UNITY AND DIVERSITY IN GREEK ART:
ATHENIAN INFLUENCES IN THE PELOPONNESE AND IN MACEDONIA*

By Olga Palagia

Summary: Athenian art was more or less dominant in the visual culture of the Greek world in the classical period but not in all areas. We explore here the influence of Athens on the art and architecture of regions that had developed their own local traditions. This happened in times of crisis, political as well as social. Such crises can be detected in the last decades of both the fifth and the fourth centuries BCE. We will begin by examining the impact of the Peloponnesian War on the artistic development of Arcadia and Laconia and conclude with the aftermath of the Macedonian conquest of Athens after the Lamian War. It appears that in the last twenty years of the fourth century the Macedonians hired Attic masons to reproduce Athenian buildings in Macedonia, and the ban on luxurious grave monuments imposed on Athens by Demetrios of Phaleron drove Athenian artists to emigrate to Macedonia.

We begin with the Peloponnesian War. After the conclusion of the disastrous Sicilian expedition, in the last decades of the fifth century, Athens suffered an exodus of artists and intellectuals who could not find gainful employment at home. Iktinos, the architect of the Parthenon, was said by Pausanias (8.41.7-9) to have built the temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassai near Phigalia in Arcadia. This major temple was erected in a remote corner of the Peloponnesian War. Pausanias admired its magnitude and expense, remarking that it had marble roof tiles instead of clay. Apollo's epithet, Epikourios, he adds, indicates that he had saved the Phigalians from the plague during the Peloponnesian War, just as he had saved the
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Athenians in the same period, except that the Athenians named him Alex-ikakos. Finally, Pausanias remarks that Iktinos’ employment suggests a connection between Phigalia and Athens.

The Bassai temple is now dated to the last decades of the fifth century. Iktinos’ involvement has been doubted by some scholars but the combination of Doric and Ionic elements in the architectural design and the Parthenonian overtones detected in the architectural sculptures betray Athenian hands at work. Although both the Parthenon and the Apollo temple are Doric, they include an Ionic sculptured frieze running around the cella. These friezes were of limited visibility since the Parthenon frieze was outside the cella but within the colonnade of the pteron, and the Bassai frieze was inside the cella. The articulation of the interior of the Bassai temple by means of an engaged Ionic colonnade supported by flaring bases is a major innovation; so too is the single Corinthian column placed in front of the back wall of the cella (Fig. 1). The interior design of the Bassai temple deviates from the norm, showing disregard of current rules. We get the impression that the remoteness of the temple allowed the architect to take liberties that he would not have attempted in Athens.

The same can be said of the style of the Bassai frieze. Its exuberance transcends the carefully balanced compositions of high classical assemblages. But before we proceed with the novelties, let us see if we can detect Athenian masons at work here, Athenian masons, moreover, who had worked on the Parthenon sculptures. If we take a look at the battle of Greeks and centaurs, we observe that the centaurs have a tuft of hair growing out of the horses’ backs (Fig. 2), a peculiar trait invented for the centaurs on the south metopes of the Parthenon (Fig. 3). In addition, the centrepiece of the battle of Greeks and amazons showing Herakles fighting the amazon queen (Fig. 4), draws on the confrontation of
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1 The Bassai temple has been studied in detail by Cooper 1996a and 1996b.
2 Iktinos’ involvement in the Bassai temple is advocated by Cooper 1996a: 369-79.
4 The frieze is fully illustrated in Hofkes-Brukker & Mallwitz 1975; Felten 1984: pl. 46.
6 E.g., south metope 1 in the Acropolis Museum, Brommer 1979: pl. 9.
Athena with Poseidon in the middle of the west pediment of the Parthenon (Fig. 5). The two adversaries form the so-called heroic diagonal, retreating in the face of the enemy while looking back at him. The Amazonomachy of the Bassai frieze echoes parts of the shield of Pheidias’ Athena Parthenos. The Bassai amazon attempting to lift her comrade from the battlefield is inspired by a similar group of Greek warriors on the shield, as we can see on a miniature copy of the shield in the Patras Museum.

