1 Introduction
Social unrest and even revolution, war, new foreign cults, exports and travel on a larger scale than ever before, prosperity in general and conspicuous wealth of a few—these describe Greece in the fourth century B.C., and they are, coincidentally, not unfamiliar characteristics of the recent past of western European history. The appearance of a plethora of studies of Greece of the fourth century B.C. over the last few decades can only reflect our familiarity with and sympathy for the issues of that century, which not a hundred years ago, and sometimes still today, was considered to mark the beginning of the end of classical Greek civilization, which had reached its apogee with the completion of the Parthenon in 432 B.C. Although such a value judgment may seem insensitive, the contemporary sympathy for the fourth century and the recent past’s condemnation of it may actually not be mutually exclusive. In 1943, Gerhard Rodenwaldt had already identified one of the principal difficulties in dealing with the art of the fourth century: it appears ambiguous and open to too great a range of subjective responses to fit neatly into the structures of modern scholarship. Rodenwaldt chronicled briefly the great swings between appreciation and denigration of fourth-century sculpture from the late nineteenth century to his time. We can add that it is not only the art of the fourth century that has experienced such strong vicissitudes, but the fourth century in all its aspects—literature, politics, trade, war, even philosophy, for the word “sophistry” has become a modern term for erudite nonsense, and the fourth century B.C. is the century of the sophist. The negative cast of so much of modern interpretation is fostered by the Greeks of the fourth century themselves. One can hardly read a text of the period that does not contrast the greatness of the fifth century with the dismal present, and Plato and Aristotle have nothing but contempt for their contemporary colleagues. The impression these observations give is misleading because each writer, particularly the orators speaking before a jury, had a particular axe to grind. Even a casual reading of the speeches gives the impression that the orators use the past in a manner similar to Pindar’s use of heroic mythology in his epinician odes, which makes one wary of accepting the pessimistic rhetoric at face value.

2 K. Jost, Das Beispiel und Vorbild der Vorväter bei den attischen Rednern und Geschichtsschreibern bis Demosthenes (Paderborn 1936); G. Schmitz-Kahlmann, Das Beispiel der Geschichte im politischen Denken des Isokrates, Philologus suppl. 31.4 (Leipzig 1939); M. Nouhaud, L’utilisation de l’histoire par les orateurs attiques (Paris 1982).
3 E.g., Plato, Politikos 299b: αὐτολάβης τινα σοφιστήν, Aristotle, Nikomachean Ethics 1.9.20. Plato, Gorgias 503b–c, 516d–e, has Kalikles denigrate contemporary politicians in favor of those of the fifth century, but Sokrates rejects his assessment of the past.
5 Aischines, On the Embassy (II) 74, even remarks on this use of the past by “popular” speakers to sway the Athenian demos.
Arnold von Salis, in his general study of Greek art, suggested that the Medusa Rondanini might serve as an appropriate head-of-chapter vignette for his treatment of the late fifth and fourth centuries. This is particularly the case for my own inquiry, since a reasonable interpretation of the Medusa Rondanini is that it is a Roman classicistic work based on the development of the beautiful Medusa in the second half of the fifth century. As a possible Roman work, the Medusa reflects the fact that so many of the statues of the fourth century are known only in Roman copies, which are increasingly considered less and less to be copies, and more and more to be Roman ideal sculpture. The very idea of the beautiful Medusa is also symptomatic of the period because it runs contrary to the normal interpretation of the figure as a horrible, death-bringing monster. The impassive face, the little wings, and the luxuriant hair convey the extraordinary ambivalence of the art and culture of what I shall loosely term the Late Classical period, from roughly 420 to 300 B.C.

There is, of course, definitely some truth to the impression of a crisis as the fourth century proceeds. After all, the conquest of Greece by Philip of Macedon and the eventual formation of the Hellenistic monarchies bring to an end the experiments with democracy. Yet the structure of the Greek city-state can be considered vastly less important than the achievements of perspective it had fostered, which endured. Indeed, I shall argue, along with many recent historians, that the fourth century does not represent a period of decline or a sharp break with the hallowed golden age of the fifth century; rather, the century develops earlier patterns into new configurations of importance. It is for that reason that the upper boundary of my study encompasses the last quarter of the fifth century and at times requires still earlier excursuses. It is also difficult to establish a terminal date; the patterns on which I focus led to a world defined by the eastern conquests of Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic monarchies. Yet it is worth reflecting at the outset on the longstanding and intimate relations of the Greeks with their eastern neighbors. Greek culture had developed out of the eastern cultures, and the two shared a basic matrix of values and perspectives in the Late Bronze Age and again from the ninth through the seventh century B.C. In the two hundred years between 600 and 400 B.C., the Greeks developed their own distinctive culture, which we generally call classical civilization. Contact with and fertilization from the East had, in fact, never ceased, neither in the Early Iron Age, from 1000 to 900 B.C., nor later in the Archaic and Classical periods, from 600 to 400. On initial view, what is most distinctive of the fourth century is the export to the east, and indeed throughout the Mediterranean, of a cultural perspective that is most clearly visible in the concrete representation of the human form in sculpture and painting, but is equally discernible in thought and politics. Although the city-state was the vehicle of this cultural revolution of the world, it could not have sustained it.

This book does not attempt to document the eastern adventure of the fourth century, nor to present studies of all aspects of Greek culture in the period, though both play a
role to varying degrees almost throughout the period. The center of my focus is plastic form and the general principles to be derived from the study of sculpture and painting. A central issue is that of aesthetics. The human form as depicted by Greek art has since the Renaissance been so thoroughly integrated into the modern western European sensibility that it has been considered a standard. The gradual broadening of western European knowledge of earlier Mediterranean and non-Mediterranean cultures has only recently begun to render the Greek standard precarious.

The word “aesthetics” was invented by a German, Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten, in the early eighteenth century to isolate the formal qualities of an object from its content.9 It is a commonplace to assert that it was the Greeks who first discovered the aesthetic function of objects and thus invented “art,” and this occurred in the fourth century B.C. As with all commonplace observations, there is an element of truth in this proposition despite its obviously nonsensical general purport. Clearly, any plastic form has an aesthetic quality, through which in part the content is molded. What the Greeks appear to have done is to have recognized the role of form in expression and thereafter to have manipulated form to express ever more varied or subtle levels of content.10 That this first happened in the fourth century is debatable, but aesthetic manipulation is, I shall argue, a primary characteristic of the period, even if the principles were recognized and developed earlier, as seems probable.

