

## 4 – PHEIDIAS *EPOIESEN*: ATTRIBUTION AS VALUE JUDGEMENT

OLGA PALAGIA

The history of Greek sculpture in antiquity is a history of attributions. Our two main sources of Greek art history, Pliny the Elder and Pausanias, writing in the first and second centuries AD respectively, are mainly interested in authorship.<sup>1</sup> They assume that their readers are aware, if not of the styles, at least of the reputations of the great masters of the fifth and fourth centuries BC. Unattributed marble statues exhibited in the public spaces of Rome are mentioned by Pliny (*NH* 36.27) in an apologetic tone. He cites their large numbers and the lack of leisure on his part as excuses for not finding out the names of their sculptors. Even though they must remain anonymous, he says, they are nevertheless worthy of the old masters.

By Pliny's time the names of Pheidias and Praxiteles had assumed legendary proportions, becoming bywords for excellence. In *Natural History* 36, which deals with marble, he uses Pheidias and Praxiteles as his main reference points, trying to link them with as many other artists as possible by citing them as contemporaries or pupils or pupils' pupils. His history of Greek sculpture, culled from a variety of Greek and Latin sources, thus turns into a string of attributions. The author presumably provides what he thinks the reader wants to hear, and what the reader is mainly interested in is old masters: citation of their names is enough to excite admiration.

Moreover, *NH* 36 is riddled with Pliny's notorious confusion between the styles of Praxiteles and Scopas (*NH* 36.28). A compliment to Scopas is implied in Pliny's enumeration of masterworks. 'Scopas', he asserts, 'deserves to be praised as highly as (Pheidias and Praxiteles)' (*NH* 36.25). Speaking of sculptures to be seen in Rome in his time, Pliny (*NH* 36.28-29) says that:

it is uncertain whether Scopas or Praxiteles made the *Dying Niobids*<sup>2</sup> now in the temple of Apollo Sosianus,<sup>3</sup> and again which one of them made the *Janus* brought

<sup>1</sup> On Pliny the Elder, see J. J. Pollitt, *The ancient view of Greek art* (Yale 1974) 73-81; J. Isager, *Pliny on art and society: the Elder Pliny's chapters on the history of art*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Odense 1998). On Pausanias, see K. W. Arafat, *Pausanias' Greece. ancient artists and Roman rulers* (Cambridge 1996); C. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to ancient Greece* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1998); W. Hutton, *Describing Greece: landscape and literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias* (Cambridge 2005).

<sup>2</sup> The *Niobids* are also ascribed to Praxiteles in *Anth.Pal.* 16.129; Auson. *Epitaph.* 28.

<sup>3</sup> On this temple, see E. M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae* I (Rome 1993) s.v. Apollo, aedes in circo (A. Viscogliosi).

by Augustus from Egypt<sup>4</sup> to his temple [in Rome]; the confusion is compounded by the fact that the *Janus* is now gilded. The same uncertainty applies to the *Eros with a Thunderbolt* now in the Curia of Octavia.<sup>5</sup> All we can be certain of is that it is a portrait of Alcibiades, the most handsome youth of his time.<sup>6</sup>

This passage gives the game away. Pliny had no idea of the real styles of his heroes.<sup>7</sup> Either his information is based on hearsay or he is uncritical of his sources. Not only did Alcibiades live in the wrong century and could not have provided a model for either Scopas or Praxiteles, but Alexandria was also virtually non-existent when the two sculptors were active. It was founded by Alexander the Great in 331 BC but only became capital of Egypt some time between 320 and 313 BC.<sup>8</sup> There is no record of any of their works ever reaching it posthumously. Pliny's ignorance is further betrayed by his conflation of two sculptors named Scopas. The first was the classical sculptor who worked in the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, while the second was a later namesake, member of the Greek *diaspora* of artists who contributed cult statues to the temples dedicated by the Republican generals in Rome in the late second century BC.<sup>9</sup> In light of all this, Pliny's confusion between Scopas and Praxiteles may be attributed to a literary *topos* arising from the desire to enhance the value of old statuary. In sum, antiques acquired additional status by association with famous names, and attributions became, by implication, value judgements.

Another pair of sculptors, Pheidias and Lysippus, was unanimously accorded the highest status in Greco-Roman tradition as the grandest old masters of them all, thus becoming magnets for attributions. The works of their pupils were sometimes upgraded by being ascribed to the master instead. The *Colossus* of Rhodes, by Chares of Lindus, a pupil of Lysippus, was occasionally attributed to his master.<sup>10</sup> Pliny (*NH* 36.16-17) is the

<sup>4</sup> In this case, Alexandria.

<sup>5</sup> On this building, see E. M. Steinby, *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae* IV (Rome 1999) s.v. Porticus Octaviae (A. Viscogliosi).

<sup>6</sup> Eros with a thunderbolt was Alcibiades' shield device: Plut. *Alc.* 16.1-2. The marble statue in the Curia of Octavia may have been associated with Alcibiades but it is highly unlikely that it was his portrait.

