

Gianfranco Adornato

1. Introduction

Words have history. Words have meanings.

In the present article I would like to reassess the notion of ‘artistic revolution’ used in the field of ancient art history, in connection with the artistic personality of the Athenian bronze sculptor, Kritios, and the alleged impact of the Persian Wars on Greek art¹. In the recent historiographic debate, the main question relates whether this process developed gradually, incrementally or emerged suddenly. To a *revolutionary* interpretation of the artistic phenomenon, namely the Tyrannicides’ group by Kritios and Nesiotes dated soon after the end of the second Persian War, a gradualist approach has been proposed².

Furthermore, it is well understood that quotations and citations from and of ancient, modern, and contemporary sources and historiography can deploy their meaning only within their own historical and literary contexts, contexts that have to be taken into consideration before the respective references are used to support our arguments. It is, of course, legitimate to create a personalized frame of a specific issue, but if we read the factual evidence through the lens of our wishful thinking, we run the risk of not being persuasive.

For this reason, I will dedicate part 1 to the discussion of «artistic revolution», adopting and applying Thomas Kuhn’s *ipsissima verba*; part 2 to the modern lemma *contrapposto* and its misleading use in literature; and part 3 to the demonstration that literary sources, in particular Lucian’s *Rhetorum Praeceptor*, do not represent a solid and reliable ground to support Kritios’ (supposed) revolutionary activity. From a methodological point of view, it is fundamental to distinguish between the actual statements of ancient literary sources and our reading, guided by our (contemporary) perspectives and intentions. At the same time, we must be aware of possible changes of meaning and nuances if we, as archaeologists, adopt words, concepts, and labels developed in other disciplines.

2. Thomas Kuhn and the (impossible) artistic revolution

Quoting the influential volume *The Structure of Scientific Revolution* (1962) by Thomas Kuhn in order to support a supposed artistic revolution soon after the Persian Wars impersonated by the renowned Tyrannicides group (dated to 477/6 by the *Marmor Parium*)³ made by Kritios and Nesiotes appears stimulating, but boomerangs⁴. Indeed, as we use the principles of the scientific revolution, we must scrupulously apply notion and parameters as articulated by Thomas Kuhn in its whole frame, not distorted by and for our needs.

In adopting Kuhn’s theory on scientific revolution, A. Stewart states that:

discoverers and paradigm disruptors need not be individual geniuses working alone. Once the paradigm (in our case, the senescent Archaic style’s formulaic description of the world and particularly of humanity) is seen as inadequate or even false, several such malcontents may well

Sections of this article were presented and discussed at the conference “480 BCE: Reconsidering the Chronological Anchor of Archaic and Classical Greece” (June 23-26, 2022), organized by Josine Blok, Floris van den Eijnde and Janric van Rookhuijzen. For comments and suggestions to a previous draft, I would like to thank Maria Ida Gulletta, Astrid Lindenlauf, Marion Meyer, Eric Moormann, Giorgia Proietti, Brunilde Ridgway, Anja Slawisch, Janric van Rookhuijzen, and the anonymous referees.

¹ According to STEWART 2008a, 2008b and 2017.

² In the last decade, the revolutionary interpretation has been claimed (only) by A. Stewart (STEWART 2021); *contra* ADORNATO 2017, 2019a; 2020; AZOULAY 2017, p. 42: «Of course, Critios and Nesiotes were by no means innovative here, for they were inspired by a schema that was already familiar in sixth-century iconography». For a gradualistic approach, *e.g.*, BARRINGER 2020; KUNZE 2020; KEESLING 2020; MEYER 2015; NEER 2010; STESKAL 2004. It is worth noting that even RIDGWAY 1970 proposed a more nuanced approach to the transition from the Archaic to the Classical period. A solid overview of the historiographic debate in MEYER 2020a and 2020b.

³ IG 12 5 444 (= FGtHist 239, 70-71).

