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A Story of Five Amazons

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

PLATES 1-4

THE ANCIENT SOURCE

In a well-known passage of his book on bronze sculpture Pliny tells us the story of a competition among five artists for the statue of an Amazon (Pliny NH 34.53): "Venere autem et in certamen laudatissimi, quamquam diversis acetibus geniti, quoniam fecerunt Amazones, qua cum in templo Dianae Ephesiae dicarentur, placuit eligi probatissimam ipsorum artificium, qui praesentes erant iudicio, cum apparuit eam esse quam omnes secundam a sua quisque iudicassent. Haec est Polycliti, proxima ab ea Phidiae, tertia Cresilae, quarta Cydonis, quinta Phradmonis."

This text has been variously interpreted, emended, and supplemented by trying to identify each statue mentioned by Pliny among the types extant in our museums. It may therefore be useful to review briefly the basic points made by the passage, before examining the sculptural candidates.

1) The Competition. The mention of a contest

von Bothmer D. von Bothmer, Amazons in Greek Art (Oxford 1957)

In referring to illustrations of comparative monuments, only standard picture books have been used, with no attempt to provide the best possible photograph or the most important publication of the monument. Thus Bieber, Lippold and S. & S. are the most commonly given sources. In order to avoid excessive footnoting, documentation and references have often been condensed, so that when several statues or several authors are mentioned, only one footnote at the end of the paragraph will provide the bibliographical support.

The Amazon types have been referred to as follows: D-P Amazon = Villa Doria Pamphilii Amazon; Capitoline Amazon type = also known as Sosikles' Amazon because the copy in the Capitoline Museum is signed by Sosikles; Ephesos (Ephesos pier) Amazon = the newly established "fifth" type known through the high relief figure decorating one of the piers of the Roman theater at Ephesos; Mattei Amazon type = after the replica in the Vatican; Lansdowne Amazon type = variously called the "Sciatta" type after the copy in Copenhagen, or the Berlin type after the copy in Berlin; the Lansdowne replica is in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, and it is published and illustrated fully in G. M. A. Richter, Catalogue of Greek Sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Cambridge, Mass. 1954) no. 37, pls. 34-36.

The bibliography on the problem of the Ephesian Amazons is extensive, and it has proved impossible to acknowledge the opinion of all the scholars who have written on the subject. Summaries of previous attributions as well as lists of replicas can be found in Michaelis, Becatti (ch. 13, pp. 185-199) and von Bothmer.

I am greatly indebted to Carol W. Carpenter for her drawing of the five Amazons as they may have stood in Ephesos (pl. 4, fig. 14). Her sketch is meant purely as a visual aid to the reading of my text and makes no definitive claim as to the correct spacing of the statues and the rendering of individual details. Although in the drawing the Amazons have been conventionally rendered as if on a single base, nothing prevents a more scattered arrangement of the statues in the proximity of the temple, perhaps within the perimeter of the altar. Such a setting would probably avoid the monotony of two figures, each leaning on a pier with the same elbow, but it would not prevent a sequential alignment (from left to right along a pi-shaped outline?) which may have prompted the order of winners in Pliny's anecdote.
among ancient masters is not limited to this episode. Pliny himself (NH 36.17) tells us that Alkamenes and Agorakritos competed for a statue of Aphrodite, which was apparently voted upon by the citizens of Athens; another, but much later source (the twelfth century Byzantine writer Tzetzes in his Chilaiades 8.353 = SQ 772) speaks of a contest between Pheidias and Alkamenes, where the former was pronounced victorious by his own compatriots. But all these episodes have a strong anecdotal flavor and are open to doubt. In the case of the Ephesian Amazons in particular, Furtwängler, as early as 1893, had suggested that the order of winners in Pliny simply corresponded to the alignment of the statues on their single base, which had with time acquired an implication of competition and prize; while D. von Bothmer has more recently assumed that "Pliny's account . . . may well be an embroidered anecdote prompted by the presence of four statues of the same subject in the same sanctuary by different artists." A safer reference to a competition is given by the inscription on the pedestal of Paionios' Nike at Olympia, which mentions that the sculptor "won the commission to make the akroteria for the temple." One may note however that akroteria are part of an architectural monument, and as such would require models and a public commission; nothing assures us that a single statue would be subject to the same rules, or, specifically, that the city of Ephesus officially commissioned the statue of an Amazon, though Pliny's passage has sometimes been thus interpreted. Furtwängler (p. 289), who had discounted this possibility, thought in terms of a wealthy private citizen, but in that case it is difficult to see why all five Amazons should be set up if only one "won" and became the object of the dedication. Although evidence is insufficient either to accept or to reject the idea of an ancient competition, we may still stress the fact that Pliny himself is aware of the discrepancy in age among his presumed competitors, and feels the need not only for justification (quamquam diversis actati-

bus geniti) but also for reinforcement (qui prae-
sentes erant iudicio). If, however, as we shall argue infra, Phradmon is a fourth century sculptor, the possibility of contemporaneity collapses and with it the entire anecdote of the contest.

2) The Artists. Aside from problems of chronol-

ogy, the name of the fourth master mentioned by Pliny has given rise to skepticism, and the ancient text has often been emended so as to avoid Kydon entirely and to eliminate the mention of a fifth statue, shifting quarta to Phradmonis. The grounds for this emendation have usually been that Kydon is otherwise unknown as a sculptor, that Pliny mis-
took Kresilas' ethnic (from Kydonia in Crete) for the name of another person, and that the four types of Amazons extant in our museums could be attributed to a fifth century monument. In recent years, however, G. M. A. Richter has defended the original lectio of the text on the basis of a new Amazonian type which was excavated in Ephesus in 1898 but did not receive official publication until sixty years later. Richter pointed out also that Kydon, not attested as an ethnic, is well attested as a proper name, and that therefore Pliny's in-
formation should be accepted in toto. This position is probably correct, regardless of the value of the whole passage.

3) The Statues. On the logical assumption that the famous bronze originals would have been re-
produced in Roman copies, scholars have frequent-
ly been tempted to "illustrate" Pliny's text with the sculptural types represented in modern col-
lections. Though lively disagreement still continues on the attributions of the single types to the various masters, the types themselves have been generally established and accepted; they are usually known as: the Lansdowne type (pl. 1, fig. 1), the Capitoline type (pl. 1, fig. 2), the Mattei type (pl. 1, fig. 3) and the Villa Doria Pamphili Amazon (pl. 1, fig. 4), which is known through only one statue and therefore cannot technically be defined as a type. Indeed Michaelis, in 1886, had listed this statue as a replica of the Lansdowne type, but

1 Meisterwerke 303; von Bothmer 221. Many other scholars have accepted a similar position.
2 E. Loewy, Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer (Leipzig 1885) no. 49.
3 By Poulsen, for instance, who assumed that all the extant sculptural types are wounded because the terms of the com-
petition so required. More recently, W. Fuchs, Die Skulptur
der Griechen (Munich 1969) 195, repeats that the city of
Ephesus commissioned a wounded Amazon.
4 See, e.g., S. Ferri, Plinio il Vecchio (Rome 1946) 77 n. 53, for a strong statement to this effect.
5 Richter, Archaeology: for the original publication of the Ephesos Amazon see F. Eichler, "Eine neue Amazone und andere Skulpturen aus dem Theater von Ephesos," ÖfJ 43 (1956-58) 7-18.
6 Michaelis; his Type I is the Lansdowne; his Type II is the Capitoline, and his Type III is the Mattei, which however he considers later than the other two (though still fifth century,
Furtwängler (pp. 286-303) strongly refuted this position and ascribed the statue to the little-known Phradmon, whom he considered a follower of Polykleitos. Furtwängler’s identification gained wide acceptance and his four types entered the literature of the next fifty years, with discussion mainly limited to deciding which type belonged to which master.

When Eichler published the Amazon from the Ephesos theater (pl. 2, figs. 5-6) he pointed out its strong similarity to the Capitoline type, but did not express himself as to whether the statue represented one more creation of the competing masters or a variant based on the classical Amazons and invented for the specific purpose of decorating the Roman stage. Richter was explicit in recognizing the originality of the type, but did not attribute it specifically to either Phradmon or Kydon, since both the Ephesos and the Doria Pamphilii Amazons are known through only one replica and could equally well be assigned to either sculptor. At this point in our knowledge, however, the picture was simple and coherent: Pliny spoke of five sculptors and five statues; the accuracy of his passage was now confirmed, since we finally possessed five sculptural types, some of them definitely associated with Ephesos through their provenience. But doubts had already begun to undermine this apparent unity.

