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Abstract

The bronze statue known as the *Antikythera Youth* was discovered in numerous fragments by sponge divers in 1900 with the remains of an ancient shipwreck near the small island of Antikythera, south of the Peloponnesus of Greece. The divers, together with the Greek government, recovered the statue and the rest of the ship’s cargo. The statue was then taken to the National Archaeological Museum, where it was assembled and restored. In the 1950s, the statue underwent a second restoration. This thesis examines the condition of the statue after the restorations and the technique by which it was made. It also examines the stylistic features of the statue in relation to other Greek sculptures as well as its iconography and possible original context.
Chapter 1. Introduction

The bronze statue of a young man (Figures 1–2), slightly larger than life size (1.94 m or 6 feet, 5 inches),\(^1\) was first discovered in 1900 by sponge divers with the remains of an ancient shipwreck near the small island of Antikythera (also known as Cerigotto; the ancient name is Aegilia) about halfway between the islands of Cythera and Crete to the south of the Pelopponesus of Greece. The bronze youth has been restored twice, first in the early 1900s by the French sculptor Alfred André and again in the 1950s by Christos Karouzos as it is now displayed in the National Museum in Athens. It is usually dated ca. 340 B.C., but the shipwreck is dated 70–60 B.C.\(^2\) The ship transported recently made and older works of art, including complete statues, fragments of bronze and marble statues, statuettes, and a hoard of coins, many of which were Pergamene cistophoric tetradrachms and Ephesian coins.\(^3\) Most scholarship has assumed that the cargo was lost in the shipwreck on its way to Rome in the first century B.C.\(^4\) No attributes were found with the bronze youth, such as items he might have held in his hands, which could help to identify him, but there are traces of those objects on his fingers. The statue’s original location and sculptor are equally unknown. Although the other contents of the ship do not reveal any clue as to the identity of the figure represented, they do give some idea of the statue’s location in the early first century B.C., just prior to its removal and transport by ship. This information may not reveal its original location, but it is possible that the statue remained in its original location as it was set up in the fourth century until its removal in the first century. If

---


\(^3\) Ibid.

it is possible to pinpoint where the statue stood just before it was removed and loaded onto a ship, perhaps this is also its original location. There is some evidence of where the ship began its journey, and where it was going. Although Svoronos thought it had been loaded at Argos and was on its way to Constantinople in the fourth century A.D., later studies have shown that the ship had probably departed from the coast of Asia Minor, perhaps Ephesos, and that it may have made some stops along the way on the islands of Kos and Rhodes before sailing past Crete and near Antikythera on its way back to Italy. It is likely that the ship was Roman because it was made of elm wood, which was used in Italy, instead of the pine used to build Greek ships. All of the cargo is from Asia Minor and none of it from mainland Greece, suggesting that the art works may also have been made in this region and that this might be the original location of the Antikythera Youth, although it is also possible that the statue was removed from its original location before Greece fell under Roman control. In this case, it could have originally stood anywhere in the Greek world.

First Restoration: 1901

The recovery of the bronze youth and the other contents of the shipwreck by sponge divers with the assistance of the Greek government took place between November 1900 and September 1901. The divers also had the assistance of A. Ikonomu, Professor of Archaeology at the University of Athens and the Minister of Education, Spyridon Staïs. All of the objects were then taken to the National Museum in Athens. The numerous fragments of the youth were assembled by the restorer of art works, Alfred André, who was called from Paris by the Greek government. Wherever pieces were missing from the original statue, André filled in the gaps.

---

6 Svoronos, 1–2.
Figure 1. Bronze Youth from Antikythera, National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph courtesy of Patricia Lawrence).\(^7\)

\(^7\) All photographs, unless otherwise stated, were taken by Professor Patricia Lawrence (Louisiana State University), and have been reproduced with her permission.
Figure 2. The *Antikythera Youth*, backview.
The cleaning and preparatory work was done by Greeks in Athens. Originally, the staff at the museum tried to obtain assistance from other experts in restoration of Greek sculpture. First they considered Kaloudis, who had restored the sculptures from the old temple on the Acropolis that burned in 480 B.C. These sculptures were also put together from many small fragments and were then displayed in the Acropolis Museum in Athens. But Kaloudis had expertise in restoring stone sculptures and not bronze statues. Wilhelm Sturm seemed a better choice. He was the restorer for the archaeological collections of the Imperial Palace in Vienna who was praised for his restoration of the *Apoxyomenos* from Ephesos, which he assembled from over 200 fragments. But since he could not be away from Vienna for the several months needed for the task, he requested that the statue be transported to Vienna. The Greeks refused, believing the statue would be safer if it remained in Athens. Then the decision was made to bring André from France. As seen in the illustrations, there were several fairly large fragments including much of the torso, arms, legs, and head (Figure 3). The many small fragments of the abdomen and pelvic area, several of which were missing, presented a challenge in the restoration process. The greatest difficulty was arriving at the exact original pose and stance of the figure. The results of this initial restoration were not entirely satisfactory, and many believed that the position was not quite correct and that the errors changed the overall attitude and rhythm of the statue.

The exact method André used in his reconstruction is described in an article by Edward Vicars in the *Pall Mall Magazine* in April 1903:

He first constructed a sort of skeleton, on which he built up the statue, piece by piece, beginning with the lower extremities. Whenever two fragments required to be fastened together, the edges were joined by very powerful cement and the pieces riveted onto a frame of copper bands, which supported and braced them from inside. When each of the fragments had been thus securely pieced together, each in its proper place, the missing

---

8 Arthur Cooley, “The Bronze Hermes from Antikythera,” *Records of the Past* 2 (1903), 210; Svoronos, 15
parts had to be restored. These M. André had already fashioned in his Paris workshop from casts supplied, and they now only required to be fitted into the gaps. When the figure had at length been completely rebuilt and restored to M. André’s satisfaction, he proceeded to cover the rivet heads with a kind of putty, and then treated the whole surface with a bronze colored preparation, so as to make it of uniform hue and consistency. The strong acids in which the fragments had been immersed for many weeks, for the purpose of removing the incrustations which so thickly coated them, had taken away all appearance of bronze from the metal, and left it of a dull black. It was accordingly found necessary to restore the original color by artificial means; and, though it may not be altogether pleasant, when gazing at this exquisite figure, to reflect that the fine bronze hue is a result of a thick layer of paste, which, moreover, conceals rivets and seams and joints, it must be remembered that without these adventitious aids it would not have been possible to restore the statue at all. After 40 days’ continuous work, M. André announced the completion of his labors.  

Figure 3. Fragments of the Antikythera Youth before restoration (from P. Kabbadías, figs. 3 and 4).
Although most scholars of the time praised the results of this restoration (Figure 5), some criticisms were made quite early. In 1905, von Mach commented that, “The statue is copiously restored and has been entirely covered in putty, so that it is far from offering an appearance at all comparable to the original.”\textsuperscript{11} He goes on to say that the statue was covered with a thick layer of paste to conceal the rivets, seams, and joints and has been artificially colored to look like a

\begin{flushright}
\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{The Antikythera Youth after initial assembly (from J. N. Svoronos, fig. 2).}
\end{figure}
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{11} Edmund von Mach, \textit{A Handbook of Greek and Roman Sculpture} (Boston: Stanhope Press, 1905), 319.
genuine bronze statue. As a result he concludes that the surface modeling of the statue is not ancient Greek but modern and “not by Scopas or Lysippos, as has been said, but by M. André, whose office is that of restorer of works of art in Paris.” Rather than praising André’s efforts as successful, given the means available to him, von Mach attacked André, claiming that “M. André’s skill, of course, made it possible for him to give the statue an appearance, by means of its surface finish, of any desired age, or of a mixture of the characteristics of several ages.”

Figure 5. The Antikythera Youth after 1901 restoration (from H. Bulle, pl. 61).
Therefore, von Mach concluded that, because of the restoration, it was impossible to make any observations at all about the style, period, or possible sculptor of this work. In spite of the problems, von Mach’s judgment of André’s efforts is overly critical. As it turns out, even with André’s enhancements, the general appearance of the statue as well as the style it revealed was in many ways similar to that resulting from the later restoration. It is true that the later work was more accurate, but André’s was valuable. Nevertheless, von Mach did point out some valid reasons for concern, and by the second half of the twentieth century most scholars agreed that a better restoration might be possible and should be attempted. Finally, in the 1950s, Christos Karouzos, Director of the National Archaeological Museum in Athens, began the task of restoration all over again.

**Second Restoration: 1950s**

When Karouzos began his work, his major criticisms regarding the first restoration were that André worked quickly and perhaps not as carefully as one would like without the assistance of an archaeologist, and that he took many liberties in assembling the fragments and in adding other substances to improve the appearance of the metal’s surface. Before the assembly of the fragments, the chemical cleaning of the statue to remove the corrosion left the surface of the bronze rough and uneven, especially on the surface of the face, which has many depressions where the original bronze has been lost. To smooth out the surface of the statue, André covered it with a layer of a resin called kolophon. Before beginning the restoration process, Karouzos and his staff removed this layer in 1947–48. The goal of Karouzos was to undertake a completely scientific approach to his restoration, and he took care to determine the accurate position of the statue as close as possible to its appearance in antiquity.

