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Phrasikleia

In a year probably not long after 550 BCE, one of Athens’ leading families lost a daughter and buried her in a rural cemetery at Myrrhinous (Merenda) in eastern Attica. The girl was named Phrasikleia, and her family commissioned Aristion (a sculptor who came from the marble-rich island of Paros but who made his reputation in Attica) to carve a statue in Parian marble to mark her grave (see Figure 30). To judge from its nearly perfect state of preservation, the statue did not mark the grave for very long: rather, it was apparently removed for its own protection and was buried (together with a statue of a nude youth) in a pit, where it was discovered in 1972 CE.¹ The image is over life size – if we assume most women in the middle of the sixth century stood less than 1.79 m (or about 5’10”) tall. It shows a girl standing upright and frontally, wearing a long-sleeved dress, belted at the waist, with a zigzag hem that flares gently over close-set, sandaled feet. The dress is incised with ornaments (rosettes, stars, swastikas, meanders) and was originally painted in deep red, yellow, and other bright colors (the skin may have been painted white or cream): the effect would strike the modern eye as garish, but the Greeks were in many ways different from us, and the practice of vividly painting marble sculpture was the ancient Greek norm. The girl pinches her dress with her right hand, but the unresponsive cloth remains sheathlike: from the front there is no hint of her form beneath – no curve of thigh, no bulge of knee, no depression between the legs. Her left hand is brought before her pubescent breasts.
and holds a single closed lotus bud exactly between them. She wears bracelets, a necklace (adorned with pomegranates or, perhaps, poppies), and lotus-bud earrings. Three long beaded tresses begin to curve over each breast; around her forehead the hair is coiffed in waves. Enigmatically she smiles – a sign not of joy or happiness, but of transcendence. This “Archaic smile” (found on many Archaic faces, both carved and painted) is a device that in effect removes her (and all other figures who wear it) from the uncertain flux of mortality, that deflects any attempt to search for emotion or thought behind the surface of the face, but that may also intimate a life-force that ancient statues were often supposed to possess. Finally, she wears a crown of (again) lotus, this time buds alternating with flowers that have just begun to open, just as the girl seems on the verge of opening up into womanhood.

The statue was, however, just one part of Phrasikleia’s memorial. It stood atop a base that has been known since 1729 or 1730 CE and has long been famous for its poetic inscription, neatly carved in five short lines on the front:

Marker (sema) of Phrasikleia.
Maiden (kore) shall I be called
forever, given instead of marriage
this name from the gods
as my lot.

In this ensemble each element, statue and text, image and elegy, complements and fulfills the other. Phrasikleia means something like “She Who Pays Attention to Fame” or “She Who Draws Attention to Fame,” and the inscribed text enlists the viewer as the vehicle of her renown. In the Archaic period, written Greek was typically read aloud: a text – any text – was a prompt to speak. Anyone who approached the sema (marker, sign, tomb) of Phrasikleia and saw the inscription on its base would thus have given voice to it, and in so doing assumed the first person identity of the maiden herself: “I shall be called kore forever. . . .” The reader stated aloud Phrasikleia’s compensation for death – according to the inscription it is not the statue but the title, Maiden (Forever) – thus conferring fame (kleos) upon “She Who Draws Attention to Fame,” giving speech to a statue that itself claims the power of speech, and so seems active or animate. At the same brief moment, the reading/speaking spectator, male or female, impersonated or “became” the virgin whom death took before marriage and sexual maturation, a woman unfulfilled, a flower plucked, like the bud she holds, before it could blossom. The
reader/speaker played a role, imitating Phrasikleia, proclaiming her kleos as he or she sounded her name, just as the statue itself in some sense acted as a replacement for, and a semblance of, the richly adorned, marriageable, but eternally unmarried daughter of a wealthy clan, a colorful marble memory. 

The Isches Colossos

Several decades before Aristion of Paros created Phrasikleia’s sema for a rural Attic funeral plot, across the Aegean on the island of Samos a man named Isches commissioned a sculptor whose name we do not know to carve a huge marble statue of a man or youth that he then dedicated in the great sanctuary of the goddess Hera (see Figure 31). Carved out of richly veined Samian marble, the statue is a completely nude colossos almost three times life size (4.81 m, or over 15′6″, tall). If it dates as early as 580 BCE (as its excavators think), it would have been taller than the Temple of Hera or any other building then standing in the sanctuary. It advances its left leg and draws back its right, so it is not really standing at all: it is walking, and its findspot, near the entrance of the sanctuary beside the Sacred Way, suggests that the statue (whatever the occasion for its original dedication) may have served as a marker guiding visitors moving into the precinct. Its arms are clenched and held at the sides. It is blocklike, conceived as the sum of four principal views (front, back, sides). The long, beaded hair (partly damaged) falls winglike behind the shoulders. The face is round, the eyes are wide and almond-shaped, and the thin mouth smiles a shallow smile. The blue-gray veining of the marble seems at first to have been ingeniously exploited to accentuate the lean, fluid anatomy of the statue – the concavity of the torso, for example, or the roundness of the buttocks, where concentric veins resemble topographical contour lines on a map. But in fact the entire statue was probably painted brick red (the conventional skin color of men in Egyptian and other ancient art). Contrasting colors certainly enlivened the hair and eyes; rosette or star patterns were painted around the nipples; dark blue or brown paint filled in the pubic area (lightly raised in relief); and there may even have been a moustache painted above a line engraved over the upper lip. On the front of the statue’s left thigh (and not on its separate, rectangular base) there is a big, handsomely carved inscription that, like any Archaic text, was meant to be read aloud:

Isches, the son of Rhesis, dedicated.
A word is missing and must have been supplied by the mind and voice of the spectator. To judge from similar dedicatory inscriptions, the word was probably “me,” and so, as in the case of Phrasikleia’s epitaph, the viewer/reader momentarily impersonates the statue, saying its words aloud: “Isches set me up.”