⁴ STEWART 2021, p. 213.

emerge simultaneously or nearly so, sometimes forming a movement. Michelangelo stood Raphael and Titian; alongside Monet stood Renoir, Sisley, and Bazille; and alongside Picasso, Braque. All of them drew liberally on their predecessors (particularly on Leonardo, Perugino, and Giorgione; on Pissarro and Courbet; and on Cézanne, respectively), but were genuine revolutionaries nonetheless⁵.

In principle, this opinion could be accepted, even though it is not clear on which parameters Michelangelo was more revolutionary than Raphael and Titian. As this statement has to be read through the lens of the theory, as proposed by Kuhn in his essays⁶, Stewart's argument does not match and satisfy the specific peculiarities of a revolution. By adhering to Kuhn's system, we must be aware of its meaning, implications, and consequences, and know that Kuhn is explicit in regarding the possibility to identify a scientific revolution and not an artistic one:

because the success of one artistic tradition does not render another wrong or mistaken, art can support far more readily than science a number of simultaneously incompatible traditions or schools. For the same reason, when traditions do change, the accompanying controversies are usually resolved far more rapidly in science than art. In the latter, Ackermann suggests, controversy over innovation is not usually settled until some school arises to draw the fire of irate critics; even then, I presume, the end of the controversy often means only the acceptance of the new tradition, not the end of the old. In the science, on the other hand, victory is not so long postponed, and the side which loses is then banished. Its remaining adherents, if any, are considered to have left the field⁷.

Since the main aspects of the scientific revolution, as proposed by Kuhn (transferred by Stewart to art), concern (a) the rejection of one long-held-theory for another incompatible with it and (b) the (immediate) shift of paradigm, it is highly problematic to transfer that theoretical frame to the artistic evidence dated soon after 480, to Kritios and Nesiotes, and to the Tyrannicides.

It is evident that Stewart's conclusions (the statues of the Tyrannicides were «not only the earliest dated monuments in the new style, but also themselves revolutionary» and «the Severe Style appears suddenly and in revealing circumstances»)⁸ satisfy partially the first Kuhnian criterion, but not the second one.

In order to strengthen the two arguments, I would start by mentioning some works of art significant from a formal and stylistic point of view.

The attacking pose of Harmodios is not innovative: from a formal perspective, an important sculpture from the Acropolis, dated to before 480, is a fighting group of Theseus wrestling with Prokrustes (figs. 7-8)⁹. From a rear view, we can appreciate the attacking pose of Theseus' body: the right arm is raised, put backward, the left arm is stretched and bent to hold the enemy; more strikingly, the left leg is advanced and slightly bent, the right leg retrocedes; the left buttock is higher and contracted, the right one is lowered and wider, following the movement of the right leg. From a chronological point of view, the pose of Theseus seems to anticipate the attacking movement of Harmodios (fig. 10) by Kritios and Nesiotes (it is impossible to establish whether this pose was already attested in the previous group by Antenor): specularly, Harmodios raises forward his right arm and lowers backward his left one; the right leg advances and the left moves backward. Since the Theseus' group dates before the Persian Wars and Harmodios' pose seems to replicate it, we must conclude that: 1) the old formal tradition is not rejected and 2) there is no paradigm shift from Theseus to Harmodios. The formal comparison between the two statues exemplifies Kuhn's statement that the new artistic tradition does not interrupt the previous one.

Consequently, from a stylistic point of view, since we detect different and incompatible solutions in the 470s at Athens (for instance, the Kritios' Boy, the Athena statue dedicated by Angelitos and

⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁶ KUHN 1962 and 1969; see also ACKERMAN 1969; on periodization DACOSTA KAUFMANN 2010.

⁷ KUHN 1969, p. 410.

⁸ STEWART 2008b, pp. 608 and 601 respectively.

⁹ Athens, Acropolis Museum, inv. 145 (body) and 370 (fragment of a neck with beard); PAYNE 1950, pp. 43-4.

signed by Euenor, the Propylaia kore, the bronze statuette of Athena dedicated by Meleso, the small bronze head of a youth, the bronze head of a warrior, the marble head from the Kerameikos)¹⁰, the archaeological and art historical evidence speaks against an artistic revolution: it is not the end of the old tradition, as stated in Kuhn's theory.