THE DORIA-PAMPHILI AMAZON

Furtwängler’s attribution of the D-P type to the Ephesian group was explicitly challenged by C. P. Sestieri, who in 1951 proclaimed the heavily restored statue a Roman classicizing creation intended to represent not an Amazon but a Diana. He based this suggestion on: its excessive similarity to the Lansdowne type; the effort apparent in the pose because of the elimination of the supporting pier present in the Berlin type; the stance, which makes it difficult to reconstruct a symmetrical group based on the four “canonical” Amazons, three of which rest their weight on the right leg; and finally the rendering of the drapery, especially the zigzag fold between the breasts, which betrays a classicizing origin. Sestieri maintained moreover that the head at present on the D-P Amazon does not belong but copies a true fifth century original, probably the Amazon by Phradmon. He suggested that the body type to be associated with the head is preserved in a torso known to him through three replicas; the best one, in the La Valletta Museum in Malta, has no attribute preserved, while the other two, in the Palazzo Corsini, Florence, and the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, Copenhagen, have been characterized as Diana by the addition of quiver and strap. Sestieri’s attribution to Phradmon has not been repeated in later literature, and the theory has also been advanced that the torso represented by the three replicas is itself a classicizing creation, intended for a Diana but also used as a stock body for portraits of Roman ladies at the Imperial court. On the other hand, Sestieri’s doubt about the D-P Amazon has been confirmed: the most recent systematic study of the Ephesian group omits the statue because it is “not certainly an Amazon, and in any event so much restored that

9 Richter, Archaeology 115; S. & S. 175 n. 79.
10 C. P. Sestieri, “Alla ricerca di Phradmon,” ArchCl 3 (1951) 13-32, 16. The restorations, as given in the text to BrBr 688-689 are: l. arm from middle of upper arm; r. arm from upper third of upper arm; both legs from knee downward; feet; plinth; dog. Extensive reworking on l. hip. Restored also is a group of folds on the r. side front, from the belt upward; pieces of the folds between the legs and some individual folds; part of hanging folds on back, r., and perhaps also part of back. The head was originally split lengthwise in two, with the break running through the cheeks; its restorations include: chin, lower part of nose, hair over the forehead at l., up to level of fillet. The l. half of the head crown retains traces of the finger tips where the r. hand originally rested.
11 La Valletta torso: Sestieri (supra n. 10) pl. 8:2; Palazzo Corsini statue: EA 326; Ny Carlsberg torso: EA 3834; Sestieri is not aware that the strap and a deer’s hoof are thus interpreted by F. Poulsen, Catalogue of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek (Copenhagen 1951) no. 86, pp. 84-85.
12 F. Poulsen, Catalogue (supra n. 11).
it had better be excluded."\(^\text{13}\) The following points should, however, be mentioned.

Sestieri’s analysis of the pose is probably invalidated by the fact that a pillar may have been included when the D-P statue was first made; the extensive reworking on the figure’s left hip has in fact been interpreted as caused by the breaking off of such a support.\(^\text{14}\)

With this leaning pose would go well also the gesture of resting a hand over the head. Sestieri disregarded this possibility because he believed the pier absent and the head wrong; but if the head is, as generally maintained, part of the original composition, it shows traces of the attachment for the fingers and confirms this reconstruction—making the statue particularly close to the Lansdowne type. This gesture is not attested for Artemis/Diana types, which are more traditionally shown removing an arrow from the quiver while in motion.

A chitoniskos covering both breasts is not simply a prerogative of Artemis/Diana. Those who believe that the D-P statue reproduces the bronze original by Phradmon stress the conservatism of the master and consider the attire typical of early representations of Amazons. If, however, it is true that these female warriors tend to appear with one breast uncovered after the middle of the fifth century, it is also true that the more modest fashion continues in vogue throughout, as shown by individual Amazons on the Bassae frieze, the Maussolleion frieze, and even the late-Hellenistic frieze of the Artemision at Magnesia.\(^\text{15}\) Specifically, the new Amazon type from the Ephesos theater has her chiton similarly fastened over both shoulders. Since the dog was added by the restorer, there is no positive indication that the D-P statue originally represented a Diana, and there is actually a possible clue (the hand resting on the head) pointing to its being an Amazon. Finally, while I would tend to concur with Sestieri’s analysis of the drapery as classicizing, I should like to stress that the head of the D-P figure is equally classicizing, especially in the rendering of the rhythmical “festoons” of hair on each side of the central part below the fillet, which recall early Imperial coiffures.\(^\text{16}\) It may also be added that the statue is usually considered an inferior work of little value, and the absence of replicas is explained on similar grounds. But a direct examination of the piece\(^\text{17}\) shows that it is an impressive work of imposing size and definite monumentality, certainly not inferior to some of the lesser replicas of the Lansdowne Amazon. A classicizing origin would effectively exclude the D-P original from the alleged fifth century competition, but this point will be discussed below in a different connection.

**THE MATTEI TYPE**

If some doubt can be entertained about the D-P statue, the other three Amazonian types have inspired greater confidence, mostly because of their high quality and the considerable number of replicas extant for each one.\(^\text{18}\) Perhaps the least well known is the so-called Mattei Amazon, which has always been found headless. An attempt to adapt to the torso a head known through a replica in bronze from Herculaneum and one in marble from Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli has been accepted by some, rejected by others.\(^\text{19}\) The most recent discussion on the bronze Herculaneum herm seems is the Mattei type (five copies, all headless, plus one marble and one basalt copy of reduced size; the Loukou Amazon is considered an adaptation of this type), and his type \(\gamma\) is the Lansdowne type (to the list of four complete statues, four torsos, four heads, one bronze statuette, one reduced marble copy and the Ephesos relief, add now the head found in 1940, at present in the Capitoline Museum, inv. 2435, Helbig\(^\text{4}\) no. 1643).

\(^{13}\) Von Bothmer, 216. H. von Steuben, in Helbig\(^\text{4}\), bibliography to no. 2216, p. 170, mentions the D-P statue as a surely eclectic work inspired by the Lansdowne type.

\(^{14}\) BRBr text to pls. 688-689 (Munich 1925). This publication also states emphatically that the head is pertinent to the statue.

\(^{15}\) For the chronology of Amazons’ attire, see von Bothmer’s comments, 168-169. Bassae frieze Amazons: S. & S. figs. 211, 212, 214; Maussolleion frieze: Lullies & Hirmer, figs. 214-215; Magnesia frieze: Bieber, figs. 702-703.

\(^{16}\) See, e.g., L. Furnée-van Zvet, “Fashion in women’s hairdress in the 1st century of the Roman Empire,” BABesch 31 (1956) 1-22, figs. 14-17; see also Ridgway, Severe Style, ch. 9, passim.

\(^{17}\) I was allowed to see the D-P statue in 1969; unfortunately the sculpture stands at present within a high niche and it is therefore impossible to examine its back or any of its details at eye level.

\(^{18}\) The most recent listing is by von Bothmer, 216-222; his type \(a\) is the Capitoline (17 replicas listed, of which 8 are only heads, plus one bronze head of reduced size), his type \(\beta\)
to accept the Pheidias attribution but doubts the fidelity of the head to a classical prototype.20

The pose and composition of the Mattei type are also not without problems. It has been generally assumed that the Amazon is not wounded and is therefore leaning on her spear, not for support, but in order to vault onto her horse, a technique known from ancient sources and exemplified by the so-called Natter gem.21 In 1955, however, a new replica of the type was found in Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli, in which the Amazon is wounded on her left thigh (the blood is plastically shown, spurtting from the wound) and the spear is used for support rather than for vaulting.22 The pose remains nonetheless lively and three-dimensional, certainly much more complex and mobile than that of all other types, and intended to be seen from more than one point of view. Indeed, the motif of the skirt tucked in at the waist above the left hip in order to uncover the wounded thigh is not clearly understood unless the Amazon is approached from the right, in a three-quarter view of her left side (pl. 2, fig. 7).

Another peculiarity of the Mattei Amazon as contrasted with the others is the fact that her left, not her right, breast is uncovered.23 Even the specific characterization of this type as an archer would seem to require an unimpeded right arm, but not the left, and a left-handed Amazon in classical times is hardly imaginable. One further possibility should be mentioned: that the figure formed a pendant to another more traditional statue with the right breast revealed. This mirror-image type of composition is not unknown in antiquity from the archaic period onward,24 and it was greatly favored by the Romans who even ordered reversed copies of famous originals for decorative purposes.25 It is interesting to note that the pendant idea was specifically applied to the Mattei type in a construction probably belonging to the estate of Herodes Atticus at Loukou of Thyreatis in the Peloponnese, where the Amazon figure was transformed into a Caryatid.26 None of the other known types, however, would form a good pendant to the Mattei composition because of the unusual three-dimensionality of its pose. This also raises a chronological problem.

