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Introductory remarks. A brief appreciation of the historical and religious significance of the statue. Description of the statue; its late history. Schreiber's method of approach and its limitations; his two rules. Method of evaluation for the various sources.
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CHAPTER I

In the twenty instances where Pausanias makes specific mention of statues of gold and ivory he speaks of Phidias as the builder of five: the Zeus at Olympia, the Heavenly Aphrodite of Elis, and one statue each of Athena at Athens, Elis, and Pellene, respectively, and he also refers to him as the helper of Theocles on the unfinished gold and ivory image of Zeus at Megara. While it can hardly be said that the statue of the Athena Parthenos was considered in antiquity as Phidias's greatest work in the chryselephantine technique, yet one may safely affirm that to the modern student it is of surpassing interest, for it seems that no other work of ancient art has been preserved in so many different sources of information. The monumental evidence is vastly more extensive than for other works of ancient art. The statue of Zeus at Olympia, as judged by the praise of ancient writers, may have been, indeed, the crowning work of Phidias's life; yet, on the other hand, as a source of inspiration for later artists and as an attractive theme for the minor arts, the Athena Parthenos is clearly unsurpassed either in the works of Phidias or his successors.

The questions which will be suggested in the following pages may be stated briefly, as follows: What should be our method of approach in the study of the Athena Parthenos? What were the relative positions of the different items such as the shield, the lance and the serpent? What of the necessity in the original statue of a column like that which occurs in the Varvakeion statuette? How were the sculptural decorations of
the helmet, shield and base carried out in the original? What was the probable distribution of the gold and ivory, i.e. is the generally accepted view that the chiton was of gold correct? If so, how may this fact be harmonized fully with the statements of the ancient writers? and if not, what about the theory that the robe in which the statue was clothed was the one presented to Athena Polias annually at the time of the Panathenaic festival? What, essentially, was a gold and ivory statue?

One ought to bear in mind in trying to appreciate the image itself that the building of the Parthenon and the setting up of the gold and ivory statue of the patron goddess of the State marked the climax of the tremendous activity of the Athenian people which followed the Persian war. Their spirits had in some way received an incalculable uplift and an immeasurable enthusiasm from their signal victories over the Mede. Their homes had been destroyed and the Acropolis had been laid in ruins, but the people nevertheless were free, and Athens had become the saving light of all Greece. There was awakened within them a feeling of irresistible power. What need they care for the hardships which the work of rebuilding their city necessarily thrust upon them? Their country, their traditions, and their culture had been preserved. One is likely to miss to some extent the spirit of the work of Pheidias and fail to appreciate its real significance if he thinks of this statue merely as an effort at display on the part of the Athenian people, or as the outcome of any crafty scheme on the part of Pericles to unite all Hellas. It was, rather, the blossoming forth of the religious life of the Athenian people as they came
into the realization of their debt of gratitude to Heaven for the defeat of the Persians, and it was likewise the miracle of their own increased strength and greatness of soul which came at this time from sources which are as yet unknown. It was the feeling that with the help of Athena nothing great and noble was beyond their power. Accordingly, they began to restore and adorn the Acropolis and to rebuild the houses connected with the worship of the one deity in whom especially they had trusted for their strength to conquer. They set up, first of all the "Athena Promachus," a statue in bronze so gigantic that the helmet and the tip of the spear could be seen far out at sea. The people said: "Athena has been fighting for us," and Pheidias, more than any other artist of that time, was able to give their belief a fitting expression in outward symbol.

Ten years later when the same artist created for the state the statue of Athena which was to stand in the Hecatompedon of the new temple of the Polias, it was no longer a militant divinity which he sought to represent; it was an Athena Triumphant. This is indicated by her attitude, by the Nike upon her outstretched hand, by the sculptural decoration of her shield — in fact, this must have been in a sense the dominant idea of the whole temple.

The description which Pausanias* gives of the statue is circumstantial but incomplete. "The image itself is made of ivory and gold. Upon the middle of the helmet is the figure of a sphinx and on the either side are Griffins wrought in relief... The image of Athena stands upright, clad in a chiton which reaches to the feet: on her breast is the head of Medusa wrought in ivory.

* 1:24.5-7.
She holds a Nike about four cubits high, and in her (other) hand a spear. At her feet there is a shield and near the spear there is a serpent which may be Erichthonius. On the pedestal of the image is wrought in relief the birth of Pandora." This description is confirmed by the statements of other writers, and numerous details are added which Pausania did not mention.

The height of the image was twenty-six cubits*. The face, hands and feet were of ivory, but the pupils of the eyes were of stone**. The gold of the statue could all be removed***. On the outside of the shield, in the representation of the battle of the Greeks and Amazons, Pheidias placed portrait reliefs of Pericles and himself****. On the inside of the shield was the battle of the gods and the giants, and on the sandals, Centaurs and Lapiths*****. The Parthenos wore the aegis******. The number of figures of deities represented on the base was twenty*******.

The Nike wore a golden crown********. Notwithstanding this wealth of literary evidence the description is incomplete. Mention is not made of the Pegasus on either side of the sphinx, of the serpents of the aegis, of the locks of hair falling down over the breast, of the small heads of animals projecting over the

* Pliny, N.H. 36.18.
** Plato Hipp. major p.290b.
*** Thuc. 2.13; Diod.12.40;Plut.Per.31.
**** Plut. Per.31;dio Chrys. Or,12 vol.1,p.214D;Cicero, Tusc. 1.15.34;Val. Max.8.14.6;Aristotle de mundo 6,p.399b; Apuleius, de mundo 32.
***** Pliny, op.cit.
****** Max.Tyr.Dissert 14.6;Aristid. Or.34.vol.1,p.475D.
******* Pliny, N.H. 36.19.
******** I.G.4.2.652.
forehead-piece of the helmet, of the girdle and the arrangement of the folds of the chiton, or of the special features of ornamentation such as the necklace and bracelets. These and other details may be discovered only from a comparative study of the numerous monumental sources.

The fate of the Athena Parthenos is not fully known. Viewed as to durability chryselephantine statues were not altogether a success*. Possibly it was a mistake on the part of Pericles to cause the statue to be made so that the gold could be removed. Too much credence may easily be given, doubtless, to the story of Lachares and his theft, as told by Pausanias** and others, but the existence of a tradition as to the removing of the περισσάρετος κόσμος *** of the statue renders it difficult to believe that the gold was intact in the second century of our era. Yet, that the gold was not all removed is made tolerably certain by the description of the statue by Pausanias, particularly where he makes mention of the Nike, which, in all probability, was of gold. The real foundation of the tradition concerning Lachares is not known. Epigraphical evidence, however, shows that there was a tendency towards disintegration of the several parts of the statue and there is no indication that it was repaired at any time. Among the treasures of the Hecatompedon are mentioned two small helmets ἀπὸ τοῦ βάθρου ****; likewise the golden Gorgoneion ἀπὸ τῆς ἀσπίδος [••••••••••••••••], also a branch with four golden leaves from the crown which the Nike wore*****. The Gorgoneion (τῆς θεοῦ *******), furthermore was

* For the repair of the Zeus at Olympia by Damophon see Pausanias 4.31.8; cf. 5.11.10.
** Pausanias 1.25.7; cf. Athen.9.70, and Plut.Is.et.Os.71.
*** Pausanias 1.25.7; cf. Thuc.2.13.
**** I.G.2.676.40f.; 2.701, ii 60f.
***** I.G.2.676.40f.; 2.701, ii 60f.
(••••••, ••••••••••••••••, ••••••••••••••••, see next page)
stolen εξ ἀκροπόλεως. Little by little, the statue seems to have lost its ornamentation. The Parthenos stood, however, until the fourth century of the Christian era*, and it may have remained in its place even for a century more. The philosopher Proclus, who died in the latter half of the fifth century is said to have seen the statue removed "by those who move things immovable"**. The theory that the Parthenos was removed to Constantinople does not seem to be supported by evidence of much weight. Its sole basis is a conjecture by Arathas (c.900A.D.)*** relative to an ivory Athena which was situated in the forum of Constantine. Some have thought that the ivory Athena which he mentions is the Parthenos, but as to this we cannot be certain.

Considerable care should be used in dealing with the question of the relation of the various replicas to each other not to approach the subject prepossessed with a particular notion which is likely to overshadow the real evidence. Undoubtedly one may study the works which are more or less direct copies of works by Pheidias and productions by the pupils of Pheidias until there comes a rather definite idea of the Pheidian style as it was expressed in marble and bronze. Care, on the other hand, must be taken in trying to apply such ideas to statues of gold and ivory until adequate knowledge is had of the actual chryselephantine technique. This need is suggested by Schreiber's discussion**** of the relation of the various replicas of the Parthenos to

con.****I.G.2.660.52f. ***** I.G. 2.645,646,656,675.

***** Synesius de calu 19.83A.

* See Zosimus 4,18 where mention is made of a small image of Achilles placed "at the foot of the statue of Athena set up in the Parthenon."

** Marinus vita Procli 30.

*** Schol.ad Arstid.50,p.701.

**** Der Athena Parthenos des Pheidias,p.47.
Colossal Statue by Antiochus.
each other. The difficulty of applying Schreiber's principle* concerning the particular feature of the style of Pheidias's work in a case where the "Stil-epitome" of the original is almost entirely a matter of conjecture, as in the chryselephantine technique of the Parthenon, is obvious. Schreiber selects two copies (Antiochus and Capitoline) as coming nearest to the original in some respects, apparently because: Beide haben den hardkantigen Metallstil der Gewandung selbst mit der Eigenthümlichkeit der Einknicken in den Faltenwand deutlich bewahrt**. Yet it is entirely possible that statues found in Rome, as the two mentioned above, showing the Metallstil, are not direct copies of the original but of some replica in bronze.

It will be seen at once that the matter of method is very important since it determines to a large degree the results which may be attained. Schreiber, for example, lays down two general rules*** which set forth his method of approach, as follows: 1. die Kopien, je mehr sie sich in der Grösse dem Original anähern, auch um so mehr Einzelzüge desselben enthalten können, und umgekehrt je kleiner, um so unvollständiger, auszurastvuger sein werden," and 2. je deutlicher sich in den Kopien das eigenthümliche Stilgerüche der Originale erhalten hat, um so

* He arrives at this general rule — a self evident rule and yet one easily capable of being applied in such a way as to vitiate its significance: "ie deutlicher sich in den Kopien das eigenthümliche Stilgerüche der Originale erhalten hat, um so näher werden sie diesen stehen und um so zuverlässiger auch

** ibid.

*** ibid. pp. 43-47.
näher werden sie diesen stehen und um so zuverlässiger auch in den Einzelzüften sein."

Incidentally, however, Schreiber admitted a fact which to some extent annuls the value of his two rules: namely, that many of the copies were produced in Rome, wrought, it may be, by artists who never saw the original statue. When this fact is once admitted, it follows that neither the relative size of the copy nor the painstaking care* of the artist can, in a particular case be a sufficient guarantee of accuracy. One would need to know in addition something of the actual copy which he sought to reproduce. Such information is wanting. When Schreiber says that the larger replicas have preserved certain details which are suppressed in the smaller, and mentions in particular the folds of the dress, the modification of the serpents on the aegis and the treatment of the locks of hair which fall down over the breast, etc., one might ask with perfect right: just how may I ascertain the original number of folds, and what assurance is there that the larger statues did not in some manner receive added touches here and there? The Varvakeion statuette, being larger than the Lenormant, gives more folds of the serpents body, but it is equally true that the Lenormant copy gives more figures on the shield and base than the Varvakeion. Schreiber's method, on the other hand, is not without its value, for the characteristics of the metal work which appear in certain marble statues which he mentions are foreign to that material, and whether they are the result of the use of a bronze replica as a model or are copied directly from the original, or however they are to be explained, it is conceivable that they may represent to some degree the peculiarities

* Schreiber appears to make painstaking care ("peinliche Sorgfalt
of style of the old technique. This possibility, however, is not to be pressed too far.

The evaluation of any given copy of the Athena Parthenos necessarily involves judgment of each item as to its essential harmony with the other known sources of information. One must answer in some way the following question: does this representation agree in this given particular (1) with the literary and epigraphical evidence so far as that evidence is known, (2) with the corresponding item in other copies and adaptations of the Parthenos, (3) with the traditions of painting and sculpture which belonged to the time of Pheidias, and particularly with what is known of the chryselephantine technique of this great master and his co-workers? Many other factors enter into our final judgement, such, for example, as the skill of the copyist, the material and size of the copy, the time and place of its making, together with any light which may be had from vase paintings, coins and reliefs of various kinds. When these tests are rigidly applied without prejudice, it is discovered that one after another of the various representations are to be considered to some extent inaccurate, and we are without a wholly adequate copy of the statue; the various artists who undertook to represent the original in coin types, reliefs, gems, terra cottas, and statues, all succeeded in some respects and failed in others; and the only recourse left for the student of today

con. measure of the degree in which "das Stilepräge der Criminale" is retained.

** op. cit. p. 43.
is to refrain from giving undue weight to the peculiarities of any single copy, but rather, to search through all the sources which have been mentioned for the elements which are clearly justified by the agreement and general harmony of the materials at hand, and to combine these results into as adequate a reconstruction as possible.
It is not within the scope of this study to discuss in
detail the events in the life of Phidias or even the relative
chronology of his various works. It would be interesting to
know what length of time was required to complete the Parthenon
statue, but owing to the fact that the date of the inscriptions
dealing with the actual expense accounts of the statue itself
has not been determined, the time cannot with accuracy at
present be decided. The work seems to have extended over a period
of at least five years ending 439 B.C., but whether it actually
required a longer time than this is not known. It may be said,
however, that the traditional date for the dedication of the
statue, that is, the time of the Panathenaic festival 439/438 B.C.,
is undoubtedly correct. The attempts of Nicole and Paretti to
assign a later date than 438 are based upon hazardous and
mutually contradictory readings of the Geneva Papyrus, and their
respective theories** are of little weight against the evidence
of certain Attic building accounts *** relative to the Parthenon
in which it appears that the selling of large quantities of gold
and ivory which was carried on in the closing years of the work
had its beginning in the selling of gold and silver in the ninth
year of the accounts, and it continued during the very period
in which Paretti, in particular, would have us believe that the
statue itself was being built, an idea which is manifestly
absurd. Since the statue was finished, as it seems, in 439/438,

* I.G.1.298 and supp. p 146; also 1.299a and 556.
** Nicole, Le Proces de Phidias; Paretti, Rom. Mitt., 1905, p 271f.
*** Cf. Dinsmoor, American Journal of Archaeology 17, 1913, p. 70.
the building accounts which relate to it must be dated prior to that time; some of them, on the other hand, should be assigned to as early as 443/442 for they include receipts from the treasurers of Athena who did not contribute to the Parthenon after that date. In general the expense accounts of the building of the statue were kept in lists separate from the regular accounts of the Parthenon, and it is not improbable that the construction of the statue was authorized by a separate decree. It is not the purpose of the writer, however, to give an exhaustive treatment of these chronological matters, but rather, to investigate the various details of the statue itself, beginning with a question of the column.

The attempted justification of the column in the Varvakeion statuette has taken two separate lines of development, neither of which is really conclusive. This fact will become apparent in the following examination of the chief arguments which have been presented by the various writers upon the subject.

The claim has been made that the "pillar" was of cult significance and for that reason must have had a place in the original Athena Parthenos of Phidias. This theory lacks clear and unmistakable proof such as would be required to overthrow the presumption against it which is caused not only by the lack of literary support in the case of the statue in question but also by the fact that the pillar is lacking in almost all the extant representations of the Parthenos.

It is claimed by Miss Bennett* that the pillar in the columnar form is found in four copies of the Athena Parthenos, as follows: (a) the Varvakeion statuette; (b) an Attic fourth century bas-relief; (c) an Athenian tessera; and (d) a Greek

gem of intaglio design. She says, further, that it is found in various other monuments not of the Parthenos type: (a) Athena Nike; (b) running Athena, connected with the pediment of the Parthenon; (c) Athena Nikephoros; (d) Athena Promachos; (e) Athena Hygieia; and (f) "mournng" Athena. The article closes with a discussion of the cult significance of the pillar in the evolution of the religious thought and expression among the Greeks.

The items of proof presented by Miss Bennett may be criticised in minor detail as follows: 1. Mention is made of a Cilician coin of the fourth century, where the statement is made that the column is "replaced" by a tree trunk. The phraseology seems to be due to Collignon, whom Miss Bennett mentions in the same sentence. In a sense, however, the statement begs the question. It is not absolutely certain that the coin gives a representation of the Athena Parthenos. The deity represented on the coin is nude from throat to waist, and the projections on the shoulders which have been thought to represent the serpents of the aegis may with equal right be interpreted as wings. The figure, at most, is not a copy in a strict sense of the term; it could not be considered more than an adaptation, made on foreign soil and with the introduction of foreign elements. It is probably an Athena, but not necessarily an Athena Parthenos. It is sufficiently obvious that, even if the identification were positively beyond doubt, the presence of a tree trunk as a support on a foreign coin would not in any serious degree argue for a column in the original Athenian statue. It would seem more likely in that case that the Cilician coin type was borrowed from some foreign marble statue of Athena, inspired in a general way by the Parthenos, in which an added support in the form of a
tree trunk was used. The fact that the column as a support is not found on any Athenian coin type which represents the Parthenos ought to be final in this matter. There is no sufficient evidence, in other words, that at this time there was a column to be "replaced." So far as we can ascertain it was centuries later that a column like that of the Varvakeion statuette came to be used in this connection, hence the importance of this Cilician coin has been greatly exaggerated. Von Sallet* points out that the leaden tessera, above referred to, is of late date and acknowledged to be of no great importance.

It has been denied also that in the bas relief to which reference has been made the hand of Athena really rests upon the column. This is, however, a matter where individual difference of opinion is possible, since the relief in question is not well preserved; but all important sources with the exception of the Varvakeion statuette are unanimously against such an interpretation. The relief shows the influence of the Athena Parthenos, but the Nike is placed differently, holds a different attribute and manifestly expresses a totally different thought. The relief in question is only a modification of the Parthenos type.