<sup>7</sup> In his book on bronzes (*NH* 34.70) he attributes to Praxiteles the *Tyrannicides*, a late Archaic group that by his own testimony was removed from Athens by Xerxes in 480 BC.

<sup>8</sup> Praxiteles was probably dead by 326 BC: H. Lauter, 'Zur wirtschaftlichen Position des Praxiteles-Familie im spätklassischen Athen', *AA* (1980) 528; P. Schultz, 'Kephisodotos the Younger', in *The Macedonians in Athens, 322-229 B.C.*, ed. O. Palagia and S. V. Tracy (Oxford 2003) 188-89; Scopas is generally thought not to have worked beyond c. 330 BC: A Stewart, *Scopas of Paros* (Park Ridge 1977) 110. On the dates of Alexandria, see P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* I (Oxford 1972) 3-7; *CAH*<sup>2</sup> VII. 1 (Cambridge 1984) 127 (E. Turner).

<sup>9</sup> On the Hellenistic Scopas, see B. S. Ridgway, *Fourth-century styles in Greek sculpture* (Madison 1997) 251-58; O. Palagia, 'Classical encounters: Attic sculpture after Sulla', in *The Romanization of Athens*, ed. M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff (Oxford 1997) 82 with n. 11. Pliny *NH* 36.25-26 deals mainly with the second-century Scopas.

<sup>10</sup> Schol. Luc. *Icaromen.* 12.

repository of the tradition that Pheidias retouched the works of his pupils, thus enhancing their value, or even allowed them to sign their names on his own works. Colotes, Alcámenes and Agoracritus have all been cited by one source or another as recipients of his generosity. Statues lacking signatures on their bases for technical reasons were especially prone to creative flights of fancy as regards authorship. For example, statues in ivory and gold set up on stone bases decorated with relief friezes presented a particular challenge to the placement of signatures. Pheidias' chryselephantine Zeus at Olympia, supported by a base carrying a frieze of gilded figures, seems to have exercised the ingenuity of the master, who ended up signing his name on the footstool.<sup>11</sup> His authorship was of course never in doubt. This was not the case, however, with another chryselephantine statue, that of Athena at Elis, near Olympia. We do not know where the artist's signature was placed, but it would not have been clearly visible. Pausanias (6.26.3), who presumably saw no signature, was told that the statue was made by Pheidias. Pliny (*NH* 35.54), however, records another tradition, attributing it to Colotes. Now Colotes was a local artist from Elis,<sup>12</sup> chiefly known as Pheidias' collaborator on the statue of Zeus at Olympia.<sup>13</sup> Even though he eventually received independent commissions for ivory and gold works,<sup>14</sup> which were clearly his specialty, his name was always linked to that of his teacher, and the locals preferred to attribute his works to Pheidias for obvious reasons.

The authorship of Alcámenes' marble *Aphrodite in the gardens* was never contested. She was nevertheless deemed so superior to the rest of his output, that she was rumored to have been touched up by Pheidias.<sup>15</sup> Were it not for Pliny's (*NH* 36.17) testimony that the marble statue of the *Mother of the gods* in Athens was by Agoracritus, we would have regarded it as a work of Pheidias.<sup>16</sup> More ambiguous is the case of the *Nemesis* of Rhamnous. It clearly falls into the category of 'hard to find signature space' as it rested on a marble base carrying a relief frieze on three sides.<sup>17</sup> No wonder Pausanias (1.33.2)

<sup>11</sup> Paus. 5.10.2. On Pheidias' Zeus, see E. B. Harrison, 'Pheidias', in *Personal styles in Greek sculpture*, ed. O. Palagia and J. J. Pollitt (Cambridge 1996) 59-64; K. D. S. Lapatin, *Chryselephantine statuary in the ancient Mediterranean world* (Oxford 2001) 79-86.

<sup>12</sup> Paus. 5.20.2.

<sup>13</sup> Pliny, *NH* 35.54 and 87.

<sup>14</sup> Pliny, *NH* 35.54; Strabo 8.334; Paus. 5.20.1.

<sup>15</sup> Pliny, *NH* 36.16-17. See R. Rosenzweig, *Worshipping Aphrodite* (Ann Arbor 2004) 29-44.

<sup>16</sup> So Paus. 1.3.4; Arr. *Peripl. M. Eux.* 9. The problem is discussed by G. Despini, *Συμβολή στη μελέτη του έργου του Αγορακρίτου* (Athens 1971) 112, 200-201.