**O f A c h i l l e s a n d A j a x**

Not long after Aristion carved Phrasikleia, in the 530s, one of Archaic Athens’ finest potters and vase painters made and decorated a wine amphora probably intended for use in a symposium, an upper-class “drinking-party” that was in essence a ritualized occasion for refreshment, conversation, entertainment, and, ultimately, sex. Now in the Vatican (having found its way to an Etruscan tomb at Vulci), the vase bears a quintessentially Archaic image (see Figure 32). In a panel framed by rich, shiny black glaze, Achilles and Ajax, the two greatest Greek heroes at Troy, sit on stools and play dice in an almost perfectly symmetrical composition: with their shields leaning against the sides of the panel, the heroes stoop over the gaming table, drawing their right legs back, moving their pieces with their right hands, holding their spears with their left (the lines of the spears continue the downward thrust of the handles, binding the image to the architecture of the vase). The heads of the heroes are locked within the great V of the spears. Achilles wears his helmet, Ajax has set his on his shield, and their elaborately, meticulously incised armor and cloaks – the sheer _poikilia_ (“lavishness,” “ornamentality,” “decorativeness”) of it all exceeds even that of Phrasikleia’s costume – differ in details. Ajax uneasily raises his right heel; Achilles plants his right foot solidly on the ground. Otherwise, the heroes are nearly mirror images of each other: massive black silhouettes that seem pasted over the red-orange fabric of the vase, flat forms in an all but depthless space. Ajax’s spears, it is true, cross in front of the table, whereas Achilles’ disappear behind it; Ajax’s left ankle overlaps his stool, Achilles’ left ankle is overlapped by his; and so there is some indication of the third dimension, shallow though it may be. But essentially the scene adheres tightly to the plane, to the surface of the vase: the blackness of the figures within the panel and the blackness of the glaze outside it are visually equivalent. Both stick to the vase like a thin, lustrous skin.

The light ground of the image – the unpainted clay around the silhouettes of the heroes – is perceived not as air or space but as a neutral surface, something that can be written upon with words that, again,
were meant to be read aloud by those symposiasts whose wine arrived in the jug, and who might have been expected to tell a tale about the heroes depicted upon it or elaborate upon the image they saw. Over Achilles' back the artist signed his handiwork: *Exekias eipoiesen*, “Exekias made [me]” – the speaking reader necessarily supplying the “me” and thus giving voice to the vase or the image, as in the case of Phrasikleia’s *kore* and Isches’ colossos. Between Ajax and his armor a vertical inscription that has nothing to do with the heroes but everything to do with the Archaic vase-painter’s sympotic audience and its homoerotic conventions praises a handsome local youth: *Onetorides kalos*, “Onetorides is beautiful” (the compliment, once spoken, might have initiated a tangential round of comments on the boy’s good looks, making his beauty the topic of public discussion and so bestowing *kleos* upon him). And then back to the myth: from the mouths of the heroes themselves stream words that give the score of the game. *Triá* (three), Ajax says, *tesara* (four), says Achilles, the greater hero and winner. And above them Exekias wrote the words *Akhileos* and *Aiantos*. Without these labels we could not be sure who the players are (and without hundreds of later variants of this scene we would not know that they are negligently playing a game when they should be driving Trojan intruders from their camp). But the labels are unusual in that they are written in the genitive case: that is, they mean not “Achilles” and “Ajax” but “of Achilles” and “of Ajax.” A word is missing, once again to be understood and supplied by the viewer/reader. The word must have been something like *eidolon* or *eikon*, Greek words meaning “likeness” or “image.” That is, around 540 or 530, Exekias acknowledged (and the reader of the vase was made to realize) that artists made semblances. The figures he painted were not Achilles or Ajax, but imitations of them.

But what did Aristion of Paros and the anonymous sculptor of the Isches colossos think they were making, and what did the viewers of these statues in cemetery and sanctuary think they were seeing? What did these statues mean, and how did they function in Archaic society? And what are the implications, if any, of Exekias’ concession – of his artistic self-consciousness – for the course of the depiction of the human figure on vases?

**Kore and Kouros**

The kind of statue that served as Phrasikleia’s memorial is (and was then) known as a *kore* (maiden). The kind of statue Isches dedicated is now
known as a *kouros* (youth): what the type was called in antiquity we do not know. At all events, these are the two most familiar genres of Archaic Greek sculpture in the round, and they are often thought to epitomize Archaic aesthetic ideals and social ideologies. Now, Archaic sculpture itself is far older and more diverse than these types: it begins with small bronze figurines and ivory and wooden statuettes produced in the eighth century. The marble *kore* and *kouros* seem to have been invented only around the middle of the seventh century, under the impact of Greek exposure to Egypt and its monumental stone statuary. But they are hardly the only freestanding Archaic sculptural types from the seventh and sixth centuries: there are also clothed male figures, there are seated male and female ones, there are horsemen and offering-bearers and reclining figures and warriors and athletes. Moreover, although the *kore* and *kouros* are quintessentially Archaic, they were not universally so. The types appear variably in different parts of Greece. The *kore* and *kouros* are both common in east Greece and on Samos, on many Cycladic islands, and in Attica. In Boeotia the *kouros* is plentiful, but the *kore* is not. And both types are rare in the Peloponnesos. Even in those areas where they do appear they could be put to generally different uses: in Boeotia the *kouros* is typically a dedication in a sanctuary, whereas in Attica it is principally a funerary statue; the Attic *kore*, on the other hand, despite magnificent funerary examples such as Phrasikleia, is principally a dedication (Figure 33). Although not all Greeks were equally receptive to the types and although some Greeks preferred different uses for them, the *kore* and *kouros* nonetheless seem the principal expressions of Archaic attitudes – aesthetic and social – toward the human form.

A *kore*, again, represents an upright, clothed young woman standing either with both feet close together (like Phrasikleia, see Figure 30) or with one foot (usually the left) slightly advanced (see Figure 33). Most often made of marble, occasionally of limestone, and sometimes (on a small scale) of bronze, terracotta, or wood, the *kore* may hold her hands in a variety of ways: she may keep them both down at her sides, or bring one arm across her chest, or pull at her dress with one hand while extending the other away from the body, or even extend both arms outwards. In her hands she may hold a variety of animals or objects: a bird, a hare, an apple, a flower, a pomegranate, a wreath, and so on. Early *korai* (and a few later ones) can be monumental – larger than life. But most are life-size or less. Whatever its size, the type is superficially – and the surface is what counts in Archaic art – a display of fashion, color, and ornament, an expression of the powerful Archaic impulse for *poikilia* that often leaves reality far behind. The *kore* can wear sandals
or go barefoot; she can go bareheaded, or wear a hat or tiara or other headgear sometimes added in bronze. Her hair can be elaborately, even fantastically, coiffed in waves and long tresses. She can wear necklaces, earrings, and other jewelry. She can wear, by itself, a peplos (a heavy woolen tunic belted at the waist and pinned or sewn at the shoulders) or a chiton (a light, linen, sleeved tunic with buttons at the shoulders and an overfall over the belt). At all events, chiton-wearing korai often obliquely drape a himation (a pleated mantle) over the right shoulder and below the left armpit, and it is even possible for a peplos to be worn over a chiton. There are other garments besides. Some areas of Greece prefer their korai dressed one way, some another, and different fashions are preferred at different times.