Even though the Bassai frieze reflects images of the Parthenon created over 20 years earlier, its composition has shed the constraints of high classical art. In contrast to the carefully balanced battle scenes of the Nike temple, for example, the fighters on the Bassai frieze adopt dramatic gestures, and this effect is enhanced by an abundance of flying or stretched draperies and graphic anatomical details. What we see here is Athenian masons transplanted to the wilderness of Arcadia.

But the art of Athens seems to have managed to penetrate the heartland of the Peloponnese as well. Lacedaemonian artists had developed strong ties with East Greece, spearheaded by Bathykles of Magnesia, who created the throne of Apollo at Amyklai in the mid-sixth century. After the great earthquake of about 463, which triggered a helot revolt, art and architecture in Laconia came to a standstill, only to be resumed after the defeat of Athens in the Peloponnesian War. With the spoils of Athens, the Spartan general Lysander dedicated a number of sculptural monuments in the sanctuaries of Apollo at Amyklai and Delphi and in the sanctuary of Zeus in Sparta, thanking the gods for his good fortune. Lysander’s victory monuments revived the arts in Laconia. He was careful, however, to employ artists mainly from the Peloponnes. This is documented by Pausanias’ descriptions and by the epigraphical testimony for

8 As illustrated in the drawing of 1674 by an artist commonly identified with Jacques Carrey (but see Palagia 2022: 53 n. 4 for an alternative identification), Palagia 1993: fig. 3.
11 Illustrated in Felten 1984: pl. 47.
12 Paus. 3.18.9-16.
13 Thuc. 1.101.2.
14 On Lysander’s cultural policies, see Bommelaer 1981: 7-23.
none of these sculptures has come down to us. The bronze group known as Lysander’s naval commanders commemorating his victory at Aigos Potamoi in 405 and erected at Delphi shortly thereafter, was created by artists of the School of Polykleitos of Argos, named by Pausanias and additionally documented by several signed statue bases.\(^{15}\) The exception was Theokosmos of Megara, an associate of Pheidias, who made the portrait of Hermon of Megara, captain of Lysander’s flagship. A second memorial to Aigos Potamoi also dedicated to Apollo, this time at Amyklai, included a statue of Aphrodite by the master Polykleitos himself, as well as a statue of Sparta personified, made by Aristandros of Paros.\(^{16}\) This artist is otherwise unknown and we do not know if he was affiliated to the School of Argos or that of Athens.

A clear allusion to Athenian art, however, can be detected in Lysander’s dedications on the acropolis of Sparta. Pausanias (3.18.4) saw two statues of Victory on top of eagles on the Stoa of Zeus Kosmetes, dedicated by Lysander from the spoils of his naval victories at Notion in 406 and Aigos Potamoi in 405. Victories stepping on eagles were very likely acroteria.\(^{17}\) Their iconography recalls the statue of Victory made by Paionios and dedicated in the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia by the Messenians and Naupaktians after 425, commemorating their victories in the Peloponnesian War as Athenian allies.\(^{18}\) Paionios was a native of Mende but his style is affiliated to Athenian art. He may indeed have been active in Athens, considering that he was commissioned with a victory monument by the allies of Athens. It may well be argued that Lysander’s twin statues of Victory were Sparta’s answer to Paionios’ Victory, and that Lysander deliberately set them up in a Zeus sanctuary because Paionios’ Victory celebrating the Athenian alliance stood in the Panhellenic sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia.

\(^{15}\) The monument was described by Pausanias 10.9.7-9. See also Plut. Lys. 18.1 and Mor. 395b and 397f. See Bommelaer 1981: 14-16, no. 15; Palagia 2009: 36-38 with nn. 48-51 on the sculptors; Bommelaer 2011; Bommelaer & Laroche 2015: 132-34, no. 109.

\(^{16}\) Paus. 3.18.7-8.