<sup>17</sup> On the base, see V. Petrakos, 'Προβλήματα της βάσης του αγάλματος της Νεμέσεως', in *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik II*, ed. H. Kyrieleis (Mainz 1986) 89-107; V. Petrakos, *Ο δήμος του Ραμνούντος I. Τοπογραφία* (Athens 1999) 251-67; O. Palagia, 'Meaning and narrative techniques in statue-bases of the Pheidias circle', in *Word and image in ancient Greece*, ed. N. K. Rutter and B. A. Sparkes (Edinburgh 2000), 62-68; A. Kosmopoulou, *The iconography of sculptured statue bases in the Archaic and Classical periods* (Madison 2002) 130-35; O. Palagia, 'Classical Athens', in *Greek sculpture. function, materials and techniques in the Archaic and Classical periods*, ed. O. Palagia (Cambridge 2006) 124-25, colour pl. 4.

believed the local guides who attributed it to Pheidias.<sup>18</sup> The tradition must have arisen early because it necessitated correction already in the third century BC, when Antigonus of Carystus took the trouble to point out that Agoracritus had signed his name on a tablet hanging from an apple bough in *Nemesis*' left hand.<sup>19</sup> Pliny (*NH* 36.17), often better informed in such matters than Pausanias, makes no mistake about the authorship of the *Nemesis*.<sup>20</sup> The Pheidian connection, however, lived on in the late Roman<sup>21</sup> and Byzantine traditions.<sup>22</sup> Pheidias was said to have designed the statue but allowed his favorite pupil to sign it: it was a love gift from an older to a younger man.<sup>23</sup> It is interesting that the *Nemesis* had been entered into a competition with Alcámenes' *Aphrodite in the gardens*, also reputed to have been touched up by Pheidias, and had lost.<sup>24</sup> Pliny's source attributed the verdict to corruption: the jury was Athenians who voted for Alcámenes because he was one of their own, whereas Agoracritus was a Parian.<sup>25</sup> But if the two works were really modeled by Pheidias, where does illusion end?<sup>26</sup> How does one define authorship? And were the ancients so gullible that they failed to distinguish the hand of the master from that of the pupil?

Ancient art historians did not apply our criteria of connoisseurship. They characterized works of art as 'square',<sup>27</sup> 'hard',<sup>28</sup> or 'dry'<sup>29</sup> or 'fed on roses rather than beef'<sup>30</sup> but were very astute especially as far as proportions were concerned.<sup>31</sup> Considering for a moment the proportions of the figures on the base of the *Nemesis* of Rhamnous, we observe long legs and short torsos, traits not found in the harmonious classical proportions

<sup>18</sup> It was also attributed to Pheidias by Zen. 5.82; Suda s.v. Rhamnousia Nemesis; Hesych. s.v. Rhamnousia Nemesis.

<sup>19</sup> *Ap.* Zen. 5.82. On inscriptions written on the statue itself rather than on the base, compare the story that Phidias wrote 'Παντάρκεος καλῶς' on the finger of Zeus: Clem. Al. *Protr.* 53 p. 47; Suda s.v. Rhamnousia Nemesis.

<sup>20</sup> Attributed to Agoracritus also by Strabo 9.396.

<sup>21</sup> See n. 18 above.

<sup>22</sup> Suda s.v. Rhamnousia Nemesis; Zen. 5.82; Tzetz. *Chil.* 7.931 and *Epist.* 21.

<sup>23</sup> See n. 18 above.

<sup>24</sup> See n. 15 above.

<sup>25</sup> See n. 15 above.

<sup>26</sup> That Agoracritus may have used Pheidias' designs was also suggested by Despinis, *Agoracritus* (n. 16 above) 200-202; Harrison, 'Pheidias' (n. 11 above) 61 n. 209.

<sup>27</sup> *Quadratus*: see Pollitt, *Ancient View* (n. 1 above) 263-69.

<sup>28</sup> *Durus, rigidus*: see Pollitt, *Ancient View* (n. 1 above) 359-61, 426-27; K. Gutzwiller, 'Posidippus on statuary,' in *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo*, ed. G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (Florence 2002) 53.

<sup>29</sup> *Siccus*: see Pollitt, *Ancient view* (n. 1 above) 428-30.

<sup>30</sup> Pliny, *NH* 35.129; Plut. *De gl. Ath.* 2.

<sup>31</sup> On the concept of *symmetria*, see Pollitt, *Ancient view* (n. 1 above) 14-22.

of the statue itself.<sup>32</sup> Was the base designed by an assistant of Agoracritus? Or did he carve the base himself but received a helping hand from his master, Pheidias, in the formation of the statue? Unfortunately, there is so little evidence besides the *Nemesis* of Rhamnous about Agoracritus' personal style, that Pheidias' putative contribution to the creation of the *Nemesis* must remain *sub judice*. Her striking similarity to *Aphrodite* and her two companions in the east pediment of the Parthenon<sup>33</sup> does not help resolve the question since we do not know whether Pheidias himself or his pupils designed the pedimental sculptures.