3. The inscriptions** cited by Miss Bennett do not give adequate literary support to the idea of the presence of a column in the original statue. It is merely a conjecture on her part that the stele mentioned in them is the same as the one spoken of by Plutarch (Pericles 13). Plutarch merely states, without comment, that in a certain stele Phidias is named as the δημιουργός of the Athena Parthenos. It seems improbable that the stele which is mentioned here was a column such as that of the Varvakeion statuette, and it is an equally unwarranted

* Zeitsschrift für Numismatik, 10, 1883, 152-155.
** I.G. 2.667.5 and 2.670.7
Cilician Coin of the Fourth Century B.C.
assumption that it was made of bronze. Ἀστήρ is used only metaphorically in the sense of "support"; it is not properly a synonym for column, nor for pillar (στῦλος), and if Miss Bennett chose to use it in that capacity it seems that she should have assumed the burden of proof and pointed out where— in her usage is justified from literary sources. Yet her only explanation here is this: "Our column may properly be called a στήλη." But the word for column in inscriptions, as elsewhere, is κίον, and there is, so far as the writer can learn, no certain instance in which στήλη is confused with it.

Besides, it is not at all certain that the "mysterious" bronze stele to which Miss Bennett refers existed. The comparatively certain reading, κατὰ τὴν στήλην, need not refer to anything at all mysterious. It is known that the gold of the Athena Parthenos was considered a part of the available treasury lists mentioned in I.G. 1.32.18ff, where by the decree of the Boule and the Demos, the treasurers were to take account, in the presence of the Boule, of the treasures in the various sanctuaries and were to write it all, item by item, on one stele, keeping the treasures of each deity separate and giving the sum-total of all. This stele was to be set up on the Acropolis, and future accounts were to be rendered by the treasurers at each Panathenaean festival. When certain items of the statue are said, in the above inscriptions, to be ἐντελεῖ κατὰ τὴν στήλην it seems most likely that the obvious reference is either to this original stele or else to a similar treasury list of some later Panathenaean.

* op. cit. p. 436.

** The nearest approach to an interchange of these terms is found in the items, κόρη χρυσή ἐπὶ στήλης (I.G. l.p.69ff) and κόρη ἐπὶ στήλης κατάχρυσος (iobid p.73ff.), as compared with χριστίτις λίθος ἐπὶ κιόνου (I.G.2.676.9), but the force of the ἐμ in these inscriptions is obscure, as it is also in Dittenberger 737.c.29: ἐσται ἐπὶ στήλη ἐπὶ τοῦ Νείονος. In general, however, the meaning of
It may possibly be that τὴν χαλκὴν should be added in the above inscriptions to the words κατὰ τὴν στήλην, following the conjectural restoration by Koehler of I.G. 2.667; but of this reading one cannot be certain. Böckh, for instance, suggests Ἀθήναν τὴν χαλκὴν, and even if one rejects his reading as improbable, still it must be acknowledged that there may have been other objects of bronze ἐν τῷ Παρθένον, aside from the more or less hypothetical bronze stele. It seems rather hazardous to take στήλην from one context and χαλκὴν from another, in lists which are otherwise vastly different, and then conclude that the original reading must have been in each case στήλην χαλκὴν.

It would seem that in order to supply missing words in a given line with any degree of certainty one ought to select them, not only from an inscription of the same general class, but also from the same context and even the same word order if possible. In the restorations made here by Koehler these prerequisites are not apparent. τὸ βάθρον, I.G.2.719, is supplied from I.G. 2.727 where these words stand alone and where, so far as the evidence goes, they are neither preceded by ἡ ἀσπίς nor followed by ἐν τῷ. In like manner, and with the same boldness, the word ἅγαλμα is supplied in I.G.2.719. 6: ἅγαλμα τὸ ἐν τῷ Ἐκατομπέδῳ κ.τ.λ. Yet ἅγαλμα occurs nowhere else in this connection; on the contrary, the usual introduction for Hecatompedon lists is simply ἐν τῷ νεῷ τῷ Ἐκατομπέδῳ.* It is clear, accordingly, that if both βάθρον and ἅγαλμα are conjecturally supplied, the restorations in inscriptions is perfectly clear: it is not an architectural member but a separate stone, or plate of bronze, inscribed in accordance with some public decree.

*** con.

* cf. I.G. 1.143 ff., also 2.652 A. 15.
ference of the words ἐν τελές κατὰ τὴν στήλην may be to ordinary treasure.

It seems impossible that a treasure list was in any way a part of the original Parthenos statue. Miss Bennett says*: "Certainly it seems reasonable to suppose that Pheidias put his signature on some portion of his statue rather than on some bronze pillar or tablet in the "Parthenon" or "Hecatompedon." But ἔγραψαί γέγραπται (Plut. Per. 13) does not assert that Pheidias "put his signature" anywhere. According to the statement of Cicero, moreover, the Athenians did not allow Pheidias to inscribe his name upon the statue at all, and we may be sure that they did not allow anyone else to inscribe it. But it is absurd to think that Pheidias put on some part of his statue a list of the value of its parts. Inscribed statues bear at most only the name of the artist and the dedicator or else some short phrase like the παντάρκης καλός of the Zeus at Olympia. An extended inscription on a statue would be an anomaly in Greek art. The most that can be said of the stele mentioned by Plutarch, then, is that it has not come down to us and that the evidence which we have concerning it is not sufficient to enable us to determine its nature either as to material or general content.

A more serious criticism, however, may be lodged against Miss Bennett's fundamental hypothesis. On page 444, in the article cited above, there is this statement: "...this ancient aniconic image, whose original meaning was lost in classical times, when it survived as a symbol, appears in several forms,...

* op. cit.
as Doric column, short or tall, as cippus, as unadorned post, and as short post with a capital." The various monuments on which her statement is based give no conclusive evidence that the pillar was ever used as an aniconic representation of Athena. The pillar, when it is associated with Athena, is used, in almost all cases, as a support for something else — e.g. owl, sphinx, Nike, etc. In all monuments of Athena (with the exception of the "Mournin:" Athena relief, which is still in dispute*) where the owl (or the Nike) fails, or is placed somewhere else other than on a column or on the hand of the goddess** the column is not retained in any form whatsoever. A probable explanation of this fact will appear below as we consider the function of the owl in the representations of Athena.

In some cases the owl seems to represent Athena, herself.

This view has literary support from a remarkable passage in Aristophanes' Wasps, 1036. γλαύξ γὰρ Ἦμων πρὶν μάχεσθαι τὸν στρατὸν διέπατο , where the scholiast offers explanation as follows: γλαύκα δὲ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν καλεῖ . E. M. Douglas cites a vase*** in the Archaeological Seminar, Upeala, on which is depicted a complete sacrifice to Athena. Athena, herself, is not visible, but an enormous owl is seated upon the altar with body in profile, but head turned full face toward the spectator. Mr. Douglas points out conclusively that the prominent position given here to Athena's owl is not unique. He cites, for instance, the countless small aryballoi to be found in every museum; the Corinthian pimn of the British museum where the owl is seen.

* See Fairbanks, American Journal of Archaeology, 6, 1902, p. 411 f; C. F. also American Journal of Archaeology, 13, 1909, p. 433.

** e.g. On Athena's lance, or on the branch of the olive tree, or flying in mid-air.
perched upon the top of a potter's oven; the so called "loom-weights" of clay, plain on one side, but showing, on the other side, the figure of an owl, the body in profile, but the head turned fully toward the spectator*. Still more interesting are certain gems from Berlin and two vases which Mr. Douglas mentions. In a black-figured vase from Munich, Athena is seen springing full-armed from the head of Zeus, and her emblem, the owl, is perched upon his wrist; but on the vase in the Vatican, which seems to portray the same scene, Athena is not visible, yet the owl appears seated upon the wrist of Zeus. The Berlin gems show a further development in that they represent the helmeted head of Athena united to the body of an owl. These representations are most easily understood, if the owl be thought of as Athena.

Additional light is thrown upon this question by a comparison of the owl with the various representations of Nike. Vase paintings and types on coins, gems, etc. show that the owl stands for the same conception as the Nike. They are found, for instance, in almost identical positions, on a pillar, on Athena's hand, in the top of an olive tree, or flying in mid air. They carry, likewise, the same token, a wreath. Both the owl and the Nike seem to be in some sense emanations from Athena. It is interesting to note in this connection that both Nike and owl rarely occur together in the same scene.

An examination of the monuments of Athena shows that whenever the owl and the Nike are represented at rest, some sort of a support is thought necessary. This support is frequently a column. If the column, on the other hand, were an aniconic

* "this is no common owl, for with human arms she holds the distaff and spins the wool, which seems to come from a calathos placed upon the ground." Douglas, *op. cit.*
representation of Athena, it could just as well occur when the owl, or the Nike, is in mid air, or on Athena’s lance, or in any other position than on her hand, but this is found in no certain instance. To conclude that the column arionic is to give it a function which is not indicated in the representations.

The second line of attempted proof is that the pillar was intended as a support for the hand because of the weight to be upheld. Lange points out that in the Asclepium at Epidaurus the statue of Asclepius in the gold and ivory technique, where the weight to be supported is inconsiderable as compared with that of the Nike of the Athena Parthenos, has a serpent as a support for the outstretched hand.* It is not certain, however, that the serpent was used "as a support." The exact words of Pausanias are these: τὴν δὲ ἔτεραν τῶν χειρῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐχεῖ τοῦ δράκοντος. It is not certain here that the ὑπέρ indicates actual contact. In fact, one of the coins cited by Lange actually shows a space between the extended arm and the serpent, just as in certain reliefs of Athena and the serpent.**

Lange further claims that such a support was an aesthetic necessity as a complement to the treatment of the right side of the statue in order that it might not appear empty in comparison with the rest. This idea may be questioned even with regard to the Varvakeion statuette, and it certainly does not apply to the original statue of the Parthenos. In those representations where the column does not appear the right hand of the goddess is

* Cf. Paus.2:27.3.
extended far enough to balance perfectly the statue as a whole.
The preponderance of evidence, also, from coins, reliefs, and
other representations of the Parthenos is against the view that
the Greeks felt that a support was necessary either from
practical or aesthetic considerations.

Another fact militates strongly against the use of the
column as a support in the original statue of the Parthenos; namely,
there is a positive literary tradition that the whole stay and
support of the statue was in some way centered in the shield.
There is, for example, such evidence as the following statement:—
in clipeo medio Daedali est imago ita collocata, quam siquis
imaginem e clipeo velit tollere pereat totum opus; solvitur enim
signem*. Most certainly if the statue had had the additional
support of a column it would not have been possible to say that
by the destruction of one likeness upon the shield the whole
statue would be destroyed — convulsa tota operis: τὸ σύμπαυν
ἀγάλμα λύειν τε καὶ συγχεῖν.

Perhaps the strongest evidence against the use of a column
as a support is furnished by the Lenormant copy. This statuette,
which is acknowledged to be one of the best representations of the
Parthenos and the only one of the more important copies aside
from the Varvakion to show the right arm intact, while unfinished
in all details excepting the face, nevertheless gives positive
proof that no column or other support was intended by the artist,

* Ampelius lib. memor. 8.10; Cf. Aristotelis, de mundo 6.399 b; Val.
Max. 8.14. 63. Apuleius de mundo, 32.
Statuette in Patras.
for the stone under the arm is cut away so that when finished the right hand would be left free. It is interesting to note, further, that in the Pergamon and Patras copies, although the right arm is lacking in both, yet the dimensions of the base, in relation to the size of the statue in each case, are such that a support in the form of a column such as that of the Varvakeion copy is impossible.

In attempting to explain the presence of the column in the Varvakeion statuette some have assumed that the column really had a place as a support for the arm of the goddess, not when the image was first set up in the temple, but at a later time when there was evidence of the giving away of the arm under the weight of the Nike. This hypothesis although without literary evidence, furnishes a plausible explanation for the appearance of the column in the two certain instances of its use.* The column on the other hand, may have been introduced by artists who were engaged in making copies of the Parthenos statue and who wrought at a time when supports were popular. Such artists, quite probably, had a difficulty to overcome which Phidias encountered only to a moderate extent, i.e. the weight of the Nike was far greater in proportion in these marble copies than in the original state, since the latter was made in the gold and ivory technique and not solid. One need only glance at the copies of Praxitelean works, for instance, to see how necessary these later artists considered it to be to have a support for their statues in marble. The maker of the Varvakeion statuette, who wrought in the time of Hadrian, would

* The Varvakeion statuette and an Athenian tessera of late date. cf. Zeitschrift für Numismatik 10,1883, p.152. I do not include the Attic relief to which reference has been made. For this relief cf. Archäologische Zeitung 15,1857, Taf.115.
be very likely to follow this common artistic tradition. The form of support may have been determined by his own ingenuity in view of the general practice and the special difficulty to be overcome.

A determination of the size of the base for the Athena Parthenos is important for the solution of certain literary and archaeological problems. Its height, for example, has been much discussed in connection with the interpretation of Pliny's estimate of the height of the entire statue: *Minervae Athenis factae amplitudine, cum sit ea cubitorum XXVI* . The base is probably included here in Pliny's statement, even though there is no positive indication to that effect. It was evidently his thought to impress his readers with the great height of the Parthenos, although he seems to deny any such intention, and probably he would have made particular mention of the omission if the height as he gives it had been exclusive of the base. It seems improbable, furthermore that the base of the statue was higher than that of the Zeus at Olympia, seeing that the latter was otherwise the larger base of the two, and, accordingly, Miss Perry's** opposition to Professor Rousopulos's theory*** in this regard is justified. Rousopulos thought that the base with sculptural decorations representing twenty dietics present at the birth of Pandora would of necessity be as much as 2.50m. in height. The sculptured base at Olympia, on the contrary, was only 1.19m. Since the number of figures across the front at Olympia

* Pliny N.H. 30.10.

** The Dimensions of the Athena Parthenos, American Journal of Archaeology 11,1895,pp.335 ff.

*** See American Journal of Archaeology 11,1895,pp355ff., where there is an extended criticism of Professor Rousopulos's theory that the base in question is not included in Pliny's estimate and that 26 cubits is probably an error, since to add the height of the base to that of the statue would make the combined height greater than that of the temple cella. We find see next page for remaining note
was four less than at Athens, it is evident that the height of the space for the relief would be very nearly the same in each, or if any difference, it would require even less in the latter. Assuming that twenty-six cubits equals 11.544m. and that Rousopoulou was correct in his estimate of the height of the cella as about 13.50m, there is still an abundance of room for the statue, even if Pliny's figures did not include the base (that is if the base is estimated in comparison with the statue of Zeus at Olympia at about 1.19m.), and, accordingly, it need not be assumed with Rousopoulou that copyists carelessly changed the figures in the above quotation from Pliny from XVI to XXVI. Pausanias, in fact, gives the height of the Nike as about four cubits. Rousopoulou's theory makes the ratio of the Nike to the entire statue 1:4, but a more probable estimate based on measurements of the Varvakeion statuette places it at about 1:6. It seems preferable, accordingly, to retain the reading of the manuscripts, "cubitorum XXVI", in order not to decrease to such a marked degree the size and resisting power of the statue relative to the weight of the Nike to be supported.

The length of the base is of aesthetic interest and archaeological importance. What effect, we may ask, would a base of 8.04m. in length, resting directly upon the pavement of the Parthenon, have on the statue as a whole in comparison with a shorter base on a low plinth as reconstructed by Michaelis? Modern taste, it is true, would favor the rising effect which con. that this conclusion is based upon an erroneous theory as to the necessary height of the base, which need not be estimated as more than four Graeco-Roman feet, or about 1.19m.
a shorter base upon one or more steps would give* but the posture and general treatment of the statue suggests that Phidias, in making a statue to be placed in a Doric temple, probably had just the opposite preference. Witness, for instance, the full front position with shield and serpent on the one side and Nike on the other, the horizontal lines caused by the girdle and aegis, and the broken lines caused by the folds above the girdle — all tending to counteract the vertical lines and give the effect of breadth rather than height. An interesting comparison, too, may be drawn between the base of the Athena Parthenos and the pedestal of Zeus at Olympia. In the Parthenon the relation of the width of the base to the depth, according to Doerpfeld's figures**, is 2:1, while at Olympia the proportion is 3:3. The explanation for this fact is probably to be found in the designedly greater width of the cult statue in the Parthenon, due to the shield on the one side and the Nike on the other.

There are also certain interesting facts relating to the pavement of the cella where the statue stood. There is, according to Doerpfeld's figures, a rectangular foundation of Peiraleus stone (2.61m. x 5.22m.), surrounded by a larger outline of marble (4.09m. x 8.04m.). That the base occupies the entire outer space as well as the inner is indicated by the presence of pry-holes and clamp-holes in the foundation. The size of the stones of the base can be ascertained and it is not impossible that they will yet be found in the architectural remains upon the Acropolis. So far as is known, however, none of the stones of the base have been found. From the data elsewhere given and discussed by Doerpfeld***,

---

* Cf. Jb. Arch, I, 1907, p.61, figs. 2 and 3.
** Ath. Mitt 6, 1881, p.294.
it appears that the pedestal of the Zeus at Olympia was composed, in the main, of poros with an outer casing of Eleusinian stone resting on a foundation of Pentelic marble. The indications on the Parthenon floor are not altogether parallel and we have no positive knowledge as to an outer casing for the pedestal, but the marble outline surrounding a poros rectangle seems to justify the conjecture that the general arrangement was similar in each case, and the fact that no platform or step was used under the base at Olympia would seem to preclude the probability that one was used at Athens. It is not impossible that a casing of Eleusinian stone was used similar to that at Olympia for it is known that stone of this kind was used at Athens in at least two other buildings on the Acropolis. In the Erechtheum, in fact, it was used as the background for the frieze to which the figures were fastened in some way analogous, no doubt, to the fastening of the sculptural decorations to the base of the Athena Parthenos.

Miss Perry* who has shown great ingenuity in calculating from the Varvakeion statuette the probably dimensions of the original Athena Parthenos found that the size of the base could not be ascertained by the method which she used for the other parts of the statue. The maker of this statuette seems to have "followed his yardstick" in copying all other details, but he must have copied the base at haphazard. The larger outlines of the foundation would accommodate a structure of 9 x 18 cubits; the base of the Varvakeion statuette, enlarged in the proportion of 7:78, as in the remainder of Miss Perry's computations, would, with certain allowances, measure 9 x 13½ cubits. Hence, they are "incommensurable." As a matter of fact, none of the other bases of importance (Lenormant, Pergamon, and Patras), show the proportion of 2:1.

