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Abstract

Very few bronze original Greek sculptures from the fifth-century BCE are extant today. It is through marble Roman copies that lost Greek originals are studied today. Along with the Roman copies, other media and ancient literary sources can be used to study Greek sculpture. My goal for this thesis is to study the previous scholarship and Roman copies of the Tyrannicides and the Amazon Group. When studying copies, scholars must first answer: Is it a copy? Of what is it a copy? If it is a copy, what can the copy tell about the Greek artist? To better answer these questions, I will look to connoisseurship as a possible solution. Ancient literature and other media also present new context in which to understand the lost originals. I will illustrate how all the sources mentioned above aid in the understanding of original Greek sculpture, particularly the Tyrannicides and Amazon Group.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Many original Greek sculptures that art historians study today no longer exist in their original form. Art historians have become largely dependent on Roman marbles to understand the lost works of the Classical period in Greece. These copies are studied and then attributed to Greek masters, if possible, through the accounts left by ancient literary sources.\textsuperscript{1} Often, Greek original sculptures were sculpted in bronze, a popular medium at the time. Through the course of the following centuries, these statues were either taken by invading hordes or melted down for other purposes. Direct evidence for these artworks is thus confined to the few original bronze Greek sculptures that remain, largely from shipwrecks. I intend to illustrate the study of Greek originals through Roman copies, literary sources, and various other media. This study will show the methods used by art historians and other scholars to understand Greek original sculptures from the Classical period as well as the Roman copies in within their context. Roman copies represent the majority of Greek sculpture known from the Classical period.

Roman copies are used to study Greek sculpture especially from the Classical period. Striking differences between an original and a copy can be observed when the medium has changed, for example, the change from bronze to marble.\textsuperscript{2} Marble does not have the strength of bronze, so for weak points in the marble, struts and stumps must be put in place for extra support.\textsuperscript{3} Because of the translation from bronze to marble as well as the dynamic poses of fifth century sculptures, struts and stumps must be added to prevent the marble from breaking. These struts and stumps can be seen in the Diadoumenos by Polykleitos (450 BCE) and the Diskobolos by Myron (450 BCE) respectively (Fig.1-Fig.2).

\textsuperscript{1} Ridgway 1984, 6.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., 5.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., 5.
Fig. 1. Diadoumenos by Polykleitos. C. 450-440 BCE. Roman copy. Marble. Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Fig. 2. Diskobolos by Myron. C. 450 BCE. Romany copy. Marble. Museo Nazionale Romano. Rome.
My goal is to investigate what can be known about the original Greek sculptures for which only copies survive. Are the Roman copies that we have accurate? In answering this question a series of problems must be tackled first. For each sculpture that is otherwise unknown, whether it be an original or copy, we must ask: is it a copy? Of what is it a copy? If it is a copy, what can the copy tell about the Greek artist? My research will try to answer these questions by focusing primarily on the sculptures of the Tyrannicides and the Amazon Group. Both groups will provide varying notions on the idea of Roman copies and their relevance in understanding Greek sculpture. It is likely that the Tyrannicides attracted the attention of the Romans because of the relative fame of the masters as well as the anecdotal connotations for which the Romans always loved a good story.\textsuperscript{4} I hope to provide an accurate study of these sculptures as well as the history into the study of attributing sculptures and what the Greek originals looked like in relation to what is known.

As to why the Romans so greatly desired Greek works of art, Ridgway suggested that the Romans could be seen in two different lights: 1) as collectors who desired to obtain works of art by the great masters documented on lists of sculptures looted from Greece and Magna Graecia, 2) or as “tasteless barbarians lacking in refinement.”\textsuperscript{5} In her opinion, the Romans could combat their “barbarism” through contact with Greece and become more sensitive to humanistic aspects of culture.\textsuperscript{6} I tend to see the Romans as a unique culture with elements incorporated from the Greeks.

The majority of copies were made during the late Republican period until around the mid-third century CE.\textsuperscript{7} There are important differences between Roman and Greek sculpture. Greek sculpture in the Classical period would not have been known today if it were not for Roman

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{4} Ridgway 1984, 23.
\bibitem{5} Ibid., 10.
\bibitem{6} Ibid., 10.
\bibitem{7} Vermeule 1967, 175.
\end{thebibliography}
copies. However, there are known to be variations among the copies, raising questions about the extent to which the copyists took artistic license when replicating the original sculpture. Evidence of these sculptures from literary sources as well as on physical evidence such as depictions of them on pottery and relief sculpture must be considered. Studying the context surrounding works of art in antiquity provide a broader understanding of the object. As all studies evolve, so does the field of art history.

The study of art history is in a period of transition, and these changes are becoming more evident. No longer are objects studied separately from the rest of other works of art. Instead, artworks are studied within broader cultural contexts. Art historians look to external influences to observe the changing styles, variations, iconography, and subject selection.

Modern art historians seem to have viewed marbles made during the Roman period with some disregard for their possible creators’ input. The Romans were thought to have produced art simply as simulacra of lost Greek originals by the masters rather than attesting to their own creativity and originality.\(^8\) The words that have been used to describe the Roman sculptures include *copy, imitation, reproduction,* and *replica.* Ridgway stated that these words tend to “imply that the sculpture lacks originality and [is] devoid of artistic input.”\(^9\) While others view Roman copies as just simple copies, Maragete Bieber looked at the Roman copies as expressions of art during their time, and even she stressed that copyists could have made “mistakes” in the reproduction of Greek dress. Art historians have tried to isolate specifically Roman traits the costumes of copies, and through this identification, art historians can distinguish a Roman copy from an original Roman creation. The Roman copies were created for a context other than originally intended by the Greeks. However, it is through the Roman copies that scholars can begin to develop an understanding of Greek sculpture in the fifth century BCE.

\(^8\) Ridgway 1984, 5.
\(^9\) Ibid., 6.
Sculptures in the Greek world were associated with religious purposes; these sculptures were either set up as offerings to the gods or to commemorate the deeds of a people. The images were used for religious purposes, as expressions of public or personal piety, and political propaganda. Greek works of art also represented narratives, and even in a single freestanding sculpture, a narrative could be discerned. For example, a narrative can be understood through the single sculpture of the Farnese or Weary Herakles (Fig. 3) attributed to Lysippos in 330 BCE. By viewing the lion skin and the club combined with the apples in his hand, the Greeks would automatically realize which hero and labor was depicted. Only in the Hellenistic period was “art was made for art’s sake.” The Romans took these sculptures from their original locations in sanctuaries and other public areas and placed them in new locations, giving them a new context. The Romans decorated their villas, gardens, and bath complexes with either the original Greek sculptures or the copies that they had made in their workshops. To further study ancient Greek sculpture, I rely on the body of research that has preceded my study.

A historiography provides a body of research based on a study of primary and secondary sources. However, the primary sources used for my study are not dated to the fifth century BCE but the first and second centuries CE. Additionally, these sources were by Roman writers who also had a different mindset from the Greeks, who preceded them, five hundred years before. These writers, particularly Pliny the Elder and Pausanias were also dealing with issues of lost works of art and only relying on the information others had told them or inscriptions they had discovered. Even in the work of Pliny in the first century CE, there were no literary works describing works of art that survive today. Pliny discusses sculpture and architecture in his many volumes. However, he does not give descriptions of the works of art he names. Although there are no descriptions of the artworks, the information that Pliny provided is still a valuable source.

10 Ridgway 1971, 337.
Fig. 3. Farnese Herakles by Lysippos. c. 330. Roman copy. Marble. Found at Baths of Caracalla, now at Museo Nazionale di Napoli.
The history of the sculptures of the Tyrannicides is important because there were actually two sets that were created in antiquity. Both sets of sculptures were originally cast in bronze. The first set was carted off by the Persians, and soon after the sculptors Kritios and Nesiotes created the second Tyrannicide group in 477/476 BCE. The second group was also sculpted in bronze and was placed in the agora where the previous group had stood. How do we know that the Roman copies that are known are examples of the first or second Tyrannicide group? There are numerous examples of the Harmodios pose as well as depictions of the Tyrannicides on pottery and relief sculpture.

The second group I will be focusing on is the Amazon Group sculptures. The Amazons were a popular group to copy in antiquity. The great heroes, Herakles and Theseus, fought the Amazons. Scenes depicting the Amazons in pathetic themes would be logical for they were seen as “barbaric” because they did not fit within the norms of Greek and Roman society. Pliny tells of a competition over which famous sculptor could create the finest example of an Amazon. Several types are known and many attributions assigned; however, there is doubt and debate over almost all of these identifications. I hope to provide an accurate study of these sculptures as well as the history into the study of attributing sculptures and what the Greek originals looked like in relation to what is known.

There is still plenty that is unknown about Greek and Roman sculpture when it comes to copies. I hope to illustrate the work that has been accomplished in regards to the lost Greek sculptures as well as the area of Roman copies. While gathering information about original Greek sculpture, I see the benefits that Roman copies have provided to the research of Greek and Roman sculpture. Roman copies present scholars with information of what interested Romans,
as well as where Romans placed the works of art. The copies alone, however, do not provide adequate evidence for what the original Greek sculptures looked like as well as identifying the sculptor. Many of the attributions that we have today have been provided by ancient accounts and modern scholars. Debate over attributions is becoming more frequent, and one possibility scholars have explored in order to resolve this problem is through the use of connoisseurship and modern methodologies. Originally used in regards to Renaissance paintings, it has relevance also with ancient works of art.
Chapter 2: Connoisseurship, Modern Art History, and Methodology

Frequently, Roman copies combined with the information from ancient literature, have been used to identify replicas of famous Greek prototypes.\(^\text{14}\) Careful consideration of these sources shows that Roman replicas or copies were more like adaptations or variations on certain Greek themes and styles.\(^\text{15}\) Often the Greek originals were first executed in bronze and later copied by the Romans in marble. Modern art historians today seem to view marbles made in the Roman period with slight disregard for their possible creativity. The Romans were thought to have produced art as reflections of lost Greek originals by the masters rather than add or produce anything attesting to their own creativity and originality. The study of the Roman "copies" relies on what is seen today. What we come to know as Greek sculpture is what is discerned from the Roman copies.\(^\text{16}\) How are these Roman copies and if found, Greek originals, identified?

Connoisseurship in its most basic definition is the technique or skill of recognizing details in works of art so as to suggest an attribution. The works of art can range from vase painting and sculpture from antiquity to painting in the Renaissance, to more contemporary objects as well. Connoisseurship provides insight to the possibilities of the artist’s identity when the work lacks a signature or written indication as to who created the work. Those who practice connoisseurship determine the nature of the object based on an evaluation, distinction, and appreciation of the work of art; they also have an ability to determine a time and place for its production and when possible to propose an identity for the artist. A connoisseur would have to have significant evidence of an artist’s other works to provide an attribution of the unidentified work to a particular artist. Connoisseurs based their methods on empirically supported

\(^{14}\) Ridgway 1984, 2.
\(^{15}\) Ibid., 3.
\(^{16}\) Ibid., 5.
procedures, and this treatment helped to establish art history as an academically recognized discipline in the second half of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{17}

Specific criteria must be established and developed to sort and classify works of art. Through careful observations, an expert can read and understand the details of a work of art and identify the sculpture. Connoisseurs can identify a place and time based on the style and medium of an artwork, and often an artist can be determined based on details and comparison with other sculptures. The core activity of a connoisseur is to pass judgment on authenticity and authorship with close observation of size, condition, medium, and technique.\textsuperscript{18} Accordingly, the technique of connoisseurship can aid in the study and identification of Roman copies. When presented with an unknown sculpture there are various questions that must be considered and answered. First, and most importantly, is the unknown sculpture a copy or an original? If the sculpture is a copy, of what is it a copy? What does the copy tell about the original artist?

