Journal of Hellenic Studies ciii (1983) 49–67

SIGNA PRISCAE ARTIS: ERETRIA AND SIPHNOS*

In memoriam W. H. Plommer

'Most things in Greece', so Pausanias tells us, 'are subject to dispute.'[1] Nowadays, however, the chronological development at least of archaic and early classical art is no longer regarded as a matter for controversy. Indeed so little dispute remains that the art of this period is being used with increasing confidence to reconstruct the social, political and economic history of Greece. Before new orthodoxies arise, however, it may be in order to question some of the old ones by re-examining the 'fixed points' on which the chronology of Greek art is based. These points of contact between art and history are familiar. They include, for example, the sack of Hama in Syria, Thucydides' dates for the western colonies, the siege of Old Smyrna, the Greek occupation of Tell Defenneh and other Egyptian sites, the construction of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi, the youthful careers of Athenian *kaloi* (notably those of Leagros, son of Glaukon, and of his son Glaukon), ostraca, the Marathon tumulus and the Persian sack of Athens.

In this paper we evaluate the evidence of two well-known buildings which are generally thought to have been constructed in the sixth century BC. We argue that available evidence may not require this chronological conclusion. We begin by attempting to demonstrate that the marble Temple of Apollo Daphnephorus at Eretria with its pedimental Amazonomachy was erected in the aftermath of the Persian Wars, not in the sixth century. We then reconsider in the light of this suggestion the traditional date of the Siphnian Treasury (*c.* 530–25 BC). Despite the fact that testimony cited to support a construction date before 525 seems conclusive, we offer reasons which might favour the view that the Siphnian Treasury, like the Temple of Apollo at Eretria, postdates the Persian Wars. This conclusion receives support from the lower chronology which some scholars now propose for early Greek coinage.

I. Eretria: The Temple of Apollo Daphnephorus

At the time of the Ionian Revolt, Athens and Eretria were the only cities in the western Aegean which joined the anti-Persian cause. When the Persians came to exact vengeance on the Athenians in 490 BC, they first landed on Euboea to punish the Eretrians. In Herodotus' words, 'no sooner had they entered the city walls than they plundered and burnt the temples in the town in revenge for the burning of their own temples at Sardis'.[2] Since the worship of Apollo was chief among Eretrian cults,[3] we cannot doubt that his temple was destroyed during this Persian attack. So much is generally agreed and most scholars also identify that temple as the one decorated with the well-known pedimental figures (including Theseus and Antiope, Amazons and Athena) now in the Chalcis Museum. A team of Swiss investigators at the site has dated the construction of the temple as early as *c.* 530–20 BC, but judges that the pedimental sculptures were not completed until later ('um 505 vollendet').[4] Many scholars now accept a date *c.* 510.[5]

* We are grateful to Dr Norman Ashton, Dr J. J. Coulton, Mr J. G. Griffith, Dr D. M. Lewis, Drs C. E. and N. J. Richardson and Mr R. R. R. Smith for their careful reading and constructive criticisms of earlier drafts. They are not responsible for any errors which may remain. E. D. F. acknowledges the generosity of the University Research Institute of the University of Texas, and M. V. that of the Wolfson Foundation, the Oxford Literae Humaniores Faculty Board, the Craven Committee, and the Ashmolean Central Travel Fund.

[1] Paus. iv 2.3.

[2] Hdt. vi 101.

[3] *Cf.* C. Bérard, 'Architecture érétrienne et mythologie delphique', *AK* xiv (1971) 59–73, pl. 40.

[4] P. Auberson, *Eretria* i (Bern 1968) 9, 24.

[5] E.g. K. Kourouniotis, ''*Ανασκαφαὶ ἐν 'Ερετρίᾳ*', *Praktika* 1900, 53–6: end of sixth cent.; E. Langlotz, *Zur Zeitbestimmung der strengrotfigurigen Vasenmalerei und der gleichzeitigen Plastik* (Leipzig 1920) 78, 117: 500–490; J. D. Beazley and B. Ashmole, *Greek Sculpture and Painting* (Cambridge 1932) fig. 52: late sixth cent.; G. Lippold, *Die griechischen Plastik* (Munich 1950) 72 f.: *c.* 520–10; D. von Bothmer, *Amazons in Greek Art* (Oxford 1957) 126: *c.* 520–10; R. Lullies and M.

Citing the fact that both Eretria and Athens adopted democratic constitutions at the end of the sixth century BC, P. Auberson and K. Schefold have suggested that the imagery of the extant pedimental sculpture represents a compliment to her Athenian alliance.[6]

Though these views agree with prevailing judgements concerning the chronology of archaic Greek art, they are not easily reconciled with the archaeological evidence of the site. Excavations conducted by K. Kourouniotis in 1899 revealed traces of two temples—one was a wooden structure, the other of marble—which were then dated to the end of the sixth century and the first half of the fifth, respectively.[7] Kourouniotis believed that the marble pedimental sculpture came from the wooden temple destroyed by the Persians. The Swiss team who re-examined the site in the 1960s saw traces of yet earlier temples, but were unable to find any stratigraphical evidence which might throw fresh light on the date of the buildings discovered by Kourouniotis. From his stylistic analysis of the surviving fragments, P. Auberson concluded that the wooden temple was built between 670 and 650 and that its marble successor was constructed, as we have already noted, *c.* 530–20 BC.[8] He believed this to be not only the building destroyed in 490, but also the last temple on the site. In support of his view, Auberson states that 'il n'existe en effet aucun élément d'architecture, aucun bloc qui permette d'envisager une reconstruction du temple au cours du Ve ou IVe siècle'.[9] This statement might appear to preclude any further discussion of a post-Persian war date for the marble temple were it not for the following considerations: (1) our hypothesis that the temple was built in the 470s and destroyed in 198 BC does not require that we discover evidence of *fourth-century* architectural features unless reasons exist for assuming major renovation during that period; (2) since we do not accept Auberson's view that the temple was necessarily constructed *c.* 530–20 and reflects the architectural style of the later sixth century, the question of sixth- or fifth-century evidence remains for the moment *sub judice*. If Auberson's chronological scale can be revised downwards, as we propose, then those 'éléments d'architecture' and other 'blocs' which he attributes to the sixth century may come to be seen as evidence of fifth-century construction.[10]

Kourouniotis, however, correctly recognised that epigraphic evidence proves that the cult of Apollo Daphnephorus continued to be practised at Eretria after the Persian Wars. Inscriptions found at the site of the temple dating from the fourth century and later and which refer to the cult of the god provide incontestable support for this conclusion.[11] Kourouniotis sought to reconcile this epigraphic evidence attesting to the continuity of the cult with the date scholars chose, on stylistic grounds, to ascribe to the pedimental sculpture. Auberson's investigation now demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that the marble sculpture belonged to the marble temple,

Hirmer, *Griechische Plastik*[2] (Munich 1965) pls 66–9: *c.* 510; H. Herdejürgen, *Untersuchungen zur thronenden Göttin aus Tarent in Berlin* (Waldsassen 1968) 162 f.: 500–490; P. Themelis, ''*Ερετριακά*', *ArchEph* 1969, 164–6: shortly before 510; G. M. A. Richter, *Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*[4] (New Haven 1970) 251: 510–500; J. Kleine, *Untersuchungen der attischen Kunst von Peisistratos bis Themistokles*, Ist. Mitt. Beih. viii (1973) 96: late sixth cent.; A. Delivorrias, *Attische Giebelskulpturen und Akrotere des fünften Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen 1974) 179–80: after 500–490; B. S. Ridgway, *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture* (Princeton 1977) 212: last quarter sixth cent.; M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* (Cambridge 1976) pl. 50*b*: end sixth cent.; J. Boardman, *Greek Sculpture, the Archaic Period, a Handbook* (London 1978) fig. 205.1–3: about 510; W. Gauer, 'Das Athener Schatzhaus und die marathonischen Akrothinia in Delphi', *Forschungen und Funde, Festschrift Bernhard Neutsch* (Innsbruck 1980) 131 f.: after 500/499–490.

[6] P. Auberson and K. Schefold, *Führer durch Eretria* (Bern 1972) 115; *cf.* Robertson (n. 5) 164. On this reading of the iconography, we must presumably infer that the original architects of the temple ('c. 530–20') had envisaged a different decorative scheme from the one partially extant.

[7] Kourouniotis (n. 5) *loc. cit.*

[8] Auberson (n. 4) 24.

[9] Auberson (n. 4) 10.

[10] Compare, for example, J. J. Coulton's recent study in which he places the Eretria Temple in the same group as the Temple of Zeus at Olympia: 'Doric capitals: a proportional analysis', *BSA* lxxiv (1979) 102–4. The comparanda Auberson himself employed in his analysis ([n. 4] 19) were buildings dated according to a conservatively high view of the conventional chronology.

[11] *IG* xii.9 202.12–14: *ἐν] τῶι ἱερῶ[ι] | [τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ] Δαφνη[φό] | [ρου]*; 204.8–9: *πρὸ τοῦ Ναο]ῦ τοῦ Ἀπόλ | [λωνος τοῦ Δαφνηφ]όρου*; similar expressions are to be found in 208.23–4; 210.28–9; 212.23; 215.12–13; 216.14–15; 220.20–1; 225.7–8; 229.4–5; 230.5.

not, as Kourouniotis thought, to the wooden one. We suggest, however, that in ascribing this marble temple to the sixth century Auberson took insufficient account of the implications of the epigraphic evidence, but we accept his view (1) that the sculpture belonged to the last temple, and (2) that no indication exists of any reconstruction. The following conclusion seems to us the most plausible one to be drawn from these observations: the Persians did indeed destroy a wooden temple of Apollo at Eretria, but a new marble temple was subsequently built upon the same spot. This temple probably survived until 198 BC when Eretria was once again attacked, this time by a Romano-Pergamene coalition which finally reduced the city.

Although this assault upon Eretria has not received the same attention as the Persian depredations three centuries earlier, it may well contribute to our understanding of Greek art at the time of the Persian invasions. In reporting the campaign of L. Quinctius Flamininus and King Attalus against Euboea, Livy speaks of the massive siege operations undertaken in order to capture Eretria, of the bravery of the defenders, and of the considerable casualties suffered on both sides.[12] After the surviving townsfolk had capitulated, the captors took stock of their booty. They found little bullion ('pecuniae aurique et argenti haud sane multum fuit'), but an unexpected wealth of art which included antique sculpture ('signa tabulae priscae artis ornamenta eius generis plura quam pro urbis magnitudine aut opibus ceteris inventa'). While *priscus* (the Latin counterpart of Greek *ἀρχαῖος*) cannot mean 'archaic' in the modern, technical reference to a definite period of Greek art, it denotes 'archaic' in the general sense of 'antique, primitive, from olden times'. *Priscus* could therefore provide an appropriate characterisation of pre-classical Greek sculpture as seen through Roman eyes.

The Persians had had a particular reason to devastate Eretria's temples, but her new conquerors—despite reports of savage treatment[13]—seem to have been more interested in plundering than in destroying her wealth. Livy goes on to speak of the Roman fleet standing offshore, loaded with spoils from Euboean cities.[14] The Amazon archer, found in the Villa Ludovisi in Rome and now in the Conservatori Museum, may have been among these *spolia* for it was originally from the west pediment of the Temple of Apollo at Eretria.[15] At any rate, the piece is thought already to have reached Rome in antiquity[16] and a captive Amazon could have been an appropriate subject to display among the *signa . . . marmorea* included in T. Quinctius Flamininus' triumph in 194 BC.[17] Auberson and Schefold speak of 'Steinräubern der Römerzeit' active at Eretria,[18] but their implication that the Romans dug up these statues is a difficult hypothesis to follow. It seems more likely that, if their preliminary barrage[19] had not already toppled the pediments, the Romans pulled down the sculpture from the temple, kept the relatively complete figures they wanted and discarded the rest.