The aesthetic function of a Greek sculpture or painting must not blind us to the fact that almost all preserved sculptures—as well as most painting, whether on walls or pots—served a cultural-religious function not dissimilar to the role of “art” in earlier societies. Any reader of Pausanias, the author of a Greek guidebook of the later second century A.D., who tries to create a mental image of the great Greek sanctuaries he described must be impressed by the vast quantity, variety, and chaotic disposition of the votives Pausanias saw. Take, for example, the purportedly original statue of Prokne and Itys on the Acropolis of Athens, which Pausanias may have seen (1.24.3).11 To the best of my knowledge, the statue (group) is depicted in modern studies only as an isolated, single “work of art.”12 Yet it stood in a sanctuary crammed with other statues, record stelai, and varied votives of pottery, metal, etc. The aesthetic isolation in which the modern viewer ideally contemplates the object was absent in antiquity.13 An inscription regulating activity in the Asklepieion of Rhodes in the third century B.C. gives a vivid picture of how a Greek sanctuary was experienced at the time: “No one is permitted to request that an image be raised or some other votive offering set up in the lower part of the sanctuary . . . or in any other spot where votive offerings prevent people walking past.”14

12 E.g., most recently, J. M. Hurwit, The Athenian Acropolis (Cambridge 1999) fig. 178 on p. 207.
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One might compare the contemporary hordes of visitors to the old Acropolis Museum, should they be turned into bronze and marble, to the distracting chaos of the ancient sanctuary. An initial attempt to control the context of statues is evident in the fourth century, when enclosures for statue groups become frequent, but it is only in the Roman period that sculpture is arranged in great visual compositions in which the individual work becomes an aesthetic unit, though generally not in the pristine isolation of a modern photograph but as part of a conscious structure with a determined content. The appreciation of Greek art in the modern world has definitely been skewed by the use to which it was put by the Romans because, more often than not, a work is preserved only in the form of a Roman copy in a Roman context. The problem has been compounded by the development in the nineteenth century of the concept of “art for art’s sake.” The study of Greek art, particularly as seen through Roman commentaries and Roman contexts, was all too easily interpreted in this romantic manner. But “art for art’s sake” is not an ancient concept, neither Greek nor Roman. The very ambivalence of fourth-century objects—which served the traditional religious-social function of all art until the nineteenth century, but now clothed in an aesthetic expressive form—easily beguiled the modern eye into seeing what it expected or desired.

The baby must not be thrown out with the bathwater. The Greeks, particularly in the fourth century, do recognize and try to understand the function of aesthetics in the plastic forms of art. The earliest evidence of the conscious expressive function of aesthetics is found in the Frogs of Aristophanes and the fragments of the sophist Gorgias. Then the works of Plato wrestle with aesthetics over and over again, though again the disparaging criticism of Plato’s apparent philistine attitude is an opinion of the early twentieth century. It is no surprise that proponents of “art for art’s sake” could not understand the effort Plato made to describe the function of aesthetics in art (plastic and literary) because they saw it as the sole function of art. Plato’s student, Aristotle, develops ideas first broached by Plato in a number of treatises that clearly define the importance given to expression in the fourth century. Here pride of place belongs to the Poetics and the Rhetoric, but also of great importance are the Aristotelian Physiognomika and Theophrastos’s Characters. It is no exaggeration to say that the principles of representation are a central intellectual concern of the fourth century, and they are accordingly the focus of this study.

In keeping with the general modern impression of the period as an unappealing amorphousness, it is frequently claimed that the lack of a well-defined chronology for the monuments of the fourth century thwarts closer analysis of the art of the period. Although more precision in dating has been gained in recent years for some monuments,
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such as the sarcophagi from the royal cemetery of Sidon,²¹ very few significant changes have been made to earlier systems. Yet it is largely fallacious to claim that there is a greater lack of precision in the chronology of the fourth century than in earlier periods of Greek art. On the one hand, the number of securely dated works, contrary to common opinion, is quite large;²² on the other hand, the chronology of monuments of earlier periods is far less secure than consensus maintains. My study will not, however, address the issue of chronology in its finer details; I shall content myself with sketching dates with a broad brush.

While the lack of a precise chronology of fourth-century monuments is a spurious reason for avoiding study of the period, there are some real problems that are largely, if not exclusively, new in the fourth century. For example, the role of the individual is conspicuously greater in the production of sculpture. This is true both for the commissioner and the artist. From about 430 on, there is an explosion of private monuments in the form of grave stelai, votive reliefs, and choregic monuments. These represent both the greater prosperity and the increasing importance of the individual as opposed to the community.²³ This is perhaps illustrated most graphically by the new practice in Athens of decreeing honorific statues of living men for service to the state, and in the proliferation of naturalistic statues as private votives. The fact that the names of individual masters dominate the literature on Greek art of the fourth century B.C. reflects the greater role of the varied expressive function of the monuments, again a shift from a common, communal perspective to a fragmented, subjective one. Yet I shall argue that the emphasis on the individual artist may have been exaggerated both in the ancient sources and in modern scholarship. Indeed, the role of the individual, both as commissioner and artist, is nothing new: signatures of artists appear as early as the late eighth century, as do inscriptions proclaiming dedications by individuals; these increase greatly in the seventh century and become common thereafter.²⁴ It is not even the range and quality of the fourth-century private monuments that distinguish them from their predecessors, since inexpensive dedications—pottery, small terracotta figurines, and miscellaneous minor items of daily life or trade—had always constituted the majority of dedications in sanctuaries. The principal change is the far greater use of stone in general and of bronze for portrait statues. This does reflect the greater value of even modest dedications in comparison to terracotta votives, but the difference in quality (and cost) between a small and poorly carved grave stele and a large and beautifully carved stele is probably no greater than the range that existed earlier. Part of the problem lies in the modern prejudice in favor of the material considered to be more noble (and expensive). But the modern prejudice appears also to have been shared by the people of the fourth century, as is amply documented by literary references to conspicuous private ostentation in the fourth century (e.g., Demosthenes, Against Meidias 158).