In the nineteenth century, Giovanni Morelli developed a technique that would later develop into connoisseurship. The Morellian technique was the study of the characteristic body parts such as hands and ears that artists would use in their paintings.\textsuperscript{19} Morelli believed that the evidence a connoisseur used should be the visual forms in the works of art. Also, Morelli thought art historians ought first to make a hypothesis and then gather evidence and detailed evidence to support a conclusion.\textsuperscript{20} Like most connoisseurs, Morelli based his attributions not only on the treatment of seemingly insignificant details, but also on the idea that an authentic work by a great master would reveal an overall coherent vision.\textsuperscript{21} Although Morelli tried to make his attributions based on his rules of a scientific inductive method, Morelli himself never fully

\textsuperscript{17} Hatt and Klonk 2006, 40.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 40.
\textsuperscript{19} Ginzburg and Davin 1980, 7.
\textsuperscript{20} Hatt and Klonk 2006, 48.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 54.
worked by these rules alone. The use of this technique helped art historians to better identify other works of art. Art historians and connoisseurs like Adolf Furtwängler (1854-1907) and Gisela M.A. Richter (1882-1972) were well versed in fields of ancient Greek and Roman sculpture and connoisseurship, and both made great strides in both fields. Their techniques can be used to attribute and reevaluate the works we have today. Before modern art historians, the ancient writers, Pliny the Elder and Pausanias, provided the earliest “art historical” accounts.

Ancient “Art Historians”: Pliny and Pausanias

Pliny the Elder and Pausanias were two writers in the ancient world whom scholars rely upon heavily for understanding sculptors, their creations, and the original location and setting of Greek art. First, to understand their writings, one must see that the ancient writers have interpreted their evidence within their own cultural framework. Pliny and Pausanias, respectively, worked three to five centuries after the sculptors created their well-known works.

Pliny the Elder wrote his *Natural History* in the first century CE. It was a work of classification and description defining a relationship between nature and civilization. Of his thirty-seven books, I will focus on the importance and use of the chapters describing works of art in bronze, marble, and precious stones and gems. Pliny did not describe works of art, but he did mention famous statues and when possible identified their sculptors. Of his many stories, Pliny’s account of the competition of the Amazons at Ephesos is one of the best known and most highly debated. I shall have the occasion to discuss it later in Chapter four.

In the second century CE, Pausanias wrote a *Description of Greece*. This was not a true art historical account, but resembled a cultural geography of Greece. He wrote ten volumes and

---

22 Hatt and Klonk 2006, 56.
23 Ridgway 1986, 14.
24 The chapter from Pliny’s Natural History that I focus on is on bronzes, Chapter 34.
arranged them by location. When he discussed works of art, he gave descriptions and dates. Also, when possible, he indicated an artist’s origin and possible teachers and pupils, but his information has not always proven to be accurate. Pausanias’ work provides descriptions of what Greece looked like to Roman eyes in the second century CE. This description also provides a document citing which statues and monuments were still extant and in use at this time. Pausanias’ descriptions that show the significance of the Tyrannicides, will be discussed in the next chapter. These ancient sources, among others, provide great insight on how Greek sculpture was seen and treated in antiquity during the Roman period. These sources do not provide a view on how the fifth century sculptors viewed Greek sculptures.

It is not until many centuries later in the Renaissance that we see an overt and calculated resurgence in interest for the art of antiquity. Prior to the modern theories of art history, first developed in the nineteenth century in Germany, people thought of art in what now seems an ahistorical sense. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, works of art were not looked upon as having their own particular significance, but rather judged as to whether they had achieved an aesthetic that was of interest to a particular time. One of the earliest art historians, Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574), was also an artist. Vasari first published The Lives of the Artists in 1550. Here, Vasari stated that art had reached its first peak in the golden age of ancient Greece, but then went on a steady decline about the fourth and fifth centuries, and again started to rise again only during the Proto- Renaissance of the fourteenth century. Many art historians during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries believed that art was a cyclical process. Based on the idea of a cyclical process, the height of art was during the Classical period. Until the Renaissance, the works of art in between these two periods were not as highly regarded because of the placement on the downward part of the cycle. Roman copies have previously been placed on the

---

downward slope of this cycle. Art history was greatly influenced by this theory put forth by Vasari and later emphasized by the father of modern art history, Johann Joachim Winckelmann. Winckelmann focused on the beauty and its role in ancient art, and in doing so, he helped shape the “history of modern aesthetics.\textsuperscript{26}

**Winckelmann**

In the eighteenth century in Germany, Johann Joachim Winckelmann pioneered the idea that ancient Greek art represented a specific achievement that was unsurpassable. He provided a historical account describing ancient works of art, with a specific focus on sculpture. Winckelmann is often considered the father of modern art history and the father of modern archaeology. He had a special interest in Greek and Roman art, and through his studies he wrote *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums (History of the Art of Antiquity)*, published in 1764. Winckelmann’s text functioned as the origin and foundation of a new kind of history of art, and it provided a new way to understanding of the visual arts. He provided a framework for classifying works of art, specifically sculpture, into periods of time. Previously works of art, for instance in private collections, had been grouped by subject matter. His theories on Greek and Roman art influenced all later criticism of ancient art.\textsuperscript{27} Winckelmann brought a critical approach to the history of art, which recognized an inequality between different works of art.\textsuperscript{28} In his book, Winckelmann addressed the question as to whether a specific Roman style could be identified in art, and he believed that a Roman style could not be distinguished. He viewed Roman art as “imitative and decadent.”\textsuperscript{29} This assumption of Roman art having no style of its own was accepted by art historians until the late nineteenth century. Johann Gottfried Herder, a

\textsuperscript{26} Scott 2006, 631.  
\textsuperscript{27} Brendel 1979, 19.  
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 21.  
\textsuperscript{29} Scott 2006, 631.
contemporary of Winckelmann, partly agreed with Winckelmann, but drew the conclusion that works of art in are from a certain period and culture should not be analyzed by the standards of another.30 With this Herder created the modern understanding of art history, and provided a reason to trace the developments that have occurred in art over the centuries. In the time after Winckelmann, an art historian from the nineteenth century, Adolf Furtwängler, there was little study of the differentiation between originals and copies of ancient sculpture.31

**Furtwängler**

Adolf Furtwängler was able to provide attributions for many ancient works of art, mostly sculpture. His most well-known and widely used book is *Meisterwerke der Griechischen Plastik* (*Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture*). Furtwängler, through the detailed practice of connoisseurship, reattributed works known only through Roman copies to the original Greek sculptors of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. In his *Meisterwerke*, Furtwängler used ancient sources citing a specific work of art to a specific artist. His approach to ancient Greek sculpture was to give a historical grouping of the copies and to provide an accurate date for the copy’s creation. Additionally, he wanted to compare a copy’s similarity to the lost original, and to study the possible additions and transformations to the original creation put in place by the copyist, for as I have mentioned already, it was common for a Roman artist to add or subtract minor details in his own copy.32

**Richter**

When dealing with ancient copies of lost originals, Gisela Richter’s primary focus was not on the copies; rather she prioritized the ancient literary sources available as well as Greek vases, gems, or coins that depicted scenes similar to those in a Roman sculptural copy. When dealing

---

30 Hatt and Klonk 2006, 22.
31 Bieber 1977, 1.
32 Ibid., 2.
with copies, one has to take into account the possibility that the Roman copies could have been altered in various ways from the original. To aid her in her study of marble copies and bronze originals, she studied the techniques of marble carving and bronze casting.\textsuperscript{33}

In 1925, Richter was made a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the first woman with this honor. Richter wrote \textit{A Handbook of Greek Art} in 1969, comprising of Greek sculpture, vase painting, gems, as well as other objects. When compiling research for her studies, Richter would look first to literary texts and then to external evidence found within other objects reflecting a similar style, such as kouroi from the Archaic period. Richter took a connoisseurial approach to ancient Greek art just as her father, Jean-Paul Richter, had with Italian Renaissance masters’ paintings. Indeed, Richter’s father was in contact with Giovanni Morelli. Through the method of connoisseurship, Richter was able to give the objects she studied an accurate chronology. I have found Richter’s work to be useful in describing and placing the works of art within a time period; however, she did not provide the answers to the questions that arise when dealing with copies.

\textbf{Ridgway}

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, a modern scholar writing in the 1970s up through today, has supplied art history with research on Greek and Roman art as well as copies and their effects on the study of ancient art. She has provided particular insight into Roman copies of Greek sculpture from the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. She argued that art historians had a tendency to attribute works of art to a major sculptor based on ancient sources for reference. In the case that there were no sources to base an attribution, the unknown sculpture might be given an attribution based on an artist’s importance as previously established by Greek and Roman

\textsuperscript{33} Carnes 2003, 235.
writers, such as an account from Pliny of a wounded warrior by Kresilas.\textsuperscript{34} Ridgway, a rather skeptical scholar, suggested that in Roman copies, we often see a “generic imitation and emulation rather than mechanical copying,” therefore it is almost impossible to verify the degree to which a Roman copy replicated a Greek original.\textsuperscript{35} Ridgway’s work has been instrumental in helping me understand the use of copies and how they should be studied with regards to understanding lost original Greek works of art. As I have illustrated, art history is an evolving field, and context as well as iconography are becoming major concerns in contemporary research of ancient art instead of the attribution of works of art to specific artists.\textsuperscript{36}

\textbf{Conclusions on Connoisseurship, Modern Art History, and Methodology}

Connoisseurship, as formulated by Morelli, was a popular method of art history prior to the late nineteenth century, but today is often viewed with scrutiny. Although connoisseurship can provide insights on the details of a sculpture, it is often difficult to offer any certain attribution because, as will be shown in this study, most copies are likely not true “copies” of a fifth century Greek prototype, as Ridgway has suggested. Connoisseurship can provide insights to the details of a sculpture, but it is difficult to give any certain attribution because most Roman copies are likely not true “copies” of a fifth century Greek prototype. It is unrealistic to think that influences in style in the Roman period did not appear in copies of Greek prototypes. Art historians have been trying to isolate the specifically Roman traits in dress, and through this identification, art historians can distinguish a Roman copy from an original Roman creation. Nonetheless, since many original ancient Greek sculptures are no longer around, art historians

\textsuperscript{34} Ridgway 1986, 8.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 11.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 8.
must rely on other objects to make their assumptions on the sculptures’ time period and to venture possible attributions to a particular artist.

The two groups of ancient sculptures that I have chosen to discuss are known only through Roman copies and literary accounts that date and attribute the statues. The Tyrannicides and the Amazon Group from Ephesos provide two different insights to Roman copies and how they are attributed. Ancient sources are necessary when outlining a history of Greek sculpture. Our understanding of these Greek originals will have to rely heavily on the Roman writers I have discussed above and what they said about the Greek sculpture. I do so aware of the new caution that has been expressed by scholars on the reliance placed upon ancient sources.\textsuperscript{37} Other works of art that have generally been attributed to the same sculptors have been included for the purpose of comparison. In the case of the Amazons, I rely on sculptures mentioned by Pliny and Lucian that have also been attributed to the masters. Unfortunately, there have not been any vases found that represent statues of Amazons created for the city of Ephesos. In the case of the Tyrannicides, I am able to rely on the depictions of the Tyrannicides seen in other media, showing their pose and importance within the ancient world.