We cannot know how much damage resulted from this treatment. Auberson and Schefold, however, draw attention to the remarkable state in which a horse's hoof has been preserved.[20] This hoof had originally belonged to one of the pediments, but after the Roman sack it was built into a city wall. The well-preserved condition of all the pedimental sculptures has often been cited as evidence that they can only have remained *in situ* in the pediment for a short time prior to their burial once the Persians had destroyed the temple. Much detailed work is indeed beautifully preserved, but no-one would deny signs of weathering, for example, on the face of Antiope, and on Athena's gorgoneion and aegis.[21] The west pediment, however, faced away from the sea and towards a sheltering range of mountains, and its siting will have aided the

[12] Livy xxxii 16; Paus. vii 8.1.

[13] Paus. vii 8.2.

[14] Livy xxxii 21.7.

[15] J. Konstantinu, 'Aus dem Eretriagiebel', *AthMitt* lxix/lxx (1954–5) 41; von Bothmer (n. 5) 126.

[16] *Cf.* Lullies (n. 5) 48; Boardman (n. 5) 156.

[17] As O. Vessberg notes (*Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* [Lund/Leipzig 1941] 29, citing Livy xxxiv 52.4–5), this triumph is the first occasion on which Greek works of marble are explicitly reported to have been displayed in Rome.

[18] Auberson–Schefold (n. 6) 121.

[19] *Cf.* Livy xxxii 16.10.

[20] *ADelt*, Chron. xvii (1961/2) pl. 165*b*; *cf.* Auberson–Schefold (n. 6) 42; 'wunderbarer Erhaltung', *ibid.* 30.

[21] E.g. Lullies (n. 5) pls 66–9.

preservation of what was after all hard Parian marble.[22] Herodotus tells us that the Persian attack was directed primarily against temples (τὰ ἱρά).[23] The relative absence of damage or traces of fire on the surviving sculpture argues against the view that this marble temple was destroyed in the Persian conflagration. Instead, as a means of visualising the scene of destruction at Eretria in 490, we compare Herodotus' vivid account of the firing of Sardis, with its thatched roofs going up in flames.[24] The wooden temple of Apollo is likely to have suffered a similar fate.

Against our hypothesis that the building dates from the post-war years, some might object that Eretria was in no position to erect a marble temple at that period, for the city had suffered a 'crushing blow' at the hands of the enemy.[25] While it is true that many of her citizens had been deported,[26] enough of the population had survived—perhaps by fleeing to the surrounding hills[27]—to contribute seven galleys at Artemisium and Salamis[28] and, together with the Styreans, some six hundred hoplites at Plataea.[29] For these services the Eretrians' name was inscribed on the Serpent Column at Delphi.[30] Eretria had undoubtedly lost the commercial hegemony of earlier days, but the Athenian tribute lists attest the city's continued existence at a modest but respectable level for much of the fifth century.[31] Her share of the booty from the Greek victories of 480 and 479 could have provided at least some of the funds not only to rebuild her major temple, but also to dedicate a large bronze bull at Olympia.[32] The alliance of Athens and Eretria in the Ionian Revolt fostered a special relationship between the Euboean city and her increasingly powerful neighbour and Eretria may also have found material assistance forthcoming from this source.

If Apollo's temple at Eretria was indeed built during the early years of the Delian alliance, then certain stylistic and iconographical difficulties in the currently accepted account can be resolved. B. S. Ridgway, for example, has recognised several 'mannered traits which can qualify as Archaistic'.[33] These stylistic features would favour the adoption of a post-sixth century date

[22] It is instructive to compare a description of the North Porch of the Erechtheum in 1837: 'This side of the temple, being so well sheltered from the sea-breeze, has preserved its sculptured ornaments as fresh and sharp as if lately finished; and the columns of this portico being fluted with capitals elaborately worked and well-sheltered, have retained remains of colour . . .'. Letter of C. H. Braceridge, quoted in J. M. Paton (ed.), *The Erechtheum* (Cambridge, Mass. 1927) 229. J. J. Coulton has, however, pointed out to us that the weathering in question at Eretria is more likely to have occurred following the destruction of the temple when the sculpture was lying on the ground than while it remained in the protected position of the gable.

[23] Hdt. vi 101.

[24] Hdt. v 101.

[25] M. N. Tod in *CAH* v (1927) 17; *cf.* the view of the numismatic evidence in M. J. Price and N. Waggoner, *Archaic Greek Silver Coinage: the 'Asyut' Hoard* (London 1975) 56.

[26] Hdt. vi 101, 119; Plato *Epigr.* 11, 12 Page ('Hellenistic literary exercises': D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* [Cambridge 1981] 171–3).

[27] If any credence can be placed in the dream of Apollonius of Tyana described by Philostratus—and it would be difficult to imagine a historical source with less to recommend it: see R. J. Penella, *Athenaeum* iii (1974) 295–300 and E. L. Bowie, *ANRW* ii 16.2 (1978) 1652–99—the Eretrians in 490 were captured like fishes in nets; Philostratus goes on to say that 780 Eretrians were captured 'not all fighting men, for the number included some women and old people, and I dare say children as well: for the main part of the Eretrians fled up to Caphareus and the highest mountains in the island'. (Philostr. *VA* i 25–6, tr. J. S. Phillimore).

[28] Hdt. viii 1, 46. These seven galleys in fact represent a larger contingent than the five the Eretrians contributed to the Ionian Revolt (Hdt. v 99).

[29] Hdt. ix 28, 31.

[30] ML no. 27. Dr Lewis has drawn our attention to the fact that the Eretrians are not included in Pausanias' record of the cities 'who fought at Plataea against Mardonius and the Persians' inscribed on the panhellenic dedication at Olympia (v 23.1). One might speculate that the omission of Eretria, Siphnos, Leucas and Thespiae was an oversight on Pausanias' part were it not for the fact that he explicitly states that the Plataeans were listed on the inscription 'alone of the Boeotians' thereby excluding the Thespians. Since, however, Pausanias does mention 'Styreans from Euboea . . . and finally men of Chalcis on the Euripus', perhaps the exclusion of the Eretrians, Styra's allies, was politically motivated. It is also possible that the Eretrians who survived took refuge in Styra until they were in a position to repair their ruined city following the defeat of Xerxes.

[31] ATL i 270–1; *cf.* iii 57 and 99 n. 1.

[32] A. Mallwitz, *Olympia und seine Bauten* (Munich 1972) 94; *cf.* L. H. Jeffery, *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961) 88 no. 19, followed by Auberson–Schefold (n. 6) 30 f. Others, however, have seen this bull as a dedication from the late sixth century (e.g. F. Eckstein, *Ἀναθήματα: Studien zu den Weihgeschenken strengen Stils im Heiligtum von Olympia* [Berlin 1969] 50–3, 118–19, figs 12–13), but see W. Gauer, *Weihgeschenke aus den Perserkriegen*, Ist. Mitt. Beih. ii (1968) 107 n. 506, 108.

[33] Ridgway (n. 5) 316 n. 15, where, it is encouraging

were it not for the assumption that the pedimental sculpture 'should precede the Persian destruction in 490'.[34] Ridgway's observation of such archaistic mannerism would be particularly apt if the temple and sculpture date from the 470s. From the standpoint of iconography, the chief subject of the Amazonomachy on the west pediment, Theseus' abduction of Antiope, is a highly appropriate mythical antetype for the joint participation of Athens and Eretria in the rape of Sardis.[35] According to Herodotus,[36] this participation in the Ionian Revolt provoked the Persian invasion of Greece, an event the Athenians soon represented as the second Amazonomachy when the Amazons came to exact vengeance on Theseus and his city for the abduction of their queen. Under Theseus' leadership, they were soundly repulsed, but—as E. B. Harrison has recently remarked[37]—not before they had 'pitched their tents on Ares' hill'.[38] The myth of Theseus and the Amazons can, in this context, be most effectively interpreted in the light of recent Athenian (and Eretrian) encounters with their Persian adversary at home and abroad. The temple's acroterial decoration reinforces this hypothesis since good evidence exists for Nikai[39] even though the group of two fighting warriors[40] remains too fragmentary to allow firm conclusions. While some might be prepared to see Nikai as references to Eretrian participation in Athens' victory over Chalcis in 506,[41] or to the firing of Sardis in 498—despite the drubbing suffered by the allied fleet during their retreat[42]—the only certain victories we can attribute to Eretria are Salamis and Plataea.

Control of Euboea must have been an important strategic goal of Athenian policy in the 470s and the goodwill of Eretria could amongst other things provide a well-established port useful for the new Athenian navy. Themistocles had recently plundered Carystus in reprisal for her tarnished record in the Persian Wars.[43] Athens' conduct towards Eretria which had resisted the Persians,[44] while Carystus surrendered, presents a study in contrast. Chalcis had been settled by Athenian colonists a generation before, and Athens now sought to extend her influence throughout Euboea. Under these circumstances it is easy to understand why Athens might have come to the rescue of her ally to help rebuild her shattered city. The restoration of Eretria's ancient temple to Apollo, with its emphasis on *daphnephoria* and its Delphic associations, would provide a suitably pious act of thanksgiving for the recent deliverance of both communities from barbarian aggression. The east pediment may have honoured the god of the temple, but on the west the divinity of Athens presides over her new protégé's triumph against the mythical antetype of the common aggressor of Eretria and Athens. Eretria thus advertises on her temple the aegis of her great ally and the *sphragis* of Athens' new leader Cimon.[45] Considered in these terms, it is no longer 'odd to find this particularly Attic theme [*sc.* of Theseus] so lavishly displayed on a great temple in another city'.[46]

The 'Oath of Plataea' in the version recorded by Lycurgus and Diodorus constitutes another possible objection to our view that the temple could have been constructed *c.* 470 since at the end of the oath these authors include the following clause: 'and I shall restore none of the temples which have been burnt or destroyed, but shall leave them so that they remain a memorial of barbarian impiety for men in future time'.[47] We do not intend to argue about the authenticity of

to note, she considers the possibility that the Athena is part of a later [i.e. post-490] repair.

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] As W. Gauer has already observed (see n. 5).

[36] Hdt. v 97.3.

[37] E. B. Harrison, 'Motifs of the city-siege on the shield of Athena Parthenos', *AJA* lxxxv (1981) 295.

[38] Aesch. *Eum.* 688–93, *cf.* Hdt. ix 27; Lysias ii 4; Isoc. iv 68.

[39] *ADelt*, Chron. xviii (1963) pl. 327; *cf.* M. Y. Goldberg, 'Archaic Greek akroteria', *AJA* lxxxvi (1982) 213.

[40] *ADelt*, Chron. xvii (1961–2) pl. 165 *c.*

[41] The view espoused by J. L. Myres, *Herodotus, Father of History* (Oxford 1953) 183, though without supporting evidence. Eretria's participation is not mentioned by Hdt. *ad* v 77, nor in ML no. 15.

[42] Hdt. v 102.

[43] Hdt. vi 99, viii 66; R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 69 f.; *cf.* A. R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks* (London 1962) 237.