Another qualifying pattern of revolution is the shift of paradigm (like a political revolution or in Greek term a *metabole*): can we declare that a significant shift of style and patterns appeared fully armed after 480 in the Mediterranean? This is a prerequisite to recognize a revolution. However, there is not a shift of stylistic paradigm soon after 480: just to mention some cases dated to the 470s, on the Propylaia kore or on the bronze head of a warrior or on the Blond Boy¹¹ we still detect clothes, hairstyle, and stylistic features characteristic of the previous period, reminiscent of Late Archaic patterns. Even Aristogeiton's face presents Archaic traits in the rendering of the beard and moustache; the hairstyle of Harmodios resembles the curl-snails on the statue of Aristodikos.

Stressing the shift of paradigm, even more problematic is the recent re-evaluation of the pedimental sculptures of the temple of Aphaia: both pediments are dated after 480 by Stewart¹², and in his recent article only the east pediment is as revolutionary as the Tyrannicides, while the west one looks Archaic¹³. Stewart's conclusion is in contradiction with Kuhn's enunciation of revolution, rejection of the past tradition, and change of paradigm: in the case of the temple of Aphaia, the alleged revolutionary character of the east pediment is juxtaposed with the incompatible tradition of the west pediment.

Furthermore, the pediments of the temple of Aphaia offer the best counter-argument to the supposed artistic revolution, as they do not reject the old-fashioned tradition and shift towards a different one: on the contrary, both styles and traditions are present and on the eastern (revolutionary) pedimental sculptures clear Archaic traits are still evident.

Since revolution happens when a rejection of the previous tradition and a shift of paradigm occur, it is inappropriate stating that «the Severe Style began (just) after the Persian sack», as Archaic features are still evident on many sculptures dated in the 470s in Athens and in the rest of the Mediterranean.

To conclude with Kuhn's *ipsissima verba*: «Picasso's success has not relegated Rembrandt's paintings to the storage vaults of art museums»¹⁴.

3. *Contrapposto*: when and who?

Another problematic aspect regards the use and meaning of *contrapposto*: «apparently for the first time, the Tyrannicides in particular codify and cleverly exploit a relatively new invention, namely, *contrapposto* (to use the standard Renaissance term for this special case of what contemporary Greeks called *rhythmos* or disciplined compositional form)»¹⁵. This *palinodia* contradicts what Stewart previously stated: that the *contrapposto* first appeared in datable form on the colossal bronze Apollo at Delphi commissioned by the Greek allies from Theopropos of Aigina to celebrate their victory at Salamis in 480 B.C.E.¹⁶

From an art historical point of view, is it correct stating that the *contrapposto* appeared for the first time in the Tyrannicides group and that it was a relatively new invention?

Before answering the question, it is worth noting that *contrapositum* or *contentio* is the Latin translation of the Greek term *antitheton* or *antithesis*, and concerns the rhetorical construction by oppositions or opposite concepts, as discussed by Aristotle (*The Art of Rhetoric* 3.9.7-10),

¹⁰ Athens, Acropolis Museum, inv. no. 698 (Kritios Boy); inv. no. 140 (Athena); inv. no. 688 (Propylaia kore); National Archaeological Museum, inv. no. Br. 6447 (Athena Promachos); inv. no. Br. 6590 (small bronze head); inv. no. Br. 6446 (warrior); Kerameikos Museum: inv. no. P 1455. STEWART 2008a and 2008b; ADORNATO 2019a and 2019c.

¹¹ Athens, Acropolis Museum, inv. no. 689.

¹² STEWART 2008b.

¹³ STEWART 2021, p. 204; ADORNATO 2019, p. 580 reporting contradiction in Stewart's analysis; on the sculptures from the temple of Aphaia: WÜNSCHE 2020.

¹⁴ KUHN 1969, p. 407.

¹⁵ STEWART 2021, p.