---

12 Ibid.
13 Karouzos, 59.
Once all of the additions were removed, the fragments were taken apart, the original core was removed (visible in Figures 9 and 13), and a modern armature was constructed as a support for the re-connected fragments.\textsuperscript{15} The most important changes compared to the earlier restoration were in the surface appearance, the focus of the eyes, the configuration of the abdomen, and the position of the right arm.\textsuperscript{16} The torso was completely reassembled in such a way that it was somewhat elongated and extended the height of the statue (Figure 6).\textsuperscript{17} It was discovered during the process of taking apart the statue and examining the fragments that in some places André had welded together fragments that did not belong to the same part of the body of the statue. André placed a fragment in the abdomen which actually belonged to the chest, and some fragments which he was correct in placing in the abdomen were welded in the wrong place.\textsuperscript{18} The position of the navel was also corrected.\textsuperscript{19} André had filed some of the fragments to make them fit together better. The area connecting the torso and the right thigh was also assembled incorrectly causing the stance to be altered from the original statue.\textsuperscript{20} Errors were found in the transition from the chest to the abdomen as well as fragments incorrectly joined together in the area of the shoulder blades.\textsuperscript{21} A supporting bronze rod on the base that André added to hold the feet in position was removed and the feet were repositioned. Another supporting rod connected the left foot to the leg at an oblique angle running all the way up the leg, and it was determined that this rod could be bent in another direction to give the foot a better step on the base and that the area of the loins needed to be turned slightly in order to create a

\textsuperscript{15} Karouzos, 61.
\textsuperscript{16} Houser, \textit{Sculpture of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries}, 186.
\textsuperscript{17} Karouzos, 60.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 62–63.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 78.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 62–63.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 64.
more accurate stance.\textsuperscript{22} The fragments of the left leg were then welded together in an inverse position.\textsuperscript{23} Then the placement of the right leg was determined, and the proper relation between the torso and the legs was established. The right leg was placed further back than André had placed it, and when this was done, the connection of the torso to the legs was improved (Figure 7).\textsuperscript{24} The right hand, which was incorrectly welded by André, was repositioned and attached in such a way that it extended more upward. There was a slight disagreement between the head and the neck because of the twisting of some fragments, which was also corrected.\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[22] Ibid., 65–69.
\item[23] Ibid., 71.
\item[24] Ibid., 74–75.
\item[25] Ibid., 75–76.
\end{footnotes}
Following the new restoration (Figure 8), Karouzos noted that his results revealed more closely the original appearance of the statue in antiquity without the addition of materials to enhance its appearance. To his satisfaction, the appearance of the torso was adjusted to reveal the beautiful rhythms and plastic richness intended by the original artist as well as the power of the head with incomparably beautiful locks of hair revealed by careful cleaning. In addition, Karouzos noted the ancient opaque quality of the bronze, the languor of the expression and gaze, and the sensuous lips. Upon completion of the restoration, several colleagues of Karouzos agreed that he had made vast improvements compared to the work by André.

Ioannis A. Pappas wrote an official report, which Karouzos included in his 1969 article, in which he states the opinion of a committee including himself, M. Tovros, and A. Sochos (all professors of Sculpture at art schools). They proclaimed the project successful in its correction

---

26 Ibid., 61.
27 Ibid., 76.
of the mistakes made by André, the placement of the fragments in their proper position, and the removal of André’s additions in order to reveal the original condition of the statue complete with the sense of motion and rhythm that the ancient sculptor intended. In 1972, Peter Bol also approved of Karouzos’ restoration. He agreed that the most important improvement was in the overall position of the entire figure. André had allowed the fragments to overlap one another,

Figure 8. The Antikythera Youth after restoration (reproduced by permission, from Ch. Karouzos, fig. 12).

---

28 Ibid., 78.
which altered the attitude of the whole figure. The walking stance was less pronounced in Andre’s restoration. Bol also mentions remaining problems which could not be solved, even in the re-assembly of the statue. There were still missing parts, particularly in the abdomen, where some of the remaining fragments make only slight contact with the upper body. The bronze is cracked in some places. The largest crack extends from the groin to the left thigh.\(^\text{29}\) The official report also states that because of damage to the fragments in the abdomen, they did not always fit together perfectly. The problem was most severe in the area between the navel and the pubic area.\(^\text{30}\) In spite of these problems, the new restoration is universally regarded as a success.

**The Sculptor’s Technique**

Originally the *Antikythera Youth* was cast in several separate pieces. The head, arms, and legs were all made separately and then welded to the torso. As Bol explains, the seams where they were connected are visible.\(^\text{31}\) One is above the buttocks. Both legs were attached to the body at the upper thigh. The front part of the left foot is also separately attached. Another seam was found at the height of the nipples and continues around to the back side. It is also apparent where the head was attached to the neck and the arms were attached to the body. The eyes were inset with an eyelash plate from the outside, which was the usual method used by sculptors of large bronzes. The white eyeball was probably made of a white stone, and the brown color of the iris was applied to it. The corner of the eye was inlaid with a red material, and the pupils were metal. As in many other Greek bronzes, the nipples were inlaid, probably in copper. The lips were separately cast and inserted into the empty cavity of the face (Figures 10–11). On the back

\(^{29}\) Bol, 19.  
\(^{30}\) Karouzos, 78.  
of the lips, a separate piece with the teeth was attached (Figure 12). Some tufts of hair also were separately cast and then attached to the head. The foot of the supporting leg (left foot) appears to have the tenon with which it was attached to the base intact (Figure 13). A dowel was also used to attach the right foot to the base. Although the exact technique of the casting has not been discussed, perhaps it was done by the indirect method. Carol Mattusch, an expert on bronze casting techniques, has not examined this statue closely and therefore has not discussed it as thoroughly as some of the other original bronzes which she has studied extensively. The bronze was an alloy of 84.74% copper and 14.29% tin. This is the highest percentage of tin in any Greek or Roman statue.

Figure 9. The head and interior of neck (reproduced by permission, from Ch. Karouzos, figure 9).

33 Houser, Sculpture of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries, 187.
Figure 10. Drawing showing lips inserted into the face (reproduced by permission, from Ch. Karouzos, figure 1).

Figure 11. Drawing of the separately cast lips attached to a support to be inserted into the face (reproduced by permission, from Ch. Karouzos, fig. 2).
Figure 12. Drawing of the teeth (reproduced by permission, from Ch. Karouzos, fig. 3).

Figure 13. Left, the right foot; right, the left foot with tenon (reproduced by permission, from Ch. Karouzos, figs. 10 and 11).
Chapter 2. The Question of “Regional Styles”

Before proceeding any further, it is essential to consider the earlier question of “regional styles,” that is, the attempts made by scholars to identify the specific characteristics of various regional styles and the relevance of this question to current discussions of Greek sculpture. The very idea of distinctly separate regional styles is more appropriate for earlier periods in Greek art than it is for the Classical period. These clear-cut separate categories were once part of the standard method of art historical scholarship, especially in the nineteenth century, but it is now recognized that these categories were often imposed upon art works too forcibly.

A natural starting point for such a discussion is Furtwängler’s *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture*, first published in the 1890s. His analysis of regional styles in the fifth century can be summarized as follows. On the Peloponnesus, the Argive style was the most prominent. In the years leading up to the classical period, it was associated with the school of Ageladas. The major features of his school were as follows. The body was supported by the left leg while the right leg was slightly bent and at ease with the foot flat on the ground. The right arm hung down while the left was in action. The head was turned to the left and inclined. At this point, the walking pose did not yet appear. The forms were flatter and more spare compared to Attic tendencies, e.g. in Athens. Statues at rest were generally in a position of relatively inactive repose. There was a contrast between the narrow hips and overbroad shoulders. The Athenian style emphasized softer flesh and more energetic poses that suggested the figure might move at

---

37 There is no evidence in surviving examples of Ageladas’ works. Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 6.14.11, 6.10.6, 6.8.6, 4.33.1–2, 7.24.4, and 10.10.6, provides only a list of his sculptures without stylistic descriptions. He is also mentioned by Pliny, *Natural Histories* 34.49, 55, and 57. Some literary sources claim that he was the teacher of Myron, Polyclitus, and Phidias. For example, Pliny states that he was the teacher of Myron and Polycleitos; see H. Stuart Jones, *Select Passages from Ancient Writers Illustrative of the History of Greek Sculpture* (Chicago: Argonaut, Inc., Publishers, 1966), 33–35 and Pollitt, *The Art of Ancient Greece: Sources and Documents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 32–33.
38 Furtwängler, 49–52.
39 Ibid., 191.
any moment, in contrast to the attitudes of rest that were ideal in the Peloponnesus. The head was not as often inclined in the Attic style but more often looked straight forward, and the free foot tended to be placed further forward and turned more outward to help give energy to the pose. In the Classical period, however, these separate regional characteristics did not remain isolated from each other. The art of Pheidias in Athens borrowed much from Argive traditions. Hegias has been thought to be the teacher of Pheidias. He was trained in the Argive school, and his style was said to adhere to older conventions. Lucian, for example, describes his style in the following passage:

According to Furtwängler, however, compared to Ageladas, Hegias made deliberate attempts to modify his own works in an effort to soften the hard edges of Argive tradition and to energize the pose and the attitude of figures. Hegias set in motion a trend that was continued by his pupil

---

40 Ibid., 184.
41 Hegias (Hegesias in Lucian, Quintillian, and Pliny); Pliny, *N.H.* 34.78, gives no more than a short list of works. Only Lucian, *Rhet. Praecept. 9*, above, gives any idea of his style, but as a rhetorician, he likely used Hegias as an example of archaic art in an argument making some point about the parallels between the progress made in sculpture and in rhetoric from an earlier, severe period to a more advanced period. See Pollitt, *The Ancient View of Greek Art: Criticism, History, and Terminology* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 360. The idea that Hegias was the teacher of Pheidias comes from an emendation of the text of Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 55.1. See Stuart Jones, 52 and Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, 35. But a scholiast on Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, 504 identifies Ageladas as the teacher of Pheidias. See Stuart Jones, 33.
42 Stuart Jones, 51–52. For further explanation of the terms sklêros and akribôs or akrîbês, see J. J. Pollitt, *Ancient View*, 124, 255, 360–361.
The assertion that Pheidias was a pupil of Hegias, however, contradicts other sources that claim he was a pupil of Ageladas. Furtwängler explains the development of Polykleitos’ style in a similar manner. Over time his style began to change when he had observed some of the features of Athenian art. His earlier works, such as the Doryphoros (Figure 24), adhere more closely to Argive conventions, although it incorporated many advances over earlier works. These advances include the development of a more naturalistic and organic form out of the accentuated tensions of the severe style of nude figures with rhythms free of the stiffness of earlier works. The figure now stood at ease, and the pose was more balanced. Polykleitos reversed the pose of earlier Argive statues in which the relaxed arm hanging down at the side was on the same side as the relaxed leg, while the weight-bearing leg and the bent arm holding some object was on the other side. In the Doryphoros, the balance between action and repose was modified so that all of the action was not on one side of the body while the other side was entirely at rest. Instead, the left arm is held up and bent (originally holding a spear) while the left leg is relaxed, but the right arm is relaxed while the right leg steps forward and bears the weight of the figure. This reversal created a more harmonious balance of the two sides of the body.