[44] W. P. Wallace, 'The demes of Eretria', *Hesp.* xvi (1947) 130–3.

[45] We hope to show elsewhere how the legend of Theseus was manipulated by Cimon along with his political patrons and allies in order to promote Athens' new aspirations for hegemony by land and sea. *Cf.* J. P. Barron, 'Bakchylides, Theseus and a woolly cloak', *BICS* xxvii (1980) 1–8.

[46] Robertson (n. 5) 164.

[47] Lyc. *in Leocr.* 81; Diod. xi 29.3.

the oath,[48] and, even if such an oath was taken, we do not know if and how it was enforced. At any rate the epigraphic version from Acharnae 'which the Athenians swore' does not include the clause inhibiting post-war reconstruction.[49] Perhaps the oath taken in the context of the years 480–79 BC referred to the ravages of those years and did not necessarily include Eretria's 'temples burnt and cast down' ten years earlier. In brief, the testimony of the 'Oath of Plataea' is too problematical to provide sufficient grounds for denying the possibility that Apollo's temple at Eretria was rebuilt at the time we have suggested.

We therefore conclude that the most economical way to reconcile the archaeological and iconographical evidence with history is to concur with Kourouniotis that the penultimate wooden temple was the one destroyed by the flames of the Persian onslaught which Herodotus describes, but to agree with Auberson that the extant pedimental sculpture belonged to the last, marble temple. Unlike Auberson, however, we date the construction of this temple *c.* 470. In all likelihood this was the building stripped by the Romans in 198[50] and which contributed *signa priscae artis* to the raiders' collection of 'ancient art' from Eretria.

II. The Siphnian Treasury at Delphi

The evidence available to us suggests that the Temple of Apollo Daphnephorus at Eretria was built in the 470s. On the other hand, the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi, the sculptural decoration of which has often been compared on stylistic grounds with that of the temple at Eretria, is conventionally dated *c.* 530–25 BC. The sculptures of the Siphnian Treasury are said to provide 'our best fixed point in all the history of archaic art'[51] and it is easy to see why such a view is generally held. The relevant literary *testimonia* are found in Herodotus and Pausanias; Herodotus dates the structure, Pausanias supports its identification.

οἱ δ᾽ ἐπὶ τὸν Πολυκράτεα στρατευσάμενοι Σαμίων, ἐπεὶ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι αὐτοὺς ἀπολείπειν ἔμελλον, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀπέπλεον ἐς Σίφνον· χρημάτων γὰρ ἐδέοντο, τὰ δὲ τῶν Σιφνίων πρήγματα ἤκμαζε τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον, καὶ νησιωτέων μάλιστα ἐπλούτεον, ἅτε ἐόντων αὐτοῖσι ἐν τῇ νήσῳ χρυσέων καὶ ἀργυρέων μετάλλων, οὕτω ὥστε ἀπὸ τῆς δεκάτης τῶν γινομένων αὐτόθεν χρημάτων θησαυρὸς ἐν Δελφοῖσι ἀνάκειται ὅμοια τοῖσι πλουσιωτάτοισι· αὐτοὶ δὲ τὰ γινόμενα [ἐν] τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἑκάστῳ χρήματα διενέμοντο. ὅτε ὦν ἐποιεῦντο τὸν θησαυρόν, ἐχρέωντο τῷ χρηστηρίῳ εἰ αὐτοῖσι τὰ παρεόντα ἀγαθὰ οἷά τέ ἐστι πολλὸν χρόνον παραμένειν· ἡ δὲ Πυθίη ἔχρησέ σφι τάδε·

Ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν ἐν Σίφνῳ πρυτανήια λευκὰ γένηται
λεύκοφρύς τ᾽ ἀγορή, τότε δὴ δεῖ φράδμονος ἀνδρὸς
φράσσασθαι ξύλινόν τε λόχον κήρυκά τ᾽ ἐρυθρόν.

τοῖσι δὲ Σιφνίοισι ἦν τότε ἡ ἀγορὴ καὶ τὸ πρυτανήιον Παρίῳ λίθῳ ἠσκημένα.(58) *τοῦτον τὸν χρησμὸν οὐκ οἷοί τε ἦσαν γνῶναι οὔτε τότε ἰθὺς οὔτε τῶν Σαμίων ἀπιγμένων. ἐπείτε γὰρ τάχιστα πρὸς τὴν Σίφνον προσῖσχον οἱ Σάμιοι, ἔπεμπον τῶν νεῶν μίαν πρέσβεας ἄγουσαν ἐς τὴν πόλιν. τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν ἅπασαι αἱ νέες ἦσαν μιλτηλιφέες· καὶ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ ἡ Πυθίη προηγόρευε τοῖσι Σιφνίοισι φυλάξασθαι τὸν ξύλινον λόχον κελεύουσα καὶ κήρυκα ἐρυθρόν. ἀπικόμενοι ὦν οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐδέοντο τῶν Σιφνίων δέκα τάλαντά σφι χρῆσαι· οὐ φασκόντων δὲ χρήσειν τῶν Σιφνίων αὐτοῖσι οἱ Σάμιοι τοὺς χώρους αὐτῶν ἐπόρθεον. πυθόμενοι δ᾽ ἰθὺς ἧκον οἱ Σίφνιοι βοηθέοντες καὶ συμβαλόντες αὐτοῖσι*

[48] P. Siewert, *Der Eid von Plataiai* (Munich 1972); T. L. Shear Jr, *Studies in the Early Projects of the Periklean Building Program* (Diss. Princeton 1966) 16–65.

[49] But see J. Walsh, 'The authenticity and date of the Peace of Callias and the Congress Decree', *Chiron* xi (1981) 53 f., n. 58.

[50] Delivorrias (n. 5) has suggested that the absence of sculpture from the east pediment of the Eretria temple may be evidence for the building having been incomplete in 490.

[51] E. B. Harrison, *Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture*, *Agora* xi (Princeton 1965) 5. *Cf.* Ridgway (n. 5) 8, and see too E. D. Francis and M. Vickers, *Burl. Mag.* cxxiv (1982) 41–2.

ἐσσώθησαν, καὶ αὐτῶν πολλοὶ ἀπεκληίσθησαν τοῦ ἄστεος ὑπὸ τῶν Σαμίων· καὶ αὐτοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα ἑκατὸν τάλαντα ἔπρηξαν.

Hdt. iii 57–8

ἐποιήθη δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ Σιφνίων ἐπὶ αἰτίᾳ τοιᾷδε θησαυρός. Σιφνίοις ἡ νῆσος χρυσοῦ μέταλλα ἤνεγκε, καὶ αὐτοὺς τῶν προσιόντων ἐκέλευσεν ὁ θεὸς ἀποφέρειν δεκάτην ἐς Δελφούς· οἱ δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν ᾠκοδομήσαντο καὶ ἀπέφερον τὴν δεκάτην. ὡς δὲ ὑπὸ ἀπληστίας ἐξέλιπον τὴν φοράν, ἐπικλύσασα ἡ θάλασσα ἀφανῆ τὰ μέταλλά σφισιν ἐποίησεν.

Paus. x 11.2

When a lavishly decorated building was discovered at Delphi in 1894, the identity of its dedicants was for a while open to doubt. This building is now generally accepted as the Siphnian Treasury in that it belongs at the appropriate place in the sequence suggested by Pausanias' text.[52] A date before *c.* 525 is based on Herodotus' reference to the dedication of the Siphnian Treasury as a prime example of Siphnian prosperity derived from their gold and silver mines *τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον* when that prosperity was at its peak (*ἤκμαζε*) at the period of the Samian attack. At this point, however, a serious discrepancy arises, for buildings which according to the conventional view of stylistic development have much in common with one another, now find themselves half a century apart. We might attempt to resolve the difficulty arising from the Herodotean evidence by suggesting a building delay. Herodotus' use of *ὅτε ὦν ἐποιεῦντο κτλ.* does not express *antecedence*, but *contemporaneity*.[53] Instead of interpreting the sentence as evidence that the Treasury had been built *before* the Siphnians received the oracle's warning about an imminent threat to their *παρεόντα ἀγαθά*, the passage can be translated as follows: 'so when they were having [perhaps inchoative: 'were beginning to make'] their treasury made, they inquired [lit. 'kept on inquiring', *ἐχρέωντο* impf.][54] of the oracle if their present prosperity could last a long time'. Herodotus nowhere explicitly records the date of the Treasury's *completion*; he merely reports that the dedication was 'comparable with the wealthiest at Delphi' and his use of the present tense (*ἀνάκειται*) may imply that he is speaking in terms of his own day. Delphi obviously stood to benefit if Siphnos continued to prosper. Although the oracle played upon Siphnian self-interest by referring to domestic projects like the refurbishment of their Agora, Delphi was presumably concerned to ensure the long-term continuation of a substantial tithe and the unhindered progress of the Treasury[55] which some might take

[52] E. Löwy (*Der Beginn der rotfigurigen Vasenmalerei*, SBWien ccxvii.2 [1938] 16–17) gives the arguments; for older discussion, see Hitzig-Blümner *ad* Paus. x 11.2 (in vol. iii.2, 692 ff.). For a recent bibliography of the Siphnian Treasury, see A. Büsing-Kolbe, 'Frühe griechische Türen', *JdI* xciii (1978) 86 n. 98.

[53] On the distribution of *ὅτε* in Hdt., see H. D. Brackett ('Temporal clauses in Herodotus', *Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts & Sciences* xii.8 [1905] 211 f.) who, however, includes this passage as the sole exception to the pattern he has otherwise reconstructed. Since Brackett himself recognised that 'by far the most frequent tense in clauses of pure antecedence is the aorist' (Brackett 211; *cf.* *ὅτε*+aorist at Hdt. iv 78, 110; v 30; vi 69), he presumably judged *ἐποιεῦντο* to be 'antecedent' on other than grammatical grounds. A. D. Godley (*ad loc.*) thus translates the clause: 'when they were making . . .' (Loeb [London 1921]); *cf.* Ph. Legrand: 'à l'époque où ils faisaient . . .' (Budé [Paris 1967]), and J. Feix: 'als sie das Schatzhaus bauten . . .' (Heimeran [Munich 1963]). Had Hdt. intended to report *antecedence* we assume that he would have written the aorist *ἐποιήσαντο* or used a different conjunction (e.g., *ἐπεί*). *ὅτε* could also be causal in this context: 'because they were having the treasury built . . .', but we see no clear basis for preferring cause over time (*cf.* J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus* [Cambridge 1938] 273, s.v. *ὅτε* 3). This difference is in any case trivial once it has been recognised that the tense of *ἐποιεῦντο* denotes contemporaneity. (Beside *ὅτε*+impf. of contemporaneous action, note its comparable use with *περ* to mean 'at the very time when', e.g. Hdt. v 99.1; vi 106.1; *cf.* Powell, *loc. cit.*, s.v. *ὅτεπερ*).

[54] Note the contrast between *ἐχρέωντο* (impf.) of the Siphnians' consultation and *ἔχρησε* (aor.) of the oracle's response, implying that Delphi may itself, for whatever reason, have temporised before finally replying to the islanders' insistent enquiries. We thank Mr J. G. Griffith for drawing our attention to this detail.