The role of the famous master is analogous to the role of the private commissioner. The number of master artists of the fourth century listed by Overbeck is more than double the number for the second half of the fifth century (86 sculptors versus 40, 58 painters versus 10); the number of passages is also greater, although not by the same proportion, at least

²² See chap. 2, pp. 26–31 below.
for sculptors (504 passages on sculptors versus 424, but 304 passages on painters versus 95). 25 There is also a greater amount of detail in the citations: lists of works and, on occasion, some characterization of style. To be sure, part of the reason for this phenomenon lies in the fact that it was the Greek writers of the later fourth century, such as Xenokrates of Athens, 26 who produced the first commentaries on art and devoted the lion’s share of their work to the artists of their time or of the immediately preceding period. Since hardly any of the original statues and none of the paintings are preserved, some scholars, such as Brunilde S. Ridgway, have argued quite reasonably against creating ephemeral corpora of works by named artists. 27 Yet the tradition, begun in the nineteenth century, has been too strong and too central to the manner of viewing the fourth century to be resisted. 28 It is also the oeuvres of named artists that have filled the void of chronological sequences in giving structure to the study of the fourth century. 29

The ancient belief in the importance of individual masters in the art of the fourth century is so strong that it cannot be ignored completely. Yet the preserved monuments of sculpture do not provide sufficient evidence to confirm this belief; for the painters the issue is moot, since nothing at all is preserved. Perhaps a slightly different approach may help us understand the ancient emphasis on the role of the individual artist. On the one hand, it appears highly likely that the Roman desire to collect works of Greek art inspired many false attributions to great, known artists to enhance the market value of the works. 30 On the other hand, several of the central problems of the study of the fourth century mentioned above point to a more positive and constructive conclusion. The lack of an internally cohesive chronological framework for art in the fourth century points to the multiplicity of styles. From the Archaic period through the Rich Style, that is, from 600 to 380 B.C., style evolves in a Darwinian progression. Individual style is subordinate to period style, yet the identification of hands of sculptors in the Archaic period is usually accepted, 31 just as it is in Corinthian and Attic vase painting. Already in the later fifth century this system appears to break down. 32 The best explanation of the change is the increasing importance of style as a conscious expressive tool, as discussed above. Aesthetic quality is recognized as a tool


27 See principally B. S. Ridgway, Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: The Problem of the Originals (Ann Arbor 1984), but her other books stress the same theme.


of expression that allows a whole new range of subtle interpretations of a subject. This is made amply clear by Aristotle (Rhetoric 3.7.1–2):

Propriety of style will be obtained by the expression of emotion and character, and by proportion to the subject matter. Style is proportionate to the subject matter when neither weighty matters are treated offhand, nor trifling matters with dignity, and no embellishment is attached to an ordinary word. (Trans. J. H. Freese, Loeb edition)

It is precisely the interpretive element of contemporary art that informs Plato’s examination of poetry and the plastic arts—the triumph of the subjective over the communal vision, to exaggerate slightly. This is the essential phenomenon that altered the structure of the city-state, as Jan Pečírka proposed many years ago, and the effect of reading written texts as opposed to public performances, as presented by Eric Havelock. In the realm of sculpture, I shall argue that the role of the individual master lies in the choice of one of a number of possible expressive styles as the preponderant personal mode of interpreting and therefore rendering. A style may accordingly become a characteristic of the oeuvre of an artist, but one shared with numerous other artists. When the Romans and probably even the later Hellenistic collectors built their collections, the market forces found it expedient to attribute any work in a given style to an artist who actually favored or excelled in the use of the style in question.

The fact that style was imbued with content is clearly illustrated by the use of archaistic motifs from the late fifth century on. Indeed, the vast influence of the style of the Parthenon sculptures on almost all works, large and small, during and after its construction demonstrates beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Greeks of the late fifth century and thereafter were, as Oscar Wilde pointed out, nascent art critics with an excellent sense of taste. The aesthetic appeal of a work and the importance of an artist’s commissions clearly guided the production of contemporary imitations. This has been recognized since the early work by Adolf Furtwängler on copies of Greek sculpture. Though much of Kopienkritik has focused on the Roman propensity to vary known types to suit a variety of tastes and functions, it is clear that the Greeks of the later fifth and fourth centuries already reproduced famous works and styles with gay abandon. The recognition of this is implicit in the numerous modern attributions of works to the schools of the great artists on no other basis than a general resemblance of a more or less “securely attributed” work to others that are unencumbered by any possible mention in the ancient sources, and it is explicit in the identification of more or less contemporary famous statues in the record reliefs and on vases, particularly the Panathenaic amphoras.

33 Note 7 above.
34 Havelock, Literate Revolution (note 16 above) 266–67.
So much of our knowledge of the sculpture of the fourth century is, as just discussed, due to the great appreciation of the period in the Late Hellenistic and Roman periods. As has become evident in the preceding remarks, the Hellenistic and Roman copies must be treated as faithful reflections of the purported originals with some caution. Yet this caution should not be taken to suggest a rejection of such copies as valuable evidence for my study. It is an undeniable fact that the Romans commissioned copies and adaptations principally of the sculpture produced between 480 and 300 B.C., the range of the works represented in the fragments of plaster casts found at Baiae. The strong classical and classicistic revival of the Late Hellenistic period is boldly underscored by the Hellenistic Greek source for Pliny’s comment (NH 34.19.51–52) that after Olympiad 121 (295–292 B.C.) “cessavit deinde ars ac rursus olympiade CLVI [156–153 B.C.] revixit.” The modern perception of a major change between High Classic and Late Classic does not appear to have been part of the Roman or even the Greek experience: Aristotle’s Poetics makes no sharp break between the fifth and fourth centuries. Indeed, Plato’s sole ideal is Egyptian art (Laws 2.656c–657a), which may be considered commensurate with the archaic style of Greek art.

Perhaps an important insight lies in the tacit Greek and Roman assessment of classical Greek sculpture as a continuous phenomenon worthy of being copied and adapted from beginning to end, without obvious predilection. The modern historian of classical art distinguishes not just two major stylistic phases between 450 and 300 B.C., but three and even four: High Classical, Rich Style, Late Classical, and often the beginning of the Hellenistic. The Rich Style is generally considered an aberrant phenomenon and sometimes as a psychological reaction to the horrors of the Peloponnesian War. This is not the case, as I shall argue in detail. Rather, if we view Greek classical art as a continuous phenomenon, as it seems the Greeks themselves and the Romans did, the art of the fourth century becomes an integral part of a single expressive vocabulary.