\(^{17}\) See also Bommelaer 1981: 9-10, no. 6.

A final note on the artistic revival initiated by Lysander and the impact of Athens on the art of Laconia is a fine relief in Parian marble now in the Sparta Museum (Fig. 6).\textsuperscript{19} It represents Apollo and Artemis about to offer a libation to an omphalos flanked by two eagles. Apollo stands on the left, wearing a \textit{chiton} and a \textit{himation} pinned on his left shoulder. He holds out a phiale in his right hand, while the fingers of his left hand are playing with the strings of his \textit{kithara}. Artemis stands on the right, pouring wine into Apollo’s phiale from an \textit{oinochoe} held in her right hand. She wears a transparent \textit{chiton} held by shoulder chords, and a \textit{himation} draped over her lower body. The \textit{omphalos} with the pair of eagles is an allusion to the Delphic \textit{omphalos}, Apollo therefore being characterised as Pythios. The god is dressed as a performer and is stylistically close to the citharode on south metope 17 of the Parthenon (Fig. 7).\textsuperscript{20} Artemis in her clinging dress can be compared to Artemis on two Attic reliefs dated around 410, a votive relief with Apollo, Leto and Artemis in the Athens National Museum,\textsuperscript{21} and a record relief from Brauron, decorating the accounts of Artemis Brauronia (Fig. 8).\textsuperscript{22}

The relief in Sparta is generally thought to be votive but is in fact a fragment of a larger unit. The toolmarks on its right side indicate that it was cut off from a larger block. The left side is broken off and it is not possible to examine its back as it is attached to the Museum wall. It may have been part of a statue base or a frieze. We simply do not know. At any rate, it is attributed to an Athenian sculptor and it is often compared to a fragmentary record relief in the Athens Epigraphical Museum, concerning the cult of Apollo in Athens.\textsuperscript{23} Even though the relief in the Epigraphical Museum includes the \textit{omphalos} flanked by eagles, the long and deeply cut draperies of the figures on either side of the \textit{omphalos} are distinctly different from those of Apollo and Artemis on the Spartan relief; there is, therefore, no question of duplication and there can be no stylistic comparison. The fact that the Spartan relief represents Apollo
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\textsuperscript{19} Sparta Museum 468, Goulaki-Voutira 2020.
\textsuperscript{20} Athens, Acropolis Museum, Palagia 2022: 59, fig. 3.
\textsuperscript{21} Athens National Museum 1389, Kaltsas 2002: 136, no. 262; Vikela 2015: 217-18, Tr 1, pl. 53.
\textsuperscript{22} Brauron Museum 1172, Lawton 1995: 118-19, no. 73, pl. 39.
\textsuperscript{23} Athens, Epigraphical Museum 5, Lawton 1995: 114-15, no. 67, pl. 35.
Pythios, on the other hand, is no surprise, as the Delphi oracle was notorious for its pro-Spartan stance during the Peloponnesian War. And we have already seen that Lysander’s dedications were mostly addressed to Apollo.

We now move on to the last quarter of the fourth century in order to examine the impact of Athenian art and architecture on Macedonia. In the turbulent years after the death of Alexander the Great in 323, Athens fell under the spell of the Macedonians of Antipater and soon thereafter of his successor, Polyperchon, who acted as regent and guardian of the kings Philip III Arrhidaios and Alexander IV from 319 to 317, when Athens was taken over by Cassander and Philip III was murdered by Olympias. It was in this short period of Polyperchon’s rule that an extraordinary building was dedicated in the sanctuary of the Great Gods on Samothrace, in the names of the joint kings Philip III and Alexander IV. This building has been studied in detail by Bonna Wescoat. It consists of a marble pavilion erected above a circular theatre area on the Eastern Hill of the sanctuary (Fig. 9). It was designed to face the pilgrims as they arrived at the sanctuary and its function was to shelter the kings while they attended the rituals enacted on the circular orchestra. Its visual impact was that of a propylon since the sanctuary did not in fact have a propylon at that point.