[55] Herodotus clearly thinks (iii 57.2) that the Treasury was built from the tithe, whereas Pausanias perhaps suggests that the tithe was only levied once the Treasury had been built. This raises the disputed question of the degree of Pausanias' dependence on Herodotus. T. R. Glover, for example, thought that Pausanias had 'Herodotus at his finger ends' (in 'Prince of Digressors',

Herodotus' language to imply was still uncompleted at the time of the oracle's reply, and the Samians also seem well informed about the money the Siphnians had on hand. Their theft of what probably constituted the islanders' annual revenue must certainly have caused a serious setback to Siphnian building operations at home and abroad. On such a view it might be held that the Siphnian Treasury had not progressed much, if at all, beyond its foundations, and that it was left incomplete to be finished at a later time.[56] There are good reasons why such a view is unacceptable: so long a delay is probably implausible in the case of a small building like a treasury, although the administrations of Greek cities were prone to change in the aftermath of national catastrophe or serious political miscalculation.[57] More important, however, Herodotus clearly considered that the *anathema* did in fact date from the period of Siphnian prosperity predating the Samian attack.

Other considerations have been thought to confirm a date for the Siphnian Treasury *c.* 530–25, for example the assumption that 'Siphnian affluence was short-lived'.[58] The basis for this view is that the Siphnian economy was not only jeopardised by the Samian attack, but ruined when their mines were flooded either at the same time or soon afterwards. Let us take the second point first: while there is no reason to doubt that these mines were eventually flooded, it is Pausanias, not Herodotus, who tells us so and we are not necessarily entitled to conflate their two accounts.[59] Since Herodotus does not mention any flooding, J. G. Frazer suggested that the Siphnians suffered this catastrophe only after Herodotus' day.[60] For Pausanias, the flood is an act of moral justice: insatiable greed led the Siphnians to abandon their tribute (ὡς δὲ ὑπὸ ἀπληστίας ἐξέλιπον τὴν φοράν) and, as a consequence, the sea flooded in and made their mines disappear (ἀφανῆ). J. B. Bury saw what must have happened: 'their miners had got below the sea-level, and the water filtering in cut them off from the sources of their wealth'.[61] Recent geological research on Siphnos supports Frazer's suggestion of post-Herodotean flooding. G. A. Wagner and G. Weisberger thus report that 'the observed flooding occurred probably after the mine had been exhausted at a lower sea-level in the classic period. Since then the sea-level rose by several meters.'[62] The flooding need not have had anything to do with the Samians. This we think is the gist of the tradition Pausanias has transmitted: driven by greed (ὑπὸ ἀπληστίας) the miners dug below sea-level thereby flooding their own mines. Having thus lost the source of their wealth they had no money left to pay their tribute and were accordingly forced to abandon it (ἐξέλιπον τὴν φορὰν). Pausanias (or his source) reversed the order of the last two events (ἐξέλιπον and ἀφανῆ . . . ἐποίησεν) because he chose to interpret the natural disaster as the consequence of divine retribution.

Recent lead-isotope analyses possibly indicate continued Siphnian mining activity, and hence relative prosperity, after 525. These tests have shown that some of the later Aeginetan coins from the Asyut hoard which M. J. Price and N. Waggoner date between 510 and 480[63]

Springs of Hellas [London 1945] 162). J. Heer (*La personnalité de Pausanias* [Paris 1979] 97 ff.) is also of this view, whereas G. Daux asserts Pausanias' complete independence from Herodotus (*Pausanias à Delphes* [Paris 1936] 182). J. J. Coulton, however, suggests that Pausanias' double phrase may imply that the Treasury was built with early instalments of the tithe which then continued to be paid even when the building was complete.

[56] *Cf.* Löwy (n. 52) 26–7.

[57] E.g. Cimon's ostracism after Ithome, the fate of the leaders of Elis and Mantinea following the battle of Plataea, the aristocratic reaction in Argos during the early 460s, and the successive changes of government at Athens following the occupation of Decelea.

[58] Ridgway (n. 5) 9.

[59] *Cf.* Boardman (n. 5) 158.

[60] Frazer *ad loc.*; *cf.* Heer (n. 55) 98: 'cet événement a donc eu lieu plus tard que de son vivant'.

[61] J. B. Bury and R. Meiggs, *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*⁴ (London 1975) 135.

[62] G. A. Wagner and G. Weisgerber, 'The ancient silver mine at Ayos Sostis on Siphnos (Greece)', *Archaeophysika* x (1979) 222. Other useful recent geological studies include: N. H. Gale, 'Some aspects of lead and silver mining in the Aegean', *Misc. Graeca* ii (1979) 9–60; G. A. Wagner, H. Gropengiesser and N. H. Gale, 'Early Bronze Age lead-silver mining and metallurgy in the Aegean: the ancient workings on Siphnos', in P. T. Craddock (ed.), *Scientific Studies in Early Mining and Extractive Metallurgy*, Brit. Mus. Occasional Paper xx (1980) 63–80, pls 1–8; N. H. Gale and Z. Stos-Gale, 'Lead and silver in the ancient Aegean', *Scientific American* cciv (1981) 176–92; *id.*, 'Cycladic lead and silver metallurgy', *BSA* lxxvi (1981) 169–244.

[63] Price–Waggoner (n. 25) 69 ff.

contain Siphnian silver.[64] This evidence does not itself prove that the Siphnian mines continued in operation at the turn of the century since the silver for these issues may have been melted down and re-used. On the other hand, since Siphnos herself continued to mint coins during the Delian Confederacy, at least down to the mid-fifth century,[65] the Aeginetans may well have been using freshly mined silver. Even if the Siphnians themselves were using existing stock-piles of silver in the fifth century, they must at least have had some reserves on which to draw. In evaluating the 'assessment of Aristides' R. Meiggs observes that 'Siphnos pays more than larger islands because of her silver mines'.[66] This suggestion is important since it requires us to assume that the Siphnian mines were still operative in the 470s and bringing in relatively substantial revenues. After their tribute quota had been trebled by the τάξις of 425, we hear less and less of Siphnian affairs and much of that information is inconclusive.[67] In the fourth century, for example, a family of Siphnians at Athens seems to have enriched themselves considerably by mining silver at Laurium.[68] We have no means of knowing why they emigrated from their native island: perhaps its staple industry had by then already failed or perhaps there were greater rewards to be earned in Attica. It is true, however, that in later centuries Siphnos became a byword for impoverishment and a place of no account,[69] but this reputation may not have arisen until Cretan pirates ravaged the island (probably in the second century BC)[70] and sold its inhabitants into slavery.

If the Siphnian mines were not flooded in the sixth century and the islanders retained these important mineral resources intact—as their quota-level in the 'first assessment' of the Delian League suggests[71]—then we may reasonably expect the Siphnians to have recovered from the effects of the Samian affair, however economically and politically devastating they may have been for a while. Scholars seeking further evidence for the financial straits in which Siphnos found herself after 525 have cited her meagre showing at Salamis in 480. The single penteconter she contributed to the allied fleet need not, however, reflect impoverishment. We know nothing of the size of Siphnos' war fleet; we do not even know if she had a navy. Even at the period of her acknowledged prosperity we hear nothing of a Siphnian fleet. If the Siphnians had had an effective navy, the Samians might have met with more effective resistance, but Siphnos seems to have been remarkably vulnerable in this respect. Siphnos' undoubted mineral wealth in the sixth century[72] does not require that we suppose her citizens spent that money building ships. On the contrary, we know from Herodotus that they enjoyed a system of profit sharing by which 'they distributed their annual revenue among themselves'.[73] After the big Laurium silver strike *c.* 483, an attempt was made at Athens to introduce the same practice until Themistocles persuaded his fellow citizens 'to desist from the distribution' and divert the funds to build a navy for use against the Aeginetans.[74]

[64] N. H. Gale, W. Gentner and G. A. Wagner, 'Mineralogical and geographical silver sources of archaic Greek coinage', *Metallurgy in Numismatics*, Royal Numismatic Soc. Special Publication xii (1980) 36–43.

[65] Although on present evidence fifth-century coin production at Siphnos appears to have been fairly limited (C. M. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coinage* [London 1978] 45), we cannot be certain as to the extent to which this may have been due to the decree of Clearchus (*ATL* ii 61–8, D 14; iii 278, 281), which forced the use of Attic coinage on most of the allied states, probably in 449/8 (but see H. Mattingly, *Historia* x [1961] 148 ff. and *JHS* ci [1981] 86 for a later date). Such coins as do exist, however, bear heads of Apollo 'the patron deity of the Delian League of which Siphnos was a member' (Kraay 47).

[66] Meiggs (n. 43) 61 citing Beloch *Gr. Gesch.*^{2} ii.2 356–71.

[67] The fourth-century dedication on the Athenian Acropolis by the Siphnians of a golden στέφανος weighing 66 drachmae, 5 obols is, however, scarcely an indication of poverty (*IG* ii^2 1425.125).

[68] J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971) 590–2, C 12. Dr Norman Ashton draws our attention to the fact that these Siphnians are the *only* non-Athenians mentioned in the surviving records of the mining leases and lessees of the latter half of the fourth century BC (cf. *Hesp.* xix [1950] 189 ff.).

[69] *Anth. Pal.* ix 421 (Antipater of Thessalonica); *cf.* [Dem.] xiii 34 (date uncertain).

[70] Diod. xxxi 45.

[71] *Cf.* n. 66.

[72] *Cf.* Hdt. iii 57.

[73] *Ibid.*

[74] On the analogy of Siphnos, suggests J. Labarbe in *La loi navale de Thémistocle* (Paris 1957) 39; *cf.* Macan *ad* Hdt. vii 144. Another similarity between the circumstances at Siphnos in the 520s and Athens in the 480s is found in the advice the Delphic oracle gave each state

Even if Siphnos had a navy at the time of the Persian invasion their contribution of only one penteconter may find its correct explanation in political rather than economic terms. The arrival of the Persian fleet in the Cyclades will inevitably have caused consternation and dismay among the island states and Siphnian commitment to the Greek cause in 480 may have been less than total. Xerxes' interest in the acquisition of new sources of silver[75] may also have reached the attention of Siphnos. As A. R. Burn has well observed:

> Small islands in the Aegean were probably temporising—those on the Greek side of the water no less than the others; pleading that they must keep men for home defence; hoping that token contributions might preserve them from reprisal-raids if the Greeks won, while they could perhaps be disowned if the Persians did so.[76]

While Herodotus' statement that Siphnos 'did not give the barbarian earth and water'[77] is explicit enough, there is a considerable difference between medising and temporising. Even medising states like Naxos or Tenos changed sides during the conflict and thus won entries for their cities in the dedications at both Delphi and Olympia and, presumably, a share in the spoil. On the other hand, islands like Paros[78] and Cythnos seem to have prevaricated. The name of Paros did not appear at all on the pan-Hellenic victory monuments, though that of Cythnos did. The underlying principle adopted in the compilation of these lists appears to have been the exclusion of those states which only contributed a single ship at Salamis. Thus, the Crotoniates, Lemnians and Seriphians, Tenians and Siphnians were at first absent from the Delphic thank-offering and the names of the two last-mentioned states were added only later.[79] The reason for the addition of the Tenians is perhaps due, as G. Rawlinson thought, 'to the *timely* character' of the aid they brought.[80] It is impossible to say whether their inclusion on the equivalent list at Olympia was an afterthought.

The total exclusion of the Siphnians from the Olympic list and their subsequent inclusion in the Delphic one is more difficult to explain. Perhaps, as R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis suggest, 'the Athenians supported their claim',[81] a claim which would not only have included the right to an

prior to their respective invasions. In A. H. Sayce's translation, Siphnos received the following warning:

> When the town-hall in Siphnos is white,
> And white-browed the market where judgements are said,
> A wise man is needed to guard
> 'Gainst an ambush of wood and a herald in red.