* op. cit.
such as the markings on the floor of the Parthenon seem to demand. This, however, is a matter of minor importance, for it is probable that by the time these marble copies were being made it had become customary only to use a base of sufficient dimensions merely to accommodate the statue and its accessories, and that otherwise the base was thought of as having little significance. This fact is especially apparent in certain important representations of the Parthenos, such as the colossal Antiochus copy and the Minerve au collier.

Another subject closely related to the size of the base is the question of the manner of the representation of the birth of Pandora. This subject is known to have been portrayed in some way upon the base of the statue. For the manner of its portrayal we are dependent on the following sources of evidence:

1. The description given by Pausanias*.

2. It is evident that Pausanias had the story in mind as it is told by Hesiod. The latter writer tells the story in the Theogony (571ff.), and again in the Works and Days (59-82). Zeus was angered because Prometheus had stolen the fire for mankind, and as a measure of vengeance he ordered Hephaestus to make a fair maiden, and he bade others of the gods and goddesses bestow gifts upon her and Hermes to take her to Epimetheus.

3. Some further idea of the way in which this story was expressed may be gained from the following works of paintings and sculpture**:
   (a) three vases in the British museum — the Bate cup; the frag-

* 1.24.7: ἦστι δὲ τῷ βάθρῳ τοῦ ἄγαλματος ἡ βεβαιωμένη Πανδώρας γένεσις. Πεποίηται δὲ Ἕρμι σαρκὶ καὶ ἀλλοι θεοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Πανδώρας γένεσις. Αὕτη γάρ πρῶτη πρὶν ἐκ τῆς γενέσθαι Πανδώραν οὐκ ἦν πιὸ γυναῖκαν γένος.
ment of a rhyton, excavated at Paphos by Gypress Exploration Fund*; and a red figured crater from Altamura**—,(b) the base of the Lenormant statuette, and (c) the base from the Pergamon.

The carving on the Lenormant statuette is in such an unfinished state as to make interpretation of the figures on the base very difficult. Various writers affirm that the scene is bounded by Helios and Selene as in the East Pediment of the Parthenon and on the pedestal of the Zeus at Olympia. They see in this a characteristic attempt on the part of Phidias to "frame in" his creations. This conjecture seems on the whole legitimate, the only difficulty being that the figure at the right end of the relief in question seems to have no resemblance to a horse and rider. The right end of the relief, instead of representing a horse and rider, according to the usual interpretation, appears rather as two figures standing facing each other with the upper portion of the male figure on the left partly effaced. Immediately to the left of the third figure, counting from the same end of the relief as before, there is what appears to be the head of a horse (or mule). A very faint outline of this animal, I think, can be traced to the right of the third figure. If this is true, it probably was intended to represent the mount of the Selene of the original relief. Helios at the other end of the relief, at any rate, would lead us to expect Selene here. This could be a legitimate interpretation whether the animal is supposed to represent a horse, in this instance, or a mule. My own impression

* See Journal of Hellenic studies, 9,1888,p.221.
** Journal of Hellenic Studies, 11,1890,Pls.XI and XII.
is that it is the latter. But it could be for Selene in either case. Pausanias, in describing the figure of Selene on the base of the Zeus at Olympia says: *καὶ ἡδὴ τοῦ βάθρου πρὸς τῷ πέρατι Ἀμφιτρίτη καὶ Ποσειδῶν Σελήνη τε Ἰπποῦ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν ἐλαύνουσα. τοῖς δὲ εστὶν εἰρημένα ἐφ' ἡμίδνου τὴν θεόν ὁχείσθαι καὶ σὺν Ἰπποῦ, καὶ λόγον γέ τιν α ἐπὶ τῷ ἡμίδνῳ λέγονσιν εὐθῆ.

The next figure to the left of the ones which have been mentioned is of such gigantic proportions that his shoulders reach as high as the top of the space intended in general for the relief, and the head, as a matter of course, extends still higher. The next figure, although it is badly broken, is clearly that of a man who is taller than the ordinary relief space would allow. Between the two men last mentioned there is a tree trunk which forks near the upper part of the relief. The remaining figures are of the regular height. Continuing to the left, the first is that of a naked man, the second, Helios and his team.

The story of Prometheus as told by Hesiod** appears to give the most suggestive clue to the interpretation of this relief. If the above description of the figures is justifiable it is evident that the Lenormant base gives greater prominence to the Prometheus motif that we will find elsewhere in this connection. Beginning at the left the figures of the relief may be interpreted as follows: (a) Helios and his team; (b) Atlas, upholding the heavens; (c) Prometheus, beside a column (κίων ); and (d) Heracles, who stands with bowed head turned toward Prometheus whom,

* 5.11.8

** Theogony 577ff.
we may suppose, he is about to deliver from his Zeus-sent tormenter.

It is certainly appropriate that the Prometheus story should be portrayed in connection with the representation of the making of Pandora, and the figures of the Lenormant base do not so favorably yield support to any other interpretation. The three remaining figures in the ordinary relief space appear to represent more specifically the Pandora story. In the middle stands Hephaestus, leaning over his anvil toward Athena at the extreme right, who is identified by her helmet and general contour. The remaining figure, not carefully worked out, probably was intended to represent Pandora in the very process of being created. Mention may be legitimately made in this connection of the lists of treasures in the Hecatompedon, in which there are found, among other items, two helmets from the base (ἀπὸ τοῦ βάθρου). The one of these which was especially ornate, παρειάς χρυσᾶς ἕχον καὶ λόφον ἑλεφάντινον *, probably was the helmet of Athena to which reference has just been made. The second helmet may have been for Heracles who, on the Lenormant base, appears also to have a shield resting on the ground at his side.

Another important source is that of the sculptures upon the base of the Pargamon statue of the Parthenos. Although this base is badly broken there still remains enough to give a reasonably sure hint as to the manner in which the story of Pandora was portrayed. It differs from the Lenormant base in that the emphasis is placed upon the making of Pandora, rather than the punishment of Prometheus. The most important attempt at the interpretation of these figures as yet presented is that by Puchstein**. There

* I.G. 2.676.401.

Colossal Statue from Pergamum.
appears, however, a few important details of the relief which Puchstein and Winter* seem not to have discovered, but which if the photograph is to be trusted here, greatly facilitate the interpretation as a whole.

At the extreme left of the relief, for example, there is a convex surface, increasing in width as it goes upward, until it comes near the upper left hand corner, where it curves outward evenly. This surface does not seem to have been broken irregularly as the rest, but, rather, has every appearance of a cloak blown upward from the back such as is frequently seen in vase paintings in the representations of the outer garment of Selene. It is clear that there would be room at this end of the relief for Selene, but not for Helios and his chariot. Since the Lenormant copy leads us to expect Helios and Selene as in a sense bounding the relief space, it is not too much to conjecture that in this scene Helios and Selene were transposed. The right end of the relief is entirely broken away, but there is room not only for Helios and his team but for another figure as well.

Neither Puchstein nor Winter attempt to describe anything to the right of the seventh figure, counting from the left end of the relief. Practically the entire eighth figure is broken away. There appears to remain, however, to the right of the seventh figure, and a little higher than the portion of that figure remaining, the indication of two fingers of the right hand and a handle or shaft held aloft in a manner which is characteristic of Poseidon and the trident. This would identify the deity which occupied the space of the eighth figure and, together with Helios and his team, would practically fill the broken space at the right end of the relief.

The second figure, counting from the left and interpreting the first space as originally occupied by Selene, has the left arm raised in a manner which, in vase paintings, is characteristic of Aphrodite. The fourth figure holds the fold of the outer garment over the forearm in much the same way as the Nike upon the hand of the Varvakeion copy. There appear, also certain faint traces of lines across the breast of this figure. These lines probably indicate the aegis. The idea that this is Athena is all the more suggestive because the next figure to the right stands stiffly turned toward the front in an attitude almost exactly comparable to the Pandora on the Bale cup where she stands between Athena, who is draping her, and Hephaestus who is placing a diadem upon her head. And the coincidence is still more striking, here, in that the next figure to the right may easily be identified as Hephaestus by the muscular right arm, holding an object which may possibly represent his hammer or some other characteristic attribute.

The above interpretation leaves two figures still unidentified — the third and seventh from the left. The main story of the base, however, is reasonably clear. Athena and Hephaestus have just carried into effect the command of Zeus. They pause after their work is completed, and the other gods and goddesses stand near on either side ready to bestow their manifold gifts and charms before sending her forth to Epimetheus. It is inferred from the testimony of Pliny* that there were twenty-one figures upon the base. The bases which have come down to us do not show that number. On account of the difficulty of making the original number of figures upon so short a relief space the makers of these

* Naturalis Historia, 36.18.
copies were constrained by necessity to omit certain deities not directly important for the story of Pandora's birth. The figures in the two reliefs as interpreted above are twelve in number, as follows: Helios, Selene, Atlas, Prometheus, Heracles, Hephaestus, Athena, Pandora, Poseidon, Aphrodite, and two others which cannot with certainty be identified. The Lenormant base, on the whole, seems the more suggestive of the two, although the evidence from each base is important in that it supplements in a general way that of the other.

The explicit testimony of Pausanias relative to the serpent, the shield and the spear of this colossal statue of Athena is not confirmed fully by any of the marble copies and reliefs which we now have.* The statements of Pliny and Ampelius, in like manner, although they confirm the presence of the spear in the original, do not help in the manner of determining its location**. The exact position, therefore, is difficult to decide.

In spite of the adverse character of the evidence from the Varvakein and Lenormant copies, I am inclined to accept as literally true the words of Pausanias: ἐν δὲ τῇ χειρὶ ‥ ‥ ‥ ‥ δόρυ ἔχει. Since in these two statuettes the hand of the goddess is so placed that it would be impossible for it to hold the spear in any manner at all, either the spear was entirely missing from these copies or it was merely leaned against Athena's

*ἐν δὲ τῇ χειρὶ ‥ ‥ ‥ ‥ δόρυ ἔχει, καὶ οἱ πρὸς τοὺς ποσινάσσις τε κεῖται, καὶ πλησίον τοῦ δόρατος δράκων ἐστίν.
** Pliny N.H. 36.18, sub ipsa cuspide aergam sphingem; Ampelius lib. membr. c.10, ipsa dea habet hastam de肩膀.
shoulder somewhat as represented on the gold medallions of the Hermitage museum.* One is not justified, however, in lightly setting aside as untrue the plain statement of Pausanias on this point. There are certain Athenian coins, too, which show the Parthenos holding the spear in a manner which is in full accord not only with the words: έν δὲ τῆ χειρὶ ... δόρυ δραίο , but also with the statement: καὶ πλησίον τοῦ δόρατος δράκων ἐστιν . These coins are to some extent worn away on the relief surface so that in some instances the spear seems to be back of the arm and, accordingly, not held in the hand: but making allowance for this fact and for the difficulty which the artists undoubtedly experienced in representing a colossal statue upon the surfaces of small coins, we may safely conclude that as to this item they furnish the most reliable monumental evidence which we now have. The supposition of Schreiber** that the serpent was not partly concealed in the hollow of the shield but that it stood in a position about mid-way between the shield and the left knee of the goddess so that there was room for the spear between shield and serpent is hardly justifiable in the light of the positive evidence for the other view which is afforded by the only marble copies in which the serpent is given, viz. Varvakeion, Lenormant and Patras. Schreiber's supposition would also render that position of the spear shown on Athenian coins absolutely impossible. The statements of Pausanias relative to the spear exactly coincides with the evidence from the Athenian coin types, and these two sources taken together render the original position relatively

* Cf. Kieseritsky, Ath.Mitt., 8,1883,pl.15; see also the marble relief found at Pergamum, Ath.Mitt.35,1910,Plate28,fig.2.

** See Der Athena Parthenos des Phidias,p.83.
certain. The shield and serpent were represented practically as they are shown in the Varvakeion and Lenormant copies, save that the shield may have leaned in at the top a trifle more so as to make it easier for the spear shaft to pass between the thumb and fore-finger without at the same time weakening the hold* upon the shield. The position which I have here suggested upon the basis of the evidence already given is further illustrated on an amphora of the Hermitage museum**. The Athena, here, stands in a position similar to that of the general Parthenos type; the serpent is missing, as it is, also, in a number of copies of the Parthenos; the right hand holds the helmet instead of the Nike. The spear is held, however, precisely as on the Athena coins***. I only mention this amphora in the present connection because it shows more clearly than the coin types the probably position of the lower part of the shaft, which seems to have rested somewhere near the right foot of the goddess.

Possibly one reason why various writers have rejected Pausanias's testimony as to the position of the spear is that they may the better explain an obscure statement in Pliny ****: sub ipsa cuspidae aereaem sphingesem. They assume, apparently that the sphinx here mentioned is the one upon the helmet, and, accordingly, that the point of the spear was in a position somewhere

* Ampelius, lib. memor. 8.10 cuius as sinistrum clineus appositus quem dixit tandem.

** Monum VI-VII, Pl. LXXI, 1.

***For illustrations of these coins see Imoof-Blumer and Gardner, Pl. V. Nos. 18, 20, 21.

****N. H. 36, 18.
near the central crest. This passage from Pliny, however, is confessedly obscure, as the various emendations which have been suggested clearly show.* The reading of Panofka seems preferable since it requires only the transposition of ac and sub ipsa cuspidae and at once the entire sentence becomes clear. That is, the serpent under the spear and the sphinx upon the helmet are alike objects of especial wonder and admiration; it is a reading which is in perfect accord with the testimony of Pausanias, and whatever the position of the spear, the presence of a second sphinx is not required.

As stated elsewhere it is apparent from a survey of the works of Greek art, and, particularly, the art of vase painting, that the Nike and the owl stand for a common concept — that of victory. Accordingly it is only on very late gems and coins that they are both represented in the same scene, and rarely, if at all, by Athenian artists. We may assume, therefore, that when such a portrayal occurs it is where the original significance of the owl was not taken into consideration.

It is not strange, then, that the owl is lacking in all important copies of the Parthenos excepting the Hermitage medallions, from which, in turn, the Nike is absent. I believe, in other words that the evidence for the presence of the owl is entirely insufficient to justify the conclusion of numerous writers** that

* supra ipsam cassidem, Meursius; sub cristaee cuspide, Bursian aureum sphinges, Ulrichs; serpentum sub ipsa cuspine ac sphinges, Panofka; sub ipsa casside, Quatremere de Quincy; and aerseam striaem, Ronchaud.

** Schreiber, Keiseritzky, Studniczka, Stark, et.al.
Gold Medallion of the Hermitage, St. Petersburg.
it was included in the original statue. The only important literary evidence which has been brought forward in its favor is a passage from Dio Chrysostom*. The parenthetical expression, ὃς φασίν, in this connection makes it certain that this author was not writing from personal observation. Moreover, a careful examination of the passage shows that the general assumption concerning that part which has direct reference to the owl is an unsupported inference, adopted somewhat uncritically. Certainly it does not follow that the entire quotation must needs apply to the statue of the Parthenos merely because the last sentence has reference to the shield. Indeed, the chief thought of the author was that of the mysterious nature of the owl and the extraordinary reverence which the Athenians had for it. They gave public consent, in fact, to the act of Phidias in setting up an image of the owl as an object of worship along with the image of the goddesses (ἀυτὴν συγκαθιδρύσα τῇ θεῷ συνδοκοῦν τῷ δήμῳ), and this is all the more remarkable because it is evident that they would not have consented to the placing of the images of such noted men as as Phidias and Pericles in connection with the Parthenos, as is testified by the fact that their portraits were secretly worked out in relief on the shield. Since it is not established beyond reasonable doubt** that the γλαύξ ἐν πόλει *** was placed even inside the Hecatompedon, it

* 12.6, καὶ τῇ γε Φειδίου τέχνῃς παρ’ Ἀθηναίοις ἐτυχὲν οὐκ ἀπεξίσαντος αὐτὴν συγκαθιδρύσα τῇ θεῷ συνδοκοῦν τῷ δήμῳ. Περικλέα δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν λαθών ἐποίησαν, ὃς φασίν, ἐπὶ τῆς ἀσπίδος.

** See Sboronus, ΦΩΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΝΟΣ , p.28ff.

*** Ἡσυχίως, γλαύξ ἐν πόλει παροιμίᾳ.
is certainly gratuitous to give a forced interpretation of the word συγκαθιδρυσαι and to assert, accordingly, that the owl shared the base of the statue. The word seems to mean primarily "to dedicate along with," and its certain reference is to the setting up of independent statues* at the same general place of worship. We may disregard the evidence from Dio Chrysostom, then, for two reasons; (1) he is not a competent witness, and (2) his testimony is both obscure and of uncertain reference.

Not only is there some uncertainty and lack of agreement among the various writers as to where the γλαυξ of Phidias was placed, but the time of its completion is equally indeterminate. Nicole dates** the consecration of the γλαυξ by the archonship of Morychides as 440/439, or one year before the installation of the Parthenos which occurred 439/438. Paretti, working from the same Geneva fragments (Nos. 263 and 264), assigns as the probable date 435/434, in the archonship of Antiochides.*** It seems certain that the word, γλαυξ, occurs in fragment 263 a few lines above the name of Phidias and the general context is relatively clear. The point is, therefore, that whether we accept the readings of Nicole or those of Paretti the γλαυξ, in either case, was dedicated separately and not as an integral part of the Athena Parthenos.

Reference is frequently made in this connection to an obscure passage in Ausonius (Mosella, 308):— vel in arce Minervae

Iotinus, magico cui noctua perlito fuco

Adlicit omnes genus volucres premitque tuendo.

It is not easy to see how this passage can be made legitimately to

* Cf. Dittemburger, Sylloge Inscriptionem Graecarum No.376 1.50.
** Le Proces de Phidias dans les Chroniques d'Apollodore p.47.
apply in any way to the Parthenos. It would be necessary to assume: (1) that the noctua of Ictinus is the same as the γλαύξ of Phidias, (2) that the γλαύξ ἐν πόλει was connected with the Parthenos, and (3) that an artificial owl covered over with magic red paint and placed in a room lighted only from the door would be likely to attract all the birds of the city and then destroy them, as insects at night are first attracted and then destroyed by a flame. The whole passage is extremely fanciful and of no great value for the point under consideration.