The Doryphoros also stood in the walking pose that is so often associated with Polykleitos. But the Doryphoros still had large plane surfaces, which, compared to nature, produced a conventional effect in the breast and abdomen that was common in Greek art until the time of Praxitiles and Scopas. Later works by Polykleitos such as the Diadoumenos, however, underwent some changes, which may reflect knowledge of Athenian works. Furtwängler notes the strongly plastic treatment of the hair, the softer rendering of certain facial features, and the richer modeling compared to the Doryphoros. The style of Polykleitos, however, could still be

---

43 Furtwängler, 53.
44 Ibid., 227–228.
distinguished from Athenian works. The abdomen with flat navel, the chest modeled in large flat planes, and the hollowed gluteus were typically Polykleitan features.\(^\text{46}\)

Furtwängler’s analysis for the fourth century is as follows. In this period, there was considerable mixing of stylistic features originally belonging to particular regions. He observes that the *Lansdowne Herakles* (Figure 33), a copy of an original of the fourth century which is attributed to Scopas, is a good example of the blending of Attic and Peloponnesian features. The type of head is Attic, with close similarities with the youth of the relief from Iliissos. The overall attitude of the statue is Attic in its freedom and boldness, with the left leg placed flat on the ground to one side and the head turned in the same direction as the free leg, while the right arm hangs down and the left forearm is extended, carrying some object.\(^\text{47}\) If we judge by the *Lansdowne Herakles* (assuming that its original was in fact by Scopas) and other related works, the young Scopas appropriated many formal elements of the Polykleitan school, but in the conception of his statues, expressed by the pose and attitude of the figure as well as in the forms of the head, Scopas worked in an Attic style. In Furtwängler’s view, Scopas, who was from the island of Paros, followed the Argive school in formal matters but remained Ionian in his spiritual conceptions. By this time, however, Ionian qualities had been absorbed into Attic art, and therefore Scopas can be called an Attic master.\(^\text{48}\) Praxiteles also found various sources of inspiration. For example, the Dresden satyr\(^\text{49}\) shows strong Peloponnesian influences compared to other works such as the *Hermes* from Olympia (Figure 29). In contrast to the *Hermes*, the front of the body has quiet, vertical, unbroken planes, as do many Polykleitan figures of the fifth century. Also the abdomen and chest are flat and the front of the body seems to pass into the

\(^{46}\) Ibid., 259.
\(^{47}\) Ibid., 296–298.
\(^{48}\) Ibid., 302.
sides almost at a right angle, while in the Hermes, the surface of the body has soft undulations so that there are no sharp separations between the sides and front. As for the satyr, the legs are in the arrested motion that Polykleitos gave his works, the head is turned and inclined to the side of the supporting leg, and the left forearm is stretched out horizontally as in the old Peloponnesian type. In other words, the figure has the bearing of the series of statues extending from Ageladas to Polykleitos. The structure of the skull of the satyr also differs from the Hermes, recalling the Polykleitan manner, in that it is more like the square Argive type. Besides the Polykleitan formal elements, however, the satyr is more like the Hermes in its attitude as a result of the facial features, the gaze of the eyes, and the downward tilt of the head. The round, soft, and tender grace of the small mouth and cheeks are thoroughly Attic and have much in common with the Hermes.\(^50\) Euphranor also worked in a cosmopolitan atmosphere in which there were many interconnections among regional schools. He seems to have been a native of Corinth and a pupil of the Peloponnesian school who settled for a time at Athens.\(^51\) His style must have been appreciated in Athens, since he was commissioned there to create the Apollo Patroos (Figure 35), and there was enthusiasm for Peloponnesian art in Athens at that time.\(^52\)

With Furtwängler’s views in mind, we may now turn to the next generation of scholars represented by Gisela Richter.\(^53\) In general, her discussion does not emphasize regional styles as much as the common qualities shared by all of Greece in a particular period. According to Richter’s analysis, the major Athenian sculptors beginning with Pheidias produced sculptures with a certain majesty (*amplitudo*), as in Pheidias’ *Athena Parthenos* or his statue of Zeus in

\(^50\) Furtwängler, 312–313.  
\(^51\) Ibid., 349.  
\(^52\) Ibid., 356.  
Olympia.\textsuperscript{54} This majesty, according to Quintillian, was lacking in Polykleitos’ work.\textsuperscript{55} Compared to those of Pheidias, Polykleitos’ works are said to have less dignity, as Quintillian observed in his evaluation of Polykleitos as an artist who excelled in finish and grace, but whose sculpture lacked the grandeur (\textit{pondus}) of Pheidian works.\textsuperscript{56} But while Pheidias was better known for idealism, Richter credits Polykleitos with perfecting the athletic conception. Though he did not rise to the same heights as Pheidias, he attained perfection in the humbler task he set for himself. In the fourth century, Kephisodotos and Praxiteles were the major Athenian artists who built upon the achievements of their predecessors. Kephisodotos made his statue of \textit{Eirene}\textsuperscript{57} more personal and gave her a tenderness in her intimate relationship with the child Ploutos not seen in earlier works, as did Praxiteles in his statue of \textit{Hermes with the infant Dionysus} (Figure 29). Although there is softness, intimacy, and tenderness compared to the more impersonal and general quality of fifth-century works, there is still some of the grandeur of the old conceptions in the sculptures of Praxiteles. The majesty is gone, and instead there is grace and serenity.\textsuperscript{58} Naturalism as opposed to idealism is another quality that was preferred in the fourth century. Lysippos consciously set out to follow nature as his master, and began a school with this new outlook. He also departed from the square-built figures of Polykleitos while making his figures more firmly knit compared to Praxitelean statues.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 219; Pliny, \textit{N.H.} 36.18, described the \textit{amplitudo} of the Athena Parthenos, which made it one of the most famous statues in the world. Pollitt, \textit{Ancient View}, 304, explains that the related adjective \textit{amplus} was used by rhetoricians writing about works of art in the sense of magnificent or elevated. The noun \textit{amplitudo} embraces the concepts of magnificence, elevation, grandeur, and dignity. The \textit{Athena Parthenos} and the Olympian Zeus do not survive. For coins representing the Athena and other adaptations of this statue, see Richter figs. 594–595, 597–604 and Boardman, \textit{Classical Period}, figs. 97–103. For representations of the Zeus, see Richter, figs. 606–613 and Boardman, figs. 181–182.

\textsuperscript{55} Richter, 239.

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 251; Pollitt, \textit{Ancient View}, 422–423, notes that, in the passage of Quintillian, \textit{pondus} seems to be an inexact translation of the Greek \textit{megethos} meaning magnitude, greatness, or grandeur; it is frequently used in the sense of weightiness or importance.

\textsuperscript{57} Boardman, \textit{Late Classical Period}, fig. 24 and Richter, figs. 659–660, 662–663.

\textsuperscript{58} Richter, 267.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 288–294.
In the next generation of scholarship, Giovanni Becatti’s version of these developments is as follows. In the Archaic period, the Peloponnesians produced austere art avoiding more graceful expressions and concentrating mostly on the nude male figure articulated with plasticity and clearly developed volumes. The great Argive school, for example, created statues of victorious athletes. But in Polykleitos, the spirit of the Peloponnesus combined with Athenian influences, while Pheidias was the most outstanding interpreter of the brilliant Attic tradition. The *Diadoumenos* (a young athlete binding his head with a fillet) of Polykleitos is characterized by a new softness and more delicate modeling, possibly because of the maturation of Polykleitos under Attic influences, but Pheidias represents the purest Attic tradition with none of the Peloponnesian qualities of Polykleitos. Becatti observes that Polykleitos borrowed from Pheidias, but Pheidias took nothing or very little from Polykleitos and the Peloponnesian tradition. For example, he believes that the *Diadoumenos* had as its model a Pheidian statue of an *Anadoumenos*, but he does not acknowledge the idea that Pheidias might have appropriated anything from Polykleitos. Becatti assumes that in the fourth century, the Polykleitan school developed mainly by becoming more relaxed, softened, and humanized with freer, more varied rhythms. Finally Lysippus, building on the achievements of the Polykleitan school, transformed the rhythms of Polykleitos by making the head smaller and the body slimmer, so that the figure appeared taller. The mathematical, rational canon of Polykleitos became transformed according to optical principles used for expressive purposes. A major difference between the artistic temperament of Lysippus and Praxiteles, for example, was that the figures of Lysippus were tense and elastic, with intersecting rhythms and disordered locks of hair, while
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61 Ibid., 166-168; For photographs of the *Diadoumenos*, see Boardman, *Classical Period*, fig. 186a and Richter, figs. 650–652.
62 Ibid., 197.
those of Praxiteles were more languid, sinuous, and in dreamy repose. Becatti suggests that this difference must have been evident in a comparison of each artist’s statue of Eros. Becatti’s discussion seems to suggest that Attic art needed only to develop further qualities it already had, as opposed to Peloponnesian art, which acquired these qualities later. In Becatti’s words, “there was a development of the Attic qualities of grace, chiaroscuro, rhythmic ease, and soft naturalism which culminated in the sculpture of Praxiteles.”