\textsuperscript{37} Ridgway 1986, 14.
Chapter 3: The Tyrannicides

Now that I have discussed connoisseurship and modern art historical scholarship, in this chapter I begin to look at the first group of Roman copies to understand better the lost originals. Roman copies provide an image of the lost Greek original sculptures. The Tyrannicides are a set of sculptures representing two nude aristocratic men in Athens during the late sixth century BCE. The two aristocrats, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, assassinated the tyrant Hippias’ brother Hipparkhos during the Panathenaic games in 514 BCE. There were two groups of Tyrannicides erected in antiquity and both are dated to the late Archaic and Early Classical periods. Through literary accounts, scholars know that there were two sets of bronze Tyrannicide sculptures. One set of sculptures was erected after 510 BCE by Antenor after the expulsion of Hippias. A second set was erected in 477/476 BCE by Kritios and Nesiotes to replace the earlier group, which was stolen by the Persians in 480.38 Scholars have suggested that it is the second group that is studied through Roman copies. The attributions of these copies are based on style of known works of art by the sculptors. Through evidence of Roman copies, other media, and literary sources, I will illustrate in order of decreasing utility the history of the sculptures and the research behind what is known today. I will also explain the popularity of the sculptures’ theme by reference to the events of the Panathenaic Festival of 514 BCE.

Ancient literary descriptions often present variations of the same account. These accounts were handed down through oral tradition for many generations starting perhaps with first-hand accounts and then passed on. It is also possible that the accounts were based in fiction or hearsay, but events that tend to reappear in the historical record could be based on fact. However they are altered, these ancient literary sources can aid in giving a narrative of both the event and descriptions of the sculptures.

38 Mattusch 1996, 82.
The Account

There are variations in the accounts of the Tyrannicides. The two ancient sources that are most relevant are the accounts by Thucydides and Aristotle. There were also multiple references to Harmodios and Aristogeiton in poetry and drama. As mentioned above, the Tyrannicides were a symbol of democracy, while aristocrats opposed the new democracy and tried to discredit and minimize their importance and achievement, while the democrats revered them. In these accounts, there were no descriptions of the style and basic appearance of the Tyrannicides. In the writings of Pliny the Elder and Pausanias, however, there are descriptions of the versions they encountered which I will discuss below. In the ancient world it was believed that the Tyrannicides, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, committed a heroic act in an attempt to end tyranny during the Panathenaic festival in 514 BCE.

The political climate in the late sixth century in Athens was one of conflict between aristocrats and a tyrant. The term tyrant, as it was understood in Greece, was not one based on oppression and resorting to the use of terror to control the people. In 561 BCE, Peisistratos proclaimed himself tyrant of Athens. After the death of Peisistratos in 527 BCE, the reigns of government were passed over to one of his sons. By the late fifth century, when Thucydides wrote his account of the assassination of Hipparkhos, Athenians believed that it was Hipparkhos who reigned as tyrant and not Hippias. Thucydides sought to answer this debate of who was tyrant in Athens during the Panathenaic Festival of 514 BCE. He answered this question by citing a pillar commemorating the Peisistratid family on the Athenian Akropolis. This pillar mentioned the names of the family, and on it were the names of five children sired by Hippias, but none
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sired by Hipparkhos.\textsuperscript{42} The other account by Aristotle follows Thucydides’ account closely, but there are some factual discrepancies between the two accounts. Aristotle does not give documentation of his sources, and his changes come later in the account. In both versions, Harmodios and Aristogeiton were aristocrats as well as lovers, and Hipparkhos had made unsuccessful advances towards Harmodios. Fearing that Harmodios would have been taken away by force, Aristogeiton plotted against Hipparkhos.\textsuperscript{43} After the insult of being rejected twice by Harmodios, Hipparkhos concocted a plot to insult Harmodios’s family. Thucydides stated that Hipparkhos invited Harmodios’s sister to take part in a procession for the Panathenaic festival, and when she came to participate in the festival, Hipparkhos said that he had never invited her.\textsuperscript{44} Harmodios’s sister was rejected for being unworthy, and this became a great insult to their aristocratic family. Thucydides stated that there were few conspirators involved, while Aristotle commented that there were many. The motivations for Harmodios and Aristogeiton had a strong basis in revenge for the advances and insult to Harmodios and his family made by Hipparkhos. The other conspirators were most likely involved in the plan to end tyranny rather than a plan of revenge. Thucydides stresses the first motive of jealousy and revenge rather than a purely political motive and that their end result was accidental and unplanned.\textsuperscript{45}

According to Thucydides, the assassination was to take place in the Kerameikos where Hippias was accompanied by his bodyguard, and supposedly he was the original target of the plot merely because he was the tyrant.\textsuperscript{46} It has also been hypothesized that the assassination plot involved the murders of Hippias, Hipparkhos, and Thessalos, the third Peisistratid brother.\textsuperscript{47} Had Athens been rid of all the tyrants of the Peisistratid family, the Tyrannicide group would prove to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42} Thuc. 6.53.1
\item \textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 6.54.3
\item \textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 6.56.
\item \textsuperscript{45} Spivey 1996, 114.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Thuc. 6.57.1.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Bell 2005, 127. Aristot. Const.Ath. 18.2.
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be a monument commemorating the end of tyranny in Athens. The plan was abandoned when one of their co-conspirators looked too familiar talking with Hippias, and the men feared their plan was discovered. Harmodios and Aristogeiton rushed to find Hipparkhos, the man who had insulted them. They found Hipparkhos near the Leokorion, and in a rage fueled by love and insult, Harmodios and Aristogeiton thrust their swords into him. Aristogeiton escaped the guards after the murder and was later captured and killed, but Harmodios was killed on the spot. Hippias heard of the news, and rushed to the armed men in procession. Men can be seen bearing shields and spears in the Panathenaic procession depicted on the Ionic frieze of the Parthenon. Traditionally, the armed men in the procession carried a shield and spear, so all those with daggers were assumed to be the guilty parties. After the actions of Aristogeiton and Harmodios, Hippias pressed the tyranny much harder upon the Athenians. Hippias had grown fearful of a revolt, so he put many citizens to death during the three years he reigned after his brother’s assassination. In his fourth year, Hippias was deposed with the help of the Lacedaemonians, and he left for the court of the Persian emperor, Darius.

As seen in poetry and other sources, it was very popular in Athens to be compared to either of the Tyrannicides. To the Athenians, Harmodios and Aristogeiton were heroes, and to sacrifice oneself for their city and in the best interest of the people was a great honor. To be depicted or described in a manner relating to either of the Tyrannicides was a great honor and compliment. In his play, Lysistrata, Aristophanes has the “Old Men” in Lysistrata proclaim: “A Tyranny, no doubt... but they won't catch me, that know. Henceforth on my guard I'll go,/A sword with myrtle-branches wreathed forever in my hand,/ And under arms in the Public Place/I’ll

---

48 The Leokorion was a shrine dedicated to the daughters of Leos, who offered to die to save Athens from plague.
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take my watchful stand,/Shoulder to shoulder with Aristogeiton.”\textsuperscript{51} The reference to Aristogeiton illustrates the popularity and the respect given to Harmodios and Aristogeiton. Aristophanes refers not only to the personae of the Tyrannicides, but also describes the “Public Place,” in the Agora, where sculptures were located. The “shoulder to shoulder” line the Old Men speak of could refer to the size and possible arrangement of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, discussed later in the chapter. In \textit{Ecclesiazusae}, the character Praxagora is asked what she will do with her urns, and she replies: “I shall have them taken to the market-place, and standing close to the statue of Harmodios...”\textsuperscript{52} This places one of the statues of the Tyrannicides in the Agora, and like most monuments, they were given as meeting points. Through the literary sources, the popularity of Harmodios and Aristogeiton start to form, but it is through the sculptures where they truly take shape.

It is apparent from the extant evidence of depictions of young males and older males, that the sculptures of Harmodios and Aristogeiton are a composition of two men, one young male and a bearded older male. They are often portrayed as standing together poised for attack. In ancient Greece, the sculptures in the late sixth century were made of bronze. The sculpture of the Tyrannicides would have also been made of bronze, and as most heroes were depicted in a heroic nudity in ancient Greece, so were the Tyrannicides. During the Late Archaic and Early Classical periods, both Harmodios and Aristogeiton would have been sculpted having idealized youthful male bodies. As time progressed into the Early Classical period, the male figure became more natural looking, and the muscles were modeled more softly and looked less rigid. From what is known about original sculpture in the Late Archaic period, these assumptions based on composition and style can be made. Through the study of original works of art from the period and through literary sources, these generalizations are presumed.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{51} Aristoph.\textit{Lys}.626
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Roman Copies

Roman copies of the Tyrannicides are believed to be based on the sculptures by Kritios and Nesiotes. Thirty years after the group by Antenor was set up, the second group was erected in 477/6 BCE and placed in the space occupied by the former just a few years earlier.\textsuperscript{53} The quick replacement of the Tyrannicides sent out a message that balance had been restored to Athens, and that they were once again under the protection of the Tyrannicides.\textsuperscript{54} The style of the group by Kritios and Nesiotes can be seen through the surviving copies, but it is unclear whether these copies reflect the style, poses, or composition of the original copies by Antenor. Scholars have looked at the stylistic differences among the copies and other original sculptures dating to the same time period in order to decipher the possible differences between the groups.\textsuperscript{55} Scholars must also take into account the popularity and reverence that was paid to the sculptures of the Athenian heroes and the power tradition could play into the style of figures created by Kritios and Nesiotes. Mattusch believes that since Harmodios and Aristogeiton were such recognizable figures, there would be no notable differences between the new and old groups.\textsuperscript{56}

In the extant Roman copies and from the representations of mature and young males, the bodies of both Harmodios and Aristogeiton are still idealized, and they are only identified by their age difference and attacking gestures.\textsuperscript{57} The copies of the head of Harmodios resembles that of a sculpture of a boy dating to 480 BCE attributed to Kritios, to be discussed later in the section reflecting the style of Kritios. On this basis, it seems probable that these copies represent the original work created by Kritios and Nesiotes.

\textsuperscript{53} Robinson 1905, 27.
\textsuperscript{54} Mattusch 1996, 62.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 62.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 62.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 62.
The Roman copies of the Tyrannicides were executed in marble and are full size copies of the bronze originals. It is agreed among scholars that these copies give a fair idea of the forms, style, and pose of the original sculptures. The most complete sculptures of Harmodios (H1) and Aristogeiton (A1) (Fig. 4) were found at the Villa Adriana in Tivoli. However, this provenance is unsure, and they are now held in the Museo Nazionale in Naples. The two figures are placed in the wedge-shaped composition, which is most likely not the original composition of Harmodios and Aristogeiton. The Naples Aristogeiton (A1) (Fig. 5) is missing its head, but it does have the entire body in one piece along with both legs and plinth preserved.58 Both arms of the sculpture have been broken off at different points, the right arm at the deltoid muscle and the left broken at the shoulder.59 The arms of Aristogeiton (A1) have since been restored, although Brunnsäker states that the left arm was previously rotated at an incorrect axis that has since been corrected.60 A bearded head of Aristogeiton has been placed on the statue. The body and head of Harmodios (H1) (Fig. 6-Fig. 7) from Naples have been preserved in one piece, but both arms have been broken at the deltoid muscle.61 The right leg is preserved slightly below the top of the right thigh to slightly below the kneecap. The head of this sculpture is remarkably well preserved. The right arm depicting the “Harmodios Blow” has been restored incorrectly, as seen from the evidence provided by the images of Harmodios on the vases and on the throne.62 The right arm should be bent back even more at the elbow so that the hand is back behind the head. Harmodios and Aristogeiton are striding out with opposite legs, Harmodios leading with his right and Aristogeiton with his left. The positions of the limbs of the Roman copies of these two sculptures seen here help to identify the possible compositional arrangements of the figures.

58 Brunnsäker 1971, 48.
59 Ibid., 49.
60 Ibid., 50.
61 Ibid., 63.
62 Ibid., 63.
discussed below. The various copies are left in fragments in various stages of restoration and damage.
Fig. 6. (Left) Harmodios (H1) from Naples
Copy

Fig. 7 (Above) Head of Harmodios (H1)
A torso and head of Aristogeiton (A3) (Fig. 8- Fig. 9) was found in the excavations at S. Omobono in Rome in 1938, now held in the Palazzo Nuovo of the Capitoline Museums in Rome. In this rendering Aristogeiton’s musculature varies from that of the Aristogeiton in Naples.