Artistic collaboration entailing an eminent artist supplying preliminary material to be elaborated on by a young protégé is documented in the art of the Renaissance. Michelangelo is known to have provided preliminary drawings of figures, sometimes of entire compositions, to the Venetian painter Sebastiano del Piombo, who signed his finished paintings in his own name. Even though Sebastiano's ultimate authorship is not contested, the collaboration of the two artists in three major projects is amply documented by Vasari and by Michelangelo's own letters and drawings.<sup>34</sup> The final product of their partnership is the *Raising of Lazarus*, painted in 1517-19 for Narbonne, now in the National Gallery in London.<sup>35</sup> Michelangelo's drawings for Lazarus and the men helping him out of his shroud survive in the British Museum.<sup>36</sup> It is not clear whether the rest of the composition was entirely devised by Sebastiano himself. But even if Michelangelo came up with more drawings, Sebastiano appears to have had trouble harmonizing the figures' scales as is evident by the size discrepancy between Christ and the figures in Lazarus' group, which was designed by Michelangelo. Problems of scale and proportions again give the game away.

Going back to ancient attributions, we confront Pausanias at his most troublesome. His tour of Olympia seems to have been plagued by indifferent guides or by sheer lack of information. It is at Olympia that he pronounced three attributions that have tantalized modern scholarship with no solution in sight. Visiting the temple of Zeus, contrary to his habit of remaining silent regarding the authorship of architectural sculptures, he ascribes the east pediment<sup>37</sup> to Paeonius and the west to Alcamenes, whom he moreover identifies

<sup>32</sup> Figures on statue base: Petrakos, 'Προβλήματα' (n. 17 above) pls. 111-16. *Nemesis* statue: Despini, *Agoracritus* (n. 16 above) pls. I-IV. Statue and base together: Petrakos, 'Προβλήματα' (n. 17 above) fig. 2.

<sup>33</sup> *Aphrodite* and her companions: O. Palagia, *The pediments of the Parthenon* (Leiden 1993) figs. 42-45. Comparison with the *Nemesis*: Despini, *Agoracritus* (n. 16 above) 124-26.

<sup>34</sup> The collaboration is analysed and illustrated in detail by M. Hirst, *Sebastiano del Piombo* (Oxford 1981) 41-75.

<sup>35</sup> Hirst, *Sebastiano* (n. 34 above) 66-75, pl. 94.

<sup>36</sup> Hirst, *Sebastiano* (n. 34 above) pls. 96-97.

<sup>37</sup> The old reconstruction in the Olympia Museum with Pelops on Zeus' proper right is more plausible than the current display. The new reconstruction condemned: H. Kyrieleis, 'Zeus and Pelops in the east pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia', in *The interpretation of architectural sculpture in Greece and Rome*, ed. D. Buitron-Oliver (Hanover and London 1997) 12-27; defended: I. Trianti, 'Neue technische Beobachtungen an den Skulpturen des Zeustempels von Olympia' in *Olympia 1875-2000. 125 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen*, ed. H. Kyrieleis (Mainz 2002) 281-300.

as Pheidias' contemporary.<sup>38</sup> Unfortunately, the dates of these two artists known to us from other sources do not tally with the date of the pediments.<sup>39</sup> Pausanias' confusion in the temple of Zeus is compounded by the fact that he misses the metope of Heracles and Cerberus (5.10.9),<sup>40</sup> mistakes Apollo in the west pediment for Peirithoos (5.10.8),<sup>41</sup> and misidentifies the marble of the stylobate in the cella (5.11.10)<sup>42</sup> as well as of the roof tiles (5.10.3).<sup>43</sup> Finally, on entering the Heraion, he sees the marble *Hermes* of Praxiteles.<sup>44</sup> The statue was miraculously recovered by excavation exactly where Pausanias saw it, standing on an unmarked statue base of the late Hellenistic period.<sup>45</sup> The statue of Hermes holding the baby Dionysus and leaning on a tree-trunk is made of a single block of Parian *lychnites*, the finest marble available to ancient sculptors.<sup>46</sup> The attribution to Praxiteles, undocumented by inscriptions, has generated one of the longest-standing controversies in the history of classical archaeology.<sup>47</sup> How did Pausanias know? How can we tell if we are faced with a masterpiece or a later copy?<sup>48</sup> Our eyes fail us and our powers of deduction are brought to bear on the question. What is the mechanism of attribution?

<sup>38</sup> Paus. 5.10.8.

<sup>39</sup> The pediments of Olympia are dated before the completion of the temple roof in 457 BC: Paus. 5.10.4. For a date in the decade 465-455, see K. Herrmann, 'Zur Verwendung des parischen Marmors im Heiligtum von Olympia', in *Paria Lithos*, ed. D. U. Schilardi and D. Katsonopoulou (Athens 2000) 384. Paeonius was active in the 420s, as he made the *Nike* dedicated at Olympia by the Messenians and the Naupactians with the spoils from the battle of Sphacteria in 425 BC: Paus. 5.26.1. See also Herrmann, 'Zur Verwendung' (above cit.) 384, fig. 11. Alcamenes' last documented work, a colossal relief of Athena and Heracles in Thebes, was commissioned by Thrasybulus after the fall of the Thirty Tyrants in Athens in 403 BC: Paus. 9.11.6. On Pausanias' problematic attributions of the Olympia pediments, see B. S. Ridgway, *Prayers in Stone* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1999) 32 n. 44.