The next generation of scholarship is well represented by John Boardman. In his view, Polykleitos, although he worked in the period when Pheidias was overseeing the sculptural decoration of the Parthenon, represented the quite different tradition of southern Greece. His figures were somewhat stockier than those of the Parthenon and relatively larger-headed. By comparing the Parthenon style, which was one of the major styles in Attic art, Boardman observes that “the figures are slighter than the Polykleitan, less expressive and emotional than those at Olympia a generation earlier, but more deliberately seeking to express an ideal and generalized view of the human subject.” The school of Polykleitos also placed a greater emphasis on proportion and the view of the human body as an almost divine demonstration of mathematical principle as well as the architectonic view of forms, which the Greeks acquired early on through contact with Egypt. Boardman makes these distinctions for the mid-fifth century, but by the end of the century, he notes that an eclectic high classical style based on the
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63 Ibid., 217–219; The Eros of Praxiteles is lost, but Boardman, Late Classical Period, fig. 70 may give some idea of it. For the Eros of Lysippus, see Martin Robertson, A Shorter History of Greek Art (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), fig. 226 and Becatti, fig. 194.
64 Becatti, 199.
67 Boardman, Greek Sculpture, 94–95.
forms of the Parthenon period but borrowing certain elements from Polykleitos had developed in
the next generation.\textsuperscript{68}

Chapter 3. Scholarship on the *Antikythera Youth*

Scholarship: Early Twentieth Century

The earliest scholarly opinions on the style and dating of the Antikythera Youth fall into two categories. There were those who praised it as a masterpiece of the fourth century B.C. rivaling the celebrated *Hermes* of Praxitiles. P. Kabbadias is representative of this group.\(^69\) These scholars generally believed it must be a work of one of the finest sculptors of the period and attempted to attribute it to one of the famous names, such as Praxiteles, Scopas, or Lysippos or to the school associated with one of these artists. Svoronos thought it was close to Lysippos and probably by one of his followers.\(^70\) Waldstein thought it was a work of Praxiteles or his school; Th. Reinach thought it was by a sculptor under the influence of Polykleitos, such as Euphranor or Praxiteles, but Arvanitopoulos assigned it to Alkamenes and dated it in the fifth century,\(^71\) although this is impossible. Bieber thought it might be associated with Euphranor because it seemed to fit the description of his works by ancient writers such as Pliny. These sources state that he was a native of the Isthmos of Corinth and a pupil of the Polykleitan school. According to Pliny, Euphranor made a bronze sculpture of Paris, and because the Youth looks as if he could be a Paris holding an apple, it has been suggested that it is the Paris.\(^72\)

Other scholars, best represented by Ernest Gardner, thought that the *Antikythera Youth* belonged to the early Hellenistic period, generally ca. 300 B.C.\(^73\) They believed the Youth lacked the originality and harmonious conception of classical works, and they generally assigned
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71 A. D. Fraser, “The Antikythera Bronze Youth and a Herm Replica,” *AJA* 32 (1928), 299.
it to an imitator of the earlier great masters who borrowed various features from previous masterpieces and combined them to create an inferior work. This is sometimes referred to as “eclecticism” and considered to be a major distinguishing feature of the Hellenistic era.\(^{74}\) This attitude seems to be a result of the privileging of certain artists such as Praxiteles and using his works as a standard by which to judge all others. Those not meeting these criteria are immediately thought to belong to an inferior period in Greek art, that is, the Hellenistic period. These assumptions were ingrained in scholarship in the nineteenth century and continued into the next century. Another accusation leveled against the *Antikythera Youth* was that he lacked the simplicity of the best of classical works and that he had a theatrical quality that characterizes the Hellenistic period. This charge, however, ignores the fact that narrative content inspired by the theater, as well as the vigorous energy of figures acting out the drama of the scene, are not unique to the Hellenistic period and occur in some of the earliest works of Greek art. Stylistically this group usually describes the statue as having a Polykleitan or Lysippic body and a Praxitelean or Scopasian head.

**Scholarship: Mid-Twentieth Century**

By the middle of the twentieth century, there was general agreement on the date of ca. 340–330 B.C. for the *Antikythera Youth*, and very little consideration was given to any later date. The statue was generally thought to be associated with the Polykleitan school, with minor features derived from the works of other artists of the period such as Praxiteles,\(^{75}\) except for Becatti, who associated it with an Attic school.\(^{76}\) Most scholars thought the Youth had a heavy

---


torso and powerful, athletic build in the Polykleitan tradition. They did not believe that the sculptor was one of the great masters of the period but probably among the less significant followers of a master’s school, whose name is not known today.

**Late Twentieth Century to Present**

From the 1960s to the present, scholarly opinion has been split between those who still observe a dominant Polykleitan element in the *Antikythera Youth*, and those who have looked in new directions. Robertson thought that the *Antikythera Youth* was comparable in style to the Hermes on the drum from the Temple of Artemis at Ephesos and that both demonstrated the strength of the Polykleitan tradition well into the fourth century.\(^{77}\) Bol attributed him to a Peloponnesian master among the followers of Polykleitos. He thought the broad chest, the stance, and the head were based on Polykleitan models, and he compared the Youth to the *Diskobolos* of Naukydes (Figure 25) or the *Hermes Richelieu* (Figures 27–28).\(^{78}\) He also saw some similarities to the works of Lysippos, particularly the arrangement and distribution of the back of the *Apoxymomenos* or the *Lansdowne Sandal Binder*.\(^{79}\) Olga Palagia disagrees with the earlier attributions of the *Antikythera Youth* to Euphranor because of their dependence on the assumption that he was a follower of the Polykleitan school.\(^{80}\) Although Euphranor was from the Peloponnesus and was well aware of the accomplishments of Polykleitos, he did not necessarily adhere closely to any tradition or school. He spent most of his life in Athens, and he probably learned his skills and acquired his tastes there as well. According to Palagia, he became one the
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\(^{78}\) Bol, 22. For the Diskobolos, see also Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, *Fourth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press), 1997, pls. 56–57; For the *Hermes Richelieu*, see Ridgway, pl. 82; Todisco, 54, pl. 53, who dates it as late as the 360s if not by Naukydes, in which case, it would be earlier.

\(^{79}\) Bol, 22; The *Lansdowne Sandalbinder* is now in Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, no. 2798; see Ridgway, pl. 71 for an example of the type and Franklin P. Johnson, *Lysippos* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1927), pls. 30–31.

\(^{80}\) Olga Palagia, *Euphranor* (Leiden E. J. Brill, 1980), 34.
greatest members of the Attic school. Stewart places the statue in the Polykleitan tradition, and Ridgway describes its stance as Polykleitan but with a powerful back that can be compared to the *Apoxyomenos*. Chamoux tentatively places it in the circle of Scopas and notes the close relations of the statue with athletic creations of the fourth century. Houser believes that the *Youth* expresses the introspection and compassion typical of the Praxitelean school of Late Classical Sculpture. She relates the *Youth* to more recently discovered bronzes such as the Athena and Artemis A from Piraeus. She suggests that the Athena and Artemis can be compared to the *Apollo Patroos* of Euphranor and that similarities between the two goddesses and the *Antikythera Youth* connect the *Youth* to Euphranor.

81 Ibid., 6.
82 Andrew Stewart, *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 185; Ridgway, 340–42.
84 Caroline Houser, *Sculpture of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries*, 191, and *Greek Monumental Bronze Sculpture* (New York: The Vendome Press, 1983), 64; for the Athena, see Boardman, *Late Classical Period*, fig. 46; Ridgway, pls. 74a–c; Houser, *Greek Monumental Bronze Sculpture*, p. 59; Palagia, *Euphranor*, figs. 32–33 and “Reflections on the Piraeus Bronzes,” in *Greek Offerings: Essays on Greek art in honour of John Boardman* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1997), 177–195, figs. 13–14; for the Artemis, see Boardman, fig. 47; Houser, *Greek Monumental Bronze Sculpture*, p. 62; Todisco, pl. 213; Palagia, “Reflections,” fig. 20.
Chapter 4. Iconography

Beyond stylistic and technical questions, the questions remain: how should the figure represented in the *Antikythera Youth* be interpreted? Who is represented, how was it displayed and where, and what was its purpose? The answers to these questions are not obvious. The *Youth* does not seem to correspond to any known statue type, and there are no known copies of the statue. Numerous theories have been proposed, but every argument made has met with objections. Some of these suggestions, however, are more plausible than others.