The question remains: what, exactly, does a kore depict besides a female figure in an elaborate costume? Does it have an identity? The question is first posed by what is probably the earliest kore of them all: an over life size (at 1.75 m or 5′9″ tall), planklike statue in Naxian marble dedicated by a woman named Nikandre to Artemis on the island of Delos around 660–50 (see Figure 34). Her monumentality and hard stone emulate Egyptian models; her so-called “Daidalic style” (characterized by a flat-topped, U-shaped face framed by triangular wedges of hair) was adopted from Near Eastern prototypes; her now eroded surface was once incised and brightly painted; and the three-line inscription on her left side hints at the circumstances of her creation and dedication:

Nikandre dedicated me to the far-shooter, pourer of arrows,
The excellent daughter of Deinodikes of Naxos, the sister of Deinomenes,
And [now?] the wife of Phraxos.

The statue was apparently dedicated by Nikandre upon her marriage (and, possibly, her release from service as Artemis’ priestess) and once again the statue speaks of itself (“me”). But whom does it represent? The choices are: the goddess Artemis (in which case the statue may have held a bronze bow and arrow in her drilled hands), Nikandre herself (in which case the statue may have held bronze flowers), or a Generic Woman – an excellent, beautifully adorned image that represented no woman in particular but the idea of woman, a fitting adornment and gift for the precinct of a goddess, an agalma (“delight,” “pleasing gift,” hence “statue”).

That is essentially the choice any kore presents: goddess (or mythological heroine), real mortal woman, generic ideal woman. Some
choices are easier to make than others: there is not much doubt that two *korai* who formed part of a six-figure dedication to Hera on Samos around 560 were supposed in some sense to be images of the dedicator’s daughters Philippe and Ornithe – the names are inscribed upon them – just as the *kore* that stood atop Phrasikleia’s grave was in some sense meant to be her substitute or double. But in most cases the choice is hard to make, nowhere more so than on the Athenian Acropolis, where the finest collection of Archaic *korai* was assembled in the course of the sixth and early fifth centuries, especially in the years between 510 and 480, when, with the Persian destruction of the Acropolis, the history of the type seems to have come to an abrupt end. Most Acropolis *korai* (see Figure 33) are under life size, though a few are monumental. A few wear the *peplos*, but most wear the *chiton* and *himation* (or a *chiton* alone). Many make offerings with outstretched hand or hands. But it is unclear who the Acropolis *korai* are supposed to be. We do not know the names of many dedicators of *korai* on the Acropolis, but those we do know – Epiteles, Nearchos, Naulochos and so on – are men: there is, then, no direct or necessary relationship between the sculptural type and the gender of the dedicant. (So, too, we are told of a *kore* that stood elsewhere over the grave of a man named Midas, and *korai* can be dedicated in the sanctuaries of male divinities.) The most popular theory has been that the Acropolis *korai* are simply generic images of young aristocratic womanhood: they are nonspecific *agalmata* meant as beautiful but anonymous adornments to the sanctuary of Athena, rich ornaments enhancing the *poikilia* of the Archaic precinct, marble maidens imaginatively placed in the service of the virgin goddess, eternal participants in (or at least witnesses of) the rituals and festivals that took place in their midst. Increasingly, however, the generic interpretation has been found wanting. Some scholars have suggested that the *korai* represent minor Athenian divinities (such as nymphs) or heroines (such as the daughters of legendary kings). Others have argued that most if not all Acropolis *korai* represent Athena herself – a few are certainly muscular enough to depict the goddess of war – whereas a few, such as the so-called “Peplos *kore,*” might depict Artemis, who also had a sanctuary atop the citadel. And there is now a theory that the Acropolis *korai*, individualized in appearance though similar in schema, were carved to represent real, living Athenian girls (for example, the *Arrhephoroi*, chosen each year to serve Athena on the Acropolis, or *kanephoroi*, high-born maidens who carried baskets in sacrificial processions, or even young women in the market for husbands) and so come close to being true portraits.
Beyond the question of identity (and it is unlikely that one explanation fits all), there has been a recent tendency to see korai (and other draped female figures in Greek art) as objects of heterosexual desire, “sex objects” whose demure gestures indicated passive submission to the dominant male viewer, whose elaborate attire was intended to be seductive, and whose drapery folds even called to mind (in a common Greek metaphor) the furrows of the field and so invited imaginative phallic “plowing.” That metaphor, however, should probably be blocked: many korai stood on high bases and so literally over-looked those who looked upon them, never meeting their eyes, keeping a modest, decorous distance – they are maidens literally placed upon a pedestal. And if some Acropolis korai were indeed images of the virgin goddess of the rock, then these at least were not properly available to the erotic male imagination: Athena cannot be plowed. In any case, the dedicatory kore, beautiful though it was, was a sacred gift for a divine recipient, to be possessed by the goddess and not by mortal men.

Whatever else they may be – and what they were depended upon their contexts, attributes, and identifying inscriptions – korai are displays of wealth and status commissioned and dedicated by aristocrats or well-to-do commoners who desired elite status: the largest Acropolis kore (some 7′ tall), and presumably the most expensive, was made by Antenor and was dedicated as a thank offering to Athena by Nearchos, probably the owner of a successful ceramics shop, who gratefully tithed his profits to pay for it. The powerfully built Antenor kore (she has the shoulders, arms, and thighs of a tight end) probably represents Athena herself. But any kore, carved of expensive marble, bedecked in painted finery and jewelry, and often crowned in bronze, is a statement of economic prosperity, a beautiful commodity (just as real Greek women were “social valuables,” possessions whose worth was exchanged from one family to another through marriage and dowries). In a sanctuary the kore pronounces the class or status of its dedicator (Figure 33). Over a grave such as Phrasikleia’s (Figure 30), it not only displays the wealth of the girl’s family but also, as the girl’s double, embodies the economic loss that a potential husband has suffered with the death of the maiden, shown dressed for a wedding day that will never come.