In the sense proposed here, the word “classic” bears the meaning “worthy of admiration.” It is an altogether different issue whether the content of the style remains constant or explores different views of human experience. The late commentaries on the classical masters give us some valuable information on the subjects they represented. In addition, the waning art of vase painting, at least on the Greek mainland and at Athens in particular, is invaluable in delineating both changing subject matter and new interpretations of old themes. Most noticeable and, I shall argue, characteristic of the fourth century is the clear movement away from depicting heroic myths, and particularly heroic battles, in favor of domestic scenes or at least apparently domestic scenes. This shift also affects the representation of the mythical heroes and gods in sculpture: Herakles stands pensively (Fig. 176), Aphrodite bathes (Figs. 147–49), Apollo kills a lizard (Fig. 181), satyrs rest (Fig. 180) or pour wine (Fig. 68) to no obvious end. As Rodenwaldt observed, we are more often than not in a quandary when confronting these statues and their ambiguous content. In the official public sphere, we can only speculate (and shall) on why an Amazon, evidently triumphant, occupies the center of the west pediment of the Temple of


Asklepios at Epidauros (Fig. 28) or why the grave relief of Dexileos at Athens depicts the triumphant (but dead) Dexileos fully clothed on his horse rearing over a fallen and naked enemy (Fig. 4). In the earlier fifth century, Amazons were the stand-ins for the Persians and thus the implacable and barbarian enemy to be conquered; the epithets “triumphant” and “heroic” seem inappropriate. Male nudity had usually been reserved for the athlete and hero, whether in myth or contemporary life; again, it seems inappropriate to represent a fallen enemy nude.

These few examples give a tiny glimpse of the novelty of art in the fourth century. But there is also a change in the very types of monuments or, rather, a signal shift or development of earlier forms, such as the explosion of grave monuments in grand displays of family pride and wealth (Figs. 86–89). Marble votive reliefs also multiply from the last third of the fifth century and are sometimes mounted on high and massive pillars to enhance their display (Figs. 91, 92); the iconography more often than not is bewildering. Despite the grandeur of both the grave reliefs and the marble votive reliefs, the scenes depicted are of a thoroughly private, even domestic, character, contrasting the very public display with the intimate world of the family. These contrast with the semiprivate dedications of large and at times complex choregic monuments, that is, monuments to celebrate victory in one of the public dithyrambic contests, a tremendous vogue that gave its name to the Street of the Tripods in Athens. These again contrast with a new emphasis on the elaboration of what we traditionally call the minor arts: metal vessels and terracotta figurines, which become exquisite works of art (Figs. 105, 107–11). In short, there is much that is new, much that is a radical development of the old, and a general transformation of the patterns and nature of everything. It is, of course, no coincidence that political and social historians have come to a very similar evaluation of the fourth century, and it is greatly to our advantage to review ever so briefly their views.

THE BACKGROUND

In the simplest terms, our period begins with the completion of the Parthenon (432 B.C.) and the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (431 B.C.) between Athens and Sparta that ends in 404 with the ignominious defeat of Athens and the dismemberment of her empire. The salient character of the next one hundred years is more of the same: war, shifting alliances, ephemeral hegemonies, and inadequate treaties. At first Sparta exercised a general hegemony over Greece. Several peace treaties were concocted with the active participation of Persia; the first, indeed, formally recognized Persia’s role in its name, the King’s Peace of 387/6, which was periodically renewed on slightly different terms.44 Thebes finally ended Sparta’s dominance at the battle of Leuktra in 371 and was herself defeated nine years later at the battle of Mantinea in 362. Athens remained largely on the sidelines until the creation of her second league or federation in 378/7; this only faintly resembled the Delian League which had become her empire in the fifth century, since the relationship of the participating states was explicitly formulated to prevent the domination of Athens, as had occurred in the earlier league.45 Nonetheless, the new league led in-
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evitably to an assertive hegemony, which came to an end with the Social War of 357–355, a most confusing Latinized name for the “War of the Allies.”

After the battle of Mantinea there was something of a brief respite: Thebes had not been crippled, the Peloponnesos was settled for the most part, and Athens had not yet lost her second league. The Sacred War (356–346), which was fought in fits and starts to dislodge the Phokaian from Delphi, around which they had created an ephemeral hegemony over central Greece, ended bloodlessly with the general Peace of Philokrates under the aegis of Philip II of Macedon. Thessaly had briefly succeeded in establishing itself as a power in north-central Greece, but Philip also brought this to an end. Indeed, all attempts to create a local or a general hegemony were in the end nullified by internecine bickering and finally by Philip, who came to power in 360. It is worth noting that Macedon was not quite the barbarian backwater that Demosthenes describes in his speeches, though it is true that she had never before played an important role in the political events of the Greek heartland. In the late fifth century, Euripides had left war-torn Athens for the new royal court of Archelaos at Pella, where he died in 407/6, and Aristotle's connection with the royal Macedonian family went back to his father, Nichomachos, who had been physician to Amyntas II.

The Persian Empire hardly enjoyed a better situation than Greece in the fourth century, at least in its western provinces of Asia Minor. Cyrus the Younger revolted against his brother, who had become Artaxerxes II, in 401 with the use of Greek mercenaries (the “Ten Thousand”) but was defeated and killed. Evagoras of Cyprus was in revolt in the 390s at the same time that the Spartan king Agesilaos tried unsuccessfully to free the Greek cities of western Asia Minor from Persian rule. There was then peace for twenty years until the Satrap's Revolt in the 360s. Finally, Macedon entered the picture in 334 under Alexander, Philip's son, who inherited his father's project of invading the Persian Empire.

Although the last decades of the fourth century are usually included in the Hellenistic period—because the battle of Chaironeia ended the independence of the Greek city-states and subjected them first to the monarchy of Macedon and later to the monarchies of the Diadochi, the followers of Alexander—the distinction seems to me inconsequential in the area of art, and I shall aim at the totally arbitrary date of 300 B.C. to end my inquiry.

The details of the political-military course of events are rarely of direct importance to the study of the art of the fourth century, with several notable exceptions. My purpose here is, however, to describe the atmosphere in which the art was produced by singling out developments that give the human context understandable contours. Rather than paraphrase the ancient sources or modern commentaries on the principal issues of the fourth century, I shall allow the contemporary texts to speak for themselves as much as possible.