It is likely that the shield of the Parthenos did not rest directly on the pedestal, but there probably was a support similar to that shown in the Varvakeion, Lenormant, and Patras copies. It is easy to see the structural and artistic necessity for such a rest. Even with a support under the shield the Varvakeion copy shows the left arm of the goddess unduly elongated. Without some such device, therefore, either this defect would be more noticable than it is, or else, if the artist should choose the other alternative, the diameter of the shield would be increased out of all proportion to the remainder of the statue.

Assuming for these reasons the probability of such a support for the shield of the Parthenos, it is interesting to consider the question which has been raised by other writers as to whether or not it was decorated and, if so, whether this fact gives a further clue to the correct interpretation of the passage from Pliny.* Smith uses as his point of departure in his treatment of this question the suggestion of Conze (Phil. 17. p. 388) that the word

* N.H. 36.19.
\( \acute{a} \nu\theta\acute{e} \mu \omicron \omicron \), found three times in a certain inscription *, probably was the support of a shield as in the Borghese Athena. Conze, in his discussion of this inscription, happens to speak of "der erste...der zweite...und der dritte Absase" and it may be that his phraseology here accounts for Smith's incorrect statement that the word \( \acute{a} \nu\theta\acute{e} \mu \omicron \omicron \) is found in "three inscriptions." The inscription in question**, in which \( \acute{a} \nu\theta\acute{e} \mu \omicron \omicron \) occurs three times, refers in all probability to the making and setting up of the statues of Athena and Hephaestus upon a single pedestal in the Hephaesteum. The shield mentioned in the tenth line, accordingly, is that of Athena, and the support was probably in the form of a flower and its accompanying leaves. It chances that there are two extant copies of the Athena Hephaestia which shows approximately the manner in which the flower was used as a support — the Cherchell Athena** and the Borghese Athena***. The \( \acute{a} \nu\theta\acute{e} \mu \omicron \omicron \), then, in the inscription cited above, unquestionably has its ordinary literal meaning. There is no indication that the word is ever used as a synonym for "support". In the inscription in question, \( \acute{a} \nu\theta\acute{e} \mu \omicron \omicron \) refers to the representation of an actual flower used as a support, which is an entirely different matter. To speak of an \( \acute{a} \nu\theta\acute{e} \mu \omicron \omicron \) "in the form of a sphinx," or as in any sense equivalent to the word soleae, is absurd. Further, in view of the fact that the Athena Hephaestia dates back to 421 B.C.****, Smith's generalization***** , that "the notion of a sphinx (or a flower) under a shield would be out of

* Pittakis 3754; I.G. L.319.
** I.G. I.319.
*** Jh. Oest.arch. I.1, 1896, Figs. 33 and 36.
***** Annual of the British School at Athens, 3, 1893-7, p.143.
keeping with the artistic ideas of the fifth century", loses its force. The remainder of the same sentence, however, sets forth what seems to be a reasonable assumption "and it is fairly certain that if a Sphinx or any other object in the round had been under the shield of the original, it would have been reproduced in one or the other of the copies." It is certain that in the three copies of the Parthenos in which the support is found, there is no trace of such decoration. It is, of course, conceivable that the original shield-rest was decorated with sculptured or painted figures, but as to adornment of this kind there is no evidence, literary or otherwise. Even the fact that the support would have presented a large surface suitable for such decoration does not give any degree of probability, in this instance, for it appears that three sides of the base of the statue, which were equally as available for sculptural decoration as the space in question, were left entirely free of any special adornment.

It is evident, then, that as far as the word άνθεμον is concerned, there is not sufficient justification for Smith's interpretation of the passage from Pliny*. As he points out, the description of the statue falls under four heads: (1) the exterior of the shield; (2) the interior of the shield: (3) the soleae; and (4) the base. It is apparent, however, that only a three-fold division was intended by the author, the main points beginning, respectively, as follows: (1) sed in scuto; (2) in soleis vero; and (3) in basi autem. It was more appropriate, accordingly, to place the sentence: adeo momenta omnis capacia artis illi fuere, after in soleis than after in basi for the

* op. cit.
reason that the word *momentum* has, in itself, the idea of a small part of division, whether of time or space, and, accordingly, the free surface offered by the sandals would be sufficiently small to justify the immediate insertion of the parenthetical sentence, beginning, *adeo momenta*.

One of the most interesting questions connected with the Parthenos is as to the manner in which the shield was decorated. It is contended by Smith, in his discussion of the shield*, that the interior was painted rather than worked in bas-relief. After presenting the evidence for his view, he says, "I think...(we) may safely disregard in the future any objections to the painted interior based on the use of the word *caelavit*." His items of proof may be summed up as follows: (1) none of the copies of the shield show relief on the interior side, as it is assumed that they would if the original were in bas-relief; (2) common sense ought to convince us that a Greek artist would not arm his patron goddess with an unpractical weapon such as a shield with interior projections; (3) on vase paintings the designs represented are either of painted or textile decorations, so that we would expect by analogy the same sort of decoration on the interior of the shield of the Athena Parthenos; and (4) the Strangford shield shows actual traces of painted figures on the interior, while the exterior is decorated with figures in relief.

Whether this evidence, when examined item by item, is strong enough to overcome the presumption caused by the word *caelavit*** that the original decoration was in relief is doubtful. Smith's question: "How comes it that none of the copies show reliefs on the interior side?" would require an answer for each copy in particular.

---

* Annual of the British School at Athens, 3,1896, pp.131, ff.
and in no case would it be found necessarily conclusive that such reliefs were lacking in the original statue. The Varvakeion statuette, for instance, does not have reliefs on the base, or sandals, or exterior of the shield (except the Gorgoneion): if the absence of such reliefs proves anything for the interior of the shield, so likewise for the other parts of the statue mentioned—-it proves more than Smith would maintain. This argument may be set aside, accordingly, as of doubtful value. The Lenormant statuette, moreover, cannot be cited as furnishing convincing proof, here, because it is manifestly unfinished in almost every detail. The diminutive size of this copy and the evident lack of skill upon the part of the sculptor would furnish sufficient explanation for the fact that interior of the shield was left without decoration in bas-relief, but it could not furnish proof as to the shield of the original Athena Parthenos. Furthermore, unless one knew the other decorative details of the copy to which the Strangford shield originally belonged, he would hardly be justified in saying that it gives presumptive evidence one way or the other with regard to the shield of the Parthenos.

It may be said, further, that any argument from "common sense" is not to be trusted too far in questions such as the one which we are now considering, for what an artist does in a given instance is largely determined by custom and convention. Common sense might ask, for instance, what Greek artist would be so lacking in the sense of harmony and proportion as to make an image of Zeus so large that "if he should rise from his throne he would lift off the roof of his own temple," but such is Strabo's testimony concerning the work of Phidias at Olympia. Besides
it is not certain that figures in bas-relief, if they were properly distributed on the interior of a shield fifteen (Greek) feet* in diameter, would in any way make the shield appear unpractical as a weapon of defense. On a concave surface of that magnitude the projection of such bas-relief, for instance, as we find in the Parthenon frieze, would be almost negligible. The figures, moreover, may have been arranged so as to leave the contact space for the arm of the goddess entirely smooth. No extant vase painting represents the interior of the shield of the Parthenos, and we have no evidence of any sort that it was lined; Smith's evidence concerning the lining of ordinary shields has little value for the solution of the problem.

On the whole we are not justified in setting aside the force of the word caelavit. The evidence merely goes to show that in the late marble copies and adaptations of the Parthenos one of the given surfaces was probably painted where the testimony of Pliny concerning the original would lead us to expect figures in bas-relief.

The scene portrayed on the interior of the shield was the battle of the gods and the giants**. We have no hint, either in ancient literature or in the extant monuments as to the manner in which this struggle was represented. Traces of color exist on the interior of the Strangford shield***, but not enough even to suggest the treatment of the composition as a whole. It is, for that reason, practically useless to cite the representations

* This is Miss Perry's estimate (American Journal of Archaeology 11, 1896, p. 344) based upon a proportional enlargement of the shield of the Varvakeion statuette.

** Pliny, op. cit.

*** cf. Smith, op. cit.
of the same scene by other artists.

The manner of the decoration of the exterior of the shield may be worked out much more satisfactorily than that of the interior. To supplement the evidence from the ancient writers on this subject there are in addition to the Lenormant copy, four fragments of shields —— Strangford, Patras, Vatican, and Capitoline. The earliest attempt to explain these various reliefs and set forth their substantial harmony with the literary evidence on the subject is that given by Conze.* After carefully describing the figures on the Strangford shield, taking each one separately, he proceeds to make a comparison item by item with the figure on the shield of the Lenormant statuette. His conclusions were based on these two copies alone, yet comparatively little is added from an examination of other fragments. It will suffice in this connection to mention a few additional points of interest.

Since the story pictured on the shield is known to be that of the battle of the Greeks and Amazons, one is justified in turning to other representations of the same scene for suggestions as to the traditional manner of its portrayal. Perhaps the most suggestive vase painting showing this legendary struggle is that of the Aryballus of Cumae.** The figures on the Strangford shield are represented as fighting on two different planes, one above the other, much the same as those of the Cumae vase. This is shown clearly by the fact that the upper figures to the right of the Gorgoneion are turned with their backs to the combatants on the plane below. Moreover, although the upper part of the shield :

** Cf. Baumeister, fig. 2151.
Aryballus of Cumae.
is missing upon the left side, there are sufficient hints in
the remainder to make it practically certain that the upper
figures were turned so as to face in the opposite directions
to those on the lower plane of the relief. One proof for this
conclusion is found in the necessity for Amazons in the upper
left quadrant in order to represent adequately the resistance
called for by the movement of the Greeks advancing from the
right. Two of these Greeks, in fact, are holding their shields
in a defensive attitude, and each of the two seem to be in the
act of casting a spear. The sculptor, however, has shown
greater skill than the vase-painter in concealing this arrange-
ment. He has represented the scene of the battle as upon a steep
hillside*, doubtless that of the Areopagus, the traditional
location of the camp of the Amazons*; and he has adopted the
further expedient of turning one Greek and one Amazon of the upper
half of the shield so that they face in the same general direction
as those in the lower half, while the figure at the extreme left
of the lower plane is facing in the opposite direction to that
of all the others around him. This mastery of technique is fur-
ther shown in the variety introduced. In the lower half of the
circle the warriors are engaged in single hand-to-hand combat,
for the most part, while in the upper half this does not seem to
be the case. Moreover, a line drawn vertically through the
shield would probably show that in the upper half the right

* At any rate certain of the Greeks, particularly those to the
right of the Gorgoneion and one at the extreme left of the
shield, appear to be in the act of climbing. The alterna-
tive would be to interpret this arrangement as a case of false
perspective as in the aryballos of Cumae. See illustration.

quadrant was, in the main, covered with Greeks, while the left, doubtless, was occupied by Amazons — a conjecture which the Vatican fragment seems to confirm. Nor is this vertical division confined to the upper half, for the general movement in each lower quadrant is away from the line of the vertical diameter. In numerous other details variety of treatment is introduced. The general attitude and movement of each figure is unique. In like manner, even where the weapons, offensive and defensive, are practically alike, which is rarely the case, they are without exception held or worn differently. The variety of positions and attitudes, also, has made possible a marked difference in the treatment of the clothing of the combatants, and this variation is further heightened by the different styles of clothing represented, not only as differentiating Greek and Amazon, but also as making further distinctions possible within these divisions. As an illustration of this fact it will suffice to mention two figures in the left quadrant of the lower part of the shield. Here the figure nearest the vertical radius —— usually identified as Phidias's portrait relief of himself*, differs from all the other fighters in that he is practically nude, wearing only the chlamys; he is without helmet and without boots; the weapon which he is swinging is different from that of all the rest of the Greeks in the part of the shield which remains. In front of the warrior just mentioned is the kneeling figure of an Amazon who, in like manner, differs in dress from all the others of her companions. This figure is wrongly identified by Conze** as a young Greek; and, accordingly, he asserts that the figure which

** op. cit. p. 37.
Pheidias intended as a portrait relief of himself is seen swinging the double-axe at an opponent who is not present. Such an interpretation seems impossible. The violent movement of the figure in question is absurd unless it is directed against a foe who is near at hand. In the Aryballus of Cumae (see illustration) just such a figure as this one is given, and in a somewhat similar attitude, under the name ofCreusa; and by way of further analogy, she and one other of the Amazons in the painting wear the helmet and dress of the Greek hoplite. The Strangford figure is undoubtedly masculine in appearance but this may be attributed to a misinterpretation of the original at the hands of the copyist. The use of a Greek helmet on an Amazon, where the rest of the Amazons wear a sort of Persian cap, or else have only a band around the head, is not confined to the two instances mentioned. A noteworthy example is its appearance on the Bologna crater*. The mythical foundation for this peculiarity is uncertain.

It may be interesting to note further that on the Strangford shield the Greeks are uniformly victorious. It is evident that the battle is nearly won. Assuming that the interpretation given above for the kneeling figure is correct, four of the Amazons are already fallen. The reclining figure on a level with the Gorgoneion is unquestionably an Amazon, and over her body a hand-to-hand combat is evidently being waged, although the shield is broken here so that the upper portion of the figures are missing. Immediately beneath the reclining Amazon just mentioned is another figure representing a wounded Amazon who has fallen backward down the steep hillside. For the time being she is prevented from falling farther partly by the fact that her right foot is caught under the weight of the figure immediately

* Furtwängler-Reichold II. p. 90, pl. 75-76. Cf. also pl. 26-28.
above her, and partly by her own arms stretched downward to a ledge of rock. The next figure to the right is the kneeling Amazon, already discussed, who is about to receive the death-blow at the hands of the old Greek to whom reference has been made above, and to whom the words of Plutarch seem in general to apply.*

So far as the shield is preserved this figure is the only one answering to the words πρεσβύτης φαλακρός. The fact that he has a double-axe instead of a stone is of comparatively little moment, for Plutarch may not have observed carefully, or the sculptor who made this copy may have had some artistic reason for changing this detail, owing to the difficulty presented by a somewhat overcrowded space.

The next figure to the right of the above group is that of the wounded Amazon who is represented also in the Lenormant and Patras copies. It has become customary to speak of this figure as that of "the dead Amazon." On this matter the Patras and Lenormant shields do not give decisive evidence, the former being too fragmentary and the latter, manifestly unfinished. On the Strangford shield, however, the general position of the figure is by no means suggestive of death—witness the bent knees and the position of the arms, neither of them being relaxed. Moreover, if the Amazon were already dead, the mighty swing of the sword by the Greek standing over her prostrate body would be utterly without meaning. This Greek, last mentioned, answers well to further statements made by Plutarch concerning the figure of Pericles. * The substantial harmony of the figure in

* Periccles 31: τὴν πρός Ἀμαζόνας μάχην ἐν τῇ ἀσπίδι ποιῶν αὐτοῦ τίνα μορφὴν ἐνετύπωσε πρεσβύτου φαλακροῦ πέτρων ἐπηρμένου δι' ἀμφιτέρων τῶν χειρῶν κ.τ.λ.
question with the Pheidian representation of Pericles, as described, is admitted by most writers on the subject, but some of them seem to have overlooked the force of the words: μαχομένου προς 'Αμαζόνα, as if they would translate it "fighting against a (dead) Amazon." Conze, for instance, says of this Greek as follows: "er tritt mit dem linken Fusse auf eine Amazone die den Arm über den kopf gewarfen todt am Boden liegt."

The two remaining Amazons to the right in the lower plain show further that the Greeks are victorious. The lower one of the two figures seems to be springing away, or falling down the hillside, while her pursuer is pulling her backward by the hair and with drawn sword is about to end her life. This feature of the composition, which is found here for the first time, becomes one of the typical groups of some of later representations of the battle. The last Amazon to the right is, in like manner springing away from her pursuer.

All the Amazons, then, in the lower plane are either mortally wounded or else in immediate peril of death. The Greeks to the contrary, are unharmed. They stand close together, their battle line extending from a point directly under the Gorgoneion around to the upper vertical radius. The line of defense of the Amazons, on the other hand, is broken. It extends around three-quarters of the rim of the shield; and, for this reason, their position is essentially weak. In such relative positions as are given, the defeat of the Amazons is inevitable.

It is further indicative of the surpassing artistic merit of this Strangford shield that death is nowhere certain:

* Archäologische zeitung, 23, 1865, p. 37; cf. also, Smith, op. cit. p. 139.
represented. On some vase-paintings portraying this struggle are abhorrent features such as the body of one or more combatants in the very act of being thrust through with a sword or spear. In this masterful production of Pheidias such is not the case. The artist has chosen a moment when the victory of the Greeks is assured but when resistance to them is, in varying degrees, everywhere manifest. It would be interesting to know positively whether death was represented in any of the sculptural decorations of the Parthenon. Possibly it is portrayed in one metope, but, at any rate, it may be safely said that we have no sufficient indication to justify the assumption that it was represented on the shield of the Parthenos.

Wonderful as the scene is which is given on the exterior of the Strangford shield, it can hardly be said to give an adequate idea of the artistic beauty of the original arrangement. In copying figures, originally on a surface about fifteen feet in diameter, upon a shield less than twenty inches in diameter, the artist seems to have chosen to reproduce in general the original figures without reducing their size proportionately to the smaller space which they were to occupy. They are, for that reason, somewhat crowded --- especially in the group around the fallen Amazon at the bottom of the relief. The maker of the Lenormant copy tried to overcome a similar difficulty by leaving out many of the figures and by transferring two of the Greeks from their place immediately below the Gorgoneion to the upper half of the shield; and the result is far from satisfactory if we have in mind the original composition of Pheidias. It is true that greater prominence is given in this copy to the figures which were probably intended as portrait reliefs of Pheidias and Pericles, and there is closer agreement than in the Strangford shield to the
Lenormant Statuette.
description given by Plutarch in that the "bald old man" (Pheidias) holds uplifted in both hands a great stone which he is in the act of hurling against the Amazons.* Yet, on the other hand, the unity of the shield is destroyed by removing the figure of Pericles almost the whole diameter of the relief distant from the fallen Amazon whom he is supposed to have vanquished. The representation as a whole is immeasurably inferior to the Strangford copy. Even had the Lenormant figures been worked out fully in their respective positions and not merely indicated, as they are, in rough outline, yet the composition as a whole and the arrangement of the figures would have been to a great extent, inartistic --- witness the position and attitude of the figure of Pheidias, astride of the Gorgoneion, and likewise the impossible lines of the falling Amazon and the disproportionate amount of space occupied by this figure as compared with the corresponding Amazon of the Strangford copy.