<sup>40</sup> W. K. Pritchett, *Pausanias Periegetes* II (Amsterdam 1999) 86-87.

<sup>41</sup> Pritchett, *Pausanias* II (n. 40 above) 83-85.

<sup>42</sup> He calls it Parian instead of Pentelic: see Palagia, 'Meaning and narrative techniques' (n. 17 above) 54.

<sup>43</sup> He calls it Pentelic instead of Parian: see Herrmann, 'Zur Verwendung' (n. 39 above) 383.

<sup>44</sup> Paus. 5.17.3.

<sup>45</sup> S. Adam, *The technique of Greek sculpture in the Archaic and Classical periods* (London 1966) 124-28. On the base, see also I. Schmidt, *Hellenistische Statuenbasen* (Frankfurt 1995) 406-407, IV.2.33; A. Ajootian, 'Praxiteles', in Palagia and Pollitt, *Personal styles* (n. 11 above) 107 with further references.

<sup>46</sup> Herrmann, 'Zur Verwendung' (n. 39 above) 384, fig. 12.

<sup>47</sup> Adam, *Technique* (n. 45 above) 124-28; Ajootian, 'Praxiteles' (n. 45 above) 103-10; Ridgway, *Fourth-century styles* (n. 9 above) 261 with n. 66; C. Rolley, *La sculpture grecque* II. *La période classique* (Paris 1999) 250-52; A. Pasquier and J.-L. Martinez (ed.), *Praxitèle* (Paris 2007) 33, 120-23; N. Kaltsas and G. Despinis (ed.), *Πραξιτέλης* (Athens 2007) cat. 14 (N. Stampolidis).

<sup>48</sup> Two arguments support the fourth-century date of the *Hermes*: a) the use of Parian marble is very common in the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia from the sixth to the fourth centuries BC but virtually disappears afterwards (see Herrmann 'Zur Verwendung' [n. 39 above]). Both copies and original marble sculptures at Olympia in the Hellenistic and Roman periods are in Pentelic marble. If the

Like ancient art history, the history of classical sculpture in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century is dominated by attributions. The urge to associate surviving marble sculptures of the Roman period, taken for copies of lost masterpieces, with famous names transmitted by literary sources goes back to the Renaissance, but the practice becomes widespread with the publication of Adolf Furtwängler's *Masterpieces of Greek sculpture*.<sup>49</sup> The original German edition came out in 1893, followed by an English translation by Eugénie Sellers two years later. Furtwängler revolutionized the study of Greek sculpture. His careful selection of a number of Roman works that he considered of such high quality that they must reflect lost classical originals, and his skillful association of them with known works by old masters, had a tremendous impact on subsequent scholarship. Like that other attribution master, John Beazley, he was a pragmatist, so busy applying his method that he did not pause to explain it.<sup>50</sup> In the Preface to *Masterpieces*, he states:

As regards principles and method in the criticism of copies, many rules may be laid down – yet I have never been able to see any use in talk about method, much less of boasting about it. Rules would never embrace, even remotely, the whole range of possibilities presented by reality. Method can be shown only by application.<sup>51</sup>

That is to say, his method was applied *ad hoc*, the underlying principle being, **this is so beautiful, it must be classical, and was probably made by someone we have heard of**. This principle continued to be in force even in the late twentieth century, a case in point being the *Riace bronzes* which are constantly being attributed to any number of old masters merely on account of their excellence.<sup>52</sup>

Furtwängler's method can be illustrated by two famous attributions that have lingered longer than any and are still current in certain quarters. He suggested that the head of the *Leconfield Venus* in Petworth House is an original by Praxiteles.<sup>53</sup> This suggestion was based on the delicacy of her features, the rough workmanship of her hair and the high

*Hermes* was a copy, it should have been in Pentelic marble. b) The lack of copies of the *Hermes* can be explained if the sanctuary did not encourage copying of originals (as was argued by B. S. Ridgway, *Roman copies of Greek sculpture: the problem of the originals* [Ann Arbor 1984] 40-43).

<sup>49</sup> See J. J. Pollitt, 'Masters and masterworks in the study of classical sculpture', in Palagia and Pollitt, *Personal Styles* (n. 11 above) 1-15.

<sup>50</sup> On Beazley's method and his debt to Furtwängler, see J. Boardman, *The history of Greek vases* (London 2001) 128-38. For a critique of Furtwängler's method, see M. D. Fullerton, 'A brief historiography of stylistic retrospection', in *Ancient art and its historiography*, ed. A. A. Donohue and M. D. Fullerton (Cambridge 2003) 102-106.