As already indicated, the main occupation of the fourth century was war and political strife, whereas a balance of power between Sparta and Athens had existed from after the Persian Wars (479) to the end of the Peloponnesian War (404). Isokrates states the case bluntly through the mouth of the Spartan king Archidamos (Archidamos 64–67):

46 J. Buckler, Philip II and the Sacred War, Mnemosyne suppl. 109 (Leiden 1989).
48 Gomme, “End of the City-State” (note 7 above) 204, notes that both Grote and the first edition of the Cambridge Ancient History, volume 6 (1927), took the position that I follow here. He notes that 338 or 323 B.C. was a more popular point to end discussion of the century. The second edition of the Cambridge Ancient History (1994) has chosen 322 as the end of its historical account, but 300 for the art (table on pp. 900–1), as has A. H. Borbein, “Die griechische Statue des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.,” JdI 88 (1973) 46.
I believe that the whole population of the Peloponnesse, and even the common people, whom we imagine to be most hostile to us, are now regretting the days of our overlordship. For since their revolt, none of their expectations has been realized: instead of freedom they have found the opposite; they have lost their best citizens and fallen at the mercy of the worst. Instead of autonomy, they have been plunged into lawlessness of many terrible kinds. Previously they were used to march with us against other peoples, but now they see others campaigning against them, and the civil dissensions which formerly they knew of only from hearsay and abroad, are now an almost daily occurrence with them. They have been so leveled by disasters that no one can say who is the worst off among them. None of their cities has remained intact, none is free from enemies on its borders; hence the land has been ravaged, cities sacked, private dwellings destroyed, constitutions subverted and laws abolished, which used to make them the best governed and the happiest of the Greeks. Their mutual relations are based on such distrust and hostility, that they are more afraid of their fellow-citizens than of the enemies. In place of the harmony which prevailed in our time and the abundance they enjoyed among each other, they have reached such a peak of mutual hatred that those who own property would prefer to throw their possessions into the sea than to give help to the needy, while those in poorer circumstances would rather seize by force the wealth of the rich than merely come across it fortuitously. (Trans. M. M. Austin⁴⁹)

Over the course of the fourth century this situation was familiar in all parts of Greece. An immediate and pressing problem was paying for the incessant wars.⁵⁰ Our information is, as always, best for Athens. In the fifth century she was enriched by the tribute of her empire to the point that Thucydides has Perikles list the vast sums available on the eve of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.13.3–5). In the fourth century she had to rely on a complex system of direct and indirect taxation, which Xenophon has Sokrates review for his interlocutor, Kritoboulos, around 360 B.C. (Oeconomicus 2.5–6):

In the first place I see you are compelled to offer many lavish sacrifices, otherwise you would be on bad terms with gods and men. Then it is your duty to entertain many strangers, and to do this in grand style. Then you must invite your fellow-citizens to dinner and shower benefits on them, or you would be destitute of allies. Furthermore I notice that the city is already laying heavy expenses on you, for keeping horses, acting as choregos, gymnasiarcm or undertaking some important function, and should war break out, I know that they will impose on you the trierarchy, the soldiers’ pay and contributions, so great that you will not find it easy to bear them. And if ever you are thought to have fallen short in the performance of these duties, I know that the Athenians will punish you just as much as if they had caught you stealing their own property. (Trans. M. M. Austin⁵¹)

The burdens of the liturgies and taxes were great even with restructuring to ease the pain; J. K. Davies has estimated that there were ninety-seven annual or festival liturgies in the fourth century, which were hardly as oppressive as the military liturgies. Demosthenes records how unpopular the latter had become in 341, when Philip complained to Athens about the disturbances caused by the Athenian general Diopeithes in the Chersonesos not long before Chaironeia (On the Chersonese 21–23):

We refuse to pay war-taxes or to serve in person; we cannot keep our hands off the public funds; we will not pay Diopithes the allowances agreed upon, nor sanction the sums that he raises for himself; but we grumble and criticize his methods, and ask what he intends to do, and all that sort of thing; and yet, while maintaining that attitude, we refuse to perform our own tasks; with our lips we praise those whose speeches are worthy of our city, but our actions serve only to encourage their opponents. Now, you have a habit of asking a speaker on every occasion, “What then must be done?”; but I prefer to ask you, “What then must be said?” Because, if you are not going to pay your contributions, nor serve in person, nor keep your hands off the public funds, nor grant Diopithes his allowances, nor sanction the sums that he raises for himself, nor consent to perform your own tasks, I have nothing to say. (Trans. J. H. Vince, Loeb edition)

In this vein pseudo-Aristotle relates three anecdotes about the cash-starved Athenian general Timotheos, the most famous of which was a ruse he used to forestall his men’s demands for pay, which he could not meet during the campaign off Kerkyra in 375 B.C. (Oikonomika 2.1350a–b):

Timotheus was reduced to sore straits. His men demanded their pay, refused to obey his orders, and declared they would desert to the enemy. Accordingly he summoned a meeting and told them that the stormy weather was delaying the arrival of the silver he expected; meanwhile, as he had on hand such abundance of provisions, he would charge them nothing for the three months’ ration of grain already advanced. The men, unable to believe that Timotheus would have sacrificed so large a sum to them unless he was in truth expecting the money, made no further claim for pay until he had completed his dispositions. (Trans. G. C. Armstrong, Loeb edition)

Warfare itself had changed since the fifth century, as Demosthenes relates (Third Philip-pic 47–50):

But for my own part, while practically all the arts have made a great advance and we are living today in a very different world from the old one, I consider that nothing has been more revolutionized and improved than the art of war. For in the first place I am informed that in those days the Lacedaemonians, like everyone else, would spend the four or five months of the summer “season” in invading and laying waste the enemy’s territory with heavy infantry and levies of citizens, and would then retire home again; and they were so old-fashioned, or rather such good citizens, that they never used money to buy an advantage from anyone, but their fighting was of the fair and open kind. But now you must surely see that most disasters are due to traitors, and none are the result of a regular pitched battle. On the other hand you hear of Philip

marching unchecked, not because he leads a phalanx of heavy infantry, but because he is accompanied by skirmishers, cavalry, archers, mercenaries, and similar troops. When, relying on this force, he attacks some people that is at variance with itself, and when through distrust no one goes forth to fight for his country, then he brings up his artillery and lays siege. I need hardly tell you that he makes no difference between summer and winter and has no season set apart for inaction. (Trans. J. H. Vince, Loeb edition)

Not only was continuous war in itself expensive, but the increasing use of mercenaries made it even more so.53 A secondary problem in the use of mercenaries was that they became an uncontrollable horde when not managed strictly and paid well. Isokrates decries the situation thus (On the Peace 44–46):

Although we seek to rule over all men, we are not willing to take the field ourselves, and although we undertake to wage war upon, one might almost say, the whole world, we do not train ourselves for war but employ instead vagabonds, deserters, and fugitives who have thronged together here in consequence of other misdemeanors, who, whenever others offer them higher pay, will follow their leadership against us. But, for all that, we are so enamored of these mercenaries that while we would not willingly assume the responsibility for the acts of our own children if they offended against anyone, yet for the brigandage, the violence, and the lawlessness of these men, the blame for which is bound to be laid at our door, not only do we feel no regret, but we actually rejoice whenever we hear that they have perpetrated any such atrocity. (Trans. G. Norlin, Loeb edition54)