The center of the shield of the Parthenos was occupied by the Gorgoneion. Ancient writers are silent on this point, but the evidence from the various copies and fragments is unanimous in its favour. Little more than this bare statement, however, can be claimed with certainty, for no two representations of this Gorgoneion are the same even in general outline. If any one of these various heads is taken as in a moderate degree representing the Pheidian original, the conclusion is inevitable that each of the others must have been made with the greatest possible freedom. They all belong, nevertheless, to what is known as the "middle" type as distinguished from the "archaic", on the one hand, and the "beautiful", on the other, some of the copies in question approaching more nearly the former, and others, the

* Cf. Plut. Pericles, 31:
latter type*. The Gorgoneion of the Strangford shield evidently approaches the "archaic" type more nearly than the others do, so far as can be determined from the fragments and copies preserved. For example, note the following particulars: the head is encircled with serpents, knotted together above and below; the tongue is outstretched; the breadth of the face is made more noticeable by the many horizontal lines in the treatment of the face and hair; and the absence of any decorative effect such as may be seen in the treatment of the hair of the Gorgoneion of the Vatican fragment and the wings on the head occupying the center of the Varvakeion shield. The latter representation would be more likely to excite pity than fear, and for that reason it may be said to combine with the characteristics of the "middle" development some of the elements of the "beautiful" type.

On the whole, the Strangford shield, in that part which has been preserved, is far superior to the other representations, both in its general arrangements as to the aesthetic principles of balance and proportion, and in the artistic effect of the design as a whole. The other fragments, however, are important, sources of supplementary evidence. Taken together they give a fairly adequate idea of the original.

When mention is made by ancient writers of statues of ivory and gold, it is not to be supposed that they mean that these were the only materials used. A complete list for the Parthenos would probably include gold, ivory, silver, bronze, crystal, iron, wood, pitch, clay and other materials of various kinds.**

Plutarch in mentioning the great constructions planned and worked

---

** Lucian, Somn. 24: ἦν δὲ ὑποκύψας ἱδρυς τὰ γ' ἐνδον δησει μοχλός τελας
put under the direction of Pericles says* that the materials
to be used were stone, bronze, ivory, gold, ebony and cypress
wood; the arts to elaborate and work upon these materials were
those of carpenter, moulder, bronze-cutter, dyer, veneerer in
gold and ivory, painter, embroiderer and embosser; and further
that each particular art, like a general with an army under his
separate command, kept his own throng of skilled and untrained
laborers in compact array, to be as instrument unto player and
as body unto soul in subordinate service. One may apply nearly
every item of this description to Pheidias in the work of building,
setting up, and adorning the statue of the Parthenos.

It is known of a certainty from literary evidence that the
materials in general were distributed as follows: (1) Ivory was
used for the face of the goddess; for her hands, feet and eyes,**
for the Gorgoneion on her breast, and possibly for parts of the
Nike*** and of the decorations of the base. (2) Gold was used****
for the drapery, shoe soles, and possibly for the aegis of the
goddess, for the crown and wings of the Nike, for the serpent
and for parts of the base —— for this last, silver overlaid with
gold seems to have been used to some extent. (3) It is possible

* Pericles, 12.
** Excepting the pupils, cf. Plato, Hipp. 1.12, p. 290c.
*** Cf. Paus. 5.11.1.
**** Cf. Thuc. 2.13; Diodor. 12.40; Paus. 1.25.7; Pollux 7.92; Demos. 24.121;
Schol. Aristoph. Peace 695; I. O. II. 649, 652A and B, 654, 657, 660,
661, 667, 674, 676, 701, 703, and IV. 2.352d.
that the Sphinx on the helmet was of bronze.

Another interesting question connected with the study of the Athena Parthenos, and, at the same time, one upon which comparatively little work has been done in a satisfactory way is that of the relative distribution of the materials used in the construction of this celebrated statue. The monumental work of Quatrémere de Quincy, entitled Le Jupiter Olympien (1815) has not only influenced largely all the later discussions of practically every phase of the question, but his general theory of the application of ivory to the surfaces representing flesh and of gold to the drapery and other parts of the adornment for the statue serves as the very foundation of all subsequent treatment of this particular problem. Nevertheless, it may be well to point out that certain things inevitably tend to make the judgements of Quatrémere de Quincy invalid in regard to the very point in his theory which seems to have been accepted by later writers almost without question, in particular, the amount of available gold relative to the surfaces to be covered. 1.

1. He evidently did not have at his disposal any of the better copies of the Parthenos. His restoration of the garments, at any rate, seems to have been based chiefly upon the study of the Athena of the villa Albani and a more ancient statue (copied from Winckelmann, volume one, Plate 13)* neither of which should be included in the list of copies of the Athena Parthenos.**

2. Accordingly, the estimate which he gives of the surface to be

* Le Jupiter Olympien, p. 228, and Plate 9, Figs. 4 and 5.

** His own words are as follows: "C'est donc d'après le genre l'habillement et de draperies des deux figures citées, qu'on à cru devoir se décider sur le choix d'ajustement à adopter dans la restitution de l'ensemble de colosse de Phidias au Parthénon."
covered with gold is worth for accuracy little more than a guess which anyone might make who is familiar with the generally accepted dimensions of the statue. He thinks of the dress as composed of a peplos and a chiton, and he supposes that the entire surface contained only four hundred square feet*. The method used in arriving at this figure is not hinted.

3. His evaluation of the number of talents used in making the drapery is considerably below the proper amount owing to the fact that he appears to follow Barthélemy, who held that the ratio of silver to gold in Greece was 13:1, as based upon Herodotus 3.95: but it is now known from the fragment of an inscription relating to the construction of the Parthenon that the ratio was more probably 14:1**.

4. The manner in which he arrived at his estimate of the surface of the drapery and wings of the Victory is not stated. He merely says: "En portant à 60 pieds superficiels tout ce métal qui aurait valu 360,000, a une demi-ligie d'épaisser; mais en le reducant des deux tiers ou des trois quarts, selon la proportion du sphurelation on trouvera qu'une somme de 120,000 francs dut suffire pour la Victoire," etc.*** This was necessarily a mere conjecture for he evidently had no possible means of knowing how much surface the actual dress and wings of the Victory may have had.

5. Another possible source of error is the method which he used throughout his treatment of this phase of the problem; namely, that of choosing to bring in the evaluation of the talents of gold rather than their weight. Thucydides (2:13) uses the words: τεσσαράκοντα τάλαντα σταθμόν χρυσίου ἀπέφθου. In view of the word σταθμός is in this connection, it seems gratuitous labor to translate

* ibid., p. 232.
the relatively stable terms of weight and surface into the constantly fluctuating standards of monetary values. If de Quincy had found the weight of the estimated number of square feet of gold at one-half linne (1.13 mm.) or any other probable thickness, and then had compared this result with the total weight of the talents as given by Thucydides and others, he would have had for his calculations a relatively trustworthy basis, and his results would have been accurate in so far as he succeeded in ascertaining the number of square feet in the actual surface to be covered and the exact weight of the talent.

In view of the foregoing statements it seems that a new estimate of the surface of the drapery is imperative in order that a safe conclusion may be reached as to the possible thickness of the covering of gold. It is affirmed by some writers that the Varvakeion statuette is in a sense a "measured" copy of the Parthenos, and practically all are agreed that it is the most accurate copy, mechanically, which we have. The method used in measuring the surface of the drapery was as follows:

(1) different sections, following in the main the indications of joints made in the process of casting, were marked off and numbered and 
(2) each section was carefully fitted with a covering of tin foil. Then (3) the weight of the pieces was ascertained and the entire sum divided by the average weight of one square centimeter found by weighing pieces of known dimensions cut from various parts of the roll of tin foil used. For the two measurements which were taken of the entire surface of the dress, the mean weight was 40.63 gms. The average weight of one square centimeter of tin foil was found to be 0.009449; hence, the actual number of square centimeters in the chiton of the Varvakeion statuette is 4299.47, or, in round numbers, 4300 sq. cm.
The next question of importance in this connection is the ratio between the size of the Varvakeion statuette and that of the original statue. The total height of the latter is given by Pliny as twenty-six cubits, or, according to the most probable estimate of the cubit, 11.544m.* Dividing 11.544 by 1.035, the known height of the Varvakeion statuette expressed in meters, the ratio is obtained 11.153:1. It is evident, then, that by multiplying the number of square centimeters of the Varvakeion statuette by the square of the ratio it will be possible to approximate the area of the original statue, as far as the drapery is concerned --- 4300 x (11.153)$^2$ = 534,874.45 (which is in round numbers, 163,000 sq.cm. in excess of the area as given by Quatremère de Quincy.) It is further evident that by assuming a thickness of one centimeter and then multiplying by the specific gravity of gold**, the weight in grams will be determined which would be required to cover this given surface with gold to the depth of one centimeter. The resulting weight is found to be about 10,322,000 gms. Accordingly, at one-half linne (1.13mm.) in thickness which is de Quincy's estimate, 1166 Kgms. would have been used for the dress alone; but this result goes entirely beyond the amount of available gold for the whole statue. The amount of gold which can be reckoned upon with certainty is only forty talents. This is the amount mentioned by Thucydides, the most creditable witness whose testimony is available in this regard. The probably weight of the talent as estimated from

* This estimate seems to harmonize fully the various statements as to the details of the statue, excepting the base; see the discussion, p. 7.

** The sp.g. of cast gold is given by Dammer, Handbuch der anorganische chemie, vol. 3, p. 757, as 19.30 to 19.33; for beaten gold, 19.33 to 19.34. In the above reconing I have used merely 19.3.
the drachme of this period, is 25.83gms*. Hence, the forty talents would equal approximately 1034.40 kgms. It is seen, therefore, that, even if one were to leave out of account the Victory, the aegis, and other features of adornment for the statue which are known to be of gold, the drapery could not have been one-half ligne in thickness, as de Quinney supposes, for it, alone, would have necessitated the use of more than 130 kgms. of gold in excess of the entire amount available. The area of the Victory and the aegis may be found by the same method used for the chiton. These two items equal, approximately, for the Varvakeion statuette, 1110 sq.cm. A proportional enlargement in accordance with the ratio used above gives in round numbers 138,000 square centimeters which, at one-half ligne would call for an additional 250 to 300 kgms. of gold. De Quinney supposes, however, that the Nike was made of gold plate only one-sixth of a ligne (0.37mm.) in thickness. This would reduce the above amount by about by about 90 kgms**, but the entire amount required would still be in excess not only of the estimate of Thucydides, but even of the fifty talents mentioned by Diodorus***. Accordingly, a new estimate of the thickness of the gold plate or covering for the statue must be made.

De Quinney saw clearly that in his theory as to the distribution of gold and ivory there would not be enough metal to cover both the statue and the accessories, and for this reason he assumed that the amount of gold which is mentioned by Thucydides did not include the adornment for the base, sandals, shield, serpent and helmet, although he knew that certain parts of the statue aside from the dress and the Victory were of gold ****

* Cf. Dcerpfeld, Ath.Mitt.7,1882,p.308 f. The normal weight of the drachma at this period is shown to be 4.31 gms.

** De Quinney says nothing about the probable thickness of gold for the aegis, and so in obtaining the above figures, I estimate it at the same thickness as that which he suggests for the dress (i.e.1.13mm.) in reality, it must have been considerably thinner.

***12.40

**** De Quinney says of the 44 talents: Et Peut,—etre cette opinion
He supposes that the accessories of the statue in the way of adornment were made from the extra four talents of gold mentioned by Plutarch.* This supposition is not at all convincing, and it is by no means certain that Philochorus (Plutarch's authority on this point), who flourished about a century and a half after the statue was made, would be likely to give a more accurate estimate of the cost than that of Thucydides who lived at the time of the building of the statue. It is clear, on this point, that one cannot with certainty go beyond the lowest figure which is given on trustworthy authority. It is perfectly legitimate, on the other hand, to include in the forty talents all the pure gold which could be removed from the statue either for weighing or for use in time of extreme need. This means that the accessories as well as the statue must be included in so far as they were made of removable gold plate.

It is, of course, impossible to ascertain how much gold was used for the various features of adornment. Let us suppose, however, that five talents would have sufficed for the decoration of the helmet, sandals, serpent, shield and base. Then, there would have remained only thirty-five talents of gold (or c.805kgms.) to be used by Phidias in making the chiton, the Victory and the scales of the aegis.

What, then, is the probable thickness of the gold plate which Phidias used? In the various surfaces as estimated above were, in round numbers, 673,000 square centimeters which at one

* Per. 31.
millimeter in thickness would require 1299 kilograms of gold. 805 kilograms, then, would furnish for these parts of the statue a thickness of plate of not more than 0.6 mm.

Such a conclusion as the above is a matter of consequence because of two things: (1) we are told by Plutarch that the gold could all be removed for weighing, and the thinness of the plate would necessarily have presented a considerable difficulty to the men whose duty it was, at any time, to strip off the gold and, after weighing it, to place it again in its original position; and (2) we are perplexed as to the difference between this work in the chryselephantine technique and that of the gilded statues mentioned by Pausanias.

Puchstein* agrees with Quatremère de Quincy in holding that the work in gold and ivory stands in a very close relationship to the class of statues designated by Pausanias as ξόανα ἐπίχρυσα, the apparent difference being, according to his view, that the surfaces representing flesh in the chryselephantine work are of ivory, while in the ξόανα ἐπίχρυσα they are of marble. He mentions the Athena Areia at Plataea, also a work of Phidias, as an example of the latter class, the body of the statue being of gilded wood while the face, feet and hands were of Pentelic Marble. De Quincy cites what he considers to be even a more convincing example in the Athena at Megara, concerning which Pausanias says**: ἀγαλμα δέ ἐστιν ἐπίχρυσον πλὴν χειμῶν καὶ ἄκρων ποδῶν ταύτα δὲ καὶ πρόσωπον ἐστιν ἀλέφαντος.

Further colour, also, is sometimes supposed to be gained for this theory from the fact that Phidias is said*** to have advocated

* op. cit. p. 101.

** 1. 42. 4.

the use of marble instead of ivory for the Athena Parthenos, but that his suggestion was rejected.

It may be said, in reply, that there are other important differences which Puchstein and Quatremère de Quincy have overlooked. Pausanias's statement, moreover, never seem to suggest that the colossal gold and ivory images belong to the same technique as the gilded ξόανα. In the quotation given in the preceding paragraph, for instance, he does not use the ordinary expression, ἐλέφαντος καὶ χρῦσου, but he is careful to say rather, that certain parts of the statue are of ivory and that the remainder is gilded. If this were just the ordinary chryselephantine construction, why should the particulars be mentioned with such precision at this place? Elsewhere, both before and after this passage, he refers to numerous gold and ivory statues without comment and if we are to believe that this image of Athena at Megara was of the same general class as the others, then we must also admit that Pausanias is departing from the custom which he follows elsewhere without exception and that he is doing so without apparent reason. In spite of the fact that ivory was used for the face, hands and feet of the Athena at Megara, it is apparent that Pausanias must have regarded the statue as belonging to the ξόανα ἐπίχρυσα and not properly to the gold and ivory class.

A study of the ξόανα which Pausanias mentions, furthermore, shows that the technique used in their construction was quite different from that of chryselephantine works, and that, while the outer appearance of the two kinds of statues may have been similar, the actual building of the latter class was vastly more con. stare, tacere iussurrunt.
complicated. This fact is suggested by the very word \( \xiόανον \).

Etymologically it is related closely to the verb \( \xiέ\omega \). As referring to images, the substantive \( \xiόανα \) may be applied properly to the results of any technique which requires only the working of the surface of a given material; that is, it is probable that the fundamental idea of the word \( \xiόανον \) is that of an image which is solid, of which the surfaces have been worked away into the desired shape. Frazer has uniformly translated the word \( \xiόανον \) as "wooden image," and so far as the usage in Pausanias is concerned, this happens to be a fairly adequate translation, for wherever Pausanias mentions the material for a given \( \xiόανον \) it is invariably wood. This however, is not the necessary and obvious meaning of the term, and considerable care should be taken in the process of induction to make sufficient allowance for the negative instances. The most helpful clue to a correct explanation of the term is suggested by the fact that wherever Pausanias makes mention of the details of these images, they are invariably solid, as, for instance, the Daedala* and also the images of Dionysus (at Corinth) made out of a sacred tree from Mount Cithaeron**. This fact is further confirmed by the word \( \dot{\alpha}ρχαίον \) which is frequently coupled with \( \xiόανον \) ***. For the primitive images were made of solid materials, generally of wood****. These facts together with the etymology of the word \( \xiόανον \) suggest that in all probability the term is strictly applicable only to statues which were made of solid material. This is undoubtedly the case with the gilded images of Dionysus mentioned above, which were first hewn out of a tree from Mount Cithaeron and then gilded entire with the exception of the face which was

\* Paus.9,3,4.  \** ibid.2,2,7.

*** For example, Paus.1.23.7;1.33.1;1.38.8;2.2.3, and so on.

**** Pausanias ascribes the earliest bronze statue to Clearchus of Rhegium, whose active period, according to Ernun, fell between 540 and 500 B.C. It is easy to see why Pausanias did not use the word \( \xiόανον \) here. (3.17.6).
adorned with red paint. These images are expressly called by Pausanias ξόανα ἐπίχρυσα *. Two statements from Lucian relative to chryselephantine statues clearly indicate that they were hollow, and were built up around a wooden framework**.

It is not easy to understand how the extremely complex technique involved in the statues which Lucian here describes could well be confounded with the relatively simple work of the ξόανα ἐπίχρυσα.

The difference which Puchstein*** selects as most striking is really accidental and relatively unimportant. Clearly it was not in the use of ivory instead of marble that these statues differed, for it is known that at least one gilded ξόανον **** also had ivory for the parts representing flesh, which shows that the use of marble was only an accidental feature. It was, rather, an absolute difference in the inner structure of these two varieties of images which necessitated the use by Pausanias of entirely different terms in describing them.

* ibid. 2.2.6.