One of the basic questions is whether he represents a mortal, hero, or a god. The following suggestions have been made: Paris presenting the apple to Aphrodite, an athlete holding a shell or garland in his right hand, an athlete holding an apple as a victory reward, a man playing a ballgame, a grave statue displaying a ball or a bird, to which a lost dog belonged, an ephebe holding a ball, a sacrifant, a young athlete receiving a garland from a Nike, an athlete to whom a ball had been thrown, and even an *apoxyomenos*. Gardner suggests he is an athlete playing with a bandalore. There is one basic problem with any of the various athletes suggested. An athlete could be idealized as an admirable Greek citizen and as a person in perfect physical condition and fit for military service but also for a well-balanced life that comes from a good education, both mental and physical. The somewhat over life-size scale, however, was more appropriate for gods and heroes than mortals, and accordingly, the more credible theories make such an argument. Other statues of similar size bear this out. To name a few examples, the bronze god from Cape Artemisium measures 2.09 meters, slightly larger than the *Antikythera Youth* of 1.94 meters, while the bronze charioteer from Delphi is slightly smaller.
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85 Svoronos, 20–22.
86 Ernest A. Gardner, “Notes on Greek Sculpture,” *JHS* 43 (1923), 142–143. A bandalore is an object very similar to a yo-yo.
87 J. Boardman, *The Oxford History of Classical Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 97. For a photograph, see Boardman, *Classical Period*, fig. 35; Richter, fig. 102.
than the Youth at 1.80 meters\textsuperscript{88} and in scale with his chariot and horses, but he was not meant to represent a superior being of any kind, but only a mortal human being, although certainly admirable for his victory in a chariot race. The Youth comes closer to the scale of the Riace warriors, measuring slightly less than 2 meters.\textsuperscript{89} If it is possible to imagine that these statues represent illustrious heroes, either eponymous heroes of Athens or some of the legendary heroes of the Iliad, perhaps, the Antikythera Youth is in some way comparable. These statues would be part of a tradition of depicting heroes in a somewhat larger than life-size scale that includes Polykleitos’ Doryphoros, thought to be a great hero, perhaps Achilles because of its stature.\textsuperscript{90} Another statue of the fourth century, the Lansdowne Herakles (Figure 33), is almost exactly the size of the Antikythera Youth at 1.93 meters,\textsuperscript{91} and represents the hero and demi-god Herakles. Therefore, it is most logical to look to either gods or heroes in order to discover the possible identity of the statue from Antikythera.

In the years immediately following its discovery, many scholars thought the Antikythera Youth represented Hermes. According to K. T. Frost, the statue is Hermes Rhetor, god of Oratory. He raises his right hand in the orator’s gesture when addressing a crowd while the left hand held the caduceus, Hermes’ usual attribute.\textsuperscript{92} This gesture, however, is not the gesture commonly associated with orators, which would be a more open-handed gesture, while the fingers of the Youth are clearly grasping some object. Also, the pieces of bronze remaining on the fingers indicate that he was holding something.

\textsuperscript{88} Boardman, Oxford History, 97; for photographs, see also Boardman, Classical Period, fig. 34; Richter, fig. 162; Houser, Greek Monumental Sculpture, 22–27, 30–31.
\textsuperscript{89} Boardman, Oxford History, 99; for photographs, see also Boardman, Classical Period, fig. 38; Houser, Greek Monumental Bronze Sculpture, pp. 118, 120–127.
\textsuperscript{92} K. T. Frost, “The Statues From Cerigotto,” JHS 23 (1903), 217–236.
Another interpretation is, as Svoronos argues, that the statue represents Perseus holding up the severed head of Medusa. Svoronos doubts all other interpretations on the basis that there are no similar representations in monuments, that the statue stands too calmly to be catching or throwing a ball, and that the size of the spherical object is too big to be an apple and too small to be a ball. Svoronos was able to identify a statue type of a Perseus holding a Medusa’s head in a pose very similar to that of the *Antikythera Youth* on coins from Argos, intaglio gems, and vase paintings. He came to the conclusion that the statue originally stood in Argos, a major artistic center in the ancient world. He argued that the statue must have held something relatively heavy in his right hand because of the treatment of the muscles and tendon of the right arm. Since the object held in the right hand was nearly spherical, Svoronos reconstructed the statue as a Perseus grasping in the right upraised hand, the Medusa’s hair, which is drawn up to form a bun on the top of her head, and holding a sword or *harpê* (sickle) in the left hand (Figure 14).  

Charles Picard also made a similar argument, but he ventured to attribute this Perseus to a specific sculptor, Antiphanes of Argos, and to suggest that it stood in the middle of a group in the Hemicycle of the Argive Kings along the Sacred Way in Delphi. The pedestals for this monument, which was erected shortly after 369 B.C., remain, but it is impossible to determine which statues made up the group. Furthermore, in order for a Perseus to be grasping the Medusa’s head by the hair, he would be holding either free strands of loose hair with the fingers closed, as Chamoux points out, or as Svoronos suggests, holding the more spherical shape of the hair arranged in a bun on the top of the head. This hairstyle, however, was not typical for Medusa; more commonly her hair would not have been so neatly arranged but free flowing and disheveled. Most of the examples provided by Svoronos on coins, intaglio gems (Figure 15), and
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93 Svoronos, 20–24.
vase paintings also depict the Medusa with loose hair in disarray or as snakes and do not support his reconstruction. Perseus also usually holds the Medusa’s head with the arm closer to the body.

Figure 14. Reconstruction of the *Antikythera Youth* as Perseus (from J. N. Svoronos, figs. 13–14).

Figure 15. Intaglio gems depicting Perseus (from J. N. Svoronos, figs. 4 and 6).
Another common interpretation is that the statue represents Paris, displaying the apple of discord or preparing to throw it. This interpretation depends heavily on the following passage from Pliny’s *Natural Histories*, 34.77:

Euphranoris Alexander Paris est in quo laudatur quod omnia simul intelliguntur, iudex dearum, amator Helenae et tamen Achillis interfector.

By Euphranor is a statue of Alexander (Paris). This work is specially admired, because the eye can detect in it at once the judge of the goddesses, the lover of Helen, and at the same time, the slayer of Achilles.95

Cooley argued that the *Youth* is holding out the apple of discord and that this accords with the tension in the outstretched arm, the light grasp of the fingers, and the momentary poise of the body. He also claimed that the gentle expectancy of the expression and the beauty of the features seem fitting for Paris as judge of the goddesses, while his muscular development is well suited for the killer of Achilles.96 It is unclear, however, what the statue would have held in the left arm hanging down at his side. He definitely held some object because there are traces of it on his fingers. As Bieber suggests, he may have held a bow, but this seems more fitting if we are dealing with all three aspects of Paris at the same time as Euphranor’s statue was said to have represented him. But if this is the Paris of Euphranor, perhaps all three aspects of Paris’ character were not represented as explicitly as Pliny describes. To make a statue with attributes for all three would seem an awkward and inharmonious composition. Also, in this case, the question arises whether this Paris with the apple of discord in hand was part of a sculptural group with statues of the three goddesses, Hera, Athena, and Aphrodite, whom he was judging. Otherwise the statue of Paris would have seemed incomplete with no one to witness or receive his action. There is also the question of whether he would have been separated from the context that would have made him all the more compelling before he was shipped to Rome. Surely if
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95 Stuart Jones, 183–184.
96 Cooley, 213.
bronze goddesses or other companion statues were included in the shipment, some trace would survive. A small attribute such as an apple, sword, staff, club, or other implement could have completely corroded in the sea so that no trace remains, but the loss of an entire statue is less likely.

If the Antikythera Youth was a Paris, however, it would be exceptional in the history of Greek art in the way that he is represented. One type of Paris in Copenhagen is an adolescent with a more delicate and less muscular build and a Praxitilean s-curve (Figure 16). This type also has longer hair and he wears a cap. Another Paris from Lansdowne House has a similar build and pose.97 There are some representations of him with a more mature build, but he is not often entirely nude. Sometimes he reveals his body by wearing only a cloak fastened around his

![Figure 16. Paris in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen (from A. Furtwängler, p. 352, fig. LII).](image)

97 Furtwängler, fig. 154, p. 358. For other statues of this type, see also Todisco, pls. 191, 193.
shoulders, but more often he is entirely clothed and completely covered. He usually wears a hat to shield him from the sun as well, and he frequently carries a staff or a shepherd’s crook. Furthermore, in no other work of art does he appear in the pose of the *Antikythera Youth*, and he very seldom holds an apple. Sometimes he appears standing before the three goddesses, but more often he is seated on a rock, holding a lyre and a staff or club, sometimes accompanied by a dog. In vase paintings he often appears with the goddesses and Hermes.

Another theory is that the statue represents a youthful, beardless Herakles. This identification was based in part on comparisons of the *Youth* to the Herakles from Lansdowne House in London (Figure 33), often attributed to Scopas. There are certainly some stylistic similarities between these statues. Another argument in favor of the *Youth* as Herakles was made by François Chamoux. Contrary to Svoronos, he argues that the muscles in the shoulder and the right leg, which bears no weight but rests lightly on the ground, indicate that he could not have held anything heavy. Perhaps he means to say that it would be difficult for the body to maintain balance standing with the weight on only one leg and presenting a heavy object. Because the fingers are open, they could have held an apple, and Chamoux argues that the statue represented Herakles, standing near a tree in the Garden of the Hesperides and picking one of the golden apples. The figure of Herakles in other works is often depicted in a posture similar to the *Antikythera Youth*, as a nude hero standing with the weight of the body on the left leg and raising his right hand to the height of his head. In some representations from the Roman imperial period (Figures 17–18), which seem to be inspired by an older tradition, Herakles is shown picking the apple with his raised right hand while holding a club upright in his left hand, with one end resting on his shoulder or upper arm and with the lion skin draped over the arm. This popular
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98 A. D. Fraser, “The Antikythera Youth and a Herm Replica,” *AJA* 32 (1928), 298–308.
subject continued to be depicted from the Classical period in Greece through the imperial period in Rome. The scene is also described in literature. For example, Quintus of Smynra (Posthomerica 6.256–259) in the third or fourth century A.D. attempted to imitate the description of the shield of Achilles in the Iliad and included a description of the shield of the hero Eurypylus. It depicted the scene of Herakles in the Garden of the Hesperides in a composition similar to that of real works of art:

Near to those were depicted the gleaming golden apples of the Hesperides on their sacred tree, round which the frightful serpent was lying dead, while on every side those maidens were cowering in dread of mighty Zeus’s bold son.