The musculature of the Artemision Zeus (Fig. 10) would be an accurate comparison in that the muscles are not as severely contracted. Brunnsåker states that with the discovery of the head of Aristogeiton (A3) for which there is no information other than it was found in the storerooms at the Vatican where it is still displayed. The pose of the head of (A3) gives art historians a solid basis to conclude in which direction the head was placed on the body. The treatment of the hair is best reproduced on Aristogeiton (A3), with the hair described as “small leaf-like locks with an incised line.”

Scholars are less certain of the restoration of Harmodios because there is less evidence. It is certain that the left arm of Harmodios was stretched downwards and back, and through the various depictions of Harmodios, it is most likely that his right arm was up back over his head to deliver that crushing blow. There are remains of struts connected to the head of Harmodios on (H3) of unknown provenance now located at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York and (H4), a damaged head from the Museo Nazionale in Rome, also of unknown origin (Fig. 11 and Fig. 12). The Naples Harmodios (H1) does not have the struts connecting the right arm to the head, and the bronze original would naturally not have the struts for support. The fragment of an upper torso of Harmodios (H2) was bought on the Roman market in 1908 and is now located in the Liebighaus in Frankfurt am Main (Fig. 13).
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Fig. 8. (Above) Torso of Aristogeiton (A3)

Fig. 9 (Above right) Head of Aristogeiton (A3)

Fig. 10. (Right) Artemision Zeus. C. 460-450 BCE. Bronze. Found off of Cape Artemision, now at the National Archaeological Museum in Athens.
Fig. 11. Harmodios (H3). Now at Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Fig. 12. Harmodios (H4) Now at Museo Nazionale della Terme, Rome.

Fig. 13. Harmodios Torso (H2) Now at Liebighaus, Frankfurt am Main.
This torso provides an image of the direction in which the arms went. The right shoulder is stretched up as if to go upwards, and the left shoulder is dropped down as if to go back behind the torso. The Harmodios head of (H3) provides the best evidence to identify the Boy as the work of Kritios (Fig. 22). Hurwit characterizes the head of (H3) as a more “sensitive, less austere rendering.” When placed next to each other, H3 and H4, one can see that they have “similar U-shaped faces, smooth full cheeks, strong rounded chin with a low forehead.” All of these copies combined help to realize the possible positions of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, and it is a plaster cast dating to the Roman period that helps scholars to understand the production of copies. It is through the works that are described below that the impact of the sculptures of the Tyrannicides can be seen and understood.

**Other Media**

The importance of the Tyrannicides can be seen from their depiction on vases and relief sculpture from the fifth century on into the third century BCE. One of the earliest vases depicting the Tyrannicides is a black-figure lekythos (Fig. 14) dating to 470/460 BCE. On this black-figure lekythos, the figures are lengthened to fill the whole band of space of the vase, and the background behind the figures is filled with a decoration of branches and vines. Harmodios and Aristogeiton are facing right with Harmodios striding ahead of Aristogeiton. As previously stated, the figures of Harmodios and Aristogeiton are differentiated through conventions used in the Archaic and Classical periods. Aristogeiton is distinguished from Harmodios by having a long beard and hair that extend to his chest while Harmodios has the hairless face of a young male. Harmodios is depicted with his left leg extended forward and is holding his sword with his left
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hand. The reason for this unusual representation of Harmodios brandishing the sword with his left hand is possibly due to the artist making a prior sketch of the sculptures, where the artist saw Harmodios from behind.\textsuperscript{70} The artist sketched Harmodios at an angle where he was seen from the back, and while still using the prototype, the artist depicted Harmodios from a frontal perspective. The artist would have to switch the sword-hand from right to left to prevent from obstructing the spectator’s view.\textsuperscript{71} It appears that Aristogeiton was copied onto the vase, as he would have been seen in the sculpture, and as in the extant copies, Aristogeiton has a \textit{chlamys} draped over his left arm.\textsuperscript{72} This lekythos seems to be in part depicting the Tyrannicide sculptures in the Agora, and based on the date, would correspond to the sculptures created by Kritios and Nesiotes. This arrangement of one figure striding slightly in front of the other is not the composition one would have seen in the sculptures in the agora. The sculptures in the agora would have shown the figures back-to-back and in line with one another. There are other vase figures that show this pose of one figure striding out in front of the other, as seen in the following vase description.

A red-figure oinochoe (Fig. 15) from the Dexileos grave in Athens, now held in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, dates to around 400 BCE. The vase depicts one figure, Harmodios, advancing out from a group, and the heads of Harmodios and Aristogeiton are shown in profile while their torsos are in a frontal view.\textsuperscript{73} The style indicates the previously mentioned date of 400 BCE, and the possibility that the vase was commissioned to specifications of a private order. It would seem likely that the Tyrannicides would be a subject befitting an aristocratic

\textsuperscript{70} Brunnsäker 1971, 103.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 103.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 103. Chlamys or mantle.
\textsuperscript{73} Mattusch 1988, 125.
Athenian officer’s grave goods. They are “aligned in dramatic silhouette,” and Harmodios can be seen striking with his “Harmodios Blow” pose.\(^7^4\)
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\(^7^4\) Mattusch 1988, 125.
As seen on the black-figure lekythos, Harmodios is advancing forwards in front of Aristogeiton, and Aristogeiton has a chlamys draped over his left arm. This arrangement of figures could be derived from the sculptures themselves, or it could be a simple and aesthetically pleasing means of depicting the two figures together.

Prize vases were often given out at the Panathenaic festival; the type of vase associated with the festival is the amphora. Often these Panatheanaic amphorae incorporated important Athenian monuments in their imagery.\textsuperscript{75} On one particular Panathenaic amphora (Fig. 16), dating to 400 BCE, the Tyrannicides were employed as a shield device of Athena’s. Instead of Harmodios advancing, it is Aristogeiton who has been depicted pulling ahead of the two men. The two dimensionality of the plane is an explanation for the advancing figure and not because this arrangement was how the sculpture group was originally composed.\textsuperscript{76} In their silhouetted depiction, both men step forward with one knee bent and the other straight, creating a strong diagonal. Harmodios is still delivering a crushing blow with his right arm bent back over his head ready to strike at any moment.

The next vase depicts the two heroes along with Hipparkhos, and this vase has more of a narrative scene and is not as the Tyrannicides are arranged for the freestanding sculptures. The \textit{Würzburg Stamnos} (Fig. 17), which dates to the late fifth century BCE, represents the Tyrannicides group as clothed figures, unlike the heroic nudity seen in the two previous vases and the sculpture groups. The anatomy of the figures here is more naturalistic in modeling. In the narrative, Harmodios pursues a fleeing Hipparkhos, who looks back at his pursuer.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{75} Ridgway 1984, 67.
\textsuperscript{76} Mattusch 1988, 122.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., 127.
Fig. 16. Panathenaic Amphora. Athena with Shield Device of the Tyrannicides. C. 400 BCE. Athens

Fig. 17. Würzburg Stamnos by the Copenhagen Painter. Late 5th century BCE. Held in Würzburg.
Aristogeiton’s pose has changed; he is already striking with his sword and making contact with the torso of Hipparkhos. Aristogeiton’s pose had to be changed for the new narrative being depicted. Harmodios is still depicted in the “Harmodios Blow” pose, and this pose is one of the main identifiers as to the narrative of the vase. The following vase depicts a subject that does not involve the narrative of the Tyrannicides, but rather it incorporates the poses of the sculptures to a different story.

The Vivenzo Vase (Fig. 18) is a hydria painted by the Kleophrades Painter in the late sixth century BCE, and the vase’s subject is the Trojan War. The Vivenzo Vase does not provide great insight into the Tyrannicide sculptures, but it does provide insight into the popularity of the group and their poses.
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This vase depicts a specific scene from the Trojan War. The figures of Ajax and Neoptolemus, the mature warrior and the young soldier, are in poses inspired by the Tyrannicides.\textsuperscript{80} Ajax is bearded, leaning forward with an advancing left side like Aristogeiton. His right hand is drawn back with his sword ready to thrust. Neoptolemus resembles Harmodios; he is young and beardless, with his sword up over his right shoulder like Harmodios about to deliver a decisive blow. Instead of the left arm being back, Neoptolemus’ left arm is forward as if to grab the shoulder of Priam.\textsuperscript{81} These men are clothed because they are warriors in battle and do not require heroic nudity. This vase raises a question as to the exact date of the vase and to which Tyrannicide sculpture the Kleophrades Painter refers. Ajax is seen with a pointed beard, typical of bearded men depicted at this time.\textsuperscript{82} In the copies, Aristogeiton’s beard is full and bushy, not pointed. Is there a possibility that the shape of Aristogeiton’s beard indicates that the Vivenzo Vase was modeled after the original Tyrannicide group by Antenor? If the vase reflects Antenor’s Tyrannicides, the vase would have to have been made between 510 and before the Persian sack of Athens in 480. However, it is probable that there is no reference to Antenor’s Aristogeiton.

Pointed beards were seen on sculptures during the early fifth century BCE, such as the Livadhostro Poseidon (Fig. 19) dated to 480 BCE and the Artemision Zeus (Fig. 11) dated to around 460 BCE. Because there are no detailed literary descriptions of the sculptures, there are always questions of style and detail. Along with depictions of the Tyrannicides on vase paintings, there is a depiction seen on a specific relief carving.

The Tyrannicides are also depicted on a marble throne found in Athens, now known as the Broomhall Throne (Fig. 20) from the Elgin Collection, and the date is uncertain.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{80} Washburn 1918, 147.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 148.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., 152.
\textsuperscript{83} Brunnsäker 1971, 107.
Fig. 19. Livadhstro Poseidon. C. 480 BCE. Bronze. National Archaeological Museum in Athens.

Fig. 20. Broomhall Throne. Date unknown. Found in Athens.
Seltman suggested that the throne dates to around 290 BCE based on stylistic grounds, but Brunnsåker does not believe the date has significant evidence to support it.\textsuperscript{84} The Tyrannicides are on the right side of the throne and carved in very low relief. The sculptures by Kritios and Nesiotes would surely have been seen by this artist, and it is likely that the artist could have been illustrating the composition of the two figures as laid out by the bronze sculptors. The figures on the throne are seen side-by-side and appear to be in the wedge-shaped composition as suggested by Brunnsåker and others. Harmodios is placed behind Aristogeiton with his right arm up, poised to deliver his crushing blow. Harmodios’ whole face is visible and not hidden by the raised upper arm. Brunnsåker argues that it can be assumed that the group was sketched from a certain point in front of the sculptures.\textsuperscript{85}

As seen on the previous vases of the black-figure lekythos and red-figure oinochoe from the Dexileos grave, Aristogeiton has draped a chlamys over his left arm. The figures are both striding forward with their left legs, and the musculature of these two figures appears to be heavier and more defined. Seltman believes that because of the stockier and heavier musculature, this representation refers to the sculptures made by Antenor.\textsuperscript{86} For this relief to be based on the sculptures of Antenor, the throne must date to no earlier than the time of Alexander and the end of his conquest of the Persian Empire in 330 BCE. Seltman suggests that the group by Antenor was returned to Athens during the joint reign of Seleucus and Antiochos, Alexander’s successors, between 293 and 281 BCE.\textsuperscript{87} Brunnsåker, however, believes that if smaller representations on reliefs and vases are taken into consideration, that there would be as many different statue groups as there are smaller representations.\textsuperscript{88} However, in my opinion, the vases

\textsuperscript{85} Brunnsåker 1971, 107.  
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and relief discussed above cannot be disregarded, they provide possible insights to the composition and style of the lost originals as well as the Roman copies. The ancient literary sources discussed later help to know who saw the original sculptures at what time and their location.