To war and the consequent financial and social strains was added another serious problem: the need to import significant amounts of grain just to survive.55 This had always been the case but became more acute in the fourth century. Athens was particularly dependent and thus cultivated foreign rulers to ensure the supply, on many occasions awarding them honors to cement relations or to recognize particular acts of generosity. The main source was the Black Sea, but Cyprus, Libya, and Egypt were also important.56 Maintaining the supply of grain thus required far-flung diplomatic relations, making it clear that there was a heightened cosmopolitanism in fourth-century Greece. In the fifth century, Greece had prided itself not only on the defeat of the Persian invasions but on a continuing and successful hostility to Persia. This remains a major motif in the fourth century, but tempered by an ambiguity typical of the century. Already in the last years of the Peloponnesian War, the Spartan victory over Athens was funded by Persia (Xenophon, Hellenika 1.4.1–7, 5.1–9; 2.1.10–32). And Athens’s recovery in the first decade of the fourth century was marked by her premier general, Konon, serving in the Persian fleet and defeating Sparta at the battle of Knidos in 394 (Xenophon, Hellenika 4.3.10–12). Xenophon is quick to point out how complex and absurd some of these relationships became, since at that same time Athens was sending ships to support Evagoras of Salamis

---

54 Austin and Vidal-Naquet, Economic and Social History (note 49 above) 338–39, text no. 108B (excerpt).
in Cyprus against Persia (Hellenika 4.8.24). In the 370s or 360s, special honors and economic rewards were given to Strato, king of Sidon, for assistance with an embassy to the Great King.57 Later, in 343 B.C., Demosthenes had read in court an inscription of the fifth century that cited Arthmios of Zelea for treason because he conveyed “gold from barbarians to Greeks” (De falsa legatione 271), which he repeats in 341 (Third Philippic 41–44), yet he himself appears to suggest at the end of the latter speech (§ 71) that the Athenians should approach the Persian king for support against Philip.58

Persian gold seems to have been accepted by any Greek or any Greek state that was offered it, yet Persia remained the barbarian enemy.59 The inconsistency is both glaring and yet typical of the extreme volatility of all Greek interstate relations in the fourth century. The conquest of Persia by Alexander is seen by many modern commentators as the culminating event of the century which brings the Classical period to an end, but on closer examination it seems to be a minor footnote in an age of so many conflicts. The idea of founding a Greek state in Asia Minor had even flickered across the mind of Xenophon when he brought the “Ten Thousand” down to the Black Sea in the spring of 400 B.C. (Anabasis 5.6.15–33). In 408, Gorgias of Leontinoi had addressed the Olympic games with the proposal of establishing harmony among the Greeks by attacking Persia,60 and Lysias apparently brought up the same idea in his address to the same body in 388 or 384.61 Isokrates was a student of Gorgias, and it may have been from him that Isokrates developed his theme, first propounded in the Panegyrikos around 380 B.C. The reality is that Greece had become so intertwined with Persia at all levels of public and private life that the unification of East and West was not a deeply dramatic turn of events but almost the recognition of a pre-existing situation.

The cosmopolitanism of fourth-century Greece is everywhere evident, but it is a natural continuation of trends in the fifth century, particularly in Athens, which was the undisputed center of Aegean and even Mediterranean trade. Cults from other Greek areas were introduced into Athens, for example, the cult of Asklepios that took up its home on the south slope of the Acropolis in 420/19.62 One of the earliest truly foreign gods in Attica was Bendis, whose cult took place in the Bendideion in the Piraeus and was officially organized as a state cult as early as 429.63 Other foreign cults, such as those of Adonis and

57 Rhodes and Osborne, Greek Historical Inscriptions, 86–87, no. 21; Austin and Vidal-Naquet, Economic and Social History (note 49 above) text no. 71.
58 The passage is included only in the margins of the best manuscript. J. R. Ellis, in CAH, vol. 6 (1994) 774, clearly accepts the genuineness of the tradition, which is elaborated in the Fourth Philippic [10] 31–34, sometimes considered spurious.
59 Lysias, Olympiakos 5: “...you are aware that empire is for those who command the sea, that the King has control of the money, that the Greeks are in thrall to those who are able to spend it...” (trans. W. R. M. Lamb, Loeb edition).

65 Parker, Athenian Religion (note 62 above) 195–96.


69 R. H. Randall, “The Erechtheion Workmen,” AJA 57 (1953) 199–210, partially reproduced in Austin and Vidal-Naquet, Economic and Social History (note 49 above) 276–82, text no. 73. 

70 Austin and Vidal-Naquet, Economic and Social History (note 49 above) 362–68, text no. 122.


73 McKechnie, Outsiders in the Greek Cities (note 53 above) 142–60, reviews the situation of the “mobile skilled workers.” However, these became metrics not only in Athens but elsewhere after a very brief stay, usually of a month, except under special circumstances: Whitehead, Athenian Metric (note 71 above) 7–11.

were 29,000 male citizens and 35,000 metics.75 If this is even vaguely correct, whatever the disadvantages of being a metic in Athens (or elsewhere) were, it clearly had its advantages, too. It is equally clear that metics did not simply occupy the middle ground between citizen and slave, though there are enough slighting comments preserved in the texts to indicate that they could easily be a subject of criticism and/or derision.76 The fact that a number of Attic terracotta figurines and vases depict travelers suggests that the cosmopolitan tenor of the age even crept into the domestic world.77

A third and particularly modern aspect of the fourth century is the development of professionalism in almost all walks of life and endeavor. One important aspect of this trend is the writing of treatises on “How to Do” something or “The History of” something. This is not an invention of the fourth century, since we hear of various works of this type in the second half of the fifth century, such as Polykleitos’s work on the canon (Galen, De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis 5),78 writings on perspective by Demokritos (Vitruvius 7 praef. 11), the beginning of the Corpus Hippocraticum,79 and the earliest treatises on rhetoric by Gorgias and perhaps his teacher, Teisias.80 But many new types appear in the fourth century, ranging from the various “Constitution of…” by Aristotle and others to Xenophon’s many works (such as his Ways and Means, Oikonomikos, On the Art of Horsemanship, and On Hunting), Aeneas Tacticus’s manual On the Defense of Fortified Positions, Theophrastos’s Characters, and, not least important for the present study, Xenokrates of Athens’s On Bronze Working and On Painting.81 These manuals and treatises are, of course, all written in prose, which was certainly not a new invention but one coupled with the habit of writing rather than with oral composition, and this arguably led to a major change in patterns of thought.82 “Athens was becoming more ‘document-minded,’ and the state was in fact demanding more written documentation,” as Rosalind Thomas has put it.83 The laws of Athens were completely reviewed between 410 and 399 to provide a recognized basic platform for the structure of the state after the oligarchic upheavals.84 As the fourth century progressed, the development of an increasingly rigorous and professional administration of the government became a simple necessity as society became more complex and financial needs had to be
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75 P. J. Rhodes, in CAH, vol. 6 (1994) 567. M. H. Hansen, Demography and Democracy: The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century B.C. (Herning, Denmark, 1985), proposes a figure of ca. 30,000 in the second half of the fourth century; A. W. Gomme, The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. (Oxford 1933) 47, proposed that in 430 there were 60,000 citizens, 25,000 metics, and 70,000 slaves; in 330 there may have been 50,000 citizens, 36,000 metics, and 82,000 slaves. Cf. Whitehead, Athenian Metic (note 71 above) 97–98.