This passage was probably inspired by actual works of art that were well known in antiquity. Although the Albano relief (Figure 18) actually shows Herakles, bearded unlike the Antikythera Youth, Chamoux notes that there are other works of art (statues and statuettes) that did represent Herakles as a youthful, beardless figure. Literary sources also describe this type of Herakles. Pliny, for example, attributes to Pythagoras of Rhegion a statue of Herakles with the golden apples. Herakles appeared with a beardless chin carrying back the golden apples.

Thus Chamoux believes the Antikythera Youth held a lion skin in his left hand and a golden apple in the right hand, but it is also possible, based on the medallion and relief which Chamoux illustrates, that the statue held a club in the left hand with the lion skin draped over his

100 Chamoux 165–66.
102 Chamoux, 167.
103 Ibid., 166–168.
left arm and shoulder. It does not appear that the *Youth* could have carried the club upright and
resting against the left shoulder as in the medallion or as the *Lansdowne Herakles*, but he could
have held it downward by the narrower end. Chamoux argues that it would not be surprising to
see a beardless Herakles in the period of the Antikythera statue.\(^\text{104}\) The type appeared fairly
often, even in the fifth century B.C. The subject of Herakles in the garden of the Hesperides (see
Figure 19 below) and the other labors of Herakles were often depicted on Attic pottery of the
fourth century.\(^\text{105}\) Chamoux believes that this statue of Herakles was part of a group of statues
illustrating the myth of the Hesperides. This subject had already been depicted in a sculptural
group by the sculptor Theocles in the Archaic period. According to Chamoux, the group of
statues in which the *Antikythera Youth* stood was based on the statue groups of the great
sanctuaries, such as the votive offering of Lysander or the Hemicyle of the Argive Kings, both at
Delphi, though only the bases for the statues remain. Chamoux also suggests that a bronze tree
was included in the statue group. Trees had been included in such sculptural groups before;
palm trees were included with works at Delos and Delphi, and a Hellenistic group of statuettes
representing a satyr kneeling at the foot of a tree suggests that such groupings also existed in
large-scale sculpture.\(^\text{106}\) It is certainly intriguing to imagine the various opportunities to create
visual interest in a sculptural group including the *Antikythera Youth* as a Herakles arranged in
connection with a tree and possibly other figures such as the Hesperides. Just as the different
parts of the human body (e.g., lips, nipples, teeth) were set off against the bronze by the use of

\(^{104}\) Besides the *Lansdowne Herakles*, several other beardless statues of Herakles are discussed in Charles Picard, vol.
3, part 1, figs. 308–312; see also Boardman, *Late Classical Period*, figs. 74–75.2 and Howard, figs. 77–88. There
are also numerous representations of the youthful, beardless Herakles in red figure vase painting. See Howard, figs.
91, 93.

\(^{105}\) Chamoux, 168–169, fig. 7; see also Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases of the Classical Period* (London:
Thames and Hudson, 1989) for photographs of a Hydria by the Meidias Painter with Herakles and the Hesperides
(fig. 287), a Pelike of the Pasithea Painter with the same subject, and cups by Aristophanes with Herakles and
Nessus (figs. 290–291).

\(^{106}\) Ibid., 169–170.
copper or other metals, presumably the apples would have been made to appear gold against the contrasting color of the tree. This would have been a striking group of sculptures, probably well known in antiquity and worthy of the talents of a great sculptor of the fourth century. It might have been an important and expensive commission given to one of the finest sculptors of the period.

Figure 17. Medallion of Antoninus Pius, 140–143 A.D. (from Henry Cohen, No. 1158, 389).

Figure 18. Relief from Albano in the Capitoline Museum, Rome, first century A.D. (reproduced by permission of the publisher, from F. Chamoux, fig. 2).
Among all of the possible interpretations, the suggestion that the *Youth* is a young Herakles seems most likely and presents the fewest problems. There is greater agreement between the pose of the *Youth* and other representations of Herakles in Greek art than any of the other heroes or gods that have been proposed. Although Herakles is frequently depicted as an older, bearded figure at or toward the end of his twelve labors (as in the weary Herakles of Lysippos), and it has been observed that the task of obtaining the golden apples was his final labor, he does often appear as a younger, beardless figure, particularly in the period in question, the fourth century. There are several examples of a young Herakles (Figure 19), sometimes in the garden of the Hesperides and at other times in other scenes, on vase paintings dating to the middle of the century. Herakles also appears on a relief in the Villa Albani in Rome copied from a relief on a choragic monument or the parapet of the Altar of the Twelve Gods in Athens made
around 420 B.C.\textsuperscript{107} This relief depicts a young Herakles seated near a tree with two Hesperides. He is a young man of modest build. It is quite possible that the artist of the \textit{Antikythera Youth} could have seen this relief or another representation like it. Most artists traveled extensively, and this type of monument could have served as a model for the sculptor. The pose of the \textit{Antikythera Youth} is comparable to the pose of the Herakles on the medallion for Antoninus Pius cited by Chamoux, and it is easy to imagine that the \textit{Youth} is reaching up to pick an apple from a tree. The myth of Herakles and his twelve labors appealed to a wide audience and would have been suitable for a bronze statue or statuary group in many contexts. The fact that no traces of a tree or other figures that belonged to such a group were found at the site of the shipwreck might be because the Roman who would have received the shipment was only interested in the figure of Herakles taken out of his original context, and the tree and other figures were left at the original site. Whatever the original context, the \textit{Antikythera Youth} must have been separated from any other statues that accompanied it if it was part of a group because there was no trace of any statues or other items that accompanied it in the contents of the shipwreck.

\textsuperscript{107} For a photograph of this relief, see Boardman, \textit{Classical Period}, fig. 239.4.
The Antikythera Youth: Stylistic Analysis

The Antikythera Youth is a bronze statue by an accomplished artist. The left leg bears the weight of the figure while the right leg is drawn back and to the side. While his left foot is flat on the base, the right foot makes contact with the base with only the first two toes. The legs and arms are moderately developed with good muscular tone, but are not remarkably muscular. The torso is relatively sturdy and somewhat short, with a fair amount of muscular development. The surface is subtly modeled with gently defined planes without any sharp transitions from muscle to muscle in the abdomen and from the abdomen to the pectorals. The shoulders are fairly wide. In short, he has a well-developed, masculine build that identifies him as a young, but fully mature man rather than an adolescent male as the frequently used term “youth” suggests. From the side view and back view, it is apparent that he is standing with his body fairly straight, with little forward tilt of the pelvis, although he does lean slightly forward in the direction of his outstretched hand.

His back (Figures 2 and 20) is treated simply and summarily, with only subtle indications of the shoulder-blades. There is also much less curvature of the spine compared to other statues. The gluteus muscles are well defined but not as well-pronounced as in other statues (for example, compare Riace A). The lack of focus of the sculptor on the back side and on the side view could indicate that the statue was meant to be viewed primarily in frontal view. If he was part of a sculptural group, as discussed previously, his back side may have been visible, but it was not the best angle for viewing him. The head widens towards the top, creating a narrower lower face and much wider forehead (Figure 21). He has relatively small features—mouth, nose, and ears. His eyes are set wider apart compared with the Apoxyomenos of Lysippos or the Agias.
They are somewhat deep set but not at all like the figures at Tegea. Not nearly so much of the ball of the eye, which tends to roll upward in these figures, shows in the *Youth*. The *Youth*’s eyes are gazing intently on some action he is performing or object he is holding. His head tilts slightly to the right to better focus on the action of the right hand or the object it holds. The treatment of the hair is quite remarkable (Figures 21–22). It comes far forward to create a low forehead. It is a mass of distinctly separate curly locks rising up away from the forehead. There is no sharp parting, but there is a divide in the middle of the top of the head which causes the

---

108 For example, the heads from the west pediment of the Temple of Athena Alea at Tegea sometimes called “Telephos” and “Achilles.” See Boardman, *Late Classical Period*, figs. 9.1–9.2.

109 For better photographs of the head and hair, see Boardman, *Late Classical Period*, frontispiece, and Houser, *Greek Monumental Sculpture*, 94.
locks to go in one direction or the other from that point on each side of the head, extending down to the ears. From the back of the head, the locks extend forward toward the front and the hairs lie flatter against the head. The curls are not unruly, however, but are neatly arranged. The artist seems to have been concerned with design and with creating an aesthetically pleasing pattern in the arrangement of the hair. This is also seen in other works of the period, but not those of Lysippos. Note the unruly hair of the *Apoxymenon* of Lysippos or of those from Ephesos and Zagreb discussed below. Another nearly contemporary work from Eleusis (today in Athens National Museum, no. 181) commonly known as “Eubouleus,” but now thought to represent Triptolemos (Figure 23)\(^ {110} \) shows the same degree of attention to the treatment of the hair. The hair has a soft, springy quality, and it has been carefully, even artfully arranged not only to produce a particular hairstyle but for the sake of creating a design for its own sake. Layer upon layer of separate corkscrew locks have been arranged all over the head. This effect of suggesting the multiple layers that make up a head of hair can also be observed in the *Antikythera Youth* although his hair consists of layers of shorter curls rather than corkscrews.

As many have observed, there is a Polykleitan element in the *Antikythera Youth* (Figure 24). He stands in a walking pose, and he has a substantial torso. He also has a chiastic distribution of action and repose in which one side of the body has an active arm with the leg at rest, balanced by the other side with an arm at rest and the leg supporting the weight. These features, however, were so common that they can be found in the works of every artist of the period with the exception of Praxiteles, who made softer and more delicately built statues such as the *Hermes with the infant Dionysus*.