¹⁶ STEWART 2017, p. 48. As demonstrated in ADORNATO 2019a, 2019b, 2019c, and 2020, Stewart's assumption that the *contrapposto* first appeared on the bronze Apollo at Delphi is not true.

Demetrius of Phalerum (*On Style* 22-24), Cicero and other sources¹⁷. I have already shown¹⁸ that a technical and artistic discussion of counter-position could be attested in a section of the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon (3.10.1-8). It is the sculptor Kleiton who explains to Socrates: «the natural disposition of all the parts, in all the different postures of the body: for, whilst some of these are extended, others remain bent; when that is raised above its natural height, this sinks below it; these are relaxed, and those again are contracted, to give the greater force to the meditated blow, and the more these things are attended to, the nearer you approach to life».

Built on opposite sections, the *contrapposto* implies a variety of solutions (*non uno fit modo*, says Quintilian) and is not «a balanced asymmetry about a central axis»¹⁹, which appears a simplistic and narrow definition.

As we use *contrapposto* in a more literal meaning, it is evident that a kouros statue is conceived according to opposite segments, since one leg is advanced, one gluteus is lowered, the head is slightly turned to the side; one arm could be straight down along the body and the other bent, one shoulder is put forward; in some cases, the direction of the foot is oblique and not perpendicular to the front line of the base. The *contrapposto* does not represent a specific chronological pattern, even though ancient artists have experimented solutions for the rendering of the anatomy and the movement. Marble statues, like the kouros 692 and Aristodikos, not to mention many exemplars of the Ptoion 20 Group, present significant improvements and formal achievements before 480; new technical and anatomical solutions are also attested on Late Archaic reliefs. The conception of the body of kouros 692 (ca. 490) is undeniably radical for its *contrapposto*: the arms are held away from the torso (the sculptor does not use struts), the right arm is bent and held forward; the left leg is advanced and bent. To this, I can add another important sculpture from the Acropolis, that is a fighting group of Theseus wrestling with Prokrustes (dated before 480; figs. 7-8)²⁰. From a rear view, we can appreciate the attacking pose and the elegant *contrapposto* of Theseus' body: the right arm is raised, put backward, the left arm is stretched and bent to held the enemy; more strikingly, the left leg is advanced and slightly bent, the right leg retrocedes; the left buttock is higher and contracted, the right one is lowered and wider, following the movement of the right leg. From a chronological point of view, the pose seems to anticipate the attacking movement we detect on the Livadhostro Poseidon (before 480; fig. 9): in this case, the bronze statue has a reversed *contrapposto* in comparison to the marble Theseus. More interestingly, the scheme is later reproduced by Harmodios' body (fig. 10), even though the arms are reversely arranged Harmodios raises the right arm forward, while Theseus backwards; the tyrannicide moves the left arm backward and the hero forward. It seems too easy to label all this evidence dated before 480 as a single swallow and, on the contrary, to admit that a single sculptural group makes a summer!

From my methodological point of view and from the sculptural examples mentioned above, it is difficult to agree that the *contrapposto* served to restore order, control, and monumentality, in opposition to the robotic pose of the kouroi²¹.

To sum up, literary sources on *antithesis/contrapositum/contentio* invite us to consider the artistic and archaeological evidence under a different perspective: even a relaxed leg of a kouros or the attitude of Athena from the Gigantomachy pediment have to do with the *contrapposto*²².

4. *Kritios: revolutionary?*

According to Stewart's own principles, artistic innovation is signaled in three main ways: the artist is described as (1) a discoverer of a new technique or image type (as its *protos heurètes* or *primus inventor*); as (2) a stylistic paradigm; and/or as (3) the founder of a school. Since *Kritios* satisfies

¹⁷ *Contrapositum* appears in Quint. *Inst. Or.* 9.3.81-84; Aug. *Civ.* 11.18; Isid. *Orig.* 2.21.5; *contentio* is attested in *Rhet. Her.* 4.21 and 4.58; Cic. *De Orat.* 3.205; see ADORNATO 2020.

¹⁸ ADORNATO 2020.