Siphnos, however, unlike Athens, did not heed this Delphic counsel "gainst an ambush of wood', and paid a heavy price for its self-assurance. The actual price is worth considering since it suggests a reason for Delphi's attitude towards Siphnos in the first place. At first the Samians demanded ten talents of silver, but the Siphnians refused. The Samians then tried a new approach, laying waste the Siphnian countryside, thereby drawing the Siphnians out of their city. The Siphnians not only got the worse of the battle that ensued, but found their retreat cut off. Unable to return to their city, the Siphnians finally came to terms ten times more disadvantageous than those they were originally offered. Although Herodotus does not explicitly say so, we might infer that the ten talents represent Delphi's tithe and the hundred talents the islanders' annual revenue.

[75] *Cf.* Aesch. *Pers.* 240, and Price–Waggoner (n. 23) 139 n. 246.

[76] Burn (n. 43) 442.

[77] Hdt. viii 46; *cf.* 66.

[78] Paros had medised in 490. A Parian trireme had accompanied the Persian fleet to Marathon (Hdt. vi 133; did it carry, as A. E. Raubitschek has suggested [in *Charites: Festschrift Ernst Langlotz* (Bonn 1957) 239], the block of Parian marble the Persians brought with them with which they intended to celebrate a victory and from which the statue of Nemesis at Rhamnus was subsequently made [Paus. i 33.2–3]?). Paros, moreover, is included *ad* Aesch. *Pers.* 884 in a list of Greek islands which, as Aeschylus' Persian chorus clearly implies, had belonged to Xerxes' realm before his defeat at Salamis. The Parians had learnt a lesson from their medism in 490 (*cf.* Hdt. vi 133), but only in part for, like the Corcyreans, they temporised before Salamis (Hdt. viii 67, *cf.* vii 168), and this temporising was probably the cause of their failure to appear either on the Serpent Column or in the Olympia dedication (Paus. v 23). The fact that the Parians stayed behind in Cythnos (itself on the patriotic side [Macan *ad* Hdt. viii 67] and on the Delphic and Olympian lists) implies malingering rather than Parian support for the Greek cause. Paros' relatively high tribute quotas (e.g. Meiggs [n. 43] 558–9) might indeed be considered punitive unless Meiggs is correct in his view that 'the comparatively high tribute of Paros should be attributed to her marble quarries' (*ibid.* 61). (A similar observation could, of course, be made with regard to the Siphnian quota.)

[79] ML 59–60.

[80] G. Rawlinson (ed.), *History of Herodotus* iv (London 1862) 393.

[81] ML 60.

honourable mention, but also to a share in the Persian spoil. Later on Siphnos was to be a steady contributor to the funds of the Delian Confederacy,[82] and is likely to have been a founding member.[83] Perhaps the Siphnian name was added to the Serpent Column at the time she joined the Confederacy, or perhaps its presence can be somehow connected with her Delphic Treasury.

These considerations notwithstanding, we are still left with the serious discrepancy between the apparent date of the Eretria temple and Herodotus' testimony with regard to the date of the construction of the Siphnian Treasury. For the sake of hypothesis, and despite Herodotus, let us therefore consider the possibility of dating the Siphnian Treasury to approximately the same period as the Temple of Apollo at Eretria, namely some fifty years later than its currently accepted date. A date for the new Temple of Apollo after the Persian Wars does, after all, depend on a much wider range of evidence than does the exclusively Herodotean date of the Siphnian Treasury. As we have already mentioned, the development of Greek art is judged in relation to a series of 'fixed points'. The validity of such 'fixed points' is proved by a demonstrable relationship between archaeological and historical evidence. In our view, the epigraphic evidence at Eretria provides strong support for the presence of a new temple of Apollo after the Persian Wars. We now recognise that monuments which have seemed comparatively unimportant as criteria for establishing the received chronology may gain new significance in a revised system of 'fixed points'. Conversely, evidence which has hitherto seemed secure—for example, that of *kalos*-names[84]—may no longer qualify as chronologically diagnostic. We must either accept a chronological discrepancy which in terms of conventional stylistic judgements seems extraordinary or consider the possibility that Herodotus in his preoccupation with Samian history was mistaken when he chose the Siphnian Treasury as his example of the island's prosperity in the sixth century. Neither conclusion is an attractive one; the first conclusion undermines what scholars usually accept as their primary instrument in analysing the history of Greek art, the second undermines our confidence in Herodotus' reliability. If, however, Herodotus is mistaken it may still be impossible at the present state of our knowledge to determine when the Treasury was in fact built. Nonetheless, if we are prepared to set the date of this Treasury adrift, we may reasonably be challenged to propose some new anchorage.

We address this task in three different ways. First, we discuss literary evidence which, if credible, would require us to date the Treasury after the Persian Wars. Secondly, we consider if the sculptural decoration of the Treasury allows a similar conclusion. Lastly, we examine stylistic arguments for the date based on the familiar observation that the south and west friezes exhibit a more conservative art than the north and east. All these arguments involve many complex issues and we shall discuss them each in turn.

(i) *The literary evidence: Vitruvius and the Caryatids*

Two Caryatids supported the architrave of the west façade of the Siphnian Treasury. According to Vitruvius[85] the Caryatid motif originally commemorated the infamy of Caryae, a Peloponnesian town which allied herself with the Persian invader *c.* 480: 'the town was captured, the men slaughtered, the state publicly disgraced, and the women led into slavery', still wearing their finery, in order that they should 'exhibit a permanent picture of slavery' (*aeterno servitutis*

[82] *ATL* iii 57, 265–74, esp. 267–8, and, in the judgement of the authors of *ATL*, Siphnos also perhaps contributed ships. See too n. 66.

[83] *ATL* iii 197–9.

[84] E. D. Francis and M. Vickers, 'Leagros kalos', *PCPS* ccvii (1981) 97–136.

[85] Vitr. i 5. Carya civitas Peloponnensis cum Persis hostibus contra Graeciam consensit, postea Graeci per victoriam gloriose bello liberati communi consilio Caryatibus bellum indixerunt. Itaque oppido capto viris interfectis civitate desacrata matronas eorum in servitutem abduxerunt, nec sunt passi stolas neque ornatus matronales deponere, uti non una triumpho ducerentur sed aeterno servitutis exemplo gravi contumelia pressae poenas pendere viderentur pro civitate. Ideo qui tunc architecti fuerunt aedificiis publicis designaverunt earum imagines oneri ferundo conlocatas, ut etiam posteris nota poena peccati Caryatium memoriae traderetur.

exemplo). Vitruvius continues: 'contemporary architects accordingly designed statues of those women for public buildings to be placed in weight-bearing positions in order that the punishment of the Caryates' wrong-doing should become well-known even to later generations and be passed down into memory'.

Before accepting J. G. Frazer's judgement that this explanation is just 'a foolish story',[86] we would do well to note the context in which Vitruvius has recounted it. At the beginning of his treatise, Vitruvius states the basic requirements for an architect's education. Not only must he grasp 'the thing signified, but also that which gives it significance'. He should be naturally gifted as a draftsman and a skilled geometrist, but he must also understand many other disciplines among which Vitruvius gives knowledge of history pride of place. He then discusses each of these principles in turn. After stressing the need for general competence in mathematics, he turns to history: 'historias autem plures novisse oportet, quod multa ornamenta saepe in operibus architecti designant, de quibus argumenti rationem cur fecerint quaerentibus reddere debent'. The medism and punishment of Caryae is the first *historia* Vitruvius cites in order to illustrate the importance of historical knowledge in the education of an architect. Over the years, many have cast doubt on Vitruvius' intellectual discrimination, but we think it unlikely that, on so important a point, he would choose an example of doubtful authority rather than rehearse a story grounded in truth. We do not deny the possibility that Vitruvius has been persuaded to represent romantic fiction as historical fact, but we submit that the context in which Vitruvius reports these events favours its credibility.

It is also instructive to observe how Vitruvius' story came to be discounted as so much nonsense. J. J. Winckelmann had identified a male statue in the courtyard of the Palazzo Farnese with a rudimentary Corinthian capital on its head as one of the Caryatids of Agrippa's Pantheon.[87] G. E. Lessing[88] drew the implausible conclusion that since Winckelmann's 'Caryatid' was male, then Vitruvius' account (referring as it did to female statues) must be fictitious. Lessing, however, raised a somewhat stronger objection when he inquired how a tiny spot like Caryae could have ever medised. This point was taken up again in subsequent discussions: 'how was it possible', C. J. Blomfield asked, 'that Caryae's citizens should have sided with the Persians?'[89] So too L. Preller declared: 'ad Persas defecisse Caryas absurdum est'.[90] Nonetheless, Vitruvius was not without his defenders. In 1818, for example, R. Walpole sought to justify Vitruvius' account by citing Herodotus' description of Arcadian refugees at the camp of Xerxes in 480.[91] More effective support, however, can be derived from the historian's statement that 'all the cities of the Peloponnese except [the Lacedaemonians, all of the tribes of the Arcadians, the Eleans, the Corinthians, the Sicyonians, the Epidaurians, the Phliasians, the Troezenians, and the Hermionians] stood aloof from the war; and by so doing, if I may speak freely, they in fact took part with the Medes'.[92] This passage also enables us to resolve a difficulty caused by the fact that two Peloponnesian towns were called Caryae, one in northern Arcadia,[93] the other in Laconia just south of the Arcadian border.[94] Vitruvius does not explicitly specify which one he has in mind, but since Herodotus tells us that 'all the tribes of

[86] J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias* iii (London 1913) 320 *ad* iii 10.7 (citing Preller, below, n. 90).

[87] Attributed by Pliny to Diogenes of Athens, *NH* xxxvi 37.

[88] G. E. Lessing, 'Karyatiden', in J. Petersen and W. von Olshausen (eds), *Lessings Werke 17. Schriften zur antiken Kunstgeschichte* (Berlin, etc. n.d.) 385–6.

[89] C. J. Blomfield, 'Some remarks on the Caryatides of ancient architecture', *Museum Criticum* vii (1826) 401.

[90] L. Preller, 'De caussa nominis Caryatidum', *Ann. dell'Inst. arch.* xv (1843) 396–406, esp. 404 (=*Ausgewählte Aufsätze* [Berlin 1864] 136–44). Vitruvius' testimony is now usually dismissed as a late fabrication: e.g. for J. Borchhardt, *Die Bauskulptur des Heroons von Limyra: Das Grabmal des lykischen Königs Perikles*, Ist. Forsch. xxxii (1976) 44, n. 100, it 'beweist nur dass zu seiner Zeit die Bedeutung der Karyatiden nicht mehr verstanden wurde'; *cf.* H. Drerup, 'Zur Bezeichnung "Karyatide"', *MWPr* 1975–6, 11; H. Lauter, 'Die Koren des Erechtheion', *Ant. Plastik* xvi (1976) 14 ff., esp. 15, n. 47.

[91] R. Walpole, *Memoirs Relating to European and Asiatic Turkey*² (London 1818) 602.

[92] Hdt. viii 73.

[93] Paus. viii 13.6, 14.1; Arcadian Caryae is not even mentioned by J. Hejnic, *Pausanias the Perieget and the Archaic History of Arcadia* (Prague 1961).

[94] Paus. iii 10.7; iv 16.9.

