



from hippias to kallias

greek art in athens & beyond
527-449 BC

from hippias to kallias

**greek art in athens
and beyond
527-449 bc**

Edited by Olga Palagia
& Elisavet P. Sioumpara



acropolis
museum
editions

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS

Uta Dirschedl, DFG project „Der archaische Apollontempel (>Tempel II<) von Didyma und die Genese der monumentalen ionischen Sakralarchitektur,“ German Archaeological Institute, Berlin, Podbielskiallee 69-71, 14159 Berlin, Germany. uta.dirschedl@dainst.de

Sylvian Fachard, Andrew W. Mellon Professor of Classical Studies, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 54 Soudias St., 10674 Athens, Greece, sfachard@ascsa.edu.gr

Astrid Fendt, curator, State Collection of Antiquities and Glyptothek, Katharina-von-Bora-Str. 10, 80333 Munich, Germany, fendt@antike-am-koenigsplatz.mwn.de

Alexander Herda, Dr. habil. Humboldt University Berlin. Independent researcher, German Archaeological Institute, Athens, 1 Pheidiou St., 10678 Athens, Greece, alexander.herda@web.de

Mathias Hofter, Ph.D., Project “Edition des Briefwechsels zwischen König Ludwig I und Johann Martin von Wagner,” Institut für Bayerische Geschichte, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, D-80539 Munich, Germany, m.hofter@lmu.de

Anne Jacquemin, Professor of Greek History Emerita, Faculty of Historical Sciences, University of Strasbourg, 67000 Strasbourg, France, jacquemi@unistra.fr

Konstantinos Kalogeropoulos, Research Center for Antiquity, Academy of Athens, 14 Anagnostopoulou St., 10673 Athens, Greece, kalokk@otenet.gr

Catherine Keesling, Professor of Classics, Georgetown University, 319 Healey Hall, 37th and O Sts. NW, Washington DC 20057, U.S.A., keeslinc@georgetown.edu

Didier Laroche, Maître-assistant à l'École Nationale Supérieure d'Architecture de Strasbourg, 6-8 Blvd du Président Wilson, 10037-67068 Strasbourg, France, Didier.Laroche@wanadoo.fr

Iphigeneia Leventi, Associate Professor of Classical Archaeology, University of Thessaly, 38221 Volos, Greece, ifleve12@gmail.com

Andronike Makres, Greek Epigraphic Society, Hellenic Education & Research Center (HERC), 17 Agias Filotheis St., 10556 Athens, Greece, info@herc.org.gr

Jenifer Neils, Director, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 54 Soudias St., 10674 Athens, Greece, jneils@ascsa.org

Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier, Director Emeritus, German Archaeological Institute at Athens, 1 Pheidiou St., 10678 Athens, Greece, wolf-dietrich.niemeier@dainst.de

Olga Palagia, Professor of Classical Archaeology Emerita, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 21 Sarantapichou St., 11471 Athens, Greece, palagia@enternet.gr

C. Brian Rose, James B. Pritchard Professor of Mediterranean Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 3260 South St., Philadelphia, PA 19104, U.S.A., roseb@sas.upenn.edu

Adele Scafuro, Professor of Classics, Department of Classics,
Box 1856, Brown University, 48 College St., Providence, RI 02912,
U.S.A., adele_scafuro@brown.edu

Andreas Scholl, Director, Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen
zu Berlin, Geschwister-Scholl-Str. 6, D-10117 Berlin, Germany,
a.scholl@smb.spk-berlin.de

Elisavet P. Sioumpara, Head of the Project “Membra Disjecta,”
Acropolis Restoration Service, Ministry of Culture and Sports, 10
Polygnotou St., 10555 Athens, Greece, eliza.sioumpara@gmail.com

Andrew Stewart, Nicholas C. Petris Professor of Greek Studies,
Departments of History of Art and Classics, University of California at
Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720-6020, U.S.A., astewart@berkeley.edu

Petros Themelis, Professor of Classical Archaeology Emeritus,
University of Crete, Director of the Society of Messenian
Archaeological Studies, 33 Psaromilingou St., 10553 Athens, Greece,
pthemeles@gmail.com

Panos Valavanis, Professor of Classical Archaeology, Department
of Archaeology and Art History, National and Kapodistrian University
of Athens, 15784 Athens, Greece, pval@arch.uoa.gr

Antigoni Zournatzi, Director of Research, Institute of Historical
Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 11635 Athens,
Greece, azourna@eie.gr

PREFACE	8
I. THE ATHENIAN ACROPOLIS	12
Weihgeschenk – Statussymbol – Historisches Zeugnis. Zur Bedeutung der Votivskulpturen des späten 6. Jhs. v. Chr. auf der Athener Akropolis ANDREAS SCHOLL	14
Managing the Debris: Spoliation of Architecture and Dedications on the Athenian Acropolis After the Persian Destruction ELISAVET P. SIOUMPARA	30
Men of Bronze, but not Hoplites: Kritios and Nesiotes’ Male Figures on the Acropolis CATHERINE KEESLING	52
The Archaic Inscribed Bronzes on the Acropolis of Athens: Some Remarks ANDRONIKE MAKRES AND ADELE SCAFURO	62
Athena in the Ergasterion? JENIFER NEILS	78
Winds of Change? Evaluating Decorated Pottery from the Athenian Acropolis Between 510 and 490 B.C., and its Relations to Earlier and Later Periods KONSTANTINOS KALOGEROPOULOS	90