**Style and Sculptor**

There are no descriptions of either group of the Tyrannicides given by any of the ancient authors.\(^{89}\) The fragments and copies of the Tyrannicides that survive today are typically attributed to the works based on Kritios and Nesiotes, so it is believed that Anetenor’s Tyrannicides could have followed the typical Late Archaic conventions for depicting males in sculpture. Because there are no representations of Aristogeiton and Harmodios by Antenor, there is only speculation based on Late Archaic conventions, Antenor’s Kore, and the second Tyrannicide sculpture group. What is seen through the copies and later the casts are the physical evidence of style that art historians have to study.

To understand the extant Roman copies and why they are attributed to Kritios and Nesiotes, the style of both Antenor and Kritios must be examined through known works attributed to both sculptors. There is not much that is known about the style of this group by Antenor, but it can be assumed that they followed the Late Archaic patterns. Antenor is the only Archaic artist who was known to work with bronze, however he also worked with marble, creating works like korai.\(^{90}\) The extant kore (Fig. 21) that is attributed to Antenor is dated to the last quarter of the sixth century BCE and was dedicated by Nearchos on the Acropolis. Since there are no examples of Antenor’s Tyrannicide group, the kore provides evidence of Antenor’s style. The kore’s left hand grips her chiton creating repeating catenary folds across

\(^{89}\) Mattusch 1996, 61.
\(^{90}\) Mattusch 1988, 88.
the front of the legs, and the drapery in the back creates tight diagonals. These representations of Harmodios and Aristogeiton were not portraits, and it is also thought that based on Archaic conventions that the distinguishable characteristics were the beard to indicate the more mature male and the clean face to depict youth. Antenor’s Kore as well as other sculptures were found buried on the Akropolis. In 480 BCE, the Persians invaded Athens and sacked the city, the Perisans destroyed the sculptures on the Akropolis, but there was one sculpture that was taken by the Persians, as documented by Pliny. The plundering of art did not become a common practice until later after 480 BCE, but the Persians took with them whatever they did not destroy and with them they took the Tyrannicides. One of the best examples for a transitional sculpture from the Early Classical period and generally accepted as the work of one of the sculptors on the Tyrannicide groups, known as the Kritios Boy.

The Kritios Boy (Fig. 22), dated to 480 BCE, is a statue of a young boy in his early teens.
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He is depicted nude, and his musculature is softer than that of kouroi that came from the previous stylistic period. The hair is shortened, curled back from the forehead and tied with a fillet. This hairstyle becomes widely used in the Classical period. The style and date of the “Kritios Boy” has been dated by the context in which he was found. The sculpture of the young boy was found buried on the Akropolis together the Perserschutt.\textsuperscript{94} Stylistically, the sculpture of the boy was the latest found amongst the debris. Based on the softer, more naturalistic musculature and movement of the boy, scholars roughly concluded that the boy dates around 480 BCE, around the time of the Persian sack. Very few sculptors were well known during the early fifth century. Kritios, whom scholars know was working around this time, had already been attributed to the work of the Tyrannicides. Furtwängler first made the suggestion that Harmodios and the Kritios Boy were related in style and likely by the same artist in 1880. The heads of the boy and Harmodios closely resembled one another, and with this resemblance, the boy was given the name and attribution of “Kritios Boy.”\textsuperscript{95}

It has previously been accepted by scholars that this original sculpture is attributed to the work of Kritios and dated to slightly before the Persian sack of the Acropolis in 480 BCE; however, Hurwit addresses the discrepancies in date and subject matter. Hurwit has presented an alternate view with regard to both the subject and the attribution of the Kritios Boy. Rather than a victorious young male athlete, Hurwit suggests that the Kritios Boy represents Theseus as a young hero because of the rings of hair around his forehead, which often appear on gods, and heroes.\textsuperscript{96} He dates the Kritios Boy to after the Persian sack in 480 BCE because there is no direct evidence linking its creation prior to the Persian sack.\textsuperscript{97} This would mean that the Kritios Boy

\textsuperscript{94} Perserschutt-Debris left from the Persian attack of the Akropolis in 480 BCE.
\textsuperscript{95} Stewart 1990, 135.
\textsuperscript{96} Hurwit 1989, 41.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid., 80.
was decapitated and ruined by the Athenians, which Hurwit believes the Athenians had too many scruples to have destroyed this statue.\textsuperscript{98}

With the recent debate of attribution and date, there is disagreement among modern scholars. There are no other originals attributed to Kritios, and as far as scholars know from literary sources, Kritios and Nesiotes only worked in bronze.\textsuperscript{99} Ridgway stated, “the most insistent tradition, that of assigning the team [of Kritios and Nesiotes] the Kritian Boy,... had nothing to recommend it except the general style and the obvious influence from bronze.”\textsuperscript{100} The modeling and musculature of the Boy is much more natural and softer than the modeling of the kouroi that came before this sculpture. The head of the Kritios Boy has inlaid eyes, typical of bronze sculptures. It was not uncommon for artists to work in multiple media, such as bronze and marble. Although in marble, the statues of the Kore and the Boy help provide an insight to the styles of Antenor and Kritios and Nesiotes, the artists commissioned to work on the Tyrannicide sculpture groups.

It is important to study the accounts of the story related by Thucydides and Aristotle to understand the Athenians’ relationship, not only to the commemorative sculptures produced in Athens, but also the impact that these two men had on the other various arts including visual and literary arts. Based on these accounts by Thucydides and Aristotle, Harmodios and Aristogeiton were indeed motivated by their personal vendetta against Harmodios. To mask an assassination based completely on revenge motives, they enlisted the help of other men to create a plot to rid Athens of the tyrants.\textsuperscript{101} Regardless of their true motives, Harmodios and Aristogeiton were a major part of Athenian history. The accounts also help to describe why Aristogeiton and
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Harmodios were visually recognized and hailed as heroes in the ancient world for killing Hipparkhos and ending tyranny in Athens.

**Significance in the Ancient World**

The Tyrannicide sculpture groups held great significance in the ancient world for the people of Athens. It is known through copies that the sculptures by Kritios and Nesiotes were copied in the Roman period. Based on dated sculptural evidence, the Tyrannicides were not copied as much in the Imperial period because of what they symbolized.\(^{102}\) The people of ancient Athens hailed these sculptures as symbols of a new political climate and as great heroes ridding their city of tyranny. The actions of Harmodios and Aristogeiton did not end tyranny in Athens. However, they were part of a catalyst. The Tyrannicides were the first group commemorating the heroes after Hippias was overthrown in 510 BCE. This group represented mortal heroes of Athens, and it was set up at public expense, setting a precedent for public statuary everywhere.\(^{103}\) Pliny describes the new practice of honoring mortal heroes, and the use of statuary to tell their heroic tales.

The practice of erecting statues from a most civilized sense of rivalry was afterwards taken up by the whole of the world, and the custom proceeded to arise of having statues adorning the public places of all municipal towns and of perpetuating the memory of human beings and of inscribing lists of honors on the bases to be read for all time, so that such records should not be read on their tombs only.\(^ {104}\)

The first sculpture group of the Tyrannicides was executed in bronze by the most well known artist of the Late Archaic period, Antenor.\(^{105}\) Pliny's account of the date helps art historians place

\(^{102}\) Spivey 1996, 114.  
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when the Tyrannicide sculpture group was placed in the agora. He referred to the date of their erection in the Athenian Agora in his *Natural History*.

The Athenians were, I believe, introducing a new custom when they set up statues at the public expense in honor of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, who killed the tyrants. This occurred the same year as the one in which the kings were driven from Rome.\(^{106}\)

The date Pliny refers to, 510 BCE, is based on the legend of when the last of the Roman kings, Tarquinius Superbus was exiled from Rome.\(^{107}\) The next literary source wrote of his travels throughout Greece.

Pausanias traveled through Greece in the second century CE documenting what he saw and describing a sort of cultural geography including works of art. Pausanias claimed to have seen both Tyrannicide sculpture groups, and therefore it is known that at this time both groups were still together. He described the location of the sculptures in the Athenian Agora as well as their history:

Near the state of Demosthenes is a sanctuary of Ares...Hard by stand statues of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, who killed Hipparkhos. The reason of this act and the method of its execution have been related by others; of the figures some were made by Kritios, the old ones being the work of Antenor. When Xerxes took Athens after the Athenians had abandoned the city he took away these statues also among the spoils, but they were afterwards restored to the Athenians by Antiochus.\(^{108}\)

Through this description, it is known that they stood near the Temple of Ares in the Agora.

Pausanias also names the sculptors apart from Nesiotes, and also tells what happened to the first set of sculptures, leading to the reason why the second set was erected.

The Tyrannicides were highly admired for their heroic act in the ancient world. Others in the ancient world equated their slaying of their local “tyrants” to the act of the Tyrannicides.

After the death of Alexander in 323 BCE, Athens fell under control of tyrants and an aristocratic
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government. In 317 BCE, the Athenian government was taken over by aristocrats, positioning Kassander as their leader. A decade later, Demetrios of Phaleron, the tyrant at this time, was overthrown by Demetrios Poliorketes in 307/6 BCE, who proclaimed Athens free and re-established democracy. Demetrios and his father, Antigonos, were rewarded by the Athenians.

Diodoros states that in 307 BCE:

“The Athenians, on proposal of Stratokles, passed a decree to set up gold statues of Antigonos and Demetrios in a chariot, near Harmodios and Aristogeiton, and to crown them both at a cost of two hundred talents, and to establish an altar and call it “the altar of the Saviours”; and to add to the ten tribes two more, Demetrias and Antigonis.”

After Greece was incorporated into the Roman Empire, Brutus and Cassius were hailed as the tyrant-slayers after the assassination of Julius Caesar in 44 BCE, and they were also awarded with an honorary sculpture in the agora. Dio Cassius stated, “The Athenians also voted them bronze statues beside the statue of Harmodios and the statue of Aristogeiton, on the ground that they had emulated these men.” The date in which the sculptures of Brutus and Cassius went up can be approximated to within a specific range of time. In 42 BCE, Brutus and Cassius were defeated at the Battle of Philippi by Octavian and Marc Antony. The date in which the statues were put up can be placed between 44 BCE and 42 BCE. These golden statues are now lost, but they must have stood in the agora near the statues of the Tyrannicides. These literary sources provide evidence as to where these sculptures stood and how much emphasis was placed on their importance in the ancient world.
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In 1954, a set of plaster casts were found at Baiae on the Campanian coast of Italy. There were many pieces found, and some of the casts match extant Roman marble sculptures which were copies of Greek originals. Some of the casts, for example, represent the Sciarra and Mattei Amazons, discussed in the next chapter. Another is a part of a head of Aristogeiton (Fig. 23) from the Tyrannicides. These casts are likely from those of molds used in the making of bronze sculptures, and it was possible to reuse them for later bronze reproductions. The head of Aristogeiton has a sufficient portion of the right side of his face preserved. In the 1960s, Richter and a colleague were given permission to study the plaster casts, and she had reasoned by comparison with the copies that the face was part of the head of Aristogeiton. This plaster cast preserved engraved hairs of the beard of Aristogeiton; these hairs are so delicate that it is probable that they reproduce the hairs as they were cut into the wax model from the production of a bronze sculpture. The copies and cast help in understanding the original sculptures in their composition and style.