Like the kore, the kouros – the beardless, often smiling youth who stands foursquare with (usually) the left leg advanced and the right drawn back, arms down at the sides, fists clenched – was a type, a “blank,” an endlessly repeatable schema that lent itself to a number of purposes and variations. Like the kore, it was either dedicatory or funerary in function. And like the kore, the kouros, through the addition
of an attribute or an inscription or simply through its location and context, could acquire a specific identity. In most if not all cases it did: that is, it is unlikely that any kouros was meant to represent an anonymous or generic youth, or Youth in the abstract. Its form was conventional and it could, surely, embody abstract values such as arete (excellence, virtue) and the peculiarly aristocratic ideal of kalokagathia (the inextricable union of elite status with moral goodness and physical beauty, the idea that to look good was literally to be good). But Beautiful Youth was only the foundation of the type, its common denominator. Any kouros set over a tomb was surely meant to be a semblance or “copy” of the dead (however idealized it might be), and kouroi dedicated in sanctuaries (and, again, they could be dedicated in sanctuaries of goddesses as well as gods) could represent gods, heroes, mortals who acquired heroic status (such as Kleobis and Biton at Delphi), or even mortal dedicants, whose absence from the sanctuary was filled by the eternal presence of their stone doubles. In short, kouroi, like korai, composed a genre, but no individual kouros was generic.

The type was invented in the Cyclades in the middle of the seventh century, after Greeks had been exposed to the colossal stone statues of Egypt (none of which were anonymous, incidentally) and to Egyptian techniques (a few early examples conform to a proportional canon then in use in Egypt). The old idea that the earliest kouroi were images of Apollo, the god most associated with youth and beauty, who is in early poetry described (and in early art often represented) as a powerful long-haired youth who strides across heavens and earth, has lately been revived. The kouros is certainly Apollonian – young, handsome, vigorous, and (most often) long-haired, like the god. And a number of kouroi may indeed actually represent him – a 10-m-tall colossus dedicated by the Naxians on Delos around 600 certainly did. It is also telling that the largest single contingent of kouroi – some 120, a veritable battalion – have been found in the oracular hillside sanctuary of Apollo Ptoös in Boeotia. But some seventh-century Cycladic vase-paintings show Apollo dressed and bearded, not nude and beardless, and so at the time and place of the invention of the type there seems to have been no exact correspondence between painted conceptions of the god and the sculptured kouros. Elsewhere the type was adopted for different roles. Although most if not all of the kouroi at the Ptoö may be Apollos, kouroi are, again, found in the sanctuaries of other gods and even goddesses, and it is not easy to see why a statue of Apollo should have been considered an appropriate dedication to, say, Poseidon at Sounion or Hera at Samos. The Isches colossos (Figure 31) has, in fact, been interpreted as a
Samian or ancestral hero – its superhuman size, it is reasonably thought, removes it from the mortal realm. And the few kouroi dedicated on the Acropolis in the sixth century may well have represented legendary Attic kings or heroes or, perhaps, mortal dedicants. In any case, it is unlikely that any single, universalist interpretation fits all.

Nudity is the “costume” of the kouros and it is this (along with its lack of artificial supports and screens) that best distinguishes it from its Egyptian stone models (though it is not appreciated often enough that there are, in fact, Egyptian nude statues in wood). In the Greek statue it is the nudity that counts, for it displays those physical characteristics that were considered most desirable in a male: broad shoulders, narrow waist, powerful buttocks and thighs, and small penis. The kouros, in short, embodied the ideal of male beauty and youth in a Youth and Beauty culture dominated by males – a dominance so complete and pervasive that even many korai have the proportions and physiques of men. And in the Archaic period, when homoeroticism and pederasty were conventional, honorable, and virtually institutionalized, when it was acceptable and even desirable for an older man (an erastes or lover) to actively court and seduce a passive boy (an eromenos or beloved) so long as he was of the same social standing, and when inscriptions on hundreds of vases such as the Vatican amphora (Figure 32) praise the beauty of a boy, it is easy to see how the type could be read as the object of erotic desire: the viewer becomes the erastes and the statue itself the eromenos. But this formulation may be reductive. Kouroi, after all, look and smile blankly over and past the spectator; they resist engagement. At all events, the nudity of the kouros was not always total and its youth not always certain. Some examples wear belts (these are early), caps, boots, or jewelry. Other kouroi had ornaments or other anatomical features added in paint now lost: the kouros buried with Phrasikleia, for example, had a painted necklace and pubic hair. A few kouroi – probably even the Isches colossos (see Figure 31) – had mustaches. Many more might have had painted facial hair (sideburns or incipient beards?) or pubic hair that has simply faded away, and so we may be interpreting the genre without crucial evidence. Facial hair effectively removes the kouros from the realm of eromenoi (at least it did for the Archaic poet we call Theognis, who says he will love his smooth-skinned boy only so long as his face remains hairless), and so the range of ages represented by kouroi might be a lot wider than we have been used to thinking: some may not be youths after all. Size and location or context may have removed some of them from the ranks of “beloveds,” too. Although it is clear that the normal male visitor to the Heraion of Samos, for example, would
have admired the beauty of the colossi towering above him (Figure 31), it is difficult to believe he would have conceived the impulse to fondle or penetrate them, and pederastic longing seems an inappropriate response before kouroi that stood atop the graves of men.43

“Stop and mourn beside the tomb of Kroisos, dead…” reads the inscription on the base of the funerary kouros from Anavyssos (see Figure 35), and the rest of the inscription tells us that Kroisos died fighting in the battle’s front ranks (eni promachois), a victim of raging Ares. Now, as A. Stewart has pointed out, to die as he did the real Kroisos had to have been a hoplite (or heavily armed footsoldier), and to have been a hoplite he had to have been of a certain age – older than 20, and so older than the usual eromenos.44 That is, Kroisos was a mature man and so bearded. And yet his double, the kouros upon his grave, presents him as a youth: it presents him idealized, “youthened,” at the height of his beauty, vigor, and power (though it also telescopes time by showing him wearing the kind of cap hoplites wore under their helmets). Thus, one role of the kouros was to idealize its mortal subject, to present him in his absence not as he was at death but at the height of his physical force and beauty – that is, in his youth – and so enhance his memory.45 Ideals of beauty differed from place to place: Samians liked their kouroi rounded, Melians liked theirs slender, Athenians liked theirs thickly built with a highly defined musculature, and so on. But Archaic sculpture (like Classical sculpture later) was idealizing wherever you found it.