** Gall. 24: κάκείνων γὰρ ἐκαστῶς ἐκτοσθεν μὲν Ποσειδῶν τις Ἡ Ζεὺς ἐστι πάγκαλος ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἐλέφαντος ἐυνειργασµένος. ... ἂν δὲ ὑποκύψας Ἰδής τὰ γ’ ἔνδον, ὅπε πολυσίσθαι καὶ ἕλλος διαπεπερονηµένους καὶ κορμοῦς καὶ σφήνας καὶ πίταν καὶ πηλόν καὶ πολλὴν τινὰ τοιαύτην ἀµορφίαν ὑποικουροῦσαν. Jup. Trag. 8: ο ἵ γε πολυτελέστατοι αὐτῶν ἑλεφάντινοι ὀλίγον ὅσον τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἀποστίλβοντες ὡς ἐπικεχρῶσθαι καὶ ἐπηλυγάσθαι μόνον τὰ δὲ ἔνδον ὑπὸξυλοι καὶ οὗτοι μυῶν ἀγέλας ἐμπολιτευοµένας σκέποντες.

*** Wahrscheinlich bestand der außerhalbige Unterschied zwischen den beiden bildwerk-artigen nur darin, dass die nackten Teile besonders des Gesichts, die Hände und die Füße, an den chryselephantinen aus Elfenbein, an den ξόανα ἐπίχρυσα aus Marmor gearbeitet waren (Jb. Arch. 1891, p. 10f.).

**** Paus. 7.26.4.
In general the term μικρός is applied only to those objects which have an outer plating of gold over a solid base of some other material, as, for instance, the core of solid wood in the images of Dionysus mentioned above, and also the silver with the gold plating among the ornaments from the shield of the Athena Parthenos. Pausanias never applies this term to the gold and ivory statues, obviously for the reason that they did not have a solid core, or base, underneath the gold but only a thin shell of various materials fastened in some way over a wooden framework (τὰ δὲ ξύνον ὑπὸΕὐλοί κ. τ. λ.).

It is evident, furthermore, that the size of the gilded wooden ξόανον would be limited by the dimensions of the tree from which it was made, and the making of it would require no great amount of skill*. It would be possible, of course, to make a colossal ξόανον, but not one that would be comparable in size with the Athena Parthnos or the θεος at Olympia. The chryselephantine statues had no such limitations as to size; they could be as large as desired or as the skill of the artist could make them. Assuredly the head and arms of these colossal statues were ivory instead of marble, for otherwise the entire method of constructing the lower portions would have been vastly modified and strengthened in order to support the tremendous weight which the upper parts would have had.

One need not assume that there was any difference necessarily in the thickness of the gold plate used for these two vastly different kinds of statues. In either case the gold could have been as massive or as thin as the specifications demanded. It may

* Cf., for instance, the Hera of Samos, which probably had a wooden prototype.
be safely conjectured, however, that even a thinner plate may have been used for the chryselephantine statues than for the ξόανα ἐπίχρυσα, for the higher a given art advances the less is its emphasis upon material, and the greater its reliance upon form and spirit. The statues which Lucian, for instance, designates as "ivory"* certainly correspond in manner of construction to the gold and ivory statues mentioned by Pausanias; but Lucian says of these statues in a jesting way that they are merely tinted and shaded with gold (δὲ ἐπιχρῶσθαι καὶ ἐπηλυγάσθαι μόνον). His words imply that the statues in question had the mere appearance of being made of solid gold, but in real construction they were fundamentally ivory statues (πολυτελέστατοι αὐτῶν ἐλεφάντινοι) and that whatever gold they had was added chiefly by way of ornament. This implication is not set aside by the fact that Lucian was in a playful mood and likely to under-estimate the amount of gold used. It is evident that to his serious thought the statues were fundamentally "ivory"; the old covering was merely accessory. A similar distinction, too, is implied in the various references of other writers to the use that Phidias made of the gold for the Athena Parthenos.

Diodorus** says: ὡς περιαριστῆς οὐσίας περὶ τὸν κόσμον κατασκευῆς, Plutarch***: τὸν τῆς θεοῦ κόσμον...χρυσίου ἀπέφθου περιαριστῶν ἐποίησεν, Pausanias****: τὸν περιαριστῶν ἀποδύσας κόσμον. Here the word κόσμος is used in each case as, in a sense, limiting the function of the gold. Κόσμος does not

* Jup. Trag. 8.
** 12. 40.
*** ἱεροτυχ. aere al.
**** 1. 25. 7.
necessarily mean "dress"; if the chiton is included in this
function of the gold it is only so far as it is considered a
feature of the general adornment and not an integral part of
the statue itself. This conjecture is considerably strengthened
by the word περιαρστός which, although it has legitimate
application to the chiton of the Athena Parthenos, evidently
includes chiefly all such items as were accessory, merely, and
were not among the essential and immovable features of the image
proper.

The expression ὁ περιαρστός κόσμος indicates that the
gold was so put on that it could all be removed without causing
any serious injury to the statue. If this be true, there must
have been an inner shell of some kind which probably constituted
an acceptable image of the goddess even when the gold covering
was removed. Probably no one thinks of the statue as being
without an inner supporting structure of some kind, and some have
thought not only that a complete hollow shell was used, similar
in material to the body of the Zeus at Megara, but also that this
inner structure was afterwards covered with gilded wood to give
to the statue its final form. However, "one swallow or one fine
day does not make a spring," and one instance does not serve to
establish a general law. It is not known, in this case, just
what function the half-wrought timbers would have served if this
statue of Zeus had been completed. This somewhat legendary
statement concerning the unfinished timbers should not be taken
too literally. Probably Theocles would never have contemplated
substituting a surface of wood for one of plaster if he had first
finished the image in the latter material, for manifestly there
would be no further advantage to be gained by covering with wood a complete image of clay and plaster.

It seems likely, then, that the περιαρετὸς κόσμος included the drapery of the Parthenos which was in the form of a Doric chiton reaching to the feet. This chiton was later removed, perhaps, and its permanent loss attributed to theft on the part of Lacheres*. In later times, however, it seems to have been customary to clothe the statue with a robe of cloth.

This last conjecture opens up once more the question of the Panathenaic procession, which has its chief monumental portrayal in the Ionic frieze which runs around the cella of the Parthenon. The procession as there represented seems to terminate in connection with some action relative to the robe of Athena which had been used first as a sail for the Panathenaic ship and then brought into Acropolis. It has been generally assumed that this robe was for the ancient statue of the Polias which was located in the Erechtheum. The term "Polias", on the other hand, may be legitimately extended so as to include the Athena Parthenos of Phidias, and in later times this statue appears to have received certain of the honors which were formerly bestowed upon the more ancient image.** "Polias" seems to have been the only cult-name, aside from "Nike," "Hygieia," and "Ergane," which was applied to the Athena of the Acropolis. Unless it appears, then, that the statue of Athena in the Parthenon was worshiped in a special way under the title of Parthenos, it is almost certain that she was worshipped as Athena Polias in common with the ancient xoanon which was believed to have fallen from heaven, and the colossal

* Paus.1.25.7; cf.1.29.16.

** See Doerpfeld's view of this matter Ath.Mitt. 12,1667,p.190 ff.
bronze statue of Athena by Phidias.

It would be too great a digression to take up in detail the various features of Doerpfeld's hypothesis relative to the "old temple" and the many theories* which his idea has provoked. For the present discussion it must suffice to say that his conclusion as to the cult significance of the Parthenos statue appears to be incontestable. Athena was worshipped on the Acropolis only as "polias", "Nike", and "Hygieia." "Parthenos" was originally only a general name for the Athena Polias, and only in relatively late times did it come to designate especially the statue of gold and ivory made by Phidias: and even then there is no evidence that it was ever used as a cult name. Accordingly if the Athena of the Parthenon was worshipped at all she was worshipped as Athena Polias. The robe which was brought into the Acropolis in connection with the Panathenaic procession could have been appropriately used in relatively late times for the Athena Parthenos. From the evidence at hand it seems probable that the colossal gold and ivory statue in the new temple of Athena Polias took over gradually, so far as the general populace was concerned, the public rites which had been performed before this time in honor of the ancient xoanon, although the latter was still held in great reverence and the unquenchable lamp was kept burning before it**.

Mention has already been made of the Ionic frieze of the Parthenon in which the Panathenaic procession is represented at the moment of its termination in the action connected with the robe. The Panathenaean festival was in several other ways connected

* It is certain at least, that unless the Parthenos was worshipped as the Polias, she was entirely ignored in the offerings which were made at the time of the Panathenaean festival (Cf.I.C. 2.163). For further discussion of this point see Doerpfeld,
with the Parthenon — more so, in fact, than with any other
building on the Acropolis. The treasury accounts were to be
rendered "from Panathenaea to Panathenaeaa", and these treasures
were kept in the Parthenon. The equipment for the Panathenaeic
procession was probably kept in the Parthenon. At any rate it is
said of Λύσιμαχος: κατεσκεύασε δὲ πομπεῖα τῇ θεῷ καὶ Νίκαις χρυσάς καὶ
παρθένοις κόσμον ἐκατόν, ἐς δὲ πόλεμον ὀπλα καὶ βέλη καὶ τετρακοσίας
ναυμαχούσιν εἴναι τριήρεις ὀικοδομήματα δὲ ἐπετέλεσε κ.τ.λ. **

Golden Nikae were kept among the treasures of the Parthenon, and
it is probable that the other articles of the κόσμος for the
goddess, gold and silver πομπεία, were likewise stored here in
the common treasury of the state. It may be that τῇ θεῷ in this
quotation refers to the Athena Parthenos as the τῆς θεοῦ of
Aristophanes' έρι.1169 does beyond question***.

The most important evidence as to the peplos in this
connection is that it was manifestly intended for a colossal
statue rather than for a small wooden image. This is indicated
particularly by the size of the robe. The literary evidence as
to the workers employed in the making of Athena's robe is meagre.
The work was begun by two maidens who had their temporary residence
in the Acropolis. They were servants of the goddess. The peplos
was finished somewhere in the city by a number of other maidens
under careful oversight. A number of inscriptions gives lists of

con. Der Alte Athenatemppel auf der Akropolis, Ath., Mitt., 12, 1887,
p.193.

**con e.g. I.G. 1,273 which records the loan of vast sums of
money from the wealth of Athena. Only two Atheneans are
mentioned, Athena Nike and Athena Polias.

* Paus.1.39.16.
** Compare also Ταμίας of Bekker an.p.306 (τα μία) .
Gem Signed by Aspasia.
these workers*. From this source of information we know that the number of maidens employed for this purpose ranged from one hundred to one hundred and twenty. This fact, as Frazer admits**, points to the weaving of a large robe suitable for a colossal statue.

The most important literary evidence relative to the decoration of the helmet is a statement by Pausanias***: "Upon the middle of the helmet is the figure of a sphinx....and on either side are Griffins wrought in relief." This description is inadequate in that it does not include a number of important details. Pausanias, in fact, seems to have mentioned only the two particulars which had for him special mythological significance. The Griffins probably were wrought in relief upon the cheek-pieces of the helmet, as they are, for instance, in the marble head in Berlin, in the gold medallions from Kertch, in the gem signed by Aspasiaus, and in some other copies of the head of the Parthenos. The monumental evidence for Pegasi instead of Griffins at either side of the Sphinx is conclusive. The small figures of animals which decorated the helmet just above the forehead-piece are omitted from the description by Pausanias and also from a number of the better copies of the Parthenos. They are clearly indicated, however, in the Minerve au collier and the marble heads in Copenhagen**** and Berlin***** in the medallions from Kertch and the gem signed by Aspasiaus. Various opinions are held as to the nature of the animals above the


*** 1.24.5. **** Cf.Pollak,op.cit. Fig.171 and pl.4.

*****Antike Denkmaler 1,pl.3.
Minerve au Collier.
forehead-piece, owing, in part, to the conflicting evidence from the several replicas. In general, the weight of the evidence seems to favour the view that the horses, or Pegasi, were originally represented. The μέτωπον, or forehead-piece, of the original helmet was probably curved on its lower edge; and at the middle there was a triangular projection downward toward the nose, as indicated in several of the marble heads, also in the Varvakeion statuette, the colossal statue by Antiochus, the statuette in Madrid, the free copy from Pergamum and the Minerve au collier. In the Corinthian mould* a triangular projection above the μέτωπον corresponds to the one below, but this feature is not supported in general by the better copies.

The Parthenos, then, wore the Attic helmet with three crests, the middle crest being borne by a Sphinx, and the others by Pegasi. The cheek-pieces were turned back and decorated with Griffins in relief. The μέτωπον, aside from any decoration of its own**, had above it the foreparts of small Pegasi, or other animals. The fore legs of these animals extended over the upper edge of the μέτωπον, but they did not necessarily fly free in the air as they do in the gem signed by Aspasia.


** Cf. Robinson, op. cit.
Copy in Madrid.
ANCIENT AUTHORITIES.

Anæas Gaz. p.54 Boiss :

ἡ δὲ ἀγαλματοποιὰ τοῦ Φειδίου τέχνη ἀλλ’ ὁμοίουργὸς ἦν εἶ καὶ μὴ ἁμα τὸ ἐν ἄκροπόλει καὶ ἐν Ὄλυμπιᾳ πεποίηκεν ἄγαλμα.

Ampelius, lib. memor. 3.10 :

Athenis Minervae aedae nobilis, cuius ad sinistram clypeum appositus quum digito tangit; in quo clypeus medio Daedali est imago ita collocate quum sigis imaginem o clypeo velit tollere, pereat totum ovus; solvitur enim signem.

Anon. de incred. 2. in Galei Oscope. Mythol. p.86 :

τὰ ἐπτὰ θεάματα...τινὲς δὲ τάττουσιν...καὶ τὴν ἵσταμένην Ἀθηνᾶν ἐν Ἀθήναις...κ.τ.λ.

Anon. de VII mirac. 5.6. apud Pasinum codd. :

ἡ τοῦ Φειδίου Ἀθηνᾶ ἐν Ἀθήναις κατασκευασμένη ἐξ ἔλεφαντος καὶ χρυσοῦ.

Apuleius de mundo 32 :

Phidiam illum, quem fictorem probumuisse tradit memoria, vidi iuse in clypeo Minervae quae Arcibus Atheniensibus praesidet, aris sui similitudinem conligasse ita, ut, si quis olim artificis voluisseít exinde imaginem separare, soluta compage simulacri totius incomplitias interiret.

Aristid. 24, p. 528 Cant. :

ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ φαίνεται τὴν τε αἰγίδα ἔχουσα καὶ τὸ κάλλος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ σώματα δὲ σχῆμα σαπέρ ἡ Ἀθήνησιν ἡ Φειδίου.

Aristid. 50, p. 701 Cant. :

Μὲν τὴν ἔλεφαντ/ποιήσαν τοῦτο ὅ Ζεὺς οὐλόμπιος, ἡ Ἀθήνησιν Ἀθηνᾶ, λέγω τοῦτο δ’εἰ βούλει τὴν χαλκὴν, καὶ νὴ Δία χαὶ βούλει τὴν Δημηνίαν, ἀπειτε ταῦτα ὑπερβολὴν μὲν ἀρετῆς τῷ ὑμιουρίῳ τοῖς δὲ θεσταῖς ἱδονῆς ἔχει.

Schol. Aristoph. pax 605 :

Φιλόχορος ἐπὶ θεοδόρῳ ἄρχαντος ταύτα φασι, καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ χρυσόν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἔστάθη εἰς τὸν ἑλέφαντα ἄγαλμα χρυσόν σταθμόν ταλάντων μδ’, ἐπικλεός ἐπιστατοῦντος, Φειδίου δ’ αἰτίας, καὶ Φειδίας ὁ ποίησας, δόξας παραλογίζεσθαι τὸν ἔλεφαντα τὸν εἰς τὰς φολίδας ἐκρίθη, καὶ φυγὼν εἰς τὴν ἱστάμενην ἀγαλματικὴν ἐν Ὄλυμπιᾳ λέγεται κ.τ.λ.
Schol. Aristid. 3, 320 D.:

ἦσαν δὲ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν ἀκρόπολι τρία ἀγάλματα, τὸ μὲν ἐν χαλκῷ, ὁ μετὰ τὰ Περσικὰ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔστησαν, τὸ δὲ ἄτερον ἐν χρυσῷ καὶ ἐλέφαντος, περιστώντα ἄμφω τέχνην ὑπερφυῆ. 
κατεσκεύασε δὲ τὸ μὲν Φειδίας, τὸ δὲ χαλκοῦ Πραξιτέλης...κ.τ.λ.

Schol. Aristid. 50, 701 Cant.:

Ἀρεθ. δοκεῖ μοι αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐν τῇ φόρῳ Κωνσταντίνου ἀνακειμένη καὶ τοῖς προπυλαίοις τοῦ βουλευτηρίου, ὁ σενάτον φασὶν νῦν. ἦς ἀντικρ ἐν δεξιᾷ εἰσίοδοι τὸν προπυλαίων καὶ ἡ τοῦ 'Αχιλλέως ὄνομαται θέτις, καρκίνοις τὴν κεφαλὴν διαστεφῆ. ὅπερ οἱ νῦν ἰδοῦται τὴν μὲν Ἐννοια ὅποι, ἡ τοῦ 'Αθηνᾶν, θάλασσαν δὲ τὴν θέτιν, τοῖς ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ ἐνύδροις ἐξαπατώμενοι κυνδύλαιοις...κ.τ.λ.

Aristodemus 16:

φασὶν ὅτι τῶν Ἀθηναίων κατασκευαζόντων τὴν ἐλεφαντῖνην 'Αθήναν καὶ ἀποδειξάντων ἐφηγειστάτην τὸν Περικλῆ, τεχνίτην ἐν τῇ Περικλῆ, ἀλόντος τοῦ Φειδίου ἐπὶ νοσφισμῷ εὐλαβηθεὶς ὁ Περικλῆς μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηθύνας ἀπαιτηθῇ, βουλόμενος ἐκκλίναι τὰς κρίσεις ἐποιεύεσθαι τὸν πόλεμον τοῦτον, γράψας τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρῶν ψήφισμα.

Aristoph. Νε. 670:

δοσον δ' ἔξει τὸν χρυσόν, ὃσπερ παρθένος.