The association of Macedonian royalty with the mysteries of Samothrace is well documented by the literary sources. Philip II was not only an initiate but is in fact said by Plutarch to have met his future wife Olympias during attendance of the mysteries. According to Philostratos (VA 2.43), his son, Alexander the Great, dedicated an altar to the Great Gods of Samothrace at the limits of his empire on the Hyphasis River. The fact that Philip II’s other son, Philip III, and Alexander III’s son, Alexander IV, renewed the dynasty’s allegiance to the Samothracian mysteries is doc-

24 On Polyperchon’s regency, see Heckel 2016: 206-12.
26 Plut. Alex. 2.1; Lewis 1958: no. 193. For Philip II’s interest in the Samothracian mysteries, see also Curt. 8.1.26; Lewis 1958: no. 195.
27 Lewis 1958: no. 209.
umented by the dedicatory inscription on the epistyle blocks of the pavilion on the Eastern Hill. We can read the words ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ, and enough letters of the name Alexandros survive to restore the inscription as ΒΑΣΙΛΕ/ΙΣΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ/ΑΛ[ΕΞΑΝ]Δ[Ρ]/Ο[ΣΘΕΟΙΣΜΕΝ]/Α[ΛΟΙΣ].

The pavilion had a Doric hexastyle prostyle façade on the west side (Fig. 9), with steps that return near the antae, a shallow room and an Ionic porch at the back. The Doric façade, between the steps and the sima, was built of Pentelic marble, while the rest of the building was of marble from the neighbouring island of Thasos, which was used extensively in the sacred architecture of the sanctuary. The import of Pentelic marble seems to have been accompanied by Athenian masons, since the techniques of construction of the Pentelic façade follow Athenian prototypes, especially the double-T clamps fastening the blocks to one another. Wescoat points out that architectural details of this façade testify to additional influences from the Peloponnese, Thasos and Delphi, suggesting that the architect who designed the pavilion introduced his own personal touch. Nevertheless, the façade and proportions of the pavilion are very close to a contemporary Athenian building, the choregic monument of Nikias (Fig. 10), the foundations of which survive near the western parados of the theatre of Dionysos. The Athenian Nikias son of Nikodemos was a successful choregos of Elpenor by Timotheos, a boys’ dithyramb performed at the Dionysia of 320/19 as attested by its dedicatory inscription. Many blocks of this monument, including the inscribed epistyle, were incorporated into the so-called Beulé Gate of the Athenian Acropolis, created out of spolia in late antiquity. Since Nikias’ monument is precisely dated to shortly after 319, the pavilion on Samothrace can have only been constructed in the narrow margin between sometime
in 319 and the autumn of 317, when Philip III Arrhidaios was assassinated.\textsuperscript{34}

The Nikias Monument, in its turn, was inspired by the design of the east façade of the central wing of the Propylaia, built by Mnesikles on the Athenian Acropolis.\textsuperscript{35} Even though it pays tribute to its classical predecessor, its divergence from the original proportions and the modification of its function reach beyond the classical. The adaptation of the Nikias Monument to serve as a quasi propylon cum royal pavilion in a sanctuary in Macedonia demonstrates the resilience of Attic architecture. But most of all, it is a testimony of the Macedonian elite’s emulation of Athenian culture.