<sup>51</sup> A. Furtwängler, *Masterpieces of Greek sculpture*, ed. E. Séllers (London 1895) ix.

<sup>52</sup> *Due Bronzi da Riace* 1984. Recent developments are summarized by C. Rolley, *La sculpture grecque I. Des origines au milieu du Ve siècle* (Paris 1994) 347-50; A. M. McCann, 'The Riace bronzes: Gelon and Hieron I of Syracuse?' in *From the parts to the whole I. JRA Suppl. 39*, ed. C. C. Mattusch *et al.* (Portsmouth, RI 2000) 97-105.

<sup>53</sup> Furtwängler, *Masterpieces* (n. 51 above) 343-46. For the head, see now J. Raeder, *Die antiken Skulpturen in Petworth House (West Sussex)* (Mainz 2000) 34-36, no. 1, pls. 1-3.1; Pasquier and Martinez (n. 47 above) 116-117.

polish, all of which correspond to similar traits in the *Hermes* at Olympia. He did not take account of the fact that her upper lip and nose are restored in a classicizing style and that the polish was most probably applied in Italy in the eighteenth century since it also covers the hair, including the back of the head. This, in fact, is probably a modern restoration since it is slightly off scale. The modern polish is an impediment to dating this head with any degree of accuracy, though, oddly enough, it is still taken for a product of the Praxitelean circle.<sup>54</sup> The narrow eyes probably indicate a Hellenistic date.<sup>55</sup>

Furtwängler identified an Athena known from two marble copies in Dresden as a copy of Pheidias' *Athena Lemnia* on the grounds that it is known not only from sculptural copies but also from reflections in Roman gems, so it must draw on a famous prototype.<sup>56</sup> Her facial similarity to Pheidias' *Athena Parthenos*<sup>57</sup> and the lack of helmet clinched the attribution since the *Lemnia* was famous for her cheeks, implying that she was bare-headed.<sup>58</sup> Furtwängler's attribution has come under attack<sup>59</sup> but so far as attributions go, seems to be more reasonable than others. The statuary type, at any rate, is firmly anchored to the classical period thanks to its appearance on a fourth-century BC relief from Epidauros, perhaps part of a decorated altar with triglyphs and metopes.<sup>60</sup>

The attribution game codified by Furtwängler was practised for over a century and became part of the scholarship associated with the study of Greek sculpture. German scholars led the way and their approach did not begin to be questioned until after World War II, when old assumptions were no longer perceived as being self-evident. Even though in his introduction to *Masterpieces* Furtwängler paid lip service to the Greek originals that were gradually being recovered by excavation, his method depended on works of the Roman period housed chiefly in northern European and Italian collections. The study of original, albeit anonymous Greek sculpture for its intrinsic merit was first

<sup>54</sup> E.g. A. Stewart, 'Goddess or queen? A colossal marble head in the Athenian Agora', in *Regional schools in Hellenistic sculpture*, ed. O. Palagia and W. Coulson (Oxford 1998) 87, fig. 12 (Praxitelean); Raeder, *Petworth House* (n. 53 above) 34-36 (early third century BC, in the Praxitelean tradition).

<sup>55</sup> R. R. R. Smith, *Hellenistic sculpture* (London 1991) fig. 106 (Hellenistic or Roman).

<sup>56</sup> Furtwängler, *Masterpieces* (n. 51 above) 3-26; for the gems, see also O. Palagia, 'Ἐρύθημα ... ἀντὶ κράνουσ' In defence of Furtwängler's Athena Lemnia', *AJA* 91 (1987) 81-84. See also H. Protzmann, 'Antiquarische Nachlese zu den Statuen der sogenannten Lemnia Furtwänglers in Dresden', *Jahrbuch der Staatlichen Kunstsammlungen Dresden* (1984) 7-22; H. Protzmann, 'Treu, Furtwängler und das Problem der Athena Lemnia', in *Das Albertinum vor 100 Jahren- die Skulpturensammlung Georg Treus* (Dresden 1994) 268-71.

<sup>57</sup> Compare G. Nick, *Die Athena Parthenos*. *AM Beih.* 19 (Mainz 2002) pl. 19.2.

<sup>58</sup> Himer. *Or.* 21.4

<sup>59</sup> K. J. Hartswick, 'The Athena Lemnia reconsidered', *AJA* 87 (1983) 335-46; E. B. Harrison, 'Lemnia and Lemnos: sidelights on a Phidian Athena', in *Kanon, Festschrift Ernst Berger*. *AntK Beih.* 15, ed. M. Schmidt (Basle 1988) 101-107; Harrison, 'Pheidias' (n. 11 above) 52-59; K. J. Hartswick, 'The Athena Lemnia: a response', in *STEFANOS. Studies in honor of Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway*, ed. K. J. Hartswick and M. C. Sturgeon (Philadelphia 1998) 105-14.