76 Whitehead, Athenian Metic (note 71 above) 34–61. Whitehead tries to make a case for a general disapprobation of metics in Athens but is unable to come up with texts that really confirm this. The two that come closest (Demosthenes 22.54 and 52.3; pp. 47–48, 49–50) do not carry much conviction beyond a moderate antipathy for noncitizens.


81 See note 26 above. Aristotle, Politics 1.7.7, comments on the usefulness of such manuals.

82 Havelock, Literate Revolution (note 16 above) 261–312.


met. In the public sector, the name of Euboulos stands out, and, after him, that of Lykourgos. Although the evidence is not absolutely clear, the tendency in fourth-century Athens was to create boards or magistracies, such as the theorikon, that were neither chosen by lot nor served only one year, providing both expertise and continuity of administration. These developments represent a slight movement away from the radical democratic selection by lot and a term limit of just one year. Perhaps unrelated is the fact that the Athenian citizens most engaged in the government were not, as one might suppose, purely or even largely from the general démos but were often men of wealth and from reputed families. The most visible sign of all these changes to a professional government was the construction or reconstruction of buildings in the Agora and the massive expansion of the public meeting place, the Pnyx. The new professionalism became all pervasive and extended to the great festival games, though the wholly negative assessment of this development fostered by E. Norman Gardiner at the beginning of the twentieth century has little basis in fact. But the evidence for the repute of athletes and the games is ambiguous. Hans-Volkmar Herrmann states that in the fourth century Olympia experienced a building boom as never before or after, and Pausanias records more statues of athletic victors of that century than for any other period. Yet the games appear to have suffered something of an eclipse, too: the West Greeks no longer participated, and the fame of athletic victors appears to have been not as great in the fourth century. At Delphi the surviving gymnasion was built in the fourth century.

94 H. Y. Herrmann, Olympia: Heiligtum und Wettkampfstätte (Munich 1972); 161; A. Mallwitz, Olympia und seine Bauten (Darmstadt 1972) 96–100.
95 Rausa, Vincitore, 113–14.
96 Herrmann, Olympia (note 94 above) 161.
and a stadium and palaestra were built at Athens under Lykourgos.\(^98\) The great Temple of Zeus at Nemea was built in the second half of the fourth century,\(^99\) and rebuilding at Isthmia is also known.\(^100\) It seems clear, therefore, that whatever status the Panhellenic games may have enjoyed in the fourth century, their physical setting was greatly enhanced with major stone buildings and facilities, and major dedications of sculpture, both of victors and others, continued to fill the sanctuaries associated with the games.

To balance the prominence of instability and change in the fourth century there is the constant sense of the past and the desire to live up to it.\(^101\) The increased concern with documentation and recordkeeping has already been mentioned. Two significant and related aspects of this trend were the regular restaging of fifth-century tragedies beginning in 387/6 (\(\text{IG II}^2\ 2318\), lines 201–3) and of comedies from 340/39 on (\(\text{IG II}^2\ 2318\), lines 316–18).\(^102\) Under Lykourgos the texts of the tragedies were standardized,\(^103\) and the Theater of Dionysos was rebuilt in stone and decorated with statues of the great fifth-century tragedians.\(^104\) Lykourgos is thus of interest not only as a great administrator but also as a promoter not just of the political and military glories of earlier times but the poetry, too. His sole surviving speech, Against Leokrates, contains a long quotation from Euripides’ otherwise largely lost play Erechtheus (§ 100),\(^105\) as well as quotations from the Iliad (§ 103), Tyrtaios (§ 107), the epigram of the Spartans at Thermopylai (§ 109), the ephetic oath (§ 77), the oath of Plataia (§ 81), unattributable verses (§ 92, 132), and a string of earlier decrees, including a Spartan law (§ 129). The first lines invoke justice and reverence for the gods that recall the invocations of Pindaric odes and Aischylos’s tragedies (Against Leokrates § 1):

Justice towards you, Athenians, and reverence for the gods, shall mark the opening of my speech against Leokrates, now here on trial; so may Athena and those other gods and heroes whose statues are erected in our city and the country round receive this prayer. (Trans. J. O. Burt, Loeb edition)

The religious tone, which recurs in the speech, probably derives from the fact that Lykourgos was a member of the Eteobutadai, a family to which the ancient and important priesthoods of Athena Polias and Erechtheus belonged.\(^106\) But the theme of reverence
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\(^{100}\) O. Bronner, Isthmia: Excavations by the University of Chicago under the Auspices of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, vol. 2, Topography and Architecture (Princeton 1973) 46–66. The “earlier” stadium was apparently rebuilt around 390 B.C., and the “later” stadium may have been built in the last third of the fourth century.

\(^{101}\) See note 2 above.

\(^{102}\) P. Wilson, The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City and the Stage (Cambridge 2000) 22–23.
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\(\text{Introduction}\)
for the gods as a patriotic quality is sufficiently frequent in speeches by other orators to indicate that it was expected by the jury as one of the qualities that defined the good citizen, and my assumption is that religious reverence is undiminished in the fourth century outside of small groups of intellectuals who had already begun to question the inherited beliefs in the sixth century. It should be remembered that the vast majority of the liturgies in Athens were for the sacred festivals, and these numbered some ninety-seven, apart from the special quadrennial Panathenaics. Equally, in times of constant war, the pressing need of many states for money might have led many Greek states to despoil the enormous treasure stored in the sanctuaries to fund their armies, but most states rejected this tactic (Xenophon, Hellenika 7.4.33–34), with the notable exception of the Phokaians during their brief control of the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi during the Third Sacred War (Diodorus 16.56–57). Athens had used the sacred treasures in the waning years of the Peloponnesian War, and suggestions were made to do this again in the fourth century, though they were apparently not carried out. This restraint before the gods does not mean there were not ugly incidents, such as the pitched battle that took place in the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia in the 104th Olympiad (364 B.C.) (Xenophon, Hellenika 7.4.28–32). But this was the exception, not the rule, and we can in general agree with A. W. Gomme that the fourth century does not represent a spiritual decline from the fifth century.