---

\(^{110}\) Karouzou, 168–169, pl. 59, dates it ca. 300 B.C.; Boardman, *Late Classical Period*, 75, fig. 73, considers it a copy of an original dating 350–340.
Figure 21. The *Antikythera Youth*, detail of the head.

Figure 22. The *Antikythera Youth*, details of the head and hair.
Figure 23. “Eubouleus” or Triptolemus from Eleusis, Athens National Museum, no.181.

Figure 24. Left, Antikythera Youth; right, the Doryphoros of Polykleitos.
The Polykleitan quality, however, is not so dominant in the Antikythera Youth as to justify the assumption that the sculptor was a pupil of the Polykleitan school. Although many have thought that the statue is basically Polykleitan, it really only has a few Polykleitan qualities, and it is not essentially Polykleitan. The rhythms in the two statues are quite different. The Doryphoros is in a calmer repose than the Antikythera statue. The Youth is more active and less relaxed, since he reaches energetically forward with his right arm and hand, and his whole body leans forward slightly. There is a slight curve to the torso of the Doryphoros in the direction of the right hip, which juts out further to the side. The torso of the Youth is more rigidly straight. And the head of the Antikythera statue tilts toward the arm performing the action, while the head of the Doryphoros tilts in the direction opposite the active arm.

Figure 25. Diskobolos of Naukydes, Louvre, Paris
Figure 26. Hermes in Basel, Antikenmuseum BS 221.

Figure 27. The Hermes Richelieu, Louvre, Paris.
Although the *Antikythera Youth* has a few features in common with the later Polykleitan school, it is not closely related to works associated with this group. The *Diskobolos* of Naukydes (Figure 25) is a late fifth-century work of the Polykleitan school. This statue presents a further elaboration on the chiastic distribution of the works of Polykleitos. The *Antikythera Youth* does so as well, but he stands in a more serene and calm pose. A Hermes in Basel (Figure 26) dating to the end of the fifth century has a torso tilting further to one side, which creates an overall more easy and relaxed pose and less tension of the body in contrast to the straight torso of the *Antikythera Youth*. The *Hermes Richelieu* (Figures 27–28), which may be dated ca. 360–350 if not earlier, is in the tradition of Polykleitos. It has been compared with the *Antikythera Youth* by

![Figure 28. The Hermes Richelieu, side view.](image)
those who assign the *Youth* to the Polykleitan school (see page 31). The Hermes, however, exhibits important differences. Like the *Doryphoros*, the torso is much less stiff and rigid than that of the *Youth*, displaying a far more fluid elasticity. The left hip has more of an outward thrust with a corresponding counterbalance of the slightly lower right shoulder. From the side and back views, it also has much more curvature of the spine, and the back is given more emphasis. The shoulder blades and the muscles of the lower back are also more prominent.

![Figure 29. *Hermes with the infant Dionysus* by Praxiteles, Olympia Museum.](image)
There is also a relationship between the *Antikythera Youth* and other works and artists of the fourth century. The *Youth* is not closely related to the works of Praxiteles, but the active pose, the gentleness of the face, and the arrangement of the hair in short curls bear some resemblance to the Hermes holding the infant Dionysus of Praxiteles (Figure 29). The hair of the *Youth*, however, is even more deliberately arranged in a specific pattern. The *Youth* also differs in his broader face, heavier torso, and more muscular body. The *Youth* stretches one arm
outward, and his body leans forward (Figure 30). Such features also appear in works of Lysippos such as the *Apoxyomenos* (Figure 31), but the latter has both arms in front of it and there is more of a forward tilt to the pelvis. Overall the body language of the *Youth* is quite different. The proportions used by Lysippos are more slender, and the head is smaller in proportion to the rest of the body. The shape of the head and the facial features also do not resemble those of the *Antikythera Youth*. Furthermore, the *Youth* differs from Lysippic works in that he has a relatively flatter back without the curvature seen in Lysippic statues. Another statue associated with Lysippos is the *Agias* (Figure 32), but it does not quite have the proportions of the *Apoxyomenos*. Although it is not closely related to the *Youth*, the *Agias* also has a substantial torso and less slender build than works securely attributed to Lysippos. Both also lack the

![Figure 31. Copy of the *Apoxyomenos* of Lysippos, Vatican Museums, Rome.](image-url)
smaller head in relation to the body. The torso of the Agias is longer and his legs are slightly shorter and more muscular compared to the Apoxyomenos. Therefore its relationship to the Youth appears to be closer than that of the Apoxyomenos. The Youth is not closely related to the

Figure 32. Agias from the Daochos dedication at Delphi, Delphi Museum (from A. Furtwängler, p. 402, fig. LXX).

Style of Scopas either, although some have compared it to the Lansdowne Herakles (Figure 33) or the Meleager (Figure 34), works generally considered Scopasian in style if not by Scopas himself.111 These statues do have some things in common in the treatment of the head and facial

111 For thorough discussion of works attributed to Scopas, see Andrew Stewart, Skopas of Paros (Park Ridge, NJ: Noyes Press, 1977), and Greek Sculpture, 182–185.
Figure 33. Plaster cast in Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum, of the Lansdowne Herakles, Getty Museum, Malibu.
features. The face of the Lansdowne Herakles does, in a general way, resemble the face of the Youth, and the curly locks of hair are similar. The Herakles also has a heavy torso. One might observe similarities with the broad face with deep-set eyes of the Herakles from Tegea, but the Antikythera Youth’s face is softer and less angular, and his eyes are not as deeply set, nor is his brow ridge so prominent. In any case, some of these features are so general to the period that they show no close relationship between any of these artists’ works and the Antikythera statue, but they do suggest that many different artists who were stylistically distinct from one another drew on common sources of inspiration.

Concerning the possible attribution of the Antikythera Youth to Euphranor, it is necessary to look beyond the passage in Pliny in which he says that Euphranor made a statue of Paris and the fact that the Youth could have held an apple in his right hand. It is also essential to look at
the actual evidence available in works of art that give some indication of Euphranor’s body of works. He was both a painter and a sculptor. None of his original paintings survive and only one surviving statue has been certainly identified as one of his works. This is the Apollo Patroos (Figure 35) that was found in the agora in Athens in the vicinity of the temple to Apollo Patroos. Other works have also been associated with him based on similarities with the Apollo Patroos, including the Piraeus Athena and Artemis A, but assigning any of these to him with certainty still presents many problems.\textsuperscript{112}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure35.png}
\caption{Left, Apollo Patroos of Euphranor, Athens Agora; right, copy of the Apollo Patroos, Vatican Museums, Rome.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{112} For a complete discussion of the Apollo Patroos and other possible works of Euphranor, see Olga Palagia, \textit{Euphranor}. For comparisons of the Athena or Artemis to the Apollo Patroos and between the Artemis and the Antikythera Youth, see Houser, \textit{Sculpture of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries}, 191 and \textit{Greek Monumental Sculpture} (New York: TheVendome Press, 1983), 64, 94. Paolo Moreno also makes several interesting suggestions in “Un Erede di Fidia,” \textit{Archeo} 16.1 (January 2000) 98–101.
The head of the *Apollo Patroos* is missing, and the heads on copies and adaptations give an inadequate idea of what the original must have looked like. The head on the Vatican copy (Figure 35) and the head on a votive relief (Figure 36) that makes reference to the *Apollo Patroos* cannot be closely compared with the Antikythera statue’s head, but the general features are not so different that the original Apollo could not have been made by the same artist as the *Antikythera Youth*, considering that two different statue types are being compared, and that the features may have been altered somewhat on a heroic or athletic statue. Even to imagine the Antikythera statue as a possible work of Euphranor, perhaps one of his statues of heroes (e.g., Paris, although he supposedly made many others), would require looking at surviving statues by this artist. Unfortunately, none of Euphranor’s heroic statues have been identified among surviving works. It is tempting to assign the *Antikythera Youth* to Euphranor, because of this sculptor-painter’s reputation and because the high quality of the bronze youth suggests he might have been made by an artist of this stature, but comparing the *Antikythera Youth* only to the *Apollo Patroos* and works derived from it does not yield any results. There is, however, one other piece of evidence that may give some idea of Euphranor’s work. It is a painting of Theseus from Herculaneum (Figure 37), which is sometimes thought to be a copy of a painting by Euphranor in the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios in the Athenian agora.\(^{113}\) The figure of Theseus resembles the *Antikythera Youth* in his build, general pose, and attitude. This painting may give some sense of what Euphranor’s heroic figures in bronze looked like, and it is a work that has been associated with Euphranor that is comparable to the *Antikythera Youth*, unlike the *Apollo Patroos* and related works. It does not prove that the Youth is the Paris or any other heroic statue

\(^{113}\) For arguments in support of this identification, see Moreno, 99. Palagia, *Euphranor*, 60, is more cautious, noting that others have attributed the original painting to Nikias, rather than Euphranor. See also Amedeo Maiuri, *Roman Painting* (Geneva: Skira, 1953), 66–68.
of Euphranor, but suggests that possibility more than any of the other evidence for the works of this artist.

Figure 36. Votive relief of Leto, Apollo, and Artemis, Athens National Museum; Apollo on the left represented like the Apollo Patroos of Euphranor.

Figure 37. Roman wall painting depicting Theseus from the Basilica at Herculaneum, National Archaeological Museum, Naples.
The *Antikythera Youth* also resembles the young man represented on a grave stele found at the Ilissos River in Athens (Figure 38). The young man has a similar muscular, athletic build with a fairly heavy torso. His head is somewhat smaller in proportion than that of the statue, but his facial features are somewhat comparable. His head widens out at the forehead, and he has a small mouth and deep-set eyes. His hair is a similar mass of beautiful short curls, mostly curling back away from the forehead.