Arcadia' joined the Hellenic cause we assume that the southerly, Laconian Caryae was the one which medised.

As a corollary to their scepticism regarding Caryae's alleged medism, scholars have suggested that Vitruvius has mistakenly attributed an event of the fourth century to the fifth. After Leuctra, the Caryates, anticipating a Theban invasion, are said to have connived treacherously with the Thebans. The Spartans accordingly destroyed the Laconian frontier town in 369/8.[95] It is unnecessary to suppose that the existence of Caryae in the fourth century precludes the hypothesis that an earlier settlement had been devastated a century before. We have no reason to suppose that all its inhabitants fell victim to an onslaught by the Hellenic League[96] or that the town so strategically situated had not been rebuilt, perhaps by a faction in favour with the Spartan government. We have already mentioned Eretria's survival following a devastating attack. Even after 369/8 those Caryates who had not been 'caught alive and slaughtered'[97] may have returned to their ruined homes and in due course continued to act as hosts to the pilgrims attending the famous local shrine of Artemis Caryatis, still active in Pausanias' day.[98]

Vitruvius does not mention Caryae's destruction in 369/8, but we are not entitled to conclude from this omission that he is ignorant of history or has invented an event in the fifth century on the basis of evidence from the fourth. Apart from the consideration that the affairs of 369/8 are irrelevant to the point of Vitruvius' *historia*, medism was apparently not yet an issue at the time Sparta attacked Caryae. Since Thebes had not yet made any approach to Persia[99] Sparta could not justify her action against Caryae by claiming that she was acting against medising conspirators. Moreover, Vitruvius' use of the terms 'Graeci' and 'communi consilio' implies retribution exacted on the part of the whole Hellenic League, not by Sparta acting alone. As G. L. Huxley observes: 'The words of Vitruvius strongly suggest that one of the first acts of the Hellenic League against Persia after Plataea was to destroy Caryae because it had, or was asserted to have, medized. Such an action would have been in accordance with the regulations of the League, whose members 'assumed obligations not limited to the repulse of the Persian invasion', and undertook to punish medizing states.'[100]

Huxley's investigation of the reasons which might have led the fifth-century Laconian town to medise provides a plausible context in which to understand the events Vitruvius describes. Persia seems to have adopted a strategy of encircling Lacedaemon. Huxley therefore takes seriously Damaretus' proposal that the Persians 'send a force to Cythera, thence to ravage Laconia, so that there should be war at Sparta's back door'.[101] With the constant threat of helot uprising,[102] Sparta may well have had reason for additional concern if Caryae, as Vitruvius states, 'cum Persis hostibus contra Graeciam consensit'. Situated on the northern marches of Laconia, Caryae controlled the road by which the Spartan army usually advanced towards Tegea.[103] In the event, Sparta's secret mobilisation during the 'winter of discontent' (480/79) deceived even her allies. As A. R. Burn goes on to suggest, Sparta's 'choice of route, all the way up the Eurotas valley, instead of the shorter way to Tegea by Sellasia and Karyai, may have been calculated to keep Argos in the dark as long as possible'.[104] We suggest that this 'choice of route'

[95] Xen. *Hell.* vi 5.25; vii 1.28. *Cf.* A. Meineke, *Analecta alexandrina* (Berlin 1843) 362; Lauter (n. 90) n. 47.

[96] *Cf.* the 'useful concept' described by A. R. Burn (n. 43) 545, citing W. K. Pritchett, *AJA* lxi (1957) 20 n. 68, *viz.* that the usual Spartan conception of warfare was '*agonal*, i.e. they fought for admitted victory, as in the games, and not for the total destruction of an enemy'.

[97] Xen. *Hell.* vii 1.28.

[98] *Cf.* Serv. *ad* Verg. *Ecl.* viii 30; Stat. *Theb.* iv 225; W. Burkert, 'Demaratos, Astrabakos, und Herakles: Königsmythos und Politik zur Zeit der Perserkriege (Herodot 6.67–69)', *MusHelv* xxii (1965) 172 (for further refs see Frazer, *Pausanias* iii 320).

[99] D. M. Lewis, *Sparta and Persia* (Leiden 1977) 147 n. 80.

[100] G. L. Huxley, 'The medism of Caryae', *GRBS* viii (1967) 30, citing P. A. Brunt, *Historia* ii (1953/4) 137 and 149 on Hdt. vii 132.

[101] Huxley (n. 100) 31; *cf.* Hdt. vii 235.

[102] See Burn (n. 43) 505.

[103] *Cf.* Thuc. v 55.3; P. A. Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia: a Regional History, 1300–362 BC* (London 1979) 205.

[104] Burn (n. 43) 506.

was influenced by Sparta's suspicion that Caryae either harboured Persian spies or was prepared to pass on information regarding Spartan troop movements to the enemy high command. Huxley has made a good case for the view that Sparta frequently found Caryae a less than convenient neighbour. Under such circumstances, we can readily understand how Sparta, while still leader of the Hellenic League, might use the pretext of medism as a timely cause for settling a local score.

We therefore agree with W. H. Plommer that it is too facile to dismiss Vitruvius' account of Caryae and Caryatids as vapid aetiology. On the other hand, we dispute his conclusion that 'figures of the Erechtheum type, slim and bolt upright, . . . never seem to have been called Caryatids in Antiquity'.[105] Vitruvius' own text appears to contradict this claim: 'quemadmodum si quis statuas marmoreas muliebres stolatas, quae Caryatides dicuntur, pro columnis in opere statuerit et insuper mutulos et coronas conlocaverit . . .'.[106] Furthermore, his language does not justify the view that he is referring to an architectural member of a non-Erechtheid type (e.g., with a raised left arm),[107] or to a Praxitelean dancing girl,[108] whether or not such a figure might be thought to represent the Spartan girls who came each year to dance in honour of Artemis Caryatis and in their choral capacity were known as Caryatids.[109] Taken in their most literal sense, Vitruvius' words can only refer to architectural members of the Erechtheum type and therefore to the type known from certain Ionic treasuries at Delphi, namely, the Siphnian and the Cnidian Treasuries and the treasury to which the 'ex-Cnidian' Caryatid belonged. We are not in a position to judge whether Vitruvius meant to say something else; we merely seek to make sense of the *argumenti ratio* he has provided for those who enquire about the historical basis of this architectural ornament.[110]

(ii) *Iconography: Delphic Caryatids and the Siphnian Frieze*

The main reason why scholars hesitate to take Vitruvius' account of the Caryatids seriously is perhaps the most obvious one: Caryatids first appear in architectural contexts which, according to current opinion, not only predate Xerxes' War by some fifty years or more, but also seem unrelated to the alleged medism of a Peloponnesian town and the punishment of its womenfolk. The Siphnian Treasury was not the only 'public building' at Delphi decorated with

[105] W. H. Plommer, 'Vitruvius and the origin of Caryatids', *JHS* xcix (1979) 97, 101. Plommer correctly notes that the pertinent architectural members of the Erechtheum were described as *korai* (cf. *IG* i² 372.86, = *IG* i³ 474.86), but this does not of itself refute Vitruvius' claim that such statues could also be known as Caryatids: the figures in the Erechtheum frieze are, as P. Wolters saw (*Zeits. für bildenden Kunst* vi [1895] 37; *cf.* Drerup [n. 90] 12), only described in the most general way: 'the man near the altar, the woman with the child, etc.' The inscriptions in question were legal documents, not religious or artistic treatises.

[106] Vitr. i 5.8–11.

[107] *Cf.* Plommer (n. 105) 99; Athen. 241d (*pace* Lauter [n. 90] 14). We suggest that the reference of the term Caryatid could have been generalised to include an architectural form of the kind to which Athenaeus alludes.

[108] T. Homolle, 'L'origine des Caryatides', *RA* v (1917) 18–67; J. Marcadé, 'Les bras des danseurs', *Mélanges Helléniques offerts à Georges Daux* (Paris 1974) 239–54; Ridgway (n. 5) 204–5 and n. 24.

[109] *Cf.* n. 98.

[110] Note Vitruvius' interest in the effects of the Persian Wars on the history of architecture. His account of the Stoa Persica at Sparta, which follows on immediately after that of the Caryatids, is well known: i 4; *cf.* Paus. iii 11.3 and J. J. Coulton, *The Architectural Development of the Greek Stoa* (Oxford 1976) 39. We believe him to be recording a genuine tradition when he describes the re-use of 'the yards and masts of the ships captured from the Persians' to roof the Odeion by the Theatre of Dionysus at Athens: v 91 (though he was mistaken in attributing the building to Themistocles rather than Pericles; *cf.* O. Broneer, 'The tent of Xerxes and the Greek theater', *U. Cal. Publ. in Class. Arch.* i [1944] 305–12; H. von Gall, 'Das persische Königszelt und die Hallenarchitektur in Iran und Griechenland', *Festschrift für Frank Brommer* [Mainz 1977] 119–32; *id.*, 'Das Zelt des Xerxes und seine Rolle als persischer Raumtyp in Griechenland', *Gymnasium* lxxxvi [1979] 444–62, pls 13–14; E. D. Francis, 'Greeks and Persians: the art of hazard and triumph', in D. Schmandt-Besserat [ed.], *Ancient Persia: the Art of an Empire*, Invited Lectures on the Middle East, U. Texas at Austin iv [Malibu 1980] 82–3. It would be interesting to determine if the architecture of the front of the stage building in the theatre at Eretria [which 'ähnelt der eines persischen Palastes', Auberson–Schefold (n. 6) 47–9] belongs in this tradition). Note too, Vitruvius' 'not only detailed but accurate information' regarding the Telesterion at Eleusis: vii praef. 16–17; Shear (n. 48) 175–8.

Caryatids. At least two other *publica aedificia*—the Cnidian Treasury and the building to which the 'ex-Cnidian Caryatid' belonged[111]—are known to have been so adorned. The Cnidian Treasury is conventionally dated to the 540s,[112] mainly on the historical argument that the Cnidians would have been unable to erect a treasury at Delphi once they had fallen under Persian sway. Cnidus' inclusion in the western satrapy, together with considerations of architectural and sculptural style, therefore influence the date conventionally ascribed to her Delphic treasury. The remains of the Cnidian Caryatids are in any case generally thought to be 'rather earlier in style than the surviving Siphnian one'.[113] Though 'earlier in style' is not necessarily synonymous with 'earlier in time', Cnidus may have been the leader in introducing Caryatids to Delphi. We shall therefore first judge Vitruvius' understanding of Caryatid iconography by reference to the Cnidian Treasury.