Aristoph. Νε. 1168, 1169:

ἐγὼ δὲ μυστίλας μεμυστιλημένας
ὑπὸ τῆς θεοῦ τῇ χειρὶ τῆς ἐλεφαντίνη.

Athen. 11. 405F:

γυμνὴν ἐποίησε τὴν 'Αθηνᾶν Δαχάρης οὐδὲν ἐνοχλοῦσαν.
Περικλῆς, Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς, χρήματα τοῦ δημοσίου λαβὼν εἰς τὸ κατασκευάσας ὀλόχρυσον ἄγαλμα τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ, ἐλεφάντινον ποιῶν, τὰ πολλὰ ἐσφετερίσατο, συμποιησάμενος μετὰ Φειδίου τοῦ πλάστου. ἐπεὶ δὲ κατακρινόμενος ὡς πλεῖστα ἀναλώσας ἐκτιθέομεν ποὺ ἀνηλώθη, ὑπὸ μεγαλονοίας ἐλεγεν· εἰς τὸ δέον ἀνήλωσα.

Aristot. de mundo 6. 399 b. : Ἄ νθρωποι καὶ τοῦ Φειδίου κατασκευαζόμενον καὶ τὸν ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν ἀκροπόλει ἐν μέση ταύτης ἀσπίδας τῷ Φειδίῳ πρόσωπον ἐντυπώσασθαι καὶ συνδῆσαι τῷ ἄγαλματι διά τινος ἀφανοῦς δημιουργίας, ὥστε εἰς ἀνάγκης, εἰ τις βούλιοτο αὐτὸ περιαίρειν τὸ σύμπαν ἄγαλμα λύειν τε καὶ συγχεῖν.


Arrian diss. Epist. 2.8.20 : καὶ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ ἡ Φειδίου ἁπάξ ἐκτείνασα τὴν χεῖρα καὶ τὴν Νίκην ἐπ' αὐτῆς δεξαμένη ἐστηκεν οὕτως ὅλῳ τῇ αἰῶνι.

Bekker An. p.306.7 : ταμίαι. οἱ τὰ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν ἀκροπόλει χρήματα ἱερὰ τε καὶ δημόσια καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τὸν κόσμον φυλάττουσιν.

Cicero Brut. 257 :

Athensiensium plus interfuit firma tecta in domiciliis habere quam Minervae signum ex abore pulcherrimum; tamen ego me Phidiam esse malem quam vel optimum fabrum tignuarium.
Cicero de orat. 2. 73:

in his operibus signis illam artem comprehendet ut tamquam Phidias Minervae signum efficere possit, non sane quemadmodum, ut in clipeo idem artifex, minora illa opera facere disce laborabit.

Cicero orator. 234:

siguos magis delectant soluta, sequantur ea sane, modo sic ut, siguis Phidiae alipem dissolverit, collocationis universam speciem sustulerit, non singulorum operum venustatem.

Cicero tusc. 1. 34:

sed quid poetas? opifices post mortem Nobilitati velint, quid enim Phidias sui similem speciem inclusit in clipeo Minervae, cum inscribere—non ligeret?

Clem Alex. protr. 47:

τὸν Ὀλυμπίας Δία καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδα ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἔλεφαντος κατασκευάσαι Φειδίαν παντὶ που σαφές.

Schol. Demosth. 3. 25:

ταῦτα πάντα εποίησαν[το] καὶ ἀνέθεσαν ἀπὸ τῶν λαφύρων τῶν Περσικῶν..., καὶ τὴν χαλκῆν Ἀθηνᾶν καὶ τὴν ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἔλεφαντος.

Schol. Demosth. 22. 13:

Παρθενων ναὸς ἦν ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει παρθενοῦ Ἀθηνᾶς, περιέχων τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς θεοῦ, ὅπερ ἐποίησαν ὁ Φειδίας ὁ ἀνδριατοπλάστης ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἔλεφαντος. τρία γὰρ ἄγαλματα ἦν ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν διαφόροις τόποις, ἐν μὲν ἐς ἄρχης γενόμενον ἐς ἔλαφας, ὅπερ ἐκαλεῖτο πολιάδος Ἀθηνᾶς διὰ τὸ ἀστῆς εἶναι τὴν πόλιν· δεύτερον δὲ τὸ ἀπὸ χαλκοῦ μόνον, ὅπερ ἐποίησαν[το] νικήσαντες [οἱ] ἐν Μαραθώνι· ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ τούτῳ προμάχου Ἀθηνᾶς·
τρίτον ἐποίησαντο ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἐλέφαντος ὡς πλουσιότεροι
gενόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Σαλαμίνι νίκης, ὅσοι καὶ μείζων ἦν ἡ νίκη·
kαὶ ἐκαλεῖτο τοῦτο Παρθένου Ἀθηνᾶς.

Demosth. 24. 121 :

οὐχ ἀπὸ ταυτομάτου τὴν ὄβριν καὶ τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν ἐπελεῖθην
'Ανδροτίωνι, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς θεοῦ ἐπιπέμφεσισαν, ἵν' ἀσπέρ οἱ
tὰ ἀκρωτήρια τῆς Νίκης περικόψαντες ἀπώλοντ' αὐτοὶ ὑφ' αὐτῶν
οὕτω καὶ οὕτωι αὐτοῖς δικαζόμενοι ἀπόλοιντο.

Diodor. 12. 39 :

tὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἄγαλμα Φειδίας μεγακατεσκεύαζε, Περικλῆς δὲ ὁ
Εανθέππου καθεσταμένος ἦν ἐπιμελητής. τῶν δὲ συνεργασαμένων
τῷ Φειδίᾳ τινὲς διενεχθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν τοῦ Περικλέους
ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ τῶν ἱ βεῶν βωμῶν· διὰ δὲ τὸ παράδοξον
προσκαλούμενοι ἔφασαν πολλὰ τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων ἔχοντα Φειδίαν
deίξειν, ἐπισταμένου καὶ συνεργοῦντος τοῦ ἐπιμελητοῦ Περικλέους.
Diὸ περ ἐκκλησίας συνελθοῦσης περὶ τούτων, οἱ μὲν ἐχθροὶ τοῦ Περικλέους
κατηγόρουν ἱεροσύλιαν.

Diodor. 12. 40 :

tὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἄγαλμα ἔχειν χρυσίου πεντήκοντα τάλαντα ὡς
περιαίρετης οὕτης τῆς περὶ τῶν κόσμων κατασκευῆς.

Dion Chrys. 12. 373R. :

ὑφ' ής καὶ τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ λέγεται προσφιλὲς εἶναι τὸ ὄρνεον, τῇ ...
kαλλίστη τῶν θεῶν καὶ σοφωτάτη, καὶ τῆς γε Φειδίου τέχνης παρ'
Ἀθηναίοις ἔτυχεν, οὐκ ἀπαξιώσαντος αὕτην συγκαθισθοῦσα τῇ θεῷ,
συνδοκοῦν τῷ δήμῳ. Περικλέα δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν λαθῶν ἐποίησεν ὡς
φασὶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀσπίδος.
Ευσέβ. Αδ Οιν. 85:

Phidias eburneam Minervae statuam fecit.

Γρηγ. Ναζιανζ. Carm. 1.2.10, p.364:

καὶ Φείδιᾳ τὰ παιδίκ᾽ ἐν τῷ δακτύλῳ τῆς Παρθένου γραφέντα κ᾽ Παντάρκης καλὸς.

Ηιμερ. Ορατ. 18.4:

μικρὸν μὲν ἐργαστήριον τοῦ Φείδιου, ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἡ Ἡ Παρθένος ἐπλάττετο.

I.G. 1.298, and Supp.p.146, l.14ff.:

ιππάρχον ἐωνήθο

I.G. 1.299. 23f.:

[ἀνα]λώματα

I.G. 1.299a. 20f.:

α παρὰ ταμιῶν

I.G. 1.299a. 20f.:

α παρὰ ταμιῶν

I.G. 1.299a. 20f.:

α παρὰ ταμιῶν
I.G. 4.2.652b. 13-15. :

στέφανος χρυσοῦ ς, ὃν ἡ Νίκη ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἡ ἐπὶ τῆς
χειρὸς τοῦ ἀγάλματος τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἀσταθμος ...........


I.G. 2.652 B. 14f. :

τάδε ἑπέτεια παρέδομεν· χρυσίον, ὁ Ἀριστοκλῆς ὁ ἀπό.......ης
ἀπήνεγκεν, τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ βάθρου τοῦ ἀγάλματος.

I.G. 2. 660. 52f. :

γοργόνειον χρυσοῦν ὑπάργυρον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀσπίδος τῆς ἀπὸ
tοῦ ἐδους. κ.τ.λ.

I.G. 2. 661. 22f. :

δακτυλίω χρυσῷ δύο, διάλιθον, χρυσᾶ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τοῦ βάθρου
ἀστα[τα].[τάδε άγραφα παρέδοσαν καὶ ἀστατα ἑπέτεια· γοργόνειον]
χρυσοῦν ὑπάργυρον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀσπίδος[τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐδους.

I.G. 2.676.40f. :

κρανίδιον μι[κρὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ βάθρου] παρείας χρυσ[ᾶς ἔχον καὶ]
λόφον ἐλεφ[άντινον].

I.G. 2.701.II.60f. :

[κρανίδιον μικρὸν ἐπίχρυσο]ν ἄ[πο] [τ]οῦ [β]άθρου
π[αρείας οὑκ ἔχον· πρὸς τῷ τοίχῳ τοῦ]σκέ[ται}
Isocrates 15.2:

ἐγὼ γὰρ εἴδος ἐνίοις τῶν σοφιστῶν βλασφημοῦντας περὶ τῆς ἐμῆς διάτριβης καὶ Χέγοντας, ὡς ἠπεὶ περὶ διικογραφίαν, καὶ παραπλήσιον ποιοῦντας, ὦσπερ ἂν εἴ τις Φειδίαν τὸν τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐδος ἐργασάμενον τολμῆ η καλεῖν κοροπλήσιον.

Isocrates 18.57:

καὶ τοιαῦθι ἡμαρτηκώς ἐπιχειρήσει λέγειν, δές ἡμεῖς ψευδόμεθα ὡς ἀνεῖν, ὡς ἐνεῖν τῷ φρυγίνᾳ πανουργίᾳ μὴ γενομένῳ μάρτυρας μᾶλλον ἄλλοις ιεροσόλυν ἐφασκεῖν εἶναι. τίνα δὲ προσήκει τῶν μὴ γενομένων παρασχέσθαι μάρτυρας μάλλον η τοῦτον, δὲ αὐτὸς ἐτέροις τὰ ψευδή τολμᾷ μαρτυρεῖν;

Marinus Proclus 30:

ὅπως δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ φιλοσόφῳ θεῷ προσφιλής ἐγένετο.... καὶ αὐτῆ ἡ θεὸς ἐδήλωσεν, ἡνικα ὁ θάυμα αὐτῆς ὁ ἐν Παρθενῶν τέως ἑγερμένον ὑπὸ τῶν καὶ τὰ ἀκίνητα κινοῦντων μεταφέρετο. ἐδόκει γὰρ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ διὸν ποιήται παρὰ αὐτῶν εὐβοῦσσας τις γυνὴ καὶ ἀπαγγέλλειν, ὡς χρὴ τάχιστα τὴν οἰκίαν προπαρασκευάζειν; ἡ γὰρ κυρία Ἀθηναίς ἐπηρίσει παρὰ συν μένειν ἐθέλει.

Maximus Tyr. diss.14.6:

εἴ τοι αὐτήν ἡγεῖ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν οἰαν Φειδίας ἐδημιουργησαν, οὐδὲν τῶν ὁμήρου ἐπὶν φαυλοτέραν, παρθένον καλὴν, γλαυκῶπιν, ὕψηλην, ἰγίδα ἀνεξωμένην, κόρυν φέρουσα, δόρυ ἔχουσαν, ἄσπιδα ἔχουσαν.

Ovid ex Ponto 4.1.31,32:

arcis ut aestaeae vel sturna vel aurea gustus bellica Phidiaca stat dea facta manu.

Paris epit. Val. Max. 1.1.ext.7:

iidem Sooratem damnaverunt, quod novam religionem introducere videbatur. iidem Phidiam tulerunt, quam diu is marmore potius quam eborae Minervam fieri debere dicebat, quod diutius nitor
Passio a. Philippo episc. Hieral. 2.5:

arsit et armata Minerva. nihil illam Gorgoneum spectus nec defendit
ille picturatus splendor armorum, melius infelix si sense tractasset.

Paus. 1.24.5ff.:

αὐτὸ δὲ ἐκ τε ἐλέφαντος τὸ ἄγαλμα καὶ χρυσοῦ πεποίηται. μέσῳ
μὲν οὖν ἐπικειται οἱ τῷ κράνει Σφιγγὸς εἰκών......καθ’ ἐκάτερον
dὲ τοῦ κράνους γρϋπὲς εἰσιν ἐπειργασμέναι.........τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα
τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς οἰδ' οἴστιν ἐν χιτώνι ποδήρει καὶ οἱ κατὰ τὸ στέρνον
ἠ κεφαλὴ Μεδούσης ἐλέφαντός ἐστιν ἐμπεποιημένη καὶ Νίκην τε
δοσον τεσσάρων πηχῶν, ἐν δὲ τῇ χειρὶ δόρῳ ἔχει, καὶ οἱ πρὸς τοὺς
ποσὸν ἀσπίδας τε κεῖται καὶ πλησίον τοῦ δόρατος δράκων ἐστὶν· εἴη
δ' ἄν' Εριχθόνιος οὕτως ὁ δράκων. ἐστι δὲ τῷ βάθρῳ τοῦ ἀγάλματος
ἐπειργασμένη Πανδώρας γένεσις. πεποίηται δὲ Ἡσιόδῳ τε καὶ ἄλλοις
ὡς ἡ Πανδώρα γένοιτο αὕτη γυνὴ πρώτῃ πρὸν δὲ ἡ γενέσθαι Πανδώραν
οὐκ ἦν πω γυναικῶν γένος.

Paus. 1.25.7:

Δημητρίῳ δὲ τῷ Ἀντιγόνου διάφορά μὲν ἦν ἐς τὸν δήμον ἥδη τῶν
Ἀθηναίων, καθὲλε δ' ὅμως καὶ τὴν Δαχάρης Βοιωτοῦ· ἥτε δὲ
ἀσπίδας ἐξ ἀκροπόλεως καθελὼν χρυσᾶς, καὶ αὐτὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὸ ἄγαλμα
tῶν περιαρετῶν ἀποδύσας κόσμον, ὑπωπτεύετο εὐπορεῖν μεγάλως
χρημάτων· Δαχάρην μὲν οὖν τούτων ἔνεκα κτείνοισιν ἄνδρες Κορωναῖοι.

Paus. 1.17.2:

πρὸς δὲ τῷ γυμνασίῳ θησέως ἐστὶν λεπόν· γραφαὶ δὲ εἰσὶ πρὸς
'Αμαζόνας Ἀθηναῖοι μαχόμενοι· πεποίηται δὲ σφιζεῖν ὁ πόλεμος οὕτως
καὶ τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσπίδι καὶ τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου Δίδ επὶ τῷ βάθρῳ.
Paus. 5.11.10:

Ἕλαιον γὰρ τῷ ἀγάλματι ἔστιν ἐν Ὄλυμπῳ συμφέρον, καὶ ἔλαιόν ἔστι τὸ ἀπείρον μὴ γίνεσθαι τῷ ἐλέφαντι βλάβος διὰ τὸ ἑλώδες τῆς Ἀλτεως· ἐν ἀκροπόλει δὲ τῇ Ἀθηναίων τῇ καλουμένῃ Παρθένῳ οὐκ ἔλαιον, ὕδωρ δὲ τῷ ἐλέφαντα ὕφελον ἔστιν· τῷ ἄγαν ὑπάλλον, ἀτε γὰρ αὐχμηρὰς τῆς ἀκροπόλεως οὐσίς διὰ τῷ ἁγαλμα ἐλέφαντος πεποιημένον ὕδωρ καὶ δρόσον τῷ ἁντὸ ὀδατος ποδεί.

Paus. 7.27.2:

κατὰ δὲ τὴν ὄδον ἡς αὐτὴν τὴν πόλιν ἔστιν Ἁθηνᾶς λίθου μὲν ἐπιχωρίου ναὸς, ἐλέφαντος δὲ τῷ ἁγαλμα καὶ χρυσοῦ· Φειδίαν δὲ εἶναι τὸν εἰργασμένον φασὶ πρῶτον ἔτι ἡ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τῇ αὐτὴν τῇ Ἁθηναίων καὶ ἐν Πλαταιαῖς ποιῆσαι τῆς Ἁθηνᾶς τῷ ἁγάλματα.

Paus. 10.34.8:

tὸ δὲ ἁγαλμα ἐποίησαν μὲν καὶ τούτῳ οἱ Πολυκλέους παῖδες, ἐστὶ δὲ ἐσκευασμένον ὡς ἐς μάχην καὶ ἐπείργασται τῇ ἀσπίδι τῶν Ἀθηνησιούμης ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσπίδι τῆς καλουμένης ὑπὸ Ἁθηναίων Παρθένου.

Plato Hippi. 1.12 p.290a.:

ΣΩ. ἐκεῖνος ἐπειδὰν ἐγὼ ὑμολογῶ ἁγαθῶν εἶναι δημιουργὸν τὸν Φειδίαν,, εἶτα φησεί, οἶει, τοῦτο τὸ καλὸν ὑ σύ λέγεις (ὅτι τὸ καλὸν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἡ χρυσὸς) ὑγνῶθει Φειδίας; καὶ ἐγὼ τῇ μάλιστα; φήσω, ὅτι ἐρεῖ, τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τοὺς ὁρθομοὺς οὐ χρυσοῦς ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ τὸ ἄλλο πρόσωπον, οὐδὲ τὰς χεῖρας, εἰπερ χρυσοῦν γε δὴ δν κάλλιστον ἔμελλε φαίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐλεφάντινον, δῆλον ὅτι τοῦτο ὑπὸ ἀμαθίας ἐξήκρατον, ἀγνὸν ὅτι χρυσὸς ἥρ ἐστὶν ὅ πάντα καλὰ ποιῶν, ὅπου ἀν πρωζένηται. ταῦτ' οὖν λέγοντι τῇ ἀποκρινώμεθα, ὡς Ἰππία; ΙΙ. οὐδὲν χαλεπόν. ἐροῦμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὅρθως
ἐποίησε, καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἐλεφάντινον, οἷμαι, καλὸν ἔστιν: ἔως τοῦ οὖν ἔνεκα φήσει, σὺ καὶ τὰ μέσα τῶν ὄφθαλμῶν ἐλεφάντινα εἰργάσατο ἄλλα λίθινα, δὲς οἶον τ'] ἦν δυοίδητα τοῦ λίθου τῷ ἐλέφαντι ἐξευρόν; κ.τ.λ.