Although traditionally attributed to Pheidias, the Mattei type has also been considered later than the others and therefore not part of the Ephesian group.27 Leaving the question of location open, I recognize in the pose a torsional movement not to be expected before the advanced fourth century B.C., according to our present understanding of the development of classical sculpture. The crossing of the right arm above the head toward the figure's left side, while the weight is supported by the right leg, produces a shoulder motion counter to the hip position, with a quasi-spiraling effect not to be found in the relatively open poses of, for instance, the Ares Borghese, or the so-called Naukydes' Dis-

---

20 Bronze Herm: Naples Museum 4889; for good illustrations see Arias, Policleto, pls. 14-15, fig. 64, where the head is considered Polykleitan. For the most recent discussion see D. Pandermalis, "Zum Programm der Statuenausstattung in der Villa dei Papiri," *AthMitt* 86 (1971) 175-209, on the herm see 184-185 and Cat. no. 52, p. 206. "Welterhin ist die Veränderung des Formats zugunsten einer Angleichung an den Doryphoros zu bemerken. Das alles bedeutet, dass wir die Amazonenbüste kaum für eine treue und qualitätvolle Kopie eines klassischen Werkes halten können" (p. 185).

21 For arguments against the Amazon's wound see, e.g., Becatti 193-196; for ancient references to the vaulting action, see Xenophon, *On Horsemanship* 7.1. The Natter gem is now lost but is frequently reproduced; see, e.g., S. & S. fig. 660. If the gem is accepted as a faithful reflection of the Mattei type, one should also postulate, as is usually done, that the head of the type wore a fillet. This elegant coiffure for an Amazon is not without precedents, but is definitely in contrast with the more unruly hairstyle of the Capitoline and Ephesos types. See infra, n. 76.

22 This is B. Andreae's comment in "Archäologische Funde im Bereich von Rom 1949-1956/57," *AA* 1957, cols. 110-138; see specifically col. 328 and fig. 108 for the Amazon. A good analysis of the pose is made by B. Schweitzer, "Neue Wege zu Pheidias," *JdI* 72 (1957) 1-18; see p. 2 for the Amazon, and especially his fig. 1 on p. 3 for a three-quarter view of the composition (our pl. 2, fig. 7).

23 In this connection, von Bothmer (p. 221) clearly points out that on contemporary vases and the copies of the shield of Athena Parthenos the right breast of an Amazon would occasionally be bared, but never the left.

24 Cf., for instance, the stance of Dormys and Kittylas (Lippold, 10:4), the draping of the mantle in the Siphanian Caryatid (Lippold, 16:4) and, more specifically, the flanking figures of some funerary monuments of the fourth century B.C., either lions or servants. For the latter see especially the two seated women in Berlin, C. Blümel, *Die klassisch griechischen Skulpturen der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin* (Berlin 1966) no. 45 (K 13 a, b) figs. 62-69, dated to the last third of the fourth century B.C.


26 On the finds from that site see most recently S. Karoussou, "Die Antike vom Kloster Luku in der Thyreatis," *RömMitt* 76 (1969) 253-265; the piece is in the Athens National Museum, no. 705. Although only one Amazon/Caryatid was found, the type was automatically, and surely correctly, duplicated in mirror image in an otherwise fanciful reconstruction which formed the frontispiece of A. Blouet, *L'Expedition scientifique de Morée*, published in 1831 and reproduced by Karoussou, pl. 81:2.

27 By Michaelis. See supra, n. 6.
kobolos; even the “Protesilaos,” with the accented crossing of the legs, achieves only a backward lean rather than a twisting position. Perhaps the earliest approximation to our Amazon, before Lysippos’ Apoxyomenos, is the so-called Oil-pourer in Munich—but he remains entirely frontal because his raised arm does not cross over but is simply shifted backwards. Even the Capua Aphrodite, who holds a closely comparable pose (pl. 2, fig. 8), seems less three-dimensional than the Mattei Amazon, because the position of her arms is reversed; yet the latest analysis of the Capua statue dates it to the last decade of the fourth century B.C.

If this three-dimensionality is recognized, one more possible explanation for the drapery may be found: the desire to create a pattern of folds emphasizing and continuing the motion of arms and legs.29 The composition would therefore flow from the raised right arm along the diagonal edge of the chiton to the crucial gathering-point of the folds over the left hip, to branch off from there in two directions, one toward the back of the figure, along the line of the lifted skirt, the other across the front to the right knee following the ridge of the deep fold which ends as the last of the irregular catenaries on the right thigh. This motion can be pursued even farther, from the right knee to the left ankle, in one last lap of the zigzag, but the pattern is not linearly applied to the frontal view of the statue, since the gathering-point at the waist leads the eye in other directions with a depth and complexity somewhat comparable to the “Hellenistic Muse” in Samos.30

A major reason for attributing the Mattei type to Pheidias was Lucian’s description of a Pheidian Amazon leaning on a spear (Imag. 4 = SQ 768). Aside from Pliny’s Ephesian anecdote, it is the other ancient source ascribing such a statue to the famous master; yet the subject seems hardly in keeping with what we know otherwise about the sculptor’s production, which focused on divine figures. The possibility must therefore be considered that Pheidias’ name became connected with a specific Amazonian type only relatively late, when there was confusion about attributions, and mostly because Pheidias was responsible for the Amazonomachy on the shield of the Athena Parthenos, which was amply “quoted” in Neoattic works.31

THE CAPITOLINE TYPE

Another Amazon exists who leans on her spear: the so-called Capitoline type, which has also been attributed to Pheidias, though both Kresilas and Polykleitos are more frequently favored. This is the only Amazon who has been unanimously accepted as wounded because she openly acknowledges her condition by lifting her garment from the painful spot. This virtual justification for the revealing of her breast seems fully in keeping with fifth century practice, which showed the female nude only through transparent drapery or under conditions of stress or rapid motion.32 The Amazon’s “four-square” pose would have been emphasized on her right side by the presence of the spear which she held with her raised arm, as shown in a gem in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.33 She is the only one of the four basic types to reflect the Polykleitan chiasmos as we know it from the Doryphoros and, without going into the matter of attributions, made more difficult by the possible unreliability of Pliny’s anecdote, she is also the only one in pure fifth century style. It is interesting to note that the “fifth” Amazon from the Ephesos theater seems the obvious counterpart of the Capitoline type: she wears the mantle as well as the chitoniskos, rests her weight on the right leg and lifts her left arm, in a mirror-image pose; her hairstyle is so close to the Capitoline’s that the fragment of her head in London was originally considered another replica of that type;34 and both Amazons are characterized by a slightly unruly coiffure which does not rely on fillets but knots the long strands over the nape.35

29 A somewhat similar explanation is given by Michaelis (p. 40) for the Lansdowne Amazon.
30 Lippold, pl. 121:1.
31 On this point, see infra. For confused attributions to major masters, see also infra.
32 Cf. the comments by R. Carpenter, Greek Sculpture (Chi-
The Capitoline type has often been attributed to Kresilas because of her obvious wound. Besides the anecdote, in fact, Pliny mentions that a wounded Amazon was made by Kresilas (NH 34.76) but the original *lectio* reads Ctesilas, a perfectly plausible name which not all scholars wish to emend; it should moreover be noted that the same passage also mentions a Doryphoros and reads like a traditional list of attributions to a master, which would be surprising for Kresilas, since Pliny had already mentioned the sculptor's work in an earlier passage (NH 34.74). The fact that Kresilas made a *vulneratus deficiens* is, per se, no guarantee that the master favored pathetic themes, and since the Mattei and the Lansdowne types are also wounded (the Mattei as obviously as the Capitoline in the Tivoli replica which explains the whole composition, pace Becatti), no special preference can be given to one type over the others.

THE LANSDOWNE TYPE

Recently a new argument has been advanced to attribute the Lansdowne type to Kresilas. In a convincing article J. Frel has shown that the so-called Proteisilaos in New York is in fact a wounded warrior leaning backward and trying to support himself on his spear before collapsing. This composition therefore corresponds closely to descriptions of Kresilas' *vulneratus deficiens*, and a basic similarity with the Perikles and the Diomedes would confirm attribution to that master. The position of the wound, a gash at the right armpit, corresponds to that on the Lansdowne Amazon and has encouraged Frel to attribute this work also to Kresilas, as has often been advocated by other scholars. Yet, together with the Capitoline type, the Lansdowne Amazon is the most frequently copied, and must obviously have been popular in antiquity—a fact which has convinced many archaeologists that the original must have been the prize-winning statue by Polykleitos. But, more than the Mattei type, this sculpture presents many features hard to reconcile with a fifth century date, features which have periodically been questioned and variously explained.

1) The Supporting Pier. Perhaps the most surprising element, in a bronze original, is the presence of the pier on which the Amazon rests her left elbow; yet its "legitimacy" is attested not only by the correspondence of the various replicas, but especially by a relief found in Ephesos which shows an Amazon of the Lansdowne type leaning on a support which cannot have been added by the copyist since it is not structurally required by the safe medium of relief.

It is usually argued that leaning poses existed as early as the fifth century, as proved not only by statues in the round (most of which, unfortunately, are not original Greek work) but also by reliefs, some of them connected with dated architecture.