II. ATHENS AND ATTICA	104
Prosperity and Art in Athens (527-449 B.C.) PETROS THEMELIS	106
Looking for Persians in Attic Vase Painting ANTIGONI ZOURNATZI	120
Cultural and Technological Evolution on the Metopes of the Hephaisteion ANDREW STEWART	134
What Stood on Top of the Marathon Trophy? PANOS VALAVANIS	144
Early Classical Female Statues: Typology, Identifications, and Influences on Later Greek Sculpture IPHIGENEIA LEVENTI	158
III. BEYOND ATHENS	170
Common Denominators? The Emergence of Territorial Organization in Athens and Eretria SYLVIAN FACHARD	172
Le portique des Athéniens revisité ANNE JACQUEMIN, DIDIER LAROCHE	182
The Sculptures of the Temple of Aphaia on Aigina in Their Contemporary Context ASTRID FENDT	192
Technische Überlegungen zu den Giebelskulturen des Aphaiatempels zu Aigina MATHIAS HOFTER	206
The Oracular Sanctuary of Apollo at Abai/Kalapodi Before and After the Persian Destruction WOLF-DIETRICH NIEMEIER	218
IV. ASIA MINOR	232
The Archaic Apollo Sanctuary of Didyma, the Canachus Apollo and the So-called Persian Destruction UTA DIRSCHEDL	234
Some Remarks on Miletos Before and After the Persian Wars ALEXANDER HERDA	250
The Polyxena Sarcophagus C. BRIAN ROSE	268
In the Shadow of Cimon: From Late Archaic to Early Classical in Xanthos OLGA PALAGIA	278

PREFACE

Dimitrios Pandermalis
President of the Acropolis Museum

The Acropolis Museum was happy to host the international meeting on the monuments of Greek art and architecture dating from the last decades of the 6th cent. BC to the middle of the 5th cent. BC. The beginning of this period coincides with the end of the Peisistratid era, represented by Peisistratos' son Hippias, who was "by nature a politician, and wise", while the end of the period is marked by the peace treaty between Persians and Athenians which was attributed to the initiative of Kallias, the richest Athenian of his time, who was also known for his diplomatic skills.

Fundamental changes in the political scenery, as well as in the artistic world, occur within this period. Many emblematic monuments, which showcase the new artistic choices, are exhibited in the Acropolis Museum's galleries. Several of these artifacts were recently conserved, their modern additions were removed and they were installed on new pedestals offering new possibilities for their study.

The Acropolis Museum is indebted to all the colleagues, who with their contributions promoted our knowledge of the monuments of this period.

PREFACE



Olga Palagia, Elisavet P. Sioumpara

The papers in this volume are based on an international conference hosted by the Acropolis Museum in Athens on May 19-20, 2017. Scholars from various countries were assembled to illuminate the transformations of Greek art during a transitional period marked by the ascendancy of Athens through the cataclysmic changes of the end of tyranny, the birth of democracy in 508, the repulsion of Persian aggression in 490 and again in 480-479 and the gradual transformation of the Athenian alliance into a maritime empire. There is a special focus on the Athenian Acropolis as a repository of new artistic developments.

Even though political and social changes may not be directly reflected in the art of a given period, art is not created in a vacuum but is firmly rooted in historical circumstances, hence the choice of the pivotal dates 527 and 449 B.C. The year 527 marks the death of the Athenian tyrant Peisistratos and the emergence of a new instability, while 449 is the date of Kimon's death and heralds a new era of peace and prosperity firmly grounded on his military achievements. Hippias, Peisistratos' son, was the last tyrant of Athens, who fell from grace in 510 and turned Persian agent in his efforts to regain power at home, participating in the first Persian invasion of Greece in 490. In the fourth century B.C. Kallias was credited with a peace treaty with Persia, signed in 449: even though the actual treaty may have been a later fabrication (since it has left no fifth-century record), the phasing out of the Persian threat led to the Golden Age of Pericles, an era of stability that gave birth to classical art.

In the last decades of the sixth century the archaic style developed into a delicate and refined visual language that remained unaffected by the significant political changes introduced by Kleisthenes in 508. Did the change from archaic to early classical come as a result of the Persian Wars? The problem is still *sub judice* and the debate is reflected in the pages of this book. There is no doubt, however, that the archaic and early classical styles co-existed for a time. The Severe Style did not appear suddenly but developed gradually into a coherent formal language.

This conference investigates the artistic impact of the conflict with Persia not only on the Athenian Acropolis but also in mainland Greece and Asia Minor. Around 470 Kimon assumed the initiative, carrying the conflict to Persian waters and expanding Athenian influence as far as Lycia. It is in those early years of Athenian imperialism that we see the last manifestations of artistic independence in cities like Aigina and Eretria. The early classical style comes as a last gasp of individualism in a fragmented Greek world before the high classical style introduced by Pheidias in the Parthenon will impose a universal rule of harmony, balance and serenity in the visual arts.

The conference was sponsored by the Acropolis Museum, the Faculty of History and Archaeology of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens and the Association of Friends of the Acropolis. The organizers are particularly grateful to the President of the Acropolis Museum, Dimitrios Pantermalis, for hosting our conference and including the proceedings in the Acropolis Museum publications, as well as for his encouragement throughout.

Bibliographical abbreviations follow the guidelines of the *American Journal of Archaeology*; abbreviations of ancient authors and epigraphical collections can be found in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.