¹⁹ STEWART 2021, footnote 21.

²⁰ Athens, Acropolis Museum, inv. 145 (body) and 370 (fragment of a neck); PAYNE 1950, pp. 43-4.

²¹ STEWART 2021, p. 213.

²² Pace STEWART 2021, p. 205, footnotes 21 and 22, whose own definition of *contrapposto* is very narrow.

two of the three categories, his and Nesiotes' Tyrannicides «are not only the earliest dated monuments in the new style but also themselves revolutionary»²³.

In order to support his own view, Stewart quotes a well-known passage of Lucian's *Rhetorum Praeceptor* (chapter 9):

εἰτά σε κελεύσει ζηλοῦν ἐκείνους τοὺς ἀρχαίους ἄνδρας ἕωλα παραδείγματα παρατιθεῖς τῶν λόγων οὐ ῥάδια μιμεῖσθαι, οἷα τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἐργασίας ἐστίν, Ἥγησιου καὶ τῶν ἀμφὶ Κριτίου καὶ Νησιώτην, ἀπεσφιγμένα καὶ νευρώδη καὶ σκληρὰ καὶ ἀκριβῶς ἀποτεταμένα ταῖς γραμμαῖς

Then he will tell you to imitate those ancient worthies, and will set you fusty models for your speeches, far from easy to copy, resembling sculptures in the early manner such as those of Hegesias and of Kritios and Nesiotes – wasp-waisted, sinewy, hard, meticulously definite in their contours.

Here Lucian mentions Hegesias and artists around Kritios and Nesiotes as exemplary ancient exponents (ἀρχαίους ἄνδρας) of ancient technique (παλαιᾶς ἐργασίας) and characterizes their works as rigid, robust and muscular, hard (ἀπεσφιγμένα καὶ νευρώδη καὶ σκληρὰ), and precisely divided into parts with lines (ἀκριβῶς ἀποτεταμένα ταῖς γραμμαῖς). In this passage, the style of artists active in the first half of the fifth century, including Hegesias, Kritios and Nesiotes, presents a high degree of hardness: it is not a coincidence that in Quintilian Hegesias' works are rather rigid and similar to Etruscan sculptures (*duriora et Tuscanica proxima*)²⁴. Similarly, Lucian's aesthetic judgment seems to recall that by Dionysios of Halicarnassos on ancient paintings characterized by precise lines (*akribeis de tais grammais*). In literary sources, the style of Kritios (and Nesiotes) is not praised for innovative solutions, actually it is similar to Hegesias's hard style and typical of the old technique of the ancient period. As already noted, the works by Kritios and Nesiotes are classified among the hard statues (Lucian) and considered similar to the hardest (Quintilian): a negative judgment²⁵, not immediately related to artistic innovations and revolutions.

In ancient literary sources there is evidence of terms, like *mutatio* in Latin, to define and single out inventions and innovative artists: innovations and improvements (not revolutions!) are introduced by the well-known formula of the *protos heurtes* or *primus inventor*, by verbs (*vincere, mutare*), substantives (*novitas*) and adjectives. The introduction of new solutions and technical advancements in sculpture as in painting are not conceived as revolutionary practices in literary sources.

In epigram 62, for instance, Posidippus refers first to images of the past and statues made according to antiquated rules (*polychronioi*), to the art of Hageladas, who is described as an "old-school" artist (*palaiotechnes*), to the rigid figures (*skleroi typoi*) made by Didymides, in opposition to the new technical and artistic solutions (*neara*) proposed by Lysippos²⁶. Still in Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* (34,65), Lysippos is praised to have changed the rules of statuary, modifying the proportions of the body from squarish to slender figure (*quadratas veterum staturas permutando*).