Yet two points are worth noting: the freestanding statues were marble originals which may have required a prop for technical reasons, and both statues and relief figures show a different relationship to their support—they virtually adhere to it, resting against it more with the hip than the arm. The result is a composition very different from that of the Lansdowne Amazon, where the space between body and pier is actually emphasized by the bending of the leg nearer the support. This more open type of composition is well attested for the fourth century and is exemplified by several statues in Praxitelean style, but the support usually has a more naturalistic shape and the position of the pier than with its very presence in a bronze original.

Ephesos Amazon to the theater stage, rather than by the pose of the original.

---

For a discussion of this point see, e.g., Becatti 191. It should be admitted that the Competition passage also gives different *lectiones* for the name of Kresilas, such as *Ctesilae* and *Cressile*, but an emendation into the more familiar sculptor's name would not be as questionable there as it is in 34.76 because of Kresilas' definite mention in 34.74.


88 This detail had already been questioned by Wolters (as quoted by Michaelis), who suggested that the figure must have originally been leaning on her axe and that the pose was introduced to add one more identifying attribute to the composition of an otherwise weaponless Amazon. Michaelis' answer (p. 31) is more concerned with justifying the originality of the pier than with its very presence in a bronze original.

89 For discussion of this relief and its setting, see infra.

40 For a recent discussion of leaning poses see Becatti, *Ninfe* 28 and passim. I agree with the Italian scholar that the so-called Narkyssos is a classicizing composition rather than the work of the Polykleitan school. More reliable in date is the leaning Aphrodite, which has been variously attributed to Phidias or Alkamanes (Lippold, pl. 56; also discussed by Becatti, *Ninfe* 28 with bibliography, n. 30). For leaning figures on reliefs see the newly reconstructed Victory from the Nike Balustrade, E. Harrison, *Hesperia* 29 (1960) 376-378, pl. 83a; cf. also the woman from the Erechtheion frieze, which P. Boulter reconstructs as leaning against a tree while stepping forward (*AntP* 10 [1971] 9-10, pls. 3-4); the trunk is definitely visible near the figure's left foot, but a leaning pose seems difficult to reconcile with a stepping motion.
the body is different—a distinctly oblique stance.\textsuperscript{48} The Amazon, however, is perfectly balanced, to the extent that her left shoulder is practically level with her right (despite the presence of the pier which should push it upward), which therefore thoroughly alters the potential chiasmos of the pose.

In defense of a Polykleitan attribution, it has been pointed out that Polykleitos himself changed his famous contrapposto pattern in the Kyniskos,\textsuperscript{48} but the two statues side by side show an entirely different concept of balance. The athlete rests his weight on his left leg and raises the opposite arm to crown himself; as a result the chiasmos prevails in his torso, with shoulder lowered on the side of the raised hip and raised where the free leg makes the iliac crest dip down. The Amazon, in contrast, lifts her arm on the side of her weight-carrying leg, so that shoulder and hip are raised on the same side, and though the left hip must be lowered because of the trailing foot, the left shoulder remains level with the right, as already noted. Basically, therefore, the Kyniskos alters the Doryphoros' pattern only in being a mirror image of the canonical pose and in turning his head toward the side of the free leg; the Amazon, like the Doryphoros, rests her weight on the right leg, but changes the scheme completely by eliminating the contrapposto pattern, or rather, by shifting her balance only up to the waist while her shoulders remain virtually level, much like works of the Severe period or of the "Severizing" phase during the first century B.C.\textsuperscript{44}

42 See, e.g., the Apollo Sauroktonos (Lippold, pl. 84:13) or the Leaning Satyr (Lippold, pl. 84:14). The Hermes of Olympia (Lippold, pl. 84:2) cannot be brought into this argument as a valid parallel, since those who consider it a Greek original recognize the tree trunk as needed for the support of the fragile marble arm, while those who consider it a copy of an original bronze would eliminate the tree trunk as a copyist's addition. The "erect" type with distant pier as attribute rather than support appears instead in the Hellenistic period. For instance, Becatti (\textit{Ninfe} 57-58) dates to the late second century B.C. the prototype of his Marine Nymph with water jar resting on a pillar.

43 Lippold, pl. 601. Various good illustrations of different replicas in \textit{Arias, Policleto}, pl. 5 and figs. 16-17, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28; reconstructed cast in Munich, fig. 29.

44 Cf. e.g., the so-called Omphalos Apollo, Lippold, pl. 32:1. Severizing phase: see Ridgway, \textit{Severe Style}, ch. 9.

45 This foot is preserved in the New York replica and its heel is much higher from the ground than in any Polykleitan statue.

46 The full profile view of the Lansdowne Amazon is generally avoided by photographers since it obscures some aspects of the composition and shows the statue at its most ungainly. See however the illustration in \textit{A\-\-\-} 57 (1933) 5, fig. 6a, and contrast the interesting side views of the Mattei type in Becatti.

Note further that the Kyniskos (or any Polykleitan statue, for that matter) trails his free leg not so much behind as to the side; the Amazon has a much closer stance, with her left foot well behind her and touching the ground only at the toes.\textsuperscript{46} Moreover, while the Kyniskos, by bending his head and raising his arm on the side of the free leg, compositionally describes an open curve to his right, the Amazon is enclosed between two vertical lines, her weight-carrying leg on one side and the pier on the other, accentuating and widening the frontal plane of the composition. The need for touching the pillar with her left elbow, in conjunction with the trailing foot, forces her to throw back her shoulders and push her stomach forward. When the statue is viewed directly in profile (pl. 3, fig. 9), this pose results in a peculiar effect of rear concavity, which is unusual for the fifth century and, to my knowledge, appears only in much later monuments.\textsuperscript{46} Thus the pillar, far from being necessary for the balance of the figure, forces it into a slightly unnatural position; its justification must therefore be sought in its aesthetic/symbolic meaning rather than in its function, especially, to stress the point once again, since the original bronze statue would have required no such support.

When do bronzes appear in conjunction with "meaningful" supports? The clearest examples seem to be no earlier than the Hellenistic period, but a fourth century date may also be possible.\textsuperscript{47} Indeed, several scholars have advocated such a date for the Lansdowne Amazon, on various grounds.\textsuperscript{48}

For comparable poses in later periods, see, e.g., the classicizing Stephanois' Athlete, Lippold, pl. 36:3 and comments in B. S. Ridgway, "The Bronze Apollo from Piombino in the Louvre," \textit{Antip} 7 (1967) 59, figs. 18-19. On the "labil" pose of the Amazon in a side view, as well as on the un-Polykleitan parallelism of hips and shoulders see the comments by H. von Steuben (in Helbig\textsuperscript{4} no. 433), who however attributes the type to Kreilas.

47 Hellenistic bronzes: see, e.g., the statue of Agon from the Mahdia shipwreck, which W. Fuchs (\textit{Der Schiffscund von Mahdia} [Tübingen 1963] 12-14, no. 1, pls. 1-8) has joined to the archaistic herm from the same wreck. See also various statuettes of Aphrodite: in Dresden, Bieber, p. 21, fig. 39; in Paris, C. M. Havelock, \textit{Hellenistic Art} (New York 1971) no. 87, p. 122. For comments on the use of supports in bronzes see B. S. Ridgway, "Stone and Metal in Greek Sculpture," \textit{Archaeology} 19 (1966) 42.

Fourth century bronzes: see, e.g., the Apollo Sauroktonos by Praxiteles, a bronze work where, as Lippold notes (240, pl. 84:13) the light lean of the body against the rather far tree trunk is only possible because of the original medium. Here however the support is needed for the positioning of the lizard, and the Apollo is slightly more off balance than the Lansdowne Amazon.

48 A dating in the first quarter of the 4th century B.C. is,
One suggestion is that the Argive Phradmon made this Amazon and that he was a fourth century master, contemporary not with the famous Polykleitos but with Polykleitos the Younger.\(^{48}\) Unfortunately little is known about this sculptor, and Pliny’s *floruit* in the 90th Olympiad (ca. 420 B.C., *NH* 34.49) seems in contradiction with an epigram attributed to a third century B.C. poet (Theodorida, in *Ant. Pal. 9.743*) about two bronze cows made by Phradmon and dedicated by the Thessalians after an Illarian campaign in 356 or 336 B.C.\(^{50}\) More recent information about the sculptor’s work is unfortunately impossible to date. In 1969 three statue bases were found at Ostia, one of which had once supported a statue of Charite, priestess at Delphi, made by Phradmon of Argos, as mentioned by the inscription. The letter forms, however, correspond to the first century B.C., and suggest that the sculptures, carried off from Greece without their pedestals, were set up in Italy on new bases repeating the original inscription.\(^{51}\) Since Pliny’s *akme* dates are notoriously unreliable, it seems best to leave the question open, though acknowledging the possibility that Phradmon lived in the fourth century B.C.