LOOKING FOR
PERSIANS IN ATTIC
VASE PAINTING

Antigoni Zournatzi

Introduction

Greek martial encounters with Persia, famously recounted by Greek historians and occasionally a theme of Attic monumental art, have long been known to find reflections in the iconographic repertory of Attic vase painters as well.¹ References to historical events in painted scenes on Attic vases are generally deemed unusual, and the themes of the vase painters' repertory are rarely identified by means of labels. A number of nearly always unlabeled scenes, however, datable in their majority to the early through the mid fifth century B.C. and depicting one or more hoplite warriors combatting adversaries dressed in the exotic (from a Greek view point) Central Asiatic nomadic trousered costume also worn by the Persians, would still appear to evoke, more than anything else, contemporary historical encounters between Greeks and Persians in the battlefield.² Attic artistic interest in a historical theme—as opposed to the seemingly customarily mythological and genre subjects of Attic vase painting—may be directly linked in this instance with local experience of two Persian expeditions against the Greek mainland, even into the territory of Attica itself, in 490 and 480/79 B.C., and especially with local pride about the role of Athens, on both occasions, in thwarting the Persian threat. Such an Athenian bias is registered on the vase paintings through a more or less explicit portrayal of the Persians as the Greeks' defeated opponents.

Whether or not these Attic iconographic documents were simultaneously meant to offer ethnographically accurate representations of Persian identity is a question that admits no straightforward or uniform answer. The varied details in which the different vase painters' Persian subjects are depicted find no complete set of parallels in the native Persian record. Attempts to determine specifically Persian traits are further confounded by the basic typological resemblance of the figures identified as Persians in fifth century vase painting with similarly trousered archer figures identified—admittedly with much less certainty than one would have desired—as “Scythians” on sixth century vases,³ and a parallel lack of any adequate understanding of regional Iranian variations of the trousered costume. The overall impression that one forms from the extant Attic representations of Persians, however, is that their details could be variously affected by Persian realities, contemporary Greek perceptions and artistic trends

-
- 1 The author wishes to express her appreciation to the organizers of this conference for inviting her to participate and for their warm hospitality. Thanks are equally due to Kalliope Kritikakou-Nikolaropoulou and Michael Roaf for helpful comments on earlier drafts, as well as to the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, the Ashmolean Museum of the University of Oxford, the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, and the Trustees of the British Museum for photographs and permission to use them in Figs. 1-4.
 - 2 The bibliography on the subject is extensive. See, among earlier treatments, Gow 1928 and Schoppa 1933, and progressive additions to the relevant corpus of vase paintings and further commentaries by Bovon 1963; Hölscher 1973; Raeck 1981, and in a series of essays by Miller, among which see especially Miller 2011, with extensive references to previous discussions. According to this latter scholar, scenes depicting Persian warriors alone or in combat constitute over 50% of the total of some 100 images related to Persians on Attic vases between ca. 510 and ca. 350 B.C.
 - 3 For an identification as Scythians (of the northern Pontic region), see esp. Vos 1963. Although this interpretation has not lost its appeal (e.g., Mayor et al. 2014; Osborne 2018, 106-107), it is difficult to preclude assumptions that, instead of denoting Scythian ethnicity, the costuming of these sixth century archers could serve as an iconographic convention for “a second rank character accompanying a hero”, and/or the ultimate prototypes of these “Scythian” archers could be the archers of different ethnic groups of the Median and eventually Persian armies (Ivantchik 2006). For the similarities between figures identified as “Scythian” and Persian, respectively, in Attic iconography, see, e.g., Schauenburg 1975, 106-118.

Fig. 1

Combat between a Greek hoplite and a Persian warrior. Attic red-figure oinochoe attributed to the Chicago Painter, ca. 460 B.C. Boston Museum of Fine Arts 13.196, Francis Bartlett Donation of 1912, 19.3cm X 12 cm Height with handle, 24cm.

*Photograph
© 2019 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.*



and, not least, the proclivities of individual painters. The present contribution seeks to highlight the possible interplay of these various parameters with reference to two famous instances: a duel painted on an oinochoe in Boston attributed to the Chicago Painter (Fig. 1);⁴ and a combat from the battle scene decorating the exterior of a kylix at Oxford, the name vase of the Painter of the Oxford Brygos (Fig. 2).⁵

Two Attic iconographic ‘studies’ of Persians

On the Boston oinochoe (Fig. 1) the warrior identified as a Persian has just shot an arrow past his opponent, and leans backward, trying to avoid the Greek hoplite’s spear thrust while he attempts to defend himself with a sword. In his outstretched left hand he holds a bow. In contrast to the almost completely naked body of his opponent, the Persian is covered from the shoulders to the ankles by a long-sleeved, trousered uniform decorated with two sets of pattern designs: alternating rows of zig-zags and dots are used for the leggings and for the upper portion of the sleeved uniform; star motifs decorate the skirt-like piece hanging from the waist to approximately the joint of the thighs. The visible part of his cap forms a bulging crown and terminates in two long flaps. Brusque, vertical wavy patterns of dark paint mark the warrior’s moustache and beard. In addition to the bow and sword, the warrior’s equipment includes an arrow case, worn on his left side, suspended from a baldric.

The second example, on the kylix (Fig. 2), depicts a man-to-man combat between two warriors, each armed with shield and spear. This is one of three combat groups depicted on the exterior of the cup, and which according to different interpretations could allude to events of either the battle of Marathon (490 B.C.) or that of Plataea (480/79 B.C.).⁶ In the selected detail, the profile face, as well as the outline of the torso and legs,

4 Boston Museum of Fine Arts 13.196, ca. 460 B.C. (ARV² 631.38; Bovon 1963, no. 13; Raeck 1981, P557).

5 Oxford, Ashmolean Museum AN 1911.615, ca. 490-480 B.C. (ARV² 399; Bovon 1963, no. 2; Barrett and Vickers 1978; Raeck 1981, P580; Miller 2006/07, 111 with a reconstruction drawing of the entire battle scene painted on the exterior of the kylix in fig. 1, 113-114).