It must be clear at this point that Greece in the fourth century manifests undiluted ambiguities as a political, social, and economic entity. It was, after all, a period of change. For the most part this was gradual and not as wrenching as might first appear to be the case. For example, the social opposition of oligarch and democrat that played a major role in the turmoil of the fourth century did not play itself out in violence in Athens after the tyranny of 404–403. That there were oligarchic sympathizers cannot be doubted; both Plato and Aristotle are clearly such. Yet in the political, rather than the philosophic, arena the acceptance of the democracy in Athens appears to have been broad and profound. This does not mean that there was not a wealthy elite that functioned as a class and asserted its status, but the assertiveness was integrated into the balanced functioning of the city-state through the system of liturgies, which the wealthy themselves viewed as a means


109 See note 52 above.

110 See also Rhodes and Osborne, Greek Historical Inscriptions, 336–42, no. 67, on the repayment of the stolen treasure, which helped to pay for the completion of the Temple of Apollo damaged or destroyed in 373: G. Roux, L’amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d’Apollon au Ve siècle (Lyon and Paris 1979) 164–72.

111 On the whole topic, see Austin, in CAH7, vol. 6 (1994) 555–56; Demosthenes, Against Androtion (22) 48, and Dinarchus, Against Demosthenes (1) 69, criticize such proposals.

112 “End of the City-State” (note 7 above) 233–48. Gomme compares the inefficiency and corruption of British administration and military in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries with the situation in Athens of the fourth century. The same comparison could doubtless be made with the contemporary United States of America.
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to curry favor (charis) with the demos. Such sublimation in the polity of elitist feelings can be concretely experienced in the building of grand choregic monuments, a notable public-private demonstration of wealth, since the choregos performed a public liturgy. Equally, Nikolaus Himmelmann has convincingly pointed to nondemocratic overtones in the iconography of Attic funerary reliefs. But if one needs evidence of the stability of the Athenian democracy, the fact that it did not disappear after Chaironeia nor suffer greatly or long under Demetrios of Phaleron (317–307) should suffice. In fact, the oligarchy made hardly any particular difference to the daily life of Athenians; Aristotle had remarked earlier that there were democracies that were run like oligarchies and vice versa (Politics 4.5.3).

Despite the ravages of the Peloponnesian War, Athens managed to assuage the horrors of political strife, to engage in foreign ventures, and especially to rebuild her economy. The Piraeus again became the major center of trade in the Aegean, as it had been under the Athenian empire of the fifth century. Admittedly, trade was not a highly regarded activity for the old landed families; Aristotle contrasts the wealth of agricultural self-sufficiency with pure money-making, which he deplores (Politics 1.8–11). But the father of Demosthenes, one of the richest men in Athens at the beginning of the fourth century, had no land and made his money from factories and lending money (Demosthenes, Against Aphobos I 9–11). Although metics may have been a major force in the promotion and success of Athens’s trade, citizens clearly participated and profited well. General assessments point to a broad prosperity of the Athenian population, in contrast to the almost constant woes of the city’s finances. The latter were, however, largely a result of the costs of war and abated or disappeared under Euboulos’s administration, during which war was largely avoided. The new professionalism in government administration, based on some restraints on the principles of radical democracy coupled with the growth of a wealthy class of citizens who did not hold land, suggests that Athenian and almost certainly Greek society as a whole was moving toward a new configuration in which cosmopolitanism and urbanism were displacing aristocratic clan and landed ideals.

An important gauge of the situation is the notable wealth amassed by sculptors and painters during the fourth century. We know close to nothing about artists and craftsmen prior to the late fifth century, though a general social antipathy toward them is...
clear. In the late fifth century, the painters Zeuxis and Parrhasios were both particularly noted for their conspicuous display of wealth, and Lysippos is said by Pliny to have made 1,500 statues (NH 34.17-37). Although wages did rise during the fourth century, it has been difficult to understand how artists could become wealthy, since the recorded rates of pay are so small: one drachma a day in the late fifth and early fourth century and, later, only two drachmas a day. A logical assumption must be that successful artists followed the trend toward developing workshops that at times employed sizeable numbers of slaves, who may have made up about 35 percent of the total Athenian population of 210,000 in 360 B.C. Slaves were apparently paid the same wage as free workmen, but the owner must have received the wage and been able to retain a portion as profit. The artists could thus have multiplied their productivity and earning power, and the profit could have been invested for further profit, in accordance with general practice. J. K. Davies has proposed that the family that produced Kephisodotos and Praxiteles was immensely wealthy in the fourth century, though this proposal must be treated with some caution, since it assumes that the names in the ancient sources are the same as those of the famous sculptors of the fourth century and a blood relationship that is so far only hypothesis.

Whatever the case, artists belonged to the swelling crowd of people making money with notable success from sources other than land.

The world of the fourth century looked back consciously to the glories of the fifth century in social, political, and artistic terms. Given the significant changes in all these areas, this is not difficult to understand. To clarify Rodenwaldt’s remark on the ambiguous nature of the art of the century, we can see that the fourth century in all respects looked both backward and forward; every sword has two edges, and in the fourth century both were particularly sharp. The sophists might be attacked for their professional, immoral, or amoral attitudes to the task of persuasion, yet Sokrates, Plato, Aristotle, and many others struggled to organize and understand the elements of the ever more complex worlds.
of politics, society, and art. Indeed, we can say without hesitation that the old, small, and clannish world of the sixth and fifth centuries was gradually turning into an urbane and cosmopolitan world in which the Greeks were becoming the leaders and no longer the followers. To bemoan this development is as curious as it is to bemoan the creation of the centralized states of Egypt and Mesopotamia in the early third millennium. The Greek world was growing up and flexing its muscles. To be sure, the initial impression is one of relative chaos and decline, yet the subsequent domination of Greek culture—that is, political, social, intellectual, and artistic criteria for judging anything and everything down to the present day—belies such a simple impression. Greece was headed toward a new and important role as leader of the eastern Mediterranean. Even when the Romans came on the scene with such vigor a mere century later, the defeat of Philip V of Macedon at Kynokephale in 197 paralleled the defeat of Athens and her allies at Chaironeia (338); Flamininus’s announcement of the liberation of Greece at the Isthmian games of 196 paralleled the spirit of the Corinthian League and merely marked a new change, not a totally new dispensation.