Because Phradmon was Argive, scholars have assumed that he may have belonged to the school of Polykleitos, and have thus been influenced by that master’s style, yet the most recent studies on Polykleitos’ followers do not discuss Phradmon.\(^{52}\) Ch. Picard, who ascribes the Lansdowne type to him, sees the work as strongly influenced not only by Polykleitos, but also by Praxiteles.\(^{53}\) Since attributions of types to masters seem unreliable and based on inadequate evidence, one is forced again to fall back on style. What is Praxitelean in the Lansdowne type?

2) *The Gesture of the Right Arm.* Besides the introduction of a support into the composition, another Praxitelean trait seems to be the position of the Amazon’s right arm, with the hand resting lightly on her head. It is the typical gesture of the Apollo Lykeios, which has generally been attributed to Praxiteles, though on insufficient grounds. Lucian (*Anacharsis* 7) mentions that the Gymnasium of the Lykeion in Athens had a statue of Apollo leaning against a column, with a bow in his left hand and the right hand over his head “as if resting from a long effort”;\(^{54}\) Lucian, however, does not give us the sculptor’s name. This same monument appears on Athenian coins of ca. 50 B.C., but they represent only a *terminus ante quem* for the dating of the statue. Many replicas of the type are extant, and modern scholarship has attributed their original to Praxiteles because of the elongated proportions, elegant pose, and perhaps somewhat effeminate anatomy, but while some may theoretically reflect a fourth century prototype,\(^{55}\) the majority are variants of the Hellenistic period, and at least one version has been convincingly attributed to the Attic artist Timarchides and dated around the middle of the second century B.C. His work stood in Rome (*Pliny, NH* 36.55) and was probably reproduced in one of the panels of the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum, to suggest the Forum Boarium and the various divinities there honored. It is significant that while Ptolemaus and Hercules in the same panel are characterized by the symbols they hold, anchor and club respectively, the Apollo is identified simply by his


Von Bothmer (p. 221) states that type γ (Lansdowne) is later than α and β (Capitoline and Mattei) and in some measure dependent on them, but he is willing to consider the three types roughly contemporary and to attribute γ to Kresilas (p. 222).

\(^{49}\) See, e.g., Johnson, *Lysippos* 31; Ch. Picard, *Manuel d’archéologie grecque, La sculpture*, vol. 311, 259-260, suggests that Phradmon may have repaired the Amazons or, rather, have recommenced on his own the “competition” after the fire of 356 B.C., thus connecting his name with the group.

\(^{50}\) For summaries of the evidence on Phradmon see especially J. Marcalé, *Revue de signatures* v (Paris 1933) no. 88, and *E.A.A* s.v. *Phradmon* (L. Guerini).

\(^{51}\) G. M. A. Richter, “New Signatures of Greek Sculptors,” *AJA* 75 (1971) 434-435; F. Zevi *RendPontAc* 42 (1969-70) 95-116, takes as certain that Phradmon lived in the fifth century B.C. and stresses that his statue of Charite thus becomes the earliest female portrait of which we have knowledge (p. 114).


\(^{53}\) Picard, *Manuel* 311, 260. Praxiteles’ name is connected with Ephesos by Strabo’s mention that he made an altar, which stood in the temple of Artemis (Strabo 14.641); but the text makes clear that this was not the main altar outside the temple, with which the Amazons have sometimes been connected; see, e.g., K. Lehmann, *Parnassus* 8 (April 1936) 9-11.

\(^{54}\) δ θεῖα δέ ὑπὲρ τής κεφαλῆς ἀνακελλαμνῆς ῥυπέρ έκ καμάτων μακροί ἀνασφαλομένον.

\(^{55}\) On the Apollo Lykeios see especially G. E. Rizzo, *Praxitele* (Milan 1932) 79-85, with illus. Cf. also the comments by H. von Steuben, *Helbig*, nos. 1426, 1897. L. Abcher (*Griechische Plastik* vol. 3 [Berlin 1956] 198, ch. II n. 13) points out that the many differences among the replicas make it impossible to reconstruct the appearance of the original.
gesture of resting his arm over his head, which therefore, by Trajanic times at least, had become an attribute.56 That the gesture is typical of Apollo rather than merely of Timarchides’ statue is shown by other variants, by representations of the god in different contexts, and even by the portrait of Antinoos as Apollo from Leptis Magna.57 When the gesture is found also in statues of Dionysos, it is easy to assume that the God of Wine inherited the pose from Apollo together with other iconographic similarities, since the Hellenistic period created a type of youthful divinity which is almost impossible to recognize as Apollo or Dionysos without qualifying attributes.58 The sequence of events would therefore be as follows: a major artist, possibly Praxiteles, created a statue of Apollo with arm raised and resting on the crown of the head, for the Lykeion in Athens. The statue became famous and was so often reproduced and imitated that the gesture became almost synonymous with Apollo; when the iconography of that god virtually coincided with that of Dionysos, the latter was also reproduced in this pose, which then passed on to many other Dionysiac types, such as the Sleeping Ariadne, resting satyrs, etc.

But this reconstruction disregards the interpretation of the gesture itself. Lucian “read” it as signifying rest after a long effort, and obviously this meaning applied to the pose by the first half of the second century A.D., Lucian’s time, though nothing assures us that it obtained at the time when the original was created. On theoretical grounds, however, it is legitimate to speculate what came first: whether it was the famous statue which launched the gesture and made it popular as an attitude of repose, or whether the gesture already conveyed that meaning and was therefore given to a resting Apollo leaning against a column. An investigation into the origin of the pose may support the second hypothesis and help determine the chronology of the Lykeios.

Arms flung backward and touching or encircling the head appear in the archaic period to signify death; we find them in two-dimensional art, such as vase painting and relief, where corpses are shown relaxed in defenseless positions which suggest the Homeric “loosening of the limbs.”59 The pose continued to be popular in classical times, and the range expanded to include pedimental sculpture; among the examples are, for instance, the dead Niobid in Copenhagen, the dead Trojan from the east pediment of the Asklepieion at Epidaurus and, more significantly for our subject, a dead Amazon on the shield of the Athena Parthenos by Pheidias.60 This Amazonomachy was often copied in later times, and though recent studies differ in the arrangement of the figures, some individual types and their poses are well established because they appear in all the extant replicas. One of them is the so-called Supine Amazon, lying on her back with one leg slightly bent, her left arm along her side and her right flung over and around her head. It is interesting to note that this same pose was adopted by the Hellenistic sculptor who made the Attalid dedications for the Athenian Akropolis, since the Dead Amazon in Naples could easily represent a three-dimensional representation of the shield figure. The correlation is not far-fetched, since the Pergamene dedication was set up in Athens not far from the Athena Parthenos herself, and since the Attalids pursued a policy of open admiration and imitation of classical Athens.61

56 G. Becatti, “Timarchide e l’Apollo qui tenet citharam,” BollCom 63 (1935) 111-113; the same author has recently returned to the discussion of the Trajanic panel in Ninfe 48-50 and pl. 38 fig. 76.

57 For Apollo in other contexts, see e.g., some representations of the competition with Marsyas (e.g., comments by H. von Steuben, Helbig, no. 1597 and ill. on p. 390). Antinous/Apollo from Lepäis Magna, Ch. W. Clairmont, Die Bildnisse des Antinous (Rome 1966) no. 38, pl. 29.

58 See for instance the difficulty experienced in classifying the torso in the de Ménul collection, H. Hoffmann, Ten Centuries that Shaped the West (Houston, Texas 1971) no. 15, pp. 47-48. See also the comments by H. von Steuben in Helbig, no. 1383.

59 See for instance the dead Giants on the North frieze of the Siphnian Treasury, Lullies & Hirmer pls. 50-51; in vase painting, cf., e.g., the François Vase, Arias & Hirmer, pl. 42, middle picture (Kalydonian Boar Hunt); in red-figure, the Brygos Painter’s skyphos in Vienna (Kunsthistorisches Mus. 3710) with the Ransom of Hektor (the corpse under Achilles’ couch): A. Cambitoglou, The Brygos Painter (Sydney 1968) pl. xi fig. 1. Note that in some cases the artists seem to have made a special effort to show the arm in this position, though it would have been simpler to draw or carve it out of sight. Presumably such effort was made because of the significance of the gesture. In vase painting, however, the pose is also found with seated singers or rapt listeners at a banquet; see E. Vermeule, “Footnotes of a Symposium by Euphronios,” AntK 8 (1965) 34-39, especially p. 35 and further bibliography in n. 6.

60 Niobid in Copenhagen: Lippold, pl. 65-6. Trojan from Epidaurus: B. Schlörp, Timotheos, JdD EH 22 (Berlin 1965) pl. 6. For the latest discussion of the Shield of Athena Parthenos, and for previous bibliography, see N. Leinen, Athena Parthenos (Toronto 1971) 41-47; the Supine Amazon is her no. 2. For various reconstructions of the Shield as well as reproductions of the extant evidence see her figs. 81-83.