6 See, respectively, Williams 1986, 77, and Barrett and Vickers 1978, 21-22.

**Fig. 2**

Combat between a Greek hoplite and a Persian warrior. Attic red-figure kylix attributed to the Painter of the Oxford Brygos, ca. 490-480 B.C. From Cerveteri. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford AN 1911. 615. Diameter 33cm.

Image © Ashmolean Museum, University Of Oxford.

of the Persian warrior closely resemble the pose of the archer on the Boston oenochoe (Fig. 1), but the Oxford figure (Fig. 2) is shown from the rear. In his left hand, he holds a tall rectangular shield decorated with an asymmetrical pattern of alternating dark and light rectangles of varying heights. His headdress, like that of the archer on the oenochoe, ends in long flaps, but forms a volute above the forehead. A beard covers his chin, and a short wavy line above the upper lip suggests a moustache. In the upper part of the warrior's costume, outlines and different decorative patterns evoke a sleeveless corslet worn over a long-sleeved garment. The surface of the corslet is covered with a net-like pattern with a single dot floating within each of the rhomboid sections. In its lower part, a different pattern of vertical strokes possibly suggest *pteryges*. Different patterns of zig-zags, elongated, irregularly-shaped ornaments, and stripes decorate the figure's leggings and long sleeves. The shoes, here depicted with upcurving toe, bear on the surface three linear marks indicative of shoe laces.

The two warriors just described display standard traits of male figures identified as Persians in Attic vase-painting. These are richly patterned long-sleeved and long-legged costumes, headgears with lappets, often shoes with laces, and a certain facial distinctiveness suggested by beards and moustaches. This basic outlook, also attested in the rare instances when references to Persians can be inferred from accompanying labels,⁷ is broadly compatible with Greek textual testimony about Persian appearance. The costumes of the Boston and Oxford warriors evoke, among others, Herodotus' description of Xerxes' Persian troops in 480/79 as wearing "on their heads loose caps called *tiaras*, and on their bodies variedly decorated sleeved tunics and trousers on their legs".⁸ The same Herodotean context supplies a broadly compatible description of items of Persian armament.⁹ Persian shoes are placed in the spotlight in the *Persae*

7 E.g., Vatican Museums 16536 (H530) by the Mannheim Painter, ca. 460 B.C. (ARV² 1065.8, 1066; Raeck 1981, P591); British Museum 64.10-7.1730 by the Hephaistos Painter, ca. 470 B.C. (ARV² 392; Bovon 1963, no. 9; Hölscher 1973, 48-49, pl. 4.2).

8 Hdt. 7.61.1.

9 For the evidence on Persian attire and armament, see, among others, Bittner 1985 and Sekunda 1992.

Fig. 3

Persian guards wearing the long robe and the trousered costume. Persepolis, Council Hall, east wing of main stairway. Courtesy of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.



of Aeschylus with reference to Xerxes' "saffron-dyed" footgear.¹⁰ Comparison with the Achaemenid evidence reveals a number of convergences in detail between Greek textual and pictorial depictions and Persian realities but also a certain selective and/or liberal Greek approach to elements of the Persian military gear.

The Achaemenid testimony

Trousers and sleeved upper garments, standard elements of Greek renderings of Persians, are characteristic of one of two types of costume in which noblemen and guards are depicted in Achaemenid art, while the second type of costume, also consistently worn by the Persian king, is a long robe with richly pleated skirt and sleeves (Fig. 3). Rather than denoting, as it was once thought, members of the two separate ethnic components (Median and Persian respectively) of the imperial ruling class, these two costumes—the former native to Central Asiatic nomadic peoples, and the latter to the Elamites in whose territory the Persians settled when they arrived in Fars—were most likely both part of the Persian sartorial tradition.¹¹ Since both costumes were known to the Greeks, the more or less exclusive emphasis of the Attic artists and Greek authors on the Persians' trousered costume—presumably, the Persians' garment of choice in the battlefield and in hunting activities—may be explained with reference to the preeminent emphasis of the Greek textual and pictorial sources on the martial character of Greek-Persian encounters.

The headgear with lappets—another common element of the wider Central Asiatic costume tradition, as well as a hallmark of Greek depictions of Persians—does not form part of normative Persian attire in Achaemenid monumental representations. In

¹⁰ Aesch. *Pers.* 660.

¹¹ See Roaf 1974, 94-103, and Stronach 2011.

the latter representations, parallels to the type of headgear worn by the Oxford and Boston warriors are generally attested in depictions of the Persians' various Iranian/Central Asiatic subjects and servants;¹² warriors, nobles and ushers in the trousered costume wear, as a rule, a domed hat.¹³ That the headdress with lappets was also worn by the Persians is clearly attested, nonetheless, by another official iconographic medium: the portrait coins issued by satraps in charge of western imperial provinces.¹⁴ The representation of Darius III on the Alexander Mosaic implies that an analogous headdress would be worn in battle even by the Persian king.¹⁵

The patterned garments of the two warriors readily evoke the variedly decorated Persian clothes mentioned in Greek literature and attested on Achaemenid reliefs,¹⁶ and a parallel for at least the zig-zag motif featured on the Boston warrior's uniform is provided by a fragment of a glazed brick relief of a figure in the trousered costume from the palace of Darius at Susa.¹⁷ At the same time, patterns and outlines give rise to uncertain impressions about the constituent elements of the attire depicted. On the uniform of the Boston warrior, pattern differentiation might equally prompt, for instance, reconstruction of a variedly decorated or crafted sleeved tunic worn over trousers. Or, by comparison with the loincloth worn by Greek warriors, one could visualize a loincloth (*perizoma*) or "shorts-like" (so Margaret Miller) accessory worn over a shirt-like garment and trousers or a one-piece close-fitting long-sleeved trousered suit¹⁸ — a visualization for which one is unable to find parallels in the known Iranian sartorial repertory, however.¹⁹