---

Arrangement of Tyrannicides

In addition to problems of style and pose, there is a debate as to the arrangement of Harmodios and Aristogeiton. Many scholars are in favor of various compositions of the Tyrannicides, and the most popular arrangements are as follows, in order of popularity: Abreast, Wedge-Shaped, “Panathenaic,” “Buschor,” In One Plane, and On Separate Bases. Many scholars have based their decisions on what they have seen in the physical evidence or chosen an arrangement based on aesthetic basis. Unfortunately there is no ancient literary evidence to suggest the composition in which the Tyrannicides were arranged. However, the line from Aristophanes, “Shoulder to Shoulder with Aristogeiton,” can be used to support the theory that the Tyrannicides could have been standing back-to-back or chest-to chest and were life-size or slightly over life-size. These must be the possible arrangements of the Tyrannicides if one is to stand “Shoulder to Shoulder with Aristogeiton.” The only direct evidence is a base fragment with part of the name of Harmodios inscribed that was found in the Agora. The statues themselves support a chest-to-chest arrangement. Brunnsåker writes of the marble copies and the slight asymmetry in the faces, and this could suggest that Harmodios and Aristogeiton were meant to be seen from a certain angle.

Another issue facing scholars is the possibility that one figure was placed slightly in front of the other. Shefton asserts that the two heroes are meant to be side by side, and they are each in an attacking pose based on their natures. Harmodios is using the butcher’s blow due to his age and inexperience, and Aristogeiton being the more mature and experienced warrior thrusts with his sword and puts the other arm forward to use in protection. This point that Shefton makes

---
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is supported by both physical and aesthetic evidence. It is also possible that they are depicted in this arrangement due to the nature of their relationship. The other popular figure arrangement is that of the wedge shape, where the figures are not parallel with each other. This particular arrangement allows the figures to cast glances at one another without stretching their necks or looking backwards. The back-to-back arrangement would be illogical for it appears that Harmodios would likely injure Aristogeiton in his attack. 122 This particular arrangement was adopted by the Naples Museum for H1 and A1. Based on the logic of the attack, it would seem likely that the two heroes should be placed facing one another. They are both in different striking positions, and it would be reasonable for the heroes to face each other as they struck their enemy down. The literary evidence from Thucydides and Aristotle pointing out the revenge motive would certainly substantiate this chest-to-chest arrangement of figures. The arrangement of figures can be observed on painted vases, but various arrangements of Harmodios and Aristogeiton were depicted.

Conclusions on Tyrannicides

Through the literary sources, Roman copies, and other media scholars can develop an understanding of what the original Tyrannicide sculptures looked like, especially with the sculptures of Kritios and Nesioites. To what extent Kritios and Nesioites replicated Antenor’s copy is unclear, or even if it was copied. The vases and relief sculpture have given the most information towards the composition, as well as an insight to the importance of Harmodios and Aristogeiton to the Athenian people.

---
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Chapter 4: The Amazons

Similar to the Roman copies of the Tyrannicides, the Amazons described in Pliny’s *Natural History* survive in a number of copies. As in the chapter of the Tyrannicides, I outline the scholarship of the Amazon group focusing on the Roman copies with connections to literary sources and other sculptures. First, and most importantly, Pliny wrote a passage describing a fifth century BCE competition between the master sculptors of the time, and the competition of who could create the best Amazon. Like most freestanding sculptures at this time, the Amazons would have originally been made of bronze. Four extant types have generally been accepted by scholars as belonging to the group. The types consist of two that bear spears and two that are resting their arms on pillars. The three types with multiple copies, Mattei, Capitoline, and Lansdowne, inspire greater confidence in Pliny’s account because of their higher quality and greater number of copies.¹²³ Only one copy of the fourth type, the Doria Pamphili, is known. There has been continuous debate amongst scholars about which artist should be credited with each of the four Amazon types. In addition, the discovery of a probable fifth Amazon type came into discussion in the middle of the twentieth century. In the following pages, the competition, location, and various attributions are discussed through ancient literary sources and physical evidence.

In Greek mythology, the Amazons were known to be fierce warrior women as well as skilled hunters located in the western part of Anatolia. Although there is debate about the real models for Amazon women in the ancient world, for my purposes, I will continue to refer only to their mythology, not the discussion of their existence. The Amazons were known to worship Artemis, the virgin goddess of the hunt.¹²⁴ According to the myths, the Amazons interacted with

¹²³ Ridgway 1974, 4.
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males only in battle and to produce children. To distinguish themselves as Amazons, the women reportedly had their right breast removed to draw back a bow better. Numerous times, the Amazons came into contact with the Greeks, as well as specific heroes. In these mythological stories, the engagements with the Amazons became a requirement for most Greek heroes. In the *Iliad*, the Amazons fought on the side of the Trojans, and as these women were meant to be seen as barbaric, they tend to lose against the “civilized” Greeks. During the Trojan War, Achilles fought Penthesilea, Queen of the Amazons. At the moment when he plunged his spear into her side, the two fell in love, as seen on this black-figure vase by Exekias (Fig. 24).

Herakles also came into contact with the Amazons during his Twelve Labors. His task was to acquire the girdle of Hippolyta, given to her by Ares.

---

125 Larson 2009, 34. The Amazons were known as the “Anti-Greeks.” Because there were no males of significance in the Amazon society, the Greeks considered the Amazons a “monstrous inversion of social norms.” Greek heroes fought the Amazons to reaffirming their patriarchal roles and male superiority over females.
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Another hero who came into contact with the Amazons was Theseus. The Amazons were defeated in a battle against Theseus and the Athenians after Theseus kidnapped Antiope, sister to the Amazon queen Hippolyta. It has been suggested by Lehmann-Hartleben that the defeated Amazons fled to the location of Ephesos. The myth of the Amazons who, defeated in battle, fled to the sanctuary of Ephesos, is the first mythical example of protection in a sacred asylum.\(^{130}\)

Ephesos, in western Turkey, was a city dedicated to Artemis and the Amazons. A major temple to Artemis stood in this city, and it was believed that it was the Amazons, faithful worshippers of Artemis, who founded the sanctuary. The Temple of Artemis at Ephesos was a well-known place of protection. The place where a person took refuge was generally at the altar, where sacrifices to the deity took place.\(^{131}\) Therefore the altar would likely be a location for wounded and resting Amazons to be the natural decoration.

**Ancient Accounts**

Competitions among artists were not unusual in the ancient world. There are many literary sources that document such competitions. Pliny, for example, wrote of a competition between Alkamenes and Agorakritos to create a statue of Aphrodite in which the Athenian citizens gave the deciding vote.\(^{132}\) A much later source, the twelfth century Byzantine writer, Tzetzes, wrote of a contest between Pheidias and Alkamenes, and Pheidias was named the victor of this competition.\(^{133}\)

The story of the competition of the Amazons is particularly well known. In Pliny’s account, the ancient writer cites five sculptors, though some translators give the number as four instead. Polykleitos, Pheidias, Kresilas, and Phradmon were all named in conjunction with the

---
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competition, but there has been disagreement about the participation of a fifth sculptor, Kydon.\textsuperscript{134} Pliny's original passage states that there were five sculptors in the competition:

The most celebrated of these artists, though born at different epochs, have joined in a trial of skill in the Amazons which they have respectively made. When these statues were dedicated in the Temple of Diana (Artemis) at Ephesos, it was agreed, in order to ascertain which was the best, that it should be left to the judgment of the artists themselves who were then present: upon which, it was evident that that was the best, which all the artists agreed in considering as the next best to his own. Accordingly, the first rank was assigned to Polykleitos, the second to Pheidias, the third to Kresilas, the fourth to Kydon, and the fifth to Phradmon.\textsuperscript{135}

Lehmann-Hartleben argued that “Kydon” refers to the region from which Kresilas hailed, while others, like Ridgway, accept “Kydon” as a competitor.\textsuperscript{136} The order of sculptors reads: “Polykelitos, Pheidias, Kresilas, Kydon, and Phradmon.” The discovery of a fifth Amazon type excavated in Ephesos in 1898 leads to Ridgway’s defense of the original interpretation of Pliny’s text. She also states that Kydon was a proper name in ancient Greece, and Pliny’s information should be accepted as a whole.\textsuperscript{137} Richter suggests that if one discounts Pliny’s account, then they must also consider the story of the Ephesian Amazons as an imaginary anecdote. She suggests this to be arbitrary, and so one must consult the original ancient text to reinterpret it as it was communicated in antiquity.\textsuperscript{138} Furtwängler used the translation citing only four sculptors, but there were four types known at the time. Therefore Kydon should be accepted as a sculptor.\textsuperscript{139} The Amazon types are very similar in conception and dress, and are identical in measurements, and subsequently reflect characteristics belonging to artworks created in the same period.\textsuperscript{140} For the purposes of this study, the fifth sculptor will be accepted and used for the five extant Amazon types.
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Types

Like all mythological gods and heroes, the Amazons also had characteristics to identify them as Amazons. Females were generally not represented in the nude until the Aphrodite of Knidos (Fig. 25) created in the fourth century. Females could, however, exhibit some nudity under conditions of stress or rapid movement.141 The most identifying characteristic of an Amazon is a single breast exposed. Amazons are also shown wearing a short belted chiton to allow for movement in battle. As stated above, the Amazons have similar styles, composition, and have the same measurements. In this section, I will discuss and analyze the five Amazon types; the first two discussed are the spear-bearing Amazons. These two Amazons were mentioned in literary sources, therefore creating possible attributions to the sculptors. There are two Amazons leaning on spears, and these are generally attributed as belonging to the work of Pheidias and Kresilas.142 After the spear-bearers, the two Amazons leaning on pillars will be discussed and these are followed by the newest type, the Ephesian Amazon.

Mattei

The first of the four Amazons to be discussed is the Mattei type (Fig. 26- Fig. 27), generally attributed to Pheidias. The Mattei type has always been found headless and is the least well known of the three types that exist in multiple copies.143 The pose of this type is the most complex and active relative to the other types and was meant to be seen in the round.144 Her weight is placed on the right leg, leaving the left leg at rest and bent at the knee as to take a step. The Mattei type clutches the spear with two hands with one arm raised above her head. The Amazon is depicted wearing a chitoniskos, a short belted chiton, with one breast exposed.
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Fig. 25. (Left) Aphrodite of Knidos by Praxiteles. C. 350 BCE. Romany copy. Marble.

Fig. 26. (Below left) Mattei Amazon. C. 430? Roman copy. Marble

Fig. 27. (Below right). Mattei Amazon. C. 430? From Hadrian’s Villa in Tivoli.
Although the literary sources, mention that Pheidias created an Amazon, the known works of Pheidias include only images of the gods. Furtwängler first made the attribution to Pheidias based on an account cited in a text by Lucian. His theory was challenged and later accepted again. Richter accepted the attribution of the Mattei type to Pheidias, and Ridgway has also stated that she accepted the attribution.

As previously mentioned, Lucian made a reference that indicates the Mattei type was the work of Pheidias. In a conversation, “A Portrait Study,” between Lycinus and Polystratus, a discussion ensues regarding what features would be used to create the perfect female type. Lycinus asks Polystratus which work by Pheidias he considers the best. Polystratus responds: “Can you ask? – The Lemnian Athene, which bears the artist’s own signature; oh, and of course the Amazon leaning on her spear.” Lycinus responds, “…Pheidias and the Lemnian Athene will give the outline of the face, and the well-proportioned nose, and lend new softness to the cheeks; and the same artist may shape her neck and closed lips, to resemble those of his Amazon.”

This Amazon is unlike other representations of Amazons because this type has the left breast exposed instead of the right. If this Amazon were an archer, then she would have needed an unimpeded right arm. Ridgway stated that it was highly unusual to have a left-handed Amazon depicted in the classical world. Alternatively, the Amazon could have been a pendant to another, more traditionally portrayed Amazon where the right breast was exposed. Creating mirror-image types was not uncommon in antiquity, and the Romans greatly favored this technique.