61 Dead Amazon in Naples: see both Lippold, pl. 127:4
But by the third century B.C. the interest of the Hellenistic period had shifted to topics other than those favored by the classical repertoire. The sleep of death was replaced by true sleep, induced by natural causes or by drunkenness, fatigue or sorrow; numerous examples exist of such subjects, from the Sleeping Barberini Faun to the Sleeping Ariadne, Endymion and others; a favorite rendering shows the head encircled by the right arm, in an easy transposition from the relaxation of death to the relaxation of slumber. A further step, from resting while asleep to resting while awake, may easily have suggested such a pose for both the Apollo Lykeios and Dionysos, who is often shown inebriated and even leaning on a satyr for support. Rather than being an attribute of Apollo, the gesture would have carried its own meaning of relaxation and was therefore applicable to the drunken Dionysos as well as to the resting Apollo.

It is only at this point in the sequence that we can imagine an important statue, well known perhaps for its location as much as for its artistic value, establishing the type as characteristic of Apollo; but if the sequence has been correctly reconstructed, the time of Praxiteles (or even of his school) seems too early a date for a pose which presupposes Hellenistic experimentation with sleeping themes. Similarly the head of the Lykeios, with his braided hair in the center of the forehead, resembles the archaizing coiffures of female figures (for instance, the Karyatids of the Erechtheion) and should represent an artistic phase in which female and male hair styles could intermingle.

To return to the Lansdowne Amazon: if the Apollo Lykeios is dated later than the time of Praxiteles, one more reason is eliminated for considering the Lansdowne type Praxitelean. Her gesture was adopted for the same reasons which prompted it for the Apollo: to suggest lassitude. In conjunction with the pier, the total composition would have shown the Amazon resting after the effort of a battle—implied by the presence of her wound. It seems fair to assume that only a Hellenistic or a Roman audience would have been receptive to this message in sign language. One

In the minor arts the motif of the arm flung over the head seems to occur with alive and awake persons earlier than in three-dimensional sculpture. See, e.g., the seated male figure in the lower register of the gold koros from Chertomlyk (M. J. Artamonou, Treasures of Scythian Tombs [London 1969] pls. 181-182; I am indebted to Dr. Stella G. Miller for this reference), which is presumably dated to the mid-fourth century B.C. by its context; or the Dionysos on the Derveni krater (Ch. M. Havelock, Hellenistic Art [New York 1971] pl. III) usually dated ca. 300 B.C. However, the date of the krater is still debatable (Havelock 356, for instance, favors a late Hellenistic origin for the vessel). It can further be shown that in many instances the two-dimensional arts, with their graphic tradition, precede by several decades comparable renderings in three-dimensional form. See, for instance, the pose of the sandal-binder on the West, and of the seated Ares on the East, frieze of the Parthenon (P. E. Corbett, The Sculpture of the Parthenon [Penguin Books 1959] pl. 23 A slab vi, and pl. 11 A slab iv respectively) as reproduced by the so-called Jason (Havelock, fig. 100, there dated ca. 100 B.C.) and the Ares Ludovisi (M. Bieber, The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age [New York 1961] fig. 103).

It may be argued that to trace the origin of the motif in death poses is wide of the mark, and that the true prototype for the Amazon’s gesture is in the iconography of Artemis drawing an arrow from her quiver (see, e.g., the Artemis of the Niobid krater in the Louvre, Arias & Hirmer pl. 175) or of a warrior raising his arm to strike what is currently known as “the Harmodios blow.” The Amazons were women of action whose shortened clothes often resembled Artemis’ attire, and the assimilation of iconography and gestures would have been plausible on many counts. Likewise, Amazons were often represented in fighting poses which required the lifting of the right arm to touch the head (see, e.g., another krater by the Niobid Painter, in Palermo, Arias & Hirmer, pl. 176; in sculpture, see one of the Amazons in the Bassae frieze, Lon-
cannot help but speculate further as to whether the entire composition of the Lansdowne type was inspired by the “Supine Amazon” on the Parthenos' shield (perhaps via the Pergamene dedication), which would explain how the name of Phidias became connected with the Ephesian anecdote.

3) The Drapery. If gesture and pose seem to point to a Hellenistic date for the prototype, further confirmation is provided by proportions and drapery. Many scholars have noted the excessive elongation of the Amazon’s legs and the general slenderness of her limbs in proportion to the body. As for the drapery, it consists of a standard masculine chiton tied by two belts, one visible and one hidden by the kolpos, an arrangement intended to shorten the length of the garment to give additional freedom of movement which was common in classical times, as shown by some figures on the Parthenon frieze. The Lansdowne Amazon, however, has also tucked in the center of her skirt, both front and back, presumably for the same purpose, thus stretching the cloth over her thighs and creating a mass of vertical folds between her legs somewhat comparable to the arrangement of an Indian sari. Her chiton is pinned only over the right shoulder, and hangs free on the left side uncovering her breast, but the general arrangement is so loose that her right flank is also revealed. The arrangement of the Mattei Amazon has already been discussed as unusual for a classical rendering, yet hers is simply a mirror image of the traditional attire with one breast covered and the other exposed. The Lansdowne Amazon, on the other hand, has both breasts bared, an arrangement which cannot be justified in terms of compositional pattern or of matching counterparts, since the remaining strap lies between the breasts rather than definitely over one of them. This display of female anatomy is one more element militating against a fifth century date, but it cannot be pinned down with certainty to a specific period.

More significant, perhaps, is the pattern of the chiton’s skirt, with its peculiar rhythm of catenaries arranged in strict bilateral symmetry on either side of the central gather and framed by deep vertical folds at the outer edge of the thighs. Logical as this rendering may seem, it is far too calligraphic for classical drapery, which usually tends to emphasize the stance and the different positions of the legs by a different pattern of folds over each thigh. I could find no parallel whatever for the Amazon’s scheme in the many renderings of the classical chitoniskos, either in Greek originals or (should the excessive regularity of the pattern be imputed to the Roman copyist) in Roman copies. Compare, for instance, other figures on the Parthenon frieze, or the stele of Chairemodes and Lykeas from Salamis, particularly significant because of its use of Polykleitan types. The Roman replicas of the Orpheus relief show steep central folds on Orpheus’ drapery and catenaries over one of Hermes’ thighs, but the two renderings are not combined. The Mantineaia base, an original Greek relief of the fourth century B.C., portrays the Scythian slave with central gather and deep enfaming folds along the outer contours of the thighs, but no catenaries in between. It should moreover be emphasized that the Amazon’s arrangement is faithfully duplicated both in front and in back; a rear view of the statue (pl. 3, fig. 10) shows the same improbable festoons over the buttocks framed by

---

68 This statement is valid even if one considers not the rather cold replicas of the Lansdowne type in New York or Berlin, but even the more impressionistic renderings of the copies from Lece (Arias, Policleto fig. 59) or from Tivoli (ibid. fig. 65; AA 1957, fig. 167 on col. 331).

the steep folds along the thighs and between them, giving a pronounced effect of transparency.

If not in chitoniskoi, this particular combination of transparent drapery crossed by regular catenaries and outlined by deep folds does occur in other renderings.\textsuperscript{71} We find it first in many archaic statues from Asia Minor, especially in seated figures from Miletus, but the motif can be traced down through Roman times and as far afield as Gandhara, Palmyra and Parthia.\textsuperscript{72} Because it seems so much at home in Oriental territory, one may speculate whether the motif goes back to a pre-Greek substratum, often assimilated into Greek forms but never totally forgotten, which reemerged in times of diluted classical influence; this non-Greek rendering would then be responsible for such works as the Phrygian Cybele from Bogazköy, some figures on Luristan objects in the Oxus Treasure, and even the traditional version of the Achaemenid costume in the Persian reliefs.\textsuperscript{73} The decorative potential of the motif, combined with its modeling possibilities, must have appealed to the Eastern Greeks, who always preferred surface animation to plastic articulation; these qualities insured the revival of the rendering whenever taste favored symmetry and calligraphy, or emphatic separation of body and cloth, or even when non-Greek connections were implied. It is therefore not surprising to find basically the same motif in statues of priestesses of Isis, or in mid- or late Hellenistic female figures, and especially in archaistic sculpture.\textsuperscript{74}

Close in spirit as these renderings may be, none can safely be pinned down to an absolute date, though all of them belong, generally speaking, to the Hellenistic period. Fortunately, one last example can be found in a portrait statue wearing precisely the chitoniskos, or the Roman version of it: the cuirassed M. Holconius Rufus from Pompeii, who is firmly dated to the Augustan Period (pl. 3, fig. 11). His short tunic under the cuirass shows the same pattern of catenaries over the thighs between the enfaming vertical folds that we have, in a rather colder execution, in the Lansdowne Amazon.\textsuperscript{75} Another, though provincial, example firmly dated to early Imperial times appears on the Arch of Carpentras in France, in the drapery of one of the Gaulish prisoners (pl. 4, fig. 12).

**HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND PLINY’S “GROUP”**

On the basis of all these elements (the presence of an unnecessary support, the mannered gesture meaning rest, the elongated proportions, the archaizing arrangement of the drapery) only one conclusion seems possible: the Lansdowne type, far from being a fifth century B.C. creation, should be dated considerably later, at least within the Hellenistic period and possibly even in Augustan times. With her she should date the D-P Amazon, which resembles the Lansdowne in so many features and which was sooner recognized as classicizing because of her more numerous stylistic discrepancies and lesser quality. The famous group mentioned by Pliny would therefore break down to an additive composition, which probably started with the dedi-
cation of a statue of the Capitoline type (by Kresilas?), perhaps matched by another in almost mirror-image pose and comparable equipment, the Ephesos pier type. These two statues must have stood somewhere within the precinct of the Artemision and survived the destructive fire of 356 B.C. After that date, and when work had begun on the temple, perhaps under Alexander the Great’s instigation, a third Amazon was added, the Mattei type (by Phradmon?), which may have formed a focal point between the two. Finally, under Augustus, two more statues were erected, the Lansdowne and the Doria-Pamphili types, the former recalling the Mattei in arm position and uncovered chest, the latter resembling the Ephesos type in her more modest attire (pl. 4, fig. 14).76

Some historical confirmation may perhaps be found in support of this proposed sequence of events. It is well known that Alexander the Great, when he took possession of Ephesos in 334 B.C., offered to reconstruct the temple of Artemis, only to be spurned by the citizens. But he nonetheless enlarged the limits of the inviolable area and greatly increased the revenues of the goddess by diverting to her the Ephesian tribute previously paid to the Persians.77 This was obviously a time of prosperity and great revival fervor at the Artemision, and an Amazon would have been an appropriate subject for a dedication at this moment of virtual rebirth, since according to myth the Amazons were considered the founders of the sanctuary.78

Augustus also improved the financial conditions of the temple, by restoring its revenues and by marking the boundaries of the lands belonging to the goddess.79 He was directly involved with construction at the Artemision site, since in 5 B.C. he ordered a new temenos wall which encompassed not only the temple of the goddess but also an Augusteum, thus associating the Imperial cult with one of the oldest shrines in Asia.80 This very redefining of the sacred area entailed, however, a curtailment of Artemis’ territory with its inherent right of asylum, since the extensions granted by Alexander, Mithradates and Antony had resulted in an abuse of the right and had turned the temenos into an unwarranted refuge for bad debtors, slaves and criminals.81 Augustus’ dedication of two Amazon statues may perhaps be connected with this very aspect of his reforms, a sort of symbolic recognition of the antiquity and strength of the Artemision’s right of asylum at exactly the time when his actions may have been construed as a curtailment of such right. In fact Tacitus tells us that in A.D. 22, when Tiberius decreed a review of all claims to the right of asylum, the Ephesian ambassadors were the first to be heard; they argued their case on the strength of the great antiquity of their right, since the Amazons had been the first suppliants to sit on Artemis’ altar when they were chased by Dionysos and later by Herakles.82

An Augustan addition to a preexisting monument seems also well in keeping with the Emperor’s policy of reviving religious practices and veneration for earlier monuments, witness his “antiquari-

76 Note that the two “early” types, Capitoline and Ephesos, have the same unbound hair style; the latest, D-P and Lansdowne, have chignons held by fillets, in a more “civilized” rendering. Since the head of the Mattei type has not been positively established, it cannot be affirmed with certainty, but comparison with the Natter gem suggests that she also wore a fillet. Cf. supra, n. 21. If we believe with Furtwängler (supra n. 1) that the alignment of the statues on their base gave Pliny his “standings” for the competitors, we may further speculate how the attribution of the single figures to sculptors was made (see fig. 14). The Capitoline type may have been given to Polycleitus because of her chiasmos; the Lansdowne was probably attributed to Phidias because of her resemblance to the Supine Amazon on the Parthenos’ shield; the Mattei could have been connected with Kresilas because of her obvious wound, and because the master’s name was rightfully linked with at least one figure within the group; the D-P Amazon may have been truly made by a Kydon, an otherwise unknown first century B.C. sculptor; and finally Phradmon’s name was shifted from his legitimate creation, in the center, to the last figure of the group (the Ephesos pier type), perhaps because of his rather obscure status in Pliny’s time.

77 Cf. D. Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor (Princeton 1950) 75.

Pausanias (7.2.7) who, however, does not consider it reliable. The Amazons were also the first to dedicate a bretas of the goddess and to celebrate her with dances (Kallim. Hymn. in Dian. 237). For a discussion of the ancient sources connecting Amazons with Ephesos see Furtwängler 289-290.

80 T. R. S. Broughton, in T. Frank, An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, 4 (Baltimore 1938) 645 and 679. I am greatly indebted to Prof. Broughton for providing me with all the sources on Roman history which I am using on this subject. For the series of inscriptions from the Cayster valley mentioning Augustus’ restorations, see F. K. Dörner, Der Erlass des Statthalter von Asia Paulus Fabius Persicus (Diss. Greifswald 1935) 15 and 28.

81 The ancient sources for these statements are Strabo 14.1.23; Plutarch, de Vit. Aer. Alex. 3; Cicero, Verres 2.1.85. Cf. also Magie (supra n. 77) 470 and n. 10 on pp. 132-133.

82 Tacitus, Ann. 3.61-63. See the discussion in Furtwängler 280-290; he asserts that the story has a late origin since it is mentioned only in Roman Imperial sources and casts Dionysos in a role patterned after Alexander’s campaigns. The pier of the two classicizing Amazons could perhaps be also understood as an abbreviated reference to Artemis’ altar.
an” activities not only in Rome but, for instance, in the Athenian Agora. Since he considered himself the logical heir of the traditions established by Alexander the Great and the Attalids, what better monument could Augustus have set up than statuary immediately recalling the great Pergamene victories, the Athenian akropolis and, if the assumption about the Mattei Amazon is correct, one of Alexander’s dedications?

OBJECTIONS

We must now consider the evidence against our proposed dates for the Mattei and Lansdowne Amazons. The first objection, and the most obvious, is that a dedication by Alexander the Great would have certainly found mention in the literary sources over and above that of a spurious context among artists. Yet we are all aware of the peculiar omissions by ancient writers, and perhaps one can even assume that Ephesos preferred to recall its proud rejection of Alexander’s offer rather than his dedications and benefactions.

Another valid objection is that if the Lansdowne Amazon (and her companion) had been set up in Augustan times, one would hardly expect the fact to have been forgotten less than a century later, when Pliny wrote. Here, however, one can counter that some statues now generally considered classicizing and of late Hellenistic date are mentioned by Pliny as the work of either Skopas or Praxiteles; one of them, a bronze statue of Janus, seems an unlikely subject for a fourth century Greek master, yet Pliny hesitates in attributing it, though this very statue was dedicated by Augustus. It is possible that an Augustan dedication in Ephesos would have been neglected by Pliny’s sources, while the sanctuary itself would have received greater glory from an attribution to famous fifth century masters, with a mistake made possible and abetted by the intentionally classical appearance of the Amazon and perhaps its direct imitation of a Pheidian prototype from the Athena Parthenos’ shield.

The Ephesos Relief. A more serious objection is represented by a relief which was found in Ephesos and which unquestionably represents the Lansdowne Amazon in two-dimensional form (pl. 3, fig. 13). This relief, which provides the best confirmation for the presence of the support in the original bronze work, was discovered in 1900 among material reemployed in the paving of the marble road in front of the Ephesos theater, at a considerable distance, therefore, from the Artemision. In recent years, however, Austrian excavations at the temple site have uncovered the foundations of a large altar, as well as fragments of architecture of the same kind as those found together with the Amazon relief. A. Bammer has therefore proposed a reconstruction of what he considers the fourth century altar of the Artemision, incorporating in it the architectural elements as well as the Amazon relief.