The diagonally cross-hatched motif of the corslet of the Oxford warrior (Fig. 2) poses the question of the manufacture of Persian body armor, but also that of the intended accuracy of the Attic vase painters' depictions of it. As restored, Herodotus' account of the military gear of Xerxes' Persian soldiers includes a reference to "[θώρηκας] λεπίδος σιδηρέης ὄψιν ἰχθυοειδέος", usually interpreted as "[corslets] having iron scales upon them like the scales of fish", and the use of metal armor by the Persians is well attested by both Greek textual and Achaemenid archaeological evidence.²⁰

12 E.g., at Persepolis, Schmidt 1953, pls. 86 and 27B. For a comparison of such Iranian hats with those worn by Persians on Attic vases, see Miller 1991, 61-64. For the confusing terminology (τιάρια, κυρβάσια, κίταρις) used for this genre of headdress in Greek texts, see Tuplin 2007.

13 See Roaf 1974, 101-102, with references.

14 See conveniently Curtis and Tallis 2005, nos. 330-333.

15 Cohen 1997, pl. III.

16 For the sumptuous decoration of elite Persian clothing depicted on Achaemenid reliefs, see Tilia 1978, 54, fig. 6 (decoration of the royal gown in the Persepolis stone sculpture), and de Mecquenem 1947, 49, fig. 25, and 51, fig. 26 (decorated garments on glazed brick reliefs at Susa). For the decoration of the trousered costume also worn by Persians, see Moorey 1985, 24-26, with further references.

17 Paris, Louvre Sb 14427. See Harper et al. 1992, 239-240, no. 168, who suggest that the figure might be a dignitary. A wider association of the zig-zag motif with Persian trouser decoration might be implied by its occurrence on the trousers of a fragmentary plastic terracotta figure from Sardis dated to the first decades of Persian rule locally and presumably depicting Persian attire (Greenewalt 1971).

18 A Greek warrior with loincloth worn over a short chiton is depicted on Munich, Antikensammlungen 2415, attributed to the Kleophon Painter, ca. 450-400 B.C. (ARV² 1143.2). For the "shorts-like" feature in Attic depictions of "Scythian" and Persian figures, see, respectively, Vos 1963, 41, and Miller 2006/07, 113 and n. 9.

19 Cf. Ivantchik 2006, 248.

20 See, e.g., Miller 1997, 48-49, with references. The Achaemenid evidence consists of several hundreds of rounded and rectangular platelets of metal armor, mainly of iron, rarely of bronze or gold-plated, excavated at Pasargadae (Stronach 1978, 221-222, fig. 96, nos. 1-7) and Persepolis (Schmidt 1957, 97, 98, 100, with pl. 77, nos. 1-5 and 11-16).

Herodotus' further report that the Persians borrowed their corslet from the Egyptians implies a (parallel?) Persian use of linen corslets.²¹ Leather armor cannot be excluded, either.²² Strictly speaking, the exact form(s) and texture(s) of Persian corslets —never depicted in Achaemenid monumental sculpture— and, perhaps, the appropriateness of different kinds of body armor to different units of the Persian army,²³ remain moot questions. To judge by the different suggestions made to date, the net pattern on the corslet of the Oxford warrior could depict (albeit in stylized manner) scale or laminated armor; and the single dots floating in each of its rhomboid sections could be the perforations for fixing such metallic platelets onto a backing.²⁴ Alternatively, the same net pattern could allude to padded or quilted linen²⁵ or decorated leather.²⁶ The occurrence of the lozenge motif elsewhere in vase painting in contexts that could convey a range of different materials, textures and methods of decoration could also imply that its presence on the Oxford warrior's corslet was merely a matter of a decorative choice. In this instance, a priority concern for decorative variation might be indicated in particular by the vase painter's doubtless intentional articulation with different patterns of the corresponding corslets of all six Greek and Persian combatants in the battle scene painted on the cup (Fig. 2).²⁷

The realism of the vase painting cannot be doubted in the case of the tall rectangular shield held by the same figure. This may be readily identified with the *gerra* carried by Xerxes' Persian soldiers in place of shields,²⁸ and must have entered the Greek pictorial repertory owing to Greek contact with Persian armies.²⁹ The particular shield shape (and size), also used by the Assyrians, is attested on Achaemenid reliefs, on which surviving color traces produce an analogous pattern of rectangles.³⁰ Etymology³¹ and material remains³² clarify the allusion of the pattern of interlocking rectangles depicted on