In Quintilian (2.13.8-10), the change of traditions and order (*mutare ex illo constituto traditoque ordine*) is associated to variations (*variari habitus vultus status*): even the Discobolos by Myron is praised for its *novitas ac difficultas* («novelty and difficulty»). Myron himself contributed to the improvements of bronze statuary as he was the first to multiply truth, more productive than Polykleitos, and more diligent observer of symmetry (*primus hic multiplicasse veritatem videtur, numerosior in arte quam Polyclitus et in symmetria diligentior*). Still he too only cared for the physical form, and did not express the sensations of the mind, and his treatment of the hair of the head and of the pubes continued to betray an archaic want of skill (*et ipse tamen corporum tenuis*

²³ STEWART 2008b, p. 608.

²⁴ Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.7; ADORNATO 2019a, pp. 567-9.

²⁵ Fundamental commentary on this passage is ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, pp. 241-3.

²⁶ STEWART 2021 does not consider this chronological and stylistic opposition.

curiosus animi sensus non expressisse, capillum quoque et pubem non emendatius fecisse quam rudis antiquitas instituisset)²⁷. In this last sentence, it is evident that Myron's sculptures appear more advanced in some patterns and still linked to the past in other features.

As highlighted in a recent article and volume²⁸, artistic improvements and ruptures or gradual differences as degrees of hardness are, as literary sources attest, constitutive parts of the artistic process. In this perspective the adjectives in Cicero's and Quintilian's quotations, used in the comparative degree, have been considered to refer to the progresses in technique, technology, and style through significant formal stages. This does not mean that we should adhere to a model of smoothly progressing stylistic development and to *euchrony*: on the contrary, this analysis allowed us to single out *several* innovations and inventions (including errors) by artists, and in their synchronic dimension as well as in their diachronic one. Ancient literary sources provide us with very interesting comments on artists and their works of art: it is the case of Myron whose formal peculiarities, as Pliny the Elder (and his sources) testify, were much appreciated but for the rendering of the pubic hair strongly linked to the fashion of the previous period. Since Myron's activity is usually dated to around the second quarter of the fifth century and then close to the Greek revolution, it is worth noting that ancient writers acknowledge his works of art as innovative and inventive in shaping the body's movements with some old-fashioned traits in the rendering of the hair and pubic hair. According to literary sources, despite the novelties and innovations in bronze statuary and a touch of *antiquitas* in his works of art, Myron was not considered one of the Greek revolutionary artists.

For this reason, it does not justified to label this approach as a rigidly gradualist agenda, since it is not rigid nor gradualist.

5. Conclusion

It is worth noting that in the 1960s Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* was cited for the first time by Michael Fried not to discuss about science, but about art, more precisely about *Modernism*. His essay became «associated in the artworld with a narrow view of artistic practice that held Modernist painting to be not one among many paradigms, but *the only viable* paradigm governing contemporary art»²⁹. *Mutatis mutandis*, the attempt to identify an artistic revolution in a specific historical event, in two ancient artists, in a dated sculptural group (to which we should now add the east pediment of the temple of Aphaia) appears similar to that episode just mentioned above. In any case, the alleged artistic revolution is not supported by the parameters listed by Kuhn. The concept of paradigm has been very influential in art history, but Kuhn's proposition that breakthrough in science is stimulated by the discovery of an anomaly in the system of the preceding paradigm is not applicable to art, because an artist cannot encounter any evidence that upsets the prevailing paradigm³⁰. In this respect, «an innovation in art differs fundamentally from one in science for once a scientific theory has been superseded there is little to be gained from examining it except for its historical significance»³¹. On the contrary, for an artist of any period, what was produced before his time could represent a vital stimulus for his activity and creativity. If we accept the artistic revolution by Kritios and Nesiotes epitomized by the Tyrannicides, we should expect the rejection of the old artistic paradigm (a specific sculptor? The whole Archaic period?) and the shift towards a new paradigm. As we have already noticed, in the 470s and 460s we still detect *many* paradigms, different styles, a variety of formal solutions. Furthermore, archaeological evidence by Kritios and Nesiotes from the Athenian Acropolis offers a counterargument to Stewart's conclusions: on five of the six bases dated to after the Persian Wars, the dowel holes and cuttings show that Kritios and Nesiotes continued to use poses that were common during the Late Archaic period. In Kuhn's perspective, it means that Kritios and Nesiotes did not shift towards a different paradigm, which is a significant prerequisite to the (artistic) revolution.