If the relief panel unquestionably belongs to this altar, and if the structure and its sculpture are safely dated after the fire of 356 B.C. but still within the fourth century, an Augustan date for the Lansdowne type would be, at the least, improbable. Though the original excavators of the relief seemed

84 For this statement, cf. C. C. Vermeule (supra n. 80) 169-170.
85 It is perhaps worth noting that the Attalid dedications spurred a series of comparable monuments not necessarily connected with the Pergamene victories against the Gauls and geographically widespread throughout the Mediterranean area. Statues of Gauls have been found at Egyptian Giza (or the Fayyum; cf. Bieber, 95 and fig. 373) as well as in Delos (J. Marcadé, Au Musée de Delos [Paris 1969] 127 pl. 80 a-b; Athens Nat. Museum. no. 247; at least one more statue of the same subject was found in the Agora of the Italians and dates from the first century B.C.), and dead Amazons were created in classicizing style: cf. the so-called Medusa Ludovisi (Bieber, figs. 452-453). Far from being Pergamene in style, this head is so strongly classicizing as to be almost in pure fifth century idiom; cf. the comments by P. Zanker, Helbig 4 no. 2343.
86 Statues by either Skopas or Praxiteles (the Niobids and the Janus) are mentioned by Pliny, NH 36.28. The Niobids have been dated to the first century B.C. by H. Weber, “Zur Zeitbestimmung der florentiner Niobiden,” JdI 75 (1960) 112-132.
87 It is pointless to repeat here the well-known facts about the interest of the Augustan period in classical motifs and Pheidian prototypes, as exemplified, for instance, by the Prima Porta statue of Augustus, the reliefs of the Ara Pacis, and the flourishing of the so-called Neoattic School.
89 Theoretically, it could still be argued that the relief came first and inspired a Neoattic artist to produce a statue in the round. How faithfully the relief imitates the statue is still an object of dispute; some scholars, e.g., Bammer, consider it quite accurate and very good work, others are less appreciative. Richter (Archaeology 111) calls it an “inferior version,” Eichler (supra n. 5) 7 describes it as stylistically very free; M. Ervin (supra n. 48) 114 states that the Amazon of the relief has been given “a good Attic head” which can find parallels in some fourth century Attic grave reliefs.
convinced that it was a classical Greek original, and Bammer stresses the difference in the marble (hard and large-grained, as contrasted with the less hard variety used in the Roman period) doubts have been raised as to the true date of the relief, and even of some elements of the architecture; it would therefore be possible to assume that the altar by and large belongs to the fourth century, but that it was extensively restored in Roman times, perhaps after the fire and destruction which are mentioned by some inscriptions. In that case the embellishment of the Roman period may have included the reproduction of a recent, famous dedication.

It may also be pointed out that the entire structure, as reconstructed by Bammer, seems unusual for the fourth century; its elaborate pi-shape and its Ionic colonnade make it a more plausible follower than forerunner of the great altars at Pergamon, Magnesia and Priene; the fence-like lattice work of the orthostats recalls the Ara Pacis. Since excavation is still continuing in the area of the Artemision, and more reports are forthcoming, it seems perhaps safer to leave open the question of the altar's date.

Hadrianic Copies. As a final objection we may consider the presence of a copy of the Lansdowne type in the sculptural program of the Canopus in Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli. Would a Hellenophile like Hadrian have reproduced a "Roman" creation instead of, or beside, other Greek works?

First, a date within the Augustan period or even a dedication by that Emperor do not automatically make the Amazon a Roman statue; the commission is likely to have been given to a Greek sculptor, probably from Asia Minor, as suggested especially by the drapery pattern. Second, the Villa included statuary with definite Roman subjects, such as the River Tiber. Finally, B. Kapossy has recently suggested that the arrangement of statues around the body of water in the Canopus was meant to symbolize the stationes of Hadrian's voyages. The Tiber represented Rome, his departure point; his three trips to Athens would be alluded to by the replicas of the Erechtheion Caryatids; the silenos figures, together with the River Nile statue, would represent Egypt; and the Amazons would stand for Ephesos. If this interpretation is valid, a famous classicizing Amazon may well be as representative of the city as an earlier monument.

Kapossy further suggests that the Mattei and Lansdowne Amazons at Tivoli had a second meaning. Set up in a position of preeminence, at the semicircular north end of the Euripos, they were accompanied by statues of Theseus and Hermes, the former symbolizing Hadrian, who often intentionally emulated Theseus, the latter representing Antinoos and his fate of death. The Amazons, who had been defeated by Theseus, would then be a symbol of Hadrian's Virtus, and this allegorical purpose would take precedence over the purely aesthetic consideration for reproducing a Greek original.

CONCLUSIONS

I shall now briefly summarize my conclusions. I believe that Pliny's account of a fifth century contest among sculptors is disproved by the style of the extant Amazon statues. The Capitoline type is truly fifth century, and must have formed the original core of the monument as known in Pliny's time, perhaps in conjunction with the figure re-determining the time of the replicas.) That Neoattic works could be extensively copied in later times is shown by many replicas of classicizing creations. On this subject see Ridgway, Severe Style, ch. 9, with bibl.

90 The Amazon relief has been dated to the Antonine period, for instance, by H. Lauter, Zur Chronologie römischer Kopien nach Originalen des 5. Jahrh. v. Chr. (Erlangen 1969) 119 and n. 599. For a possible Roman date of the egg-and-dart molding based on its shape, and for the general discussion of repairs to the altar in Roman times, see Bammer, AA 1968, 415-416 n. 36, who acknowledges a similar state of affairs for the altar of the Samian Heraion but considers the possibility unlikely for the Ephesian altar. For mentions of fire and ruins at the Artemision in the time of Claudius, see the inscriptions published and discussed by Dörner (supra n. 79).

91 It has long been recognized that not all works in Neoattic style were made by Athenian masters, and especially, not all in Athens. See W. Fuchs, EAA s.v. Neoatticitismo. The copies of the Lansdowne type listed by Lauter (supra n. 90) 116-119 date no earlier than A.D. 20, and are therefore perfectly compatible with an original made some time in the second half of the first century B.C. (Lauter, who assigns the type to Kreilas, is not interested in dating the original but only in


93 Note, for instance, that Hadrian adopted the Amazons as device for his cuirass, as in the statue in the Villa Albani, EA 3526. For the interpretation of the so-called Ares statue as Theseus see E. Berger, "Das Urbild des Kriegers aus der Villa Hadriana und die Marathonische Gruppe des Phidias in Delphi," RömMitt 65 (1958) 6-32. Without necessarily subscribing to the entire theory, I would accept the identification of the warrior as Theseus, but as Theseus/Hadrian and in connection with the Amazons. His helmet and shield are further proof that original Greek models were disregarded in favor of special renderings.

94 That sculptural groups could be enlarged by the addition of later works is shown by several examples. See, for instance,
produced by the Ephesos theater pier. A possible date for the two bronze statues would be ca. 440-430 B.C. The Mattei type, because of her torsional movement at hips and shoulders, her three-dimensional pose, her drapery which must be viewed from the side to reveal its arrangement and which subordinates tradition to compositional lines (the uncovered left breast), must belong to the late fourth century, perhaps the time of Alexander. Finally the Lansdowne type (as well as her probable pendant, the Doria-Pamphili Amazon) is a classicizing creation, probably by an Asia Minor artist, inspired by fifth century prototypes but executed during the first century B.C. For this date militate: 1) the presence of a virtually unnecessary support, unprecedented for bronzes before the Hellenistic period; 2) the gesture of the right arm which implies lassitude, a meaning which becomes popular only after the fourth century B.C.; 3) the elongated proportions, which are not classical but correspond well to later canons; and especially 4) the artificial arrangement of the quasi-transparent drapery, with its deep framing folds and its linear catenaries in between. This last motif is well exemplified in archaic sculpture of the first century B.C. and sets the lowest possible date for the Amazon. A connection with Augustus seems defensible on the basis of historical events and sources, yet the dating of the Lansdowne type does not stand or fall together with such historical framework. Whether Augustan or more generally late Hellenistic, this new chronology for the Amazon is, to my mind, firmly founded on an analysis of pose, iconography and style.

Another important, and more general conclusion should be drawn from this study: the recognition that the “Roman” period could produce first-rate works of high artistic value after the manner of classical Greek masters. These works were not true copies or even variants of Greek prototypes, but new originals which did not pedantically quote, but paraphrased and, as it were, translated into a new idiom, the styles of the major Greek sculptors. When these new creations have obvious Roman subjects and contexts, and are therefore datable on historical grounds, it is easy to recognize influences and distinguish contributions; but modern scholarship can be entirely at a loss when dealing with mythological subjects equally familiar and appealing to both Greeks and Romans. If we can recognize the vigor and inventiveness of Roman sculptors in historical reliefs and portraits, we should also admit the possibility that such qualities obtained also in the creation of cult images and mythological monuments, a lesson which the Sperlonga groups are forcefully beginning to impart. When a greater understanding of style and fashions has opened our eyes, it is likely that in many cases we shall no longer speak of Roman copies of a Greek original, but of Roman originals in Greek style, in a belated restitution to Caesar of what is Caesar’s.
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the case of the Hellenistic Niobids (E. Künzl, Frühellenistische Gruppen [Cologne 1968] 36 and n. 73), the Laokoon (P. von Blanckenhagen, “Laokoon, Sperlonga und Vergil,” AA 1969, 256-275 and esp. 261 listing other examples), and even the mention in Pliny (NH 34.71) of a quadriga by the fifth century master Kalamis to which Praxiteles added a charioteer.
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FIG. 8. Capua Aphrodite
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Fig. 11. Statue of M. Holconius Rufus from Pompeii
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Fig. 14. Tentative reconstruction of Amazon group