<sup>60</sup> Epidauros Museum. Palagia, 'Athena Lemnia' (n. 56 above) 82, fig. 2.



advocated by Rhys Carpenter<sup>61</sup> and this new direction was facilitated by the fresh material constantly coming to light in Greece. Almost none of Furtwängler's attributions have stood the test of time. But it took a century of testing, and it was the recovery of original masterpieces documented by inscriptions or found where Pausanias saw them that finally provided the right framework for further research. A few examples will be cited here, beginning with the cult statue of Agoracritus' *Nemesis* and its base, reassembled by Giorgos Despinis<sup>62</sup> and Vasilis Petrakos<sup>63</sup> in the 1970s and 1980s from fragments scattered in her sanctuary at Rhamnous. This constitutes one of the most spectacular reconstructions of high classical statuary in the twentieth century. The statuary type had long been known thanks to a large number of copies but nobody had previously associated it with the *Nemesis*.

Several originals of the Hellenistic period, signed by their sculptors or identified thanks to their findspots, which were mentioned by Pausanias, have come to light since Furtwängler wrote. Substantial fragments by Damophon of Messene were recovered in or near the temples where Pausanias saw them. His cult group of Demeter and Despoina at Lycosura is now divided between the Lycosura Museum and the National Museum in Athens.<sup>64</sup> A substantial number of fragments from his statues at Messene, recorded by Pausanias (4.31.6, 7, 10), are now in the Messene Museum.<sup>65</sup> The Zeus of Aigeira, by Eucleides the Athenian, found where Pausanias (7.26.4) saw it, is now in the Athens National Museum.<sup>66</sup> The head and feet of an acrolith of Hygieia were excavated in the temple of Asclepius at Pheneus, near a statue base signed by Attalus the Athenian.<sup>67</sup> The sanctuary was destroyed before Pausanias' time. The artists Dionysius and Timarchides are not only known from epigraphical and literary sources, but have also left behind their portrait of C. Ofellius Verus, identified by means of a signed statue base in the Agora of the Italians on Delos.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>61</sup> R. Carpenter, *Greek Sculpture* (Chicago 1960).

<sup>62</sup> Despinis, *Agoracritus* (n. 16 above).

<sup>63</sup> Petrakos, 'Προβλήματα' (n. 17 above); Petrakos, *Ο δήμος* (n. 17 above) 251-67.

<sup>64</sup> Pausanias 8.37.3-5. P. Themelis, 'Damophon of Messene: new evidence', in *Archaeology in the Peloponnese*, ed. K. A. Sheedy (Oxford 1994) 23-24; Pritchett, *Pausanias II* (n. 40 above) 131-33; B. S. Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture II. The styles of c. 200-100 BC* (Madison 2000) 235-38; B. Andrae, *Skulptur des Hellenismus* (Munich 2001) 95-96, fig. 51 and pl. 55; N. Kaltsas, *Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum, Athens* (Los Angeles 2002) nos. 584-91.

<sup>65</sup> Themelis, 'Damophon of Messene' (n. 64 above) 1-23; P. Themelis, 'Damophon', in Palagia and Pollitt, *Personal styles* (n. 11 above) 154-85.

<sup>66</sup> Athens, National Museum 3377 and 3481. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide* (n. 1 above) xvii; Andrae, *Skulptur des Hellenismus* (n. 64 above) pl. 54; Kaltsas, *National archaeological museum* (n. 64 above) no. 592.

<sup>67</sup> Pheneus Museum. Smith, *Hellenistic sculpture* (n. 55 above) 240, fig. 300; Ridgway, *Hellenistic sculpture II* (n. 64 above) 234-45; Andrae, *Skulptur des Hellenismus* (n. 64 above) fig. 53.

<sup>68</sup> Delos Museum A 4340. J. Marcadé (ed.), *Sculptures déliennes* (Paris 1996) no. 85 (statue); G. I. Despinis, 'Hellenistische Künstler I', *AM* 110 (1995) 363-64, pl. 72.2 (base), see also 349-69 on the family.

Oddly enough, with the exception of the classical *Nemesis*, none of the Hellenistic originals has served as a basis for further attributions. This is due not only to the lack of prestige attached to Hellenistic works but also to the fact that the attribution game is now largely discredited. The reputation of the old masters of classical antiquity is in decline, having initially been condemned as a construct of the star-struck Romans.<sup>69</sup> Connoisseurship is now regarded as a sign of elitism and as an exercise in the power game.<sup>70</sup> The evidence, however, of the astronomical prices commanded by famous works of art in the classical and Hellenistic periods, and the elite position of some of the leading artists indicate that preoccupation with the great masters is by no means a meaningless exercise. To cite but a few examples: Ptolemy I offered the Athenian artist Nicias 60 talents for his painting of the *Underworld*;<sup>71</sup> Damophon of Messene's fee for the colossal cult group of Lycosura was over 3, 500 tetradrachms;<sup>72</sup> and there was a bid of 100 talents (or 600, 000 denarii) for Aristides' painting of *Dionysus* auctioned after the fall of Corinth in 146 BC.<sup>73</sup> Admittedly, the fourth-century painter Aristides was an old master by then,<sup>74</sup> but the bid was not made by a Roman but by Attalus II of Pergamon. As for the high social standing of at least some of the artists, one need cite only two obvious examples. The family of Cephisodotus and Praxiteles in fourth-century Athens provides the first example.<sup>75</sup> Cephisodotus the Elder's sister married the Athenian statesman Phocion, a member of the Athenian elite with a long and distinguished career.<sup>76</sup> His son (or son-in-law) Praxiteles was wealthy enough to afford the attentions of the high-class courtesan Phryne.<sup>77</sup> Praxiteles' son, Cephisodotus the Younger, was trierarch six times, an indication that he belonged to the moneyed classes.<sup>78</sup>