²⁷ Plin. *NH* 34,58.

²⁸ ADORNATO 2019a; MEYER - ADORNATO 2020.

²⁹ JONES 2000, p. 489.

³⁰ ACKERMAN 1969.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 372.

Starting from these premises, it seems wise not to (ab)use and blindly apply «artistic revolution» to the archaeological and art historical evidence dated around the Persian Wars. Conversely, if a scholar intends to demonstrate that an artistic revolution happened soon after 480, s/he has to provide facts and objects compatible to Kuhn's theory in order to support his/her conclusions. As a methodological approach is exposed to advance a hypothesis, it is not possible to change the rules along the way, accepting just a part of it or recurring to personalized theoretical frames.

From materials to literary sources, I have demonstrated that in Antiquity there is not a specific technical lemma to indicate a revolution in the artistic production: in their works, ancient authors mention novelties, innovations, inventions, achievements in technique and formal traits. Apparently, none of the survived texts praised Kritios and Nesiotes as revolutionary artists: this is a modern inference, not supported by sources.

In this historiographic debate, the notion of Kuhn's scientific revolution applied to the artistic revolution fails to satisfy the specific principles of the total rejection of the previous theory and of the shift of paradigm, as we have highlighted in the scrutiny of the sculptural materials. Looking back at the archaeological evidence, as soon as we apply Kuhn's principles to the sculptures dated around 480, we must conclude that no artistic revolution nor revolutionary artists are detectable in Athens (Kritios' and Nesiotes' Tyrannicides group) and on the island of Aigina.

With Kuhn's *ipsissima verba*: «artists, whether in imitation or revolt, build from past art»³².

Bibliography

ADORNATO 2008: G. ADORNATO, *Delphic Enigmas? The Γέλας ανάσσω, Polykalos and the Charioteer statue*, «AJA», 112, 2008, pp. 29-55.

ADORNATO 2017: G. ADORNATO, *More than Holes! An unconventional Perspective of the 'Greek Revolution' in Bronze Statuary*, in *Artistry in Bronze: The Greeks and Their Legacy. XIXth International Congress on Ancient Bronze*, ed. by J. Daehner, K. Lapatin, A. Spinelli, Los Angeles 2017, pp. 80-6.

ADORNATO 2019a: G. ADORNATO, *Pondus, uno crure, and Polykleitos' Statues*, in *Αριστεία. Μελέτες προς τιμήν της Όλγας Παλαγγιά. Excellence: Studies in Honour of O. Palagia*, ed. by H. R. Goette and I. Leventi («Internationale Archäologie: Studia Honoraria», 38), Leidorf 2019, pp. 49-59.

ADORNATO 2019b: G. ADORNATO, *Kritios and Nesiotes as Revolutionary Artists? Ancient and Archaeological Perspectives on the So-Called Severe Style Period*, «AJA», 123, 2019, pp. 557-87.

ADORNATO 2019c: G. ADORNATO, *The invention of Classical Style in Sculpture*, in *Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, ed. by O. Palagia, Berlin 2019, pp. 296-327.

ADORNATO 2020: G. ADORNATO, *Body in transition, in Innovations and Inventions in Athens, c. 530-470 BC* (Wiener Forschungen zur Archäologie 14), ed. by M. Meyer, G. Adornato, Vienna 2020, pp. 57-65.

ACKERMAN 1969: J. S. ACKERMAN, *The Demise of the Avant Garde: Notes on the Sociology of recent American Art*, «Comparative Studies in Society and History», 11/4, 1969, pp. 371-84.

AZOULAY 2017: V. AZOULAY, *The Tyrant-Slayers of Ancient Athens. A Tale of Two Statues*, Oxford 2017.

BARRINGER 2020: J. M. BARRINGER, *When does 'Classical' begin?*, in *Innovations and Inventions in Athens, c. 530-470 BC* (Wiener Forschungen zur Archäologie 14), ed. by M. Meyer, G. Adornato, Vienna 2020, pp. 49-57.