-
- 21 Hdt. 1.135. Egyptian manufacture of linen corslets: Hdt. 2.182 and 3.47. Alexander's corslet of "two-ply linen", taken as loot at Issus, could have originally belonged to a Persian (Plut. *Alex.* 32.5; cf. Anderson 1970, 23).
- 22 The red-painted corslet of a "Persian-clad" cavalryman on a sarcophagus from Çan is thought likely to have been made (at least in part?) of leather (Sevinç *et al.* 2001, 395 with figs. 3-4 on p. 389, and figs. 11-12 on p. 396).
- 23 See Joannès 1982, 16-17, for a Babylonian text of the Achaemenid period mentioning an "iron cuirass" as part of the panoply dispensed to a cavalryman; and this same scholar's contention (p. 18) that lack of reference elsewhere to the material of cuirasses dispensed to soldiers accompanying a cavalryman would indicate that those cuirasses were "undoubtedly not of metal".
- 24 For possible laminated armor (made of small square plates sewn side-by-side onto a backing), see Anderson 1970, 269 n. 54. Cf. the rectangular bronze platelets found at Pasargadae (Stronach 1978, fig. 96, nos. 6-7).
- 25 See, e.g., Anderson 1970, 23, and Miller 2006/07, 114, who also allows (p. 111) that the lozenge pattern could depict metal.
- 26 E.g. Schmidt 1957, 29, seal no. 30, pl. 9, PT4 655, with reference to the lozenge-decorated corslet of a warrior in trousers on one of the seal impressions of the Persepolis Treasury tablets.
- 27 See Miller 2006/07, 111, fig. 1.
- 28 Hdt. 7.61.
- 29 E.g., at Plataea (Hdt. 9. 61-62) and Mycaea (Hdt. 9.99 and 102). For tactical uses of this shield, see Barrett and Vickers, 1978, 21-22. For further instances of Persians bearing *gerra* on Attic vases, see Miller 2006/07, 111 with n. 6.
- 30 E.g., Schmidt 1953, pl. 151; cf. Tilia 1978, 66 (color traces), and line drawing on p. 67, fig. 12.
- 31 Γέππων <*gêrs- = "to branch off", whence the gestalt of "branching off, crossing each other, being tangled, interwoven" (Martin Schwartz, personal communication). Frisk (1960, 300) interprets it as "Schild aus Flechtwerk".
- 32 For examples of this shield type, excavated at Pazyryk, in the Altai, and datable to the fifth/fourth century B.C., see Rudenko 1970, 219-220, fig. 107, pl. 144 A-D.

its surface to its actual manufacture from interwoven leather straps and wooden rods. The sum of the offensive gear of the two Persian warriors is included in Herodotus' list of Persian weapons. Herodotus does not specify the combinations in which the various weapons were carried by individual soldiers, and information about the finer structural details of Persian weaponry is generally lacking in Greek texts. Discussion of these particular accessories hinges primarily on comparisons with evidence available from the Achaemenid domain.

In the case of the Oxford warrior (Fig. 2), the appositeness of the depiction of the *gerron* in combination with a spear emerges from the Persepolis reliefs, in which the spear is the only visible weapon carried by guards holding *gerra*.³³ Sword and archery equipment, as depicted on the Boston oenochoe, are a common combination of weapons in Achaemenid iconography, and are equally depicted without an accompanying shield in Achaemenid reliefs.³⁴ Nonetheless, the sword brandished by the warrior on the Greek vase possesses none of the characteristic features of the Persian short-sword (or dagger) variety, the only Persian sword type mentioned in Herodotus' list, and the only variety of this weapon depicted in Achaemenid representations.³⁵ Longer swords—in all appearances absent in Achaemenid iconography—are not entirely unattested in archaeological contexts associated with the Achaemenid army.³⁶ To judge by Greek iconographic parallels, however, the vase painter's model for the leaf-shaped blade of the Boston warrior (Fig. 1) was most likely the straight cut-and-thrust sword used by the Greeks.³⁷

The tip of the arrow, flying past the hoplite figure to the left, is not sufficiently articulated to allow comparison with the trilobe socketed arrowheads (probably of Scythian origin) favored by the archers of the Persian armies.³⁸ A confusion of Persian archery equipment is evident, on the other hand, with reference to the types of bow and arrow case carried by the Persian. Achaemenid iconography testifies for two different types of bows used in Persian armies, each combined with a different kind of arrow case (Fig. 3). Bows of the first type—also emblematic of representations of the Persian king as “archer”—are tall and segment-shaped, with uniform thickness and well developed ends.³⁹ This type of bow is shown with an elongated quiver carried high on the back over the left shoulder. Bows of the second type—not shown directly on Persepolis reliefs—are of the composite, doubly convex bow variety with set-back handle, a type primarily associated with the Scythians.⁴⁰ In Persepolis sculpture this bow type is

33 Above, n. 31. For Persian spear types, see Moorey 1980, 60-61.

34 E.g., Schmidt 1953, pls. 52, 57, 121.

35 E.g., Schmidt 1953, pl. 154. For the Iranian evidence in general, see Moorey 1985, 26-27. For classical references to (short) Persian swords, see Miller 1997, 46-48.

36 E.g., two partially preserved specimens from Deve Hüyük (Moorey 1980, 53-59, esp. no. 150 and fig. 9), and a specimen in iron from Persepolis, considered by Schmidt (1957, 97, and pl. 75, no. 1) an “alien (i.e., non-Persian) type of weapon”.

37 For this type of sword, see, e.g., Anderson 1970, 37-39. The same generic type of sword is held by both a Greek and a Persian warrior, e.g., on a cup of ca. 480 B.C., painted by the Triptolemos Painter (Edinburgh 1887.213: ARV² 364.46; Raeck 1981, P560; Bovon 1963, no. 4).

38 See Moorey 1980, 64-66.

39 Cf. Moorey 1985, 27. This type of bow is held by the Persian royal figure on the monumental reliefs at Bisotun (Luschey 1968, fig. 5) and Naqsh-e Rostam (Schmidt 1970, pl. 42A), and on royal coinage (Stronach 1989, 260, fig. 1, and pls. I and II, 1-3 and 5-6).

40 Cf. Moorey 1985, 27.

Fig. 4
 “Scythian” or
 Amazon. Attic
 red-figure plate by
 the painter Epikte-
 tos, ca. 520-510
 (?) B.C. London,
 British Museum
 1837,0609.59.