The *Antikythera Youth*’s relationship to other works of art of the middle of the fourth century and his striking resemblance to the figure on the Ilissos stele place it firmly in the same period. This statue does not have any features in common with statues produced even shortly after the period to which it is generally assigned. He is quite unlike even the earliest of Hellenistic works, even though he only slightly predates them. A type of athlete scraping

**Figure 38.** Ilissos grave relief found in Athens, Athens National Museum.
himself with a strigil, quite unlike that of Lysippos in pose, is represented in two bronze statues, one found in Ephesos (Figure 39)\textsuperscript{114} and the other only recently discovered in 1997 in the Adriatic sea off the coast of Croatia (Figure 40), both dating to the late fourth century B.C. If they are not copies cast from an earlier original, they show how different the art of this period was compared to the mid fourth century to which the Antikythera Youth belongs. The pose and rhythms of the body are much more complicated in these apoxyomenoi, and the hair stands up away from the forehead while other locks curve forward; it is in disarray compared to the more neatly arranged curls of the Antikythera Youth with a slight parting in the middle and curls on either side. The unruliness of the hair in the later apoxyomenoi is perhaps a development out of that same tendency of Lysippos (his own Apoxyomenos, for example). The hair of the Youth has much more in common with that of the young man in the Ilissos relief, the Lansdowne Herakles, or even the Hermes of Praxiteles than it does with either apoxyomenos.

The earlier controversy over the dating of the Antikythera Youth and the difficulties in determining its stylistic relationship to other sculptures is quite understandable given the information that was available a century ago. When the statue was discovered in 1900, scholars lacked the evidence for the sculpture of the fourth century that is available today. Analysis of this bronze work was made in relation to what was then known of fourth-century sculpture, largely later copies in marble of famous works—Praxiteles’ Hermes and the Aphrodite of Knidos, just to name two. Before the Antikythera Youth, fewer bronze sculptures had been discovered. Even today, there is only a small number of bronze statues compared to what must have existed in antiquity, but several bronzes discovered since 1900 have contributed to a better understanding of all periods of Greek sculpture. The Cape Artemision God was found in 1926,

\textsuperscript{114} For further discussion of this statue, see Steven Lattimore, “The Bronze Apoxyomenos from Ephesos,” \textit{AJA} 76 (1972), 13–16.
Figure 39. Apoxyomenos from Ephesos, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (from A. Furtwängler, plate V, fig. 6).

Figure 40. Apoxyomenos in Zagreb, Croatia (from National Geographic, September 2002).
and the Riace statues were only recovered in 1972; both belong to the fifth century. For the fourth century, the *Marathon Youth* was found in 1925, and the Athena and Artemis from Piraeus in 1959. For the period just after the *Antikythera Youth* (ca. 300 B.C.), the *Apoxyomenos* in Vienna (first discovered in 1896) had already been recovered and restored by 1900, but not the better preserved statue of the same type in Zagreb. The *Getty Athlete* was discovered in 1964. These along with the *Antikythera Youth* provide a better picture of Greek sculpture in general as well as in the late classical period. It is also possible that the early scholarship reflected some degree of privileging of certain famous works by certain great masters of the time whose works were frequently copied. Perhaps being confronted with a statue that was so unlike other creations of the fourth century, yet bearing some slight similarities with other works of the period, scholars once thought that the *Antikythera Youth* was the work of a later imitator or that it was somehow inferior to the famous statues that were known from copies. At that time, scholars seemed to privilege the work of Praxiteles as a standard by which all other Late Classical works would be judged. Perhaps it is because the *Antikythera Youth* did not exhibit the same kinds of features that early scholars dated it later. To put it simply, they had a much more limited idea of what Late Classical art could be. But we now have a better picture of the fourth century because the later discoveries show the wide diversity of artistic activity of the Late Classical period. Earlier opinions, however, may have come out of the eighteenth and nineteenth century view that the Classical period was the high point in Greek art and that art declined gradually over

---

115 For a more complete discussion of these discoveries, see Caroline Houser, *Greek Monumental Bronze Sculpture* (photograph of the Getty athlete, p. 113); for a photograph of the Marathon Youth, see Boardman, *Late Classical Period*, fig. 42; Houser, p. 104; Ridgway, pl. 84. For a discussion of the Piraeus bronzes, see Palagia, “Reflections,” 177–195.
successive periods—the Late Classical being inferior to the High Classical and the Hellenistic being inferior to both.
Chapter 6. Conclusion

Given the scarcity of information about this statue and the countless unanswered questions it raises, what conclusions can be drawn from it? We are fortunate that we can deduce as much as we have about this statue given the condition in which it was found and the circumstances of its recovery and restoration. We now have the statue in its best possible condition and we now have a better idea of its pose and attitude, from which it is possible to appreciate its unique features from an artistic standpoint. The restoration also revealed information about the technique used to make the statue, since it was taken apart again, allowing one to examine it inside and to determine exactly how the statue was cast, in how many pieces, and where the lines of division were for the separate molds by which it was cast. This information, however, was not published by Karouzos or in any other easily accessible report in as much detail as is common today. Therefore there is a need for a new study of the technical aspects of this statue with comparisons to other bronze statues.

As for stylistic considerations, the old question of “regional styles” is not particularly productive in examining a statue such as the Antikythera Youth. Although Furtwängler and others observed the blending of regional styles, their discussions were mainly in terms of distinctly separate regional styles which could still be easily recognized in a particular work of art. For the Late Classical period and after, terms such as Attico-Peloponnesian are meaningless, since it is often impossible to determine the exact origin of each characteristic in a work of art. These all belonged to every part of Greece by this time. So much was blended together that a work cannot be easily separated into its component parts. It is important, however, to be aware of the history of scholarship on this and other works of art in order to avoid the possibility of repeating them even if in a new guise.
The *Antikythera Youth* embodies the unique, personal style of an unknown artist. It is not Polykleitan, Praxitelean, Scopasian, or Lysippic, and there is insufficient information about the works of Euphranor to determine a relationship between Euphranor and the *Youth*. Nor is it a combination of the best attributes of each; rather this work and its sculptor are different from the other sculptors of the period. Yet it shares just enough with the other sculptures of the time to place it in the same general period in a sequence in relation to other statues. It should perhaps be placed near the *Lansdowne Herakles* and the young man of the Iliissos relief, slightly before or slightly after, and before the mature work of Lysippos. Its proportions and facial features are much more like the Herakles and the Iliissos young man than the *Apoxyomenos* of Lysippos. The *Agias*, however, does not have the longer and more slender proportions with a smaller head. Perhaps it is sequentially closer to the *Antikythera Youth* than works more securely assigned to Lysippos. The statue appears to be more of a mainstream work than a demonstration of striking innovation, but it is of high enough quality that we would surely know the name of the sculptor if more information was recorded about all of the fine artists who were not as famous as some of the names passed down in the written sources. We will likely never know the name of the artist who created the *Youth*. Whatever his stature in relation to other artists, the important point is that he was an artist of independent genius. Perhaps his work does not so powerfully project a personal style compared to the creations of the most famous names, but he certainly created a memorable statue. The situation was similar in early Italian Renaissance sculpture, with famous names such as Donatello dominating, while other talented sculptors such as Antonio Rossellino created high quality works of art such as the *Virgin and Child* (Figure 41) without exhibiting the force of their personalities to the same extent.
Whatever figure the *Youth* represents, one need not know for sure to appreciate his imposing presence compared to the works that surround it today in a museum setting. It is likely a heroic figure, and that alone tells us how the ancient viewer would have responded to it in general. Whether it stood in a sanctuary alone or in a statuary group, or in a prominent place in a city where it could be viewed by the public, it was a prominent monumental sculpture with a particular context that is today unknown. We simply have to appreciate this statue as we have it,
without an original context. This is not to say that the context is not important. Whether he was a Herakles as opposed to a Theseus or a Perseus would have been of great significance to his contemporary audience. We are certainly missing a great amount of the impact of this statue without the group which may have accompanied it when we look at it today standing in isolation. We are missing much of its meaning and purpose. It is desirable that we know what narrative goes with the character this figure represents and what impressive task he performed. It might help us to figure out what connection this hero might have had with the event or experience that resulted in its commission.
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Yours sincerely,

Ioanna Ninou
Photographic Archive
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PRESSES UNIVERSITAIRES DE FRANCE
Société d'édition et de librairie
Société anonyme au capital de 141 843,66 €, à directoire et conseil de surveillance
RCS Paris B 152 087 168 SIRET 152 087 168 001 33
Sûge social : 6 avenue Reille 75685 Paris Cedex 14

Paris, March 7th 2006

Ms. Elisabeth MYERS
999 N. 9th St. Apt. 402
Baton Rouge
USA

Dear Ms. Elisabeth MYERS,

We are delighted to inform you that for a thesis the Revue Archéologique grants the reproduction of illustrations on a non exclusive and free basis.

So we have decided to grant you permission for the translation into the English language and the reproduction of illustrations from the following work:

- « L'Herakles d'Anticythera », by F. Chamoux, Revue archéologique, 1968, p. 161-170, figures 2,3,4,5 and 7, © PUF

in your thesis on the bronze statue from Antikythera, also known as the Antikythera Youth or according to Chamoux, the Antikythera Herakles.

This permission is granted on a non exclusive basis and is free of charge.

If you wish to publish your thesis, please remember to include the usual copyright mentions.

- author’s name, title of the work from which the illustrations are taken
- the following copyright mention: © PUF, year of publication

Since this letter forms an agreement, please return one copy countersigned.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Laurence ZARRA
Vita
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