DACOSTA KAUFMANN 2010: T. DACOSTA KAUFMANN, *Periodization and its discontents*, «Journal of Art Historiography», 2, 2010, pp. 1-6.

JONES 2020: C. A. JONES, *The Modernist Paradigm: The Artworld and Thomas Kuhn*, «Critical Inquiry», 26/3, 2020, pp. 488-528.

³² KUHN 1977, p. 152.

- KEESLING 2020: C. M. KEESLING, *Innovation and Deception: Athenian Commemoration of the Persian Wars*, in MEYER - ADORNATO 2020, pp. 211-27.
- KUHN 1962: T. KUHN, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago 1962.
- KUHN 1969: T. KUHN, *Comment*, «Comparative Studies in Society and History», 11/4, 1969, pp. 403-12.
- KUHN 1977: T. KUHN, *The Essential Tension*, Chicago 1977.
- MEYER 2015: M. MEYER, *Wenn und warum? Zur Diskussion um den Beginn der Klassik*, «Gephyra», 9, 2015, pp. 15-21.
- MEYER 2020a: M. MEYER, *Joint Efforts*, in *Innovations and Inventions in Athens, c. 530-470 BC* (Wiener Forschungen zur Archäologie 14), ed. by M. Meyer, G. Adornato, Vienna 2020, pp. 11-22.
- MEYER 2020b: M. MEYER, *Open Questions: Old and New Discussions about Chronology and Dates*, in *Innovations and Inventions in Athens, c. 530-470 BC* (Wiener Forschungen zur Archäologie 14), ed. by M. Meyer, G. Adornato, Vienna 2020, pp. 23-46.
- MEYER - ADORNATO 2020: *Innovations and Inventions in Athens, c. 530-470 BCE, Two Crucial Generations*, ed. by M. Meyer, G. Adornato, Wien 2020 (Wiener Forschungen zur Archäologie 14).
- NEER 2010: R. NEER, *The Emergence of Classical Style in Greek Sculpture*, Chicago 2010.
- PAYNE 1950: H. PAYNE, *Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis*, London 1950.
- RIDGWAY 1977: B. S. RIDGWAY, *The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture*, Princeton 1977.
- STESKAL 2004: M. STESKAL, *Der Zerstörungsbefund 480/79 der Athener Akropolis*, Hamburg 2004.
- STEWART 2008a: A. STEWART, *The Persian and Carthaginian Invasions of 480 B.C.E. and the Beginning of the Classical Style: Part 1, The Stratigraphy, Chronology, and Significance of the Acropolis Deposits*, «AJA», 112/3, 2008, pp. 377-412.
- STEWART 2008b: A. STEWART, *The Persian and Carthaginian Invasions of 480 B.C.E. and the Beginning of the Classical Style: Part 2, The Finds from Other Sites in Athens, Attica, Elsewhere in Greece, and on Sicily; Part 3, The Severe Style: Motivations and Meaning*, «AJA», 112/4, pp. 581-615.
- STEWART 2017: A. STEWART, *Kritios and Nesiotes: Two Revolutionaries in Context*, in *Artists and Artistic Production in Ancient Greece*, ed. by K. Seaman and P. Schultz, Cambridge 2017, pp. 37-54.
- STEWART 2021: A. STEWART, *Continuity or Rupture? Further Thoughts on the 'Classical Revolution' (2500+ Years after Salamis)*, «Journal of Greek Archaeology», 6, 2021, pp. 200-26.
- WÜNSCHE 2020: R. WÜNSCHE, *Neues zu den Ägineten*, in *Innovations and Inventions in Athens, c. 530-470 BC* (Wiener Forschungen zur Archäologie 14), ed. by M. Meyer, G. Adornato, Vienna 2020, pp. 253-81.
- ZWEIMÜLLER 2008: S. ZWEIMÜLLER, *Lukian "Rhetorum Praeceptor": Einleitung, Text und Kommentar*, Göttingen 2008.