©The Trustees
 Of The British
 Museum.



implied by its equally distinctive, combined quiver-and-bow case, the *gorytus*, carried at waist level on the left side. Outside Iran, these two distinct archery sets are featured clearly in the armament of the Persian force in the battle scene painted on the east interior wall of the Tatarlı tomb.⁴¹ The archery set of the Boston warrior (Fig. 1) diverges from the Achaemenid prototypes. On the oenochoe (Fig. 1), the Persian long segment-shaped bow, which was used with the simple quiver, is featured instead with the composite bow-and-arrow case (*gorytus*) which belonged with the doubly convex bow.

Concluding remarks

This brief overview of the traits of the Persian warriors painted on the Boston oenochoe (Fig. 1) and the Oxford kylix (Fig. 2) leads to contrasting conclusions about the relative accuracy with which the painters of these two vases portray their Persian subjects. The imaging of the Oxford warrior reveals, as it is commonly acknowledged in earlier discussions, a close familiarity with Persian military gear and tactics. This is illustrated by this artist's care to depict the body armor worn by Persian soldiers, his faithful representation of a Persian shield type that was alien to Greek military equipment, and one of this shield's tactical uses: namely, in combination with a spear.

The difficulty we encountered in our attempt to clarify the individual elements of the uniform of the Boston archer (Fig. 1) might be attributed, at least in part, to the highly stylized drawing of this figure's body. The simultaneous liberal interpretation of the shapes and types of this archer's weapons would caution, nonetheless, against any sweeping assumptions that Attic vase painters would have customarily modelled their

⁴¹ Summerer 2008, 274-275, fig. 6, and comment on p. 283, dated ca. 470 B.C.

Persian figures on the basis of actual or recollected Persian prototypes. Clearly, one should make allowances for artistic license. At least in this instance, the confusing or incongruous features attested in the depiction of Persian identity might be seen to point, not entirely unexpectedly, to influences from a different Attic iconographic scheme.

Assuming that sixth century Attic depictions of trousered archers were ultimately indebted to “Scythian” (or generically Iranian/Central Asiatic) models, the shifting attention to Persian subjects by the early fifth century B.C. would have offered Attic vase painters an opportunity to add a more significant political and ideological dimension to their compositions, but also resulted in confusion of the Persians and “Scythians” independent identities. The archer depicted on a plate painted by Epiktetos (Fig. 4), dated approximately a generation earlier than the Oxford kylix (Fig. 2) and half a century earlier than the Boston vase (Fig. 1), has been identified as a Scythian or, perhaps less likely, an Amazon.⁴² This “Scythic” type displays the standard features of figures identified as Persians in later vase paintings, minus the beard and shoes. The stylization of his headdress recalls that of the headgear of the Oxford warrior. Despite differences in its decoration and the somewhat variant articulation of its top, the figure’s uniform evokes just as closely the rendering of the garment of the Boston archer. One may note, in particular, the flat design of both costumes, the distinct articulation of the part of the uniform around the hips, and the otherwise homogeneously decorated sleeved top and trousers. The “Scythic” figure also carries, like the Boston warrior, a bow and case that, in this instance, depict accurately the combination of the composite bow and the *gorytus*, commonly attested among Scythian and Persian types of armament but preeminently associated with Scythian tactics.

The close similarity between the mid-fifth-century Boston archer and his fifty-odd years earlier “Scythic” counterpart might be seen to illustrate the merging of “Scythian” and Persian traits in Attic vase painting already noted by modern scholars. On the oenochoe (Fig. 1), the compatible earlier “Scythic” iconographic type is adapted to the requirements of the later Persian theme by, primarily, two evident modifications. These are the addition of a sword which, despite its seemingly generic Greek modelling, could serve as a reference to one of the Persians’ widely known weapons of choice; and the replacement of the composite bow —the Scythian weapon *par excellence*— with the long segment-shaped bow emblematic of the Persians,⁴³ which the painter confusingly depicts with the *gorytus*, instead of the quiver, led astray by a standard iconographic model of earlier “Scythian” representations.

42 London, British Museum 1837,0609.59, ca. 520-510 (?) B.C.: ARV² 93.

43 For an unambiguous occurrence of the long bow (without a quiver) as a token of Persian identity in an Attic context, see the synoptic sketch of a trousered archer on Kerameikos Ostrakon 849 (471 B.C.), inscribed “Kallias, son of Kratios, a Mede (i.e., Persian)”, evidently accusing Kallias of pro-Persian leanings (Brenne 1992, 173-177, figs. 7, 8, pl. 39, 3-4).

Bibliography

- Anderson, J. K. 1970. *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Barrett, A. A., and M. Vickers 1978. "The Oxford Brygos cup reconsidered," *JHS* 98, 17-24.
- Bittner, S. 1985. *Tracht und Bewaffnung des persischen Heeres zur Zeit der Achaimeniden*. Munich.
- Bovon, A. 1963. "La représentation des guerriers Perses et la notion de barbare dans la 1re moitié du Ve siècle," *BCH* 87, 579-602.
- Brenne, S. 1992. "Portraits' on ostraca," *AM* 107, 161-185.
- Cohen, A. 1997. *The Alexander Mosaic. Stories of Victory and Defeat*. Cambridge.
- Curtis, J. and N. Tallis, eds. 2005. *Forgotten Empire. The World of Ancient Persia*. London.
- Frisk, H. 1960 *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I. Heidelberg.
- Gow, A. S. F. 1928. "Notes on the *Persae* of Aeschylus," *JHS* 48, 133-157.
- Greenewalt, C. H., Jr. 1971. "An exhibitionist from Sardis," in D. G. Mitten, J. G. Pedley and J. A. Scott (eds.), *Studies Presented to George M. A. Hanfmann*, 29-46. Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Monographs in Art and Archaeology II. Mainz.
- Harper, P. O., J. Aruz, and F. Tallon, (eds.) 1992. *The Royal City of Susa: Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre*. New York.
- Hölscher, T. 1973. *Griechische Historienbilder des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Beiträge zur Archäologie, 6. Würzburg.
- Ivantchik, A. I. 2006 "Scythian' archers on archaic Attic vases: problems of interpretation," *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 12.3-4, 197-271.
- Joannès, F. 1982. *Textes économiques de la Babylonie récente. Étude des textes de TBER - Cahier n° 6*. Paris.
- Luschey, H. 1968. "Studien zu dem Darius-Relief von Bisutun," *AMIran* 1, 63-94.
- Mayor, A., J. Colarusso, and D. Saunders 2014. "Making sense of nonsense inscriptions associated with Amazons and Scythians on Athenian vases," *Hesperia* 83, 447-493.
- de Mecquenem, R. 1947. "Contribution à l'étude du palais achéménide de Suse," in R. de Mecquenem, L. Le Breton, and M. Rutten, *Archéologie susienne, Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique en Iran* 30, Vol. 2, 1-117. Paris.
- Miller, M. C. 1991. "Foreigners at the Greek Symposium?" in W. J. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, 59-81. Ann Arbor, MI.