The hypothesis that the Siphnian Treasury could belong to the immediate aftermath of the Persian Wars demands that we reconsider the Cnidian Treasury in similar terms. If it is unclear that Cnidus was a founding member of the Delian League,[114] we have at least Aeschylus' authority for her liberation from the Persian yoke after Salamis.[115] She was also a Spartan colony[116] who acted openly in the interests of 'other Spartan offshoots'.[117] By 480, Cnidus had been under Persian rule for more than half a century. The 'Dorians of Asia had furnished thirty ships' for Xerxes' fleet at Salamis.[118] She had no place on the Serpent Column at Delphi. Some statement of homage to the god of Greek victory and a declaration regarding the just enslavement of those who had medised would be highly appropriate sentiments for Cnidus to express in the early 470s. The offering of a Treasury to Delphi might therefore be seen as an act of civic thanksgiving for the Greek victory and, in particular, for their own deliverance. Pausanias indeed reports that the Cnidians may have erected their treasury 'on the occasion of a victory' (ἐπὶ νίκῃ τινί), but is uncertain (οὐκ οἶδα) whether victory or a desire 'to display their εὐδαιμονία' was the real cause of the dedication.[119] (Though εὐδαιμονία is usually translated 'prosperity' in this context, in the wake of Salamis and Mycale the Cnidians might reasonably have regarded themselves as εὐδαίμονες in the sense of 'divinely favoured'.) Despite their record of commercial success in the sixth century, the immediate source of Cnidian εὐδαιμονία (and their Delphic 'tithe') may have been military. If the Cnidians were among those 'many others of Asia' at Mycale who 'when the battle was already decided, joined in on the Greek side . . . regardless of oaths and hostages',[120] they would have shared in the θησαυροὶ . . . χρημάτων[121] left behind by the fleeing Persians. This windfall could have provided both the occasion and the funds for building their Treasury at Delphi. Pausanias' uncertainty about the occasion of the Treasury's construction may be due to his admitted difficulty in reading boustrophedon inscriptions[122] and the idiosyncracies of Cnidian

[111] *FdD* iv. 2, pl. 16; G. M. A. Richter, *BCH* lxxxii (1958) 92 ff.

[112] *Cf.* Ridgway (n. 5) 101 n. 19: 'The Knidian Karyatids are usually dated before 540 . . .'. See too Büsing-Kolbe (n. 52) 88 n. 104.

[113] L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece, the City-States c. 700–500 BC* (London 1976) 200.

[114] *ATL* iii 213; *cf.* Meiggs (n. 43) 55–6.

[115] Aesch. *Pers.* 891.

[116] Hdt. i 174.

[117] Jeffery (n. 113) 199.

[118] Hdt. vii 93, with Macan's n. *ad loc.*

[119] Paus. x 11.4. Pausanias' doubt necessarily renders his testimony inconclusive: 'effet de style chez Pausanias, lecture erronée, ou témoignage fidèle en présence d'un texte peu explicite?' enquires F. Salviat ('La dédicace du trésor de Cnide', *Études Delphiques*, BCH Suppl. iv [1977] 23–36). The treasury inscription is too fragmentary to be decisive. The concluding words are usually restored to suggest an epinician dedication, but δεκάτ[αν ἀπὸ τῶμ πολεμί]ων (so Th. Homolle, *BCH* xx [1896] 591; *FdD* iii.1 289; Salviat 33) would probably imply a victory *against Greeks* (*cf.* πολεμίων) for which we see no appropriate context (*leg.* δεκάτ[αν ἀπὸ τῶμ Μηδικ]ῶν *vel. sim.*?). Now the Cnidians had participated in the commercial success of the eastern Greeks at Naucratis through their membership of the Hellenion (Hdt. ii 178). They also seem to have enjoyed special privileges in the Naucratite precinct of Miletus (Jeffery [n. 113] 352). G. Roux accordingly interpreted Pausanias' ἐπίδειξις εὐδαιμονίας in the sense of 'economic prosperity' and proposed δεκάτ[αν ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Κνιδί]ων (*Énigmes à Delphes* [Paris 1963] 68; *cf.* Salviat 35). Salviat, however, restores the inscription as part of the architrave of the façade so that the lacunae become even longer than before and the area of uncertainty enlarged. He judiciously leaves the lacuna open.

[120] D.S. xi 36.5 f.; Diodorus is probably relying upon Ephorus, *cf.* Burn (n. 43) 550.

[121] Hdt. ix 106.

[122] *Cf.* Paus. v 6 (on the 'Chest of Cypselus' at Olympia).

orthography.[123] Even so, our proposal regarding this dedication is not at variance with either of Pausanias' alternatives.

It is therefore possible that the Cnidians dedicated a Treasury at Delphi immediately after the Persian Wars for reasons comparable with those which were to motivate her decision to build the Lesche following victory at the Eurymedon. The united Greek action against Caryae must have been one of the first undertakings by the Hellenic League after Plataea and Mycale and herein may lie its significance. Cnidus, with her Spartan affiliation (and perhaps even supported by her mother-state), could have established the Caryatid motif in this post-war Delphic Treasury as a timely reference to a joint Hellenic campaign in whose promotion the Spartans must have played a leading rôle. So too the Siphnians—especially if they had temporised for the reasons A. R. Burn has proposed (p. 58 above)—could scarcely have found a more fitting way to celebrate their escape from the threat of the Persian yoke or declare their support for the cause of Hellenic freedom than by fulfilling a long overdue obligation to Delphi.[124] And they could more easily afford to fulfil this obligation if, as is likely, they shared in the distribution of war-booty. The Cnidian and Siphnian Caryatids would thus display a paradigm of the deserts meted out to traitors and at the same time publicly affirm that their own loyalty was unimpeachable. If the absence of the Siphnians from the panhellenic dedication at Olympia reflects any Spartan ill-will, then the use of the Caryatid motif could demonstrate an attempt to resolve such discord by acknowledging the just punishment of Laconian traitors to the Hellenic cause. The manifesto of the Caryatids might also include tacit criticism of those neighbouring islands who, unlike Siphnos, had given the Persians 'earth and water'.[125]

[123] For examples of Cnidian script, see e.g. Jeffery (n. 32) pl. 68 and 'Table of Letters'.

[124] We might compare the Mantineans and the main force of the Eleans who, arriving late for the Battle of Plataea, 'professed their regret and offered (or afterwards pretended to have offered) to pursue Artabazus and his corps, a ludicrous proposal which Pausanias of course vetoed. When they got home, they banished their generals. Probably the delay was not involuntary but political and indicates that the party in power was not whole-hearted for the cause of Hellas' (*CAH* v 340, *cf.* Hdt. ix 77; see also A. Andrewes, *Phoenix* vi [1952] 1–5, esp. 2). The Siphnians, without a warfleet, were unable to make a similar gesture by offering, for example, to pursue the Persians to Mycale, and so elected to redeem their promissory note in the hope of avoiding the disfavour of the Delphic authorities.

[125] The historical context of the 'ex-Cnidian Caryatid' is too fragmentary to allow us to judge its iconographic intent, but there is evidence outside Delphi (but still Apolline) which we must take into account. Pausanias' description of the Throne of Apollo at Laconian Amyclae (iii 18.8–19.5) has been thought to include references to architectural members of Caryatid type (*'Ανέχουσιν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτόν, κατὰ ταὐτα δὲ καὶ ὄπισθεν, Χάριτές τε δύο καὶ Ὧραι δύο*; *cf.* E. Buschor and W. von Massow, *AthMitt* lii [1927] 79–80), so that Caryatids resembling those of the Siphnian Treasury have frequently been incorporated in restorations (Buschor–v. Massow 79–80; E. Fiechter, *JdI* xxxiii [1918] 166 ff.; R. Martin, 'Bathyklès de Magnésie et le "trône" d'Apollon à Amyklae', *RA* 1976, 205–18). It is therefore important for us to consider both the occasion of this dedication, and the identity of its 'Caryatids'. Scholars (e.g. W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece* [London 1950] 142 n. 1) have dated the Throne to about the same period as the Siphnian Treasury and the two monuments share comparable extant architectural features (e.g. Fiechter pls 13–14). If the Siphnian Treasury dates from the 470s, then could a similar date be appropriate for the Throne at Amyclae? Furthermore, our information about its architect, Bathycles of Magnesia (= Overbeck nos 360–1) is chronologically inconclusive. We do not know when he lived, but he was almost certainly not (*pace* Levi *ad* Paus. iii 18.9) 'an early or mid-sixth century sculptor' and a contemporary of Croesus; Paus. iii 10.8 precludes such an assumption since Pausanias states that the image of Apollo for which Croesus sent gold was a crude piece of work *not* made by Bathycles (*ἔργον δὲ οὐ Βαθυκλέους ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ ἀρχαῖον καὶ οὐ σὺν τέχνῃ πεποιημένον*). Against a view that the Throne was refurbished in the 470s it might, however, be argued that Amyclae lacked the political clout to win such attention, for 'in contrast with the Spartan cult of Orthia, Amyclae was something of an outsider in Spartan politics' (Cartledge [n. 103] 107–8). On the other hand, Amyclae is prominent in two crucial events involving Spartan conduct during the Persian Wars. In 490 the Spartans were reluctant to depart for Attica because they were celebrating the Carneian festival *at Amyclae* (Hdt. vi 106). Eleven years later in 479, however, the Amyclaean Hyacinthia was disrupted when the Spartan army left Laconia before the conclusion of the festival (Hdt. ix 7–11). This action was a breach of custom, contrast Aristomenes' conduct in the Second Messenian War in bringing about a truce so that his army could return to celebrate the Hyacinthia (Paus. iv 19.3) or the behaviour of the hoplites from Amyclae who in 390 were allowed to go home from the invasion of Corinth, even though they were on active service (Xen. *Hell.* iv 5.11). For a general discussion, see W. K. Pritchett, *Ancient Greek Military Practices* i (= *The Greek State at War* i) (Berkeley/L.A. 1971) 125. A post-war Throne of Apollo could represent a thank-offering to the god (on the part of a state unlikely, for example, to

Indeed the whole sculptural programme of the Siphnian Treasury could be seen as a response to the events of the recent Wars. The Nike acroteria, like those of the Eretria temple,[126] might be interpreted as a commemoration of Greek victory. The analogy of the Trojan War was soon exploited in literature and art as a mythical antetype of the Persian Wars.[127] The Judgement of Paris on the West Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury or the Assembly of Gods and the Battle scene of the East Frieze may thus allude in mythical terms to recent military events. The motif of the Olympian Assembly, for example, reappears on the Parthenon Frieze which J. Boardman has skilfully interpreted as a Persian war memorial.[128] C. Clairmont has identified the scene on the fragmentary South Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury as the Rape of Helen,[129] which we interpret in Herodotus' sense as a cause of hostility.[130] We agree with L. V. Watrous' characterisation of the Giants on the North Frieze as overweening oriental barbarians.[131] Finally, the Struggle for the Tripod on the East Pediment proclaims that Zeus will not allow force to triumph against Delphic Apollo.[132] These themes work well together as a commentary upon a Greek victory won against the forces of the east and divinely sanctioned by the will of Zeus. At the entrance to the building, however, the visitor sees a topical reminder of these events stated in historical rather than mythical terms, for there stand the women of Caryae enduring eternal punishment for their treachery against Greece.

(iii) *Style*

It is a commonplace that two different hands were at work on the decoration of the Siphnian Treasury (p. 59). In his inaugural lecture at Oxford, Martin Robertson spoke of the coexistence of conservative and innovative styles during the Italian Renaissance and observed that

> there are cases in Greek sculpture where we can detect something analogous. There is reason to believe that the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi was erected shortly before 525 BC; but, while the sculptor of the northern and eastern friezes presses forward to the kind of style which culminated a generation or so later in the classical revolution, his colleague who carved the no less beautiful friezes of the south and west was a conservative, a master of the purest archaic style.[133]

Elsewhere, Professor Robertson characterises the stylistic contrast 'as that between ripe and late archaic',[134] though, as he also remarks, 'there is no reason for supposing any difference of

build a Treasury at Delphi) and a recompense for having disrupted Apollo's festival in the year of Plataea. Pausanias' 'Charites and Horae' (appropriate enough in an epinician context) may in fact have been 'Vitruvian' Caryatids if J. Borchhardt is correct in his view that by the Roman period 'die Bedeutung der Karyatiden nicht mehr verstanden wurde'.

