneously.

The thorough interweaving of Late Archaic and Early Classical styles in each metope examined indicates that the artists, working in a transitional period, employed elements from earlier and later periods, sometimes to a greater or lesser degree. The consistent use of mixed styles suggests the integration of new methods of representing the human form to create a building that was both expensive in material and “cutting edge” in presentation.
CONCLUSION

The juxtaposition of two styles in the metopes of the Athenian Treasury has been a primary issue concerned with dating this building. Located near the Athenian Treasury, the Siphnian Treasury ca. 530 BCE had two distinct styles on the friezes, but these are on separate friezes. The east and south are attributed to Master A, while the west and north are attributed to Master B.174 Scholars have accounted for these differences with theories about the timeline of production or the origins of the sculptors, as having two distinct styles on different sides of the building allows for clear distinction between carvers. In contrast, the Athenian Treasury offers no such clear pattern in the find spots or use of style to indicate such a planned difference in style. Instead, each metope studied has aspects of a current style and one that predates it. The artists combined styles differently in each metope, possibly adapting styles to the subject matter or personal preference.

Some of these sculptors would have originated from marble-rich islands and would have traveled with the marble wherever commissions were available.175 It remains impossible to estimate the number of island sculptors active at a site or if they only accompanied marble from their island, but the two functions are generally considered to be connected during the Archaic period.176 The international origins of at least some of the

---

174 Ridgway 1993, 394.
175 Snodgrass 1981, 141-2.
176 Snodgrass 1981, 142-3.
sculptors would have contributed to the appearance of multiple styles on the Athenian Treasury, the Siphnian Treasury, and the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina.

The specific juxtaposition of styles on the Athenian Treasury resists categorization, as nothing in the archaeological record closely resembles this situation. The Siphnian Treasury stands nearby, but it is separated by at least one generation of artistic production and was commissioned by the people of Siphnos. The Old Athena Temple in Athens also dates to ca. 510 and some of its figures are well preserved.\textsuperscript{177} The regional style of Euboea influenced the figural style of the pediment of the Temple of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria ca. 490 BCE, complicating a one to one comparison with the Athenian Treasury. The Temple of Aphaia at Aegina has two distinct styles in the sculpture, and dates ca 475 BCE, a decade after the Athenian Treasury.\textsuperscript{178}

Hands of sculptors are difficult to discern on the Athenian Treasury. Based on the current understanding of sculptural dating, through comparison with sculptures ranging from 510 to 475 BCE it seems apparent that Late Archaic and Early Classical styles are used simultaneously in each of the metopes studied. The artists experimented within the artistic tradition of the emergent Early Classical style, while continuing to use elements of the earlier Archaic tradition. Through innovation in the juxtaposition of styles, iconography, prominent location, and wealth of materials, the Athenians communicated with the rest of the Greek

\textsuperscript{177}Ridgway 1993, 395-6.

\textsuperscript{178}The dating of the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina has been debated for many of the same issues as the Athenian Treasury. Ohly’s archaeological report dated the figures between 500 and 490 BCE, but recently other scholars have suggested lowering the chronology based on stratigraphy. D. Gill (“The Temple of Aphaia on Aegina: Further Thoughts on the Date of the Reconstruction,” \textit{BSA} 88: 1993, 180-1) lowered the date of the 5th century temple to the decade of the 470s BCE. Stewart (2008a 55-6) agreed with the 479-470 BCE dates in regard to the pedimental sculpture. The pediments were executed in two styles with the west looking more Archaic and the east looking more Early Classical.
world their triumph over the invasion of their homeland and their supremacy as a center of artistic production.
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