Ideals also change. In the century-long history of the Athenian kouros, for example, the type gradually seems to become more “naturalistic.” Kroisos’ kouros of ca. 530 is more anatomically correct than an Athenian kouros of 590, but it is itself less convincing as a representation of the human form than a kouros of 500 will be – say, the kouros that stood over the grave of Aristodikos in rural Attica, atop a base inscribed with a single word meaning “of Aristodikos” (“[marker, tomb] of Aristodikos” or, perhaps, “[image] of Aristodikos”) (see Figure 36). Despite this internal stylistic evolution (which seems peculiar to Attic sculpture46 and which in any case cannot be the result of Archaic sculptors actually trying to be naturalistic or Classical, because they did not know what “naturalism” and “the Classical” were), later kouroi stand essentially the way early kouroi do: left leg advanced, arms clenched at the sides, frontal and four-square. And this unchanging, endlessly reproducible stance must be at least part of the message of the type. Although nudity is, ironically, a social equalizer in real life – in a locker room it is hard to tell a naked commoner from a naked aristocrat – the nude kouros, whatever its specific identity, was the emblem of an elite that through the very
dedication and expense of the statue promoted its own unchanging status and ideals such as kalokagathia. As a result, the formally conservative kouros became socially reactionary, its stance far more old-fashioned than the active, even daring poses adopted by sculptures that were beginning to fill temple pediments by the end of the sixth century, far more static even than the dynamic figures carved in relief on their own bases (Figure 37). Such discrepancies, as well as the contrast between its increasingly convincing anatomy and its own unconvincing pose, no longer made visual sense. And when the aristocracies or elites that had commissioned them by the hundreds (if not thousands) began to decline in late Archaic city-states like Athens, kouroi no longer made social sense, either.47 The kouros gradually goes out of use around 500, and by around 480 the history of the type is over. Nude youths are still carved, but they are no longer kouroi. They do not smile, they do not walk, they shift their hips, they put all their weight on one leg and relax the other, they turn their heads, and so they look inward rather than outward (Figure 38). Revolutionary works such as the introverted Kritios and Blond Boys from the Acropolis, who stand the way they do because they seem to think the way they do, reject the schematic premises and ideologies of the extroverted, stiff, vacant kouros and announce the beginning of the Classical.

As Never EuphronioS

Archaic art is prismatic and schematic. It analyzes the world, breaking it down into its component parts, putting it back together, and filling it with figures that are limited and conventional in the poses they strike and the gestures they make. It never intends to reproduce the world as we experience it or see it, a world that is momentary, changeable, and obscured. It is an art that establishes its own permanence and “truth.” And so the first great Archaic vase-painting – a funeral scene painted on the front of a monumental amphora that was set over a grave in Athens’ Dipylon cemetery around 760–50 – splits in two what was in fact a circular dance of mourners around the corpse lying on its couch and stretches both halves tight on either side of the bier (see Figure 39). As a result there is no overlapping of forms, and so there is no front and no back. The figures evenly adhere to the surface of the vase, a plane that is in essence equivalent to reality, a world without depth, without space, in which the bier has only two front legs and the nearly identical individual figures, consisting of profile heads, frontal shoulders
and torsos, and profile legs, are uniformly presented and equally illuminated. The scene does not seek to duplicate the natural world with all its complexity, irregularity, flux, and depth. It seeks to make a world up — a world of absolute clarity and order, where nothing is hidden or implied. The Dipylon amphora presents an Archaic world at its starkest and most severe, but it is virtually the same world that Achilles and Ajax occupy on Exekias’ amphora, painted over two centuries later (see Figure 32). The heroes there are not frontal-profile composites like the Dipylon figures: they are (with the exception of their frontal eyes) pure profiles. Still, their space is, as we have noted, almost as depthless as that of the Dipylon funeral, and their formal power resides solely in — it derives from — their adherence to the plane, to the surface of the vase. A lot had happened in Athenian vase-painting between the creations of the Dipylon and Vatican amphorae, but they are demonstrably products of the same continuous tradition, and the images they bear are Archaic in the same way.

Athenian vase painters, then, had painted dark brown or black figures over a light ground (the plain fabric of the clay) for hundreds of years before Exekias practiced the so-called Black Figure style, where lustrous black figures stand silhouetted against a red-orange fabric and interior details are sharply incised, with additional detail in pure white (for the skin of women, above all) or reddish-purple (for articles of clothing, male hair and beards, horses’ manes, and so on). But just a few years after Exekias painted the Vatican amphora, around 525, another vase painter working, perhaps, just down the street in the Athenian potters’ quarter turned Black Figure inside out simply by reversing its color scheme: now the figure was left in the reddish color of the clay and the areas around the figure were covered with rich black glaze. In this Red Figure technique a thin loaded brush is used to indicate details within the figure (anatomical features or details of clothing) with lines that vary in quality from a thick dark raised or “relief” line to a light dilute. The rendering of musculature or cloth could thus be more varied and subtle than the hard Black Figure incising tool (which created an even, unmodulated line) allowed, and with dilute there was even the possibility of shading, for indicating that light falls differently over the different contours of the human form. Red Figure is just as artificial a style as Black Figure, but the technique is inherently better suited to a more accurate rendering of human anatomy and for the depiction of figures that seem to twist and move and so break free from the picture plane, which had dictated the nature of representation for hundreds of years. By the end of the sixth century, in short, the world implied on Red
Figure vases is very different from the explicit world of Black Figure: it is a world of some depth and perspective, a world not of “truth” but of “seeming,” a more complex world occupied by foreshortened figures who are figures of the moment and who exist in space as if spotlight on a darkened stage, not fixed and flat upon a seemingly backlit screen (Figure 40).  

What is not clear is whether the desire to represent such figures led to the invention of Red Figure, or whether the invention of Red Figure led to the representation of such figures. This much seems self-evident: whoever invented Red Figure was almost certainly trained as a Black Figure artist (if he was an Athenian vase painter he could not have been trained as anything else), and so he must have been in some sense and for some reason dissatisfied with the style in which he had been schooled. The dissatisfaction must have been either technological or aesthetic (or, perhaps, both). That is, either he was unhappy with the monotony of Black Figure and simply wished to add technical variety to his craft – to give himself more options, as it were – or he recognized the artistic limitations of Black Figure and consciously sought a new and different way to represent new kinds of figures. Whatever the case, other techniques (white ground, Six’s technique) were developed at roughly the same time as Red Figure, and that suggests a strong desire to open up the possibilities of representation.