The second example is particularly interesting since it concerns Damophon of Messene, who, though much admired by his contemporaries, was not held in high esteem by the Romans and therefore no copies of his works survive. It is interesting that his

<sup>69</sup> The trend was set by B. S. Ridgway, *The severe style in Greek sculpture* (Princeton 1970) 56-92; see also Ridgway, *Roman copies* (n. 48 above).

<sup>70</sup> See, for example, N. Spivey, *Understanding Greek sculpture* (London 1996) 14-15. O. Palagia, "'Through a glass darkly" II: misconceptions about the study of Greek sculpture', in *Proceedings of the XVth international congress of Classical archaeology, Amsterdam, July 12-17, 1998*, ed. R. F. Docter and E. M. Moormann (Amsterdam 1999) 297 explains how connoisseurship is castigated by some for its lack of political correctness.

<sup>71</sup> Pliny, *NH* 35.132; Plut. *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 11.2; O. Palagia, *Euphranor* (Leiden 1980) 70.

<sup>72</sup> Themelis, 'Damophon of Messene' (n. 64 above) 26; Themelis, 'Damophon' (n. 65 above) 169.

<sup>73</sup> Pliny, *NH* 35.24 and 100.

<sup>74</sup> On Aristides, see M. Robertson, *A history of Greek art* (Cambridge 1975) 432-33.

<sup>75</sup> On their social and financial standing, see Lauter, 'Praxiteles-Familie' (n. 8 above) 525-31; Schultz, 'Kephisodotos the younger' (n. 8 above) 187-89.

<sup>76</sup> Plut. *Phoc.* 19.1; J. K. Davies, *Athenian propertied families. 600-300 B.C.* (Oxford 1971) 287.

<sup>77</sup> Paus. 1.20.1; Ath. 13.591. Schultz, 'Kephisodotos the younger' (n.8 above) 187-88.

<sup>78</sup> Davies, *Athenian propertied families* (n. 76 above) 286-88, no. 8334; Schultz, 'Kephisodotos the younger' (n. 8 above) 187-89.

activity coincides with Pliny's (*NH* 34.52) blind spot: *cessavit deinde ars*. It may well be that Damophon's mixture of styles did not appeal to Roman purists. We have epigraphic evidence of Damophon's high status in his native city of Messene and elsewhere in the second century BC. Honours and privileges were voted to him in Messene, Lycosura, Cephallonia, Melos and several other Greek cities.<sup>79</sup> He was wealthy enough to have waived part of the fee owed him by Lycosura.<sup>80</sup> The elite status of Damophon and his family is confirmed by his burial in a heroon,<sup>81</sup> and by the fact that his son, Xenophilus, was honored with a bronze portrait statue, the base of which survives near the Asclepium of Messene.<sup>82</sup>

The high social standing of famous artists was not in doubt in classical antiquity. It is probably the demise of the city as a political entity that heralded the beginning of the end of their privileged position. With the exception of the art-loving Attalids (who were more interested in old masters anyway), Hellenistic royalty did not encourage the 'cult' of the artist. This remains a characteristic of more democratic societies. Damophon's exceptionally high status in Messene, while it still functioned politically as a city, may serve to illustrate the point.

*Department of Archaeology and the History of Art  
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens*

<sup>79</sup> *SEG* 41.332 (Lycosura decree); Themelis, 'Damophon' (n. 65 above) 169-72; P. Themelis, 'Ηρωες και ηρώα στη Μεσσήνη' (Athens 2000) 93-94.

<sup>80</sup> P. Themelis, 'Ο Δαμοφών και η δραστηριότητα του στην Αρκαδία' in *Sculpture from Arcadia and Laconia*, ed. O. Palagia and W. Coulson (Oxford 1993) 102-103; Themelis, 'Ηρωες' (n. 79 above) 94.

<sup>81</sup> Themelis, 'Damophon' (n. 65 above) 185; Themelis, 'Ηρωες' (n. 79 above) 88-95.

<sup>82</sup> Themelis, 'Damophon' (n. 65 above) 185.