Miller, M. C. 1997. *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC: A Study in Cultural Receptivity*. Cambridge.

Miller, M. C. 2006/2007. "Persians in the Greek imagination," in *Proceedings of the 25th Anniversary Symposium of the Australian Archaeological Institute at Athens: Athens 10–12 October, 2005*, 109-123. *Mediterranean Archaeology* 19/20.

Miller, M. C. 2011. "Imaging Persians in the Age of Herodotus," in B. Truschneegg, R. Rollinger and R. Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich – Herodotus and the Persian Empire*, 123-157. Wiesbaden.

Moorey, P. R. S. 1980. *Cemeteries of the First Millennium B.C. at Deve Hüyük, near Carchemish, Salvaged By T.E. Lawrence and C. L. Woolley in 1913* (with a catalogue raisonné of the objects in Berlin, Cambridge, Liverpool, London, and Oxford). *BAR-IS* 87. Oxford.

Moorey, P. R. S. 1985. "The Iranian contribution to Achaemenid material culture," *Iran* 23, 21-37.

Osborne, R. 2018. *The Transformation of Athens: Painted Pottery and the Creation of Classical Greece*. Princeton, N.J.

Raeck, W. 1981. "Zum Barbarenbild in der Kunst Athens im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v." Chr. Habelts Dissertationsdrucke, Reihe klassische Archäologie 14. Bonn.

Roaf, M. 1974. "The subject peoples on the base of the statue of Darius," *Cahiers de la Délégation archéologique française en Iran* 4, 73-160.

Rudenko, S. I. 1970. *Frozen Tombs of Siberia: The Pazyryk Burials of Iron Age Horsemen*. Translated by M. W. Thompson. Berkeley, Ca.

Schauenburg, K. 1975. "EYPYMEΔQN EIMI," *AM* 90, 97-121.

Schmidt, E. F. 1953. *Persepolis*. Vol. I, *Structures, Reliefs, Inscriptions*. OIP 68. Chicago.

Schmidt, E. F. 1957. *Persepolis*. Vol. II, *Contents of the Treasury and Other Discoveries*, with contributions by S. P. Noe et al., F. R. Matson, L. J. Howell and L. Bellinger. OIP 69. Chicago.

Schmidt, E. F. 1970. *Persepolis*. Vol. III, *The Royal Tombs and Other Monuments*. OIP 70. Chicago.

Schoppa, H. 1933. *Die Darstellung der Perser in der griechischen Kunst bis zum Beginn des Hellenismus*. Coburg.

Sekunda, N. 1992. *The Persian Army 560-330 BC*. Illustrated by S. Chew. London.

Sevinç, N., R. Körpe, M. Tombul, C. B. Rose, D. Strahan, H. Kiesewetter, and J. Wallrodt 2001. "A new painted Graeco-Persian sarcophagus from Çan," *Studia Troica* 11, 383-420.

- Stronach, D. 1978. *Pasargadae. A Report on the Excavations Conducted by the British Institute of Persian Studies from 1961 to 1963*. Oxford.
- Stronach, D. 1989. "Early Achaemenid coinage: perspectives from the homeland." *IrAnt 24 (Mélanges P. Amiet II)*, 255-279.
- Stronach, D. 2011. "Court dress and riding dress at Persepolis: new approaches to old questions," in J. Álvarez-Mon and M. B. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia*, 475-487. Winona Lake, IN.
- Summerer, L. 2008. "Imaging a tomb chamber: the iconographic program of the Tatarlı wall paintings," in S. M. R. Darbandi and A. Zournatzi (eds.), *Ancient Greece and Ancient Iran. Cross-Cultural Encounters*, 265-299. Athens.
- Tilia, A. B. 1978. *Studies and Restorations at Persepolis and Other Sites of Fārs*. Vol. II. Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Reports and Memoirs XVIII. Rome.
- Tuplin, C. 2007. "Traacherous hearts and upright tiaras: the Achaemenid King's head-dress," in C. Tuplin (ed.), *Persian Responses: Political and Cultural Interaction with (in) the Achaemenid Empire*, 67-97. Swansea.
- Vos, M. F. 1963. *Scythian Archers in Archaic Attic Vase-Painting*. *Archaeologica Traiectina* 6. Groningen.
- Williams, D. 1986. "A cup by the Antiphon Painter and the battle of Marathon," in E. Böhr and W. Martini (eds.), *Studien zur Mythologie und Vasenmalerei. Festschrift für Konrad Schauenburg zum 65. Geburtstag am 16. April 1986*, 75-81. Mainz.