The Athenian masons who built the façade of the royal pavilion on Samothrace were not the only ones to seek employment in Macedonia. In 317, Demetrios of Phaleron was appointed by Cassander ruler of Athens. One of the first reforms he introduced was a ban on luxurious funerary monuments (as attested by Cicero, \textit{Leg.} 2.63-66, Demetrios of Phaleron, \textit{FGrHist} 228 fr. 9), and this obviously compelled several marble sculptors to emigrate in order to find employment elsewhere.\textsuperscript{36} Some of these sculptors made their way to Macedonia just as the veterans of Alexander’s army were returning from Asia laden with gold and ready to commission their own monumental tombs. Only a handful of monumental grave reliefs have come down to us from Macedonia, however. The best-preserved example is a sculptured marble anta (Fig. 11) that was reused to construct a marble sarcophagus inside Pella Tomb VI. This is a Macedonian tomb comprising a chamber and antechamber. The chamber contained three marble sarcophagi, assembled of spolia from two sculptured grave monuments. The tomb was excavated and published by Pavlos Chrysostomou.\textsuperscript{37} It is dated after 281 from a stamped Thasian amphora handle naming the magistrate Astyanax and found in the dromos of the tomb.\textsuperscript{38} The destruction of the grave reliefs prior to their reuse may be attributed to some disaster that befell the cemetery. The reliefs on the

\textsuperscript{34} On the date of Philip III’s death, see Wheatley 2015: 243-44.
\textsuperscript{35} Townsend 2003: 98; Wescoat 2017: 181.
\textsuperscript{36} On Demetrios of Phaleron’s ban, see Mikalson 1998: 59.
\textsuperscript{37} Chrysostomou 1999; Chrysostomou 2019: 587-707; Chrysostomou 2020.
\textsuperscript{38} Chrysostomou 2019: 613.
grave monuments were cut down to facilitate reuse. One grave monument consisted of a *naiskos* sheltering high relief slabs showing a horseman fighting two fallen adversaries. The figures are heavily damaged but their outlines are visible. Of the other grave monument only two sculptured antae have survived. On the best-preserved anta we can see parts of a single figure as well as traces of colour (Fig. 11). A second anta with a similar figure, heavily damaged, was re-employed in the same tomb. From the debris found in the tomb, Chrysostomou suggested that the antae belonged to a funerary *naiskos* of the late fourth century. There are several examples of such *naiskoi* in Athens and Attica. Two prominent examples come from the Kerameikos cemetery in Athens, the *naiskos* of Prokles and Prokleides and of Dionysios of Kollytos. Each one of them stands on a base and is topped by a pediment supported by pilasters. The names of the figures are inscribed on the epistyle. The *naiskos* of Prokles contains sculptured family members in high relief. The *naiskos* of Dionysios housed no sculptures but a painted image of Dionysios which has since faded.

The anta from Pella Tomb VI represents a youth in relief, between 14 and 18 years of age (Fig. 11). His height is about 1.48 m. He wears a short *chiton*, a large Macedonian *chlamys* fastened on his right shoulder, a *kau sia*, the Macedonian elite hat, and military boots. He leans against the anta on his left and his right hand is lowered by his side. The high quality of the relief is evident from the details of his finely carved hair. Traces of paint are visible on the figure and in the background.

Two questions arise: how do we reconstruct the original monument and what is the function of the two youths represented on the antae? The reconstruction proposed by the excavator with the relief antae placed on the sides and facing inward (Fig. 12) is uncanonical. Relief antae in Attic monuments are placed on the outside, as on a votive relief.

40 Chrysostomou 2019: 596-99, figs. 34-8, pls. 27-9.
42 Kerameikos P 690, Stroszeck 2017: 214-19, figs. 40.1 and 40.3.
from the Athenian Asklepieion. The form of this relief is unusual: a family of votaries approach Asklepios and his family who are shown in high relief and placed in a separate naïskos. The back wall of the naïskos is decorated with Hekate, wearing a polos and holding two torches (Fig. 13). The excavator suggested that the Pella naïskos held free-standing statues. This too is uncanonical. Very few funerary naïskoi with statues from Athens and Attica have come down to us and none has sculptured antae. They all have flat roofs supported by Ionic columns. A fine example of special interest to us here is the naïskos of Diogeiton and Hagno from Rhamnous. Hagno is a free-standing statue, and so is her maid, placed at her side. The maid is placed in a position similar to the Macedonian youth from the Pella tomb as reconstructed by Chrysostomou (Fig. 12), but she is free-standing, not in relief. This is how Athenian sculptors managed their funerary naïskoi at home. However, the sculptor who created the funerary monument reused in Pella Tomb VI, is no longer at home. Would he have made his own rules? Did he really place the relief antae facing inside? And did he fill the naïskos with statues? Or were the figures of the deceased painted in the background as in the Attic stele of Dionysios in the Kerameikos? We will never know.