---
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A lost gem, known as the Natter gem (Fig. 28), illustrates an Amazon holding a spear with both hands as if ready to vault onto a horse. Furtwängler suggested the possibility of the Mattei type preparing to vault onto her horse because the Amazons were “daring horsewomen.” There is a resemblance between the two works based on the gem engraving, the Mattei type’s arms and head can be reconstructed. A herm with an Amazon head found at Herculaneum may also add to the possible positioning of the head and arms of this type (Fig. 29). Although many scholars do not believe this type to represent a wounded Amazon, Boardman stated that the Mattei type is wounded in the left thigh. It is likely that Boardman relied on a Mattei type replica found in 1955 at Hadrian’s Villa in Tivoli to apply the attribute of a wound. This Amazon found in Tivoli, has blood plastically shown spurting out from the wound on her left thigh.

Fig. 28. (Left) Drawing of the Natter Gem (now lost) depicting the Mattei Amazon. 18th century.

Fig. 29. (Right) Head of an Amazon from a Herm. 1st century BCE. Bronze copy. Found at Villa Papyri at Herculaneum. Now in Naples.
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**Capitoline**

The other Amazon that leans on a spear is known as the Capitoline type (Fig. 30 and Fig. 31). In the past, it was attributed to the hand of Pheidias, but scholars today favor an attribution to either Kresilas or Polykleitos.\(^{153}\) I believe the Capitoline type to be the work of Kresilas as is suggested by Furtwängler, Eichler, Richter, Lehmann-Hartleben, and Ridgway.\(^{154}\) This Amazon type has been the only type unanimously accepted by scholars as wounded because she is lifting her garment up to reveal the wound.\(^{155}\) Like the Mattei, the Capitoline type is also wearing a shortened, belted chiton. The dress of this Amazon type, although it often differs considerably from copy to copy, has a common style, which bares a breast while wearing a shortened chiton.\(^{156}\) She also rests her weight on the left leg while the right leg is relaxed which gives the figure a slight contrapposto pose reminiscent of Polykleitos’ Doryphoros (Fig. 32). Of the four freestanding types, this type is the only one that places the weight on her left leg. The Capitoline type is revealing her right breast and raises her arm to show a wound. The Amazon holds the spear in her right hand, placing emphasis on the wounded right side. Holding the spear as she does, the pain would have been great for she stretches the wound open, however, her face does not indicate the pain that this position would have caused.

As noted, scholars have read Pliny’s text to mention a wounded Amazon created by Kresilas.\(^{157}\) The original reading of the name, however, reads “Ctesilaus,” creating some doubt.\(^{158}\) It is known from elsewhere in the *Natural History* that Kresilas created a *volneratus deficiens*, a wounded warrior; however, it is unsure whether he favored pathetic themes.
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Fig. 30. Capitoline Amazon. C. 440 BCE. Signed by copyist “Sosikles.” Roman copy. Marble. Now at Capitoline Museum, Rome.

Fig. 31. Capitoline Amazon. C. 440 BCE. Roman copy. Marble. Now at Capitoline Museum.

Fig. 32 Doryphoros by Polykleitos. C. 450-440. Roman Copy. Marble.
In Furtwängler’s *Masterpieces*, he separates the sections based on sculptors and the sculptures attributed to each artist. Of the five sculptors listed by Pliny only three of the artists believed to have created Amazons have sections in this book. In the sections dedicated to Kresilas and Polykleitos, an Amazon is listed and described among their works. However, in the section dedicated to Pheidias, no Amazon is listed among the works. These attributions put forth by Furtwängler have been influential in studying the Amazon types to this day.

To support the attribution of the Capitoline type to Kresilas further, Furtwängler compared the Amazon’s stylistic characteristics to those of a portrait of Perikles (Fig. 33). The Perikles sculpture, also only known through Roman copies, has been definitively attributed to the work of Kresilas. Furtwängler compared the eyes and stated that both sculptures had the same general shape described as “elongated and narrow with thick heavy lids.”\footnote{Furtwängler 1964, 135.} In this head of an Amazon (Fig. 34), the little folds around the eyelids, a detail from the original, which marks an element of style, are often lacking in most copies.\footnote{Ibid., 135.}
While the earlier scholars mention Kresilas as the attributed artist to the Capitoline type, Eichler and Frel, associated the style and wound of the Sciarra (Lansdowne) type to the work of Kresilas.

**Lansdowne/Berlin/Sciarra**

This Amazon type has numerous replicas and various names. For my purposes, I will refer to this type as the Lansdowne. The Lansdowne type leans her left arm on a pillar, as she rests her weight on the left leg (Figs. 35, 36, 37). Generally, when scholars see pillars incorporated into marble sculptures, they are an indication that the original sculpture was in bronze and that the pillar is a strut necessary in marble. Like the other types, the Amazon is wearing the shortened chiton, belted at the waist. Unlike the other Amazon types, the Lansdowne type has both breasts exposed. The type has often been attributed to the hand of Polykleitos, Richter however, suggests that the previous attribution of the Capitoline to Kresilas and this one are more uncertain and should be switched.¹⁶¹ Ridgway also asserts that her new attribution of the Lansdowne type to Kresilas has been discussed among scholars beginning during the second half of the twentieth century.

According to Furtwängler this Amazon type is one of the two Amazons that have generally been associated with having wounds.¹⁶² The Lansdowne type in Berlin shows a wound on the right side of the body, and Ridgway argued that the wound was an addition made by the copyist (Fig. 36). Ridgway stated that the wound here is not harmonious with the movement of the right arm, and that there is no wound indicated on the relief copy from Ephesos.¹⁶³

¹⁶¹ Richter 1955, 111.
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Fig. 35. (Above left) Lansdowne Amazon. C. 440 BCE. Roman Copy. Marble. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 36. (Above) Berlin (Sciarra) Amazon. C. 440 BCE. Roman Copy. Marble. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Antikensammlung.

Fig. 37. (Left) Sciarra Amazon. C. 440 BCE. Roman Copy. Marble. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.
Although there is a wound on the Amazon found in Berlin, the wound is not the most important part of the statue. The artistic interest lies in the composition of the figure.\footnote{Richter 1933, 4.}

Like the groups of the Tyrannicides and the Amazons, there are only small-scale copies left of the Athena Parthenos and her shield. The shield depicted an Amazonomachy on the exterior and a Gigantomachy on the interior, but for my purposes I will be focusing on the Amazonomachy. The best evidence for the copies of this shield is the Strangford shield located in the British Museum (Fig. 38). Although the upper left portion of the shield is missing, the shield can be reconstructed through other lesser copies (Fig. 39). The two Amazons at the bottom of the shield have been defeated and are posed as defeated. The arm up over the head is an indicator of death and defeat. Much like these two Amazons on the shield, the Lansdowne Amazon also has her arm raised over her head, but she is standing up. It is known that this Lansdowne Amazon is wounded, and the sign of her arm over her head could suggest impending death.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig38.png}
\caption{Strangford Shield. Copy of Shield by Pheidias. Athena Parthenos. Now at British Museum in London.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig39.png}
\caption{Reconstruction of the Shield by Evelyn Harrison.}
\end{figure}
The Lansdowne type and the Capitoline type were the two most frequently copied types in antiquity.\cite{Ridgway 1974, 8} Due to the frequency of these copies, scholars believe that one mostly like should be attributed to Polykleitos. Richter also attributed this type to Polykleitos and described it as having a “quiet pose and harmonious design.”\cite{Richter 1933, 4} These are qualities that have often been used to describe the Doryphoros and Diadoumenos, both works known to be by Polykleitos. Ridgway believed that this relief found at Ephesos, possibly from an altar, represented the Lansdowne Amazon in a two-dimensional form, and it provided a confirmation for the presence of a support pillar in the original bronze work (Fig. 40).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Amazon_Relief.jpg}
\caption{Amazon Relief. Part of Altar? Found in 1900 in Ephesos.}
\end{figure}
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The pillar would not have been needed in a relief sculpture because the figures were already incorporated into the stone and would not need the support. This relief was discovered in 1900 among debris among a paved road in Ephesos.\textsuperscript{167} Through excavation at the temple site, the foundations of a large altar were discovered, and also the same kind of architectural fragments were found near the altar and the site of the relief.\textsuperscript{168}

Eichler attributed the Lansdowne type to Kresilas.\textsuperscript{169} As mentioned above, Frel also attributed the Lansdowne type to the hand of Kresilas. There are a few similarities between the wounded warrior, thought to be a copy of a prototype by Kresilas in the Metropolitan Museum in New York (Fig. 41) and that of the Amazon in Copenhagen (Fig. 37) as noted by von Bothmer.
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The treatment of the drapery is very similar in both sculptures, and the proportions appear to be the same. The workmanship suggests that these two sculptures were executed before the middle of the second century CE. Frel states that the warrior is leaning on the spear precisely because he is wounded. He remarks that there is a horizontal incision on the dorsal half of the right armpit. This incision can only indicate a wound. It is thought that the incision went unnoticed by other scholars because it lacks the drops of blood in relief that were typical of wounds in ancient sculpture. The drops of blood on this statue were most likely painted on and have since disappeared. The Amazon in Copenhagen is leaning on a post, and she has a small incision near her right breast. This wound became standard on other copies of wounded Amazons, though most wounds were more detailed than this one. The Amazon certainly had painted drops of blood near the wound. The treatment of the drapery is very similar in both the Lansdowne type and the relief, and the proportions appear to be the same. Because of the possibility of the wounded warrior being attributed to Kresilas, similarities were found between the Lansdowne type and the wounded warrior. These similarities would help attribute the Lansdowne type to Kresilas.

**Doria Pamphili**

The fourth Amazon is known as the Doria Pamphili type (Fig. 42). There is only one copy of this type, and it was previously restored incorrectly as a representation of Artemis. Furtwängler was the first to make the attribution of the Doria Pamphili to the contest. The pose and style of this Amazon has been described as very similar to that of the Lansdowne type. There is a general agreement among scholars that the Doria Pamphili is the weakest example of
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the Amazons and can therefore be attributed as the work of Phradmon.\textsuperscript{173} However, while many scholars have dated the Doria Pamphili, the weakest type, to the work of Phradmon, Eichler left this work unattributed. He left the attribution open because there is only one extant copy and one copy of the new type.\textsuperscript{174} There are no other extant works by either Phradmon or Kydon.