The odds-on favorite candidate for the inventor of Red Figure is an anonymous painter who may have had some connection with Exekias but who certainly worked for a potter named Andokides, and so is called the Andokides Painter. A number of his works are “bilinguals” – that is, vases that are decorated in both artistic “languages,” with a Black Figure scene on one side and a virtually identical Red Figure scene on the other – and it is as if the artist were experimenting with or testing the different effects or characters of the two styles. On one bilingual cup, in fact, Red Figure warriors fight Black Figure ones: the two techniques are dueling each other from opposite sides of the vase, and the Red Figure warriors appear to be winning (see Figure 41). Although the Black Figure sides of his bilingual vases are often (and probably rightly) assigned to a different artist (the Lysippides Painter, generally considered a pupil of Exekias), the Andokides Painter’s scenes are formally or compositionally not much different: the figures are still flat, the action still planar. His Red Figure scenes are simply the “negative” of the Black – another silhouette style, a continuation or “pursuit of black-figure by other means.” That is, it is not that the Andokides Painter was merely incapable of fulfilling the potential of the new style: its potential simply never occurred to
him. And so, if he was the inventor of the Red Figure, mimesis was not his motive or his goal. Instead, the Andokides Painter invented Red Figure not so that a new kind of figure could be depicted – a figure that was more anatomically accurate and generated its own space with twists and turns – or so that new illusionistic effects be explored, but simply to break Black Figure’s monopoly, so that the Athenian vase painter would have another technique at his disposal and improve the overall commercial attractiveness of his product. His purpose was to add to the ornamental variety and decorative richness of the craft of vase painting itself – its poikilia. In this view, it was only the next generation of vase-painters – the so-called Pioneers (led by Euphrontios, Euthymides (Figure 40), Phintias, and Smikros), working some ten to fifteen years after the Andokides Painter’s invention – who realized what Red Figure was in fact capable of: the new technique came first, the new conception of the human figure came later.\textsuperscript{55}

But Red Figure is itself less ornamental or poikile than Black Figure (which, with its added white and reddish-purple details, is by far the more decorative of the two styles), and it is the more demanding style, too.\textsuperscript{56} That may be why Red Figure vases form only a small minority of vases produced in the last quarter of the sixth century: the new option, for all the poikilia it added to the craft, and for all its later success, was not immediately or readily seized upon by most vase painters. In any case, the Andokides Painter is not the only candidate for the inventor of Red Figure. Psiax (who also painted vases potted by Andokides) is another, and almost from the beginning he seems more inventive, more progressive, more interested in the foreshortening of figures than his contemporary the Andokides Painter (Figure 42): Psiax, in other words, is the true “father” of the Pioneers.\textsuperscript{57} If it was Psiax who invented the new style, then it may after all have been to accommodate a more daring and experimental approach to the depiction of the human figure, to provide a new tool that allowed the artist to represent “better” figures as they appeared to the eye. In that case, the innovative aesthetic impulse preceded and called for the new technology.

Whatever the case, the late sixth-century Red Figure vase painter was not the only artist interested in the plausible depiction of the human form. Beginning around 525, relief sculptors, too, experimented with figures and objects shown in a variety of three-quarter, back, and frontal views, or in a kind of trompe-l’œil even showed the same figures from two different points of view.\textsuperscript{58} It is more likely that vase painters followed their lead in exploring visual effects rather than the reverse. Figures in relief were also normally set against a dark painted background
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(cf. Figure 37), and the change from Black Figure to Red may have been partly driven by the desire to emulate the light-on-dark effects of relief. At all events, the representation of figures as they appeared to the eye—optically rather than conceptually—marks as fundamental a shift away from Archaic ways of making as the rejection of the foursquare kouros after 500. It may not be coincidence that the shift begins very soon after Exekias implied that he made mere images of Achilles and Ajax (see Figure 32)—that art was imitation, that he made figures not of “truth” but of “seeming.” In any case, although the Archaic period conventionally ends only in 480, the beginning of the end of the Archaic style came much earlier. It came when partly carved, partly painted foreshortened chariots seemed to emerge from the background on the east frieze of the Siphnian Treasury and when on the north frieze Hermes charged obliquely toward the background to do battle with a giant; when on a Red Figure cup by Psiax a kneeling archer, his right leg sharply foreshortened beneath him, showed the viewer his back and the sole of his right foot (Figure 42); when on the base of a missing kouros youths playing ball were shown in six different frontal, three-quarter, and back views and so presented a study guide to the human figure in action (see Figure 37); and when variously foreshortened, drunken revelers on a vase by Euthymides (a Pioneer) made their tipsy way home, barely keeping their balance (see Figure 40), and Euthymides taunted his greatest rival with words, painted along the edge of the scene, that like other Archaic words were meant to be read aloud: “As never Euphronios.” There is a double meaning in that: both “Euphronios [his name means Good Sense] never acted like this,” but, more importantly, “Euphronios never painted anything like this.” Until then, no one else ever had, either.

Notes

1 Kaltsas 2002, 48–9 (Cat. 45). If Svenbro 1993, 12–13, is right that Phrasikleia’s family was the prestigious and politically important clan known as the Alkmeonidai, and that the statues were buried to prevent their being vandalized by enemies of the family—specifically Peisistratos and his followers, who on the way to his third and final tyranny are said (by Isocrates, Team of Horses, 26) to have destroyed the houses and ransacked the graves of the Alkmeonidai—then Phrasikleia must date before 546 (not 540, the date Svenbro gives for Peisistratos’s invasion of Attica). This scenario would explain the statue’s excellent state of preservation. But the statue buried along with her seems a decade or so later (cf. Kaltsas 2002, 49 [Cat. 46], who dates the youth to the 530s), whereas Phrasikleia herself has also been dated more generally to the 540s or 530s (Stieber 2004, 142, improbably dates her around 520). A later exile of the Alkmeonidai (around 514) might best explain the
joint interment of the statues, whereas the threat of the Persian invasion of 490 or 480 remains a lesser possibility. On the struggles between Peisistratos and the Alkmeonidai, see also chapter 1, *The Peisistratids of Athens.*

2 Svenbro 1993, 14.

3 Similarly, the first line can be read as either “[This is] the marker . . .” or “[I am] the marker . . .” Around the corner of the base, on its left side, the sculptor is identified in another inscription – “Aristion of Paros made me” – and the reader/spectator is called upon once again to give voice to the statue, assuming its identity (“me”). For more on orality and the role of words in early Greek images, see Hurwit 1990, Slater 1999, and Boardman 2003.