Finally, a word on the function of the youths on the antae. The excavator has suggested that their equipment and young age point to royal pages. The institution of the royal pages was introduced to Macedonia by Philip II and continued down to the last king of Macedon, Perseus. Their function was to accompany the king at banquets and hunting expeditions and to stand guard outside his bedroom. The only other representation of royal pages known to me is on the banquet frieze of the Macedonian Tomb of Agios Athanasios, where they are shown in short chiton, Macedonian chlamys and boots, wearing a helmet or a kausia, and

44 Chrysostomou (2019: 601 n. 39) cites as parallel a funerary naïskos of the late fourth century from Tragilos, housing two statues. This naïskos, however, did not contain sculptured reliefs, see Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1983: 136-38.
47 Carney 2015.
carrying shields and spears. I have suggested elsewhere that their presence on the banquet frieze indicates that the banquet takes place in the royal court. If royal pages are indeed represented on the funerary monument from Pella, then it should be associated with a royal burial. We know that sometimes elite tombs in Macedonia were additionally decorated with marble reliefs placed outside. This is the case of the multi-chambered rock-cut tomb of Pella, which was decorated with the Hellenistic grave relief of Antigona, probably placed outside the tomb. Of course, we will never know if the grave *naiskos* with the royal pages stood outside a royal tomb in Pella but this remains a distinct possibility.

We conclude with the introduction of the handshake motif, common in Athenian grave reliefs, into Macedonian funerary painting. Attic grave reliefs often depict members of a family shaking hands in order to symbolize family unity beyond death. More often than not, one of the family members is seated. A fine example is the *naiskos* of Prokles and Prokleides mentioned earlier. Here father and son shake hands. The gesture does not signify a warrior’s departure or a reunion in the underworld but the unity of the family. Father and son shaking hands are also depicted in the large grave relief of Hierokles from Rhamnous, where Hierokles, shown seated, is attended by his daughter-in-law, two of his sons, a horse and a groom. A similar scene can be found in the painted pediment of the Macedonian tomb of Phoinikas in Thessaloniki, which dates from the end of the fourth century, shortly after the stele of Hierokles. The centre of the pediment is heavily damaged but we can make out a seated woman shaking hands with a standing man, followed by two more men and a horse. This quiet family scene is unique in the funerary painting of Macedonia and can be attributed to Athenian influence.

To sum up, in the closing years of the fifth and fourth centuries, we get glimpses of the art of Athens in areas like Arcadia, Laconia and Mac-

48 Palagia 2017b: 421 with n. 65, fig. 18.11.
49 Pella Museum, Lilimbaki-Akamati 2008: 212-13, pl. 15.
50 See n. 41 above.
52 Tsimbidou-Avroniti 2005: 49, pl. 4.
edonia, which were dominated by local artists or artists from other regions like East Greece or the Peloponnese. In most cases, Athenian influence can be attributed to the actual presence of Athenian artists, who were seeking employment away from home in times of crisis, thus enriching the local art scene with new motifs and techniques. It is worth noting, however, that Athenian artists operating away from home did not feel bound by community standards thus achieving relative freedom in artistic expression, as is evident from the exuberant style of the Bassai frieze.


FIGURES

7. Athens, Acropolis Museum. Parthenon south metope 17. From Palagia 2022, fig. 3.
11. Drawing of sculptured anta with a royal page from Pella Tomb VI. From Chrysostomou 1999, fig. 4.
12. Hypothetical reconstruction of funerary naiskos with sculptured anta. From Chrysostomou 1999, fig. 3.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dinsmoor, W.B. 1910. ‘The choragic monument of Nicias’ *AJA* 14, 459-84.