The greatest difference between the Doria Pamphili and the previous three Amazons besides the fact that there is only a single copy, is that the chiton covers both breasts. Lehmann-Hartleben describes this type as harsh and decorative in style. Other scholars described the type as classicizing.\textsuperscript{175} In 1951, C.P. Sestieri argued that the Doria Pamphili statue was not one of the Ephesian Amazons, but rather a representation of Artemis, for the figure had both breasts covered and wore a short chiton as Artemis normally did.\textsuperscript{176} Sestieri did not deny the similarity between the Doria Pamphili and Lansdowne type, but he commented that the Doria Pamphili statue had no pillar and the head as restored did not belong on this statue.\textsuperscript{177} The head currently on the Doria Pamphili type does not have the serene, aloof expression as seen on fifth century Greek sculpture, but rather a pensive and solemn expression. Ridgway stated that Sestieri’s theory did not take into account that the pillar was most likely included when the copy of the Doria Pamphili was first made. I agree with Sestieri about the problem of the head because the other three Amazons types have very similar hairstyles with a middle part and gentle waves radiating out from the part.
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\textsuperscript{174} Eichler 1956-58, 7.  
\textsuperscript{175} Lehmann-Hartleben 1936, 10.  
\textsuperscript{176} Ridgway 1974,  
\textsuperscript{177} Sestieri 1951, 14.  
\textsuperscript{178} Ibid., 15.
Fig. 42. Doria Pamphili Amazon. Roman Copy. Marble.
**Ephesian**

The previous four Amazons have been universally accepted apart from Sestieri, but there has been a fifth Amazon added as part of the competition mentioned by Pliny.\(^{178}\) This Amazon type was not found as a freestanding sculpture, but as a part of a pillar executed in high relief decorating a Roman theatre among paving stones in Ephesos (Fig. 43).\(^{179}\) The new type was found at Ephesos in 1898, but nothing was published on it until Eichler’s discussion in 1956-58. This new type belongs to the Ephesian group based on the following characteristics put forth by Richter. The relief has the fifth century style and it was found at Ephesos, now held in the Kunsthistorische Museum in Vienna.\(^{180}\) The Ephesian Amazon rests the weight of her body on the right leg, with the arm lowered. Like the Doria Pamphili, the chiton covers both breasts.\(^{181}\) With the addition of a fifth type, Pliny’s account of five sculptors and five sculptures is confirmed.\(^{182}\)

Previously held at the British Museum, a part of an Amazon head (#1239) (Fig. 44) fits into the piece of the Ephesian Amazon, now held in the Kunsthistorische Museum in Vienna.\(^{183}\)

It was believed that the head in the British Museum was a copy of the Capitoline type, but now due to its fit into the Ephesian type it is known to be part of the recently discovered Ephesian type.\(^{184}\) Eichler provided the necessary foundations to pursue the role for the Ephesos Amazon in the competition recounted by Pliny. He left the Amazon up for question and discussion. Eichler believed this Ephesian Amazon to be a variant of the Capitoline type. This Amazon was created in Roman times as decoration for the theatre.\(^{185}\) However, Hartswick argued that the similarities
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between this type and the Capitoline are too great and that it is unlikely that they are two separate types.186 However, I tend to believe that the Ephesian type is not a variant of the Capitoline because both breasts are covered, and there is no indication of a wound. There has never been an attribution of the Ephesian Amazon to a sculptor because there is no definite way of knowing whether the Ephesian Amazon is a reproduction of Kydon’s or Phradmon’s Amazon. There is no evidence for either sculptor’s style. 187
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Issues Concerning the Style of Amazons

While many scholars accept the Amazons as a part of a fifth century competition as well as the usual attributions, Ridgway does not. Her approach led her to place the Amazons in different periods based on style and composition. Although the Mattei type has traditionally been attributed to Pheidias, Ridgway believes this type to be considerably later than the others and therefore not part of the Ephesian group. Her suggestion of a later date is particularly supported by the movement of the torso. The composition of the Mattei type creates a “quasi-spiraling effect” through the right arm crossing over the head to the left side, and the weight of the figure is supported by the right leg.\textsuperscript{188} This pose that was not seen until the fourth-century.\textsuperscript{189} This combined with the tilt of the shoulders and contrapposto of the hips, creates the spiraling effect that Ridgway proposed. Based on the fourth century style seen in this type, Ridgway proposed new dates and possible dedications of Amazons to Ephesos. She suggested that the Mattei type was dedicated in the fourth century by Alexander the Great. Had Alexander made a dedication at Ephesos, however, there would have likely been a mention of it in the literary record. There were omissions by ancient writers, and it could be that the citizens of Ephesos preferred to recall the rejection of Alexander’s offer than a dedication.\textsuperscript{190}

Ridgway also argued that based on style, the Lansdowne and Doria Pamphili types were created in the first century BCE but inspired by fifth century prototypes.\textsuperscript{191} She believed that these Amazon types were a “classicizing” creation, created by a Greek artist from Asia Minor. The gesture of the right arm was a popular gesture after the fourth century.\textsuperscript{192} The pose of the Amazon resting on the pillar suggests “lassitude,” indicating that she has just finished a battle.

\textsuperscript{188} Ridgway 1974, 5.
\textsuperscript{189} Ibid., 5.
\textsuperscript{190} Ibid., 15.
\textsuperscript{191} Ibid., 16.
\textsuperscript{192} Ibid., 16.
The resting pose also implies the wound, and we can assume that this type is for a Hellenistic or Roman audience. She also suggests that like the Mattei, the Lansdowne and Doria Pamphili types were also dedicated to Ephesos by a ruler in the Mediterranean. Augustus is known to have been involved with rebuilding parts of the Artemision, such as a new temenos wall. The dedication of the two Amazons was possibly connected to his reforms and associated with the religious aspect. The only Amazon type that Ridgway believed is a true fifth century copy is the Capitoline type. Pliny's account of the competition of the Amazons is called into question by Ridgway based on her finds of the style of the extant Amazons.

**Arrangement on Base**

In addition to the various possibilities and disagreements for the attributions of the Amazon types, the arrangement of the types on a tentative base also provides debate. Lehmann-Hartleben raised the issue of the original position and interrelation of the four Ephesian Amazons because of the exact repetition of the Lansdowne and Doria Pamphili types. Due to the similarity between the two types, repetition would be out of line with the balance of fifth century sculpture arrangement. Lehmann-Hartleben placed the spear-bearing Amazons at either end of the base with the two resting on pillars in the middle. Based on the attributions given by Lehmann-Hartleben, the base would not have placed the Amazons in the winning order. Furtwängler, on the other hand, placed the Amazons on the base based on the order given by Pliny, and he inserted his attributions. The Amazons resting on pillars would have been at either end, the order from left to right: Lansdowne, Mattei, Capitoline, and lastly the Doria Pamphili. Ridgway also put forth her placement of the Amazons regardless of the story order that Pliny
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gave, reading left to right the Amazons were placed as follows: Capitoline, Lansdowne, Mattei, Doria Pamphili, and the Ephesian Amazon. Because the attributions are unknown and the story was challenged by Ridgway, it is difficult to make an accurate placement of the Amazons.

**Conclusions on Amazons**

In conclusion, the attributions can be seen as somewhat clear, but there are many open-ended avenues of re-attributing the Amazon types to the sculptures. There was little sense of intellectual property or plagiarism in antiquity, so there could be multiple examples of similar sculptures created by different sculptors. Based on the various attributions discussed, I find that the attribution of sculptures to sculptors from the fifth century is fantastical. Based on the current evidence, I am unconvinced of Pliny’s account of a competition between five sculptors, two whose work is previously unknown to scholars. Perhaps with new discoveries, particularly examples of the Doria Pamphili or Ephesian type Amazons, Pliny’s account could be considered more credible. Ridgway’s argument based on style, shows that these sculptures would not have been created at the same time. She also reminds that Roman copies are not true copies or variants of Greek prototypes, but rather new originals, paraphrasing the styles of major Greek sculptors.
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Chapter 5: Conclusion

Through the study of Roman copies, scholars are given a glimpse of what original Greek sculptures looked like. The few original Greek sculptures that still survive today show scholars what was indicative of a certain period through popular medium, technique, iconography, and style. Another issue concerning Roman copies is the fact that these sculptures, lost originals as well as copies, have been found out of context. Ancient writers as well as modern scholars were and are seeing these works of art out of their original context. With this new understanding of copies proposed by Ridgway and Bieber, one can understand that Roman copies are not true copies. They are works that emulate the sculptures of the masters of the fifth century.

Ancient literary sources provide accounts of the writers’ interpretations of the works of art and how the sculptures were received and viewed in the ancient world. It is unfortunate that these sources do not provide scholars with descriptions of the sculptures. It is through descriptions of their placement and prominence in fictional works, that scholars can understand the impact that the sculptures had on the ancient world.

Connoisseurship, although useful for establishing artists to vase painting from antiquity, does not provide concrete attributions for sculptures to the masters. While connoisseurship has been useful in attributing unknown Renaissance paintings to artists as well as artists to ancient Greek vase painting, it is exceedingly more difficult to use this technique with regard to Roman copies. I believe that connoisseurship could be useful to a certain extent, however inconsistencies follow. As I have discussed, connoisseurship uses details, such as hands and ears, however, the original sculptures are lost and copies often lack the details needed for this technique. This branch of art history has been pushed towards the background of the field because the focus has moved from attributions to iconography and context. Art history is a
changing field, and art historians are no longer solely focused on the works of art, but the context surrounding the objects.

This study of the historiography of the Tyrannicides and the Amazon group provides insight into how copies and other objects are researched and about how they have been written. Through the study of the Tyrannicides, it is clear that these sculptures were popular in the ancient world. There are various copies and fragments, some in better condition than others. The copies have provided indications of the similar poses. However, due to incorrect restorations the poses can be slightly varied. The images seen on vase paintings depicting the Tyrannicides are most useful for reconstructing their distinctive poses. Harmodios currently has his right arm extended up, but the arm should be extended up and back behind his head. This pose is provided by the evidence from the vases, such as the Red-Figure oinochoe from the grave of Dexileos and the Panathenaic Amphora.

It is unclear if the Roman copies of the Tyrannicides reflect the work of Antenor or Kritios and Nesioites. Also, scholars do not know if Kritios and Nesioites copied Antenor’s set, and if they did, to what extent? What scholars do know is that Antenor was working around the late fifth century BCE. The assumption can be made that the musculature of Antenor’s Harmodios and Aristogeiton would have likely reflected kouroi created during this time. If the so-called “Kritios Boy” is used as an indication of the new style emerging, then the Tyrannicides of Kritios and Nesioites would have echoed a more naturalistic rendering of the bodies. The generic types of an older bearded male and youthful male would still be used during the time of Kritios and Nesioites. The Roman copies of the Tyrannicides emulate the known Early Classical style, and based on this assumption, the Roman copies can be attributed to Kritios and Nesioites.

Like the Tyrannicides, the Amazons were popular subjects to copy. Because of the various types of Amazons, it is easy to conclude that Pliny’s account must have some basis in fact.
However, this source was written 400-500 years after the competition, and like all accounts passed down, it too could have been altered. Although many scholars have attributed these Amazons to the account of the competition mentioned by Pliny, the differences in style and century argued by Ridgway bring the account into doubt.

Currently scholars are not able to provide definite attributions to any of the five sculptors mentioned by Pliny. What scholars do know is understood through the Roman copies. As seen on the Mattei type Amazon, only one of the copies, the one from Hadrian’s Villa, has a wound on her thigh. The belief for the motive of this Amazon is not one being wounded but rather her vaulting onto her horse. The Capitoline is the only Amazon that has been generally accepted by scholars as being a copy of a fifth-century original, and her wound is clearly seen on various copies. Because the Ephesian type has often been described as stylistically similar to the Capitoline type, it is believed that the Ephesian type can also date to the fifth century BCE. Ridgway has been the only scholar to put forth the argument that the Lansdowne and Doria Pamphili types date to the first century CE. Based on the evidence, I cannot give a definite date to these Amazons.

Roman copies provided necessary information in understanding Greek sculpture, particularly to the Tyrannicides and the Amazon Group. The copies have dispelled the notion that Roman artists were not unique with regards to their art. The Romans were selective in choosing which Greek sculptures were to be copied, and it appears, based on the evidence I provided in previous chapters, that exact copies were not important to the Roman sculptural theme. Through examination of the copies scholars understand that the copyists did take artistic license with the sculptures, but the extent that such liberties were taken is unclear. Though there is no way to fully comprehend the style, pose, and composition of the lost originals, through study of the Roman copies scholars can understand the basic motivation of the originals. I believe that Ridgway best articulated the issue of copies: “...we shall no longer speak of Roman
copies of a Greek original, but of Roman originals in Greek style.”\textsuperscript{199} There are numerous Roman sculptures, which scholars cannot certainly attribute to being purely copies of Greek prototypes. Because it is difficult to ascertain the specific Roman characteristics, Roman statues should be seen as emulating the Greek style. Through this study, I have conveyed how the Roman copies of the lost originals, the literary references that provide accounts of these works, and the other media that depict the Tyrannicides and the Amazon Group aid in interpreting these copies in antiquity.
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