5 Kyrieleis 1996.

6 Kyrieleis 1996, pl. 23.


9 Cf. Chapter 6 on poetry performed in the elite context of the symposium.

10 For *poikilia* as a fundamental principle of Archaic art, see Hurwit 1985, 23–5; also Neer 2002, 16, 33–4.

11 See Slater 1999. But see Boardman 2003, who disputes the notion that inscriptions on vases (and by extension texts on bases, such as Phrasikleia’s, or on sculptures, such as the Isches colossos) were meant to be read aloud.

12 For *kore* in general, see Karakasi 2004.

13 The distinction is not always easy to make: some say Phrasikleia’s dress is a *chiton* (cf. Kaltsas 2002, 48), some say a *peplos* (cf. Ridgway 1993, 139; Stieber 2004, 145). Karasaki 2004, calls it a *chiton* in her text (121) but a *peplos* in a table (169).]

14 For Philippe, Ornithé, and the so-called Geneleos Group, see Boardman 1978, Figures 91–3; Ridgway 1993, 135–6.

15 For the “bulge” in *kore* and other dedications on the Acropolis at this time, see Keesling 2003, 42–3, and passim. One *kore*, Acropolis 688, may date to just after 480.

16 For the list of the 15 or 16 known dedicators of *kore*, see Keesling 2003, 87.

17 *Greek Anthology* 7.153.

18 See, for example, Schneider 1975.

19 Harrison 1988, 54.

20 Ridgway 1993, 147–51; Keesling 2003, who stresses that her argument “applies only to a single votive context, the Athenian Acropolis, and does not presume that *kore* dedicated in other sanctuaries represented the same subjects as those dedicated on the Acropolis” (98).

21 Karasaki 2004, 136–9; Stieber 1994, 104–14, and 2004, who calls *kore* “mimetically realistic portrayals of the appearances of real Archaic women (140).” In the same vein, Stewart 1997 suggests that *kore* represent the daughters of “Athenian men who liked to honor Athena with [their] images” (137). But unlike Philippe, Ornithé, or Phrasikleia, no Acropolis *kore* is identified as an actual girl with a name inscribed on the statue itself or its base, and this seriously weakens Stieber’s case; cf. Keesling 2003, 109.

Of course, their inaccessibility may only have added to their allure, and some korei (e.g., Acropolis 670, 671, 673, 674, and 682) set high atop bases or columns tilted their heads and lowered their eyes toward possible viewers on the ground, their eyes even physically distorted to take the steep angle of viewing into account; see Boardman 1978, Figures 111, 151, 152, 153, 158.

See Keesling 2003, 56–9.


For Kleobis and Biton (often now identified as the Dioskouroi), see Ridgway 1993, 74 and 107, n. 3.38.

Guralnick 1982.

Just as the Moschophoros (a statue of a bearded man carrying a sacrificial calf on his shoulders) dedicated by Rhonbos around 560 almost certainly represents Rhonbos himself; Boardman 1978, Figure 112.

On the other hand, in Tyrtaios 10, lines 27–30, a man in the bloom of youth is said to be a wonder to men and an object of desire for women, beautiful even when he has fallen fighting in the front ranks (*promachoisi*). The diction seems echoed in the epitaph of the funerary Anavyssos *kouros*.

Such idealization was not universal in Archaic sculpture: Geneleos, for example, represented...arches (dedicatory of that impressive group of statues on Samos c. 560–50) as a reclining fat man, and the Boxer Stele from the Athenian Kerameikos depicts its subject with a broken nose; see Boardman 1978, Figures 93 and 233.

Other local schools are far less interested in the investigation of anatomy; see Ridgway 1993, 71.

The illusionism of late sixth-century art is still very limited: scientific or linear perspective is unknown, and there is, with one or two possible exceptions, no diminution of objects or figures supposed to be in the distance; for one of the exceptions, see Hurwit 1991, 40.

Some have considered the possibility that the inventor of Red Figure was a sculptor of marble reliefs who changed specialties; but see Williams 1991a, 105; Robertson 1992, 9, 11–12.

Some hint of dissatisfaction with Black Figure is found even in the works of a quintessential Black Figure artist, the Amasis Painter, who instead of using white for the color of his female figures often outlined their flesh and left it in the color of the clay (“in reserve”). In other words, portions of some of his figures approximate Red Figure. It is not clear, however, whether this precedes and anticipates the invention of full Red Figure or is a response to its invention. See Boardman 1974, 55 and Figures 85, 87, 89.

For more on bilinguals, see now Neer 2002, 32–43. Neer believes that Red Figure “makes its earliest appearance on ‘bilingual’ vases” (32), whereas Boardman 1975, 17, has suggested that most of the Andocides Painter’s bilingual vases were painted relatively late in his career.

On Psiax, see Williams 1991a, 104, 106–7 (“teacher of Euphronius”); Williams 1991b, 287; Robertson 1992, 12–13. Like most scholars, Boardman 2001, 82, places Psiax a little later than the Andokides Painter, but the relative dating of vase painters in the last quarter of the sixth century is hardly an exact science, and it is impossible to say for sure that a given vase was painted around 520 rather than around 525.

Kaltsas 2002, 68–9 (Cat. No. 96).

It is not necessary to assume (as some have) that the first Red Figure vase painter was a relief sculptor who changed professions (see n. 49 above), only that he was impressed with the innovative reliefs he saw in the world around him. For other proposed influences (metalwork, textiles), see Williams 1991a, 106.
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FIGURE 3A. The “Chigi Vase”: a Protocorinthian olpe from Veii (Rome, Villa Giulia 22679). Ca. 640 BCE. Photograph credit: Jeffrey M. Hurwit.
FIGURE 3B. Scene from the “Chigi Vase.” [Drawing in E. Pfuhl, Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen (Munich 1923) no. 59].

FIGURE 4. Scene from the Protocorinthian “Macmillan Aryballos”, ca. 655 BCE, from Thebes (British Museum 1889.4–18.1) [Drawing in Journal of Hellenic Studies II (1890) pl. 2].

FIGURE 5. Scene from a Protocorinthian aryballos, ca. 675 BCE, from Perachora [Drawing in T. J. Dunbabin, Perachora vol. 2 (Oxford 1962) pl. 57, no. 27].
Figure 6. Scene from the Nereid monument, ca. 390–380 BCE. London, British Museum GR 1848.10–20.51 (Sculpture 872). Photograph courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.