[126] M. Y. Goldberg (n. 39) 199, 212–13, has assembled a phalanx of Nike acroteria of '525'; it would be good to know what victories they reflect.

[127] E.g. Hdt. i 4; the Eion poem (F. Jacoby, *Hesp.* xiv [1945] 186–7, 203); Paus. iii 9.3 (Agesilaus of Sparta sacrificing at Aulis before attacking Persia).

[128] J. Boardman, 'The Parthenon frieze—another view', *Fests. F. Brommer* (Mainz 1977) 39–49, pl. 16.

[129] C. Clairmont, *JHS* lxxix (1959) 211–12.

[130] Hdt. i 4: on this passage, however, see M. E. White, 'Herodotus' starting-point', *Phoenix* xxiii (1969) 39–48.

[131] L. V. Watrous, 'The sculptural program of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi', *AJA* lxxxvi (1982) 169–71, but we do not agree with his specific interpretation, for example, of their helmet crests.

[132] This image has inherently chauvinistic implications at Delphi and may have served as a particular warning to Heraclid states. For example, 'not many years before Xerxes' invasion of Greece', the Phocians made a dedication at Delphi to commemorate a victory over the Thessalians (Hdt. viii 27; according to H. D. Westlake, 'The medism of Thessaly', *JHS* lvi [1936] 15, the war with Phocis 'can scarcely have been concluded before 500'). With a tithe of the booty won in battle, the Phocians had set up groups of large statues (μεγάλοι ἀνδρίαντες) at Abae and around the tripod in front of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi (Hdt. *loc. cit.*). The Delphian statues were still there in Pausanias' day: 'Heracles and Apollo are holding out the tripod and are set to fight over it, with Athena restraining Heracles' anger and Leto and Artemis restraining Apollo' (Paus. x 13.4). For recent discussions of the Struggle for the Tripod, see Watrous (n. 131) 167 nn. 67 ff. The best account remains that of F. Passow, 'Herakles der Dreyfussräuber auf Denkmaalen alter Kunst', in C. A. Böttiger (ed.), *Archäologie und Kunst* (Breslau 1828) 125–64.

[133] M. Robertson, *Between Archaeology and Art History* (Oxford 1963) 19–20; *cf. id.* (n. 5) 152; *id.*, *A Shorter History of Greek Art* (Cambridge 1981) 41; M. Wegner, 'Gleichzeitigesungleichartiges', *Fests. Hans Erich Stier* (Münster 1972) 72–87.

[134] Robertson (n. 5) 156.

date'.[135] In Robertson's view the style of the north and east friezes appears substantially in advance of its time. This account of the relationship between the two styles appears to depend upon an assumption that the sixth-century date is fixed beyond doubt. We agree that 'the artist of west and south is an untroubled archaic, the other is in the van of those whose innovations were to lead to the classical revolution'.[136] On the other hand, rather than concluding that one sculptor presses forward to anticipate the style of a later generation, we suggest that he and his art may in fact belong to that generation; at the same time we accept Robertson's description of his colleague as 'a conservative' working in the same generation but retaining his mastery of an earlier style.[137] Robertson himself had just argued a similar case by citing Beazley's observation that the Triptolemos Painter, 'an excellent later archaic draughtsman' had joined in painting the same vase together with an artist whose style could be characterised as 'early classical': Robertson concludes 'that the Triptolemos Painter retained in a quite pure form his late archaic style into the early classical age'.[138] We consider this conclusion to be a thoroughly logical one and see no reason why the same principle cannot obtain with respect to the contrasting styles of the Siphnian Treasury. In other words, we suggest that the artisan who carved the Siphnian Treasury's south and west friezes had retained his archaic style in an age more typically represented by that of his colleague.

We may be in a position to identify that colleague, for B. S. Ridgway has recently described the east and north reliefs as 'the work of a sculptor ['Master B'] from the Cyclades who seems to have spent a good deal of his active career in Athens'.[139] In this connection she refers to L. H. Jeffery's attempt 'to integrate the signature on the giant's shield (N. side) as "Aristion of Paros"'.[140] It would indeed be attractive to see a distinguished native son of Paros commissioned by his Siphnian neighbours to work his own island stone on their behalf. Andrew Stewart's reconstruction of Aristion's career suggests that this sculptor may also have had a hand in the pedimental decoration at Eretria.[141] R. Lullies has also commented on the stylistic affinities which link the Parian north-east frieze of the Siphnian Treasury and the Eretrian group of Theseus and Antiope.[142] If these observations are correct, Aristion is not only confirmed as a first-rate sculptor whose stylistic hand-writing is as fluent as it is distinctive, but as a master of the iconography particularly topical in post-war Greek art. We could then see Aristion active as a sculptor of friezes and pediments in the 470s, having perhaps already established his reputation as a statuary by such works as Phrasikleia and, possibly, the Anavyssos *kouros*.[143]

In judging the possibility that the sculptural decoration of the Siphnian Treasury may yet be roughly contemporary with that of Apollo's Temple at Eretria, we have attempted to reconstruct something of Siphnian history in the fifth century and, in particular, at the time of the Persian Wars. We have shown the idea that the Siphnian mines were flooded at about the

[135] *Ibid.* 155–6. Nevertheless, some scholars, for example J. Kleine, have tried to explain this stylistic discrepancy in chronological terms: 'Danach wären Nord und Ostfries vor 525 begonnen, die Katastrophe von Siphnos hätte eine Arbeitsunterbrechung bewirkt, Sud- und Westfries schliesslich wären um oder nach 520 gearbeitet worden' (Kleine [n. 5] 32 n. 89). The assumption that a necessary correlation exists between apparent stylistic development and historical time derives in no small measure from the influence of H. Brunn on nineteenth-century attitudes to the study of Greek art. In this connection his observations regarding the Aeginetan pediments make for highly instructive reading: *Über das Alter der aeginetischen Bildwerke* (SBMünchen 1867.1 4) 405–28. We are most grateful to Prof. Philipp Fehl for bringing this reference to our attention. For evidence for the simultaneous production of works in several different styles at another period, see M. Vickers, 'Fifth-century brickstamps from Thessaloniki', *BSA* lxviii (1973) 292–4. For an excellent critique of the principles of method at issue in evaluating the relationship between style and history, see A. F. Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*, Soc. Prom. Hell. Stud. Suppl. Paper xiv (London 1979) ch. 6, 'Time and Style', 133–54.

[136] Robertson 1981 (n. 133) 41.

[137] *Cf.* the illuminating remarks on the different 'syntaxes' employed by Mantegna and Dürer in W. M. Ivins, *Prints and Visual Communication* (New Haven 1953) 60–1.

[138] Robertson 1963 (n. 133) 19; *cf.* J. D. Beazley, 'Marpessa', *Charites: Fests. Ernst Langlotz* (Bonn 1957) 136–9, esp. 138–9 on *ARV*² 362.21 and 280.18.

[139] Ridgway (n. 5) 270.

[140] *Ibid.*, and 279; see also Jeffery (n. 113) 185.

[141] A. F. Stewart, 'Aristion of Paros', *AAA* ix (1976) 257 ff.

[142] Lullies (n. 5) 48.

[143] Stewart (n. 141).

time of the Samian attack to be overstated; we do not really know when Siphnos' mines were either exhausted or flooded, but there is no overriding reason which requires us to suppose that the island's economy was impoverished in the first half of the fifth century. On the other hand, neither these observations nor the other arguments we have raised provide conclusive reasons for seeing the Treasury as a product of the early 470s; they merely assemble the political, documentary and art-historical context in which such a view would be possible. If we are to reject that view or one like it and accept Herodotus' implication regarding the Treasury at face value then we question the confidence most scholars now place in dates derived from stylistic comparison.

This, however, would be by no means the only discrepancy present in the current view of archaic Greek art. Martin Robertson has recently expressed his concern about the tendency to down-date the introduction of the Early Owl coinage of Athens to the last quarter of the sixth century, despite the fact that 'this late dating is in accord with the evidence of coin-hoards'. Robertson, however, finds the 'very archaic style' of some of the coinage 'hard to reconcile' with a late-sixth-century date.

> In many cases this might be ascribed to mere backwardness or to deliberate archaism, as is certainly the case in the later history of Athenian coinage; but in others the early character seems remarkably strong and pure, and there is no reason for archaism at this stage of production.[144]

A redating of the Siphnian Treasury and other *signa priscae artis* may shed light on this apparent discrepancy between archaeological facts and art-historical hypothesis. Bernard Ashmole long ago astutely observed that the heads of some of the figures on the Siphnian Treasury are closely comparable with profiles of heads on the Early Owl coinage.[145] C. M. Kraay argued that the bulk of these Early Owls was probably struck between 483 and 480[146] and the recent evidence of the Asyut hoard tends to confirm this.[147] Ashmole's comparison is thus vindicated, and the data to which it refers can now be attributed to the period *c.* 480 BC. The Early Owls belong to the years preceding Xerxes' war, the Siphnian Treasury to its immediate aftermath. Considered in these terms, the basis for Robertson's concern regarding the relative chronology of early Athenian coinage and archaic Greek art is removed. Likewise, Eretria's early coinage, now thought to cease production in 490[148] may be reassigned to the programme of that city's post-war economic revitalisation.

Magdalen College, Oxford and University of Texas at Austin,
Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

E. D. FRANCIS
MICHAEL VICKERS

[144] Robertson (n. 5) 150.

[145] B. Ashmole, 'The relationship between coins and sculpture', *Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress* (London 1938) 17–22; see further however Price–Waggoner (n. 25) 66–8.

[146] C. M. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coinage* (London 1976) 62–3. A relatively low date for the origin of Early Owls has come in for criticism from those who still prefer to associate this coinage with Solon's currency reforms (notably H. A. Cahn, *Kleine Schriften zur Münzkunde und Archäologie* [Basel 1975] 81–97). Not only does 'the evidence of finds appear to run counter to this conclusion' (Kraay 56, and see next note), but the stylistic arguments made in support of such a view can also be accounted for (though not, of course, the association with Solon) if our dating of the Siphnian Treasury is accepted.

[147] Price–Waggoner (n. 25) 63. Their chronological conclusions have been challenged by H. A. Cahn ('Asiut: Kritische Bemerkungen zu einer Schatzfund-publikation', *Schweiz. Num. Rundschau* lvi [1977] 279–87) who (281–2) regards the Persepolis foundation deposits, which include Greek coins, as providing a *terminus ante quem* of 513 BC. This view depends on E. F. Schmidt's assumption (*Persepolis* i [Chicago 1953] 39–40, 63, 70; ii [1957] 110, 113–14, pl. 84, nos 27–8) that the building of the Apadana was started before the campaign against the European Scythians because no reference is made to this people on the short list of countries under Persian rule on the foundation tablets. The fact that there is a notable lack of unanimity regarding the date of the Scythian expedition (*cf.* Price–Waggoner 129; M. C. Root, *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art* [Leiden 1979] 75) is not directly relevant to the question. We concur with M. Roaf that the 'omission [of the Scythians] is not conclusive' and follow him in believing that the 'Apadana reliefs and the East Door of the Central Building were probably designed and started a few years before Darius' death in 486' ('The subject peoples on the base of the statue of Darius', *Cahiers de la Délégation Française d'Archéologie en Iran* iv [1974] 90–1). If such were indeed the case, then the Persepolis deposits would no longer constitute a major difficulty for the downdating of early Greek coinage.

[148] Price–Waggoner (n. 25) 56.