Pliny N.H. 34.54:

Phidias praeter Iovem Olympium, quem nemo aemulatur, fecit ex eborre aequino Minervam Athenis, quae est in Parthenone stans, ex aere vero praeter Amazonem supra dictam Minervam tam eximiae pulchritudinis, ut formae cognomen acciperit.

Pliny N.H. 36.18:

Phidias olerissimum esse per omnes gentes, quae Iovis Olympii famem intellegunt, nemo dubitat, sed ut laudari merito sciant etiam qui opera eius non videre, proferemus argumenta parva et ingenii tantum. neque ad hoc Iovis Olympii pulchritudine utemur, non Minervae Athenis factae amplitudine, cum sit ea cubitorum XXVI eborre haec et auro constat, sed in scuto eius Amazonem proelium caelavit intumescente ambitu, in parmae eiusdem concava parte deorum et Gigantum dimicationes, in soleis vero Lapitharum et Centaurorum adeo momenta omnia capacia artis illi suere in basi autem quod caelatum est, Πανδώρας γένεσιν appellant; dìi sunt nascenti..XX numero. Victoria praecipue mirabili, periti mirantur et serpentem ac sub ipsa cuspide aeream sphingem. haec sint obiter dicta de artificie numquam satiis laudato, simul ut noscatur illam magnificientiam aequalemuisse et in parvis.

Plut. de Iside et Osiride 71:

δόσπερ Ἑλλήνων οἱ τὰ χαλκὰ καὶ τὰ γραπτὰ καὶ λίθινα μὴ μαθόντες μή δ’ ἀγάλματα καὶ τιμάς θεῶν, ἄλλα θεοὺς καλεῖν εἶτα τολμῶντες
λέγειν ὑπὲρ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν Δαχάρης ἐξέδυσε, τὸν δ' Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσοῦς βοστρύχουν ἔχοντα Διονύσιος ἀπέκειρεν, ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς ὁ Καπετάλιος περὶ τὸν θιμύλιον πόλεμον ἐνεπίσημον καὶ διερθάρη, λανθάνουσι συνεφελκόμενοι καὶ παραδεχόμενοι δέξας πονηρὰς ἐπομένας τοῖς ὀνόμασιν.

Plut. de Is. et Osir. 75. p.381D. :

οὗ δὲὶ δὲ θαυμάζειν, εἰ γλίσχρας δμοιότητας οὕτως ἡγάπησαν Ὄιγυπτιοι. καὶ γὰρ καὶ Ἐλληνες ἐν τε γραπτοῖς ἐν τε πλαστοῖς εἰκάσμεν θεῶν ἔχροσαντο πολλοῖς τοιούτοις· οἷον ἐν Κρήτῃ Δίδυμον ἔγαλμα μὴ ἔχον ἀρχοντὶ καὶ κυρίῳ πάντων οὐδενὸς ἀκούειν προσήκει. τῷ δὲ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὸν δράκοντα Φειδίας παρέθηκεν, τῷ δὲ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἐν Ἡλιδίοις χελώνην, ὡς τὰς μὲν παρθένους φυλακής δεομένας, ταῖς δὲ γαμεταῖς οἰκουρίον καὶ σιωπὴν πρέπουσαν.

Plut. de vit. aere al. 2 : καίτοι ὁ γε Περικλῆς ἐκείνος τὸν τῆς θεᾶς κόσμον ἄγοντα τάλαντα τεσσαράκοντα χρυσίου ἀπέφθευσεν ἐπιαριετοῦν ἐποίησεν.

Plut. Per. 13 :

ὁ Φειδίας εἰργάξετο μὲν τῆς θεοῦ τὸ χρυσοῦν ἔδος καὶ τούτου ἐμηιουργός ἐν τῇ στήλῃ γέγραπται.

Plut. Per. 31 :

Φειδίας ὁ πλάστης ἐγρολάβος μὲν ἦν τοῦ ἀγάλματος, ἀσπερ εὑρίττα, φίλος δὲ τῷ Περικλεῖ γενόμενος καὶ μέγιστον, παρ' αὐτῷ δυνηθεὶς τοὺς μὲν σ' αὐτὸν ἔσχεν ἕχθροὺς φθονούμενος, οἱ δὲ τοῦ δήμου ποιούμενοι πείραν ἐν ἐκείνῳ, ποῖος τις ἐσοίτο Περικλεῖ κριτῆς, Μένωνα τίνα τῶν Φειδίου σύνεργῶν ἰκέτην ἐν ἀγορῇ καθίζουσιν, αἵτωμενον ἁδειαν ἐπὶ μηνύσει καὶ κατηγορίᾳ τοῦ Φειδίου. προσδεξαμένου δὲ τοῦ δήμου τὸνάθρωπον καὶ γενομένης ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ διώξεως, κλοπαὶ μὲν οὐκ ἥλεγχοντο τῷ γὰρ χρυσίον οὕτως εὐθὺς δὲ ἐρχης τῷ ἀγάλματι προσειργάσατο καὶ περιέθηκεν ὁ Φειδίας γνώμη
τοῦ Περικλέους, ὡστε πάν δυνατόν εἶναι περιελούσιν ἀποδείχαι τὸν σταθμὸν, ὅ καὶ τὸτε τοὺς κατηγόρους ἐκέλευσε ποιεῖν ὁ Περικλῆς. ἦ δὲ δόξα τῶν έργων ἐπίεσε φθόνῳ τῶν Φειδίων, καὶ μάλιστ' ὅτι τὴν πρὸς ἦμαζόνας μάχην ἐν τῇ ἀσπίδι ποιῶν αὐτοῦ τὺν μορφήν ἐνετύψωσε προσβότου φαλακροῦ πέτρου ἐπηρμένου δι' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν χειρῶν, καὶ τοῦ Περικλέους εἰκόνα παγκάλην ἐνέθηκε μαχομένου πρὸς ἦμαζόνα. τὸ δὲ σχῆμα τῆς χειρὸς, ἀνατεινοῦσης δόρῳ πρὸ τῆς ὑψώσας τοῦ Περικλέους πεποιημένον εὐμηχάνως οἶνον ἐπικρύπτειν βούλεται τὴν ὁμοίότητα παραφαινομένην ἀκατέρωθεν.

Pollux 7.92 :
Τυρρηνικά· τὸ κάττυμα ἕξυλινον τετράγωνον, οἷ δὲ ἱμάντες ἐπίχρυσοι· σανδάλιον γὰρ ἦν, ὑπέδησε δ' αὐτὸ Φειδίας τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν. ἐκαλοῦν δ' αὐτά τυρρηνικουργῆ, ὀσπερ καὶ τὰ ἐμβαθρα βανιουργῆ.

Strabo 9.396 :
τὸ δ' ἀστυ αὐτὸ πέτρα ἐστὶν ἐν πεδίῳ περιοικουμένη κύκλῳ· ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ πέτρᾳ τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς λεγῖν οἱ τε ἀρχαῖοι νεῶς οἱ τῆς πολιάδος ἐν ὑ ε ἀσβεστος λύχνος, καὶ ο παρθενών ὑ ὄ ὅ τοι τοῦ Φειδίου ἔργον ἐλεφάντινον ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ.

Suidas, Φειδίας :
Φειδίας ἀγαλματοποιός, ὁς ἐλεφαντῖνην Ἀθηνᾶς εἰκόνα ἐποίησε. Περικλῆς δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνάλωμας ταχὺς ἐνσωφάσσατο ν' τάλαντα, καὶ ἑνα μη δῷ τὰς εὐθύνας πόλεμον ἐκλήνησε. κ.τ.λ.

Suidas, Φιλεάς :
eὶ καὶ Φιλεάς Ἀνδροκίλην· ἱεροσυλίας ἐγγαμπᾶτο ὀσπερ οὐκ αὐτός ὅν ο τῆς θεοῦ τὸ γοργόνειον ἐκ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ύψελόμενος.

Suidas, Φιλούργος :
οὗτος ἄσωτος ὃν ἐφωράθη ἐν Ἰσοκράτης 18.57] λέγεται. μέμνηται
τούτου Ἀισχύνης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος.

Synesius de calu. 19. 83A.:

ὅμως εἴ καὶ Φιλέας Ἀνδοκίδην ἱεροσύλλας ἐγράψατο, ἀσπερ οὐκ αὐτὸς δὲν ὁ τῆς θεοῦ τὸ γοργόνειον ἐξ ἀκροπόλεως υφελόμενος.

Themist. or. 25. 309D.:

ἀλλ' εἴ καὶ φόδρα ἦν σοφὸς ὁ Φειδίας ἐν χρυσῷ καὶ ἠλέφαντι μορφήν ἐπιδείξασθαι θείαν ἢ ἀνθρωπίνην, ὅμως χρόνου γε ἐδείκται καὶ σχολῆς πλείονας εἰς τὰ ἔργα. λέγεται οὖν, ἢνίκα ἐδημιοῦργει τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, οὐδὲ εἰς τὴν κρηπίδα τῆς θεοῦ μόνον ὀλίγον χρόνου καὶ πόνου προσδεηθῆναι.

Theoph. Antioch. ad Autol. 1.10:

Φειδίας εὑρίσκεται ἐν Πεῖση ποιῶν Ἡλείοις τὸν Ὀλύμπιον Δία καὶ Ἀθηναίοις ἐν Ἀκροπόλει τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν.

Thuc. 2.13:

ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν προσετίθει χρήματα οὐκ ὀλίγα, οἷς χρήσεσθαι αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἦν πάνυ ἐξελεγόνται πάντων, καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς θεοῦ τοῖς περικειμένοις χρυσίοις, ἀπέφαίνε δ' ἔχον τὸ ἄγαλμα τεσσάρακοντα τάλαντα χρυσίου ἀπέφθου καὶ περιαίρετον εἶναι ἀπαν. χρησαμένους τε ἐπὶ σωτηρία ἐφι χρῆναι μὴ ἔλασςω ἀντικαταστήσας πάλιν.

Valer. Max. 8.14.6:

ceterum sordido studio deditum ingenium qualemquamque illum laborem suum silentio oblifieri noluit, videlicet Phidiae seclusus exemplum, qui olpeo Minervae effigiem suam inglusit, qua convulsa tota operis conligatio solvetur.

Zosimus 4.18:

Νεστόριος ἐν ἑκεῖνοις τοῖς χρόνοις ἱεροφαντεῖν τεταγμένος..... εἰκόνα τοῦ ἤρωος ἐν οἴκῳ μικρῷ δημιουργῆσας ὑπέθηκε τῷ ἐν Παρθενῶνι καθιδριμένω τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἀγάλματι. τελῶν δὲ τῇ θεῷ
τὰ συνήθη κατὰ ταύτον καὶ τῷ ἡρωι τὰ ἐγνωσμένα οἱ κατὰ θεσμὸν ἐπραττε.
A LIST OF COPIES OF THE ATHENA PARTHENOS

1. The Varvakeion Statuette. Of Pentelic marble. Found Dec. 30, 1880, among the ruins of a house of the Roman epoch, near the Varvakeion, Athens. Unusually well preserved. Size of statue: height, including base, 1.035m.; height of base, 0.103m.; width of base, 0.41m.; depth of base, 0.33m. (right side) to 0.285m. (left side); Nike, (without head) 0.14m.; Nike (with calculated head) 0.16m.; column supporting the hand, 0.444m.; capital of column (height) 0.08m.; base of column, (height) 0.04m.; diameter of shield, 0.40m.; thickness of soles 0.013m.; head of statue, about 0.10m. There are traces of colour on various parts of the statuette, chiefly yellow and red*. Lange, *Ath. Mitt.* 5, 1880, p. 370; 6, 1881, p. 56 and pls. 1, 2; Brunn-Bruckmann, Denkmäler, pls. 39, 40.

2. The Lenormant Statuette. Of Pentelic marble. Found, 1859, West of the Pnyx, Athens. Marble left in the rough at the back and on the right side only the face completely finished. Figures roughly sketched on base and shield. Decorations of aegis and helmet wanting. Size of statue: height, 0.42m.; base, 0.063—0.07m.; breadth (front) 0.20m.; greatest depth, 0.16m. National Museum, Athens. Fr. Lenormant, *Gaz. des beaux arts* 8, 1860, pp. 129, 203, 278; Conze, *Annali dell' Instituto*, 1861, p. 334, pl. 89, and Arch. Ztg. 23, 1865, p. 39ff., pl. 196; Brunn-Bruckmann, Denkmäler, pl. 38.

3. Statuette in Madrid. Of Italian (or at any rate not Grecian) marble. Both arms restored; the right, from the middle of the upper arm, the left, from the elbow. Original location *Cf. Schreiber, Die Athena Barthanos des Phidias, p. 9.*
of serpents on the aegis indicated by drill holes; drill holes also numerous in the helmet. Both cheek-pieces missing. Helmet still surmounted by Sphinx, but accompanying figures broken off. Height, 0.99m.; base, low and unimportant. Now in the royal collection at Madrid. Clarec, pl. 474A, 902A; Hubner, Beschreibung der antiken Bildwerke in Madrid p. 39 no.10; Brunn-Bruckmann, Denkmäler, pl.511; Amelung, Jh. Oest. Arch I. 11,1908,pp.194-196.

4. Colossal statue by Antiochus of Athens, The head is well preserved, many other parts of the statue restored (in some instances, incorrectly). Restorations: parts of the nose and lip; girdle knot; parts of the drapery (especially the apotyagma); edge of the aegis; and both arms. Base, low and unimportant. In the Buoncompagni collection, Museo delle Terme, Rome. mon. dell' inst. III.27; Overbeck, Plastik II. Fig.189, p.452; Brunn-Bruckman, Denkmäler, pl.253; Arndt-Ameling, Photographische Einzel-aufnahmen antiken Sculpturen (Einzelerkauf)Nos.274,275; Schreiber, Der Athena Parthenos des Phidias, pp. 14-19.

5. Free colossal copy* from Pergamum. Marble. Parts missing: feet and lower part of chiton; serpent, shield, and lance; Nike and both arms; parts of decorations of helmet and aegis; the tip of the nose. Drill holes in aegis show original location of serpents. Parts of figure are preserved on front of base. Cheek pieces are preserved. Size of the statue: height, including base, 3.51, (with calculated crest about 4m.); height of base, 0.405m.; length of base 1.185m.; depth of base, 0.69m. Now in Berlin.

* Koepp is very much opposed to calling this statue a "copy." (See Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum. 25, 1910, p.282). It is merely a question of language whether this statue should be called a free copy or an "adaptation." None of the extant copies exactly reproduce the details of the original Athena Parthenos.
6. Torso in Patras. Of Pentelic marble. Discovered accidentally at Patras, 1896, in the square called Psilalcnia. Surface, generally well preserved. Parts missing: head, right shoulder and shoulder-blade; right arm, left arm from the middle of the biceps; about two-thirds of serpent and shield; parts of the right foot and the folds of the dress at bottom of right side. Pedestal, practically complete, but of no great importance. Figures on the shield but none on the base. Size of statuette: height (as far as preserved) 0.885m.1 height of base 0.075m.; from base to end of apotyigma 0.432m.; thence to center of girdle 0.203m.; thence to Gorgoneion 0.076m.; thence to angle of V of drapery 0.076m.; width of base (also depth) 0.38m. Smith, Annual of the British School at Athens 3, 1896-7, pl. 9, pp. 131-148; Arndt-Amelung, Nos. 1304-1305.

7. Unyne au Collier of Parian marble (head, Pentelic). Arms, restored. Height, about 2.09m. There are on the helmet, in a dition to the indications of the usual ornamentation, projections which are indicative of other figures, such as are found on the gem of Aspasius. Statue now in the Louvre; formerly at Borghese. Clarac, mus. de sculpt. 3, 319, 346; Brunn-Bruckmann, Denkmäler pl. 512; Schreiber, Die Athena Parthenos des Phideis, p. 25 (567) pl. 3, figs. 1 and 2.

8. Torso in Acropolis Museum, Athens. Of Pentelic marble. Found near the Propylaea, 1859. Present height 1.28m. Parts missing; head; both arms (except a fragment of the left); lower part of the statue, including both feet; base, serpent and shield. Michaelis Der Parthenon p. 278 no. 2, pl. 15.2; Lange, Ath. Mitt. 6, 1881, pp. 61ff. Schreiber op. cit., p. 31 (573), pl. 4, J.

10. Torso in Villa Borghese, Rome, Schreiber, op. cit.pl.4,H.

11. Copy now in the residence of the Conghlin family, Rome, Schreiber op. cit. pl. 3, D. 1,2.


In addition to these copies mention might be made of numerous marble heads and marble reliefs, and also of various representations** of the Parthenos in the minor arts. Attention may be called in particular to a jasper intaglio in Vienna, signed by Aspasius, Ath.Mitt.33, 1908, pp. 113-134; to the two gold medallions from Kertch, now in the Hermitage of St. Petersburg, Ath.Mitt. 8,1883,pp.291-315, and to the terra-cotta mould from Corinth, American Journal of Archaeology 15, 1911,pp. 482-503.

* A similar fragment is in the Vatican, see Michaelis, der Parthenon, p.284.35. Another fragment is in the Capitoline, Schreiber, op. cit.pl.3,F,3.

** For a new list of heads see Pollak Jh. Oest. Arch. I. 4,1901. pp.144-150; for marble reliefs and representations of the Parthenos in minor arts see Robinson op. cit. pp.500-503.
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<td>Brunn-Bruckmann</td>
<td><em>Denkmäler Gr. und Pöm Sculptur, Pls. 32, 39, 40, 511, 513.</em></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Die Athenastatue des Phidias im Parthenon, 1865-9.</em></td>
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