Figure 7. Scene from the North Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi, ca. 525 BCE. Delphi, Museum. Photograph courtesy of the Archives of the American School of Classical Studies, Alison Frantz Collection.

Figure 8. Scene from a Protocorinthian aryballos, ca. 650 BCE. Paris, Musee du Louvre CA 1831. [Drawing from K. Friis Johansen, RevArch 13 (1921) 8 fig. 1.]
FIGURE 9. Scene from a Protocorinthian aryballos from Gela, ca. 650 BCE. Syracuse. [Drawing from MontAnt 17 (1906) 157–158 fig. 116.]

figure 11. Greek Scaraboid with an archer testing an arrow, ca. 500 BCE. Attributed to Epimenes. Courtesy of Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1931 (31.11.5) Image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
FIGURE 14. Scene of a prothesis, on an Attic black-figure loutrophoros, late sixth century BCE. Courtesy of Metropolitan Museum of Art, Funds from various donors, 1927 (27.228). Photograph, all rights reserved, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
FIGURE 15A–B. The Blinding of Polyphemus, on a Protoattic amphora from Eleusis, ca. 660 BCE. Courtesy of the German Archaeological Institute, Athens; photograph: Eva-Maria Czakó, D-DAI-ATH-Eleusis 546, 547.
Figure 16. Anacreontic symposiasts on an Attic red-figure cup by the Briseis Painter (Side A). Ca. 490–80 BCE. Courtesy of the J. Paul Getty Museum, Villa Collection, Malibu CA (86.AE.293).

Figure 17. Anacreontic symposiasts on an Attic red-figure cup by the Briseis Painter (Side B). Ca. 490–80 BCE. Courtesy of the J. Paul Getty Museum, Villa Collection, Malibu CA (86.AE.293).
FIGURE 19. Dedication to Antiphemus, founder of Gela, on Attic kylix. [From Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene n.s. xi–xiii (1949–51) 108.]

Bases
1. Older “Zanes” bases
2. New “Zanes” bases
3. Ptolemy and Arsinoc
4. Base for Dropion statue
5. Dedication of Micythus
6. Eleian Semi-circular Bases
7. Bull of Eretria
8. Archaic Dedication
9. Nike of Paeonius
10. Zeus in Memory of the Victory at Plataea
11. Base of Telemachus
12. Dedication of Praxiteles
13. Dedication of Apollonia
14. Base of Philonides
15. Base of M.M. Rufus
16. Dedication of Phormis
17. Base of Callicrates

Altars
A unknown altars
A1 Altar of Hera
A2 Altar of Heracles
A3 Altar of the Mother
A4 Altar of Artemis

FIGURE 22. Site plan of Olympia. [From A. Mallwitz, Olympia und seine Bauten (1972) 313.]
Buildings of the Treasuries Terrace

- Oikos
- I Treasury of Sicyon
- II Treasury of Syracuse
- III Treasury of Epidamnus
- IV Treasury of Byzantium
- V Treasury of Sybaris
- VI Treasury of Cyrene
- VII Unknown Treasury
- VIII Altar?
- IX Treasury of Selinous
- X Treasury of Metaponto
- XI Treasury of Megara
- XII Treasury of Gela
- B Well
- D The Seat of the Priestess of Demeter

- F Roman Festival Gate
- H Classical Stoa Foundation
- K Platform for Judges
- R Gaion Ramp
- S Retaining Wall
- W Tank for Water Storage
- Greek Gutters

Archaische Bauten (7.-6. Jh. v. Chr.) = Archaic Buildings (7th–6th cent. BCE)
Klassische Bauten (5.–4. Jh. v. Chr.) = Classical Buildings (5th–4th cent. BCE)
Hellenistische Bauten (3.–1. Jh. v. Chr.) = Hellenistic Buildings (3rd–1st cent. BCE)
Römische Bauten (1. Jh. n. Chr.– 4. Jh. n. Chr.) = Roman Buildings (1st–4th cent. CE)

FIGURE 25. Deinomenid charioteer, Delphi. Ca. 466 BCE. Photograph courtesy of the Archives of the American School of Classical Studies, Alison Frantz Collection.
Figure 26. Reconstruction of Serpent column, Delphi. [From J.-F. Bommelaer, *Guide de Delphes: Le Site* (1991) fig. 69 left.]

Figure 27. Sicyonian metope with *Argo*, Delphi. Early sixth century BCE. Photograph courtesy of the Archives of the American School of Classical Studies, Alison Frantz Collection.
Figure 28. East pediment, Archaic Temple of Apollo, Delphi. Late sixth century BCE. Photograph courtesy of the Archives of the American School of Classical Studies, Alison Frantz Collection.
Figure 30. Phrasicleia kore, by Aristion of Paros, ca. 550–540 BCE. National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Inv. No. 4889). Photograph Jeffrey M. Hurwit.
FIGURE 32. Black Figure amphora by Exekias, ca. 530 BCE. Vatican Museums 344. Photograph courtesy of Hirmer Fotoarchiv, Munich.
FIGURE 33. Kore, Acropolis Museum 685, ca. 510 BCE. Photograph Jeffrey M. Hurwit.
Figure 34. Nikandre kore, from Delos, ca. 650 BCE. National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Inv. No. 1). Photograph Jeffrey M. Hurwit.
Figure 35. Kouros from tomb of Kroisos at Anavyssos, ca. 530 BCE. National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Inv. No. 3851). Photograph Jeffrey M. Hurwit.
Figure 37. Base of kouros from Themistoclean wall, ca. 510–500 BCE. National Archaeological Museum, Athens (inv. No. 3476). Photograph courtesy DAI, Athens.

Figure 38. Kritios Boy, ca. 480 BCE. Acropolis Museum 698. Photograph Jeffrey M. Hurwit.
Figure 39. Funeral scene from Late Geometric amphora by Dipylon Master, ca. 750 BCE. National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Inv. No. 804). Photograph Jeffrey M. Hurwit.

Figure 40. Red Figure amphora by Euthymides, ca. 510 BCE. Munich Antikensammlungen 2307. Photograph courtesy of Hirmer Fotoarchiv, Munich.
Figure 41. Detail of bilingual cup by Andokides Painter, ca. 525–520 BCE. Palermo V 650. [From Jdl 4 (1889), pl. 4.]

Figure 42. Fragment of Red Figure cup by Psiax ca. 520 BCE. Munich. Drawing by K. Ibach, after Williams 19991b, fig. 2.